

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 13, 1969.

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

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 44 persons, 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.

Mr. LAWN presented a similar petition signed by 19 persons.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE presented a petition signed by 14 persons, stating that the signatories, being 16 years of age or older, were deeply convinced that the human baby began its life no later than the time of implantation of the fertilized ovum in its mother's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception), that any direct intervention to take away its life was a violation of its right to live, and that honourable members, having the responsibility to govern this State, should protect the right of innocent individuals, particularly the helpless. The petition also stated that the unborn child was the most innocent and most in need of the protection of our laws whenever its life was in danger. The signatories realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State, in circumstances claimed to necessitate it on account of the life of the pregnant woman. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would not amend the law to extend the grounds on which a woman

might seek an abortion but that, if honourable members considered that the law should be amended, such amendment should not extend beyond a codification which might permit current practice.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS**KENCO SCIENTIFIC**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had submissions from the proprietor of Kenco Scientific relating to the retention in South Australia of an effective private industry in connection with scientific glass-blowing. I understand similar submissions were made to the Premier last month in conjunction with submissions made at that time to the Chamber of Manufactures. Since I understand that the Premier wrote to Kenco Scientific saying that the matter would be examined by the department of which he is Minister, will he say what action has been taken by the Government to ensure the continuance of this industry in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to get a report for the Leader.

POINT TURTON

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the construction of a slipway at Point Turton?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Sketch plans and estimates are currently being prepared in connection with the proposal to provide a slipway at Point Turton to enable the matter to be further considered by the Fishing Havens Advisory Committee. The committee has agreed that such a facility is necessary, and earlier this year, when determining priorities for the provision of facilities for fishermen, classified this project as one that could be undertaken during the 1970-71 financial year.

LUCINDALE ROAD

Mr. CORCORAN: Yesterday the Attorney-General was good enough to tell me that he had a reply to my recent question about Main Road No. 298 in the South-East. Will he give that reply now?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Maintenance grants have always been made available to the District Council of Beachport to enable the portion of the Lucindale-Furner Main Road No. 298 within its district to be kept in reasonable condition. The council is at present in receipt of unexpended funds for this purpose.

BERRI EVAPORATION BASIN

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Berri evaporation basin?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Advantage was taken of a good flow in the Murray River last month to release water from the Berri evaporation basin. This was released via the valve in bank C, which does not discharge into Eckert Creek but which can only partially lower the basin. The increase in the salinity of the river was very small. As the flow in the river is now rising and is in excess of 11,000 cusecs, the valve in bank B discharging to Eckert Creek has been opened to lower further the level in the basin. A flow of 15,000 cusecs is expected within the next fortnight, which will ensure a good flow down Eckert Creek, and the valve will be closed before the peak arrives to make sure the saline water is passed down the river.

WALLAROO INDUSTRY

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about the suitability of sand at Wallaroo for glassmaking?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The General Manager of the South Australian division of Australian Consolidated Industries Limited has reported that samples of sand have been taken in the Wallaroo area to see whether they are suitable for glassmaking. Investigations are under way in many parts of the State, including the Wallaroo area, to determine the suitability of known sand reserves for use in glassmaking. When it has been ascertained whether the Wallaroo sands can be used for this purpose, I will make this known to interested parties.

COLEBROOK HOME

Mr. EVANS: As the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs said last week publicly and in the House that he had made an offer to United Aborigines Mission Incorporated to continue at Colebrook Home and as I have seen no public statement whether U.A.M. has accepted or rejected the offer, will the Minister now say whether he has received a reply from that organization?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am happy to say that I have a reply from U.A.M. which was handed to me only just before the House met and which states:

Dear Mr. Millhouse, Your letter of August 6, 1969, was duly considered at a meeting of the council of our mission held yesterday evening, and I now advise you as follows: For the sake of the Aboriginal children at present under our care in Colebrook Home we feel

we have no alternative other than to accept your offer to allow us to continue in occupancy for an indefinite period after the expiration of the lease on October 31, 1969. In accordance with your verbal assurance, we shall rely on your giving us reasonable notice before closing the home, in which connection you mentioned a period of six months' notice. Your acknowledgment of this letter would be appreciated. Yours sincerely, T. H. Elder (President of United Aborigines Mission Incorporated).

I will acknowledge the letter as soon as I am able to do so. I may say how pleased I am that U.A.M. has accepted the offer made to it, and I hope that it will be able to continue at Colebrook for some considerable time until there are plans for other use of the property.

WHYALLA REGISTRY OFFICE

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In the absence of the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday), I am attending to his Parliamentary affairs, and a reverend gentleman at Whyalla has written to the honourable member suggesting that a registry office be established in that city. The writer explains that at present most people who want to arrange a wedding in a registry office must make two trips to Port Augusta, at great cost. The writer also states that every day he is becoming more convinced of the necessity for such an office at Whyalla. Will the Attorney-General investigate this suggestion?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member mentioned this matter to me and showed me the letter before the House met today. The matter is strictly one for the Chief Secretary, to whom I will certainly convey the request and, if I may, show the letter referred to by the honourable member.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Watervale water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The current position with this scheme is that estimates of capital cost, annual cost, and revenue have been prepared. The Regional Engineer, Central, has the documents so that he may carry out a survey of potential ratepayers: this is considered most desirable, because of experience in other areas. Present indications are that the extension to serve Watervale is not economically attractive, a return on capital of less than 2 per cent being likely, with an annual operating deficit of about \$16,000. If the Regional Engineer's survey also discloses opposition to the scheme, it will be most difficult to justify recommending it.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION

Mr. LAWN: Yesterday questions were asked in the House about dissatisfaction in the Education Department, reference being made to resolutions passed by teachers in which the resignation of the present Minister of Education was requested. Today I have received a copy of a letter forwarded to the Premier by 65 members of the staff of the Enfield High School. The letter states, in part:

We, the undersigned members of the staff of the Enfield High School, wish to register our dismay at the Minister of Education's reply of—

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the honourable member ask the House for leave to read the letter?

Mr. LAWN: I thought my request for leave to make a brief explanation before asking the question included that. However, I ask for leave to read the letter.

Leave granted.

Mr. LAWN: The letter continues:

—June 27 to the letter from the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers of May 7, 1969, and inform you that it cannot be accepted as a satisfactory answer to the call for immediate action which was made to the Government last May. In addition, we are appalled by the discrepancy which exists between the amount stated by the Minister as being the Education Department's share of Consolidated Revenue and that which is revealed from the Estimates of Expenditure for the year ending June 30, 1969, and call on you to account publicly for this enormous discrepancy, an amount approaching \$24,000,000. Overcrowded classrooms, dissatisfied, frustrated and overworked teachers, inadequate buildings and equipment are indicative of a desperate need. We reiterate that education in South Australia is in a state of crisis.

I have read sufficient of the letter to convey to members the feelings of the staff. Will the Premier say whether he has received this letter from the Enfield High School and whether, because of the dissatisfaction among the staff of the Education Department and the obvious inefficient Minister at the head of that department, he intends to ask for the resignation of the Minister of Education?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In the light of my reply yesterday I consider that question to be somewhat offensive. The honourable member is taking up this matter for his own political ends, otherwise he would not, at this time, make a statement about the "inefficient" Ministerial head of the department. That is a slur that he cannot substantiate in any way. The honourable member refers to what he calls a crisis in education, but when he uses the

word in that sense he does not know the true meaning of "crisis". He knows full well that, when in Government, his Party conducted the finances of this State in such an inefficient way that the State is still paying the penalty for that maladministration. He knows that most Opposition members in the debate last year violently criticized this Government for introducing a stamp tax to raise further revenue, so at the one time he adopts the attitude of spend more and raise less—a completely irresponsible attitude. I suggest that, if the people to whom he refers have a grievance concerning finance, they should write to the honourable member and sheet the blame home where it belongs.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. EDWARDS: An area, just about half a mile above—

Members interjecting:

Mr. EDWARDS: —the Tod River reservoir in the Koppio Hills and along what is called Pillawarta Creek, is a lovely spot and members of the Koppio branch of the Country Women's Association and of the National Trust of that area would like this land to be set aside as a national reserve or park. Will the Minister of Lands consider making this area a national reserve?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Finding it easier to interpret what is plain and clear English, I understand "above" to mean upstream. So would most people, except members of the Opposition. I shall be pleased to examine the request, which has been made previously, although not whilst I have been in this office, in order to determine what action should be taken, and I will then inform the honourable member.

COCKBURN RAILWAY

Mr. CASEY: As the Attorney-General is aware of the gauge standardization programme between Broken Hill and Cockburn, will he obtain a progress report about that section of the line? Also, as South Australia is to assume control over this section, which is in New South Wales, will he obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport a comprehensive report on the duties of South Australian employees when the work is completed; whether they will be employed on the line of lode; whether the Silverton Tramway Company will continue to operate; whether the company will handle shunting of ore trucks on the line; and on other matters concerning the project?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will do my best to get this information.

ROLLING STOCK

Mr. VENNING: I understand that the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, has a reply to a question I asked on July 29 concerning the contracts let for rolling stock to be used in connection with gauge standardization in this State, and I should be pleased if the Attorney would give me the reply.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The contract has been awarded to Mechanical Handling Limited, of Woodville, for the manufacture of 52 steel standard gauge bulk grain hoppers. These waggons are of 53-ton capacity.

BUILDERS LICENSING

Mr. VIRGO: Last session I asked the Minister of Housing numerous questions about the appointment of members of the Builders Licensing Act Advisory Committee. The Minister's reply to me on February 13 was as follows:

The measure will receive priority as soon as we meet again, because it has already been delayed considerably.

When we met again, I raised the matter on June 19, and the Minister said that the final draft was before Cabinet. On August 6, the Minister informed the member for Onkaparinga, who apparently is opposed to the measure, as follows:

It will be dealt with at the Cabinet meeting tomorrow morning and further action will be taken next week.

On the following day the Minister told the member for Barossa:

It will be finalized on Monday . . . I will have a statement to make next week when the House re-assembles.

As the House re-assembled yesterday, will the Minister give me this long-awaited reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The House re-assembled yesterday and I replied to the member for Onkaparinga. If the honourable member was not here I am sorry, but the question was asked by the member for Onkaparinga and I told him that Cabinet had authorized the drafting of the amendments to the Bill.

Mr. Virgo: Why don't you answer the question I asked?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot ask half a dozen questions at once.

Mr. Virgo: When you get that sort of treatment from a Minister, you are entitled to ask—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Edwardstown is out of order. I will not warn him again.

Mrs. BYRNE: On August 7, I asked the Minister of Housing a question about the Builders Licensing Act, stating that I had received from a constituent correspondence containing a consulting engineer's report of one and a half pages outlining structural defects in my constituent's house. The Minister replied that, if I cared to give him a copy of this letter, he would have the case examined. If I furnish him with copies of other correspondence containing similar complaints, will he also have those cases examined?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, certainly.

LOAD PERMITS

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of July 31 about load permits on wide vehicles?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Under the provisions of the Road Traffic Act, wide-load permits are issued by the Road Traffic Board not the Transport Control Board. The Road Traffic Board has not delegated this authority to the Police Department, as wide loads are frequently also overheight, overlength or overweight. This latter feature requires engineering knowledge of roads and bridges in order to determine whether or not the permit should be issued. In view of these factors and to maintain State-wide consistency in the operation of overdimensional vehicles, all permits are issued from the one source. Where an overwidth vehicle only has to be shifted regularly over a prescribed route the board does issue annual permits to avoid individual issues for each trip.

COPPER

Mr. McKEE: The Premier may recall that last session I asked whether, because of the copper deposits to be worked at Mount Gunson in the near future and because of the possibility of other deposits of copper being discovered in the State, the Government would consider establishing a lead smelting works at Port Pirie. The Minister of Works, on a visit to Port Augusta, said that this State had the potential for additional mineral discoveries in northern areas. Can the Premier now say whether production has commenced at Mount Gunson and whether the Government considers that the project there is large enough to warrant the establishment of such an industry in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government has recently approved a water supply scheme for Mount Gunson, as part of the build-up to the operation of the project. Although I believe that it is not yet working as a full-scale project, I will have a report prepared concerning the operation of the Mount Gunson mine, including associated matters and the particular reference that the honourable member makes to the possible setting up of a smelter and its likely location.

EDUCATION GRANTS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: It was announced last evening by the Commonwealth Treasurer, when introducing a well-received Commonwealth Budget, that, as from the beginning of next year, that Government intended to pay to independent schools \$35 in respect of each child attending primary school and \$50 in respect of each child attending secondary school. Can the Premier assure the House that the State Government's payments of \$10 for children attending independent primary schools and \$20 for those attending independent secondary schools in this State will continue next year?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member is correct in saying that a well-received Budget was introduced last evening, and it will obviously result in the re-election of the Gorton Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Gorton Government has obviously followed the lead given by South Australia in the matter of per capita grants to students attending independent schools. Indeed, the South Australian Government is pleased to know that those grants which it initiated in this State, on the fulfilment of our election promise, now stand at \$10 for children attending a primary school and \$20 for secondary schoolchildren. This Government is gratified that this will amount to a substantial annual per capita payment in conjunction with the Commonwealth payment. The State payment will not be reduced: it will continue and will provide substantial assistance in relation to the continued activities of the independent schools in our community.

Mr. HUDSON: I am pleased that the member for Angas led the way for me in this matter. Last evening's Budget paid no attention to the needs of Government schools, although it did, as the honourable member has said, make certain grants available to

independent schools. Will the Minister of Education say what protests she has made in the past to the Commonwealth Government about the lack of Commonwealth aid on a per capita basis for Government primary and secondary schools? Further, as a result of the announcement made last evening, will she say what protests she intends to make now to the Commonwealth Government about the virtual complete neglect of the special problems and difficulties associated with the Government schools as distinct from those experienced by independent schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Perhaps the member for Glenelg did not see the press announcement in Saturday morning's newspaper that the terms of reference for a nation-wide survey to be made of the needs of education had been agreed to by all Ministers of Education in Australia; that the facts gathered by those making the survey would be collated and presented at the next meeting of the Australian Council of Education; and that a joint approach would then be made to the Commonwealth Government. Concerning schools in the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory, the Commonwealth Government is joining with the States in preparing the information necessary for this survey. Last evening, the Commonwealth Treasurer, in presenting the Budget, and in speaking specifically of education, referred to continuing help in the field of teacher education and said that the Government would continue and, in fact, increase the capital grants made for the provision of buildings for teachers colleges.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Although last evening's Budget provided more than \$24,000,000 for independent schools, the Minister has pointed out that it is necessary for the State schools to have an inquiry before assistance is considered. In view of the crisis in education in this State and the embarrassment that shortage of finance has caused the Minister in recent weeks, will she complain to the Prime Minister about the current situation?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: No; at this stage I do not intend to do so because, in common with other Ministers of Education throughout Australia, we believe there is a proper way of doing this. If the honourable member studies the text of the press release made on Saturday, he will see the wide coverage given to all the needs of primary and secondary education. On the basis of what will be collated, an approach will then be

made to the Commonwealth Government. I hope that, perhaps next year, on the basis of that report and approach, the Commonwealth will enter the fields of primary and secondary education.

WEEDS

Mr. GILES: The Minister of Lands, in reply to a question I asked last week about noxious weeds, said that extra research facilities, as well as other practical help, would be made available and that research work was currently being carried out by the Agriculture Department on eradicating African daisy. Will the Minister now ask the Minister of Agriculture whether biological work is being carried out on the control of this weed and, if it is, what it entails?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I personally do not know of any such work being carried out, but I will refer the question to my colleague.

PORT ADELAIDE STATION

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about renovation work to take place at the Commercial Road (Port Adelaide) railway station?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As a first stage towards reconditioning the station, tenders were invited for a long-term lease of the ground floor area. However, this proved to be abortive, and, as a result, Railways Department plans for remodelling the station are now being prepared and work is expected to commence this financial year.

WEST LAKES SCHEME

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about West Lakes planning regulations?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Fifth Schedule to the West Lakes Indenture contains planning regulations which substantially follow the model planning regulations drawn up by the Director of Planning. The regulations "zone" the land within the West Lakes scheme into residential, shopping, business, and industrial zones. Until the major works of the scheme (which include the excavation of the lake with outlet pipes to the sea and ancillary works and the reclamation of land from swamp areas) have been completed, the planning regulations may be varied only by the consent of the development corporation. The draft Bill to give effect to the scheme provides that the Minister of Marine

may, subject to the consent of the developers, vary the regulations contained in the indenture. If the corporation fails to give consent, the matter is subject to arbitration.

The Minister of Marine could give notice of any proposed amendments, and any person desiring to make submissions as to the amendment of existing regulations, or as to why any proposed amendments should not be made, could submit such submissions to him. After the major works have been completed, the provisions of the Planning and Development Act concerning making of planning regulations will operate in the normal way. I point out that at the date hereof the draft Bill has not yet been approved by Cabinet.

GERANIUM AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently the Minister of Works wrote to me informing me that his department intended to do something about the disposal of effluent at the Geranium Area School. I point out to the Minister that, when I was at the school last Saturday, effluent from the pond was lapping the edge of the main road. As this is a rather serious problem about which something needs to be done, will the Minister have it looked at as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will look into the problem to which the honourable member has referred. As I should hate to see this effluent on the road, I will get a report as soon as possible on the ponding problems he has raised.

PARK LANDS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question whence, when the north-south arterial road is placed through the park lands, other land to replace the park lands will be obtained?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The new roadway proposed for the south park lands is a relocation of a short section of the Glen Osmond Road. In effect this means the reduction in road area and an increase in the area of park lands, as the Glen Osmond Road is thereby shortened. The new roadway in the north park lands is again the relocation of the existing LeFevre Road, and the overall proposal in this area will reduce the amount of road area and substantially increase the area of the park lands, as two other roadways will also be closed.

SOCIAL WORKERS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to my recent question about social workers?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Social Welfare Department has a total of 72 social work staff appointed to its field branch. A further 16 people from a departmental training course are attached to the branch on a part-time basis to obtain practical experience under the supervision of selected officers. Those trainees who successfully complete both the theoretical and practical parts of the 12 months' course will be appointed to the field branch about the end of 1969. The numbers of field (social work) staff and trainees at the various offices of the department are as follows:

Location	Number of field staff	Number of trainees
Head office, Adelaide	41	7
District office, Brighton	5	3
District office, Elizabeth	7	1
District office, Enfield	4	2
District office, Mount Gambier	1	—
District office, Port Adelaide	9	3
District office, Port Augusta	2	—
District office, Whyalla	3	—
Total	72	16

Five staff (two welfare officers and three probation officers) operate in the area of the city of Tea Tree Gully.

LEASES

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands told me yesterday that he had a reply to my recent question about perpetual leases. Will he give it now?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked whether any significant reduction had taken place in the number of applications for freeholding of perpetual lease land since the removal of the area and value limitations on holdings in last year's amendment to the Crown Lands Act. It is difficult to answer that. When the honourable member asked the question, I thought I could produce figures to indicate the trend, but that is not possible because, when the Government announced its policy of freeholding land where required, there were many applications and even more inquiries. As I explained in replying to the question the other day, there have been modifications in our procedure as we have tried to streamline it by giving to people, when they inquire about freeholding, estimates rather than true valuations. Through this

means, people may decide that the likely price is too high and not bother about the matter further. Since the limitations were removed there have not been so many applications. However, it is obvious that, after the Government's announcement, most people who were interested applied or inquired then, so that the number coming in now would be relatively small, comprising people who have since made up their minds, and there are not many of these people. Several applications are at present at varying stages of attention with the department.

UNION FUNDS

Mr. VENNING: With employment today, it is necessary, and in most, if not all, cases compulsory, to pay a fee to an appropriate union. I believe that the Australian Labor Party, at election time, is permitted to draw on such union funds for election expenses, etc. As many unionists would be Liberal and Country League supporters, can the Premier say whether it would not be reasonable and possible (indeed probable) for the L.C.L. to participate in such funds in a way similar to the way the A.L.P. participates?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am afraid that I do not know all of the internal workings of the trade union movement in relation to its funds or the way it collects them or disposes of them. From time to time I contact members of the movement in my capacity as Premier, but I have not discussed this matter with them. I assume some unions make payments to the A.L.P. for election purposes. If I am correct in that assumption, I believe this would be a voluntary payment to the A.L.P., and therefore that Party could not draw on funds, as the honourable member expressed it. As I say, I believe this would be a voluntary payment by the trade unions, but my friends opposite may put me right on this. Therefore, if the L.C.L. were to share in this, it would have to be a voluntary payment to the L.C.L.

Mr. Broomhill: And that's not likely!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Because of this Government's magnificent record in industrial development, providing thousands more jobs in South Australia, I look forward confidently to the day when the unions will make such payments as they desire to the L.C.L.

TRADES HALL

Mr. HURST: I wish to ask a question of the Premier, although possibly in his absence I should ask it of the Treasurer.

Mr. Hudson: Perhaps the Premier has been invited—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg must restrain himself. The honourable member cannot dominate this Parliament while I am in the Chair.

Mr. HURST: Perhaps the Treasurer will be good enough to convey my question to the Premier. It arises from the question asked by the cockie from Rocky relating to the trade union movement. According to a press report that I noticed the other day, the Premier has apparently declined representations made by members of the trade union movement for assistance in the building of a new trades hall, which is a worthy project of the movement. Having noted the interest shown by members opposite in the trade union movement, I ask the Treasurer to try to convince the Premier that he should seek to persuade members on his side to realize the worth of this project, with a view to their donating a few thousand bricks to construct the new building.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know to whom the member was referring when he mentioned the cockie from Rocky. I suggest that he should observe the usual courtesies and refer to the honourable member concerned by his proper title.

Mr. Hudson: Is it rude—

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: We often hear that wellknown horse laugh from the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Hudson: Why blame me?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I suggest that the honourable member have that matter attended to, for the benefit of everyone. However, that is by the way. The matter raised by the member for Semaphore was not one for the Premier's decision alone. The Premier received submissions from representatives of the Trades Hall, and I understand he discussed the matter at some length with them and, on being asked for the first time, replied that the matter would be considered. The matter was considered by the Government, and the Premier's reply to the representatives concerned was in accordance with the Government's wishes in this matter. I know that the honourable member does not suggest that there was any lack of consideration or any discourtesy by the Premier. Indeed, I do not think the representatives of Trades Hall suggested that; on the contrary, I think they appreciated that they were well received and that their case was well

considered. I have already made representations on this matter to the Premier, and I cannot see that the decision can now be altered. If the honourable member desires to press this matter with members on this side, that is always his prerogative, and perhaps he can convince them. There is no point, I suggest, in taking this matter any further.

Mr. Corcoran: He was only asking—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer is answering the question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am sorry if I have misunderstood the question. If the honourable member cares to ask his question again in more specific terms, I may get the gist a little better. The answer given was a considered one, and it was not on the Premier's own decision but on that of the Government.

ROADSIDE SALES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question about children selling fruit from roadside stalls?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: This matter has been raised and investigated several times during the past few years. Where children are employed it has been found that they are members of the proprietors' families. There is, therefore, no control over the hours they work or the conditions under which they work. I have referred the matter to the Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government for comment regarding control of roadside sales.

NARACOORTE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Education now reply to my question regarding the provision of an opportunity class at the Naracoorte Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The present policy of the Education Department is to set up opportunity classes if there is a minimum of 12 children awaiting placement in such a class, with the possibility of more in the district qualifying for admission. Records held in the Psychology Branch of the Education Department show that there are 11 children in the general area of Naracoorte awaiting placement, at least one of whom would not be close enough to travel daily to such a class. Therefore, the position has not been reached yet where an opportunity class could be established at Naracoorte and the Education Department does not intend to establish one there next year.

BAROSSA SCHOOLS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about completion of the Ridgehaven and Holden Hill Primary Schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is hoped that the Ridgehaven Primary School will be completed by December and Holden Hill by mid-January. If these time tables can be adhered to, both schools will open for the new school year commencing on February 3, 1970.

POTATOES

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport the information I sought about the importation of potatoes from Western Australia?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states that the monthly tonnages of potatoes imported from Western Australia for the year 1968-69 were as follows:

<i>Month</i>	<i>Weight</i>	
July, 1968	777 tons	10cwt. 1qr.
August, 1968	1,506 tons	5cwt. 2qr.
September, 1968	667 tons	8cwt. 0qr.
October, 1968	109 tons	5cwt. 3qr.
November, 1968	118 tons	10cwt. 0qr.
December, 1968	224 tons	3cwt. 3qr.
January, 1969	Nil	
February, 1969	Nil	
March, 1969	Nil	
April, 1969	Nil	
May, 1969	Nil	
June, 1969	Nil	
Total	3,403 tons	3cwt. 1qr.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question about the provision of traffic lights?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The provision of pedestrian crossings and associated traffic lights is the responsibility of the individual local government authorities and, accordingly, there is no overall priority list for their installation. No Government financial assistance is given for the provision of pedestrian crossings, but their installation does require the previous approval of the Road Traffic Board. As far as can be ascertained, there is no undue delay in the supply of equipment for pedestrian crossings, as this equipment is currently manufactured within Australia.

UPPER MURRAY POLICE
HEADQUARTERS

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Premier received from the Chief Secretary a reply to my question about the effects that the new police facilities to be built at Berri will have on the existing facilities at Renmark?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although office space has been included for Criminal Investigation Branch personnel in the plans for the new divisional headquarters building to be erected at Berri, it is not intended to move the main C.I.B. unit from its present base at Renmark within the foreseeable future. The fact that Renmark is a point of entry to, and departure from, South Australia for certain of the criminal element has always been a major consideration in deciding the policing requirements in the area. If there should be any change in the crime situation in the future, the position would have to be re-assessed.

TAILEM BEND WATER SCHEME

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Works now reply to my question about the provision of water services indirectly from the Tailem Bend to Keith main?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: During the construction of the first stage of the Tailem Bend to Keith main, namely, the section from Tailem Bend to the tank at Binnies Lookout, there was no prospect of any branch mains being laid in the near future. In these circumstances, there was no restriction on the laying of indirect services from this section of the main. This is contrary to the normal policy of the department for mild steel concrete-lined mains. In accordance with this policy, the owners of properties abutting the steel main which will be rated are approached before the pipes are laid and the location of direct services for these properties is decided upon. The service connections are made to the pipes before they are laid so that repairs can be carried out to the inside cement mortar lining. The making of these connections to the steel pipes is more costly than in the case of cast iron and asbestos cement pipes, and indirect services are not laid for properties which will be subsequently supplied from branch mains. The department does not, except in unusual circumstances, subsequently make additional service connections to the completed steel main, because it is not possible to repair the internal cement mortar lining or to remove from the pipe the pieces of this lining dislodged by the drilling of the hole through the pipe. The decision of

the Commonwealth Government to grant the State up to \$6,000,000 towards the cost of the trunk main, plus branch main, should make it possible to complete the laying of all branch mains within four years and, in view of the changed circumstances, the department has applied the normal policy to the section of the main from Binnies Lookout to Keith.

PORT AUGUSTA BRIDGE

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about Commonwealth activities in the construction of a railway bridge to service the proposed line between Port Augusta and Whyalla?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although I have written to the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner about this matter, I have not yet received a reply.

Mr. McKEE: The Premier says that he had written to the Commonwealth Government seeking information from it in respect of this project. As I understand that work has commenced on the project at Port Augusta, I am surprised to think that the Premier of this State is unaware of such a project going on within his State. It appears to me that he has been instructed by the Commonwealth Government to keep this project quiet and that the announcement would be made in respect of this matter—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. McKEE: It seems to me that the Premier has been instructed not to announce the project because, as I said before—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. McKEE: Will the Premier be allowed to make the announcement in regard to the bridge or will the Commonwealth Government make it at an appropriate time because of the forthcoming Commonwealth elections?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It would appear that the member for Port Pirie has the post-Budget jitters. I listened with interest to his criticism disguised as a question. Despite that criticism, I still intend to carry out my original intention and to obtain the very best information I can for the honourable member. I know that he would not want me to give an off-the-cuff answer that might omit certain information that could be important

to him. Therefore, I am using my best endeavours and my department's facilities to obtain for him all the information I can, so that he will be fully informed. Although he lives closer to the work and therefore might be expected to know more about the project than I, I will find out all I can so that he may give his constituents all the information obtainable.

BARLEY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of last week about barley storages?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of the Australian Barley Board states:

Barley that has been sold for progressive delivery will be cleared before harvest. There remain about 1,000,000 bushels, which we are endeavouring to sell for export. If the endeavour is successful, all storages will be empty before the 1969-70 harvest.

BREAD

Mr. HURST: I understand that representatives of parties in the baking trade have approached the Minister of Labour and Industry with a draft Bill affecting the bread-baking industry. As this matter is urgent, can the Minister say whether the Government intends to introduce such a Bill immediately?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have had many approaches from the various sections of the baking industry: from the two unions concerned, from representatives of the Bread Manufacturers Association of South Australia (metropolitan section) and from its country section, and from some bakers who are not members of the manufacturers association. As recently as last week I had a discussion with representatives of the executive of the Bread Manufacturers Association. The honourable member is not correct in his chronological order, because the Bill to which he referred was first presented to the former Government but was not agreed to. Subsequently, it was presented to me and to the Chief Secretary, who is interested in this matter because of the health aspects involved. The Government is not prepared to accept the Bill, because it has features that we believe are undesirable. The Government appreciates the objects of the baking industry that are contained in the Bill, but the Bill as presented is not satisfactory.

About two weeks ago I put a proposal to the executive of the association and asked it to confer: last week I was told that my

proposal was not acceptable, and we are having further discussions on this matter. I believe the association held its annual general meeting yesterday, but I have not heard what eventuated. At present, no baking occurs at the weekend in the metropolitan area, although fresh bread is coming into the city at weekends from the country. Some bread is being sold, or offered for sale, in shops at weekends under the guise of fresh bread, and two weeks ago I made an announcement about this. Some bread is being partially baked during the week, reheated on Saturday night or Sunday morning, and then displayed in shops as fresh bread. I draw the attention of members and of the general public to this position because, obviously, this is not fresh bread, although reheating the bread does not contravene the law.

Following last week's discussions both parties are considering the matters that were canvassed at that meeting, and we hope that a solution will be achieved. The major problem, which was caused by the heavy influx of fresh bread on weekends and which was aggravated by the amount of illegal weekend baking in the city, has largely disappeared. I think that it was this problem that caused much concern to members of the baking industry, both employers and employees. I hope that the present discussions will lead to an amicable settlement that will not require the introduction of such a Bill as that referred to by the honourable member, although minor legislation may be required eventually.

BLACK FOREST LAND

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the purchase of additional land in Forest Avenue, Black Forest, for use by the department?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Although repeated efforts have been made to contact the owner of the land to which the honourable member refers, no replies have been received and the owner's address is at present unknown. A further effort will be made to contact the owner with a view to his accepting an offer to purchase. If this approach fails, consideration will be given to the compulsory acquisition of the property. For the information of the honourable member, an area on the opposite side of the department's land measuring 54ft. by 164ft. has recently been purchased and is a valuable addition. When the property that the department is at present seeking has been obtained, steps can be taken to develop the whole area as playing fields for the Black Forest Demonstration School.

GAS

Mr. JENNINGS: Members would be aware that during the Address in Reply debate many references were made to natural gas, which is to be produced in South Australia soon. The Minister of Works knows that my district will be the first in the metropolitan area to receive natural gas.

Mr. Hudson: Due, no doubt, to the very special nature of representations made by the member for the district.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg is out of order. Please restrain yourself.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. The member for Glenelg is out of order, but on this occasion he is correct.

Mr. Venning: Not very often, though.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rocky River is out of order.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, he is out of order, but he is not correct. Having studied the references made in that debate and having heard the Minister say how the time is now getting fairly imminent, I have had formal approaches made to me by important organizations in my district to find out whether the Minister has information for them about the dangers they consider might be inherent in natural gas as a result of the accidents that have occurred in Victoria and as a result of the odourless nature of natural gas, although I understand that it will not be entirely odourless. Will the Minister of Works give me a considered reply on this matter so that I can allay the fears of people in my district?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I think it was only yesterday that I gave these assurances following discussions I had with the General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company last week, and following assurances I had given. From the information that has been supplied to me I know that the company has gone to considerable lengths (in fact, to extraordinary lengths in some cases) to provide the public with adequate safeguards. The matter that came to a head in Melbourne a week ago was investigated by the company concerned here in Adelaide, and, although there was no need for the company to take special precautions about some appliances, it decided in the interest of the public and in its own interest, to adopt a certain procedure and fit a certain device at its own expense. I repeat the assurances I gave yesterday that all precautions are being taken, and I believe that some of these fears are being exaggerated.

Concerning the odour of the gas, by law towns gas and bottled gas have to be stench (that is the official term). A chemical, the name of which is unpronounceable, is introduced into the gas for this purpose. Legislation will be introduced before November 3 this year, when natural gas is scheduled to come onto line, to bring up to date the Gas Act and other legislation because the calorific value of natural gas is about 1,000 British thermal units compared with 500 b.t.u. in towns gas. At the same time, the legislation will provide for the mandatory stenching and odourization of natural gas. This is an added precaution the honourable member seeks, so that natural gas will have this other safeguard that other fuels do not possess at present.

TEACHER ALLOWANCES

Mr. VIRGO: Some time ago the Minister of Education announced that she had appointed a committee to inquire into the allowances paid to students at the various teachers colleges. I am led to believe that, as a result of the committee's inquiries, the Minister took action not only to amend the amounts payable but to vary the basis for such payments. Will the Minister supply the House with a copy of the committee's report, together with its recommendations and a table detailing the outcome of actions she has taken as a result of it?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will consider this matter.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. HUDSON: On July 30, I directed a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, and asked for a report on the commencement and completion dates for the work to be carried out on Brighton Road by the Highways Department. I also asked whether or not any special arrangements were being made to minimize interference with the shopping centre at Brighton. As I understand the Attorney now has a reply, I should be pleased if he would give it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The reconstruction and widening of Brighton Road is programmed to commence at the southern end in October, 1969, and is expected to extend to Sturt Road by the end of the current financial year. Although it is hoped that construction between Sturt Road and Stopford Road can commence early in 1970-71, this date is dependent on land acquisition and alterations to premises and is largely uncertain at this stage. Although every effort will be made to

reduce to a minimum any inconvenience to motorists and landowners, it is impossible in a work of this nature to avoid all temporary inconvenience. It is therefore inevitable that there will be some temporary interruption to the full and free access of customers to the shops when construction is carried out adjacent to the Brighton shopping centre.

HILLS FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of July 31 regarding the Hills Freeway?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The location of the freeway in this area is difficult to describe accurately. In general, it can be described as passing through land owned by the Morello Jersey Stud Company and on the southern boundary of land owned by the Littlehampton Brickworks, K. and R. Childs and the recreation reserve on the eastern end of Littlehampton. However, if the honourable member wishes more accurate information, the Minister of Roads and Transport has supplied me with a plan, which the honourable member may peruse, if he wishes to see me later.

KINGSTON SOUTH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 7 regarding the Kingston South water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have a reply for the honourable member, but I am afraid that I cannot add very much to my previous reply to him. The possibility of extending mains into the Kingston South area has been examined on several occasions, the most recent being in April, 1967, but has not been recommended. In the meantime, the demand for water has increased in Kingston township and approval has been given to drill a new bore and equip it, to enlarge the pumping equipment on the three existing bores, and to lay a new 8in. main in Kingston township to improve the distribution in the town. All of this work is now well in hand and will be operating for the coming 1969-70 summer. The improved distribution and availability of water will undoubtedly affect the total consumption in Kingston, and until this has been gauged and satisfied it is not possible to further consider the practicability of extending the existing scheme to Kingston South. The economics of extending the water supply scheme to Kingston South will be deferred until after this coming summer, when the department will

have been able to measure the effectiveness and total capacity of the improvements that have been made to the existing scheme.

COKE

Mr. ALLEN: Recently, I was approached by a person in my district regarding the availability of domestic coke supplies. He was in the process of removing a slow combustion stove and replacing it with an electric stove, and claimed he had been informed that, as a result of the advent of natural gas supplies to this State, there was a possibility of a shortage of domestic coke. Because many people in the country rely on domestic coke for heating purposes, will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the likely availability of domestic coke after natural gas comes to Adelaide?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will certainly obtain a report for the honourable member. I know that at present the Port Pirie plant is manufacturing gas from light virgin naphtha. The Brompton plant is working on refinery products, and I understand that the Osborne plant is still on coal. I understand further that the Osborne plant will be switched to natural gas when it arrives. I am not sure whether the Colonial Gas Company's plant at Mount Gambier works on coal or refinery products.

Mr. Corcoran: Refinery products.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: So there would be no coke available there. I will obtain a report for the honourable member, indicating what the position will be after the advent of natural gas.

FERRIES

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, ascertain what is the construction cost and the annual running and maintenance costs of a ferry at a major river crossing in this State?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will get that information.

ABALONE LICENCES

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture how many licences are issued in this State for abalone fishing and whether this number represents the maximum number of licences to be issued?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

OAKLANDS PARK

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Immigration and Tourism a reply to the question I asked last week concerning an assurance being given that the gum trees along the Sturt River in the national pleasure resort would not be disturbed as a result of the widening of the river?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Section 1507 is held by the Public Buildings Department, having been reserved for possible hospital use. The adjoining section (1508) comprises the Oaklands national pleasure resort. The Sturt River bisects both sections, and a strip running down the western edge of their combined lengths will be involved in straightening the stream. I am referring this matter to the Minister of Roads and Transport so that he, in turn, may refer it to the Highways Commissioner, with a view to seeking an assurance that the removal of red gums during the straightening work will be kept to a minimum.

LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister of Lands will be aware that, in relation to any acquisition by the Highways Department of property affected by freeway proposals, where the department's valuation exceeds \$20,000 the valuation is then referred to the Land Board (at least, I understand that is the procedure). A problem has been referred to me which I took up with the Minister's Secretary on Monday, and I was informed that a delay of some weeks would occur before a final determination could be made on an appropriate valuation for the property concerned. The person involved has to settle on Friday, and a series of other chain settlements depends on this one. The delay involved in this case is greater than the normal delay, because of the department's estimated valuation exceeding \$20,000. Will the Minister of Lands investigate this matter, first, to see whether or not the current procedures adopted can be expedited as a result of, say, appointing an additional valuer; and, secondly, to see whether or not in this kind of case a letter of intention can be provided to the person concerned, so that the necessary bridging finance can be obtained to cover the person between the day of making the settlement and the time when the money is paid by the Highways Department?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will examine this matter. True, the Land Board exercises a general supervision over valuing that takes place within Government departments in matters involving more than a certain sum,

varying according to the type of property; but the \$20,000 is correct, I think, in the case of house acquisition. I will examine the member's question and get a reply as quickly as possible, probably tomorrow.

KANGARILLA JUNCTION

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about a junction at Kangarilla?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Kangarilla junction as constructed is negotiable by any vehicle without difficulty. Some drivers who are unfamiliar with the junction are negotiating it in an incorrect manner. The layout is currently under review in order to minimize such incorrect manoeuvres, and any modified plans will be finalized soon. These modifications have not been finally decided on but could include the widening of the McLaren Vale approach and minor alterations to the shape and size of islands.

DOCTORS' FEES

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about doctors' fees?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Secretary of the Australian Medical Association states that my letter dated June 23, 1969, setting out the Government's views regarding the increase in fees from July 1, 1969, was printed verbatim in the July issue of the association's monthly notice. There are 14,000 members in South Australia and the notice was sent to each member, including general practitioners and specialists.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Premier said that letters had been sent to 14,000 members of the association: possibly there is an extra nought on that figure that should not be there. Does the Premier believe the letter has had any effect on the situation and, if he does not, will he say what further steps he intends to take?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Since giving my reply to the honourable member, I, too, have been alarmed at the figure "14,000". From my layman's knowledge, I would not expect there to be that many doctors to serve a population of about 1,200,000, so I will have that figure checked. I believe that my letter has been received with mixed feelings, and I speak only on the basis of the contacts I have personally with the medical profession. I understand some doctors agree with the sentiments expressed in the letter and some do not.

As individuals, they will fix their fees as they see fit, some fixing them up to the maximum and some charging less than the maximum. The Government will take no further action than has already been taken. Honourable members will know that the Government does not enter into price control in this matter, and it does not intend to venture further into this field of professional fees charged by medical practitioners.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. VIRGO: On February 5, the Attorney-General, in reply to a question asked both by the member for Unley and by me, said that the Colonel Light Gardens Inquiry Committee had held its first meeting on January 24, deciding on a certain line of action. Since then the Attorney-General and I have had the opportunity to present evidence to the committee, but I have heard nothing more about the progress it has made. Will the Attorney-General (I presume through his colleague the Minister of Local Government) inquire to see whether the committee has completed its work and, if it has not, to find out when it expects to bring down its report?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

MINING

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question whether the South Australian Government was represented at a meeting of Upper Murray graziers concerning future mining in the area by large mining companies?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No representative from South Australia attended the meeting on July 23. The meeting was called by landholders in the Murray Valley protesting against the action of mining interests who were thought to be initiating prospecting activities in the Murray Valley. Prospecting involves dangers to the catchment only should large-scale mining eventuate. The soil conservation services of both New South Wales and Victoria take a very active interest in protecting the catchment from damage during mining operations. In the past, there has been considerable activity and the control exercised has always been adequate in preservation of catchment efficiency. There is no reason to suggest that this situation will not be maintained.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 30 relating to the proposed provision of subsidies for schools for this financial year, and asking

whether or not there had been any general reduction in the department's own contribution to subsidies in view of the increased funds available from the Commonwealth for school libraries?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As one step in implementing the Commonwealth assistance for secondary school libraries, all secondary schools in South Australia were recently advised of a sum of money which has been allocated to each school as a special sum to upgrade the book collection. This allocation has been provided as a special assistance to secondary school libraries and is not intended in any way to replace the normal subsidy programme for the purchase of library books. The total sum of money made available for subsidies for secondary schools in 1969-70 was about the same as for 1968-69. However, there has been a greater demand for special subsidies for the development of playing fields in a number of older schools which were denied these facilities in the past. This has had the effect of reducing the sum of money which can be made available for general purposes, including the purchase of library books.

There has been no attempt to use Commonwealth funds to replace subsidy moneys normally used for the purchase of library books. The Commonwealth money is additional and provides a considerable increase in the sum available for library books in 1969 (not a slight increase, as suggested by the honourable member). Although some individual schools may have less subsidy money in 1969-70, other schools with special needs will have been granted a larger sum. The basis of the allocation of subsidy money has been to provide a fair distribution of the available funds, having regard to the particular needs of individual schools.

MOUNT GAMBIER RENTS

Mr. BURDON: Some time ago I presented to the House a petition concerning house rents in Mount Gambier. Amongst the signatories to the petition were public servants, mill workers and people working in the forests. During a subsequent debate on this matter, I gained the impression that the Minister of Housing had indicated that my representations on behalf of people living in the forest areas, particularly the isolated areas, would be further considered. Will the Minister say what consideration has been given to the question, what

action has been taken, and what is the current situation in relation to the employees on whose behalf I presented the petition?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept that the situation as outlined by the honourable member is correct. Yesterday, when the member for Millicent asked me a question about this matter, particularly with regard to Woods and Forests Department houses at Mount Burr, I told him that I would look into the matter to see how far the re-assessment of the rents had gone. Regarding persons in the forestry areas around Mount Gambier, particularly those living in small groups in isolated forest areas, the Public Service Board, in a directive to heads of departments issued at about the time of, or immediately subsequent to, the announcement of the new rentals, instructed departments to advise the Public Service Board about departmental employees who were living in remote areas, or in special circumstances of that kind. This directive applied not only to employees of the Woods and Forests Department but also to certain other employees, such as employees of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, who were obliged to live in certain places. This was a particular instruction given by the board in its circular and, although I have not a copy of the circular with me now, I will remember it. I assume that the Forestry Board, in terms of this instruction, would have advised the Public Service Board of the names of the persons in the Forestry Board's employ who were so situated. I will follow the matter up to find out the result of this general inquiry, and I will let the honourable member know.

Mr. Corcoran: Would it apply to other places in the South-East?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, it would apply to all persons living in isolated areas who have to observe special requirements, such as where houses are supplied and, in terms of their employment, they must occupy them.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

Mr. VIRGO: On October 1, 1968, I asked the Attorney-General whether he would obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport a report on the progress being made as a result of a statement by the Minister, reported in the *Advertiser* of July 31, that he had called for a comprehensive report on planning for and improvements to the Adelaide railway station. The Attorney's reply to me was a short "Yes" but, unfortunately, despite a long wait, there

has been a vacuum. Therefore, will the Attorney again make a note of this matter and carry out his promise of October 1 to get a progress report?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Mr. HUDSON: On today's Notice Paper the second item under Notices of Motion: Other Business for Wednesday, August 27, states that the Hon. B. H. Teusner is to move that certain regulations under the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act be disallowed. That Notice of Motion was placed on the Notice Paper last Wednesday, which was the last day for disallowance of those regulations. Before the Notice of Motion was given, I had written out a similar Notice of Motion to disallow but, when I knew that the member for Angas was giving such Notice of Motion, I did not proceed to give my notice. I have heard on the grapevine that the Subordinate Legislation Committee will not be proceeding with this particular motion for disallowance and that, if that particular Notice of Motion is allowed to lapse, the House will not be able to debate a motion to disallow those regulations. Will you consider this matter, Mr. Speaker, to determine what procedure should be adopted to prevent a situation arising in which the rights of an individual member to argue and vote on a disallowance motion are not interfered with (not intentionally, but accidentally) through the action of the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee in not proceeding with a Notice of Motion of disallowance previously given?

The SPEAKER: I can see the honourable member's point. However, first, I have no knowledge of what the honourable member says he has heard on the grapevine, namely, that the committee does not intend to proceed with the Notice of Motion. I understood at the time that the member for Angas, on behalf of the committee, had to give the notice that day, otherwise he would have been too late. The member for Glenelg has raised a point that is interesting for the whole House. It is a hypothetical question and I could not answer it until the situation arose, but the question is interesting. I think what he is driving at—and the point is well taken—is that, if the Subordinate Legislation Committee does not proceed, for reasons of its own, with a Notice of Motion, why should that prevent the House, or other members, from proceeding with a matter of that kind? I think the point is

very important and that it requires consideration. I will certainly inquire and let the honourable member know. I should add that the main point now is that the time has expired and this prevents other members from taking proper action.

CARAVAN PARK

Mrs. BYRNE: When speaking in the Address in Reply debate I advocated, as reported at pages 656 and 657 of *Hansard*, that the Tourist Bureau grant a subsidy to the Curdnatta Park caravan park at Sandy Creek, and I mentioned the advantages to both the tourists and this State's tourist industry of granting such a subsidy. Will the Minister of Immigration and Tourism consider this proposition?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, and I will get a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

TUBALCO PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Mr. CORCORAN: On behalf of my Leader, I ask the Premier whether he has a reply to the Leader's question about the granting of preference to tenders submitted by Tubalco Proprietary Limited.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have re-examined the documents concerning the latest tender by Tubalco Proprietary Limited to supply copper pipe to the South Australian Government. As I indicated when the Leader first asked his question, this matter has a reasonably long history and representations were first made by the company regarding preference for its tenders to the Playford Government in 1964. Further representations were subsequently made to the Walsh Government and to the present Government. The papers on the matter show that wherever possible the preference given to local manufacturers has always been extended to this company. In the case of the latest tender, the difference in the prices tendered by Tubalco Proprietary Limited and the successful tenderer is so great as to be beyond the upper limit of preference that can be extended to local manufacturers.

ANZAC HIGHWAY INTERSECTION

Mr. VIRGO: Because of the peculiarity of the cycle of the traffic lights at the intersection of South Road and Anzac Highway, there is at no stage a green light for pedestrians to cross South Road from west to east or east to west on the southern side of Anzac Highway. At all three stages of the cycle,

vehicles have right of way to either go straight through on South Road or turn left from Anzac Highway into South Road. In view of the need to consider the pedestrian (who, to me, is more important than the motorist) will the Attorney-General take up this matter with his colleague with a view to having these lights altered so that pedestrians desiring to cross the road can do so with the aid of the traffic lights?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

WARNING DEVICES

Mr. BURDON: With many other members of this House, I have in the past raised the matter of warning devices at railway crossings, and only a week or two ago I asked a question about certain crossings at Mount Gambier. This is a problem that concerns me greatly, and I have what I believe may be a solution to it. At present, we do not appear to be getting anywhere with providing warning devices, because the Railways Department has commitments and problems in respect of gauge standardization in the north and other railway matters. As the Minister of Roads and Transport and the Minister in charge of railways are one and the same person, controlling the Highways Department and the Railways Department, can consideration be given to having work on railway crossings done by contract rather than by the Railways Department's staff? I do not suggest that the installation of these warning devices at crossings be taken out of the control of the Railways Department. However, I believe that the Highways Department provides the finance and I consider that the carrying out of this work by contract would be much more expeditious. I hope the Minister of Roads and Transport will consider this suggestion so that some of these problem crossings that I have in my district may be attended to at an early date. I hope the Minister will consider my request that these works be carried out by contract.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is a refreshing suggestion to be made by a Socialist, and is in sharp contrast to the attitude of the Opposition last year when it was suggested that more work should be done under contract to the Highways Department. This is a very good suggestion, and I shall discuss it with my colleague.

INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked about two weeks ago regarding the practice adopted by

the Institute of Technology this year with respect to the exclusion of students?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: In answering the honourable member's question, first let me say that the institute's policy is quite clearly that students who have been admitted to courses will be allowed to continue these courses, subject only to satisfactory academic progress. In other words, so far quotas have been confined to first-year subjects, and only further problems of staffing and accommodation would make the council consider imposing quotas in later year subjects and so cause students who had successfully completed one stage of a course to be refused admission to a later stage.

I believe the honourable member's question, however, arose from the institute's refusing a quota place (that is, entry to first-year subjects) to an applicant who was not previously enrolled as a course student although he had been allowed to study several odd subjects as a concession. This student started to study at the institute in 1967. His school background included passes at the Intermediate examinations in 1961 in drawing, woodwork and mathematics I, which did not meet the entry requirement for the ordinary certificate in building technology: he was allowed, to help him as far as was possible within institute rules, to enrol as a non-course student in some subjects for which he did possess the necessary background.

In 1969, this student applied for entry to the new course for the building technician's certificate, which has now replaced the ordinary certificate in building technology. The entry requirement for this course is termed certificate entry—broadly, four passes in Leaving subjects. He obviously did not meet this requirement but was told that, because of his institute studies, he would be granted provisional certificate entry, and that he would be considered with other applicants for selection against the quota. His application was then dealt with by a quota selection panel, which filled the quota of 20 for the first year of the course, and left without places 11 applicants who were formally qualified to enter the course. The basis of selection was that adopted by the council-academic merit. The student was dealt with by the panel as being effectively a new applicant, since he had never been enrolled in a course and was judged to be of less academic merit than those other applicants who were selected. However, had no quota been imposed, he would have

been accepted into the course, and his provisional certificate entry would have been made permanent if he had then succeeded in passing the first year of the course.

ROAD INSPECTORS

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to a question I asked last week about the number of road inspectors employed by the Highways Department in enforcing road maintenance contributions?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Highways Department employs a total of 18 inspectors and 16 assistants to traffic inspectors, all of whom are employed on the dual function of policing the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act and the Road Traffic Act. Seven inspectors and seven assistants are permanently stationed in the country. The remainder are stationed in Adelaide but police the metropolitan and near country areas.

SCHOOL BUILDING FINANCE

Mr. HUDSON: In yesterday's *Advertiser* it was announced that an assembly hall had been approved for the Marion High School at a total cost of \$126,000, of which the Government would be providing \$56,000 (I think that is the correct figure)—\$38,000 for building, some \$8,000 or so for design costs, and a further amount for contingencies. The figure of \$38,000 for building suggested that the previous policy of a limit of \$76,000 on the actual building cost still applied, with the department subsidizing the school on a \$1 for \$1 basis only up to that level. My question arises from the position at the Brighton High School, where the school council will have in hand a large sum of money but not quite sufficient to meet the likely costs of the assembly hall proposed for that school if the previous policy of the department that a \$1 for \$1 subsidy will be available only up to a limit of \$76,000 is maintained. I have had previous discussions on this matter with the Minister of Works. Can the Minister of Education say whether consideration will be given to increasing this upper limit in view of the great problems that school committees and councils have in raising the necessary funds and in view of the fact that in the two years since the policy was first instituted there has been a significant increase in building costs?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I would have to consider this matter specifically. I happen

to have here a circular that applies to subsidies, and the maximum subsidy on a \$1 for \$1 basis for assembly halls is \$38,000.

Mr. Hudson: That is the figure I want to have raised.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is the same as when it was first introduced on February 2, 1968, and the department is still working on this figure.

Mr. Hudson: There has been a rise in building costs.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The honourable member's proposition will be considered, and I will obtain a reply for him.

Mr. HUDSON: I should like the Minister to consider an alternative proposition. I believe that a practice adopted in several Victorian schools under the auspices of the Victorian Government is that the school committee establishes a co-operative in the name of the school committee: this is a separate legal entity, and it can then borrow from Government instrumentalities, such as the Savings Bank, with the loan guaranteed by the Government. The advantage of this procedure is that work can proceed on a building such as an assembly hall, a swimming pool, or some other large project, before the school has actually collected all its share of the cost of the project. Consequently, there is a much greater chance that those who have contributed to the cost of the project will receive the benefit, or part of the benefit, whereas at present the benefit accrues to later generations of students. Will the Minister consider establishing such a scheme in South Australia in order to expedite many of these larger capital projects that are partly financed by school committees within our schools? If this scheme were available, I am sure that it would make a tremendous difference to the amount of work that could be done.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am quite familiar with this method of raising funds, and I have been considering a proposition made to me some time ago by the council of a high school. I have asked this council to obtain further information. I have studied the plans of the halls provided in Victoria. Of course, we have no similar legislation in this State that would permit us to do this, and I am presently awaiting the opportunity to peruse the Victorian Act to see whether this could be done in South Australia. Knowledge of the matter to which the honourable member refers is in the possession of the department and has been

considered for some time. I suggest to the honourable member that, if the school committee to which he is referring was prepared to submit a proposition along these lines, it could be looked at in the context of what we are already considering at present.

POTATO BOARD

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I move:

That the Proceedings of the South Australian Potato Board regulations, 1969, made under the Potato Marketing Act, 1948-1966, on May 22, 1969, and laid on the table of this House on June 17, 1969, be disallowed.

I move this motion with some diffidence, because I believe that potato growers have recognized that the Potato Board has been of considerable value to them. Although some of them have been dissatisfied with certain actions of the board, its existence has resulted in benefits to them, and they realize that it must continue. However, I believe that paragraphs 3 and 4 go beyond what can be done by regulation under the Potato Marketing Act. The section referring to the power to make regulations provides:

The Governor on the recommendation of the board may make regulations prescribing all matters which by this Act are required or permitted to be prescribed, or which are necessary or convenient to be prescribed for carrying out or giving effect to this Act, and in particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing powers:

- (a) for requiring any persons to furnish the board with information relating to potatoes:
- (b) for enabling the board or any person authorized by it to inspect any records or accounts relating to potatoes or any premises on which potatoes are produced, stored, graded, packed, or otherwise treated:

The crux of the matter is that paragraphs 3 and 4 of the regulations provide:

No person shall peruse any document the property of or in the possession of the board without having first obtained permission so to do of the chairman or by a resolution of the board.

No person shall make any copy of any document the property of or in possession of the board without having first obtained permission so to do of the chairman or by a resolution of the board.

These seem to be regulations that exceed the provisions of the Act, and if there is any action to be taken to enable the board to function more efficiently it should be prescribed by legislation rather than by regulation. The

Potato Board has found it difficult to control its meetings, because of the action of one member of the board. I do not condone the action of this member, but most of the disturbance within the board seems to have been caused because this person could not obtain all the information that he required.

This situation is not of recent origin. I have a letter written in 1966 by another member of the board who stated that when he became a member he could not obtain the information which he wanted and which would have enabled him to act as a member of the board should act. If these regulations make it more difficult for a member of the board to obtain this necessary information, they are not in the best interests of the potato growers he represents. Any restrictions are not in the best interests of the board. On the other hand, there are two merchant members of the board who know all the details of the board's business at all times. The board has as its agent the distribution centre, which keeps all the board's accounts. At any time the merchant members of the board know what every potato grower is doing with his potatoes. If a restriction is placed on the ability of a grower member of the board to obtain information, this is not in the best interests of the board.

I asked several questions last week in order to obtain information about potatoes coming into South Australia, but to my knowledge this information has not been available to board members. The fact that the information has not been forthcoming has caused these troubles at the board meetings. Apart from paragraphs 3 and 4, the rest of the regulations merely deal with how an ordinary meeting should be run. There is still, however, a fundamental difficulty: board members find it hard to get information, so they would still be unhappy. I appreciate the value of the board, and the growers also appreciate it. Three of the four branches of the Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Society Limited have said that these regulations should take effect, despite the fact that they have had legal advice that the regulations are beyond the scope of the Act. Consequently, one hesitates to go against the opinion of these branches, despite the fact that the branch that disagrees with the regulations comprises the growers in my own electoral district. If the doubt about the legality of these regulations had not been raised, I would have abided by the majority decision of the Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Society.

I think a Minister of Agriculture made a statement on how much more South Australian growers received for potatoes than did Victorian growers (who did not have a potato board). Therefore, we must recognize the value of the board. I have attended many meetings of potato growers over the last five years and I can say that, although there has been nothing wrong with any of the board's actions, there has always been a certain amount of suspicion in growers' minds. The board's actions should always be above suspicion. There was much dissatisfaction with the board when prices were adjusted almost from day to day, because growers wondered whether someone was benefiting from this policy. For some time I heard no criticism of the monthly pool system. However, on at least three occasions this pool has been broken within the month, and it has been closed down. I believe this was done for quite legitimate reasons, but an action like this creates suspicion and, as I have said, the board must be above suspicion if it is to have the full support of growers.

At the end of last year potatoes were imported into South Australia at the same time as the Potato Board had to export potatoes to other States at a considerable loss. The distribution centre, which keeps the accounts of the board, is made up of wholesalers and merchants. It has just erected a modern, expensive building. Many growers believe that the board should take over this facet of its business. An application has been made for an organization of growers to take out a licence as a merchant, but it has been refused. I find it hard, however, to understand why it was refused. In moving this motion, I hope that in some way legislation can be introduced to make the Potato Board function even more efficiently than it has in the past.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PORT ADELAIDE BY-LAW: NUISANCES

Notice of Motion (Other Business) No. 2:
The Hon. B. H. Teusner to move:

That by-law No. 20 of the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide, in respect of nuisances, made on June 27, 1968, and laid on the table of this House on February 18, 1969, be disallowed.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I do not intend to proceed with the motion standing in my name because the by-law that it deals with has been disallowed in another place.

Notice of motion lapsed.

DOG-RACING

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, betting by means of a totalizator, operated by the Totalizator Agency Board, on dog-racing, conducted by licensed clubs under the Dog-Racing Control Act, 1967, should be introduced in this State as soon as possible.

Mr. McANANEY: The sport of horse-racing has functioned in South Australia for many years, and the totalizator and book-makers have been entitled to operate at horse-racing meetings. Without those facilities the sport would be a very minor one indeed. Bookmakers have been able to operate at open coursing meetings over the years, with some support. After this matter had been discussed for a number of years, Parliament in 1967 agreed to allow tin hare racing in South Australia. First, we had a resolution on this subject. The Government noted this and introduced legislation to control dog-racing. I believe in fair play. Dog owners should be entitled to the same privileges as those extended to people in the sport of horse-racing.

Mr. Broomhill: On that basis, what about pigeon-racing?

Mr. McANANEY: No approach has been made by those interests. When we reach that bridge, the member for West Torrens can cross it. I have a good evening once a year with the homing pigeon club at Victor Harbour. Last week, a letter that was published in the press criticized me for introducing my motion, as it was said that cruelty to dumb animals could result. This matter was fully considered by Parliament in 1967, and severe penalties are imposed in cases where cruelty to dumb animals occurs.

Mr. Jennings: Cruelty to dumb animals is something that you should be sensitive about.

Mr. McANANEY: Section 8 (1) of the Dog-Racing Control Act states:

A person who has been convicted by any court of an offence under this Act or under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1936-1964, shall not, unless exempted from the provisions of this subsection—

- (a) take part or be concerned in the conduct of dog-racing in the State;
- (b) train or undertake the training of any dog for dog-racing;
- (c) accept office, or act, as a member of the governing body of any dog-racing club; or
- (d) attend, or be present, as a spectator or otherwise, at any place where dog-racing is conducted or any dog is being trained for dog-racing at any premises appurtenant thereto.

If that provision does not cover this matter, then I am prepared to move an amendment to ensure that anyone who commits any offence of a serious nature shall be debarred from participating in dog-racing. It is a dog's natural instinct to chase things, and it is difficult to stop it from doing this and train it to do something else. If it is necessary to blood an animal, it can be done by means other than having a live animal attached to anything to encourage a dog to chase it.

Mr. Broomhill: How do you do that?

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member heard me read a section of the Act. It is a strict control, and the honourable member may move an amendment at any time to make it even stricter. Most members of Parliament would support it; indeed, I am sure that I would. Since the 1967 Act was passed, it has been claimed that dog-racing has not grown to any great extent. Well, neither would horse-racing have grown to any great extent if it had not had the facilities that are available for tin hare racing in the other States. About 400 greyhounds were registered in this State between October, 1968, and June of this year. Over 160 of those greyhounds were purchased and registered by owners in other States. About 85 greyhounds have been brought from other States to South Australia for breeding purposes, as well as for racing purposes. With the registration of interstate and imported sires in South Australia, the breeding of greyhounds has proved to be of a greater advantage for a better breed of racing dogs, and ever since these dogs have come to South Australia the sport has increased the interest of new owners.

During these same months just over 80 litters, with an average of 6.4 puppies in each litter, have been registered. Some litters have a progeny of 10 to 12 puppies. An increase of 35 per cent of owners has been registered, bringing the number to 600, with about 300 trainers being registered to date. A large percentage of greyhounds are racing on the speed tracks at Bolivar as well as at trials at Strathalbyn and Port Pirie.

I emphasize that a group of keenly interested people at Strathalbyn have in their own time and with limited resources established a course on the trotting track, and they will be able to use those facilities if they secure a licence to have T.A.B. there. It has been proved that the State will receive much money from greyhound racing activities. I do not emphasize this because it does not influence

me, but if the horse-racing fraternity is entitled to have these advantages, then surely a different section of the community should, if it has the necessary facilities, be given the same advantages.

I come now to the figures that show how T.A.B. has benefited the resources of this and other States over the last year. In 1968, N.C.A. Ltd. of New South Wales paid \$790,872 in State taxation, such sum not including the 1 per cent received by the Government by way of turnover tax on bookmakers' holdings at Wentworth Park. The N.C.A. donated \$22,700 to country clubs, and this subsidy proved to be of great assistance to those clubs, enabling them to provide additional amenities, to increase prize money and to liquidate debts.

During 1968 the public wagered \$26,480,355 on greyhound events conducted at Wentworth Park, compared with \$22,845,964 wagered in 1967. On-course totalizator turnover at Wentworth Park for the same year was \$3,593,350, compared with \$3,309,090 for the previous year, representing a growth of 8.6 per cent. Wentworth Park prize money rose from \$250,615 to \$283,265 in 1968, an increase of 13 per cent.

For the year ended June 30, 1968, the public wagered \$96,112,000 on greyhound racing in New South Wales, of which \$62,000,000 was bet with bookmakers, \$9,329,000 with the on-course totalizator and \$24,783,000 with T.A.B. Investments with bookmakers represented 64.5 per cent of the total amount wagered. Bookmakers' turnover at Wentworth Park increased from \$12,777,243 to \$14,249,234, an increase of 11.5 per cent. That indicates that this industry in New South Wales has a big turnover. It employs a certain number of people, and it has benefited the revenue of the Government in that State.

I shall deal now with the Victorian statistics. Administrators of greyhound racing in Victoria expect the amount invested through T.A.B. to reach \$21,000,000 for the year ended July 31, representing an increase of \$6,250,000 on the previous 12 months. If this amount is reached, it will possibly exceed the T.A.B. amounts for both racing and trotting in South Australia for the same period. On-course Victorian totalizator investments are up 30 per cent and bookmakers' holdings have risen by 39 per cent. The Victorian State Treasury received \$1,500,000 from T.A.B. in the 1967-68 season. On-course totalizators provided \$1,200,000, and the remaining \$300,000 came from percentages, licences, stamp duty fees, and so on.

It is expected that Treasury revenue will increase to \$1,650,000 when figures for the 1968-69 season are released at the end of this month. Matching these T.A.B. figures, the attendances at Olympic Park and Sandown Park are up 35 per cent, and country attendances are up 12 per cent. Lavish amenities already have been provided for the public, and it is expected that a further \$200,000 will be spent in improvements to the Sandown Park dog tracks in the next 12 months. Prize-money has increased 50 per cent in the past 12 months, and the two main tracks between them now pay \$10,000 a week to greyhound owners. Country clubs will receive about \$160,000 from T.A.B.; the greyhound racing control board, \$25,000; and the National Coursing Association, \$10,000, to offset the cost of registering and marking litters.

Three of Australia's main events will receive a lift this year. The Melbourne Cup will be worth \$14,000, the National Championship \$12,000 and the Australian Cup \$17,000. I understand that, if T.A.B. facilities are provided, South Australia will take its turn with the other States involved in holding championship events, and that we shall have the benefit of holding a major dog-racing meeting here every three years or so.

It is intended to have control over dog-racing in this State similar to that exercised over horse-racing, and the one organization (in this case the National Coursing Association) must have that control and must be responsible to the Government to see that the sport is kept clean, as is commonly the case concerning any successfully-run sport. Careful control over greyhound racing is exercised in Victoria; the dogs are locked up for a certain period before a race; they are weighed before being put into the cage; and if the weight varies during this period they are scratched from the race. Indeed, this is possibly the cleanest sport available to those members of the public who desire to receive a reasonable run for the money they invest. This is one of the reasons why T.A.B. facilities should be provided in connection with greyhound racing here.

The association has asked only that T.A.B. facilities be provided, and that is in line with my own thinking. I have previously spoken in this House against the presence of bookmakers on racecourses. Horse-racing is successfully conducted in New Zealand and in Paris where bookmakers do not operate. Leading jockeys take part in the races conducted

in those places, and I think that the absence of bookmakers speaks for itself. Indeed, the more quickly we dispense with bookmakers in connection with horse-racing in South Australia, the better it will be for the industry. The National Coursing Association has views on this matter similar to my own, and that is why the motion has been moved in its present form.

It will be in the interests of the association to ensure that no cruelty takes place. Indeed, if it allows cruelty to occur, the association will be in jeopardy of losing its licence to conduct the sport in this State, and this is where a safeguard is provided. People interested in dog-racing are entitled to have the same facilities as those existing for people interested in horse-racing. Although my view is not influenced in any way in this regard, I point out that the Government will receive considerable revenue from T.A.B. betting on dog-racing. I hope that every fair-minded member will support the motion.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I have pleasure in supporting the motion. I congratulate the member for Stirling on presenting such a sound case for introducing totalizator facilities for dog-racing in this State. Indeed, I am afraid that he has not left much for subsequent speakers to say about this matter, for he has covered the subject fairly well. I support the motion, because South Australia is now the only State in which dog-racing is conducted without betting facilities being provided. Members know (and this was referred to by the member for Stirling) that a Bill to permit the use of the mechanical lure was introduced and passed in the House in 1967.

We were only one vote short of being able at that stage to introduce betting facilities in connection with dog-racing. Since the introduction of the mechanical lure, I understand that five clubs and tracks have been established within the State, namely, at Bolivar, Strathalbyn, Gawler, Port Pirie and Whyalla. I believe the Bolivar track has been established at a cost of about \$50,000, and I know that other clubs have spent substantial sums in establishing their tracks. As the member for Stirling said, the sport is well organized and well conducted and, having attended races at Port Pirie and at Bolivar, I assure honourable members that that is so. In fact, I congratulate those associated with the sport on the way in which they have developed it to the extent that they have. I believe that the South Australian bred dogs

are recognized as being the best in Australia and are in big demand. As a result, of course, many of these dogs are being taken to other States, where they are being raced successfully, having won many major races there.

For as long as we have no betting facilities here, the best of our dogs will continue to be taken to other States to be raced. However, that situation will be largely overcome if this motion is passed, and South Australia will be able to take its turn in holding major dog-racing events. The Select Committee set up to take evidence on this sport before the introduction of the mechanical lure particularly pointed out, when submitting its report to Parliament, that it was satisfied there was a need for the sport here because of demands of interested people, particularly English migrants.

In its recommendation, the committee also submitted that the sport would not survive without the introduction of betting facilities. I believe all members would agree that this Parliament would be most unreasonable and most unfair if it did not pass legislation providing for totalizer betting at dog-racing meetings in this State. I say that because we have allowed the mechanical lure to be introduced and have allowed these people to establish tracks at great expense. The clubs have spent this money anticipating that Parliament will allow them to have betting facilities. When we allowed them to use a mechanical lure we also gave them the impression that we would allow betting.

Mr. Broomhill: How do you come to that conclusion?

Mr. McKEE: I do not know where the honourable member was when the previous legislation was before the House, but I can tell him that it was the opinion of members generally that if the mechanical lure was permitted it would be common sense to allow betting.

Mr. Freebairn: The member for West Torrens is against the workers.

Mr. McKEE: I do not think he is trying to be difficult; he is inquisitive and wants information. It would be most unreasonable if we did not allow these people to have betting, seeing that we have already allowed them to establish high-class tracks at Bolivar and other places. For that reason alone I support the motion. It is only fair and reasonable to allow people who follow this sport to enjoy a small wager on the events. I do not think I need to appeal to members further on this matter, for I think they realize that it is common sense to pass the motion. I leave it to them to do so.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I, too, support the motion. I am sympathetic towards people interested in dog-racing. I must say that, although I do not know much about dog-racing, the brief introduction I have had to the sport leads me to think it is well run and organized. Indeed, I should say that the experience I have had would suggest that the organization of the sport is much to the credit of those gentlemen who administer it. I should like to add a little levity to this debate. Searching around in the Parliamentary Library, I came across a book written by a Mr. Nichols, who comments on greyhound racing in England. Although I do not go along entirely with what he says, I think it may be of interest to honourable members to know one man's impression of greyhound racing, which he describes very graphically as follows:

For of all the organized fatuities which have yet been devised to satisfy the cravings of a leaderless democracy, dog-racing is the supreme example. Come with me to one of the most renowned tracks of London, and see this sport with unprejudiced eyes. The stadium holds, at a modest estimate, 30,000 people. It is lit by lamps whose beams radiate into the foggy night, so that from a distance they look like pale, ghostly ballerinas, with milk-white skirts, poised before a vast audience. It is bitterly cold. There is no gaiety. It is all strangely silent. Suddenly there is a roar. You stare out and you see a white streak flash round the course, followed by six other white streaks. And before you realize it, the race is over. How long does each race take? Thirty seconds? It doesn't seem as long as that, but even assuming that it takes a minute, it is indeed a brief reward for a quarter of an hour's wait, on a night like this.

If I went to a play and found that each of the three acts lasted four minutes and each of the intervals lasted one hour (which is exactly the same proportion), I should demand my money back. But such an attitude would be regarded as eccentric by the devotees of the dogs. Turn round, and scan the faces of England's youth, lit by the lamplight. They look doped. Hunched shoulders, caps over forehead, and half-burnt cigarette drooping from lips which occasionally part and reveal blackened teeth.

I think Mr. Nichols is romancing slightly. About two years ago, at about the time the member for Port Pirie was actively promoting the cause of dog-racing in this State, when I was on a visit to Melbourne I took it upon myself to visit a greyhound racing track which, I think, is called Sandown. I can see some friends of mine in the gallery nodding their heads, so I presume that is what it is called. I was most impressed with the organization at that track. On making myself known to committee members present at this

excellent meeting, I was invited by them to attend Olympic Park where the President of the greyhound organization, whose name escapes me, made sure that I was given the experience of looking at the complete organization.

I met the veterinary surgeon, who receives the dog into the entrance stalls. From feeble memory, I believe he weighs the dogs when they come into the stalls and they are not allowed to take part in a race until at least an hour or an hour and a half after they are weighed. Their weight is again checked, and at all times the dogs are under close veterinary supervision. I am well satisfied that there is no loophole at all that would allow improper practice, at least on the veterinary side of greyhound racing in Victoria. I would commend tin hare racing to those members who have not seen it. It is much more exciting than any horse race. From my limited experience, I would say that the way the organizers of greyhound meetings in Victoria run their races could well be copied by people in this State, because the organization of greyhound racing reflects great credit indeed on the organizers in that State. Although I have not yet had a chance to visit one of the meetings in South Australia, I believe that if the organizers of the sport in South Australia do their work anywhere nearly as well as the organizers of the sport in Victoria they deserve great success indeed. I am pleased to support the motion, commending it to members.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): About four years ago I had the privilege of introducing into the House a motion whereby totalizator agency board betting could be introduced for horse-racing in South Australia. I remember the utter confusion that the introduction of that motion caused in this Chamber, particularly for members now sitting on the Government benches who were then in Opposition, as well as several other members.

Mr. Freebairn: Including the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. CASEY: I will not mention names and I do not think it is proper for the member for Light to do so at this stage, because if I liked to name all those members I could embarrass the honourable member more than he could embarrass other people. He has spoken in the debate, and I suggest that he leave the matter at that. When I moved the motion about the introduction of T.A.B. betting in South Australia, I knew that T.A.B. would have far-reaching effects and I contemplated then that the dog-racing fraternity

in this State would require off-course betting in that industry: I call it an industry, because it is.

In any sport today, particularly those involving animals, we start with breeding, go on to training, and eventually go into racing. To think that I had something to do with the introduction of off-course betting in this State gives me a certain amount of pride. At that time I went to much trouble to get facts and figures from other States. Of course, we have seen the benefit that T.A.B. has been to racing clubs in South Australia, and we must not forget the revenue that the Government gets, although I think that revenue should be of secondary importance. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) made many references to revenue, probably trying to soft-soap members into believing that, if they voted for this motion, the Government would get much money and that that was a good thing for the State. I think we must overlook this type of reasoning in cases like this. I think that T.A.B. betting, both on-course and off-course, will benefit the industry generally.

In my limited experience of dog-racing, I have always felt a great thrill at seeing the dogs racing down a track and particularly jumping over hurdles. I have had greyhounds on my property and I have used them for foxing. Seeing them foxing is a great thrill. The dog, after spending a considerable time twisting and turning, eventually catches the fox. This is in the pastoralist's favour, because I and other members consider foxes to be vermin that should be destroyed at all times. However, that is beside the point. The fact is that dog-racing is a reality in other States and it is big business in America. It is conducted on a sound financial basis, and I sincerely hope that the industry in South Australia will profit from the introduction of legislation to permit T.A.B. betting.

Mr. Jennings: It was a sport a moment ago: now it's an industry.

Mr. CASEY: I have said it was an industry. I wish the honourable member would open his ears and listen. I hope that when a Bill is introduced it will be passed without difficulty. I support the motion.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): I also support the motion. Possibly, if I was a member when legislation to allow gambling on horse-racing was introduced, I might have voted against that. However, if horse-racing is the sport of Kings, our legislation should not permit that sport to be the only one enjoying the luxury or privilege of gambling on meetings.

For that reason, I support this motion strongly. At present, wagering is permitted on open coursing or Plumpton coursing. I have had the privilege of seeing races conducted on the Bolivar track and I am satisfied that there is less chance of interference with an animal's performance in this sport than there is in horse-racing. This is another reason why I consider the sport to be respectable and one that should be given the privilege allowed in other sports.

I know of no reason why I should not be able to wager on T.A.B. that a particular goalsneak will not kick 10 goals during a football match at Adelaide Oval. I know no reasons why one or two sports should be selected as sports on which betting is allowed and, as dog-racing and horse-racing are similar sports, I support the motion strongly. Doubtless, those conducting the meetings will act in a proper manner. I am satisfied that the clubs have good officials and that the sport needs this type of encouragement.

I do not believe in bookmakers, because people who cannot afford to do so are able to bet on credit. However, in order to bet with T.A.B., one has to tender the money at the time of making the bet.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): So far there does not seem to have been any opposition to this motion and I assure the House that I will not oppose it. However, I recall that, about five years ago, a member who is now on this side and was then on the Government side unsuccessfully tried to make a move about a certain matter relating to dog-racing in South Australia. I think he received a severe shock at the result.

Mr. McKee: Whom are you referring to?

Mr. BURDON: I am referring to the member for Port Pirie, who has been more successful since then. The motion moved by the member for Stirling is in line generally with what has been taking place in South Australia in the last four years or five years. For many years this State was one of the few places in Australia where one was not able to gamble at all or even buy a lottery ticket. Those days are behind us and we are now living in a more enlightened age. If persons who own race horses or enjoy the sport of horse-racing can have the facilities for betting, those people who similarly enjoy the pleasure of dog-racing should also have betting facilities.

I do not know, of course, whether those who bet on dog-racing will be more successful than those who bet on horse-racing: my movement in betting fields is extremely

limited. However, I congratulate the member for Stirling on moving this motion and the member for Port Pirie on his persistence over the years in following the line he has taken. Those people who have dogs are entitled to facilities similar to those enjoyed by other sporting people. I do not think that some of the things that it was said here two or three years ago could happen and were happening in this sport will happen in South Australia. Certain charges have been made in other States, and there are regulations there that, to a great extent, have eliminated those things with which this sport was charged. Let me remind the member for West Torrens that he may enjoy going to the races (I do not complain about that), but there are just as many malpractices in horse-racing as there are in any other sport. I have no doubt that, whatever is presented to the dog-racing people, this legislation will be policed.

If the House in its wisdom grants those people, as I believe it will, these facilities, it will be up to those who control this sport in South Australia to do the right thing; otherwise, they will only be doing harm to themselves and their cause. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I, too, support the motion. I remember four years ago, when I first came to this place, the member for Port Pirie was submitting a case for people to establish dog-racing in South Australia after many years of vain attempts to give the people interested in dog-racing the right to race in South Australia. Although I had been in this House only three weeks, I remember crossing the floor and voting with the Government of the day to give people interested in coursing the right to have that facility. Also, I remember that on the casting vote of the Speaker that right was denied. However, the Speaker was doing the right thing in maintaining the *status quo*, and I have no quarrel with that.

Mr. Hudson: You think the Speaker should maintain the *status quo*?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, I think he should. It is good that the member for Glenelg thinks so, too. However, I commend the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) as a great democrat.

Mr. Hudson: As a what?

Mr. RODDA: He is a great democrat. My colleague seems to be somewhat taken aback. As the member for Mount Gambier has said, "Why should those people be denied certain rights and privileges?"

Mr. Corcoran: Why not grant betting facilities to the bookmakers?

Mr. RODDA: One by one they cross the river, so I suppose they will end up there as well. I see no reason why the sport of coursing should be denied all the privileges pertaining to other sports. If anybody wants to bet on a dog race, he should be allowed to; the facilities should be available to him. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): It is wonderful that at last we see this Government moving forward to aid the means of betting and to further social matters in this State. For many years it has curtailed these things. The Greyhound Racing Association sent a deputation to the Premier of the day; it was told that its remarks would be noted and it would get a reply. However, it was not until the member for Port Pirie raised the matter in this House that we were given the opportunity to debate it. I am sure the Select Committee that went away to investigate betting on greyhounds wished at the time that the legislation would cover betting as well as the hare. The greyhound-racing fraternity of this State has had a chequered career in regard to betting facilities.

I have been lucky on my travels overseas to see greyhound-racing in other parts of the world and to observe how well it is organized, especially at the White City in London, where feature races are run. This applies also to other parts of Britain. Many people who cannot afford other hobbies such as race horses and trotting horses find that dog-racing is a real working man's sport. It helps him and is of great interest to him.

I congratulate these greyhound-racing people on their persistence. They have had to be persistent, whereas in other parts of the world and in other States of Australia their counterparts have not needed to be persistent. In Melbourne and Sydney the same things are happening. In T.A.B. betting this sport has leapt ahead. At Harold Park, the crowd enjoys trotting one night and dog-racing the next. The crowds are almost equal in size: in fact, I am told that the crowd at the dog-racing could be slightly larger. In Melbourne, dog-racing is a strong sport, and I am sure the people of South Australia when given the opportunity of enjoying a colourful night's entertainment will do so.

We cannot all win. The member for West Torrens sometimes wins and sometimes loses—and that applies to his football team, too! I

am sure that, if he goes along to the dog-racing, he will have an enjoyable evening there. If dog-racing is good enough for some people, it should be good enough for others. In this case the dog-racing people will be able to conduct meetings and benefit from the experience of their counterparts in other States, to ensure that it is a good clean sport and that they keep it good and clean. If they do that, they will get good attendances at their meetings, although at the beginning the attendances may not be very big. However, they are on the upward trend with their new tracks. I wish them every success and hope the House will support this motion unanimously.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Premier:

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—

which the Hon. D. A. Dunstan had moved to amend by striking out all words after "That" first occurring and inserting:

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 houses 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.

(Continued from August 12. Page 875.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): Last evening I had almost concluded my remarks. I draw the attention of members to the nature of certain American cities, because part of their nature is a consequence of the extensive use of the motor car. This is particularly noticeable in Los Angeles, which is described almost everywhere else in the United States as any number of towns in search of a city: it is so broken up with freeways that there is virtually no city centre. The possibility of Los Angeles having real character or any beauty is probably lost entirely as a result of the freeways and the extensive use of the motor car. I do not know whether members are aware that Los Angeles is one of the worst places in the world for smog, or whether they are aware that the opinion in the United States is that in most American cities more than 50 per cent of the smog is caused by the exhaust fumes of motor cars.

This problem has been so serious in California that not only are all private incinerators banned but also every new motor car and every secondhand motor car that changes hands must have a special anti-smog device fitted to the exhaust. This prevented the position from deteriorating further but, while I was in Los Angeles in 1967 for three days, I did not see the hills that form a back drop to the city at any time, solely as a result of the smoke and the smog-laden atmosphere that hangs over Los Angeles. Few of the larger cities in the United States are beautiful: the outstanding one, and one of the most attractive in the world, is San Francisco, because of its setting; but it is a setting that obviously means that the motor car cannot be used to the extent that it is used in other cities of the United States, and that further developments must concentrate on public transport.

The bay area rapid transit system is partly a consequence of the city's location, but because of that system the nature of the city

of San Francisco will not be destroyed by the introduction of extensive freeways travelling in every possible direction. The bay area rapid transit system would not have been possible without Federal aid legislation having been passed to provide a loan and a grants system of aid to cities introducing systems involving mass transportation. The city of Denver, the capital of Colorado, is one mile above sea level at the foot of the Rocky Mountains in a most attractive setting. Its population is just over 1,000,000, so it is not much different from Adelaide but, because of its peculiar location, it experiences bad smog. When I flew into Denver from Dallas in the south, a few miles out of Denver I could see what looked like a dust storm, a brown, dirty haze extending upwards for thousands of feet.

Mr. Casey: You thought you were at Oodnadatta.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes; it looked like a dust storm, but when I flew over Denver I could see what was, in fact, smog. However, once one was on the ground it was difficult to see laterally. Denver often experiences temperature inversions and has bad smog, but it would have no greater degree of industrial concentration than would Adelaide. It could not be described as an industrial city, and the greatest degree of smog in Denver is a consequence of the motor car, and of the heavy use of the motor car that occurs in the United States. On a relatively still morning in Adelaide, if members looked occasionally towards the hills they would notice a brown tinge, which year after year is gradually becoming more and more noticeable. We are lucky in that not only is North Terrace a relatively windy place but so is Adelaide, so that any pollution of the atmosphere generally clears more rapidly than it does in Denver and Los Angeles.

We are going to be faced with smog problems in Adelaide: certainly there are serious smog problems in Sydney, which is my home city. When returning from the United States I flew along the coast from the north and saw the city of Sydney spread out: it was a perfectly clear Sunday morning and the atmosphere was completely clear, without a trace of pollution. When leaving Sydney, I travelled from North Shore to Kingsford Smith airport at about 9 a.m., and when travelling towards the harbour bridge and looking over to the city proper and the industrial areas, I could notice a dense smog. It had the same dirty brown colour as was to be seen in the United States cities to which I have referred.

The first afternoon I was in New York I remember looking along one of the canyons of the city when the sun was in a peculiar position and shining low down on the horizon and along the street. It produced the peculiar effect of showing up what looked like a solid brown shaft of dirt a couple of hundred yards away, and it seemed that if one walked along the canyon at this time of the evening one would have to pass through this solid shaft of dirt. I believe that the whole nature of life in many American cities has been disturbed and altered by the presence of smog. It was rare in New York, for example, to find any of the local inhabitants in a good temper. One found that, if one spent the whole day wandering around the city, one's eyes were sore by the end of the day.

It is clear from American experience that bad smog arising largely from the excessive use of the motor car does affect the character of life in American cities, and it does affect the attitudes of the people. It makes social relationships more difficult, and it is probably a contributing factor (along with many others) to outbreaks of violence and rioting. Therefore, the aesthetics involved in the development of a city must be considered if we are planning to build freeways. We must be very careful not to reach a situation where we see Adelaide's basic character beginning to be destroyed by the insistence of people on the use of the motor car and by the fact that many people have no alternative to using the motor car, if they are to get around the city.

Mr. Broomhill: Isn't that what this proposal is asking us to do?

Mr. HUDSON: I am not sure on that point, because I believe that in a city of Adelaide's size and shape we will have some freeways. I do not favour excessive development of freeways, but I find it difficult to see how we can do without a north-south freeway at least, and probably an extension to serve the Modbury-Elizabeth area. This would be fairly common ground among many people. However, I believe that the M.A.T.S. plan as it stands probably involves a development which is not open-ended and which can only mean that in the future the only course available will be to construct still more freeways to add to those we have already constructed. I fear that, if this is done and if this is the way development is concentrated, we may well face the kind of situation here that the city of Denver faces.

The relationship between Adelaide and Denver is even closer in many respects, because Denver is noted for its parks. Oddly enough, Denver has a very low annual rainfall—a little lower than that of Adelaide. I suspect that, because of its low rainfall, the people of Denver are conscious of the need for green surroundings. The parks of Denver, whilst they do not encircle the city in the way that the parks do in Adelaide, nevertheless remind one of Adelaide. The approach to the development of public parks in the inner city area of Denver brought out a fairly direct comparison between that city and Adelaide.

It is, therefore, vital to ensure that, if we are to take action of this nature, we produce a system that allows for the full and proper development of public transport and for further developments in the public transportation field to be integrated with any freeway system we have. This, however, is not the case in respect of the Government's plans; indeed, one of the big problems is to know what the Government's plans are. As I said last night, what the Government has done (in response, I suspect, to political pressures from within and without its own Party) is not to produce a plan but to produce a muddle. The Government has shown the greatest degree of incompetence in making decisions. It seems that no firm decision can ever be guaranteed on this matter; the Government even goes back on decisions it has already taken.

In relation to this point, I mention the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway and also the northward extension of Brighton Road into Glenelg North, a matter with which I am sure the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) will deal at some length. The Government has, with great publicity, tried to suggest that it is asking the House to approve a plan, but it is not doing that: it is asking the House to approve certain proposals and to approve some vague ideas about other proposals, most of which the Government has, in fact, deferred for further consideration. This is an impossible and improper request to make of members.

As the Premier has now re-entered the Chamber, I want to make one or two further references to alternative routes for the Noarlunga Freeway. Last night I criticized the form of the statement announcing the deferment of the Noarlunga Freeway, because it seemed to me that all that was being done was to create a disturbance between those people living along the 1962 route and those

people living along the 1968 route. As Mr. Flint and other Highways Department officers have said, the number of people involved in each of these two routes is more or less the same, so the same degree of disturbance of people's houses and lives is involved. It may appear that the 1962 route involves, in one or two places, fewer houses but, as that route covers a few more miles than the M.A.T.S. route, the overall effect, according to Highways Department officers, is that roughly the same number of houses is involved.

It seems to me that, if this matter is to receive further consideration, the question that ought to be asked of the committee (and I appeal to the Premier to ask this question of it) is this: is there a route for the Noarlunga Freeway that will minimize the extent to which people's houses are interfered with and pulled down? The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) has suggested that a feasible route for the Noarlunga Freeway travelling from the city would be along the route of the proposed Glenelg Expressway to Morphett Road; then a freeway should be built over the Sturt River to the vicinity of South Road. It is possible that this could be incorporated with the suggestion of the Marion council (namely, that Darlington be avoided by locating the Noarlunga Freeway to the west of the Flagstaff Hotel) and it might be possible to avoid destruction of houses in the Darlington area altogether by locating the freeway in that position. I want the Premier to tell members and the people involved whether the committee will be asked specifically to consider this suggestion. We know it would mean that the freeway would be a mile or two longer, but it would be a mile or two longer, anyway, if the 1962 route were adopted. We do not know whether this suggestion is practicable, but certainly it is a suggestion that may involve much less interference with people's lives, and for that reason it deserves and should receive the maximum consideration.

Apparently, it is almost impossible to get through to the Premier on this point, and I regret this. One can only hope that alternative ways of making submissions to the committee that is studying this matter will be made available to members here and to members of the public. I raise the Darlington matter also because of the peculiar involvement of the Minister of Roads and Transport. The Darlington proposal involves not just the freeway but also the Darlington Interchange.

The effect of it is that the whole of Ridge Crest Avenue, Darlington, has to be acquired by the Highways Department, and it so happens that the whole of this street involves either land owned by Murray Hill Proprietary Limited or houses built by a subsidiary of that company. The feelings of the people in that street are considerable.

Mr. McAnaney: Who owns the houses now?

Mr. HUDSON: I understand a couple of them are being rented and are still owned by Murray Hill Proprietary Limited. It seems to me that, in view of the most peculiar situation that exists concerning that street, and as at least one of these houses was purchased only a short while before the M.A.T.S. plan was published, if an alternative route can be found which avoids Darlington altogether (and avoids that particular problem area), without knocking over many more houses, then this will be desirable. I am not prepared (just as the member for Edwardstown is not prepared) to go along with a proposal to shift a freeway line so that, as a result of the shift, the problem is transferred to other people, probably even to a greater extent.

Mr. McAnaney: How can you avoid that?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling has not listened to what I have been saying.

Mr. McAnaney: I have.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Edwardstown has suggested that the Noarlunga Freeway could follow the route of the Glenelg Expressway to Morphett Road, or to the Sturt River, and then continue along the Sturt River. He has suggested that it could be constructed above the river, if that is feasible, and it may well be feasible.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the bends in the river?

Mr. HUDSON: Work is currently being undertaken to eliminate that, to straighten the river, and to line—

Mr. McAnaney: It won't eliminate the curves.

Mr. HUDSON: To a large extent it does. I should imagine it would not be an impossible engineering feat, if the river curved a little to the right then to the left, for the pillars that have to go into the ground to be located so as to cope with slight curves in the river. I believe that should be investigated.

Mr. McAnaney: You are supporting the Government, in effect?

Mr. HUDSON: No. Unfortunately, this is what we have not been able to get across to either the Minister or the Government. When the Noarlunga Freeway re-examination was announced, the Minister said in another place that he was just referring to the committee a reconsideration involving a comparison between the current route and the 1962 proposal.

Mr. McAnaney: Have you submitted it to the committee?

Mr. HUDSON: We want to know whether the Government will submit this to this committee, requesting it to give the most detailed consideration to the matter, because superficially it appears to us that, although adopting this suggestion involves a freeway which is a mile or two longer and which may take people a little more out of their way, if it is feasible it avoids knocking down almost any houses. Surely this is the relevant point, and I think the member for Stirling will agree.

Mr. McAnaney: No, I like going in a straight line.

Mr. HUDSON: That is the trouble. The Government wants to go in a straight line, and to hell with whatever is in the way. That attitude will not do, and people are saying to the Government that it will not do. We are trying to say to the Government, "If you have to depart from a straight line, so long as you are building a freeway which does not have intersections and along which people can still travel at reasonable speed, is it not worth while avoiding knocking down 1,000 houses (or whatever is the number involved) at the cost of adding a minute or two to the time it takes to travel the length of the Noarlunga Freeway?"

Mr. McAnaney: For the next 100 years.

Mr. HUDSON: Does the member for Stirling really believe that the houses of all the people involved along the proposed route of the Noarlunga Freeway are not worth one or two minutes extra travelling time for those who will use the freeway?

Mr. Broomhill: Not only houses, but reserves, shops and so on.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. It involves a breaking up of communities which are not involved if the Sturt River is used. Is the honourable member really prepared to suggest that this kind of proposal should not take into account human values?

Mr. Evans: Do you think properties adjacent to a freeway are devalued?

Mr. HUDSON: If properties are in a residential area I think they are devalued but, if they are in an industrial area, I do not think they are.

Mr. Evans: So your proposal has four more miles of houses affected.

Mr. HUDSON: If the member for Onkaparinga cares to examine the proposed route we suggest, he will find this is not the case. First, the Glenelg Expressway will be established anyway, so if we have a freeway instead of an expressway along that route no difference is made to the houses adjacent to that, and that is part of the reason for the extra length of the Noarlunga Freeway. Instead of that freeway running in a straight north-south line, it will have a deviation to the west and then come back towards the former route along the line of the Glenelg Expressway.

Regarding the route along the Sturt River from Morphett Road to the Darlington area (leaving aside for a moment the question whether the freeway route could run to the west of the Flagstaff Hotel), the extra distance is probably no more than one quarter to one half a mile and furthermore, for a significant part of that distance, the route is not through residential areas. To some extent at Morphettville it is through a residential area, but once it gets close to Oaklands Road there is quite an extensive area where it runs through market gardens, Highways Department land originally reserved for the south-western districts hospital, a so-called national pleasure resort (that is the reserve which covers significant areas on both sides of the river and which was referred to in a question to the Minister of Lands this afternoon) and a commercial and light industrial area where the Sturt River cuts Marion Road. So, for some part of this distance, there are no residential areas close to the Sturt River.

Therefore, the indirect consequence for those living close to the freeway would be much less along this route than it would be along any of the proposed routes already considered by the M.A.T.S. planners. If one cares for the interests and attitudes of people, and whether they will get their houses knocked over or be adversely affected because they live alongside a freeway and do not get any compensation for that (and, if this proposal of the member for Edwardstown is practical, it involves less interference directly and indirectly to the people of the district), surely that must be the prime purpose in any reconsideration. I think the member for

Stirling may be having second thoughts: I hope he is. Certainly he will know fairly well the area of the Sturt River to which I am referring, because it has come up in relation to the Public Works Committee, of which he is a member, and in relation to another inquiry with which both he and I are associated.

Mr. Giles: Have you considered using an elevated type of construction over the railway line?

Mr. HUDSON: That is another suggestion which was put up recently by the member for Edwardstown and which has been discussed. The only problem with having an elevated road over the Brighton railway line, and again I cannot comment on the engineering feasibility of that—

Mr. Giles: The cost would be high.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know about that. One of the problems is that that railway line could be used only for a fairly short distance. As the honourable member would know, the railway line travels fairly generally in a south-westerly direction, and the further south it goes the more westerly the direction becomes until it actually reaches the Hove railway station. As a consequence, the length of line that could be used, if this were a feasible proposition, would not be very great. I imagine that the Sturt River suggestion would be much more feasible from that point of view.

I think that the comments made this afternoon by interjection, particularly by the member for Stirling, show that Government members do not appreciate sufficiently the need to avoid interference with people's lives and properties where that is possible, and that it is worth sacrificing a minute or two of time on a trip on the Noarlunga Freeway if that means that fewer houses will be demolished. Until we get this point established with the Government, I will not understand how any member can properly support the Government's proposals and the Government's motion.

I do not support the motion as it stands. The Government has shown not only disregard for people but also incompetence, and it has maximized discontent and trouble in the community. It has created a muddle and has shown continuing indecisiveness. The House should really be expressing lack of confidence in the Government on the whole matter. I have not completely lost hope that the Government may see the light but, until it does, I will not support the motion. I heartily support the amendment moved by the Leader.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I fully support the Government's motion. In my opinion, the Government has given effect to some suggestions made in the amendment. The Government has put the plan before the people for discussion and so that councils in the area affected could make suggestions for improvements. The very fact that the proposal regarding the Noarlunga Freeway has been considered further shows the Government's willingness to consider all submissions made to it.

Mr. Hudson: But we still haven't a satisfactory answer about the terms of that consideration.

Mr. McANANEY: The Government has stated its willingness to consider and examine any ideas submitted. This has not been a matter of urgent decision. The Leader, in his criticisms, has said that small parts of the freeway have been left out and that, therefore, the Government's suggestion is silly, because some parts are not definite at this stage. However, this shows that the Government's approach is flexible and that no immediate decision has to be made about the Noarlunga Freeway, because the first stage of the work is the Hindmarsh Interchange, and we will not get down to that area for several years. Naturally, we have to estimate how many people will be disturbed by the provision of a freeway. When I am in Adelaide I stay in a house on Henley Beach Road. About seven feet has been taken from the frontage of the house, and I sleep in the front bedroom and do not like the noise from the road. I will buy another property, having been driven from that house because an arterial road has been widened.

Whatever is done in this or any other road scheme, the way of life of people will be disturbed, and naturally the Government wants any upset to be kept to a minimum. The M.A.T.S. proposals were brought in as a plan. Although we have been told that we should have decided what would be done, surely we adopted a democratic course by putting the plan before the people so that they could make submissions and offer criticisms, and so that meetings could be held and that members of Parliament could attend. I have asked the Director of Planning about a matter affecting the Noarlunga Freeway, and he gave the reason why what I asked for could not be done. This is the proper approach, and we have done almost all that the Leader has suggested we should do.

We have time in which to adjust the plan: what is important is the general principle that we need freeways. Despite the Leader's statement about freeways in Los Angeles, a constituent who lives at Victor Harbour and who was in Los Angeles recently has said, in a letter to me, "What is wrong with the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia? Four new freeways are being built in Los Angeles, where freeways are supposed to be a failure." This man said that he had stayed with people who lived 40 miles from Los Angeles.

Mr. Casey: Do you know the size of that city?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, I have been there. This person stayed 40 miles out, so the city must be fairly big. It has grown since I was there. It took this man 36 minutes to get into the city in the peak morning period and 34 minutes to get home in the evening. These freeways keep people moving, and we must look to the future regarding public transport. If we are to move ahead, the Leader's idea about the use of capsules must be examined, but surely capsules are for a much more densely-populated city than Adelaide is at present.

Mr. Broomhill: You support the amendment then?

Mr. McANANEY: The amendment contains nothing that the Government is not doing. If we had freeways and wider roads, we would be able to consider matters such as the use of capsules. The amendment states that any plan must be financially feasible, and the M.A.T.S. plan is so.

Mr. Broomhill: You had better explain that clearly.

Mr. McANANEY: What we received in the last five years from the Commonwealth Government and expect to receive in the next five years would be sufficient to provide freeways and widen roads. We have a new five-year plan under which we will receive in the next five years much more money than we received in the last five years (it is an increase of 50 per cent). This is much more than we expected. From additional amounts received because of increased quantities of petrol used and the number of cars on the road, sufficient money will be available to build a freeway as the need arises, without reducing the amount spent on country roads.

If there is more growth and if more motor cars are used, we will have more money with which to build the roads that the people need.

However, in a drought period or a period similar to Labor's term of office, when fewer cars are on the roads and the Government gets less revenue, less money will be available for the M.A.T.S. proposals and the work must slow down. The indications are that the Commonwealth Government will make available more money from the petrol tax and that we will have no further worries here.

One organization (I think it was the Institute of Architects) stated that, if we went on with the M.A.T.S. proposals, fewer schools and hospitals would be built and the organization advocated the use of public transport. However, the M.A.T.S. proposals will be paid for by the people who will use the facilities provided. The sooner we get back to the principle that, in Commonwealth and State financing, the general population (other than provision for the sick and for education) must pay for the services they desire, the better it will be. Receipts duty was introduced because we were losing \$15,000,000 on the railways and \$6,000,000 on water supply. Why not make the people who use the services pay for them? I am an accountant and, if there were 38 other accountants in this House with me, we should get these things straightened out and this rubbish would not be talked at times.

If the M.A.T.S. plan goes ahead, the motorists will provide the money for the roads. One of the major problems connected with the M.A.T.S. plan is finding the money needed to provide for public transport. That will be a drain on the State's resources, for Loan money will have to be used to cater for the public transport system suggested in the M.A.T.S. plan. That is the difficulty, and that is what the people who suggest there should be more public transport overlook—that with more public transport less Loan money will be available for other things and there will be fewer schools and hospitals. The M.A.T.S. plan should be financed, as I have said previously (I have to repeat it half a dozen times for it to penetrate the minds of members opposite; often I find that this is necessary) by the motorist in respect of the roads. Financially it is feasible: the motorist should pay for the roads section of the plan. The great difficulty is the raising of Loan moneys to finance the public transport section of the plan.

I have not heard from the architects yet. I asked them to reply and suggest how it could be done. I strongly oppose any suggestion that motorists' money should be used to finance

public transport. It is suggested that country people are against the M.A.T.S. plan. I have listened to the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) who, in his usual style, blasts at everything. The Government has deferred a freeway that affects my district, and people are upset about this because there is now a likelihood that the railway line to Strathalbyn and Victor Harbour will be closed. As a result, a freeway will be needed for people to take their goods from Glen Osmond or Darlington to Port Adelaide in half an hour, whereas without a freeway it will take them two hours, and the people of Adelaide will be unable to move because of the trucks in the streets. This freeway must come.

I was accused of not having any consideration for the people living in Edwardstown. If it is a feasible plan to use the Sturt River, we must consider the people on both sides of the river and those who want to use the freeway. We must consider how it will affect them and their homes. An overall solution must be arrived at that is fair and just to both sections of the community. It is said that it is easy to drive the extra two miles, but think how much driving the extra four miles (two miles each way) will mean in additional cost over the years. It will be hard for the people who will have to move out of their houses, but they will have perhaps eight years' notice and can plan ahead. People do not like to be uprooted. Honourable members may remember what happened when the Colonel Light Gardens scheme was introduced and it was proposed to move people from Carrington Street, which was a slum area, to that suburb. This happened also in Woolloomooloo in Sydney. When rebuilding of the area was suggested, the people said, "No, we want to stay where we are."

This problem has to be examined for the benefit of all concerned. I am not speaking against the Sturt River scheme if it is feasible but how it will affect one group compared with another must be assessed. Sometimes we make mistakes, as I am quite prepared to admit. People who say they never make mistakes have never done anything because, if we try to do something for other people, inevitably we make some mistakes. The people who do not try to be constructive are a liability to this Parliament and the State as a whole.

It has been said that we are changing from one viewpoint to another, but most of these alterations to the arterial roads in Adelaide

have been made after the various councils in those areas have examined the plans put before them and have come up with an alternative route that they think is better. These things have to be assessed according to the various needs. The councils are democratic bodies and closer to the people than we are, so they are more likely to assess correctly how this scheme will affect their ratepayers than, say, the member for West Torrens is in connection with somebody living at Modbury. The councils are closer to their ratepayers than members are, and they try to consider their convenience as much as possible.

I shall not go into the details of this. However, when the councils make decisions on how this plan will affect their ratepayers, they must fit into the general plan. It has been suggested that the scheme be referred to the State Planning Authority. This body has been in existence for a number of years and all these plans are being made at the proper level, at the base; they will work up through the various authorities to the Minister, and we shall have an integrated plan that will suit the needs of the people and cause as little inconvenience as possible to those people who happen to be in the line of a freeway, which will be sited in the best interests of the people of South Australia.

As the representative of a country area, I believe the people in my district know they will get a fair share of road moneys for their area. If the railway line is to be taken from them, they will need a freeway through as quickly as possible. As I have said, that line has been losing money; it has outlived its usefulness in that area. I was most impressed with the efficiency of the railway works at Islington and how the rolling stock was looked after. However, some people will not use the railways. In my district one person put up a strong case for the railway line to be kept open, but he uses his truck and drives alongside the railway line. The people themselves should decide whether or not they want the railways.

If enough people wanted to use the railways, we would be extending them but, if people do not want to use them, we cannot keep the lines open when we are incurring an overall loss of \$15,000,000, which is the expected loss for this coming year. I think the loss on that particular line is about \$200,000. By using the Noarlunga Freeway, people will be able to get to Adelaide from Victor Harbour in less than an hour, while the shortest time

on the railways is 2½ hours. Do members opposite suggest that they should spend 2½ hours in a train when they can do the journey in an hour on the freeway?

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

Mr. McANANEY: No Opposition member has yet introduced any valid argument in this debate.

Mr. Broomhill: And certainly you haven't.

Mr. McANANEY: If I had had something to rebut I would have made every effort to do so, but the Leader's amendment is supplementary to the motion which, in part, states:

(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.

The whole crux of the argument is that we have a flexible plan. Being democratic, we introduced a plan so that the people of the State could make submissions on it. The Opposition has now agreed that it favours freeways, because its members are not game to be branded as adopting the mid-Victorian attitude that freeways are not necessary. It has been suggested that because of the provision of freeways some people will suffer disabilities, but it is the responsibility of the Government (and not necessarily always the Government, because councils have a part to play in the planning) to ensure that every effort is made to reduce the disabilities that people may suffer if their house is situated on the route of a proposed freeway. These people should be fully considered. Nothing in the Leader's amendment is not already being done, but we have been criticized because we made the plan flexible and are willing to listen to arguments about it and suggestions as to how it can be reviewed.

Mr. McKee: Have you consulted the electors in your district?

Mr. McANANEY: No-one has closer contact with his electors than I have, and their opinion is that a freeway system is necessary for South Australia. I fully support this flexible plan and the democratic way in which this Government has introduced it so that it will fit in with the opinions of people, and I am sure that, where an alternative suggestion is made that would be economical to the community, the interest of every citizen will be considered so that the plan will fit in with the needs of the whole community.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): One feature of this debate has been the reluctance of Government members to support the motion moved by the Premier last Thursday. It seems that this reluctance stems from the fact that they are not sure of what they are supporting. I say that in all seriousness. The Minister of Lands made a forceful speech last evening defending the Government's attitude, and I appreciated his remarks. The 29-page dissertation from the Premier was confined mainly to technical aspects of the plan. Then the Minister of Lands gave us his views on why the plan should be proceeded with. The speech of the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) was (and I am sure he would admit this) a series of contradictions; he said that, on the one hand, it should happen but, on the other hand, if it does not happen something else should happen. This is a very serious matter that will affect the city of Adelaide for many years.

Mr. McKee: Particularly the people of Adelaide.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, the people are more important than the city, because without them there would not be a city. Consequently, we must consider the feelings of the people. We are all very proud of the city of Adelaide, which is without equal in Australia. The following point made by the Premier is valid:

Colonel Light's plan for Adelaide made wonderful provision for road transport, and, as a result, we have enjoyed a level of traffic convenience envied by people throughout the world.

When Colonel Light planned the city I do not suppose he could have visualized road transport as we have it today. Nevertheless, through foresight, luck or good management, he planned the city so that it has met our needs up to this time. Because of the way the Premier and other Government speakers have ridiculed the suggestions put forward by the Leader of the Opposition about the future development of public transport, it is important to realize how valuable Colonel Light's contribution was.

The Premier described the Leader's suggestions in this field as "fun parlour" talk; he referred to them as "Disneyland"—things which are unrealistic and to which people are attracted simply because they are unusual. The very point missing in this plan is that we are not looking far enough ahead, nor are we taking sufficient note of the developments likely to occur in the field of public transport. In the present plan great

emphasis has been placed on the use of the motor car and insufficient on the use of public transport; this is the very basis of the difference between the Government approach and the Opposition approach to this plan.

The Leader said that options should be left open, a statement that was reiterated by the members for Glenelg and Edwardstown. We want an open-ended plan whereby we can make adjustments if they are necessary. I honestly believe that, in spite of the alterations that have been made from time to time, the plan with which we have been presented is not as flexible as it should be.

I can talk of the things that have happened to the plan since it was first printed. Even though early in 1964 Sir Thomas Playford arranged for the study to be undertaken, and during our term of office the study continued, I think that the first time people became aware of it was when it was first printed. I should have thought that, when the Government first received the printed study, it would have thought it incumbent on it to study it, deciding whether or not it agreed with any principle (as it asks us to do now), but it did not do this.

For the reason the Government has explained (that it thought the public should view the scheme), it released the study to the public without making any decision at all whether it agreed with the plan in principle, whether the plan was financially feasible or whether, even though it had been recommended by experts, it was the best thing for the city. Of course, in the first place everyone in the path of a freeway proposed in the plan was immediately concerned. Regarding the emotional aspect of the issue, there has been much heartache and distress caused by this course. The plan was released for six months, withdrawn and then alterations were made to it that caused more people to be distressed and more heartaches.

Finally it was agreed that the issue should be debated in this House. However, before the motion could be presented in this place, further alterations to the plan were announced. Now the thing has been presented in the House with major parts still deferred for consideration. In fact, even if the Government were to proceed with the plan (even if the House by virtue of numbers were to agree to it as it has been presented to the House), in many cases the people of South Australia still would not know whether or not they were affected by it. The member for Stirling said

that the Opposition had finally said that it believed in some freeways. I want to put the honourable member right on this score. I do not believe that any Opposition member, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, has ever said that we do not believe in freeways. Members on this side have clearly stated that we believe that some freeways are necessary.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you against the plan?

Mr. CORCORAN: I do not know what the plan is. In case the Minister of Lands was not here earlier, I repeat that I think the basic difference between the Government and the Opposition on this issue is the emphasis that is placed in this plan on the motor vehicle as opposed to public transport, and I will deal with that matter later. We hear talk about a properly co-ordinated and balanced plan. Hundreds of thousands of words have been printed and spoken on this subject since it was first raised. Some arguments have been emotional, but I will try to speak realistically and sensibly and will appeal to the Government not to proceed hastily with this plan. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) said there was no urgency about the plan. I agree with him, and the mere fact that the Leader of the Opposition has moved that the report does not make adequate provisions and should be referred back to the State Planning Authority for reassessment for a number of reasons does not mean there will be a long delay. That is because, as the Leader has pointed out in his speech, the major part of the time taken to prepare this study was occupied in the collection of data on which to base a plan, and that data is relevant now and can be used for any alteration to or adjustment of the plan.

The Minister of Roads and Transport (Hon. C. M. Hill) has stated that, if we do not get on with the proposals, we may lose the money that the Commonwealth Government would otherwise grant in the next five years for expenditure on arterial roads in the metropolitan area. However, I do not agree with that statement: the money would not be lost, because arterial roads in the metropolitan area need improvement (that is obvious from looking at such roads as Goodwood Road and Brighton Road) and that work will proceed, irrespective of what is done about the plan.

Mr. Broomhill: The Premier knows that.

Mr. CORCORAN: Well, although the Government has not said that this will happen, the Minister of Roads and Transport has expressed a fear that it could happen if the

plan were delayed. However, what is done about this plan would not affect that situation, in my opinion. I said initially that I thought the major difference between the Government and the Opposition on this matter was the motor car *versus* public transport. This is obvious to me from the Premier's explanation of his motion and the reasons that he gave why we should support the plan. At page 796 of *Hansard*, he is reported as saying:

While our present transportation system, particularly with respect to roads, is approaching the limit of its capacity, we see ahead an enormous expansion in travel demand. The population of metropolitan Adelaide is expected to increase from 750,000 to 1,250,000 in the next 20 years. Individual person trips made on an average week-day, at present numbering 1,386,000 are expected to increase to 2,651,000 by 1986.

This further statement by the Premier is important:

Patronage of public transport (on a per capita basis) has been rapidly declining over the past several decades.

The reasons for that can be found easily, particularly when we see the recent report on the state of the railway system in this State. I have never thought that the best method of financing the railways, or any means of public transport, was by increasing fares, but this method has been adopted consistently in past years. The Premier's statement continues:

At present, 19 per cent of all trips are by public transport. If the previous trend in public transport usage is allowed to continue, it is estimated that by 1986 as little as 9 per cent of total person trips will be made by public transport.

That statement is made for a reason. I believe it is made to justify the Government's attitude to this plan. The Premier's statement continues:

The rate of car ownership, at present 2.75 cars for 10 people, is expected to reach 3.80 cars for 10 people by 1986. The number of motor cars in the metropolitan area is expected to increase from 198,000 to 443,000.

This is based on the data collected during the study. The Premier's statement continues:

The total vehicle miles of travel on our roads, at present a little over 4,000,000 on an average week-day, can be expected to exceed 10,000,000 by 1986.

Those facts would be true if we allowed the present trend to continue, and that is my point: why should this trend be allowed to continue? Last night the Minister of Lands asked, "Why should we force people not to use their motor cars?" We do not have to force people to do anything. It is important

to change social habits by providing the sorts of things that are needed—not to force people to change their social habits but to give them something that will cause them to leave their motor cars at home and use public transport. The only way this will be done is by providing to the public of this State a flexible, efficient and fast means of public transport.

Mr. Wardle: That sounds idealistic, though.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am at a loss for words to answer that. When the honourable member talks about it being idealistic, we may as well accuse the Leader of the Opposition of being idealistic when he says we should look for future developments in public transport. This is the point I am coming to. Whilst the Premier may try to make fun of the Leader's suggestions and the member for Murray may say that my suggestion is idealistic, if we can put men on the moon in this day and age we can surely do something about public transport. Surely this is not beyond the scope of our scientists and engineers. To say that it is absolutely ludicrous to talk about "Dial-a-bus" is being a little old-fashioned. If we are to take advantage of the advance in technological methods, we should have a plan that is open-ended, that can provide for these sorts of thing if and when they come. Surely the Government should be looking seriously at the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the future of public transport.

I say this in all seriousness, not to try to ridicule the Government in what it has done but because I believe it is a worthwhile suggestion. I hope the Government will take it seriously and will examine it. This is another reason why we want this plan withdrawn and taken back to the authorities so that, if they were not up to date with the latest development in the United States in this field, they could look at it again to see whether they could apply some of those developments to this plan; because only in that way shall we be able to lessen the amount of road traffic that will develop by 1986.

The people must be convinced that it is better to use public transport, and these flexible, efficient and fast methods could be the answer. I say they could be the answer. I am not trying to stir up the Government on this matter; I am trying to be as reasonable and as constructive as possible. I believe that we must examine the possibilities of public transport far more closely in this issue than we have done.

On the subject of finance, I think Government members would recognize that it is far easier for the Government over this period of time to finance freeway construction than it would be for it to finance improvements in public transport. I think this is a fact, as the present financial arrangements apply. Although I do not know whether this has influenced the thinking of the Government, I imagine that it could have. We know that the money will be coming into the Highways Fund and that there will be Commonwealth Aid Road grants, and that a certain amount of this can be devoted to development in the metropolitan area. That being the case, we are fairly sure that that money is there. However, we must bear in mind that, unless special arrangements are made, the money for any improvements to public transport will have to come from our Loan funds, and that this will be at the expense of schools, hospitals, and other such things.

Therefore, it is an important consideration. But surely to goodness if this is the case the Government should be preparing a case to place before the Commonwealth Government for the sort of finance we need to improve our public transport. I am sure that such a case would be backed by every other State, because every other capital city has a problem that is at least as bad as our own, if not worse. This is what the Government should be looking at. It should be impressing on the Commonwealth Government the need for us to improve our public transport system, and it should be telling it of the difficulty we will have in financing any improvement in it. I think that if the Government did this it would receive a sympathetic hearing eventually.

The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) impressed upon us this afternoon that he believed that the people who used these facilities should pay for them. He knows, I suppose, as other members know, that there is a difficulty in convincing people in the country that it is necessary to have this sort of thing in any capital city because they believe (and they could be right) that it must be done at their expense and they would not gain as much benefit from it as would the people who live in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Burdon: And there would be a lot of truth in that.

Mr. CORCORAN: Well, I have my doubts about it. I do not want to rake up any muck in this, because I believe it is important to this State, as the member for Stirling said,

that we have a proper transportation system in the metropolitan area because this must benefit everyone living in the State. However, I hope that the assurance given by the Premier in his statement to this House will ring true, and that rural roads will not suffer. I do not see any need at all for them to suffer, and I think that the plan can progress without that happening. I only hope that the assurance given by the Premier is correct and that it is different from the reply given by the Attorney-General in this House on October 24 last year to the member for Glenelg, as follows:

Information contained in the M.A.T.S. Report indicates a distribution of highway funds between the metropolitan district of the Highways and Local Government Department and the remainder of the State, as set out on the table herewith. The metropolitan district of the department is not precisely coincident with the planning area adopted for the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study; but the percentages given in the table may, for practical purposes, be regarded as the percentages sought by the honourable member. It should also be noted that the planning area adopted for the purpose of the study is not presently and will not by 1986 be fully urban in character. It should also be noted that there are areas of urban development in the State outside the Adelaide metropolitan area. As the remainder of the reply is a statistical table, I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

That table, headed "Percentage Distribution of Highway Funds", shows that for the year 1968-69 the metropolitan district percentage is 34.1, and for the remainder of the State it is 65.9 per cent. In 1985-86 the metropolitan district percentage is estimated at 49.8, while the remainder of the State is 50.2 per cent. During the period from 1968-69 to 1985-86, the decrease for the remainder of the State is 15.7 per cent, and the increase in the metropolitan district is 15.7 per cent. This causes me alarm, but as the Premier has said that country people need have no fears in this regard I accept that. If the Government would do the things that I have suggested about improving public transport (and I believe it should, because that is the real answer to our problem) in conjunction with freeways and motor vehicle traffic, it would have to rearrange its finances.

The report has suggested that \$107,000,000 is to be spent on improving public transport but, if we are to spend that much or more on public transport, this Government should be doing what I have suggested it should do. We are planning 20 years ahead, yet we have had the report for just over 12 months, and to

rush in and agree to it on principle is not a sound policy. We should take more time: we can be critical of the Government, but it has a major problem and the solution is not easy. However, if more time was taken and this matter had been handled in a better way, I would not be criticizing the Government.

The member for Onkaparinga grins at what I have said. Anything that effects the lives of people for the next 20 years and beyond is important and should be thoroughly considered. That is why I agree with the Leader that the plan should be withdrawn and reassessed. We do not suggest ignoring the State Planning Authority or people in the State who know the State best; we suggest giving it to them because having collected the data from the experts, we do not need their advice. We have people in this State who can assess the plan properly, but I give a warning that we cannot rely entirely on engineers.

I am reminded of what occurred in the South-East (and the member for Victoria would agree with me) about drainage. Drainage was wanted in the South-East area, but it was considered an engineering problem. The engineers were asked to drain water from A to B, and they did it, but if they had conferred with agricultural authorities the drains would not be as they are today. It is not only engineers who are involved in this matter: it is people involved with planning generally. The plan should fit the general pattern of development, and everyone should play a part in it. It is a long, detailed, complex exercise. I hope the Government will heed our advice, and regard our advice as a constructive approach to the problem in which we should be sharing, because it is so important.

I am not happy about the present position in regard to finance. More finance should be provided to improve the public transport system. We should be using public transport to a greater extent and going to the Commonwealth Government with a case that would convince it of our needs. We should not, through Loan funds, be robbing schools and hospitals to finance this plan. It must be remembered that people will be affected, no matter what plan is eventually adopted. As someone said this afternoon, this is the price we pay for progress: it is unfortunate, but it is true.

Mr. Broomhill: Let it be shared by all, though.

Mr. CORCORAN: The answer is not to move it from one set of people to another, but to do what is advocated by people who should have feelings about this matter, so that as few as possible are affected. I agree with the statement of the member for Glenelg that it does not really matter if we go a little farther and it takes a little longer if, in doing so, we consider the needs of individual people, because they are important. I realize that an engineer would like to plan a route in a straight line from point A to point B. I realize that people who have to drive their cars a little farther because the route is indirect would consider (as the member for Stirling said) that over 20 years it would cost more, but I am old fashioned and sentimental enough to believe that we should not unnecessarily take people's properties for Government purposes.

In regard to compensation, I realize there is some danger and I want to be realistic. The Attorney-General is drawing up legislation to set up a court that will provide speedy hearings of compensation questions. You, Sir, and other members have had experience of property acquisitions, particularly in regard to roads. It seems to take a very long time before people know the final position. Where litigation is involved and where there is disagreement on the price, it is essential that the matter be speedily finalized.

I am concerned, too, about the matter raised by the Christian Life Movement (it did occur to me, however, before I received this organization's circular). The Victorian Government has enacted a provision in respect of this matter. I point out that there are inherent dangers in it. The organization contends that compensation should be based on replacement or re-settlement costs. Where replacement or re-settlement costs are involved, some consideration should be given to the people affected. It is all very well to go to a person affected by this scheme and say, "We will give you what we consider to be fair market value for your property," but there are many things that go into a home that cannot be paid for—things that have been built up over the years. Those things cannot be paid for. These people have to move. Even if, with the funds available, in another area close to the area in which they lived before they are able to build a house, there are many things to be done around the house. There is the expense and inconvenience of moving, and surely it is reasonable to expect some consideration for this aspect. I think it is important that the Government seriously consider this, and I hope it will.

My remarks in this debate are in the form of an appeal to the Government to be reasonable. It should not try to hit back at the Opposition. The Premier said unfairly that, because we were opposing the Government in this matter, we were being political. I think the tenor of my remarks indicates that we are not being political but that we are vitally concerned with something that will affect the people of this State over a long period. That is the crux of the matter. I heartily support the Leader's move not only to withdraw the plan and have it reassessed by the authority and plans integrated for roads, but also to have emphasis placed on improvement to public transport. I could talk about how it can be improved. I have a statement from an ex-Railways Commissioner, who I believe to be a person of great ability who devoted his whole life to this subject and wanted to have something to say about it. No doubt other members have seen this. He says emphasis should be on public transport. Secondly, he says that the plan should be financially feasible, and I hope I have suggested to the Government ways and means of tackling this. Thirdly, he says the destruction of houses and other things should be minimized, and this is an absolute must. Other members who have spoken in the debate have indicated ways and means of doing this and I think it is incumbent on the Government to do it. He says that the Government should move forthwith to amend legislation to deal with compensation, and I have spoken about that. Although I applaud what the Government is doing to speed up litigation in this matter, I think it should seriously consider the matter I have raised and the matters raised in the pamphlet from which I have quoted. I support the amendment moved by the Leader.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I do not want to prolong this debate, but I believe the Opposition has a duty to the people of South Australia, in the true realm of an Opposition Party, to point out to the Government that this scheme is wrong, because it is opposed by so many people who have made a close study of urban development as well as of transport needs. I think that the two are inseparable. Unfortunately, in the M.A.T.S. plan no mention is made of the future needs of urban development. All this plan is doing is providing for motor vehicles to move into the metropolis. Freeways from the Adelaide Hills towards Port Adelaide are mentioned. That is all right: I have no qualms about the need for some freeways in the metropolitan area. A couple of days ago I asked the

Premier to give members a detailed map so that we could see what had been proposed initially when the plan was released to the general public and what was contemplated later. However, I am still waiting for that map. It is too late now, because I am speaking in the debate. If the Government was genuine in its approach, it would have supplied a map to all members, including Government members, who are not very vocal at present. I do not think they know anything about the plan. The member for Stirling is the only Government back-bencher who has spoken, and it is time other Government supporters, if they intend to vote with the Government, spoke in support of the motion.

Mr. Venning: We will.

Mr. CASEY: That is good, but I do not see the honourable member's name on the list: perhaps I have induced Government members to change their minds all of a sudden, and I will be interested to hear them. South Australia has a good record in town planning: in 1916 the first Town Planner was appointed, and this was the first State to pass an Act relating to town planning. That was in 1920, but since then we have done practically nothing. The Attorney-General laughs at that statement: perhaps in the last few years we have tried to do something, and I am pleased that we are possibly on the right track at last. I hope that we stay there, because we have many cities in the world to learn from and it is a pity that the Government, before introducing this plan, had not learnt from cities that had experienced transportation problems.

To say that the plan is vastly different from what was first announced is the understatement of the century. The statements by the Premier in this Chamber and by the Minister of Roads and Transport in the Upper House show that the deferments total 14. Why were these deferments made at this stage? I do not think that the Government knows where it is going on this matter. The Minister of Lands (Hon. D. N. Brookman) was extremely concerned about motor vehicles, and he favoured the use of private motor vehicles instead of public transport. The Premier said that the freeways in Los Angeles were extremely safe and the fatality rate was extremely low. Let us consider what happens in the United States of America and what some of the experts think of the Los Angeles freeways. Mr. Harrison Salisbury, writing in the *New York Times*, states:

Time and time again Los Angeles freeway movement is impeded by accidents. So chronic

is the problem that the engineers propose to remove stalled cars from the highway by helicopters. The truth is that a horse and buggy could cross Los Angeles almost as fast in 1900 as an automobile can make this trip at 5 p.m. today.

These are known facts. I experienced this in 1965, and nobody can tell me that the freeways in Los Angeles are the answer to the transportation problem. They are not, because as soon as we make provision for more motor cars to come into a city, we get more motor cars and an erosion of the city by motor cars. Therefore, we have to keep on making more freeways for more motor cars.

In this scheme, a total of about \$30,000,000 is set aside for parking stations in the metropolis. What happened in some cities in America where parking stations were made available for vehicles? One of the commissioners in charge of transportation in a certain city advocated a site for a garage (as a parking site is called over there). It was logically located between a department store and the foot of a bridge. In the analysis of that situation, it was found that, if this garage had been built at this particular point, 129 businesses, including several unique spice shops to which customers come from all over the metropolitan area, a couple of art galleries, some dog beauty parlours, a couple of very good restaurants, a church and a great many residences, including several recently rehabilitated old houses, would have been affected. The businesses included those which would be taken, and those facing, on the opposite sides of the streets, for these made a unit; the businesses left faced a huge deadening garage. That is the type of thing that happens in the metropolis.

I know that motor vehicles are essential in suburban areas. I am concerned only about motor cars coming into the metropolis. Once we start encouraging motor vehicles to come into the metropolis and make avenues available for them, they will come in ever-increasing numbers. For example, one American city took out statistics by providing parking sites at suburban railway stations for people coming in from the suburbs and channelling all the road traffic into those suburban railway stations. It was found that, if they could fill those parking stations, they would save 28 miles of parking space in the metropolis.

That is the type of study that has never been undertaken here; I can see no reference to such a study in the M.A.T.S. Report. These things vitally affect the metropolis. The business half of the city is what we are interested

in because, once we get more motor vehicles into the metropolis, the more we congest it and clutter it up, and the pedestrian is in fear of his life every time he crosses a street.

Certain types of vehicle (such as delivery vans and commercial vans of all descriptions) must come into the metropolis. What will happen to this type of vehicle if we infuse ordinary motor cars into the metropolitan area? We will reach the stage, as has happened in New York, where all deliveries will have to be made between midnight and 2 a.m. Of course, this does not contribute in any way to the efficiency of running a metropolis, because it is uneconomic.

Do we want to strangle the metropolis? The metropolis is supposed to be the heart of a city, where the business of running the State and all that goes with it should be centred. It should be alive. However, we will kill it if we encourage people to bring private motor vehicles into the city. Statistics and, indeed, practical experience in the U.S.A. have proved this, and I have witnessed it myself, particularly in San Francisco. On my return from the U.S.A. in 1965 I had something to say about the problems the cities there were facing; and since then we have received more information on the subject. Strangely enough, the people in the U.S.A. are in the happy position that they can spend millions of dollars on transportation in their cities and if they make a mistake they have millions of dollars with which to correct it. However, we do not have this type of money in Australia, so we should not rush madly into this sort of thing unless we are absolutely sure of where we are going.

Mr. McKee: Sir Henry Bolte says that the Commonwealth Government in Canberra has millions of dollars to spare.

Mr. CASEY: We can put the money to much better use in this country than squandering it on such a plan as we have before us now. I do not know where we are going in this matter. I am only trying to be helpful to the Government and to point out what I think are problems which this plan will not solve. Let us look at the situation with the railways. I have an idea that somebody said that as the railways were not the answer to moving the people they would not be patronized. Well, the human being is a creature of habit, and I think that if we can convince him it would be ludicrous for him to bring his motor vehicle into the city (because of the increased traffic, because it would be more

expensive for him, and because he would be more likely to be involved in an accident) and that he could be channelled into a swift railway service or even a bus service into the metropolitan area, he would weigh up the situation very smartly. I maintain that he will do that because he knows that it will affect his pocket.

Let us compare the rail transit system with freeways. If we extend a road system that will merely encourage the greater use of private motor transport between work and home, we will naturally cause a decline of patronage on buses and trains. This is only natural. Strangely enough, it has been proved in the U.S.A. that the extra number of motor vehicles entering metropolitan areas as a result of people being encouraged to use their own motor cars is not in the same proportion as the decline in the number of people using rail transport. However, it should be remembered that one rapid transit rail track is equivalent to 70.5 lanes of freeway, and that while automobiles can carry 3,000 seated passengers in each lane each hour a rapid transit system can carry 50,000 seated passengers on each track each hour.

We need only go to Sydney to get a practical demonstration of this. On my first visit to Sydney well before the last war, I was amazed at the number of people being transported by rail. Today, the stage has been reached where double-decker carriages are provided in order to transport people from the city. These are aspects that this plan does not consider. Although it has been suggested that there would be a feasibility study of railway services, I understand that this is not practicable. Why introduce a measure before all the facts are available? The Government is asking us to support a measure that introduces all modes of transport, particularly railways, and to approve a railway system that is not feasible. I challenge the Premier to say what he said about the rail transport system in the plan is feasible, because I know he cannot do that.

If one aspect of the transport system, as proposed in this plan, is not feasible, we cannot support the M.A.T.S. Report. We are trying to help the Government by suggesting that it should not proceed with this plan, because it is not in the best interests of the people of this State. We ask that it be referred to specialists to reconsider it, so that everything can be taken into account. We can learn from the mistakes of other people, and much information is available. I hope the

Premier will show some common sense and not try to bulldoze the plan through. Perhaps the Government has gone to such pains to try to remedy its initial mistake of releasing the report when it had no right to do so.

A prominent businessman in Adelaide last year told me that he wanted to extend his activities by increasing the size of a warehouse that was built alongside a planned freeway. He asked me whether it would pay to go ahead, and I told him that he should speak to the Minister of Roads and Transport about it. He said that the Minister had said that he would go on with this plan. Since then this man has sold his interests to a firm from another State, and I am sure that he was influenced by the contents of the M.A.T.S. plan as it was submitted to the people of South Australia. If the Premier does not believe my story I will supply him with the name of the gentleman and details of his business.

A Mr. Edmund Bacon was Director of the Planning Commission of Philadelphia: he has written about some of his problems as a planning commissioner and how he was confronted by irate citizens as the result of his plan for the construction of a freeway in Philadelphia. The people came out in force with placards saying "Fry Bacon". He was happy to accept that point, but he did say that he was prepared to listen to what the citizens had to say because the very earthiness and directness of their reasoning brought about some concrete and specific local logic.

As the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) pointed out today, the people have not been considered to the extent that they should be considered. When he suggested that perhaps a freeway could be moved in a certain direction to avoid certain built-up areas, he was criticized by the member for Strirling (Mr. McAnaney) because that member said that it would mean three or four miles extra travelling a day for motorists. We do not know how much extra travelling would be involved: we do not know about such things, but the Government should find out about them.

I sincerely hope that the Government will consider all points mentioned by members on this side. It is no good the Government's saying, "We have 19 members and the Speaker and the Legislative Council, so that is it—we are going ahead with this plan, and to hell with everyone else." The people will not accept this attitude. The Government must be completely fair, because this plan will affect the city of Adelaide for many years to come.

If we make a mistake it will cost a large sum to rectify it.

The city of Los Angeles has experienced serious problems with its freeways. At one time it was recognized that Los Angeles had the best transportation system in the world, but unfortunately the motor car has taken over. I am speaking now in general terms of the metropolis itself, not the suburban areas. Housewives find freeways absolutely essential in suburban areas. If we are to give priority to motor cars ahead of public transport, where will we finish up? We will have to ask every family to have about three motor cars, because there will be no public transport. Let us be sensible about this matter.

The other day I read an article describing what happened when Mr. Krushchev visited Los Angeles (I believe he went to Disneyland). He had one look at Los Angeles and said, "This is chaos. I will ensure that this does not happen in our cities. I will give freedom to the taxi-cabs." And Mr. Krushchev did just that. I understand that when he went back to Russia he went via Vladivostok and announced that he would not have private motor vehicles cluttering up the metropolis and would consider increasing the number of taxi-cabs in those cities. I believe he had quite a good point. In a taxi-cab one can get to one's destination, but if one goes in a motor car one has to park the car to start with.

The Minister of Lands was adamant that he preferred motor vehicles to public transport every time. I do not think he understands the full implications. I do not think he has studied the problems experienced in other countries, particularly in the United States. Residents of San Francisco have emphatically rejected all plans for extending freeways into the city's residential section. The latest rejection occurred in October, 1967, and reaffirmed a desire to prevent any further intrusions of highway structures into the city. That is exactly what I spoke about in 1965. Strangely enough, the rejection has meant that this city has turned away \$250,000,000 available in State and Federal highway funds. When given a choice of proposals (and notwithstanding the enormous pressures from the automobile industry, highway builders, service and supply organizations), people selected a scheme based on rapid rail transit. These are the sort of things I want the Government to look at. Unfortunately, we must have higher density living in Adelaide. This is one of our problems.

I think we are going too far out and cannot use our transport system as we should, because greater distances must be travelled for a limited number of passengers. Anyone who has been in the Army (and the Minister of Lands, having been in the Army, would know this) knows that the longer the lines of communication, the more difficult it is to keep up supply. Similar circumstances apply regarding public transport. I hope the Government will consider these matters. Regarding the automobile, I wish to quote from *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. In the chapter headed "Erosion of Cities or Attrition of Automobiles" the following appears:

What if we fail to stop the erosion of cities by automobiles? What if we are prevented from catalyzing workable and vital cities because the practical steps needed to do so are in conflict with the practical steps demanded by erosion? There is a silver lining to everything. In that case we Americans will hardly need to ponder a mystery that has troubled men for millennia: what is the purpose of life? For us, the answer will be clear, established and for all practical purposes indisputable: the purpose of life is to produce and consume automobiles.

That puts the position in a nutshell. In my remarks I am not referring to the outskirts of the metropolitan area but to motor vehicles coming into the metropolis itself. I hope the Government will consider the points raised by the Opposition. The speakers from our side have been constructive in all ways. We do not condemn the M.A.T.S. Report outright. We think it has many good points, but we also think that, in the way it has been presented, too little consideration has been given to all aspects of transportation. As I have said, the biggest single deficiency is the lack of a specific plan for rail rapid transit. I support the amendment.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I, too, support the amendment and join the previous speaker in drawing attention to the fact that it seems that Government members are unable to support the Premier on this occasion, because they have been strangely silent on this extremely important question. I am extremely concerned about the effect of the M.A.T.S. plan on my district, and many people have complained to me. However, obviously Government backbenchers either have not spoken to people in the community or do not care what happens to people in the metropolitan area, because they represent country districts.

The name of the study, the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, is a mouthful, but I tell the Premier that his Government

has made the plan a four-letter word in the opinion of people in my district. As other members on this side have said, we are not being destructive. Our amendment does the Premier the favour of giving him the opportunity to get off the hook and I hope that when the time comes you, Mr. Speaker, will recognize that there is a need for the Government to be let off the hook. As the Leader has said, the Government acted very hastily in bringing this report before the public and the effects of doing that have now been brought home. That the Premier spoke for two hours to give the reasons for his motion points to the difficulties that have been created.

Whilst most matters in general have been mentioned by earlier speakers, I will refer to the difficulties that my electors will face. One of the most interesting features of the Premier's lengthy speech was the repeated references to the Grange railway line. The Premier stated:

Closure of Grange Railway Line, City of Woodville and Corporation of the Town of Henley and Grange: An investigation is proceeding to determine the full implications, including costs, of retaining the line. It has not been possible to complete an investigation in the time available, and so this matter remains deferred.

Later, referring to the Findon Road extension, he stated:

The design of this proposal is related to the design of the proposed Port Freeway and the proposed Escourt Road Extension. Detailed design of those proposals cannot be completed until a decision is reached on the future of the Grange railway line. The matter is deferred pending a determination of the future operation of the Grange railway line.

Then he spoke of a new road connecting Audrey Street, Tennyson, with Trimmer Parade at the intersection with Tapley Hill Road, Seaton, recommended in the study. He concluded that reference by saying:

The alignment of the proposal in the study assumes the closure of the Grange railway line.

Later he spoke about the Estcourt Road extension, in relation to Military Road and Clarke Terrace in the city of Woodville, and then he stated:

This project envisages a new arterial road connecting Estcourt Road, Tennyson, via North Parade, Seaton, to Clarke Terrace, Woodville.

He concluded by saying:

The alignment at the western end of this proposal will be affected by the West Lakes Development Scheme, and the alignment at the eastern end will be affected by the decision regarding the future operation of the Grange railway line.

When he talked of the Findon Road extension, he concluded by saying:

The matter is deferred pending a determination of the future operation of the Grange railway line.

This clearly demonstrates the impossible mess the Government is in on this matter. First, in the present proposals that we are asked to endorse, we have a reference to the fact that consideration is being given to the closure of the Grange railway line. Then, as a result of that one simple decision, another four decisions at least are made. In other words, if the Government had been able to determine whether the Grange railway line was to remain or was to be closed, the other four decisions could have been made definitely at this point of time. This is the whole tone of the proposals we are asked to consider now.

The Grange railway line is a matter that I have raised for several months, ever since the proposal was first made that it be closed. I have received about four different answers to the questions I have asked in Parliament. Before the latest announcement was made by the Premier in the House last week, I received correspondence from the Minister of Roads and Transport on this matter, following questions I had asked in Parliament in February of this year. The Minister at that point of time said:

I refer to your question in the House of Assembly of February 12, 1969, and advise that the decision of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study to recommend the abandonment of the Grange railway line was a marginal one. It was based on the future role of rail rather than on present patronage.

Later, the Minister told me:

Major problems and costs are associated with the grade separation of the line at the Port Road and proposed Port Freeway crossing and these costs had a major bearing on the decision to abandon the line. The Grange line does not carry any freight traffic so its future use is confined to providing passenger services only. The area served by the line is restricted and as it is relatively close to the city it is considered that it could well be served by a radial bus route system.

This was on June 30 and last week. This letter makes clear that the Minister had reconsidered the proposal I put to him complaining about the proposal to abandon the Grange railway line. He indicates that he has considered this but nevertheless he feels that the decision to abandon the line should be upheld.

Within a month we find that a substantial number of matters affected under the M.A.T.S. plan are all deferred because the Government cannot decide whether or not the line should

now be closed. One reason for this was that I had, by questions in the House, drawn the attention of the Minister to the fact that the decision to abandon the Grange railway line had not taken into account the likely development of the West Lakes proposal and that, as a result of development in that area, considerable new patronage would be available on the Grange railway service. In addition to this, for many years the Government has held land between the Grange railway station and Henley Beach for the expected continuation of the Grange line so that it would run between Henley Beach and the city. Now with these things to be considered, I believe that it has only been in the last week or two that the Minister has realized he has made a mistake in his support for the abandonment of the Grange railway line.

I think this is a typical example of the muddling of this Government. I repeat that the one decision on this Grange railway line has meant that the Government has been forced to defer at least four other projects that are dependent on that first decision. This runs right through the Premier's speech. The two Government members who have been game enough to get up and try to support the Premier on this matter have said that they are putting forward firm and concrete proposals and that they are asking members on this side of the House to support the Government.

What does the Government ask us to do here? It says that we are required to acknowledge the general principles underlying the report and to endorse those general principles. Well, this is an impossible thing for members on this side to do. How can we give the Government a blank cheque to endorse the principles underlying the report and to endorse the principles of all of the things to which I have just referred? We would be endorsing whatever decisions the Government may take in relation to these five matters I have referred to: in relation to the Grange railway line, for instance, where, if we were to know what was to happen on the Grange railway line and if we disagreed with it we would therefore disagree with the other five principles involved in the report.

So it goes on. In particular, we look to the Noarlunga Freeway, which also has a very substantial effect on my district. We are well aware of the feelings that have been expressed to the Government by residents of Kurralt Park and similar areas. The Government has made it clear that at this point of time it has

deferred this project. It has not told us that it has abandoned it, and it could well be that in some months' time, if the proposal of the Government was accepted, it would make a public announcement that it had had another look at it and that the 1968 proposal was the one it was going to adopt. However, at this point of time the feelings of the people have been adequately put to the Premier, to members of the Government, and certainly to the Minister of Roads and Transport. The Minister knows that people throughout the length of the Noarlunga Freeway are hostile.

Mr. McKee: Has the Government taken any notice of them?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes, it has taken some notice, and it has deferred that proposal; and it has said it has done this because it is prepared to listen to public criticisms and to public outcry.

Mr. McKee: But it is trying to rush it through tonight.

Mr. BROOMHILL: That is true. What has the Government told other people by the decision it has taken in relation to the Noarlunga Freeway? It is clear to me that it has said, "If you people who may be affected in any way by the M.A.T.S. proposal squeal loudly enough we will shift it away from you and give it to someone else." These are signs of indecision by the Government, signs of a lack of knowledge of where it is going. As a result, we now find in relation to the Noarlunga Freeway that the Government has said, "We have deferred the 1968 plan; we will be looking at the 1962 route and any other route that people may be able to put forward as suggestions." I say this because I consider that it has made this decision as a result of public outcry. Every person who lives in any likely place where the Noarlunga Freeway might go will be squealing and telling the Government that it should move it.

The position is made worse because of the problems of people who live both on the existing 1968 deferred proposal and on the 1962 proposal. These people, as has been pointed out pretty clearly by other speakers, will be in an impossible position until the Government makes a firm decision. I have tried to establish what the Government meant about the 1962 proposal. In the *News* last week was printed a plan showing the M.A.T.S. suggested freeway and the 1962 proposed freeway, and since then many people living on the 1962 route have asked me where they stand. The

best that I can say is that the Government will probably make some decision in the future, that perhaps the Government will go back to the 1962 proposal (and this would affect these people), or that it may retain the original M.A.T.S. proposal. While the Government is dilly-dallying, these people will not be able to sell their houses and will suffer the worry of not knowing what is to happen.

In addition, if the 1962 proposal is adopted there will be dramatic effects elsewhere in my district, because the Noarlunga Freeway, which has now been deferred, ran through Kurralta Park into West Beach Road, whereas the route under the 1962 proposal ran along the old Glenelg railway line, but, in addition to the freeway, other roads directed traffic from the freeway on to Anzac Highway and back towards West Beach Road. These people now do not know whether they will be affected. In a strip that is almost two miles wide, the people will not know what is to happen until the Government gives a lead and reaches decisions which are fair, proper, and financially feasible. That is what the Leader's amendment seeks to achieve.

We do not suggest that all the proposals are bad or should not be proceeded with: we say that the whole question of public transport, freeways, and roads should be reconsidered. The Government should consider whether these proposals are valid, necessary, and financially feasible, and then tell the public what the proposals are. The Premier should not do now what he did when the plan was first released: he said that this is what the Government thought the plan should be, but it would give the public six months to consider it. Under the present proposal we do little better, because we are only endorsing a principle. The Government has stated that it will make firm announcements from time to time, but this is the most ridiculous way to handle this important matter. If Government members voted on this motion according to their consciences, they would support the Leader's amendment.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You are not suggesting that they will not do that?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes, they have been given instructions not to speak in the debate, because it is well known that they would be unable properly to defend the Government's actions. I think they should recognize that we are not using this issue as a political matter. If the Premier has made a mistake (and it is obvious to everyone that he has) he should be big enough to say that the Government

rushed into this and that the Leader's amendment would give time for further thought and the opportunity to correct the mistake. The Premier would not lose face with the public if he took this step, but he might gain credit for being big enough to admit that a mistake had been made.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Stirling said that there was no hurry.

Mr. BROOMHILL: He did, and the Premier's proposal makes this clear. The Government will be making all sorts of different decisions from time to time, but we are asked to endorse them now. I do not know how the Government can expect us to consider such a matter seriously.

I believe that you, Mr. Speaker, are familiar with the situation affecting Glenelg North. The way the Government has tackled the matter in this area and in other areas is a complete joke. The M.A.T.S. plan proposed that Brighton Road be extended to meet Military Road at the Sturt River outlet on Military Road and the Patawalonga. It was obvious to everyone that this was a mistake. It fitted in nicely, however, with the pattern of the member for Stirling because it went in a straight line.

Mr. Lawn: Once, he liked curves.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I think that was in a different context. Apparently the people who considered extending Brighton Road thought of little else than drawing the shortest line between two points. This meant that we would have had the Tapleys Hill Road and, within a short distance to the east, this extended Brighton Road coming right through Glenelg North. One only has to look at a map to see what a mistake this would have been. Glenelg North is a reasonably small suburb because it is bounded by Anzac Highway and the Sturt River, and it would have been cut in half.

The problem created for the community there would have been immense, and all sorts of difficulty were drawn to the attention of the Government, the Highways Department and me. The extension would have cut through 74 houses, a council depot, the Holdfast Bowling Club, a church, and the grounds of the St. Leonards Primary School. This was obviously unsatisfactory to the Glenelg council and to the residents of Glenelg North. In view of the relatively small number of people affected, I believe that almost everyone in the area must have attended the public meetings, and they let the council and the Highways Department know exactly how they felt on this issue.

Following the first such meeting, there were reports in the *Advertiser* and the *News* on January 31. The *Advertiser* report is as follows:

The M.A.T.S. proposal to extend Brighton Road to connect with Military Road, which would have involved the demolition of 74 houses, will almost certainly be changed, following submissions to the Highways Department by the Glenelg council. The Mayor of Glenelg (Mr. C. W. Anderson) said yesterday he was delighted with the decision to reconsider the proposal, though it was not yet known what route the proposed connecting road would now follow. The original plan would have routed the road extension through 74 houses, a council depot, the Holdfast Bowling Club, a church, and the grounds of the St. Leonards Primary School.

A similar report in the *News* states:

The executive engineer of M.A.T.S., Mr. A. G. Flint, today confirmed that "this particular proposal will need to be varied." He said the Brighton Road extension was one of a number of suggested alterations to the arterial road system. "Investigation so far supports the need to re-investigate the Brighton Road proposal. The contribution by the council, being more aware of local requirements, has been very helpful."

That was the attitude and those were the comments of Mr. Flint following public meetings held at Glenelg North. As a result, residents in the area were left with the impression that the department had reconsidered the matter and that the proposal of the Glenelg council to connect Brighton Road with Military Road would be accepted. However, on August 4, I received correspondence from the Chairman of the Glenelg North Citizens Committee. This was forwarded to me by the Town Clerk of Glenelg, who informed me as follows:

I enclose herewith for your information a copy of a letter sent to the *Advertiser*. I consider that the letter accurately portrays the council's feelings in this matter.

Because the letter is lengthy, I do not intend to read all of it, but it points out that the Glenelg council supports what I have said and that the citizens of Glenelg North are irate that, following public meetings, they received information from the Highways Department that the project regarding Brighton Road, which vitally affects them, had been changed. The final part of the letter states:

It seems apparent that the citizens of Glenelg were deluded into believing a change in planning would occur. Why? Was it because an active group of citizens who were fighting to protect their homes and assets were proving troublesome at a time when the whole M.A.T.S. plans were under fire? Or did Mr. Tham and Mr. Flint speak without adequate authority? I hardly think that these two gentlemen would place themselves in that

position. Whatever the reason for this remarkable situation is, the matter should be immediately clarified so people know where they stand. If the proposed route is not to be proceeded with, then tell us quickly, or if it is still a possibility that an extension of Brighton Road will divide Glenelg North into two small and insignificant suburbs then the whole matter should be reopened in order that full submissions can be made by the citizens affected. This has not been done in any depth to date, as all activity in opposition to the plan ceased after the pronouncements of Mr. Tham and Mr. Flint in January this year.

This is clearly an example once again of mismanagement by the Government and by the department in all avenues of public relations associated with this issue. It is regrettable that, instead of reaching the stage that should have been reached, with the Government making firm announcements about what will occur in the future regarding transport in this State, we have nothing but a report full of deferments, and threats about what is likely to happen in many parts of the State. I think it is of some interest to look at what was stated in the *Advertiser* on Friday, August 1, under the heading "Reprieve from M.A.T.S.", as follows:

Thousands of people in the eastern and south-eastern suburbs will be heaving a sigh of relief at the Government's decision to abandon the Foothills Expressway and the Hills Freeway proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan.

Either we were deliberately misled or the Government changed its mind overnight on the abandonment, as against deferment, of the Foothills Expressway, because no-one seemed to be able to follow what the Government was doing. The report also states:

Yet even if the announcement has been timed strategically as a prelude to the coming Parliamentary debate on M.A.T.S., it is to the Government's credit that it has shown itself willing to accommodate protests against the plan in these areas at least.

I think this is the attitude that has been adopted by all people in the community. They are saying, "If the Government will listen to protests about the proposals, it is up to us to protest." If this House is foolish enough to accept the Premier's proposal, anybody likely to be affected by the plan would be foolish not to ensure that his protest was stronger than that of someone else, and the Government has a difficult time ahead of it.

Some important matters have not been dealt with adequately by the Government in its reports to Parliament. I have some statements by Messrs. Atkinson, Coulter, Higbed and Ward. I understand that these statements

were made available to the Minister of Roads and Transport and to the Deputy Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Flint). I will quote from the document, because I consider these people to be thoroughly familiar with all the difficulties that the present Government has got us into, and some of the criticisms are expressed much more adequately than I could express them. The first interesting reference states:

We believe that those responsible for the M.A.T.S. Report were committed to a freeway solution before their work began. Alternative schemes were not considered in detail and a deliberate attempt has been made throughout the report to mislead the public. This has been done in a number of ways.

Throughout the report reference is made to some of these misleading matters. Referring to the Minister of Roads and Transport, they state:

In 1966, Mr. Hill, you drew attention to the inaccuracies in the population predictions made in the 1962 Town Planning Report. If the predictions were already invalid four years after 1962, how invalid are they likely to be by 1986? If M.A.T.S. did not use the 1962 figures, which figures were used? Figure 9/2 on page 97 shows the increase in the West Lakes area at Port Adelaide from 3,700 to 11,600, but it is now planned to build 4,000 houses in this area, accommodating 16,800 people. The M.A.T.S. assessment would appear to be deficient in this area alone by 7,900 people.

I consider that point to be valid. The fact that development at West Lakes was not adequately catered for led to the error in the recommendation to abandon the Grange railway line. Many other errors are pointed out in this document, and all these errors have a vital effect on some part of the M.A.T.S. scheme.

If the figures that were used on those occasions are shown to be incorrect, the additional effect of such an error in many areas must be taken into account. The report continues:

Figure 9-3, page 98, shows North Adelaide's population changing from 7,200 to 11,900, an increase of 4,700 almost certain to be exceeded many fold as high rise development replaces single-storey homes. Do you not consider it unwise to spend \$700,000,000 on a transport scheme for a population already showing marked differences from projected trends? It has often been said that the 1962 plan was not a plan but merely an extrapolation of trends evident up to 1962. The evidence presented here merely confirms this opinion. If a plan is really a plan, then it is not possible for random occurrences to prevent the realization of that plan—at least not without rethinking and reshaping the plan. Would it not be more wise to plan Adelaide first and then design transport to fit this plan?

Later, the report states:

The M.A.T.S. report contains mathematical errors of an elementary kind and these errors in every case show public transport at a disadvantage. Table 9-10, page 106, shows in the percentage increase column the figures 123, 128, 42 and 91. These figures should be 107, 93, 42 and 91. The same table is given on page VI but here the figures are given as 2.10, 1.92, 1.42 and 1.91 and described as "growth factor" not "percentage increase". This table and many others contain figures of spurious accuracy. Thus, we are told that on an average week day in 1986 total person trips will be 2,651,299. Any modern 13-year-old school boy would tell you that this figure should be given as 2,600,000. We believe these non-sensical but frightening figures were included to put off older members of the public who might be tempted to calculate the simple percentage increases given above. Compare the figures given in table 9-2, page 96, which are all given to the nearest thousand. Mr. Flint, are these the figures the M.A.T.S. planners actually used and, if so, would you not agree that such amateur mathematicians should not play with computers? If the mistake was not intentional, how is it that such errors occurred in a report which cost the taxpayer \$700,000?

At page 113 the report states:

The development of the transportation plan to satisfy both current and future travel needs should be in harmony with overall planning objectives and community values.

It goes on to say:

A transportation plan should provide for safe and efficient movement of people and goods while preserving the social, aesthetic and cultural amenities of the community. Page 127 continues with the same commendable attitude when it says, "Unlike physical and economic evaluations most community values can only be measured in qualitative terms. These factors, nevertheless, were carefully considered in evaluating the alternative highway networks". This illustrates how nicely the M.A.T.S. Report points out that we should take into account community values when considering the development plan. In this category we have to consider the community values of the houses of the people affected; yet the biggest final criticism I received of the M.A.T.S. Report, despite the nice phraseology, was that in all cases the freeways followed the shortest route between any two points with no consideration of alternative routes which might have been a little longer but which would have saved houses and the destruction of the reserves that we know will be affected under the M.A.T.S. plan, and the cultural amenities of the community and its business interests. Whilst the expressions used by the M.A.T.S. committee were nice, nevertheless the effects of the report were quite the reverse. The report further states:

M.A.T.S. at no point mentions air pollution and yet about 50 per cent of urban air pollution in large American cities is caused by automobile exhausts, and this pollution is so bad that the sulphur dioxide content of the air has become a regular part of the weather reports. Is this not also a community value which should have been considered?

I believe that the Leader and the member for Glenelg dealt pretty thoroughly with air pollution, and I think this is something that we have to consider when we talk about the community values of any overall plan that we should have for transport development.

In conclusion, I say that the people in this State will not be prepared to accept the proposal that the Government has put forward. I sincerely hope that the Premier's motion is not carried, because if it is we will find ourselves within the next few months being placed in the position where we have given the Government, and the Premier in particular, as well as the Minister of Roads and Transport, virtually an open cheque to make whatever changes to the principles of the M.A.T.S. plan that they may wish to make. As a result of their using the authority that we accept the general principles of the M.A.T.S. plan, we could find wholesale changes occurring from day to day and from week to week to which this Parliament and the people involved would not be able properly to voice their objections. The Premier or the Minister, whoever was game enough to be the spokesman, would say that he had the authority of Parliament to make any of these changes, and accordingly the people of this State would suffer.

I repeat what has been said by the previous speaker; the amendment that has been put forward by the Leader does not create any embarrassment to the Government; in fact, it rescues the Government from the embarrassing position in which it has placed itself. As the amendment will not delay the progress for transportation that we all recognize requires early action, I support it.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support the amendment. I have for some time studied the representations made in the various submissions that the Government has put forward from time to time, and throughout I have had grave reservations. I was pleased when the Leader moved his amendment, for because of the astronomical expenditure estimated for the M.A.T.S. plan the people in the country are vitally concerned about the scheme.

I am surprised that only one Government back-bencher has had the courage to rise in support of the motion. Either Government

members are not prepared to support the plan or they have not yet had sufficient time to analyse the Premier's statement. I think I heard a Government member interjecting earlier that he intended to speak to the motion. Apparently, Government members are not yet fully convinced that the Government has submitted a plan that is acceptable to the people of this State. Country members on this side also would like more time to study what has been put before us in the last few days. If it is fair for the Premier to inform his back-benchers that they could have more time to study these proposals, it is only right and proper that the House should give additional time to Opposition members. In that case, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Wallaroo has asked for leave to continue his remarks.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave has not been granted.

Mr. HUGHES: I regret that Government members have not seen fit to grant me this leave. With others, who are extremely interested, I am sure that Government members sitting behind the Ministers are not convinced that the plan laid before the House by the Premier is in the best interest of the State, because if they were they would have said so.

Mr. Virgo: It is indefensible.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course it is. They do not have the guts (and I am not in the habit of using that word, but it has been used before in the House and I will use it again) to stand up and support the Premier on this measure for fear of repercussions they know will be forthcoming from people in the country districts that they represent. I would not have taken notice had it not been for a Government member's interjection made when the member for Frome was referring to the point that I am now making, that "we will". When will we? Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have been a member of this House and have been held in high regard by all members for a considerable time, and you would know that in debates in this House on an extremely important measure such as this, it has been common practice for speakers of both sides to alternate. However, here we are with as yet, apart from the Premier and the Minister of Lands—

Mr. Virgo: He didn't say anything.

Mr. HUGHES: He stood up and supported the Premier, and no doubt he believed what he said. I am not referring to the Minister, but

it has been shown that Government members do not have the courage to get up for fear of what is going to happen to them when people in their districts react.

Mr. Hurst: Even the member for Eyre has not spoken on this motion.

Mr. HUGHES: I am surprised at that, because he is not afraid of the Government on such matters as this, but he knows, the same as I know, that this plan is not being accepted in the country half as much as the Premier would like it to be. People in the country are concerned, because of the incomplete analysis that has been made and because of the Government's taking a course that may not be in the best interests of this State. This situation has been brought about by the shifting of the Government from one plan to another for a considerable time. This statement cannot be denied by any Government member who cares to follow me, because the Government has amended its original proposals more than once. I think with horror about what would have happened if the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) had not pressed for a debate on this measure. If he had not done so the Government would have proceeded with this plan without amending it and without any consideration for the people affected.

This plan has caused heartache in many homes, particularly those of elderly people. Sometimes the younger generation can accept such disturbances, but middle aged and elderly people become fearful if they think their houses may be bulldozed down. No-one here can deny that many people must have had such fears. How very true is the following paragraph from a paper that no doubt every honourable member has received:

If in the near future the South Australian people, through their Parliament, vote a virtual open cheque for \$1,200,000,000 for a 20-year highway programme, the most charitable thing to assume about this action is that they haven't the faintest notion of what they are doing.

I heartily agree with that. Several members opposite have apparently not done their homework on this matter; if they had, they would have been on their feet long before this and the paragraph I have quoted need not have been printed. It is becoming common talk amongst the general public that several members of Parliament do not have the faintest notion of what is involved in the M.A.T.S. plan. The paragraph continues:

Within the next 15 years they will doubtless find out, but by that time it will be too late to correct all the damage to our city—including

the efficient organization of industry and transportation—that this ill-conceived and preposterously unbalanced M.A.T.S. programme will have wrought.

This is true. Had it not been for the storm of opposition that followed the remarks of the member for Edwardstown and of the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill in another place, the Government would have proceeded with the original plan. Because of the strong opposition that was voiced against the Government for its planning to spend this huge sum without the matter being first debated in Parliament, Cabinet had to have another look at it. Consequently, it was announced that the matter would be brought before Parliament and that members would be able to debate it. It was also because of the strong opposition voiced that the Government shifted its position.

I have studied the Minister's remarks in this connection. If members care to look into this, they will find the Government has shifted considerably from its original intention regarding this plan. On looking through the speech one finds paragraph after paragraph stating "This portion of the plan is to be deferred." One deferment relates to the railway system in this State. The curtailment of our railway system is a burning question, because trains are one of the best means of transport. This public transport, if properly handled, can pay for itself. Balance sheets of railway organizations in other countries show attractive results, and there is no reason why similar results could not be obtained in this State. The Premier's speech states:

1. Proposed Goodwood-Edwardstown Rail Diversion, Cities of Unley and Marion: The diversion as proposed in the study report shall not be adopted.

Had there not been opposition to the plan originally intended to be forced on the people of the State, the Government would have gone ahead with this particular part of the plan. However, because of opposition, this portion will not now be adopted. The Premier's speech continues:

2. 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 indicates that the Government needs only the slightest provocation to close several railway stations. Much to my regret and contrary to the wishes of the people, the Government

has already closed country rail services. Without going into the country to ascertain the position, the Government has simply announced in the *Advertiser* that certain passenger services will no longer operate. That is the way the Government acts: it does not go out to the people and investigate how certain services can be improved. It immediately tells the people and its employees, through the daily press, what it will do, and that is not good enough. On item No. 3 the Premier states:

Closure of Grange Railway Line, City of Woodville and Corporation of the Town of Henley and Grange: An investigation is proceeding to determine the full implications, including costs, of retaining the line. It has not been possible to complete an investigation in the time available, and so this matter remains deferred.

I do not know how much longer they want! This is the third deferment in the first three paragraphs, and I understand that there are 14 deferments altogether. Item No. 4 states:

Arterial Road System, City of Salisbury: A major review of the Study proposals for arterial roads in the Salisbury area is progressing. This review arose from a detailed submission received from the Salisbury council and is proceeding in close consultation with the council. The council has prepared a comprehensive series of plans to a greater degree of detail than that adopted during the study. These plans are in general accordance with the basic arterial road classifications proposed in the study, but some significant amendments are suggested. Investigation is proceeding, so this matter is further deferred.

That matter is further deferred, so the first four sections to which the Premier has referred have been deferred! Had it not been for the outcry by members of this Parliament and by the general public, these proposals would have been acted upon, not deferred. Item No. 6 states:

Grand Junction Road Extension, City of Port Adelaide: The study recommends the extension of Grand Junction Road, Rosewater, westwards to form a new link with the Bower Road Causeway, thus establishing an east-west by-pass of the Port Adelaide centre. A detailed investigation of possible alternative routes is being undertaken and is not yet complete, so this matter remains deferred.

"Deferred" is a favourite word with the Government. In addition to the concern by many people in the city, whose houses and industries will be affected seriously, country people are concerned because they consider much money would have been wasted if the Opposition had not been alert.

Mr. Hurst: It's political torture carrying on like this.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, it is.

Mr. Wardle: It is, at this hour of night!

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member will have much more of it if he wants to keep me here. I have done this before: this is nothing new to me and, as I have said, if it is good enough for Government members to have more time to consider these proposals it is good enough for Opposition members to have more time.

Mr. Jennings: And your voice is back in form.

Mr. HUGHES: Whilst it is not fully back in form, it is good enough for me to carry on until midnight or early in the morning. However, in view of the interjection by the member for Murray, who apparently wants to go home, I am happy to co-operate with him, so I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has asked leave to continue his remarks. That leave be granted?

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: No.

Mr. McKee: Divide!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave must be granted unanimously; therefore, a division is not necessary.

Mr. HUGHES: I appreciate very much the efforts of the member for Port Pirie to give me a little relief. Of the first six items in the Premier's speech five have been deferred. Let us now look at item No. 7:

Young Street Extension: Port Road to Dry Creek Expressway, City of Port Adelaide, and Torrens Road Extension: Cheltenham Parade to Young Street Extension, Cities of Port Adelaide and Woodville: A joint study of these two proposals is progressing. The Young Street scheme comprises a northwards extension of Tapleys Hill Road, Hendon, to Grand Junction Road, Rosewater, and thence farther north to the proposed Dry Creek Expressway in the Gillman area. The Torrens Road extension provides a more direct link between the Woodville-Woodville North area and Port Adelaide via the northern end of the Young Street proposal and Grand Junction Road, Rosewater. The proposals for these two projects envisage the elevation of the Outer Harbour railway line in the Alberton area and the construction of the roads at ground level. Planning is proceeding on the assumption that the railway track will remain in its present position and arterial road overpasses will be constructed where necessary.

Planning is proceeding. I thought that we had a plan placed before us, but what is it?

Mr. Burdon: The Government wants us to sign a blank cheque.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. Most of these items are deferred, yet we are expected to vote for this scheme the largest sum that has ever

come before this House. We are asked to sign a blank cheque. That was item No. 7. Now let us look at item No. 8, which refers to the Findon Road extension. The Premier states:

Findon Road Extension: Pitman Avenue to Cheltenham Parade, City of Woodville: This proposal is designed to provide a more direct connection between Findon Road on the south side of Port Road and Cheltenham Parade on the northern side. A provisional alignment is shown in the study in some detail.

Mr. Burdon: There is not much detail in any of it, is there?

Mr. HUGHES: There is not much detail in the proposal placed before us by the Premier last Thursday.

Mr. Burdon: Aren't some members opposite going to follow you?

Mr. HUGHES: I hope they do.

Mr. McKee: I think they will be asleep.

Mr. HUGHES: I hope they do follow me. I am in no hurry: I want to analyse these items as I go along. However, I should welcome extra time to look at them, although I have already gone right through them. Government members have not bothered about this but have merely accepted the word of the Premier on this matter. However, they are not prepared to get up and say so. I just want to enlighten them regarding the deferments and the planning that is still going on in connection with this vital measure. The Premier goes on to say:

The design of this proposal (the Findon Road Extension) is related to the design of the proposed Port Freeway and the proposed Escourt Road extension. Detailed design of these proposals cannot be completed until a decision is reached on the future of the Grange railway line. The matter is deferred pending a determination of the future operation of the Grange railway line.

Again, the matter is deferred.

Mrs. Byrne: How many does that make?

Mr. HUGHES: That is seven out of eight; I did not bother to read one of them. The member for Stirling was the only Government back-bencher who has had the courage to try to support the Premier. He made a pretty poor attempt at doing it, nevertheless, he did it. I turn now to item No. 12, which is as follows:

Military Road Extension at Patawalonga Lake, City of West Torrens, and Brighton Road Extension at Glenelg North, Town of Glenelg: The study recommends a rearrangement of the arterial road system in North Glenelg comprising a direct connection between Military Road, West Beach, and Brighton Road at its junction with Anzac Highway. The scheme

involves a deviation of Military Road near the Glenelg sewage treatment works, to join Tapley Hill Road near the Sturt River crossing with a new bridge over the Patawalonga Basin.

The extension northwards of Brighton Road from its present intersection with Anzac Highway through Glenelg North would link with the deviation of Military Road. Objection was made by the Glenelg council to this proposal. Investigations are still proceeding on the two proposals, which must be further deferred.

Mr. Hurst: Another deferment!

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Even though the member for Stirling had the courage to get up and speak in support of the Premier, he took jolly good care not to mention any of the Government's shifting in this matter.

Mr. Hurst: Is there anything about a freeway from Wallaroo in order to assist decentralization?

Mr. HUGHES: I will have something to say about decentralization later. I will deal with interjections as they come.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the honourable member had better deal with the motion or the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am dealing with what is on the Notice Paper. The Minister of Roads and Transport, speaking about the M.A.T.S. plan, referred to the proposals being debated in both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. The press report of his remarks states:

Mr. Hill said the advantages of decentralization were well appreciated. But it was not easy to achieve in practice. An example was Elizabeth. It was developed in an effort to achieve decentralization, but it was found that people still wanted to come to central Adelaide.

This Government is doing exactly what the Playford Administration did when it built Elizabeth where it is now. Apparently, the position was not considered as it should have been, and the Government was not prepared to listen to people who knew something about these things. Professor Orchard, who was the foundation Professor of Highway Engineering at the New South Wales University of Technology, stated:

As in all other countries, the cities of Australia have been designed and built long before present-day traffic was known or could even reasonably have been contemplated. The result is that in common with all countries Australia is presented with cities which from the traffic aspect are out of date and are out-moded. Clearly the first step is that the growth of cities like Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide must be held. They are already too big. Australia has a considerable intake of

migrants every year, and these all have to be housed. The easiest way is to squeeze them into existing houses and to add houses to existing towns and cities. That is what is being done, but the former cannot continue indefinitely and the latter will only accentuate the existing serious traffic problems. My view is that this growth of population should be absorbed by building entirely new towns at a sufficient distance from the existing large towns to prevent them from becoming dormitories of the large towns.

That is exactly what happened when Elizabeth was built: that town should never have been built where it is. It could have been built at Wallaroo, and it would have been most acceptable. To cut down expenditure, it could have been built in the Murray District. This would have accomplished what Professor Orchard said should be done. Dormitory towns serve no useful purpose, because they are too close to Adelaide and are creating transport problems.

Yesterday, the Premier tried to ridicule the Leader of the Opposition by referring to comments he had made in the newspaper on his return to South Australia from his overseas trip, where he had made extensive research into transport problems in other countries. In the various cities he visited he observed the costly mistakes that had been made. The Premier referred to his remarks as "fun parlour" or "Disneyland" schemes. If ever anyone was playing gutter-type politics, the Premier was doing so yesterday. The Leader went to much trouble during his overseas trip to analyse the mistakes made in other countries so as to ensure that they were not repeated in South Australia. The Premier has made two quick trips overseas, but not for the same purpose. The Attorney-General was overseas for the same period as the Leader, so I am keenly waiting to hear what he has to say on transport problems. I hope the Attorney-General does not have cold feet, as most Government members have.

Mr. Virgo: Do you think the Premier told them not to speak?

Mr. HUGHES: That is evident. On his return, the Leader made comments about the extensive research he had undertaken while overseas, and it was only natural that the press should seek information about it. When he passed on some of his findings to the press, he was ridiculed by the Premier, yet the Premier did not come up with one iota of information on what he had observed during his overseas trip. Consequently, he should be the last person to criticize the Leader.

A book written by Brian Richards, entitled *New Movements in Cities*, deals extensively with transport problems from about 1900 until the present day. It is interesting to observe that, dating back to the horse and buggy era, knowledgeable men in other countries could visualize what was required to serve future transport needs. They put forward some most acceptable propositions that operate today. Those men had the foresight and ability to deal with these matters in the right way. Once they had made up their minds they went ahead; they did not have to shift around and make people afraid that they would lose their houses because they would not be considered by the authorities. This Government should never have released the proposals to the public in the way it did. The first place the proposals should have been released was in this House, so that members could have had an opportunity to assess them, to come to an amicable agreement regarding them, and to tell the public the final result.

At the Paris exhibition in 1900 there was on display an elevated structure two-and-a-half miles long. It had stations at quarter-mile intervals, ran for eight months, and was used by 6,500,000 people. It ran for 12 hours a day, carrying daily about 120,000 people, and there was a total of 40 minor accidents. What a great feat that was, and it showed what public transport could do. However, when one looks at our transport system one is confronted with the huge cost involved in the recent derailments. Considering these derailments, one almost shudders to set foot on the rail systems in South Australia. In 1920, the city of Paris held a competition for a transit system to replace the then inefficient metropolitan system.

Mr. Hurst: Paris has a good railway system.

Mr. HUGHES: I believe it has, but I have not had an opportunity to visit these countries. These were men of vision, men of the calibre of Colonel Light. If we had someone here with the vision of Colonel Light, we would not have these proposals before us. We know that certain highways are necessary, but Colonel Light could see that we would progress beyond the horse and buggy stage, because he planned wide streets. A jocular reason for surveying the streets so widely was so that the horse could be pulled up on one portion and fed on the other. However, that was not the reason. He was a man of foresight, and Adelaide is now handling the type of traffic that he envisaged.

Mr. Virgo: The only trouble is that our people have messed it up since.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I refer to a transport system now in operation at Lake Biwa, Japan, manufactured by the Nippon Conveyor Company. The system consists of a series of open cars running in an enclosed tube, with windows on both sides, up a steep hillside. The two-seat cars are propelled by a series of rubber belts moving at different speeds, with accelerator or decelerator rollers between each length of belt. This system, called a "car-lator", is used as a ski-lift in winter and for sightseers in summer. Cars bunch up at stations at a speed of 120ft. a minute to allow for easy loading and unloading while slowly passing, but increase to 4½ m.p.h. between stations, carrying 3,000 persons an hour.

That is one way in which the Japanese people deal with their transport problems: another system is capable of handling many more than 3,000 people. If we had people with this type of leadership and vision handling our public transport system, people would be able to move quickly and easily without the need for such expenditure as is envisaged in this plan.

The figures relating to the transport system cause me concern. The report refers to roads, highways, and recommended freeways. I realize that there had been certain deferments, but I am concerned about the \$93,700,000 to be spent on land acquisition. That figure is out of all proportion. What does it do? There is 60.8 miles of freeway; that is all there is for such an enormous amount of money. The construction cost is to be \$186,100,000; that is colossal. If we group those two sums together, that is the sum to be spent if the Government proceeds with this plan. Can the back-benchers who have not yet spoken tell me where this money will come from? All I can say is that I think a considerable amount of it must be taken from Loan funds. If members can show me that it will not be taken from Loan funds, I shall be happy to hear it; but I am concerned that vast sums will be taken from Loan funds to meet the cost of this work, which money could be used for the building of schools, hospitals and urgent public works.

I do not think any Government should be allowed to proceed with a scheme of this magnitude that will take so much of our Loan funds, using money that could be used for schools, hospitals and other public works. If the scheme goes ahead, it will mean that one section of the people will receive benefits at the expense of another. Country members are always rising in defence of the part country

people play in contributing to the State's economy in primary production—and I agree with them entirely. Yet about this plan they have so far shown no concern.

I hope I may be proved wrong and that every member will express his concern that this enormous sum is to be spent on one section of the community at the expense of another. This money should not be taken from Loan funds. A plan should be arrived at. We all know we must plan for the future; we must plan for a greater population, but there are other ways and means of getting this money than from Loan funds or perhaps taking it out of the pockets of one section of the community. A case should be prepared by the Government, which should have the strength to go to Canberra, meet the Prime Minister and place before him and his officers this situation. When Mr. Gorton was over here prior to the last State elections, he referred to this State Government as a "member of the family". My experience of family life is that one member of the family usually goes to the aid of another in time of need. I believe that if this Government was strong enough in its appeal to the Commonwealth Government in Canberra this money could be forthcoming over a period of years.

Perhaps an undertaking has already been given and we do not know anything about it. However, I hope that this money will be forthcoming, because it will ease my conscience a good deal and it will also ease the consciences of many country people as well as many people in the city. I am speaking tonight as a member who represents a country district that contributes a great deal to the economy of this State. In fact, I am pleased to tell the House that I represent one of the richest grain-growing areas in this State. Of course, there are other members who live in and represent districts that are equally as rich in primary production; for instance, the member for Yorke Peninsula.

Mr. Ferguson: Mine is a little better than yours.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, it could be. I did not say mine was the best: I said it was one of the best. We are getting somewhere now, for the member for Yorke Peninsula has admitted that he is living in a district which is even better than mine and which is making a big contribution to the economy of this State. Now that he has admitted this by way of interjection, I would like to hear him lodge the

objection which I know would emanate from the people of his district, the same as it would from the people of my district.

Mr. Ferguson: You don't know.

Mr. HUGHES: I do, because I mix with the people in the honourable member's district as well as with those in my own. I am very surprised to hear the honourable member at least imply that there is no objection from his district to the proposed spending of this huge sum of money on this scheme. I can tell this House that I meet people from the honourable member's district quite frequently, and I know very well that many of them are concerned about the possibility of this huge sum of money being spent on this scheme. The honourable member would have us believe that he does not know this. He knows it all right but he will not get up in this House and say so.

It is not only the country people who are showing very grave concern in this matter. I, as a country member, have received extensive representations both from people living in the metropolitan area and from metropolitan councils. I know that the Mayor of Marion has disputed the statement by the Minister of Roads and Transport that the Government had consulted the Marion council before pronouncing in favour of the route of a section of proposed freeway between Marion Road and South Road. I received the following letter from the Mayor on this subject:

My council views with very grave concern the fact that work listed in the report of the M.A.T.S. study can be performed without being brought before Parliament—

This was before the undertaking was given, and I have not had the opportunity until now to bring these matters before the House. When the Premier was moving a motion, the opportunity was taken by the members for Glenelg and Edwardstown to raise this matter, because more time should have been allowed for this debate before now. The Premier took exception to my remarks then, because he said I was not speaking to the motion. At least I said what I wanted to say, and that was that, at that time, I had received strong representation from people about this plan. The letter continues:

The very magnitude of the work involved coupled with the discussion and controversy that has taken place on it warrants, it is considered, full discussion by Parliament and the approval of Parliament before the proposals are implemented. It has been noted that the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, M.L.C. is endeavouring to have the M.A.T.S. proposals fully

debated by the elected representatives in Parliament. The action of Sir Arthur is fully supported by this city and I ask if you, too, would be kind enough to support the matter being fully debated in Parliament, both in the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly. That is what I am doing: I have been asked by these people to do it, and I will do it. The letter continues:

It is considered that the public interest in this matter can only be served by a decision of Parliament thereon. I have written to all members of Parliament on similar lines to yourself and I trust you will find it practicable to give my request to you your full support.

I certainly support the Mayor of Marion's remarks. Under the heading, "Mayor denies 'Consultation'" the following article appeared in the *News* on August 7:

The Mayor of Marion, Mr. Ron Keen, disputed today the statement by Mr. Hill that the Government had consulted the Marion council before pronouncing in favour of a section of M.A.T.S. freeway route between Marion and South roads. "The Government did not consult us at all," Mr. Keen said.

To me this situation is terrible, because it seems that the Government had said that it had approached the council, yet the Mayor, in a public statement, denied this.

Mr. Virgo: He is saying that the Minister is a liar.

Mr. HUGHES: That is what the Mayor is saying, but he did not use "liar". It is what he meant: it is not the truth and he denies it. The article continues:

"Marion Council made submissions on the Noarlunga Freeway route and the rapid rail transit line, and is opposed to the route in the built-up area of its district. However, we are pleased that further consideration will be given to an alternative to the Noarlunga Freeway." Freeways should not be built in built-up areas with the decentralization of industry, shopping, and commercial enterprises, Mr. Keen added.

That is what I told the House in my opening remarks. Had not strong opposition been launched in this House by several questions from the member for Edwardstown which brought forth a storm of protest from the general public, the Government would have gone ahead and done exactly what this man is saying. When I introduced this matter in the initial stages there were a few grins on the faces of members opposite, because they thought I was stretching the point, but I do not see any grins on their faces now. It is not only my view now: it is that of the Mayor of Marion.

I have also received correspondence from Mr. D. G. Pitt, the Clerk of the Corporate Town of St. Peters; his letter makes a strong

protest about the M.A.T.S. plan and asks for my support. I have also received correspondence from the Brighton council on this matter. This correspondence shows how strong are the objections to the M.A.T.S. plan. Through the united efforts of these people, the Government has become windy about this measure, and the Premier is doing everything in his power to defend the Minister of Roads and Transport. Indeed, two Ministers have had to be defended this week, because the tide is turning against the Government. The fact that certain proposals are to be deferred and that additional plans are needed shows that the Government is edgy.

I have not heard one person commend the plan. I admit that I have read in the press one or two weak letters supporting the Minister of Roads and Transport on this matter; I do not know who the authors were. I am sure that the general public does not support the M.A.T.S. plan; indeed, it fears the plan and it realizes the implications of the Government's trying to raise the enormous sum necessary to finance the plan. Members of the public realize they have to pay for it. Even if it is over a long period and even if the money is obtained from some other source, the people realize that eventually it comes back to the taxpayer.

Mr. McAnaney: They still have to pay the deficit.

Mr. Virgo: I don't know how the member for Stirling—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Nankivell): Order!

Mr. Virgo: —can interject from over there.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown has made his speech.

Mr. Virgo: How can the member for Stirling interject out of his seat?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will name you.

Mr. Virgo: Good!

Mr. HUGHES: I have received from a most responsible body a letter relating to the huge sum involved in land and property acquisition. These people realize only too well that this money has to be found by the taxpayers, and they believe that these days better ways can be found to attack the transport problem. I, too, believe there are better ways. I do not think the Government is giving enough attention to public transport, the sum of money allocated for this being small.

Mr. McAnaney: Where have they allocated it?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: It is small in relation to the huge sums allocated for freeways and expressways. I believe that all country members should consider seriously how they will vote on this matter, which is vital not only to those living in the metropolitan area but also to those living in country areas, who contribute a huge amount towards the economy of the State. I know that much controversy arose in country areas about making money available for the festival hall, country people believing that this was another example of centralization. Similar feelings apply in this matter. The Government should consider what was done in other countries in the past in the cases I illustrated. Although I know much money must be spent in providing for future transport needs, I believe the Government can find a less costly method of providing for this.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): This issue having been thrashed around fairly well, I should say that anyone who speaks now will be like a man who plays the fiddle to a deaf man in an empty house. This afternoon the member for Stirling said that this scheme was democratic. I think use of the word "democracy" in this Parliament should be banned. If this plan is democratic, there are many forms of democracy that I do not know about, and this is one of the unusual ones. The Government has made up its mind and will not accept any advice. This has been the usual attitude of L.C.L. Governments over the years. All people agree that something must be done about our traffic problem but they want something sensible, which the amendment sets out to achieve. We ask the Government not to rush into this issue, because it is a big one. The Government ought to consider the concern shown by the people.

Mr. McAnaney: Isn't that what we are doing?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. McKEE: The Minister of Lands (Hon. D. N. Brookman) said last evening that he had complete faith in the M.A.T.S. Report and that he supported it up to the hilt. The only inference that we can draw from such a statement is that Cabinet has decided to accept the plan as it is. The only Government back-bench member who has spoken is the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), who said that it was a democratic scheme and he supported it up to the hilt.

Q2

I think this debate is taking place about 30 years too late. As the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) said last evening, it was obvious in 1945, after the Second World War, that rapid development would occur. However, despite that Liberal Governments have been in office for more than 30 years, no such Government has tried to meet the problem that everyone knew would develop. The L.C.L. has allowed the city to sprawl in all directions, having no regard to complications. One would think that a responsible Government would plan early and acquire land for freeways when it could do so cheaply, before the land was developed. That could not have been done in the central part of the city, which had been established for some time, but the adoption of such a method elsewhere would possibly have halved the cost of the whole scheme.

As the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) has said, one of the simplest ways to help to solve the problem would be seriously to consider decentralization. Elizabeth is now a suburb of Adelaide, and cities such as Elizabeth could have been built on the Murray River, thus avoiding the necessity to pump water a long distance. If this had been done and provision had been made to tackle these problems as the city was developing, the result would have been much better. This is happening not only in Adelaide but also in other parts of the Commonwealth. The capital cities of Australia have been allowed to grow too big. I am sure Government members will agree that, if we allow cities to develop like this, it will cost a tremendous amount of money even for people to come to work on Government transport. Something must be done about reducing Government transport fares to enable people to travel long distances to work.

As a country member, I have had representations from several councils in the mid-north, including the Corporation of Port Pirie and the District Council of Pirie, which are now experiencing difficulty in raising money to carry out ordinary maintenance work. They think that, if this scheme is adopted, they will be severely affected in respect of any further grants. They are concerned now because they are not getting a reasonable grant, so what can they expect if this project continues? No doubt, something must be done but I think the Leader's amendment would solve the problem.

The State Premiers should get together and put pressure on the Commonwealth Government, because they are all in the same boat: every capital city is faced with the same problem. Some are even worse than Adelaide in this respect. The State Premiers should put pressure on the Commonwealth Government and say to it, "We think you should come to the party and help us with our problems." They have made their contribution to the problem by not properly planning their cities. Sir Henry Bolte says that in Canberra they have money running out of their ears, and that would appear to be so judging by the Budget brought down by the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. McMahon) last night. There should be no difficulty there.

I do not want to delay the House any longer. Most people in the State are opposed to this scheme. Therefore, the Government would be wise to look at it again before it makes possibly the biggest mistake ever made by an L.C.L. Government—and, goodness knows, it has made plenty in the past! We do not want to see it commit political suicide by going on with this scheme, although I do not think it has to do that to commit political suicide: it has already done so. However, this will certainly aggravate the issue if it is continued with. I support the amendment.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): Like other members on this side, I support the Leader's amendment. We on this side have made it clear that we support freeways and that we realize that we cannot rely on an arterial road system until 1986. Nevertheless, as this plan is for the next 20 years, it will not matter if it is delayed for perhaps another 12 months. It would be in the interests of the people of this State for this plan to be withdrawn and referred to the State Planning Authority for reassessment. This plan was prematurely released by the Government, and since then public reaction has shown that it is not acceptable. We have had some constructive criticism of the plan, as well as some destructive criticism. Petitions have been presented to Parliament, and experts and well-qualified people have said that the plan is not feasible, while some experts have said that it is feasible.

As it is envisaged that the plan will be implemented over 20 years—and I personally believe that it will be nearer 50 years before it is ever completely implemented, if it ever is in its present form—it would not hurt at this stage to have it reassessed. Apart from this, it is possible that by doing this many millions of dollars would be saved.

I have studied the financial aspect of this matter at some length, and no doubt other honourable members have done so, too. We have been told whence the funds are to be available for road works, for public transport and for parking. However, it seems, especially in respect of the financing of public transport and parking, that this is quite hypothetical, and I am not assured by what has been said by the Premier that these financial assumptions are sound. Also, we must not forget maintenance and operational expenses. No one can say just how much these will be, because as one freeway is put down there will be maintenance expenses involved before another one is built. We should not commit any future Treasurer or any Government in this State to expenditure if we are not sure that the plan is feasible or, if it is feasible, that the money will be available. I am not assured on this point by the explanation given in the Premier's statement in moving this motion.

I wish to refer now to the section of the Modbury Freeway that is in my district. On this subject the Premier said:

The proposed Modbury Freeway is designed to serve the rapidly growing north-eastern parts of the metropolitan area and provide an additional access to the city of Adelaide from the north of the State. In the motion before the House the Modbury Freeway is approved in principle.

I do not feel that I can endorse the principle of the Modbury Freeway when I am not sure what the route will be, because it is further stated that the two sections of this freeway that are situated in the Barossa district will be deferred. The first of these is the section situated between the Torrens River and Grand Junction Road at Holden Hill near the Hope Valley reservoir. The Premier said:

With regard to the section in the vicinity of Hope Valley reservoir, the original proposal was for the freeway to pass through a housing area. Investigations have been undertaken with a view to the possible relocation of the freeway to encroach on the reservoir reserve, thereby avoiding a number of houses.

I hope that it will not be necessary for the construction of the freeway adjacent to the reservoir property to cause houses to be demolished. However, no reference is made to the houses that could be demolished between the Hope Valley reservoir and the Torrens River: these houses are about four years old and were erected by the Housing Trust. Adjacent to these houses was land originally acquired for a projected freeway, and this route was outlined in the 1962 development plan. When

people purchased these houses they knew of this plan and were satisfied that their property would not be affected. They were surprised when they found that the route was to be altered slightly, because this would cause most of the houses to be demolished. This alteration was not necessary, because the only reason for the change was to make a slightly larger curve so that the motorist could drive faster. There will probably be more accidents.

Mr. Virgo: And a few more deaths.

Mrs. BYRNE: Nevertheless, our main consideration should be to see that no houses are demolished unless their demolition is essential, and in this area it is not essential, because land has already been acquired and retained for this purpose.

I refer now to the other deferred section in the Barossa District, which is at Salisbury Heights. The Premier said:

It has not been possible to complete the review of the proposed freeway in the Salisbury Heights area in the time available. The difficult topographical conditions and the associated engineering problems necessitate the investigation being carried out in considerable detail to enable any alternative alignment to be recommended with confidence. Consideration of the freeway in the Salisbury Heights area also involves further study of a four-mile section of the freeway between Milne Road, Modbury North, and the Main North Road, Hillbank. Investigations are proceeding.

Four miles is a long section, and adds to the reason why I cannot at this stage endorse the principle of the Modbury Freeway concerning these two deferrals. When we consider that a four-mile section is being deferred, who can say what will happen in the future? It is admitted that with the present proposed route not many houses would have to be demolished, but even one is too many. People in this area submitted two suggested routes to the Highways Department which would decrease or eliminate house demolition and, from correspondence they have received, I understand that these suggestions are still being considered. Of course, at this stage no-one knows whether either of the two routes suggested will be accepted. They wrote the following letter to the Highways Department:

The undersigned wish to register objections to the route chosen for the Modbury Freeway between Milne Road and the Main North Road.

Our objections to the proposed route are:

1. It is not a minimum cost route.
2. It cuts through the middle of the developing area of Salisbury Heights where residences have already been established.

3. It would mean the unnecessary destruction of a number of established residences.
4. At least one owner of a block near the proposed route would be denied access to his land. There is no road north of Lots 20 and 21, Salisbury Heights, and hence no connection from Lot 20 to Bowey Avenue.

Two alternative routes shown on the accompanying map are proposed.

Naturally, I cannot produce the map here, but I have seen it and I know that the Highways Department has a copy of it. The letter continues:

Alternative I has the following features:

1. It avoids all residential areas which have been defined to the present time.
2. It would not divide the Salisbury Heights area into two separate areas.
3. While the cost, relative to the M.A.T.S. proposal, is likely to be somewhat higher because of the increased length and the more extensive earthworks required north of Cobblers Creek, the cost south of Cobblers Creek should be less and the cost of land acquisition should also be much lower overall.

Alternative II has the following features:

1. It would be less costly than the M.A.T.S. proposal because,
 - (a) the total length would be less,
 - (b) less earthworks would be required,
 - (c) cheaper property would be acquired.
2. The grades involved would be less steep than those involved in the M.A.T.S. proposal.
3. It would be shorter.
4. It would not involve the destruction of more than one existing house.
5. The route follows an existing easement from where it crosses Bridge Road to where it leaves Stanford Road.
6. The approach to the Main North Road is such that it can be readily extended to join an Elizabeth Foot-hills Freeway contemplated in the distant future.

These alternative routes were suggested by people living in the area and I commend their consideration.

On July 22 I asked the Premier, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, that interested parties be able to appear, if they so wish, before the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. On August 5 I received the following reply:

The committee referred to by the honourable member is an advisory committee only. It has considered many submissions and has made recommendations to the Government on many aspects of the M.A.T.S. proposals. No provision exists for persons to appear before the committee, and full consideration is given by the committee and the Government to all submissions put to it.

The submissions referred to would, of course, be written submissions, but I am referring to personal submissions. Although provision for personal submissions has not been made in the past, I think that it should be made in the future. As many sections not only of the Modbury Freeway but also of other freeways have been deferred, spokesmen for people in the sections affected should have the opportunity to present the facts to this committee. After all, who knows an area best: outsiders or the people who live there?

It is extremely important that people whose houses will be demolished because of freeways (and we all know that, whatever the final decision in relation to the sections of the plan that have been deferred, many will be demolished) must receive adequate compensation. They must be compensated for the real loss of their property apart from the market value of their houses. We all know that when a person establishes a property he puts into it a great deal of time, effort and money, and this is never taken into account when the property is valued for resale. Valuers look mainly only at the house and nothing else. Of course, if that happens in relation to this plan hardship will occur. In fact, hardship has already occurred as has been outlined by other members. Removal costs are also not considered when compensation is looked at. The Premier referred to social problems in his speech but whether they will be forgotten about later no-one knows. Also, people living near the freeway should not be forgotten, even though their houses will not be demolished.

The plan seems to concentrate too heavily on freeways, not giving enough attention to public transport. It seems to deal with the increasing use of the motor vehicle and the decreasing use of public transport, on which more emphasis should be placed. It was stated that at present there are 2.75 cars for 10 people, and this is expected to increase to 3.80 cars for 10 people by 1986. At present 19 per cent of all trips made is by public transport, and it is estimated that only 9 per cent of trips will be thus made in 1986. However, every effort should be made to induce people to use public transport rather than private motor cars. We all know that insufficient parking space is available in the city of Adelaide now. Of course, the plan provides for parking space but, if we had more decentralization of industry, there would be less need for parking space in the city. In many of the outer suburbs of the metropolitan area regional shopping centres are

being erected. In my district only two weeks ago such a centre was opened, another being expected to be opened at Ingle Farm next year. In about 15 months or 18 months, probably the largest shopping centre in the metropolitan area will be opened at Modbury. All this development causes people to shop locally instead of travelling to the city. This shopping locally is desirable. Our roads are crowded only at peak periods and we can drive on some of our arterial roads at 10 o'clock in the morning without seeing many cars while travelling one mile.

Greater decentralization of industry would prevent such a heavy use of roads at peak periods, but, unfortunately, industries establishing in this State do not do so in the areas where their location would solve this problem.

I, like the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), think that the Government has made up its mind on this matter, and I think that this plan will be adopted without reassessment. The Premier stated early in his speech that because of the public interest, and so on, the matter would be put to Parliament by the Government in a positive form so that a full debate could be conducted by the elected representatives of the people of this State. However, we all know that this is a farce. If Government members vote on Party lines and are supported by the Speaker, our amendment will be defeated, regardless of whether what we propose is logical. Unfortunately, the public are not protected by a debate such as this to the extent that they think they are. I support the amendment.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals, whether in original form or any other form, comprise a plan for the city of Adelaide. I am a country member, representing a district about 300 miles from Adelaide. One may ask how this proposal affects the country and why country members would wish to take part in a debate that concerned only city dwellers. I do not want to frighten the House by the number of reference books that I have available, but the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) is preparing considerable data and, if I used it all, the House would not adjourn until early tomorrow morning. Whilst I thank the honourable member for his assistance, co-operation and willingness, I shall be mercifully brief on this occasion. However, I realize that steps must be taken to provide road and rail transport that will meet the needs of the city of Adelaide in the years

that lie ahead, but I disagree with the attitude that the Government has adopted towards the public in general in what I believe to have been a premature release of the M.A.T.S. proposals. The Government should have taken the opportunity fully to investigate the M.A.T.S. Report because it is of great magnitude, as is the financial impact that its implementation would have on the people of South Australia.

This problem is Adelaide's: the financial problem is for the people of South Australia. If this House gives a favourable vote to the Government on this matter, the Government will be given a blank cheque to impose on country people all the things that members of the present Government have screamed against in past years. It was not so long ago that members of this Government were in Opposition in this Chamber. Whenever the Labor Government announced any transport proposals, the then Opposition took every opportunity to hammer the Government. It missed no opportunities to tell the people what the Labor Government proposed to do to them in relation to finance and transport and the cost country people would have to bear. The time has arrived when the country people of this State can be told, as indeed they are being told, what is in store for them under the proposals of the M.A.T.S. scheme that it is apparent the Government intends to impose on them.

It is estimated that about \$440,000,000 will be required to implement the present plan. It has been stated that the Highways Fund will be about \$105,000,000 in deficit during the period when the M.A.T.S. proposals are being implemented. That is the point I wish to make to the people of South Australia. This is a proposal to turn the metropolitan area of Adelaide into a completely different shape and form from what we know it today.

It has been suggested that this huge sum of money—more than \$100,000,000—will be made up in increased motor registration fees and driver's licence fees and an increase in road maintenance tax, the latter increase to be effected by reducing the present 8-ton limit that applies in the country today to a 4-ton limit. Incidentally, South Australia is the only State in Australia that does not now have the 4-ton provision. However, it would appear quite clearly from these proposals that this is also going to be imposed on the people of South Australia. We know the attitude that was

adopted by the Party opposite, as the Opposition three years ago, when there was a suggestion that certain road tax proposals would be introduced in this State. That Party went to every corner of the State to tell the people what was contemplated.

Mr. Hurst: It hasn't been there on this issue.

Mr. BURDON: I doubt it. Very few members of the present Government have risen to tell the people what is contemplated by the Government on this occasion. I am rather surprised that we have not had the members for Chaffey, Eyre, Burra, Rocky River, and other country members rising to their feet to defend the actions of the Government. I could mention other members of the Government, too. I do not desire at this stage to refer to one of the Ministers on the front bench who is now looking over at me and who had quite a bit to say earlier in relation to the transport proposals.

I understand that the present Minister of Roads and Transport indicated last October that about \$123,000,000 would be available for rural roads over the next five years and that this sum represented about 62 per cent of the total money that would be available in the Highways Fund over that period. Thus, only 38 per cent of those funds will be available for other works. As I said earlier, somebody will have to pay for this, and it is clear to me that any charge imposed on the people of this State will be carried right through to the country people.

It seems to me that, once Parliament provides this sum of money, little work will be done on rural roads. I have said this previously and I do not think it is necessary for me to enlarge on the subject, because during the last day or two most of the members on this side, particularly the country members, have firmly indicated the financial implications to people not only in the metropolitan area but throughout the length and breadth of South Australia.

I believe that members on this side have clearly shown that the Leader's amendment has considerable merit. Therefore, I consider that the Government would be very wise to take notice of it. If no other Government member intends to attempt to defend the actions of the Government before the Premier winds up the debate, then I hope that some of the country members will see the error of the Government's way and vote with the Opposition for the Leader's amendment.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): This debate, which has continued for more than two days, has given members an opportunity to study these matters. It has also fulfilled a promise made by the Government that it would introduce this matter to enable a debate by the people's representatives. This is a move that has been widely welcomed in the community.

Mr. Broomhill: By whom?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: A leader in the *News of August 1* states:

The Premier, Mr. Hall, and the Government have moved wisely in revising the M.A.T.S. plan. They could have stuck obstinately to all details of the plan. But instead, in the face of fairly widespread objections on many points, they have changed some of the proposals. Yet they have held fast to the main outlines and principles of the scheme, which aims to cope with our increasing traffic problems. One way or another, a plan of this sort is vital if Adelaide is to progress in an orderly fashion. One of the main points at issue is how much such a plan should be allowed to interfere with existing homes and social amenities.

We can be sure public discussion will continue despite yesterday's announced revision. As scrutiny of the plan continues, there may be even more changes. The State Planning Authority is looking into the possibility. This is democracy at work—the legislature reacting to public demand. When voices are raised Parliament listens. And Parliament itself will become the forum of the debate next week, with Mr. Hall making time available. This is a notable advance from earlier days when there seemed to be some reluctance to have the plan decided in Parliament.

That well considered leader is surely an important public recognition of the wisdom of the Government's choice in this matter. I believe that, although the matters discussed have ranged over the whole ambit of transport in Adelaide and in other parts of the world, little has been added to the argument. There seems to be little new material in what the Leader said in his speech, other than additional points to back up his contention on this matter. In relation to the plan that was proposed by the Government, he said:

We would have thrown it back to them telling them to have another look at it.

He was referring to the experts, but my Government did not do this: it made the plan available as it had come to the Government. We did not run from the responsibility of informing the public what the long-awaited plan provided for the metropolitan area. The Leader also said:

I am not suggesting that at this stage South Australia could say that it wanted this particular technique

He then referred to a type of public transport. He went on in some detail to enumerate some systems that have been experimented with in the United States of America. Several cities in that country have been used as examples of cities with too many freeways. In some American cities there have been isolated examples of the large-scale development of public transport. This, however, has been wrongly interpreted as suggesting that freeways have been a mistake. In every case these examples relate to the development of public transport where systems of freeways have already been developed.

It is agreed that in some American cities there has been, in the first place, emphasis on freeways and now, consequently, there is particular emphasis on public transport. It is not accepted that the development of public transport in any way means that freeways are a failure. In the United States of America at present there are as many freeways under construction and as many freeways on the drawing boards as has ever been the case. The M.A.T.S. plan avoids unbalanced development of freeways. It has been pointed out that we need to learn from mistakes overseas and to develop our system as a fully integrated transportation system, but this is the very essence of the M.A.T.S. plan.

The charge has been made that this is no longer an integrated plan. I point out, however, that the plan as it stands, with some deletions and variations, is a well integrated and comprehensive plan for transportation for metropolitan Adelaide. Not only are the arterial road and freeway proposals integrated but the road plan generally is integrated with public transport proposals.

Referring to the public transport proposals, the only significant variation that has been made has been the adoption of the original railway route from Emerson crossing to Goodwood rather than the deviation as was proposed in the M.A.T.S. Report. This variation in no way affects the basic concept of the public transport plan, which relies on an integration of the bus and rail services and provides for a joint feeder bus-rail service in the outer areas and, predominantly, a local bus service in the inner areas. In one particular area that is not served by a railway line (I refer to the Modbury-Tea Tree Gully area) an equivalent service is provided by buses operating as local buses within the area and proceeding to the city as express buses on the freeway.

A vital component of the public transport system is the proposed King William Street subway, the development of which is considered essential if we are to encourage people, particularly from the outer areas, to use the railway service. The variation made by the Government, aimed at reducing the number of houses and other properties affected (that is, the adoption of the existing rail route rather than the proposed deviation in the Edwardstown-Goodwood area) in no way affects the basic principles underlying the co-ordinated public transport system.

The proposal for the ultimate closure of the Grange railway line is subject to review and a decision has not yet been taken on this matter. It is agreed that if the railway line is retained there will be a reduced need for bus services in this area or, alternatively, if the railway line is closed then the equivalent service must be provided by the buses. I cannot accept that this variation is significant in relation to an integrated plan for the entire metropolitan area.

A number of arterial road proposals have been subject to review and some minor variations have been made. Generally speaking, these variations have been as requested by councils, and they have for the most part involved relatively minor changes in alignment of new road connections. In almost every case the alternative that has been adopted serves essentially the same purpose as the original proposal. It is only a matter of picking the actual alignment which is most acceptable to all parties concerned. Again, I cannot accept that the variations that have been made, and are likely to be made as a result of further investigations of a number of matters which have not yet been finalized, are significant in affecting the total plan of the metropolitan area as a fully integrated plan. It has been announced that two major proposals are not acceptable to the Government: the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway. These proposals were generally listed for implementation in about 15 to 20 years' time.

The Government intends to await the proposals of the State Planning Authority for revision of the Metropolitan Development Plan before deciding on what alternative provisions may be required in the areas which these two proposals were intended to serve. There is no question that arterial road widening under the metropolitan road widening scheme must continue in these areas but, as there are no other major proposals which are associated with the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway and as this work is not likely to be required

for some 15 years, there should be no concern about the deletion of these proposals affecting the effective integration of the transportation proposals covering the entire metropolitan area.

We are confident that ample time will be available, when the details of the review of the development plan are known, for the necessary alternatives to be developed in order that, when these are implemented (in 15 to 20 years' time), we shall retain a fully integrated plan serving the whole metropolitan area. When this matter was first introduced in the House formally last week, I commenced to detail the Government's attitude at some length, and I completed reading that document yesterday. I believe that the lengthy document I read was somewhat tedious for members to listen to but it was nevertheless necessary to present such comprehensive matter in the detail that members required. It is rather intriguing to find that, in the case of the Noarlunga Freeway (and some members opposite were deeply involved in protesting about this route), members opposite seem no more pleased now that it has been deferred and will be re-examined. Yet at the same time other members opposite have said that it is necessary to have freeways on the western side of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Virgo: What is the point you're trying to make?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The point I am trying to make is that surely it is politically false to try to lead the public to believe that there is a painless way of implementing a plan of the magnitude that both sides say is necessary.

Mr. Hudson: Why didn't you listen to what was said?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member has had his chance to speak in detail, and I suggest that that was his opportunity to do so; it should have been sufficient because it was unlimited.

Mr. Hudson: If you keep on making these allegations—

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Glenelg has tried to nail down the Government into putting up its own scheme to the committee that will consider the revision. The Government has said that it will defer the Noarlunga Freeway route and refer it back to the committee so that anyone interested can make personal representations on the matter. However, the member for Glenelg has made a big point in this House, in the debate and in

questions, by asking the Government what scheme it will put to the committee. What a peculiar attitude that has been! We have deferred the route that has been presented to the Government yet the honourable member says that, instead, we should be presenting a plan to the Metropolitan Transportation Committee now. That is the sense of his statement to the House, and it is not a sensible attitude to a comprehensive review of the important matter of the route for the Noarlunga Freeway.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I bring that up as an example of the honourable member's attitude.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Hudson: Why isn't the committee instructed to seek out the route that will minimize the knocking down of houses? Why don't you ask them to do that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This is the very point I make. The honourable member is re-making it for me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member says that, in any reassessment or review of the route, we should make the mind of the committee up now, before we receive the representations from the people concerned. That will not be done.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Didn't you hear what the honourable member said?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member just said it again. This Government will wait until the report comes in and will listen to the public again. It would be rather interesting to know what the members who have been so vocal will put to the committee. What route will they choose for the committee to follow? Of course, they are free to continue to hold their opinion on this matter.

Mr. Hudson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has made his speech.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what happens in circumstances in which our statements are being continually misinterpreted by the Premier? This is his continual practice.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has raised a point of order about whether the Premier is making statements that do not correctly quote what

the Opposition has said. As objection has been taken to that, I ask the Premier to withdraw those remarks, but at the same time I want to explain that I am not responsible for what the Premier says in his speech, nor am I responsible for what the Leader of the Opposition or the member for Glenelg has said. If objection is taken, all the Speaker can do is ask that the words objected to be withdrawn.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not want to misconstrue the honourable member's statement. Perhaps we can run through this again. While I am on my feet I have not time to get the *Hansard* proof of the question the honourable member asked yesterday but I understood him to ask what proposals the Government would put to the review committee in regard to the route of the Noarlunga Freeway. I am not saying that he said that, but he appeared to make that point several times.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, the particular objection that I take relates to what I am supposed to have asked in this House. My question related, first, to the fact that the Government had referred the M.A.T.S. route and the 1962 route to the committee for further consideration. I asked what other alternatives the committee was being asked by the Government to investigate.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a point of order.

Mr. HUDSON: I am objecting to my question being misinterpreted.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must take his seat. I cannot accept that as a point of order. If the honourable member takes exception to that, which is not really a point of order, as I have said, all he can do is ask leave of the House to make a personal explanation. There is no point of order involved here. I cannot be responsible for what any honourable members says in his speech.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is no point in my misinterpreting or trying to misinterpret the honourable member. He can correct me if I am wrong. Let me substitute by saying that whatever he did say I do not believe is a sensible attitude. If he likes to get up in the House and say—

Mr. Hudson: If you do not know what I said, you cannot believe that it was not a sensible attitude.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member knows very well what he said in that regard. In view of the niceties, so as not to raise his blood pressure and because he may be able to point to the misinterpretation of some minor point in his submissions, I do not press that point; but my comment is the same as I have outlined previously: if I have misinterpreted the honourable member, it is because of his poor explanation of the point.

Mr. Hudson: The reason you have misinterpreted it is that you do not understand the English language; that is your problem.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am not misquoting the member for Frome when I quote him as saying only this evening, "This plan has many good points in it." The Leader has said that we need freeways. It seems that the problem is that, because it is not a plan that the Leader is promoting in this House, the route of the freeway is in the wrong place. The Government has indicated time and time again that the way in which it introduced the scheme was most democratic. The process was observed whereby the public had six months' general review of the whole plan. This meant that during that time anyone in the community affected by the plan could submit his objection to the committee and to the Government, with suggested remedies for the problem. I think I detailed to the House the number of representations the Government received. Each one of them was carefully assessed, and the result of these assessments was that alterations were made.

Compensation has been raised as an important point, and the Government acknowledges it to be an important point. The Government's assurance in the first place was given at the time of the announcement of the proposals, and there has been the more recent announcement of the proposed establishment of a special court, and of the activity of the advisory committee set up by the Government to examine the existing legislation and its adequacy to ensure fair compensation in all circumstances. This, of course, is a very important part of the Government's attitude to this plan. Nearly 1,000 individual representations were made to the Government by councils and persons involved in this matter. They were listened to and their submissions were noted. In several instances this procedure resulted in alterations to the plan. How could the Government have been more democratic? Should it have adopted the plan as produced and said, "This is it, gentlemen"? Should we have done that? Should

we have said, "Take it; this is it"? We did not do that, but is that what the Opposition wanted with this plan?

Mr. Virgo: Don't be so childish.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Opposition members did not want the plan to go out and for that to be that. Did they or did they not want a plan subject to public review? It is a pretty important question. Did they want a plan that could be reviewed?

Mr. Hudson: You've heard us on this point any number of times.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am not so sure that we have heard this.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You had to apologize the last time you went on with this nonsense.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Is that so? I repeat that we will again listen to representations regarding this important freeway which has been deferred and about which members have been so vocal in this House. Surely, to the people of South Australia, whether they be rural members of the community or metropolitan members of the community, this is a plan that stands as being utterly vital to the development of the metropolitan area as an integral part of this State. If we reject this plan, what are the consequences? It would mean that the reports of all the assembly of experts from within this State and from without this State would be said to be faulty right through to their basic principles and would be cast aside.

Now, we cannot accept that. It would be ludicrous if suddenly we found that for the next several years the expenditure of large sums in the metropolitan area could not be knowingly matched to an ultimate freeway system. This would be planning for a type of plan that had no head and nowhere to go. Would we develop all the subsidiary roads to channel traffic to nowhere? Have we the time? If anyone drove around this metropolitan area when people were going to or coming from work, he would find out whether or not we had time to wait. We do not have the time.

As I have said, I believe that this plan has the support of the overwhelming number of South Australian citizens. I fully respect the criticisms of this plan that have been made by the public. Whether it be on principle, whether it be on the belief of people about what the planning should be, or whether people have been personally affected, I fully respect the representations that have been made.

Mr. Virgo: Ten thousand of them!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I assure those people that they have been fully considered and that they will be fully considered in the future, but the overwhelming number of citizens in this State support this plan in the knowledge that, although it is a futuristic plan, it is one that can be implemented as from now. It provides the opportunity for this city to grow economically and to provide during that growth for the obvious recreation of the citizens who will live and work in this area.

Mr. Virgo: How do you know that members of the public support it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Obviously, this plan represents one of the greatest measures that this Government has been or will be involved in. It is an integral part of Government planning, and it is obvious that this State cannot do without it. Earlier in this debate allegations were made against one of my Ministers. These are allegations that I believe—

[Midnight]

Mr. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, yesterday you ruled out of order any reference to this matter, and refused to allow any member to deal with it, but now the Premier is again attempting to, although every member on this side respected your ruling.

The SPEAKER: I think the member for Edwardstown is correct. When the Premier had made the statement and I gave the Leader of the Opposition the right of reply, which was fair, I said I would not allow members to pursue this line of argument. I ask the Premier not to pursue it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I thank you, Sir, for that advice. I assure you I was not going into the subject matter. My reference to it has been sufficient for me to make the point that this is an important part of Government planning. The reputation of one of my Ministers has been referred to and, therefore, this for the Government, becomes a matter of confidence.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government will treat the amendment and its proposal as a matter vital to its existence.

Mr. Broomhill: What nonsense.

Mr. Hudson: You took a long time to do that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I therefore oppose the Leader's amendment and urge the House to support the motion that I moved on behalf of the Government.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question. For the question say "Aye"; against say "No". I think the Noes have it.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Divide!

While the division bells were ringing:

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I thought in this House you could not call pairs off at the last moment.

Mr. Hudson: On any matter of confidence there will not be any pairs—is that it?

The Hon. R. S. Hall: When have there been pairs on a matter of confidence?

Mr. Langley: Let's know about it now.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Hudson: There will be a kick-back on this.

Mr. Corcoran: Any time you are in trouble you want to call it a vote of no confidence.

Mr. Ryan: Rotten political crawlers: how rotten can you get.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Ryan: Rotten to the core!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Ryan: How rotten can you get.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: One of our members is overseas and you said you would give him a pair. Obviously, we can't trust your word for one moment.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: The Government is on the line.

Mr. Lawn: It took you a long time to declare it a confidence vote.

Mr. Hudson: You will get a kick-back on this. You will want a pair in order to survive but you won't get it.

Mr. Virgo: Just a mob of rats!

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the Chair is that the words to be struck out remain part of the question. The Ayes will pass to the right of the Chair, the Noes to the left. I appoint the Premier teller for the Ayes and the Leader of the Opposition teller for the Noes.

The House divided on the question:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teusner, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

While the division was being taken:

Mr. Lawn: You could not trust this bloke any more with pairs. Whether we are in Opposition or Government, this bloke could not be trusted. This bloke will be finished as Leader after this Parliament because they will know he cannot be trusted.

Mr. Ryan: You must be real proud of this.

Mr. Lawn: Look at them—all silent and all glum. Guttersnipes!

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Why don't you enjoy yourself?

Mr. Lawn: You think as we do, but you cannot say that. You wouldn't have done this if you had been in his place.

Mr. Virgo: You can only fool some of the people some of the time.

The SPEAKER: There are 19 Ayes and 16 Noes, a majority of three for the Ayes, so the question passes in the affirmative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. Lawn: Politics has never been so low in South Australia.

Mr. Ryan: Dictatorship!

The SPEAKER: Order! The question now before the Chair is that the motion of the Premier be agreed to. For the question say "Aye", against say "No". I think the Noes have it.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Divide!

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr. Lawn: There is not one member opposite with a smile on his face.

Mr. Burdon: A further disgrace to the Parliament of South Australia!

Mr. Ryan: What a shambles!

Mr. Lawn: Unprincipled Liberals!

Mr. Virgo: What are their assurances worth? Even with his signature on it, he would not stand up to it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. The Ayes will pass to the right of the Chair, the Noes to the left. I appoint the Premier teller for the Ayes and the Leader of the Opposition teller for the Noes.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Teusner, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Bryne, Messrs. Casey, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

While the division was being taken:

Mr. Virgo: You wrote a letter to the Leader of the Opposition guaranteeing pairs, and this is the rotten treatment you hand out, and you expect the people to respect your undertakings. We will bring Riches here from the hospital on a barouche. One of you blokes will be sick before long; we might make you sick, too.

The SPEAKER: There are 19 Ayes and 16 Noes, a majority of three for the Ayes, so the question passes in the affirmative.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is the position that faces this House when the Opposition has a pairs book signed by the Government Whip for three pairs for today, pairs which were denied at the last moment by the Government after an undertaking had been given to the Opposition on this issue? On this issue this pairs book was signed today. There was no indication whatever that the pairs would not be honoured. We have had no possibility of getting our members to this House. We have relied on the word of the Government, and that word is shamefully dishonoured in this House. I have never known this in the history of the House. What is the position this House faces if there can be no honouring of undertakings given solemnly by the Government?

The SPEAKER: The point of order raised by the Leader concerns the Parties, for the Chair does not recognize pairs. Pairs are a matter of arrangement between both Parties, this practice having applied for many years.

The Chair cannot enter into this matter at all: it is a matter between the two Parties.

Mr. Lawn: Parliamentary ethics!

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the votes that have just been taken.

The SPEAKER: I beg your pardon?

Mr. CORCORAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Premier has no right to speak on this matter.

The SPEAKER: What was the Premier saying?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I said I should like to refer to the votes just taken.

Mr. Ryan: You can't make reference to it.

The SPEAKER: The Premier is out of order.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: The Premier can take a point of order but he cannot refer to a vote of the House. Once a vote is taken in the House, under Standing Orders there can be no reference to it. What is the point of order?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I understand that I can refer to a vote in the House, and I ask for your direction on whether I can. I refer in this matter—

Mr. CORCORAN: On a point of order—

Mr. HUGHES: You have given a decision on this matter, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Premier should abide by it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot accept two or three points of order at once. What is the Premier's point of order?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Members opposite have objected that we have, without notice, made this a matter of confidence. This was done—

Mr. Hudson: He will not take notice of any ruling. Sit him down.

The SPEAKER: I cannot allow the Premier to pursue this. There is no point of order involved, because the vote has been taken and the Premier cannot reflect on that vote. Secondly, if the Premier wants to refer to the matter of pairs, I have already told the Leader of the Opposition that the Chair cannot rule on it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: On a point of order, I understand (but I ask for your ruling) that there are procedures, if the Opposition would like this vote taken tomorrow, with notice, to have this decision rescinded.

The SPEAKER: What vote?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The one that we have just referred to. I understand that there are procedures under Standing Orders if the Opposition would like—

Mr. CORCORAN: On a point of order, the vote that the Premier is referring to has been taken already and I do not see that there is any point in his point of order.

Mr. Ryan: Why don't you resign? The people don't want you, and you know it. You can't be trusted.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a rather difficult situation. While I occupy this Chair, I will be fair to both sides.

Mr. Virgo: I beg your pardon!

The SPEAKER: All right, if honourable members do not want to hear me—

Mr. Corcoran: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Virgo: Well, be fair for once!

The SPEAKER: The Premier is raising a point of order now and I want to get what it is. Is the Premier trying to move that the vote just taken be rescinded?

Mr. Corcoran: You're putting words into his mouth, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Premier cannot refer to a vote already taken in the House, unless he wants to move that the vote taken be rescinded.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move forthwith to rescind resolutions of the House passed during the present sitting, for the purpose of giving full notice to the Opposition of a vital vote on this issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has moved that Standing Orders be so far suspended to enable him to move a motion without notice, which I understand is that the vote already taken be rescinded. That motion is in order. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House, I accept the motion to suspend Standing Orders. Is it seconded?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The question is:

That the motion to suspend Standing Orders be agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot raise a point of order at this stage.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not raising a point of order; I am speaking to the motion.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot speak to the motion.

Mr. HUGHES: Why not?

The SPEAKER: You cannot speak to it. Will the honourable member take his seat?

Mr. HUGHES: No; I am not prepared to take my seat. I could have spoken for three days on this matter and I have been denied the privilege of speaking on it fully because the Premier wanted to get it through tonight. I do not think I should sit down.

The SPEAKER: For the suspension of Standing Orders the motion must be put. Whether the Premier has a right to suspend Standing Orders is the motion I am putting. After the question has been put and voted on it can be spoken to, but only one honourable member can speak. The Premier has moved to suspend Standing Orders and the motion has been seconded.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I move:

That the resolutions passed this sitting on Order of the Day (Government Business) No. 1 be rescinded.

I take it I am allowed to explain why?

The SPEAKER: The Premier can speak to the motion but only for a limited time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes; I want to speak for only a very limited time. I believe, on reflection, that there is a good argument for what the Opposition has said about its not having had notice of the vote being taken tonight.

Mr. Corcoran: That you did not have notice about it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member will listen, I will explain: that the Opposition did not have notice of this vital issue. This, as I have said earlier, is regarded by the Government as a vital issue. In view of the Opposition's concern, that it knew not of its coming as a vital issue, I am moving this motion. If carried, it will enable the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition to be dealt with at greater length and he will not, therefore, be in difficulty in relation to the specific matters he referred to and to the "pairs" issue. It does not alter the Government's decision that it is a vital issue, but it does allow the Opposition at least more time between one sitting of this House and the next.

For this reason I am moving this motion. The Government regards this as a matter of confidence. It cannot be otherwise, because of the great importance of the issue involved.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON seconded the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier can do as he likes on this matter but, if he thinks that moving his motion resolves it, he is very much mistaken. He well knows that at present there are two people involved in a vote in this House whom the notice given by his motion for a further vote later today would not allow us to get back here. The first of these is Mr. Loveday, who is overseas as a delegate representing not only this side of the House but the whole Parliament.

Mr. Corcoran: The whole Parliament!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He went overseas after I had had a discussion with the Premier and been told that he would be given a pair except on constitutional issues, and that whilst on constitutional issues the Premier could give me no undertaking as to the time when such a constitutional issue would be introduced, there would be time in the debate to get Mr. Loveday back if necessary. It was on that basis that we allowed Mr. Loveday to go overseas.

Mr. Corcoran: Only on that basis.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes; he was not allowed to leave these shores until I had seen the Premier and got that undertaking.

Mr. Corcoran: That is dead right.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Originally, the Premier did not give me an undertaking in writing about a pair, so I went to see him and explained the basis on which I was seeking an undertaking. The Premier then said that he had misunderstood my original approach, and we then reached agreement on it in his room in the terms that I have now outlined to the House. It was only upon that basis that Mr. Loveday was nominated in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting to go overseas as a delegate from this Parliament. The second thing is that Mr. Riches is severely ill in the Adelaide Hospital at present, and the tradition of the Parliament is that in circumstances of this kind we do not force him to be brought here on a stretcher.

Mr. McKee: We have always honoured this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have never forced a man in those circumstances to be brought in here at danger to himself. The

Premier gives us until later today to risk Mr. Riches's life and to summon in that time Mr. Loveday back from overseas because we are not being given the honouring of the discussions that were the basis of his going overseas on behalf of members opposite as well as those on this side. We can get Mr. Clark back here later today. However, the whole purpose of this exercise is to see to it that you, Mr. Speaker, are not in a position to decide this matter by exercising your casting vote. In other words, the whole of this exercise is to see that this Parliament does not vote freely on this issue.

The Premier can have his motion if he likes and put this thing again. However, if he thinks that this is going to get him off the hook for what he has done tonight and what he is continuing to do in his proposal now, he is very much mistaken. This is not the way this Parliament has operated previously and, if this is the way the Premier intends to continue, it is clear that there can be no dialogue, no trust, and no undertaking between the two sides of this House on any subject.

Mr. Corcoran: It is a bad state of affairs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not mind how members vote on this motion and on the proposal of the Premier to bring this thing on later today, because it will not affect the position one iota.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to Standing Order No. 202, which states:

A resolution, or other vote of the House, may be read and rescinded; but no such resolution or other vote may be rescinded during the same session, except with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole House, and after seven days' notice.

The SPEAKER: The point is that the Premier obtained the suspension of Standing Orders to enable him to move a motion with the consent of the House.

Mr. Hudson: What is the motion he has moved?

The SPEAKER: He has moved to rescind the motion and he obtained leave to suspend Standing Orders to move for the rescinding.

Mr. Hudson: Isn't he moving the rescission motion now?

The SPEAKER: Yes, it has been moved and seconded.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that under Standing Order—

Mr. Corcoran: He has suspended Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has suspended Standing Orders, so they do not apply.

Mr. Corcoran: We have given everything away.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. S. HALL moved:

That the vote on Order No. 1 be made an order of the day for later today.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of the committee and notified the selection of its representatives.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.31 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 14, at 2 p.m.