

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, February 24, 1971

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

PETITION: NARACOORTE ABATTOIRS

Mr. RODDA presented a petition signed by 2,105 residents of Naracoorte and district. The petitioners prayed that the Government would direct the Minister of Agriculture to grant a licence to South-East Meats Australia Proprietary Limited to enable an export abattoir to be established at Naracoorte and to allow a reasonable proportion of the meat processed at such abattoir to be sent to the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

35-HOUR WEEK

Mr. HALL: In view of the financial difficulties of this Government as a result of an increase in expenditure this year of about 15 per cent, I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry whether he is still an advocate of a 35-hour week.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Leader well knows that this is a matter for the Australian Council of Trade Unions, which I understand is now negotiating in respect of a 35-hour week. The matter is left entirely in the A.C.T.U.'s hands, and I have not seen fit to intervene.

STATE'S FINANCES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Treasurer say what is the Government's policy regarding reductions in expenditure in the light of the present financial situation? Yesterday, when I twice asked the Treasurer questions regarding any reductions in detail in expenditures in South Australia he twice avoided giving a direct answer. On the first occasion, he tabled the copy of a memorandum, dated February 10, which he had circulated to his Ministers, asking them to go easy but not containing any specific directions as to cuts. On the second occasion, having avoided the question I asked him, he concluded his answer by saying:

I assure him—

that is, me—

that I will take some measures that he will take notice of.

However, he did not elaborate on those measures. I point out to him that, in the present financial situation in Australia, the Commonwealth Government has already announced

substantial reductions in its budgeted expenditure.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It will still spend more than it budgeted for.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I am right in saying that the Victorian Government, through its Premier (Sir Henry Bolte), has already made a similar announcement with regard to reductions in expenditures in that State.

Mr. Hall: And Queensland.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: In what areas?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am prompted by the Leader to say that Queensland has already made a similar announcement. What the people of South Australia want to know is the policy of the South Australian Government on this issue. They want to know whether the Government intends, as a matter of policy, to make any reductions in its expenditures or whether it expects to make good, merely by the taxation measures which were announced by the Treasurer yesterday, the gaps which have been left.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the Premiers' Conference, the Prime Minister indicated that, in his view, the policy to be adopted in Australia in relation to inflation was not the carrying out of the normal fiscal measures that a Commonwealth Government would carry out in this respect and not the imposition of a uniform price control system or measures directly affecting the private sector; he said that he believed that the prime weapon for coping with inflation was to reduce expenditure in the public sector and to transfer employment from the public sector to the private sector. He spelt out clearly that we were to sack people, letting them transfer to private employment. I say frankly to the member for Mitcham that that is not the policy of this Government: we refuse to do that. We do not believe that there is any substantial area of work within the Government service that is not essential to the people of the State. In consequence, we do not intend to follow the course so far announced by Queensland and, to a lesser extent, by Victoria. In Queensland, a holding up of works on hospitals and schools and a cessation of recruitment of teachers and nurses have been announced. We do not intend to do that. We will not return to the crisis point in hospitals which existed when this Government took office and which we have solved.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We now have recruitment of nurses in South Australia, and the previous Government could not recruit a single one before it went out of office.

Mr. Coumbe: You know that's not true.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know perfectly well that it is true, because the last advertisements by the previous Government for nurses to be trained at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital did not get one reply. However, we got recruitment of nurses and nursing aides. We will not put the clock back to the situation that faced hospitals and schools when we took office. As to the building of hospitals and schools, we do not intend to reduce the programme.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps the honourable member will point to what he considers non-essential areas of Government service in which he says substantial reductions can be made.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Publicity officers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is interesting, because, if the honourable member considers we must reduce the number of publicity officers, why did the Leader of the Opposition apply for a 100 per cent increase in his staff so that he could appoint two persons to his publicity staff?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You offered it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was applied for, and it was granted.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You made the offer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member starts talking about cuts in an area in which his own Party has had an increase.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You know very well—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier was asked a question and he is entitled to be heard in silence. I ask honourable members to refrain from interjecting.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order when I am on my feet. The honourable member knows that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I now rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If this is to be your ruling, will you please ask the Premier to refrain from answering interjections?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order, and I ask honourable members to refrain from interjecting, just as I did when the honourable member for Mitcham was asking his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has indicated to the Public Service Board that, in several areas where positions already created are vacant, those positions will not be filled, except in the most essential cases, and we have indicated that the closest watch is to be kept upon any expansion of the Public Service and that we will not go further into the red by taking people into the Public Service beyond present establishment. That is an economy measure which we have taken and which is already proving of some effect to us. We are examining the public works expenditure in South Australia to find out whether there are areas at the margin where works that are not immediately essential can be delayed but, given the requirements of the people of South Australia and the nature of services that we have undertaken, we do not consider that we can make substantial delays. The Commonwealth Government has announced, for instance, that it does not intend to proceed with the anti-pollution department that it intended to set up. We need to take action about pollution here but, we have not engaged many public servants on this matter because it is largely a matter of reorganizing existing Government services under the Minister. We do not intend, for instance, to stop the work of the Committee on Environment in South Australia or the other actions that we are undertaking directly on pollution and conservation in South Australia, because we believe those to be vital. The honourable member has asked me where we were making our cuts but has not actually, apart from an interjection made by his colleague that did not prove to be very rewarding to him, pointed to any area of Government activity in which he suggests we should start sacking people in accordance with Mr. Gorton's proposals.

Mr. Millhouse: You said yesterday you would introduce measures that I should take notice of.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: And we will.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on, what are they?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some of them will relate to this place.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: But there are others, too, that will be coming up.

Mr. Millhouse: Let us know when they are ready.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We'll tell you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants me to make off-the-cuff decisions without proper consultation with the people concerned I shall make them, but I should think that would be very much more arrogant than the course the Government is taking at present.

Mr. Millhouse: Originally, you were to announce these things on the Monday after the conference.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I listened yesterday to what the honourable member's Leader had to say on the subject of expenditures. I have analyses of some of the figures the Leader gave to the House, and it will be useful to the House to have this background. A major factor affecting the expenditures of all departments of the Public Service (including those quoted by the Leader of the Opposition) in the first six months of this financial year is the effect of awards which became operative in the previous financial year. The carryover effect of a full year's payment of such awards provided in the Budget presented to Parliament was about \$7,500,000. The comparable carryover effect 12 months previously was only \$1,900,000.

In addition to the \$7,500,000 carryover effect, and the extension of service pay at a cost to revenue of about \$4,000,000, there have been further awards during the first six months of 1970-71. The full effect of all awards and service pay is a major reason for the actual payments in the six months to December, 1970, being markedly in excess of the actual payments in the six months to December, 1969. As to the particular departments quoted by the Leader there are two significant factors which affect a number of them. The first of these factors is a change of functions, which means that the actual figures shown for the most recent six months for some departments are not directly comparable with the figures for previous years. Specifically, these changes are as follows: the Attorney-General's Department now includes payments for salaries for the Solicitor-General and the Sheriff's staff, and reimbursement of jurors and witnesses etc. (over \$60,000 in the six months to December, 1970, for the latter), which in 1969-70 and previous years were recorded under other departments. The Registrar-General's Department now includes the expenses of the Births, Deaths and Marriages section which, in 1969-70, was recorded under the Public Actuary. In other words, many of the increases about which the Leader has

spoken referred to completely different functions.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the other departments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government Department now includes the expenses of the Government Motor Garage and the Road Safety Council, previously recorded under other sections of the Estimates. The second unusual factor is the occurrence of abnormal costs or changes in the timing of payments. The effects of this factor on the departments listed are as follows: for the Electoral Department the costs vary from year to year according to the time of elections or referenda. The actual payments in the six months to December, 1970, include more than \$120,000 on this account compared with no such payments in the six months to December, 1969. For the Public Service Board the recorded payments in the first six months of this year have been increased by unusually heavy costs of staff training, advertising, and payments to consultants. It should be remembered that some of the consultants were employed not by this Government but by its predecessors, and costs of \$60,000 for these items in the first six months of 1970-71 compare with about \$11,000 in the same period of the previous year. There will be little expenditure on them in the current six months.

For the Superannuation Department, unusually heavy costs for automatic data processing services and purchase of office machines have occurred in the first six months of 1970-71. They are not expected to recur. For the Valuation Department, costs of A.D.P. services and of posting out valuation notices exceed by about \$30,000 costs in the same period of last year. For the Minister of Works, Minister of Education, and Labour and Industry Departments, there do not appear to be any abnormal items, and for the first two the present run of expenditures is a pointer to the final result. The increase has been caused largely by increased staffing. For the Labour and Industry Department it is probable that payments in the second six months of the year will be held.

The Public Buildings Department has certainly shown a sharp increase in the six months to December, 1970, compared to the same period in the previous year. Apart from the effect of awards and service pay, this has been caused largely by expenditure on many small contracts for essential maintenance and

repair of public buildings let during the previous financial year. The department has taken action to slow down the rate of payments while still continuing essential work. Members opposite should be aware that these contracts were let not by this Government but by the former Liberal Government. There is bound to be some excess over the original provision, but not so great as may be inferred from the December figures. As well as the unusual items to which I have referred, there have naturally been increases in staff in all the departments specified. The Government considers that the staff in each case has been required for the job to be done. As I have already said, it will be kept under close scrutiny and held to only what is necessary.

Mr. COURCEL: Will the Premier give me further information on the financial statement he made yesterday in the House to enable me to assess more fully the implications of what he said? Will he ascertain for me the estimated cost to the State this financial year of the 6 per cent increase which was awarded by the Arbitration Court and which came into effect on January 1, 1971, and will he ascertain also what is the estimated cost to the State this financial year of additional service pay scales introduced in certain Government departments in 1970?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think I specified earlier, in reply to a question by the member for Mitcham, the effect of the service pay increase. From memory, that had an impact on the Revenue Budget of about \$4,000,000 (he can check *Hansard* tomorrow on that). Concerning the 6 per cent increase, I will get an accurate figure for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Treasurer explain the full import of his earlier statement that the Government does not intend to fill positions beyond the present complement in the various Government departments, but specifically in relation to new positions or appointments that are pending? Recently, the Minister of Roads and Transport indicated (and he referred to this matter again yesterday) the appointment of a commissioner of transport. Also, applications have been called for three Deputy-Directors in the Agriculture Department at high salaries. Can the Premier say whether it is intended that people who have applied for these positions will be appointed, or has a ban been placed on further appointments of this kind?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member has misunderstood me, and that may have been because I did not explain

the matter fully. I will try to explain the position for him. Wherever possible, the Government intends to leave vacant already created positions that we have not been in the process of filling, unless we consider it absolutely essential under present conditions to fill them. Wherever possible, however, existing and created positions will not be filled, unless at present we are in the process of filling them, because a decision has been made that that must be done. The honourable member will know that in every department there are several position which have been created but which do not have occupants at present, and wherever we can we will leave those positions vacant. That is the present situation. If we have called for applications and are in the process of filling a position that process will normally proceed, and there will be some positions that we consider essential as a matter of Government policy. For instance, the Director-General of Transportation is a position that has not so far been created, but it will be the Government's policy eventually to create and fill it. At present we have vacant the position of Director of Industrial Development. Although we have received applications we have not proceeded to fill that post, but that matter is still being considered because we believe that the appointment of a full-time Director is most important to us. In the meantime the Senior Industries Promotion Officer is acting as full-time Director. I cannot say that no positions for which applications have been called and are being considered will be filled, but we will not fill those positions which have been created and which are vacant unless we find it absolutely essential to do so.

Mr. HALL: Can the Treasurer say whether members will have the chance this week or next week to discuss the financial proposals he outlined yesterday?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members will have the chance as soon as I can get the Bills before the House, and they will be introduced as soon as I can have them drafted and printed.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have a further investigation made into the use of Railways Department houses in the metropolitan area? The Minister will recall that I have asked him several questions on this matter in the House; I have corresponded with him; and I have had several private conversations with him. The last answer I was

given (a reply prepared by the department) was that the Railways Department houses did not exceed departmental demands in the metropolitan area. I have ascertained since then that houses in my district have been unoccupied for all this period, which makes it hard for me to convince my constituents that the number of Railways Department houses does not exceed departmental needs. Indeed, in the circumstances I find it hard to believe this myself. I should also like the Minister to have investigated the condition of unoccupied Railways Department houses on Churchill Road and in streets running off that road, some of which houses are badly neglected and have grass growing all around them. In this condition, these houses are generally a nuisance.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter of railway houses in the metropolitan area is currently being investigated. I will direct the honourable member's question to the Railways Commissioner so that he may examine it in the course of his investigations to determine Railways Department needs. I am not satisfied that the policy followed for many years of the Railways Department's owning houses for railway employees is necessarily sound. I refer particularly to the houses owned in the metropolitan area mainly for transit employees. This is the aspect currently being examined, coupled with determining the number of houses that should be retained for this purpose. The second part of the question, regarding the condition of the houses in Churchill Road and adjoining streets, will certainly be referred to the Railways Commissioner and, if the situation is as the honourable member has described it (I have no doubt it would be: the honourable member would not come in with a false story on this matter), the matter will certainly be examined.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. CURREN: Will the Premier read to the House the letter he sent to the Prime Minister and to the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria about the proposal in respect of the Dartmouth dam?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The letter states:

I am writing in similar terms to Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte. The Acts which your Parliaments have passed concerning the amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement have been expressed merely to "ratify" the proposed amending agreement. Unlike previous measures amending the River Murray Waters Agreement by statute, the amendments were not expressed to take effect

as statute law. It would appear that the amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement, even if agreed by all parties, would not be in consequence justiciable. This point was made by South Australia at the Ministers' conference which was held last year on this matter. The decision of the South Australian Government, and indeed the Parliament of South Australia, has not changed on this matter. We are prepared to accede to the construction of a storage by the River Murray Commission at Dartmouth on the Mitta Mitta forthwith and are prepared to appropriate the moneys for this purpose. We will not, however, agree to amend the existing River Murray Waters Agreement in a way which deprives us of our existing rights to have the storage constructed at Chowilla at some future time.

In order to break the existing deadlock, it is the intention of my Government to introduce to the South Australian Parliament a Bill in the form enclosed. The effect of this is to approve so much of the amending agreement as provides for the construction of the dam at Dartmouth and the necessary ancillary arrangements and to appropriate the money therefor. We do not, however, approve words in the amending agreement providing for the ending of the Chowilla proposal, but in relation to that matter will seek power to carry out the necessary works relating to amendments which we have previously put to you in the event of your Government and Parliament approving these amendments at some future time. In the upshot, if the measure passes our Parliament as I expect it to do, we will be ready and able to support the River Murray Commission's immediately proceeding with the construction of the Dartmouth dam.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. Millhouse: Will you table a copy of the Bill?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The member for Rocky River!

Mr. Millhouse: That's what he said.

The SPEAKER: Order! There must be one question at a time.

LAND TAX

Mr. VENNING: Will the Treasurer say why he continues to use the avenue of rural land tax as a means of obtaining revenue when in other States this means of revenue raising is almost non-existent? The Premier has continually tried to condition the State, particularly the rural people, by saying, "All right, we are now under the Grants Commission, and for this reason we have to levy our taxation in accordance with some other States of the Commonwealth." However, the Premier must know the position in the other States concerning rural land tax.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have previously explained to the honourable member

that one of the processes of the Grants Commission in examining the basis on which it may recommend grants to us to bring us into line with the Budget standard of New South Wales and Victoria is to ensure that we make an aggregate comparable effort in revenue raising. If we do not do that, the commission does not grant us money to bring us to the budgetary standard. While it is true that Victoria is not now levying rural land tax (or it has announced that it will not from next year, from memory, but I am not certain of the date) and that New South Wales is not markedly active in this field either, the fact is that the aggregate of their tax raisings is still greater than ours. There are areas where we do not tax and where we will not tax. For instance, New South Wales has \$34,000,000 a year in poker machine revenue, and that is counted against us on the basis of our having a lesser tax-raising effort in this State, since we do not raise as much money from gambling taxes. If we are under regarding some things, we have to go over regarding others, and there are limited areas, indeed, in which we can do that. In relation to land tax, we tried to give a further remission, which was worked out in a conference between this place and another place. This is effective, and it is as far as we can go in the present circumstances faced, as we are, with the obligations of providing services for rural areas.

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Treasurer say what income he expects to receive from rural land tax under the new quinquennial assessment? This question has been asked at several meetings I have attended recently at which land tax has been discussed but the information has not been available.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From memory, I think I quoted the figure when the matter was being debated earlier, but I will obtain a figure as accurate as we can make it on present estimates.

CHAIN LETTER

Mr. RYAN: If I give the Attorney-General the particulars of a chain letter that is being circulated in South Australia, will he have this matter investigated? Today, in the absence of my colleague the member for Adelaide, I interviewed one of his constituents, who yesterday received a chain letter. The chain letter comprises two pages, and I do not intend to read all of it, but I think the first two paragraphs amply explain the reason for asking my question. The letter states, in part:

Do you need \$8,000 in business capital free, without obligation? Let so-and-so tell you how. I have run one of these promotion letters four times in the past; the first I received \$7,500 in cash and around \$7,800 in the other three letters. If this letter is continued as it should, everyone will receive up to \$8,000 in business capital and you will not have to worry about paying it back.

As I believe these chain letters are illegal, will the Attorney-General have the matter investigated?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes.

IRRIGATION METERS

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Works please supply me with a report on progress in installing water meters in the Murray River irrigation areas? The Minister will recall that four or five months ago a question similar to mine was asked by the member for Chaffey about the progress being made with the installations. I shall be pleased if, in his reply, the Minister can tell me what size meter is being installed at present. I understand that the department intended to commence installing meters of the largest size, working down to those of the smallest size. Also, can the Minister say when installation is likely to be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can tell the honourable member that the programme arranged for installation of all the meters on the river will be completed in about two years. This information was given me not long ago when I met a deputation of people concerned about the matter. From memory, I think that at that time about 200 to 300 meters had been installed, although I am not aware of the specific size of those meters. However, I will obtain details for the honourable member and bring down a reply.

CITY PICTORIAL

Mr. McRAE: Will the Attorney-General take notice of the February 4 issue of the *City Pictorial* and, first, consider prosecution for what is contained on the front page thereof and, secondly, consider investigating the means by which the photographs on that page were obtained? I do not want to cause any unnecessary further embarrassment to any of the persons who are affected by this somewhat offensive series of pictures and articles. However, owing to the sickness of the member for Adelaide, I have been requested by one of his constituents, who is the proprietor of the hotel at which Mrs. Josephs was murdered, to raise this question. The front page of this issue of the *City Pictorial* contains a picture of what

appears to be a dead person who has been killed in rather an awful way by a series of knife stabbings. The caption under the photograph states:

The victim of a brutal murder, Gwendolene Josephs, widow and licensee of the Exeter Hotel, as she was discovered by her house-keeper in the kitchen of the hotel in Rundle Street at 7.30 a.m., Monday, November 18, 1969. She had been stabbed 10 times and bled to death.

Also, on the front page appears the main heading "Rundle Street Murder (see story inside)", and subheadings including "Amazing Police Detection", "Strange Quirk of Fate", and "Two Appeals". The *City Pictorial* has a wide circulation. I ask the Attorney-General to consider, quite apart from the offensive and horrible impact the picture of the victim must have on her relatives and friends, the completely offensive quality of that picture to the general public, particularly to those who read the publication. Even worse than that is the fact that I have been told (and I consider my information to be reliable) that at least some of the pictures (and very definitely it would seem one of them, namely, the picture of the murder victim) have been obtained illegally. Although I cast no direct allegation, I point out that these pictures were certainly not authorized by the Police Department or the Attorney-General's Department; therefore, they must have been obtained from the courts in some way. I have received information that the author of the article was in fact a juror in the retrial of the man Ireland who was subsequently convicted of the murder of Mrs. Josephs. I ask that an investigation be carried out into how these pictures were obtained, so as to prevent the recurrence of this highly offensive type of story. This is a matter of extreme concern to the constituent of the member for Adelaide because, since taking over as licensee, she assures me she has spent a considerable sum in making improvements to the hotel to brighten its image and to attract new customers. Since the appearance of this offensive series of pictures and articles, her custom has fallen off and she has suffered grave damage. She would greatly appreciate an investigation being carried out into the circumstances of this publication so that, first, if there has been an offence, it can be dealt with.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to condense his explanation.

Mr. McRAE: I will complete it, Sir, in one sentence. She asks for this investigation for two reasons: first, because of her own personal

situation; and secondly, because of the possibility of a recurrence of this type of thing.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will have the matter investigated.

SOCIAL WORKERS

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Social Welfare say what positive steps the Government has taken or intends to take to overcome the shortage of social workers and psychiatric social workers in the community? Some weeks ago attention was drawn to the grave position that exists in this respect not only in the Minister's department but also in the Education Department. Although the Minister at that time was able to explain that particular incident satisfactorily, I believe all people in the community are concerned at the continuing shortage of social workers. The need for social workers applies particularly in the case of young people who may need counselling or psychiatric help. Can the Minister say whether Cabinet has considered the problem and, if it has, whether it can provide a solution almost immediately?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I very much share the honourable member's concern about the shortage of trained social workers and the great difficulty in coping with the needs of the community in this direction. Some things can be done to alleviate the difficulty, but all of them cost money, as the honourable member will appreciate. When I assumed office as Minister, I arranged for an extensive departmental investigation and survey into the needs and what could be done to alleviate the difficulty. That investigation has continued over the past few months. Also, consultations have taken place with people outside the department in this regard. In the next week or so, I shall be able to make recommendations to Cabinet about this matter. To be perfectly candid with the honourable member, in the present state of financial stringency I cannot predict with confidence what Cabinet's decision will be. I can predict with a certain amount of confidence what Cabinet would like to do, but what it can do will depend largely on the assessment by the Treasury of the financial situation. Obviously, amongst the things that can be done if finances are available in the immediate future are, first, the conducting of an intensive campaign to recruit more professional trained social workers and also the intensive training of voluntary workers who, with certain training, could supplement greatly the work of the trained professional social worker. Frankly,

it seems to me that the only way the needs of the community can be met or partially improved immediately in this area is by recruiting volunteers, people willing to give their services voluntarily, to undergo training, and to work in conjunction with and under the supervision of trained social workers. I am working along those lines but I must repeat at this stage that whether this plan can be implemented in the immediate future depends on the balancing of priorities that must take place regarding the State's finances.

MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Education investigate the delay in the preparation and seeding of the oval at the new Mount Gambier High School? As the Minister knows, the Mount Gambier High School was re-established on a new site about 18 months ago and one of the items still outstanding is the preparation of the new oval. Originally it was intended to sow the oval in autumn, 1970, but this did not eventuate. It was then to be sown in spring late last year, but this also has not eventuated. We now bring this matter to the Minister's attention, hoping that the work can be done soon so that arrangements can be made for an autumn sowing this year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to examine the problem raised by the honourable member and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

MINISTERIAL OFFICERS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Premier say how many press relations officers and public relations officers his Government has appointed to Ministerial offices since it has been in office on this occasion? I understand that Ministers now have their own press officers and that these appointments were an innovation made by the present Government. I also understand that the amount of written material being sent around the community has increased enormously as a result of the appointments, and that is probably logical. A person connected with country newspapers told me some time ago, "We get an enormous amount of material every week. One needs a wheelbarrow to remove it, but never mind, the Boy Scouts unit has benefited from it, because the Boy Scouts collect paper from our office." The Premier, in reply to an earlier question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier, in reply to an earlier question from

the member for Mitcham, said that in this respect the staff of the Leader of the Opposition had increased by 100 per cent. Is the Premier aware that this staff was increased as a result of an invitation he gave the Leader after the announcement that there were to be Ministerial press officers and a big increase in the number of public relations officers throughout the Ministerial offices? It is only natural that the Leader of the Opposition must—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not entitled to debate the question. He is commenting and debating.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If I have transgressed, Mr. Speaker, I may have been led into it by the Premier's debating the matter earlier this afternoon and not giving the full story to the House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When the Government took office, a Press Secretary and two Publicity Officers were employed in the Premier's Department. There was also a photographer. One Publicity Officer went but was replaced subsequently and two Press Secretaries were then employed by the Government. Since then, some Ministers have been given Press Secretaries but not all Ministers have them.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Will they have them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At present there is no proposal to increase the Government's press staff.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought all Ministers would have them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier is answering one question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If members opposite want me to answer questions, I suggest that they refrain from interjecting, so that I can answer one question at a time. The Chief Secretary does not have a Press Secretary and his press work and publicity are carried out by the Press Secretary to Cabinet, who is in the Premier's Department. The Minister for Conservation and Minister Assisting the Premier does not have a Press Secretary, his work being carried out by officers of the Premier's Department. The Minister of Lands also does not have a Press Secretary. The remaining Ministers have them. During a Public Service Board investigation of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition a request was received for an increase in staff to provide for a press officer and a publicity officer or research assistant. That request was examined

by the Public Service Board, a recommendation submitted to the Government, and the request acceded to.

INDECENT PUBLICATIONS

Mr. SLATER: Is the Attorney-General aware of any distribution through the post in South Australia of what may be considered to be indecent material and, if there is, can he give information regarding this distribution?

The Hon. L. J. KING: This matter was raised towards the end of the sittings of the House prior to Christmas, the question being whether anything could be done to prevent the distribution of unsolicited material of an indecent character through the post. I said then that I would take the matter up with the responsible Ministers in the other States with a view to making a joint approach to the Postmaster-General to try to eliminate this evil. The problem we faced was that the distribution tended to take place from post office boxes, which made it extremely difficult for the Postmaster-General to police it. The joint approach was made subsequently and I have now been told (although I have not the letter with me) that the Postmaster-General has considered the suggestion and will take steps to police this strictly. Wherever he is able to detect offences, he will revoke the authority to use the specific post office box. It is hoped that, in this way, the evil will be reduced, at least to some degree.

T.A.B. STAFF

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to expedite a reply to a question I asked last session concerning the policy of the Totalizator Agency Board on retrenching male staff?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will discuss this matter with my colleague.

WOMBATS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands whether wombats are creating havoc to sections of the wild dog fence to the extent that consideration is being given to the use of poison to reduce the number of wombats in those areas? I have heard this rumour, but if it is the case the people in those areas and the Minister for Conservation should be aware that if wombats are creating havoc by burrowing under the fence and damaging it, we must control them, because their activities will cost the Government money. At the same time, however, we must consider conserving our native fauna. I do not condemn this action by asking the

question: I merely wish to ascertain whether this action is being considered because of the wombat menace.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will ask the Minister of Lands to check on the accuracy of the rumour the honourable member has heard and to establish for him whether, if it is true, the action referred to has been taken by the department.

STEVENTON ESTATE TANK

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has considered installing a safety device on the water storage tank on the Steventon Estate, and whether the overflow pipe outlet is to be extended to the creek bed? On December 27 last year, and at other times, my attention has been drawn to a large volume of water overflowing from the Steventon Estate water storage tank. The overflow pipe from the tank terminates in a drainage easement in a creek on private property and, as the water flows through other private properties, at times the volume of water has caused damage to some properties. On November 19 last year, I was informed by letter that arrangements had been made for alterations to the feeding system that would considerably reduce the possibility of a recurrence of this incident. Whether any alterations have been effected I do not know, but if they have been they are apparently not satisfactory. I understand that there is no safety device on this tank, although such devices have been installed on similar tanks.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have this proposition examined to ascertain whether it is practicable, and tell the honourable member what is the outcome of my investigations.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say whether, in view of the tax increases he announced yesterday, it will be his policy to instruct the Prices Commissioner to check price increases which could flow from these measures across the board to consumers? After the announcement of the recent 6 per cent wage increase it was alleged in my district that prices had been marked up by 30 per cent. It is obvious that many of the increases announced by the Premier will be passed on to consumers, including primary producers who cannot in their dire circumstances pass on their costs. This would be a most effective exercise for the Prices Commissioner, and I should appreciate

the Premier's assurance that the Prices Commissioner will maintain effective control on the prices to be paid by consumers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Prices Commissioner will certainly be keeping a constant watch on retail price movements, and I am glad to know that the honourable member supports so much the activities of the Prices Commissioner.

Mr. Rodda: I have never done anything else.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am pleased to hear that. I should be grateful for the honourable member's assistance in gaining the support of the members of his Party in other States in getting a uniform price system, as a result of which we could make price control even more effective. South Australia could then control the prices of goods entering South Australia from other States, prices over which we have no control at present. If the honourable member knows of 30 per cent retail

price mark-ups as a result of the 6 per cent wage increase, I should be pleased if he would pass that information on to the Prices Commissioner. Indeed, the Commissioner has already investigated, at my request, a complaint received from the honourable member's district in relation to a line of retail goods. That investigation was instigated by me last year.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Works inform the House of the holdings of metropolitan reservoirs? Last week this State experienced hot days and hot nights, and on one day a record consumption occurred with a consequent drain on resources.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Expecting that this question might be asked yesterday, I obtained the following figures, which were taken on February 22:

	Capacity Mill. gall.	Reservoir Holdings	
		22/2/71 Mill. gall.	22/2/70 Mill. gall.
River Onkaparinga—			
Mount Bold	10,440	5,111	5,220
Happy Valley	2,804	2,470	1,971
Clarendon Weir	72	70	68
River Myponga—			
Myponga	5,905	4,008	3,693
River Torrens—			
Millbrook	3,647	491	1,029
Kangaroo Creek	5,370	2,595	311
Hope Valley	765	566	638
Thorndon Park	142	114	115
River South Para—			
Barossa	993	801	840
South Para	11,300	7,214	7,374
Total	41,438	23,440	21,259

The present metropolitan reservoir holdings are considered satisfactory and closely follow the planned holdings for this time of the year. The quantity of water pumped through the Mannum-Adelaide main to date is 4,126,000,000gall., which compares with 7,145,000,000gall. pumped to February 22, last year. At present, it is estimated that pumping from the Murray River through the Mannum-Adelaide main will only be required to meet the demand in those areas directly served by the pipeline. This will require one, two or three pumps only operating during off-peak tariff hours and will vary from time to time depending upon the demands.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Mr. McANANEY: Yesterday I asked the Treasurer a question regarding the cost of Government advertising to obtain Legislative Council enrolments and, despite the assistance offered by the Minister of Works, I saw when I read the *Hansard* pull this morning that I did not receive answers to the questions I asked. Will the Treasurer therefore obtain at his earliest convenience the information I requested yesterday?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have a careful look at a re-interpretation of what the honourable member asked me yesterday to see whether I can discover what he was asking for.

INTERSTATE FIRM

Mr. BROWN: Will the Attorney-General, through his department, have a further investigation conducted into Advertising Merchandising Proprietary Limited of Surfers Paradise regarding its failure to send an advertised watch within 48 hours of the receipt of money for same, and the failure to return such money? On October 28, 1970, the Attorney-General told the member for Fisher, in reply to a question, that after investigation the trader concerned intended to dispatch watches as they became available, and that customers should receive their watches in due course. My point is that the watch has not been sent or the money refunded to the person concerned. I understand from investigations that the address of the company concerned does not exist.

The Hon. L. J. KING: When this matter was raised last year I referred it to the Police Department, which subsequently reported on it. As further information has been furnished by the honourable member, I will again refer the matter to the Police Department to see what its investigations reveal.

ROAD FATALITIES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say how many road fatalities have occurred in South Australia so far this year, and how many of the persons involved have had blood alcohol readings over .08 per cent?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain the information (or as much of it as is available) and let the honourable member have a reply.

PENSIONERS' REGISTRATION FEES

Mr. CRIMES: Will the Treasurer appeal to the *Advertiser* to make good its apparent omission, in its report of increased charges in this State, of a reference to concessions to pensioners in respect of motor registration fees, which was included in his statement to the House yesterday? My question arises from many queries I have received from pensioners on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I very much regret that what I said in this respect yesterday was not included in the *Advertiser* report, as it has led to many pensioners being concerned that they may face a substantial increase in motor vehicle registration fees, which is not the case. Classes of pensioners who are granted travel concessions in these areas will receive a rebate of the total amount of the increase in registration fee, and I would ask that that aspect be publicized. I, too, received

many inquiries from pensioners this morning, because they could see no announcement of a rebate in the report of my speech.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works take urgent action to rectify the unsatisfactory position regarding the Public Buildings Department's activities in my area? During the last few weeks, wherever I have travelled in my district I have received constant complaints about the Public Buildings Department's failure to honour promises and to solve serious problems concerning schools and police stations. In regard to the Penong school, tenders were first called about five years ago, but nothing has been done since.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What did the Hall Government do?

Mr. GUNN: I am not concerned about the Hall Government; I am concerned about what this Government intends to do. At the Penong school, one of the rainwater tanks is sagging, paint is peeling off the building, and dry rot has set in on some of the timber work. At one police station, it is necessary in the winter time to pull beds away from the wall of the sleep-out, where the policeman's children have to sleep, in order to escape getting wet. Will the Minister have this serious situation rectified immediately?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The points raised by the honourable member about the Penong school rather alarm me. The Headmaster of the school, of course, has authority to spend up to \$120 (I think it is) on urgent work, and I am rather surprised that some of the things referred to by the honourable member have not been handled in that way. I do not doubt what the honourable member has said about the condition of the school, and I will certainly have the matter examined as one of urgency. In view of his general statement, I should be interested to know more specifically about every complaint that he has—

Mr. Gunn: I will soon furnish them.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —rather than hear a general statement such as he has made. Particularly in isolated parts of the State, the department sometimes has great difficulty in getting work carried out, because of the lack of contractors who are prepared to tender for the work. I think even the honourable member realizes that it is extremely expensive to the Government and to the department to send men on day labour to be engaged on this sort of work. I am not making any

excuses for the department; I realize that Government buildings are involved and that they have to be maintained and serviced. However, we have difficulties of which the honourable member should be aware. An awareness of these difficulties could lead to a little more understanding by him of the department's problems. I shall have the matter examined and, if the honourable member has any other specific problems in his area, I shall be pleased to hear about them also.

TYRE DISPOSAL

Mr. SIMMONS: Can the Minister for Conservation say what consideration has been given to disposing of used tyres? A few months ago a scheme was put forward to use discarded car tyres by building reefs in the sea off the coast of Adelaide. This ingenious scheme was designed to increase the fish population and at the same time solve one of our most intractable problems, pollution. Unfortunately, however, the scheme did not have the success it was hoped that it would have, because it depended on voluntary labour, which I understand was not forthcoming in the required volume. Even if it had been successful, it would necessarily have been only a temporary expedient. I should like to know whether a long-term solution to this problem has been considered.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This matter is causing the Government much concern. The problem of disposing of used tyres has been brought to the attention of the public only in the last couple of years, because hitherto the rubber-manufacturing industries in this State either reclaimed tyres in South Australia or transported them to other States to be reclaimed. However, in recent years this has proved uneconomical, with the result that stocks of used tyres are now building up rapidly. This will increase in the future, and disposal will present a problem. On the examination that I have undertaken, I believe that the matter of disposing of these tyres can be effected in only two ways: first, by establishing artificial reefs, to which the honourable member has referred; or, secondly, by using a pollution-free type of furnace to burn them, and the purchase of such a furnace would be costly. Whilst I favour using tyres to construct reefs, because it would be serving a useful purpose, the difficulty concerning the experiment conducted in this regard was that it was based on voluntary labour, and the work is difficult, heavy, time consuming and costly. Much finance would be required to dispose

properly of all the tyres becoming available in this way in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Plenty were left over.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Some were left over, and the Minister could not find any real use for them. However, this is a serious matter and it is being investigated at present. We will certainly have to find an answer soon.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands when the Government intends to present to Parliament a Bill to ratify the rural reconstruction scheme, which was the subject of a recent meeting between the various States?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It will be presented during the current session.

ADELAIDE ABATTOIRS

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to table all reports currently held by him in relation to the Adelaide abattoirs? Last week, I visited the Far North of the State where, as most people are aware, a drought is being experienced. Most of the properties in the area have disposed of many cattle, others having sent cattle south for agistment. However, most people inside the dog fence are trying to retain most of the sheep. At present, those who are sending sheep south are getting a bill of a few dollars for the freight of several hundred sheep. They are continually asking me why the ban has been placed on killing mutton for export at the abattoirs.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain from my colleague a report on the honourable member's question and also to ask the Minister whether he is willing to table the reports referred to.

SHOCKMOBILE

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport explore the possibility of setting up a shockmobile service in South Australia? I assure him this has nothing to do with the tax announcements made yesterday. I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of February 13.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How much will it cost?

Mr. MATHWIN: There is an increase in the licence fee of \$1 for a start.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How much will it cost, though?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister is the economic expert, so I will leave it to him.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: The report in the *Advertiser*—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask leave to explain his question. I know he was interrupted.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am sorry; the interruption put me off. I ask leave to explain my question. The report in the *Advertiser* of February 13 states that accident fatalities can be reduced by up to 30 per cent as a result of the use of shockmobiles, which will be used in Victoria within the next six months. These mobile surgeries, which are built in Germany, will be staffed by a doctor and assistants who will race to the scene of accidents, treating patients there.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I have said before, if any matter associated with road safety worth looking at is drawn to my attention it will be looked at carefully; the case referred to by the honourable member is no exception. However, I am somewhat at a loss to understand whether the honourable member is now advocating that the Government should incur further expenditure or that we should follow the suggestion of the Leader and curtail expenditure. After examining it, the Government will make up its own mind about the matter referred to by the honourable member.

POLICE PENSIONS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier urgently review the Police Pensions Fund, and consider supplementing or increasing pensions to retired commissioned police officers? I understand that the average age of the 19 retired commissioned police officers is 71 years. These officers were the founders of the Police Pensions Fund. However, their current fortnightly pensions are at a level that is causing them financial hardship. In view of the 24 per cent increase made to similar retired officers in Victoria about 12 months ago, will the Premier urgently consider this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When the alterations to the Superannuation Act were announced and enacted last year, I said that the Police Pensions Fund was under review and that I intended, during this part of the session, to introduce a Bill relating to that fund and to back-date the pension increases to the dates that applied to other Government pensions. That review is taking place currently. I expect to be able to introduce a Bill shortly, when I shall be able to outline to the honourable member in detail what the Government is able to do in this regard.

FIRE FIGHTING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to inquire whether fire-fighting equipment should be subsidized in this State along the lines of subsidies introduced in Victoria recently, whereby individuals can receive on equipment, which is used solely for fire fighting, a \$1 for \$1 Government subsidy?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that the honourable member will be aware that the whole ambit of fire-fighting services in South Australia is being examined at present by the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Agriculture. No doubt the matter raised by the honourable member will be considered. However, I will raise the matter with my colleague and get a report for the honourable member.

HOUSE PURCHASE

Mr. McRAE: In the light of the Government's consumer-protection policy, will the Attorney-General examine the general implications of our temporary house finance system? In particular, will he investigate the situation of two of my constituents (Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Sherwood, of 65 Midway Road, Elizabeth East), who currently face eviction from their house? Mr. Sherwood, who is a carpenter on award rates, purchased the house on \$1,500 deposit in July, 1969, and had it insured. In order to purchase the house he obtained temporary finance of \$8,000, at a high flat rate of interest, from the Finance Corporation of Australia, pending a bank loan. Subsequent examination by the bank revealed defects in the house to such an extent that the loan was refused. The insurance company concerned has refused to make good the defects, saying that they are not covered by the policy. As a result, my constituent, his wife and five children face immediate eviction, after having paid \$2,000 to the finance company. Will the Attorney-General and his officers urgently inquire into the situation with a view to assisting my constituents, who are facing drastic consequences apparently without having committed any moral fault? Also, will the Attorney-General's officers endeavour to restrain further action pending the investigation? At the same time, will the Attorney look at the overall situation regarding temporary house finance so far as the State Government is concerned?

The Hon. L. J. KING: From the facts outlined by the honourable member, it would appear that the Attorney-General would have no legal power to intervene. I shall certainly

have the facts looked at to see whether any intercession by my department can achieve anything for these unfortunate people. I will take up with the Treasurer the general question regarding the availability of bank finance and the necessity for temporary loans, but I think the honourable member will realize that this has been a problem that has beset applicants for loans for a considerable time. Efforts to solve this problem have so far been unsuccessful.

TRADING HOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry considered taking action to reverse the decision to end Friday night and weekend shopping in those outer parts of the metropolitan area where it is presently enjoyed? If he has not considered such action, will he do so? I believe that the Tuesday after Easter is the day on which this activity will cease. During the Parliamentary recess, I lived for some weeks in the District of Mawson (I lived there with the knowledge of the local member and apparently with his active assent). While I was there, I saw the tremendous activity that takes place at shopping centres along the South Road and in other parts of that district. More importantly, I talked to people who live there and who are dreading the day when it will be no longer possible for them to carry out their shopping activities on a Friday evening or at weekends. Apart from the time I spent in the Mawson District, I have spent much time in the Elizabeth area, where I have talked to many people who have expressed a similar view to that expressed by the people in Mawson. In case the Minister is preparing to give me this answer, I point out that the action I have asked him to take cannot be taken simply by introducing a Bill in this place, because that would be reversing a decision already made this session.

I think I am correct in saying that but, if I am incorrect, that is good. The matter will probably mean some administrative action in relation to the next session of Parliament and I even go so far as to suggest that the session should be called very early so that legislative action could be taken to bring about this result. The matter is so important and there is such a depth of feeling about it that I make the suggestion to the Minister, encouraged by the fact that he was not in Ministerial office when this matter was before the House and of course he is a new broom and may be anxious to make his mark. I assure him that, if he were

to do this, he would earn the gratitude and probably the electoral support of many thousands of South Australians.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It seems a pity to give the honourable member such a brief reply, but the reply to both his questions is "No". Apparently, while he was in the District of Mawson he contacted some Liberal electors there.

Mr. Millhouse: They're going to be Liberal electors next time.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: He conducted a door-knock campaign, but we held a referendum, which has given us a different result.

NAILSWORTH CROSSING

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister of Roads and Transport aware that the crossing adjacent to the Nailsworth school on Main North Road was severely damaged (once again) early last Sunday morning, with the result that the police have had to take immediate action to see that children are escorted across the road to and from the school? As this is not the first time this crossing has been damaged severely, will the Minister take the problem up with the Road Traffic Board, the Prospect council, and any other relevant authority, to find out whether the whole subject of this crossing can be reconsidered to prevent recurrences of this kind and the inconvenience and serious possibility of fatalities to children crossing the road at this spot?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to discuss this matter. As the honourable member knows, I am aware of some of the history of the crossing. The matter is serious, for when a crossing that has been in operation becomes inoperative because of an accident or for any other reason, the danger to persons using the road near the crossing is many times greater than that to people using the road at a place where there is no protection at all. I have never been convinced that the crossing or type of crossing causes an accident, any more than I have ever been convinced that stobie poles cause accidents. The stobie poles and the poles that hold these traffic lights have never moved of their own accord, and so I think the matter comes back again to those people who are propelling a ton of steel along the road being called on to exercise a little more concern and respect for other persons using the road. However, this is a special case and there is a special problem. The Road Traffic Board and the council have viewed the crossing numerous times. In fact,

not long ago I was at this location with the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board, the Town Clerk of the Prospect council, and other persons. I will again discuss with them whether anything worth while can be done and I will inform the honourable member accordingly.

INSTITUTE LIBRARIES

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Education say what consideration the Government has given to the recommendations in the report made after a long investigation by the distinguished educationist Mr. E. Mander-Jones, a former Director of Education, of the position of institute libraries throughout South Australia in relation to the free library system and the State Library? It is now about 10 months since the report prepared by Mr. Mander-Jones was presented to the Minister of Education, the commission having been given to Mr. Mander-Jones by the Steele Hall Government when I was Minister of Education. It was considered then that there was great need to rationalize institute libraries throughout the State and I know that Mr. Mander-Jones travelled widely in this State and also went on to other States to see libraries there before he prepared and presented the report to the Minister of Education. Many people are interested in what the Government intends to do about this report, because institute libraries have been working under great difficulties for many years. I therefore ask the Minister whether he can say now, after the Government has had considerable time to study the recommendations made by Mr. Mander-Jones, what it intends to do in this matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think I received a copy of the report late in June or early in July last year. I then circulated the report to various interested people throughout South Australia, asking for comments and submissions, and in the intervening period such submissions on the recommendations made by Mr. Mander-Jones have been received. I think the honourable member appreciates that the future role of institute libraries and the future role and organization of subsidized libraries and the Libraries Board are matters of controversy and, in the circumstances, the Government considered it necessary to allow full opportunity for all those involved in the area to express their views on the matter. Within the next few months the Government will decide what should be done in this field. The factor that disappoints me at present is

that, even presuming that we reach agreement on this and put the necessary legislation through Parliament, the financial position for at least some months is likely to be such that the kind of expansion in expenditure in this area implicit in Mr. Mander-Jones's report or in many of the other submissions received will not be possible. However, the honourable member can be assured that the matter is being studied and when we reach a conclusion it will be announced. Later this year a further opportunity will be given to people interested in the whole question to study it and express views on legislative proposals arising from the report.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport find out what is the expected opening date of the section of the South-Eastern Freeway from Stirling to Verdun, as there is considerable interest in this matter in the community?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain the information and let the honourable member know.

BREATHALYSERS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary how many breathalysers are used by the Police Department in metropolitan and country areas, and whether it is intended to increase the number of breathalysers operating at present?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I saw those details in the Police Commissioner's report recently but, as I cannot recall the figures, I will obtain them for the honourable member.

SHIPPING

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Marine say what direct and/or indirect financial loss is occurring in State revenue as a result of the loss of direct shipping contact with Japan? I have been informed that there is now no arrangement to ship normal cargoes direct to Japan. I understand that containerization is the method of transfer but that containers are not always available. This situation has resulted in an increase in the cost of exports from South Australia to Japan, so that in some instances competition with some other States has left the local agricultural or other producer (and I am especially interested in agriculture) at a disadvantage compared to his counterpart in other States.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot reply to this specific question. I assume that when the honourable member speaks of the

shortage of containers he means containers filled at Port Adelaide and railed to Melbourne for shipment to Japan. There have been some interesting developments in this field in respect of Port Adelaide, but I will obtain a considered reply for the honourable member.

AMERICAN RIVER WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When the Minister of Works wrote to me in reply to my inquiry about a scheme to provide a supply of water at American River by the shortest practical route, he told me that this proposition had been prepared by the Water Supply Branch of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and that it had been forwarded for examination and final preparation. In the last few months I have asked the Minister whether an officer of his department could visit American River to discuss the scheme with local residents. People there are not aware of their obligations: they know they will be asked to pay more than the normal rate but they do not know how much more. I have told them that, as far as I know, the department never requires a sum greater than 1½ times the normal rate but, even so, individual users of water do not know what rate they are likely to have to pay. Although no firm costing has yet been done, it would help considerably if an officer could visit that district. Can the Minister say whether this visit can be arranged?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot agree with the honourable member that, although we have no firm costs, an officer should visit the district. It is imperative that the department should first know the cost before we send an officer to the district, because he could then talk with some authority, certainly to the people concerned. I hope that it will not be long before the costs are known. When they are known I shall be pleased to send an officer to Kangaroo Island, but no useful purpose would be served by sending him at this stage.

GRAIN SHIPMENTS

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Marine say what is the total tonnage of grain shipped each year from Ardrossan and Wallaroo from 1955 to the end of 1970?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member reads the reports of the Marine and Harbors Department for those years he may see these figures for himself. No doubt the honourable member is busy, and I will ascertain whether one of my officers can spare the time to do it for him.

CEILING FANS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Education say whether ceiling fans are being installed in all temporary or wooden classrooms, as was approved of and for which funds were provided by the previous Government? During last week the temperature in a classroom in a small country town rose to 110°F. Many schools were forced to send young children home early because of the high temperatures experienced last week.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I understand that the Public Buildings Department has called tenders for the installation of ceiling fans in classrooms, but I am not sure whether a contract has been let. Generally, the use of fans when the temperature rises in temporary classrooms gives only limited relief. It probably gives a psychological relief and may give some greater degree of comfort if the weather is humid, but on a dry, hot day, when the fan circulates still air, the degree of relief to the occupants of the room is not great. The general policy that has been adopted when temperatures become extreme, as they did last week, is that we ask headmasters to vary school programmes to the extent that is necessary. Generally, we do not agree with the policy of sending children home and closing schools. At present many mothers of schoolchildren are working and, unless we can give these parents sufficient notice that the school will close, we could find that children sent home at lunch time were out in the street for the rest of the afternoon because their houses were locked and they could not get inside. It is the general policy that the school continue operating under these difficult circumstances and that it try to vary its educational programme to meet the conditions as best it can. I will ascertain the date of the letting of this contract and inform the honourable member accordingly.

TUMBY BAY MAIN

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works investigate the possibility of replacing the 6in. water main that supplies the township of Tumby Bay from the Tod trunk main? Tumby Bay has experienced many problems this summer with poor water pressures and, despite attempts by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to improve the situation by using booster pumps, the problems seem incapable of solution. Two factors seem to be the basis of this trouble: first, the main is too small to supply this growing town; and

secondly, the main itself, which is of cast construction and has lead joints, is very old and has not been able to withstand any increased pressure.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

SOUTH RAILWAY LINE

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say what is the potential capacity of the South railway line; what services are now causing the saturation which the Minister says this line has reached; and why cannot the Overland Express and jet freight services receive equal priority? In reply to a question I asked yesterday, the Minister left little doubt that, because jet freight services were a paying proposition and the Overland was not, the former would take priority over the latter. I may have misunderstood the Minister, but that is certainly the way his reply read. In view of the extensive television advertising to try to make the Overland more attractive to potential users of the service, will the Minister say whether this is a wise allocation of priorities?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has stated that that is the way my reply read; he should have said that that is the way he read it, because that is not what I said. His question today calls for detailed information on the number of trains running on the line and so on and, rather than provide him with information that he may misread again, I think it would be better if I obtained a prepared report and provided it for him.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture how much grain was allocated out of the wheat contingency reserve for the 1969-70 season, whether any allocation has been made for the 1970-71 season, why such allocations have been made, and how much wheat is in each category of allocation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. LAWN

Mr. LANGLEY moved:

That two months' leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr. S. J. Lawn) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Adjourned debate on the motion of Hon. G. T. Virgo:

That this House—

- (a) endorse the action of the Government in adopting the philosophy of action contained in the Adelaide

Transportation 1970 Report prepared by Dr. S. M. Breuning;

and

- (b) while mindful of the need for close co-operation between the Housing Trust and the State Planning Authority, take into account the differing functions of those organizations, and accordingly endorse the decision of the Government in determining not to constitute a single authority to perform the functions of those organizations.

(Continued from February 23. Page 3508.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): A study of the Breuning report and the Minister's speech of yesterday reveals that Dr. Breuning has perpetrated a cruel practical joke on the Minister and, therefore, on the people of this State. The difficulties ensuing from that practical joke are compounded because of the ineptitude of the Minister. The complexities of administration today are such that the public does not always have the opportunity to grasp the essential detail. They are not always able to analyse a situation because they can pick up only limited information in their daily round; this lack of information results from the restricted amount of detail that the Minister chooses to supply to them. The people can be excused for having limited information in relation to metropolitan transportation because they have never been given sufficient details by the Minister.

A detailed comparison between the speech I, as Premier, made in this House on August 7, 1969 (in which speech I outlined the previous Government's transportation plans in extensive detail) and the Minister's speech of yesterday is, to say the least, notable. In my speech in 1969 I outlined seven pages of plans and proposals to guide the public. Yesterday the Minister failed to give any detail and treated this House and the public with contempt. Ever since the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was approved in principle by my Government, the Minister has set out, by abuse and misrepresentation, to mislead the public about that plan's objectives. *Hansard* has numerous references to prove this.

When the Government changed on May 30 last year, the Labor Party was placed in an extremely difficult position, because it had inherited what is regarded around Australia as one of the most forward looking transportation plans that this country has seen. For political reasons the Labor Party had been deriding that plan, but when the Government changed it was caught between responsibility and irresponsibility. Unfortunately for this State, it chose still

to follow the path of irresponsibility. It chose to invite to this State at significant public expense a so-called expert in transportation, to whom the Labor Party gave carefully controlled terms of reference. The present Government paid for an answer that was known to it before it got it. So, we have what is now known as the Breuning report—one more example of the present Government's shifting of the onus of responsibility from its own shoulders to those of others. Let us look at Dr. Breuning's qualifications, details of which I sought in this House. In addition to asking for Dr. Breuning's academic qualifications, I asked:

What major works have been constructed, supervised, or planned by Dr. Breuning in the United States of America?

The Minister replied as follows:

1. The academic qualifications held by Dr. Breuning are: a Master of Science in Civil Engineering, obtained from the Technical University, Stuttgart, Germany; and a Doctor of Science in Transportation Engineering with Regional Planning and Business Administration, from Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University. 2. Dr. Breuning has been engaged in a variety of tasks and with many construction and planning organizations after gaining his qualifications. For instance, he was engaged by the Montreal Transportation Commission to work with the Consulting Engineers, DeLeuw Cather & Company, on the Montreal subway programme, part of which is the Expo express, one of the most advanced automatic rail systems in the world. Dr. Breuning served as a consultant in highway economics on the Canadian Colombo Plan team in Burma.

While serving as Professor of Civil Engineering at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he consulted to such well respected firms as—the firms are then named—

in long-range systems planning and traffic research. He served as Director, Highways Transportation Programme, project transport, involving the direction and administration of an inter-disciplinary research programme related to highway transportation development.

What works did Dr. Breuning do in the United States of America? This was the question I asked of the Minister, and the answer is obviously "Nil". The Minister could not give any details of such work. The Minister said that Dr. Breuning went to Burma and Canada: the doctor went away from where he resided. So, it would appear that Dr. Breuning has done no practical work in the United States of America, except research.

Dr. Tonkin: He probably writes his reports there.

Mr. HALL: Dr. Breuning may be very good at research, and I do not decry that. Research involves looking into the future, and it appears

from his report that he is indeed looking far into the future—long after the turn of the century. We therefore have very little detail about the practical qualifications of Dr. Breuning and about work he did that related to his work in Adelaide. The Minister's speech was vengeful; he launched into the political scene and forgot transportation until the third *Hansard* pull.

Dr. Tonkin: It took him 15 minutes to get to the subject of transportation.

Mr. HALL: There were 15 minutes of vengeful words and of launching into the political scene. I was reminded of the Premier's remarks about my statement that Cabinets throughout Australia would be improved if two people who were not politicians could be invited to serve on them. The Premier replied that he did not need such members because he had so much talent helping him already.

Mr. Millhouse: He got the wrong talent at the last election.

Mr. HALL: He certainly failed if he had anything to do with choosing the Minister of Roads and Transport. I wonder how long the credibility of this Government can stand the Minister as a member of Cabinet. The Minister's speech contained only one point, in comparison with the seven full pages of the *Hansard* report of the speech I gave in this House in 1969. That speech detailed for public guidance the plans of the previous Administration. However, the present Minister shows his contempt for the public by moving a motion as follows:

That this House—

- (a) endorse the action of the Government in adopting the philosophy of action contained in the Adelaide Transportation 1970 Report prepared by Dr. S. M. Breuning; and
- (b) while mindful of the need for close co-operation between the Housing Trust and the State Planning Authority, take into account the differing functions of those organizations, and accordingly endorse the decision of the Government in determining not to constitute a single authority to perform the functions of those organizations.

So, the Government wants to adopt a philosophy: it is the first time I was aware that the Minister knew anything about philosophy. The second part of the motion is a non-positive proposal, but it is the part that I can approve because it at least indicates the Government's desire to reject one portion of the Breuning hoax. The first part of the motion therefore becomes the main subject for debate. We can set aside paragraph (b)

of the motion because I am sure this House agrees with it. We must therefore consider the Minister's action in moving to adopt the philosophy of action of the Breuning report.

This House has been given no justification for the Minister's motion. We are to move away from a plan that would have cost more than \$500,000,000,000 without one reason being given to this House! This is incredible. There is to be no debate on the Minister's initiative, except a statement of philosophy. What on earth does this Government think it can do to the State? Surely it has learnt in its first six months that the public is tired of being governed by a dictatorship, ruled from outside the Labor Party.

Mr. Crimes: The old story!

Mr. HALL: Yes, the old story, repeated month after month! The Government refuses to state the position or tell the public of its plans. There is no doubt that the Minister was impressed by the verbosity of Dr. Breuning. In fact, I suggest that he was taken in by it and by the very report he ordered. It is interesting to look at the report, which the Minister did not do in the House yesterday; he ignored it, except in regard to its philosophy. We had better see what we can find in it, for the Minister, who should help, will not help us in regard to any Government intention on any detail. We have an obligation on behalf of the public at least to try to probe the Government's intentions. We have the report beginning with a letter to the Minister which, in part, states:

Dear Mr. Minister: . . . We have compared transportation plans and discussed the potential for the future with many professionals the world over.

That is a very impressive statement. Further on, the letter states:

Adelaide can become a leader in transportation, based on the convictions of its people . . . If we were dealing with the builders licensing regulations, the Government would provide for other convictions, that is, court convictions, but I must not develop that point. The letter states that we have "some uniquely favourable circumstances", and the learned doctor goes on to say:

We have had no reason to question the basic information given us . . .

I am quite sure the doctor had no opportunity to do so. We see on page 1 of the actual report in the first line of the terms of reference that the doctor and his assistant were required to conduct a preliminary inquiry, and I ask members to bear that in mind as we discuss further the antics of the Government and Dr.

Breuning in concert, as they were disclosed yesterday and as they are revealed in this report. At page 2, the report states:

Consequently, we have used the massive data which were collected by previous studies but have carefully avoided further compilations or reiterations. We have emphasized breadth in our approach . . . Instead we have considered Adelaide's transportation as part of a continuum . . .

At this stage the doctor began to launch into Americanisms, which permeate this document and which have so impressed the Minister, who obviously does not understand them. The report continues:

We have sought to create a mechanism for continuous, systematic innovation, to guarantee a dynamic response to ever-changing needs and living patterns.

The doctor then talks of leadership and vision. The main criticism (on page 3) of the M.A.T.S. plan is as follows:

The concept that emerges implicitly from the M.A.T.S. plan is a continuation of present trends, which the plan then sets out to reinforce. We do not say that this is necessarily unacceptable, but we feel that it emerges by default rather than by design.

Further down the page, there is a wonderful turn of words, as follows:

Metropolitan Adelaide has spoken through its politicians, academicians—

and that is a delightful word, which I am sure the Minister understands. At the bottom of the page Dr. Breuning says:

. . . in the end, a coherent picture emerges. The learned doctor and his assistant were obviously short of time; they had several weeks to study the immense plans, prepared at a cost of \$600,000 or \$700,000 over three years, and to co-ordinate them with the present Government's intentions. But they had time to make this report:

Adelaide in 1970 is a pretty city, ringed in green. From high above South Terrace on a Sunday afternoon one can see a father and his young son kicking a football. A bit further on a numerous family pile out of a car; some start jogging while others stroll around the large oval track. Earlier a dozen or so schoolboys were holding foot races. On week days at 5 o'clock the intersection with King William Street sometimes backs up for a block or two, but in 10 or 15 minutes that passes. A determined sense of efficiency pervades the tall buildings around Victoria Square, tempered by the venerable Glenelg tram.

I am sure that the doctor was referring to the Premier working in that tall building in Victoria Square. The report continues:

Graceful girls in minis wait for their buses in front of stately city hall. Yes, Adelaide has done pretty well for itself.

But further on, the report states:

Every Eden has its serpent . . .

At this stage, the doctor failed to name the Minister, but I think the Minister is there by definition. We go on through this interesting report, as follows:

We are, however, convinced that the great majority of Adelaide's citizens do not want to give up suburban life—

a statement to which I will return directly. The report continues:

There is perhaps no single point on which we found so much unanimity as on this need for consolidation, and various policies, besides transportation, should be productively directed towards that end. . . . We have emphasized the need to tailor transportation to shaping and serving the city as people wish it to be. Of course, on page 11, we go back to using some well chosen words, namely:

In responding to these needs and desires transportation must do more than extrapolate the past.

I wonder whether the Minister knows what "extrapolate" means. I will provide the definition, if he wishes—"to practice extrapolation; calculation of more or less probable values for a function outside the limits between which values are known". But we are going to do more than that! The report continues:

We suggest maximal flexibility to take advantage of changes as they become available, and a policy of aggressive innovative development.

Here is a gem:

Full buses make a profit; empty ones lose money.

I am pleased to have that information. I remind the House that the Minister has accepted this report, and so in essence this represents the Minister's words and policy. But there is a serious sting in the tail, for the report continues:

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

I have no hesitation in differing with the Minister's adopting that philosophy. The report continues:

A sound procedure for developing some of these should stop the continuing decline of transit ridership or even reverse it. The steady increase in car density together with the overall increase in population results in a steady growth of vehicular traffic in Adelaide. In relation to the future needs of rapid transport in the city, the doctor comes out with a recommendation that is intriguing:

In the meantime, the land needed for these routes should be acquired whenever convenient

to do so. Since it will be some 10 years until actual route construction, the property should be otherwise utilized in the interim.

An interesting recommendation to establish a Department of New Development ends with this sentence:

An initial financing of \$5,000,000 for the first five-year period is suggested.

No doubt, that is a note that the Treasurer has already made in his priorities. To confirm the deliberate confusion that the Minister is drawing the public into on transportation, we have this, under the heading "Reserve right-of-way for future high-speed corridors", which the Minister is now proposing to adopt:

The proposed corridors include to the south the Noarlunga Freeway alignment; to the north-west the Port Freeway alignment; to the north the Salisbury Freeway alignment; to the north-east the Modbury Freeway alignment; and the necessary connections around the west and the north of the city—that is, the alignment through Hindmarsh, across the north of North Adelaide, and connecting to the north-east corner of Adelaide proper.

He is recommending that we adopt this so the main reason why Dr. Breuning was brought here, apart from finding some way of shifting responsibility from the Government, was to look into the future. With regard to what I have called "comedy capsules", I again refer to "Action recommendation A-8: Dial-a-bus demonstration project". The report states:

Dial-a-bus is a special bus service in which a traveller calls a central switchboard, whereupon a bus is directed to pick up the traveller at a given time near his origin. Thus the walk to a stop and the wait there are eliminated. The purpose of a demonstration project is to learn how travellers respond to this service and where particularly it might operate best.

That is a dial-a-bus service. How on earth are we to dial a bus?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: By telephone.

Mr. HALL: The Minister must be joking.

Mr. Payne: A public telephone.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member is trying desperately to support his Minister. About 47 per cent of the public do not have telephones. The Minister might be expected to give relief to some of the people that the Labor Party is supposed to be concerned about. It makes much here and in Canberra of pensioners and people on lower incomes in the community, but the Minister says that those who do not have a telephone will have to walk to one. Is a person then to be expected to run back to his house to pick up the bus? Unless there is tremendous economic progress in the community, we know that not many more people will have a telephone of their own in 10 years' time. Therefore,

this falls to the ground as a stupid proposal, a cruel hoax and a practical joke.

Then we have a thing called a rail-bus, which can travel on road and rail alike. I suppose it can make a loss in two directions at the same time. Then we have a development programme for automated vehicle operation, where one can drive along at 8 m.p.h. and steer past intersections (it would not be on a freeway); one can drive along reading one's morning paper, hoping the vehicle will not act as did the computer that gave the matriculation results! This is a stupid and impossible suggestion. Why go to Disneyland? We have it here. Page 26 of Dr. Breuning's report states:

Our total evaluation of the city— which is a mighty reference, considering that the first line of Dr. Breuning's terms of reference contains the words "preliminary inquiry". By page 26, that has turned into "our total evaluation of the city". By page 27 he has not limited himself to the "total evaluation of the city": it is now "a global outlook"! One wonders what the literary achievements of Dr. Breuning are. I think they are considerable.

Dr. Tonkin: Perhaps he had a press secretary.

Mr. HALL: On page 28 we see the sentence:

Let us then carry on vigorously with whatever repertoire of possible improvements can be mustered, and create a framework for continuing incremental change in all our transport systems.

That reminds me of the other expert that the Premier got for South Australia, the one who looked at the festival hall and produced a plan. When confronted with the question "How do we get the finance?" he replied "Dynamic positivism". Is that what the Minister is going to use for this plan—"dynamic positivism"? There is nothing else here that gives us anything worth two cents in assessing what the Minister intends. It is all very fine to criticize this afternoon, but I do not even know what the Minister intends to do, because he will not tell us.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You can't blame me if you are so dumb that you can't understand it.

Mr. HALL: I believe that Dr. Breuning has treated this State and this Administration as a backwoods State, a colony, with contempt, by writing this contradictory nonsense and saying that in 10 years' time we shall have a new technology and can make it all happen. I

have always believed that the Minister is incapable of administering his department, and I believe that Dr. Breuning has expressed this incapacity better than the Minister could himself. The fact that the Minister is adopting Dr. Breuning's report is an expression of the lack of any planning and feeling for transportation, because the Labor Party is shot through with contradictions in its attitude to transport. The Government's policy speech would not stand the test laid down by the Attorney-General's unfair advertising legislation. That policy speech states:

A Labor Government will withdraw and revise the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport proposals. Freeways from north to south, to Tea Tree Gully, to Port Adelaide and Glenelg, will be necessary, but we do not believe that a massive concentration upon elevated freeways will produce eventually anything other than a city cut up and jammed up with private motor cars.

On August 12, 1969, in a debate about our previous proposals on M.A.T.S. that I had initiated in this House, the Premier said:

The result of the collection of that material made it perfectly clear that the freeway development in Adelaide providing a freeway over the 50-mile strip north to south would have to occur, as there would be no adequate means of providing for future motor car transport within the city of Adelaide if there were not a freeway along the length of the projected strip of development. I see no way of avoiding a freeway of this kind. Concomitantly, in order to provide adequate transport movement there would have to be a freeway to Port Adelaide and also to the Tea Tree Gully area. All that was inevitable in some form: indeed, over a considerable period many properties had been acquired for projected freeway development in these areas.

That appears on page 845 of *Hansard* of 1969 and shows that the Premier then clearly accepted a significant number of freeways in the metropolitan area. In his election speech, he repeated that freeways would be necessary, although he said that, if his Party came to power, it would rethink these matters and would revise the M.A.T.S. plan. Now the Minister of Roads and Transport is saying that the M.A.T.S. plan is finished. He said this effectively on August 11 last year, as reported at page 603 of *Hansard*. In reply to the member for Eyre, he completed his answer by saying clearly and concisely, "We are not proceeding with M.A.T.S., if you can get that into your head." That is not a polite way of answering a member's normal inquiry, but it is typical of the Minister. The Minister then definitely killed M.A.T.S. About two months later, on October 13, the Hon. C. M. Hill obtained the following answer from

the Hon. A. F. Kneebone, this reply having been supplied to the Hon. Mr. Kneebone by his colleague, the Minister of Roads and Transport:

(1) The total amount paid to Dr. Breuning and his associate was \$9,263, comprising \$6,041 for consulting and travelling time and \$3,222 for air travel and accommodation.

(2) No payments are outstanding.

(3) The report has not yet been received by the Government.

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

(5) This figure included Commonwealth funds totalling \$7,780,000. The corresponding expenditure for the 1970-71 financial year is estimated to be \$12,896,850.

On August 11 the Minister said, "We are not proceeding with M.A.T.S., if you can get that into your head," but two months later he supplied a reply to his colleague that refers to the spending of about \$12,800,000 on M.A.T.S. in this financial year. That shows that he has told a deliberate untruth. Therefore, what sort of management is South Australia getting in this respect? What can people believe when the Minister flourishes the Breuning report and says that he adopts its philosophy? What philosophy? Judging by the performance of the Minister last year, the philosophy is to tell the public what the Minister thinks he can get away with, as the Minister's own replies confirm.

The Breuning report contains many contradictions. On page 1 there is the statement that the terms of reference asked for a preliminary inquiry; on page 2 there is reference to a total outlook; and on page 27 the reference is to a global outlook. We have come from a preliminary inquiry, through various definitions, until we have reached a global outlook. What do the members of this House believe? Let us look at the implied criticism of M.A.T.S. in the Breuning report. On page 3, the report states:

The concept that emerges implicitly from the M.A.T.S. plan is a continuation of present trends, which the plan then sets out to reinforce. We do not say that this is necessarily unacceptable, but we feel that it emerges by default rather than by design.

On page 5, Dr. Breuning states:

We are, however, convinced that the great majority of Adelaide's citizens do not want to give up suburban life.

In other words, by that time he is convinced that what is continuing is what South Australians want. On page 8, he says:

We have emphasized the need to tailor transportation to shaping and serving the city as people wish it to be.

Therefore, first, he makes the directly implied criticism that M.A.T.S. is no good because it is a continuation of the present system, and then he goes on to accept the proposal that we should develop the city that the people want, and that the people want the type of life they now have. Of course, M.A.T.S. was deliberately tailored and planned over three slogging years of preparation to provide for the city that the people want. Questionnaires given to people in the metropolitan area ascertained their travelling habits, and that plan was tailored for them. However, this hoaxer has come along and stated this contradiction within the first eight pages of his report. He pretends to base the rest of his report on this type of thing. On page 10, he states:

Summarizing the picture, some factors crystallize as crucial requirements to which the transportation system must respond—

I remind the House that Dr. Breuning describes these as crucial requirements. The fourth is:

Supporting viability of low-density housing.

The famous paragraph on page 11 states:

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

That is a direct contradiction of point No. 4 in the crucial points. Only a fool would put those two points in the same report. Every member who is a proper representative of an outer metropolitan district knows how he tries to get transport for these areas as they develop and to give those people who go out there first as a type of metropolitan pioneer some of the services that inner areas have. Dr. Breuning suggests that we support their viability by not giving them transport! What utter rubbish the Minister has brought here. It is the philosophy of dictatorship—no service at all. This is the famous Breuning report! There are conflicts between the Breuning report and the Minister's own statements. At page 120 of *Hansard* of July 21 last year the Minister states:

The Government and the Labor Party have always held that the M.A.T.S. plan should never have been presented to the public in its present form. It has meant, and still means, great inconveniences to people on projected freeway routes, who are not sure whether their properties are to go or lose value generally. We believe that the plan should have been studied by the previous Government

with a view to assessing a more effective role for public transport and a less ruthless cutting up of parks, gardens and suburbs.

Yesterday the Minister has asked us to endorse a report in which a paragraph states:

The proposed corridors include to the south the Noarlunga Freeway alignment; to the north-west the Port Freeway alignment; to the north the Salisbury Freeway alignment; to the north-east the Modbury Freeway alignment; and the necessary connections around the west and north of the city, that is, the alignment through Hindmarsh, across north of North Adelaide, and connecting to the north-east corner of Adelaide proper.

The Minister must admit that this is the M.A.T.S. plan, but he tries to mislead the public with this futile play on words. What we do about this deliberate hoax concerns the Opposition tremendously. In fact, the Minister has put before this House a motion that will enable him to interpret the truth as he sees it. He can go to M.A.T.S. and reject it or accept bits and pieces. He has accepted an expenditure of \$12,800,000 for this year, yet he has said that he has withdrawn the plan. He can adopt this philosophical approach and do what he wants to do, because Dr. Breuning has covered every contingency. The Government can have freeways if it wants, because the Minister will still go ahead and buy for them, or the people can dial a bus if they have telephones, and 53 per cent of the people in Adelaide have telephones. One can do anything!

It is the Minister's philosophy to tell the public what he thinks is good for them, not to tell them the truth. It is a philosophy of telling them what one thinks one can get away with. Why has not the Minister told the public that he has approved the M.A.T.S. freeway routes? I ask him that directly, as the first question. Why is he recommending a dial-a-bus scheme, when only 53 per cent of the people of Adelaide have a telephone service? Will he reduce bus services in newly developing areas? Will he not provide bus services in developing areas, as suggested in the plan he is asking us to adopt? Everyone who has bought a block of land to build in an outer area wants to know whether this is another area of the Breuning report that he has accepted or rejected.

Has he told the public that he plans an initial expenditure, from the increased motor vehicle registration tax that the Premier announced yesterday, of \$5,000,000 over five years in experimenting and fiddling with his ideas? Has the Minister told the public that he has adopted a 10-year delay in the urgently necessary programme of building roads and

freeways around Adelaide, without having any known basis for the choice at that time? Nothing in the Breuning report outlines why it should be 10 years. Dr. Breuning has said that there may be new technologies in 10 years' time, but who knows?

Of course, in this State we will see a tremendous decline. We are seeing a decline now in this State's reputation in other States. We will also see a decline in the State's international reputation, because the very people who talked planning when they sat opposite us in Opposition for years are refusing to adopt planning. They always talk of planning, but they never plan. In this State we will experience tremendous hardship if the Government continues to waste money, such as an initial expenditure of \$5,000,000 on automated transport material, which anyone knows cannot work in a situation of cottage dwellings like we have in this State.

Anyone who looks at expensive modes of transport knows that we must have a high-density population to start with, and to think that houses built four or five to the acre can support even a capital investment such as would be involved in this monstrous plan, let alone support the running expenses, is stupid, and it is misleading the public on a grand scale. I conclude by referring the House to Dr. Breuning's summary of recommendations. He has one page of summary, which commences with the word "Organizational" and beneath that is the word "Changes." He has "Policies" to the left of the page and "Actions" to the right of it. The items under "Policies" are:

1. Foster public transport.
2. Develop innovations.
3. Keep pace with traffic growth.
4. Acquire land.
5. New developments.

Under "Changes" he states:

1. Establish commissioner of transportation.
2. Establish department of new development.
3. Establish institute for transportation.

At least we have the administration firmly planted astride the pocket of South Australians. The items under "Actions" are:

1. Information programme.

No-one can ever accuse the Minister of involving himself with information programmes, and that certainly would come under the heading of innovations. A further item is:

2. Demand information.

That may be within the Minister's province. The next is:

3. Review rail services.

We have been telling the Minister for a long time that he should review them. The rest are as follows:

4. Arterial street widening.
5. Bottleneck improvement.
6. Acquire access rights.
7. Reserve future corridors.
8. Dial-a-bus.
9. Rail bus.
10. Reserved lane bus.
11. Automated vehicle.
12. Land acquisition model.

It seems that there is no No. 13: that is the great question mark. What is No. 13? This report is reducing to the ridiculous the situation in which three years of slogging preparation by some of the best brains in Australia (despite the previous derogatory remarks of the Minister about them) have been cast aside for a person who has nothing to his name of any substantial construction in the United States and who comes here and fools the Minister with his bright literary writings. The Minister is a victim of his own machinations: he asked for an answer to get him out of trouble, but now I think he almost believes it. I believe that this report, if adopted, will be a disaster for South Australia. I move:

To strike out all words after "House" and insert "endorses the M.A.T.S. plan as proposed by the previous Government".

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the motion. For the question say "Aye"—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Are you closing the debate, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: I am putting the question as required by Standing Orders.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Do you want the debate closed?

Mr. Millhouse: No.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If you do not someone had better get to his feet, otherwise the debate will be closed.

Mr. Coumbe: You are not the Speaker.

Mr. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet before you put the question, but unfortunately you did not notice me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell has the floor and must be heard in silence.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the motion and have several arguments that I wish to present. Before doing that I should like to speak about the previous speech, although

I prefer to call it a reading, and not a professional one. It was a reading interspersed with antics. During the reading and before it we had the picture of the former Premier of this State standing up and attacking the reputation of a professional man. I do not think that that is an edifying action by the former Premier. I should like to have attended the Stuttgart University, or the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for that matter, and I think that the former Premier's argument on this aspect was rubbish. He suggested that because a man obtained a degree in one place and then went to another he would not be any good. All professional people in this Chamber, including the member for Bragg, know that statement to be absolute rubbish. It is well known that many professional men leave the university from which they obtained their degree to get further experience elsewhere. I do not know whether that can be said of Dr. Breuning, but he obtained his degree in Germany, and no-one could name another country in the world that needed as much reconstruction as did Germany after the Second World War.

Mr. Mathwin: Japan!

Mr. PAYNE: Bunkum: the honourable member did not go there, but I did, and I know that is not so. If Dr. Breuning obtained his degree in Germany he would have had much experience, but the Leader of the Opposition went on with this garbage about Dr. Breuning obtaining his degree and then going elsewhere.

Mr. Mathwin: You are talking rubbish: I was in Japan, too.

Mr. PAYNE: The Leader spoke about the terms of reference and read several excerpts from the first paragraph. I am not sure whether he could pronounce some of the words, because he had to go to a dictionary to find out what they meant. The Leader started off by saying "Conduct a preliminary inquiry into what work", and then he tailed off, but he did not wish to quote "needs to be done for revision of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study". It seems that he does not think anyone should dare to talk about revising the M.A.T.S. plan, that master plan, that Hall-promoted plan. I think it fair that I read the entire paragraph so that members may judge for themselves. It states:

Conduct a preliminary inquiry into what work needs to be done for revision of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study to ensure adequate movement within the projected development of the city, leaving the way open

for the maximum use (within the financial competence of the State) of developing flexible systems of public transit;

Members should keep that paragraph in mind. I believe that the Government's action in this matter will save the metropolitan area of this city from what Sir Arthur Rymill, when referring to the M.A.T.S. plan, described as the rape of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Millhouse: You are supporting the Council, too, are you?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. PAYNE: I take off my hat to Sir Arthur Rymill, who apparently submerged Party politics and thought first about the welfare of the State. This is an example that should be followed by Opposition members in this House.

Mr. Mathwin: Are you game to cross the floor? You have never done so.

Mr. PAYNE: Has the honourable member found out what union he is in yet?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about unions in this Bill, and interjections are out of order.

Mr. PAYNE: I believe that it is not too much to say that the Government's action to have the M.A.T.S. plan undergo this further check by Dr. Breuning will prove to be the saving of our city and metropolitan area from encirclement and strangulation by the monumental quantities of concrete, steel and earth, which were to be part of this undertaking to preserve and enshrine the motor car. I drive a big car, but that is necessary although I do not bother to clean it: I do not worship the motor car. I was not a member when the M.A.T.S. plan was discussed originally in this House, but I have read the relevant *Hansards*. My house is in an area close to one of the suggested routes of the Noarlunga Freeway and, consequently, I have been interested in all the discussions in public, and have been in a position in which other members on both sides have not been placed concerning the question of compensation. Being in this position made me even more interested in public discussions, so I attended many public meetings as a private citizen during the last two years. I have, therefore, given the matter some thought.

During the first session members opposite continually tried to harass the Government over the Breuning report. Indeed, they tried to cast aspersions on the reputation of the man responsible for the report even before it was published. Why did they do this? They

did it because they were frightened the report would show them up and embarrass them, as it has. It has shown that the Liberal Government acted irresponsibly in trying to get the M.A.T.S. plan committed hastily to a wrong course merely because the boss said this should happen. Before I entered this place I would have been surprised that an attitude such as that could prevail. However, having been here and having seen what happens, I know that members opposite are capable of having an attitude such as that. It is the standard rule of Liberals to operate on this premise: to smear their opponents if they cannot beat them. If they are worried about what is to be published in a certain report, they believe they should smear those responsible for the report before it is published. Where is their idea of fair play? Members opposite decided continually to nag about Dr. Bruening and to ask whether he was qualified to perform his task. They were trying to knock him down even before he got started. If members have any doubts about what I am saying regarding the tactics of Liberal politicians, they should cast their minds back to some of the advertisements that appeared in the newspapers before last Christmas. They could be described only as despicable.

I shall now refer to some aspects of the M.A.T.S. hiatus, and from this I believe I can show complete justification for the content of the Breuning report. I do not think anyone would quarrel with the starting mechanism of the M.A.T.S. Report. I refer to the role of the Town Planning Committee and its general proposals for our future development, and to the subsequent setting up of the joint steering committee and to the M.A.T.S. investigation.

One can only admire the tremendous collection of detail and data contained in the report. I commend the people and organizations involved for their efforts in producing this valuable report. However, I deplore the conclusions drawn from that study by the Hall Government, and I condemn its efforts to stuff the resultant hotch-potch down the throats of the people of this State, as it tried to do. In his speech yesterday the Minister said, in reply to an interjection, that it was obvious that Liberal members did not always read what was in front of them. How right he was. Page X of the M.A.T.S. report contains a section headed "The continuous planning process", the first paragraph of which states:

The transportation plan should be capable of modification to meet the changing transport

needs brought about by unforeseen changes in the growth of the metropolitan area. Modification should be based on critical and periodic review of the recommended plan.

Therefore, what was wrong with our examining that plan? Why should a report not be issued? This massive plan was years in the making, yet the Liberal Government intended to belt straight into it with originally only a short objection period. However, that came unstuck. Eventually, through the efforts of the Labor Party and, to his everlasting credit, Sir Arthur Rymill, the matter was introduced into Parliament, and it then came much more into the public's view. As a result, the people were allowed to make a judgment of the Government that was trying to push this stuff, and that Government was thrown out of office.

Another significant piece of information was in front of the Hall Government before the public outcry, yet it failed to see this. On page 6 of the M.A.T.S. Report appears a transportation planning process chart. It has many headings and presses down on its two lowest levels, amongst which are "community acceptance" and "continuing review". I think the then Minister of Roads and Transport was a wake-up to the community acceptance aspect, as he tried to help in this field by adding 500 people to the newspaper community in one fell swoop in an attempt to bolster this already collapsing scheme in order to convince people that the plan was the ultimate in its field because he and Mr. Hall said so. The Minister said (which I found interesting) that there was a dearth of speakers on the then Government side in support of the plan. Even the member for Alexandra, who never misses an opportunity to waffle, took only about 1½ pages of *Hansard* to say his normal nothing.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And he was one of the two speakers who supported the Government.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes. I almost felt sorry for the Leader in 1969 and early 1970, when he reminded me of Pandora and the box, although he had help from his Minister of Roads and Transport in another place, who was trying to help him close the lid on all the strife they had stirred up. However, he was not successful in doing so, thank heavens, because of the people of South Australia. The clincher came in August, 1969, when the then Premier (Mr. Hall) stated in *Hansard* that he believed this plan had the support of the overwhelming number of South Australian citizens. Who was he kidding? *Hansard* is full of references in earlier pages

to the thousands of objections received, yet he said that everyone was in favour of it. Some of his Government's deferral proposals to portions of the routes and so on were a direct result of these objections. I think I have shown clearly that the M.A.T.S. plan was unsatisfactory to the people of this State. The Labor Government promised the electors, that it would review the whole plan, and the electors accepted that promise. This Government has now honoured its promise. The terms of reference are clear and sensible and, as the Leader said, Dr. Breuning recognized the vast amount of work that had been done and the terrific amount of data that was available.

The Leader seemed worried that the report contained only 25 pages. The books he is used to reading (like *Tiny Tim*) probably have only 30 pages. The Leader is not logical: he repeatedly says the first thing that comes into his head. The Breuning report fully supports what the Labor Party has said all along—before and after the last election. The Labor Party said that it could not support a plan that perpetuated the transport problems already with us; we said that we should upgrade all the existing arterial and main roads and improve traffic control to get the best use out of our existing network. This attitude has been confirmed by the Breuning report. Indeed, some of these points have already been implemented. In this morning's newspaper there is an article about a system of traffic control that is being implemented.

Furthermore, we should be pursuing lines of investigation that relate to existing and new modes of transport. To do this we need the organization suggested in the report. Doctor Breuning said that we ought to have a director-general of transport. Surely such an appointment would be welcomed by all concerned. The system we have been used to was all right when we had horse trams, but there are now three or four types of transport, and a director-general of transport would co-ordinate routes, promote efficiency, effect economies, and provide many benefits for the customers. The proposed transport planning and development branch was suggested in the M.A.T.S. Report, too. It was given another name in that report, but it was to be the same sort of body. This branch can give useful service through developing new forms of transport and reviewing land requirements.

I particularly welcome the suggestion that a tertiary class, Institute of Transportation,

be set up to conduct research into and investigate new forms of transport and to involve South Australian industry in these projects. Yesterday I could not help noticing that certain Opposition members were sceptical about new forms of transport. It seems that the Liberal Party, particularly in this State, has an unbending and narrow view of life. I remind members of that Party that some people had the same attitude when the first trains and planes were talked about. In those days if anyone dared to say that man would go to the moon he would probably have been arrested and hanged.

I do not think much of the Leader's effort. His whole line was to belittle a man who is not here to defend himself—a professional man who is entitled to respect because he has gone to the trouble of acquiring impressive qualifications. I would not mind a degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; I am sure that some other members would not mind one, either, but they would have Buckley's chance of getting it.

I wish the Leader had stayed here to hear at least some of my speech. We were all subjected to a tirade of bunkum from the Leader, who said, "The Minister will not tell us what he is going to do." Actually, of course, the Minister issued a four-page public statement that described the things that would be done immediately. Surely we should get away from the childish practice of ridiculing the suggestions in the Breuning report. We have heard much drivel about spending \$5,000,000 in this connection, but I point out that that expenditure was to be over a period of years, with a chance of getting terrific dividends. I have much faith in the professional and working people of South Australia. Money invested in research always yields dividends, yet this bloke rubbished the idea, despite the fact that he asked why we did not approve an expenditure of \$576,000,000.

Mr. Coumbe: Whom do you mean by "this bloke"?

Mr. PAYNE: I am sorry; I mean the Leader of the Opposition. I stress to members opposite that Doctor Breuning is saying, "Don't be too hasty." I think I earlier heard the Leader saying "rubbish", or something like that, but I know he is wrong. When jet aeroplanes were developed, two or three companies committed themselves to constructing turbo-prop aircraft, and they are still trying to get their money back. Once they had committed themselves to a course of action

they could not stop. The message of Doctor Breuning is spelt out clearly enough: we must not be hasty in dealing with something of the magnitude of the M.A.T.S. Report. The people of Australia have already paid dearly on one occasion for precipitate behaviour. We have paid \$248,000,000 for the F111 aircraft, and what have we got for all that expenditure? Nothing! Such gigantic losses can occur when we act too hastily. The Government and the Minister are to be commended for honouring the Labor Party's election promise and commissioning the Breuning report. Furthermore, that report has been brought into this House as soon as possible. I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am glad the Leader of the Opposition moved his amendment to this motion, because as it stands at the moment, without an amendment I certainly could not support it. The reasons why I could not support the motion as it stands are numerous, and the first reason springs from its very wording. I do not know whether the Minister himself drafted it or whether he had it drafted for him, but whoever drafted it did it rather inexpertly. I must confess that I do not know what the phrase "the philosophy of action", contained in paragraph (a) of the motion, actually means; "philosophy" means love of wisdom and "philosophy of action" is, I suggest, with great respect—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Would you care to give a true definition of the word?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister wants me to quote the definition of "philosophy"—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The correct definition!

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I will quote it, Sir, for your satisfaction. The primary meaning of "philosophy" is "love of wisdom or knowledge, especially that which deals with ultimate reality". The Breuning report has nothing to do with ultimate reality, as I shall point out in a moment.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Does it also mean "inquiry into the nature of things based on logical reasoning rather than empirical methods"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is all right.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is allowed to debate the motion but not to argue interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I merely point out that the phrase "philosophy of action" is an unhappy one and puts together two words which should not be conjoined; and that really

sets the tone for the report itself and for the debate that has followed. I refer particularly to the speech made by the Minister yesterday: it was a poor speech, and I think I need say little about it. The Minister was rebuked in the course of that speech three times and he was obliged twice to withdraw remarks he made. The Minister is always very personal in his speeches, but usually there is some matter in them as well. One would have expected on this occasion that the Minister would have notes and would have made a prepared speech, but apparently he was speaking off the cuff and, unfortunately, little in that speech was directed to the report itself or to the issues raised by the report. We did hear from the Minister, however, that the Government has adopted the report straight out, and we would have wondered about that from the wording of the motion. However, I found this morning when I read the *Hansard* pull that, in fact, the Government has adopted the report, the Minister having said:

I want to refer now to one or two things the Government has done since deciding to adopt this report.

So even if he did not say it in as many words in his motion, we know from the Minister's speech that the Government has adopted the report, with the exception that is set out in paragraph (b) regarding the amalgamation of the Housing Trust and the State Planning Authority. I should like to say a little about the genesis of the Breuning report. The Minister was inaccurate yesterday when he said that the previous Government received the M.A.T.S. Report in June, 1968. Most members will know that the M.A.T.S. Report was presented to the first Dunstan Government in about October, 1967. It was not printed and made public until after we came into office, but it was in the hands of the previous Government some months earlier, and that has been admitted by the present Premier and, I think, by other members on several occasions. I know (because I saw it myself) that in several respects the M.A.T.S. Report was acted on by the previous Dunstan Government while it was in office. I recall quoting in this House from a docket concerning a bus service for Gawler (I quoted it, I think, in 1968 or 1969) in which there were references to the M.A.T.S. Report ("the M.A.T.S. Report recommends this; therefore, we must do that"). Consequently, there should be no mistake about this: the M.A.T.S. Report was received by a Labor Government, it was published, and we tried to adopt it during our time in office.

When it was seen by the then Labor Opposition that there was much public antagonism to the recommendations in the M.A.T.S. Report, the then Leader of the Opposition (the present Premier), who undoubtedly would have accepted it had that opposition not appeared, did what he so frequently does: he changed his ground and decided to oppose it. The Labor Party did oppose it, and from an electoral point of view, certainly to gain a temporary advantage, I think this was a good tactic. It was, in my view, not a responsible action to take, but it was politically opportune at the time and, again, that is a characteristic of the present Premier. When he went to America in 1969, the Premier was in touch, I presume, when he was in Boston, with Dr. Breuning. The irony of it is that he went to study metropolitan transportation systems and problems, amongst other things, and spent most of his time at Atlanta, in Georgia, doing that, but he did not adopt many of the principles and practices of that city because they are fairly much in line with the recommendations in the M.A.T.S. Report itself.

When he came into office, the Premier had to find someone who would give him a report along the lines he wanted, and he knew that Dr. Breuning would be prepared to do this; so it was arranged, with one slip-up, of course, for Dr. Breuning to come to South Australia with an assistant to make a further report. The one slip-up, as members will recall, was that the Premier announced here that Dr. Breuning had been retained for this purpose before Dr. Breuning himself was aware of it, he first hearing of it from newspaper people, but that is by the way. That is how we have this report before us; it was a report by a person picked to make it, because his general outlook on these matters was already known and because it was an outlook that suited the policy enunciated by the then Leader of the Opposition prior to the last election.

I come now to the report itself. Much has been said about it by the Leader, and I will not go over the same ground. That the Minister had so little content in his speech (and the member for Mitchell, who has just spoken, so little in his) is, I suggest, indicative of the content of the report itself. In fact, I believe that it could have been condensed into about two pages of foolscap rather than the 24-odd pages contained in the copies distributed to us. The report is, in fact, mainly words, with very little else in it. However, I should like to make two main points about the

report. First, its fundamental theme is that we should wait to see what developments in technology take place in the next 10 years or so before we in South Australia commit ourselves. It is suggested that, as there might be great advances in technology, we would be unwise to commit ourselves before we knew what those advances were. The problem I see with an approach of that type is that we live in an age of rapid change and development: obsolescence occurs quickly these days. There is no reason to expect that this trend will not continue, certainly during the next few decades.

Mr. Simmons: Planned obsolescence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe, but if we wait to see what is around the corner we will never get started with anything, because in 10 years' time further developments will be in the offing. I do not expect that in transportation or in any other field of endeavour we will ever get to a point of static perfection; if we do get to that point, it will be a signal that our civilization is in decay. If we wait for 10 years, we will be no better off than we are now. We all know that obsolescence is one of the great problems of this age. Those who take any interest in defence know that equipment is obsolescent almost as soon as it is in the hands of any of the services. This is something we must put up with. At pages 8 and 9 of the report, Dr. Breuning states:

The strength of such an approach lies precisely in not committing itself to massive irretrievable developments which future technologies may conveniently by-pass.

He does not say that these developments will be by-passed, because no-one can say that. However, I bet that in 10 years' time someone can say exactly the same thing of developments that have occurred at that point of time. That is the fundamental weakness in the approach he has made.

The other point I make is that South Australia is a comparatively small community of about 1,200,000 people, about 10 per cent of the Australian community. We are not a particularly wealthy community, nor are we a comparatively wealthy part of the Australian community. Beyond doubt the developments that Dr. Breuning foreshadows (and I say nothing about their merit or demerit for the moment) will be expensive. It will take much money to develop the dial-a-bus, the rail train or bus and the other five or so things he suggests. It is most unlikely that a community of the size and financial resources of this one will be able to afford to be a leader in Australia or in the world in such innova-

tions, which will be extremely expensive. It is all very well for members opposite to say that the previous Government tried to commit the State to \$500,000,000 expenditure on the M.A.T.S. plan; that was over 20 years. That sounds, and is, much money, but I venture to suggest that it will be peanuts compared to the cost of these developments if they ever take place. Much has been said about such developments, much fun having been poked at them, perhaps with justification. We do not know what is around the corner. Maybe it will be possible to develop a dial-a-bus, although it is beyond my imagination and the imagination of most people. However, I cannot see the State ever being able to afford to be the leader in this field, if it does come about.

Those are the two fundamental weaknesses in the Breuning report. First, he asks us to wait for 10 years, but I say we will be no better off if we wait; in fact, we will simply be 10 years later in tackling the problem. Secondly, I do not believe that, as a community, we will be able to afford to do the things that he suggests may (not "will") be around the corner. Although I have made my most important points, I wish to deal with a couple of detailed matters in the report. First, I refer to the recommendation on cost that Dr. Breuning makes. He suggests that we should spend (and the Government has adopted this suggestion, judging by what the Minister has said) \$5,000,000 over five years to set up a director-general of transport, a new department, and the institute of transportation (the research body). That sounds all right, but how does it tie in with the announcements made by the Treasurer yesterday and today that no new appointments will be made or expenditures undertaken because of the present financial stringency?

Presumably, by adopting this report, the Government intends to spend about \$1,000,000, which is the sum set out in the report, either this year or next financial year, to set up the director, the department and the institute. The Minister has said that the advertisements are already out for the position, and that the planning for the institute is under way. This is directly contrary to the policy, such as it is, enunciated by the Treasurer yesterday. As a House we are asked to endorse this motion, which is a contradiction of what the Treasurer has said. I hope the Minister will clear this up.

As I understand it, this is additional expenditure. Apart from the points I have made, I

venture to say it is unnecessary expenditure. My recollection is that, while we were in office, we set up the Metropolitan Transportation Committee, presided over by the Director of Planning (Mr. S. B. Hart). That committee was required to co-ordinate the activities of the various transport authorities—railways, tramways, and so on. I believe it was doing that job (and it may still be doing it for all I know) perfectly properly. Eventually, we would have worked up to the appointment of an officer such as is suggested in the report and such as the Government now intends to appoint. However, for the time being we believed that this was unnecessary. Therefore, I query the contradiction between this and what the Government has said about the financial situation. In any case, I query the necessity for this appointment.

The Leader has already referred to the fact that, although other names are given, this report confirms the broad pattern of freeway development contained in the M.A.T.S. Report. They are not called freeways or expressways but are called high-speed corridors. However, the meaning is exactly the same, and apparently the routes are the same, too. At page 21, the report states:

It was not possible for us in the limited time, nor were we asked to study and comment on the freeway location in detail. But alignments for some of these corridors have been worked out in the M.A.T.S. Report and in subsequent discussions and public hearings. They were discussions and public hearings initiated by us.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They were not initiated: they were thrust on you by public outcry.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The report continues: On some of them considerable acquisition of land has already taken place, and it becomes increasingly costly and futile to reconsider.

With that I agree, so I hope the Government accepts at least that part of the report, and apparently it does. I did not reply to the interjection of the Minister a moment ago, but I could not help hearing it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It prompted me to remember the fury, which has now fallen on the Minister and the Labor Government, of members of the M.A.T.S. Revision Committee. Before the election the Labor Party promised the people who lived in the Minister's district and in the District of Mitchell all sorts of things.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Such as? What did it promise?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The people believed that, if the Labor Party came to office (and they were encouraged in this belief by public statements by the Premier and the present Minister), the objectives that they had in mind would be met. However, I remember only a few months ago seeing at least one letter in the *Advertiser* expressing disgust and disappointment with the present attitude and with the Minister, now that he is in office. I think I have said enough on that. The fact is that the Breuning report endorses the freeway routes set out in the M.A.T.S. plan.

One other matter I wish to mention particularly concerns the acquisition of land. This is dealt with at two places in the Breuning report, namely, at page 13 and again at page 23. I admire the way the report is set out, even if there is not much content in it. Policy recommendation P-4 states:

Prepare for future high speed routes by continuing acquisition of land as it is offered. There is no doubt that Adelaide will, at some time in the future, need high speed north-south transportation corridors.

I must read on, to be fair. It states:

These routes should by-pass the centre as well as provide access to it. They should cater to relatively long-range travel from outer suburbs. In view of the questionable need for freeways and of the expectations that new and better travel modes will be available, decisions as to the type of facilities to be built should be delayed as long as feasible. In the meantime, the land needed for these routes should be acquired whenever convenient to do so.

It does not matter two hoots to the people whose land is being acquired whether the land is used for a freeway, a rail bus, or a dial-a-bus. The people will lose their property, nevertheless.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The Government hasn't thought of that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not think that has penetrated. On page 23, recommendation A-12 states:

Land-acquisition model and assembly of supporting data. The classical justification for early acquisition of right-of-way has been the economic one of forestalling the rapid rise in costs of urban and suburban land. There is, however, a growing awareness of some other very significant criteria which affect land acquisition, to wit, the social problem of the impact on neighbourhoods and individuals whose property is taken.

Because we realized this when we were in office, we prepared an amendment to the Highways Act and last year, in the earlier part of

this session, the Minister introduced that amendment. It amended section 20A of the Act. I know I cannot quote from the second reading explanation, but perhaps I can give the reference to it so that other members may look it up. It is at page 1950, the bottom right-hand column, and continues on to page 1951. In my view (and this was the view we were encouraged by the second reading explanation to take) the amendment would allow the acquisition of land which was not directly required for freeway purposes but the value of which was directly affected by freeways.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've been sitting in the sun too long, obviously.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me quote the section. It allows of the acquisition of land, subject to the certificate of the Minister, for any purpose which, in the opinion of the Commissioner, is necessary or desirable to facilitate any scheme of road construction or development that may be undertaken by the Commissioner in the future. I believed (and I still believe it, incidentally) that that covered the case I have in mind. A former constituent of mine who now lives in Queensland had, I think, two blocks in St. Peters Drive, Modbury, that were not required directly for purposes of the freeway but their value has been greatly affected by the fact that the freeway is to go through there.

Because Mr. Peckover lived in Queensland, he wanted to sell the land but found it impossible to do so. We considered the matter when we were in office but found that there was no way in which we could help him. However, we considered that this amendment to section 20A of the Act would help him and, when the amendment was passed, I wrote, telling Mr. Peckover that I thought it would help him and that he should get in touch with the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What was the answer? I would hate to pay you for a legal opinion if that is your interpretation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Peckover did get in touch with the department and was again knocked back. I wrote to the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He's saying that the Highways Act of last year enables us to buy properties. How silly can you get?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope *Hansard* got all that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I hope so, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The letter that the Minister wrote to me, dated January 27, states:

Thank you for your letter of January 5, 1971, regarding Mr. Charles Peckover. This is a very difficult case—

The Minister does not think it is a very difficult case now, from the way he spoke to the Minister of Education. He thinks it is clear. However, the letter continues:

—and I express sympathy to the Peckovers and appreciate the degree of worry that they must be experiencing. Nevertheless, I do not believe that the amendments to section 20— it is section 20A, actually—

of the Highways Act materially alter the situation. These amendments refer to properties actually affected. Mr. Peckover's property does not fall within this category.

In my respectful opinion, it does not refer to properties affected, but there it is. The Minister's letter continues:

Mr. Peckover's property does not fall within this category. This land is not actually required for road purposes and I do not think that I have any legal basis for its acquisition or payment of compensation to Mr. Peckover. I must remind you—

and this is where he could not resist the dig— that the cause of the Peckovers' difficulty was the premature release of the M.A.T.S. plan—

The Minister went on to say (and it does not really line up with his comment to the Minister of Education a few minutes ago):

but despite this I propose to discuss the matter with the Attorney-General and seek his view on the position.

The Minister's own view is crystal clear but, nevertheless, he said that he would seek the Attorney-General's view. The Minister concluded his letter by stating:

I will write to you again at a later date. He could have said "at a much later date", because I have not heard from him since. Be that as it may, I hope that, with the reinforcement of the passage in the Breuning report to which I have referred, action will be taken to help people in that situation if the Attorney-General's opinion is that, notwithstanding the amendment last year, no help can be given at present. I do not think I can say much more about this report. It is rather ironical that on page 2, in the letter of transmission addressed to the Minister, Dr. Breuning refers to Mr. Robert Nairn (Staff Engineer in the department). Of course, Mr. Nairn has now left the department.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What's funny about that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not say it was funny. I thought I used the word "ironical".

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What's ironical about it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The only person singled out for any specific mention is no longer in the department to guide the actions of the present Minister and the Government. I agree with Dr. Breuning about Mr. Nairn. I have served with him in the Army.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Surely it would have been discourteous of Dr. Breuning not to mention Mr. Nairn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It could be called a discourtesy by Dr. Breuning in not referring to Mr. Flint.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Mr. Nairn spent every day with Dr. Breuning.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All right. I did not really expect this point to be taken up, but it shows that both Ministers on the front bench are pricked.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are trying to assassinate a man who has left the service.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I am saying how much weaker the department is without him. It is ironical that Mr. Nairn is the only one singled out for mention by Dr. Breuning. I state two general points. First, we will be no better off by waiting: we will be worse off, because we will have lost the 10 years and the problems we face in Adelaide will be worse. Secondly, even if these rather fanciful possibilities take place I cannot see South Australia being able to be the leader in that field. This is one weakness in the report and as a document I believe it is disappointing. I do not believe it contains sufficient guidelines for the Government or for this community, and that undoubtedly is the reason why that extraordinary phrase "philosophy of action" is used in the motion. I support the amendment: indeed, I seconded it because it refers to positive proposals that were spelt out in detail in the motion submitted in this House and in another place for the implementation of the M.A.T.S. plan. Although politically it may be attractive to disregard this when after all this Government will be dead and buried in much less years than 10, it will be a disaster for the people of this State if the principles enunciated in the M.A.T.S. plan are not used in the development of transportation here.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): So far we have heard two speakers from the Opposition. It is rather a pity that they did not reverse their order, because although both said much the same thing, I consider that the second speaker said it with greater effect. Although I disagree with some of the things he said, I congratulate the member for Mitcham on an attempt to bring some light into the debate in place of

his Leader's heat. I am not sure what the arrangements are in respect of shadow portfolios on the other side, but I assume that the Leader is his own shadow Minister of Development. He introduced the debate for the Opposition, and one wonders how much support he will obtain from his back-benchers. For example, to what extent will the member for Murray, with his problem of the Murray River, pollution, and egg-farming, be concerned about transportation problems in the metropolitan area? One wonders about the extent to which the member for Rocky River or the member for Frome would be concerned about the problems of pushing people from one part of this metropolis to the other, considering the things they should be concerning themselves with in the interests of their constituents.

We shall see the extent to which the Opposition front bench gets back-bench support in this matter. One wonders whether the Leader of the Opposition had actually read this report before coming into the House, because his speech consisted mainly of reading excerpts from the report and rambling from page to page. He seems to have completely misunderstood many aspects of the report, and he attacked the Government as though it had already accepted dial-a-bus as the sole means of metropolitan transport in the near future. He said that we were getting stuck into our supporters, the poor people who could not afford a telephone. This, however, is only one of a series of possible preliminary recommendations in the Breuning report, yet the Leader attacks us as though we have now adopted it as a firm recommendation and as the sole form of transport that metropolitan Adelaide will have in future.

The Leader also tried to be funny at the expense of the writer of the report. Dr. Breuning is no literary professor and did not produce a document along the lines of Homer's *Iliad*, the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*, or Milton's *Paradise Lost*.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Or a speech of the Leader!

Mr. HOPGOOD: I cannot comment on the literary efforts of the Leader of the Opposition, but for light reading I would go to Leslie Charteris or Micky Spillane rather than to the report. I regret the Leader's temporary absence from this Chamber. In this regard we do not criticize, for example, the member for Heysen because his batting aggregate has not yet reached that of Barry Richards, and we do not criticize the member for Mitcham

because he cannot run as fast or as far as Kerry O'Brien.

Mr. Venning: He is not bad.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Perhaps the climate of Moana may have helped the honourable member over the holidays. I hope he gets plenty of exercise there. We criticize things we think fail to live up to what they purport to be. What the Breuning report purports to be is a recommendation to the Government as to how it should treat the M.A.T.S. plan, and we should criticize it on those grounds and not on any literary grounds.

I now turn to some comments of the member for Mitcham. I appreciate what he said about obsolescence and I agree that it occurs rapidly. He said that if we wait to see what is around the corner we will always be waiting, but to say this is to ignore one of the other points that Dr. Breuning makes: whatever system is contemplated may not be introduced for a decade. Our metropolitan road system is not yet at saturation point, so why should we buy a method prematurely and buy obsolescence before we need it? Should not our obsolescence be as up to date as possible. Surely it is better to defer the club in order to get the spear. As the member for Mitcham has said, others will be getting a gun, but we will have a spear and will not be stuck with a club.

The Adelaide transportation report arose out of grave public disquiet over the M.A.T.S. plan, a disquiet that the member for Mitcham has admitted. The M.A.T.S. plan has done certain things for us: it has encouraged debate on what sort of Adelaide we should have for the future. It has stimulated the sort of public debate which should have followed the publication of the 1962 Town Planning Report. However, because the Playford Government at that time sat on that report, and we had to wait until the present Premier was Minister in charge of town planning matters before any legislative effect was given to the report in the form of the Planning and Development Act, there was no widespread and concerned debate on that report, whereas there has been widespread and concerned debate on the future of metropolitan Adelaide after the publication of the M.A.T.S. Report, and this debate has been valuable indeed.

For example, I refer to the seminar, Adelaide 2,000, held at the University of Adelaide from May 22 to May 24, 1970, and there have been various other studies held. For instance, today's *News* reports that a seminar promoted by the Adelaide University Department of

Adult Education, entitled "City Living—with special reference to North Adelaide", will open on March 19. It will include discussion on urban renewal and the ways of achieving, with good planning, a civilized compromise between development and preservation. These things, which have been going on for the last three or four years, have been valuable indeed.

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

Mr. HOPGOOD: Prior to the dinner adjournment I was discussing the continuing debate that has gone on in the community regarding the future of metropolitan Adelaide, and I was recommending, particularly to honourable members opposite, the content of this debate. I refer, for example, to various Workers Educational Association seminars that have been held, as well as to various publications that have emanated from those seminars and from other public discussions. The keynote of Doctor Breuning's criticisms of the M.A.T.S. Report is to be found on page 3 of his report, which has already been quoted in this debate but which I should like to quote again. On that page the following appears:

The concept that emerges implicitly from the M.A.T.S. plan is a continuation of present trends, which the plan then sets out to reinforce. We do not say that this is necessarily unacceptable, but we feel that it emerges by default rather than by design.

This brings us back to the M.A.T.S. Report, a report which was designed for Adelaide, which in turn had developed largely along *laissez faire* lines. Where there had been a desirable development in the overall pattern it had largely been dictated by topography rather than as a result of specific decisions taken by Government. I think all members should be glad that this has occurred; otherwise, we would have the sort of sprawling radial development of the type existing in the capitals of the Eastern States instead of the more desirable linear development that we have been able to achieve. This has occurred fortuitously, as a result not of planning but of topography.

If one looks at the M.A.T.S. plan, one finds that it has at least three basic assumptions, the first of which is that population build-up of metropolitan Adelaide will continue at the rate predicted in the 1962 Town Planning Report; the second is that the present disposition of population and employment centres will be maintained; and the third is that there will be no practicable alternative to the commuting systems available to us at present in the foreseeable future. I should like to take each of these assumptions one by one and examine them closely. It is doubtful, in my opinion,

whether the first assumption will eventuate. In short, we may not, in 1981 or 1991, be dealing with an Adelaide as large in terms of population as was predicted in the 1962 report. If this is so, problems will not exist to the extent anticipated in the report. Despite a certain volatility, migration has, generally speaking, slowed down, and I believe that this trend will continue.

This afternoon I took out from the Commonwealth Statistician figures relating to permanent and long-term movements in and out of this State, that is, arrivals and departures. If one looks at the excess of arrivals over departures in various years from 1964 (and I repeat that I am dealing only with long-term movements, that is, people coming and going, residents of South Australia for more than one year) one can see the sort of pattern that emerges. In 1964, the excess of arrivals over departures in South Australia was 6,743; in 1965 it had slowed down to 3,500; in 1966 it dropped to 2,963; in 1967 it dropped right down to 693; in 1968 it rose slightly to 940; and in 1969 the figure dropped to 284. I make no specific qualitative judgment on this; I merely say that that has been the trend over this period. Some would say that this is a good thing. Certainly, those concerned about development would say so. On the other hand, people who are more concerned with conservation would see it as a bad thing. For the time being, let us simply say that this is what has happened. On top of this there is building up tremendous pressure for a further relaxation of the migration programme. The new Commonwealth Minister for Immigration has already signalled a diminuendo in this programme, and public opinion will push this further. I refer members to the following article by Mr. Ian Moffitt in today's *Australian*:

But most politicians are still rolling towards the old objectives—"progress", "development". Only public demonstration, in depth, will influence them: a ferment on conservation which equals the clash on conscription.

I believe that the ferment over conservation will eventually force our political leaders in Canberra to an even greater slowdown in the migration programme. The migrants who are already here are at present the most enthusiastic in favour of a further slowdown in the migration programme. I do not criticize what has gone on in the past. Migration has had tremendous cultural benefits in Australia; it has saved us from a sort of cultural incest. Nevertheless, we must look at the situation. I am not in favour of stopping people from

coming to Australia, but I wonder whether we should encourage them to come at the present rate. If more and more people are saying this, the message will get home to Canberra eventually. So, can we take as anything near gospel the sort of prediction made in the 1962 report, on which the M.A.T.S. Report was based?

Eventually the Commonwealth Government will realize, if it is concerned about inflation, that migration itself has some sort of inflationary pressure. It may be that it will take this step. Certainly the Commonwealth Government has been loath to take serious steps about inflation, except for shoving off very unpopular measures on to the State Governments. Apart from this, it has only turned off the spout in Lake Burley Griffin. Someone has even suggested that this spout could act as an inflationary gauge. At times of depression and deflation it could be turned on fast and more money could be spent. In times of inflation it could be turned down, and with very bad inflation it could be turned down to such an extent that it would start to suck water in. Of course, it is the wage-earner who usually gets hit in times of inflation. One other thing the Commonwealth Government has done is to demonstrate its priorities by abandoning its plan for preservation of the environment. An article in today's *Australian* is as follows:

The Commonwealth Government has saved \$25,000 a year and shown that it does not greatly care about pollution. There will be no Commonwealth office of environment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HOPGOOD: It seems to me that there will be a turn-down in migration and that this will be an Australia-wide trend. Secondly, the change in mores will contribute to a reduction in natural increase. Therefore, in 1981 and 1991 we will not be dealing with an Adelaide in terms of population anywhere near as large as was predicted. We can see this sort of trend developing already. In the figures from the Town Planning Report of 1961 we note that the Noarlunga District Council had a population of 5,495, and it was predicted that by 1971 the population of that area would be 30,000. In fact, we find that in June, 1970, the population was 24,400. So, it will be well short of the estimate. Also, we find that the city of Adelaide, which had a population of 23,119 in 1961, was projected as having a population

of 24,000 by 1971. In fact, Adelaide's population in June, 1970, was an estimated 16,100. The point I am making is that these are short-term estimates; they are estimates over a period of 10 years. What then may we say of the longer-term estimates—of the 154,000 that was predicted for Noarlunga by 1991, or the 31,000 predicted for Adelaide? We cannot say, but it is interesting to note what an earlier Town Planner said about the population of metropolitan Adelaide.

If honourable members care to look at Parliamentary Paper 1923, volume 1, No. 20, they will find the report of Mr. W. Scott Griffiths, the then Town Planner, who referred to population predictions for Adelaide and the municipalities. I remind honourable members that there have been only minor changes in municipal boundaries since that time, and more is the pity. In 1923, Mr. Griffiths predicted that by 1971 the Adelaide City Council area would have a population of 49,448. As I have just indicated, the population in 1970 for that same area is, in fact, 16,100. For Port Adelaide, the prediction was 56,456—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson!

Mr. HOPGOOD: The actual population for Port Adelaide is 39,200. For Yatala South, which is now called Enfield, the prediction was 38,335, and the actual estimated population is 81,500. In Prospect, a population of 18,680 was predicted, and there is an actual population of 20,700. For Yatala North the prediction was 31,602; in fact, the figures in respect of the three councils in that area (there is no longer a Yatala North) are as follows: Elizabeth, 33,600; Salisbury, 50,200; and Munno Para, 19,300. For Noarlunga, or Morphett Vale (one of the councils in those days), there was no prediction in 1923, because it was not considered there would be a metropolitan population in that area by 1971. In fact, as I have already indicated, there is a population there of 24,400. Concerning the whole of the metropolitan area, the prediction was 635,718, and the actual population at present is 825,400. Therefore, the overall prediction was woefully low and, secondly, the predictions regarding distribution of population were way out. It was expected that the city of Adelaide would have a population three times in excess of its actual present population. On the other hand, it was predicted that there would be virtually no expansion in Noarlunga when, in fact, there

is a considerable metropolitan expansion at present.

Mr. Mathwin: What does this prove?

Mr. HOPGOOD: It proves that one must be careful when trying to apply present trends to the future, because these can go all wrong. The figures clearly show that for a prediction to be true it must also be a prescription. What are we prepared to prescribe? Are we prepared simply to sit back and take whatever natural increase is given us and whatever comes to us by way of migration? What sort of Adelaide do we want in 1981 or 1991? This takes us back to the second of the assumptions referred to in the M.A.T.S. Report; that is, that the present disposition of population and employment centres will be maintained. The present trend is obvious: the population is fleeing to the fringe far more rapidly than the dispersal of employment is taking place. The city of Adelaide is becoming depopulated. On the other hand, the employment centres are not moving out to where the people are living; nor, for that matter, are the services. What we must do is encourage the population to come back to the city, where employment already exists. Also, we have to disperse employment and services to the outer areas where the people are now living. The effect of this dual development will be to cut down long distance commuting, particularly in peak hours and, after all, that is what M.A.T.S. is all about.

I realize that, in effect, it is a non-traffic solution to a traffic problem to try to cut down the commuting on work journeys by doing things other than things that affect the means of transport. There may be other non-traffic solutions open to us on which we should not shut the gate. For example, one of these is a four-day work week with longer daily hours in those four days. The effect of this would be that people who worked for the industries taking advantage of these conditions would be commuting at later hours than those during which most people were moving up and down the road. I believe that would be desirable. If we can solve the problem of the peak-hour traffic, we will solve the problem of all traffic, because problems really arise only in connection with the peak-hour traffic. I believe that important non-traffic decisions still have to be made by our society that will have a most important effect on the traffic pattern, and I look forward to those decisions which, if implemented, will have great effects on the sort of traffic decisions that still have to be made.

I remind honourable members of assumption 3 in the M.A.T.S. report which is that there will be no practicable alternative commuting systems available to us in the foreseeable future. The Breuning report refers to costly mistakes in the adoption of transport modes only just prior to their being outmoded. The member for Mitchell has referred to this. On page 9 of the report Dr. Breuning states:

For an example from recent transportation history, consider the turbo-props (Lockheed Electra) which several airlines brought *en masse* only to see it utterly superseded by the jets. The loss on the turbo-props was staggering; in retrospect the coming of age of a successful jet technology seems trivial considering that jet fighters were operational in the last year of the Second World War, and yet the fact remains that able, profit-oriented executives in many airlines went out and bought turbo-props and that a giant manufacturer spent a fortune on its development.

Dr. Breuning could just as easily have referred to certain developmental railway lines that were constructed in South Australia prior to the First World War. I am not opposed to railways as such; I am certainly not in favour of closing facilities where they exist and are used by people. I favour extensions to certain spur lines, looking forward eventually to one extension in my district. Let us consider the old Willunga line, which was built under the guarantee system. That system was a marvellous lark: people who lived near where the line was to be laid down guaranteed to the Government that they would recoup any losses on the line, the losses to be collected by district councils through rates. This turned out to be a complete farce, as it was not possible to collect the money. Eventually the guarantee system was abolished. However, the defect of this system was that certain lines, such as the Willunga line (which was very nearly extended to Yankalilla), were laid down at a time when heavy road transport was just coming in. One wonders if those types of extension would have been made if people had had a little more foresight.

As I have said, I am not opposed to railway services, and I look forward to certain minor extensions still being made. I am quite opposed to closing facilities that already exist. Here is another example of blindness in looking at possibilities for the future. One may also mention the tremendous amount of money spent by a State Government in removing the gradient from the Mile End goods yard. Most of this was piled up to form a bridge over this goods yard. Then they started looking around and found that, in most other

parts of the world where they had up-to-date systems, gravity was used for shunting and this enabled shunting to be carried out far more efficiently. One wonders how much money this mistake has cost the South Australian Government over the years since it was first made. Gravity was used in the Eastern States, yet the mistake was made here.

It is obvious that greater use must be made of public transport, particularly in respect of commuting to and from the city. This is where the heavy traffic occurs on our roads and where the greatest savings can be made. The private car is extremely wasteful of road space. If I had had the leisure time recently when Parliament was not sitting, I should like to have gone to O'Halloran Hill or Reynella, on the main South Road, and counted the number of empty seats in cars going to Adelaide during peak hour traffic periods in the morning and coming back in the evening. I think the number of vacancies in those cars would have been quite staggering. This is quite wasteful and inefficient.

I have travelled from my own home to here by bus. The only reason why I use my private car at all is that we never know when we are going to adjourn in the evening, so no-one knows whether the buses will still be running then. However, it seems to me that, when a person has guaranteed hours, knows when he has to be at work and when he will knock off, and if a bus passes his house and will bring him to the city, this is obviously the way to travel to and from work. It is cheaper to travel by bus from Morphett Vale than to use one's own motor car.

The M.A.T.S. plan tried to do away with the most efficient commuting system in the metropolitan area. I refer to the member for Hanson's Glenelg tram. That is a facility which, if used properly, could carry four times the number of people at peak periods as does the Anzac Highway at present, and I remind honourable members that the tramline occupies only half the space that the Anzac Highway occupies; but again I can see the limitations of the Glenelg tram, for it lacks the flexibility of other more recent forms of transport.

I have already criticized the Leader of the Opposition and the fact that he seemed to imply that we were putting all our eggs into one dial-a-bus basket, whereas this is simply not so. I should like to refer to urban busways on their own rights-of-way. It seems to me that this is possibly the most promising development for the future in urban public transport. First, it is flexible. The bus can run around

its catchment area, around suburban streets and on arterial roads, picking up the people who have to come to town, and then, having come so far, it can move on to its own roadway and, at extremely high speed, whiz straight to the city.

I refer to the operation of a very efficient service from most parts of my own district. A big problem that the proprietors of that service have is that, having picked up the maximum load that they can pick up outside the transport control area, they then have to come to the city at a snail's pace, both because of safety regulations under the Road Traffic Act and also because of the pressure of other traffic on the road. If these buses could be pushed to their own right-of-way, there is no reason why they could not bring a full bus load from, say, Reynella to the city during peak periods at very high speeds. This would be far less wasteful than driving a private car.

The Leader of the Opposition made the extremely dogmatic statement that the metropolitan area would be based predominantly on a cottage development and, therefore, public transport could not be efficient. I refer the Leader to the National Capital Development Commission in Canberra, which city is developing on a linear pattern in a way that Adelaide has fortuitously developed. Canberra's plan for urban transport involves a flexible urban busway. I believe we should consider these developments in Canberra and in other parts of the world, and follow the initiatives that are carried out there and develop our own initiatives on the lines of this report. One point I have not discussed concerning the private motor car is pollution.

On page 57 of Adelaide 2,000 are tables about air pollution and its causes, which show that refuse disposal is responsible for 2½ per cent of air pollution. I am sure the Minister of Local Government would be glad to know of that low figure. These are general figures for a city like our own. The report shows that electric generators are responsible for 12 per cent; motor cars for 60 per cent; space heaters for 6 per cent; and industry for 18 per cent. Air pollution resulting in a temperature inversion in New York in 1966 brought about 80 deaths and a similar atmospheric event in London in 1952 killed 4,000 people. Incidentally, there is no mention of air pollution in the M.A.T.S. Report. One problem we have is whether industry will be able to control pollution, and whether after-burners and electrostatic precipitators will do the job. What guarantees have we that industry, controlled

by Government, will be prepared to take the bit between its teeth and bring in pollution control measures? If that is not done the problem will get worse and remain with us. What of freeways and their future? I quote from Adelaide 2,000, and this is what a certain present resident of South Australia said in an article entitled "Planning in the U.S.A.":

Freeways carry and attract large volumes of traffic and as each new one is opened, capacity volumes are soon reached creating a demand for more freeways . . . Building more freeways is clearly not the most efficient or economic way of meeting the needs of the expanding metropolitan area . . .

According to the footnote, those words were written by a man named Stuart Hart, who will be well known to all members. Can we avoid a Los Angeles in South Australia? People who come back from overseas tell me not to go in for this sort of development and not to put all our eggs in one basket. Honourable members will be interested to know what Los Angeles drivers do on their way home. They plug in a cassette in their motor cars to while away the two hours or so needed to get home from the job on the freeway. They are doing courses in French, German, Malay, and so on. I congratulate them on their ingenuity in being able to fill in this waste time while travelling, but I can think of more conducive ways of studying than sitting in a hot motor car on a freeway and listening to a cassette.

I am reminded of a man who lived 2,000 feet above Los Angeles for some time and who watched the rise and fall of the smog level every day. He watched how far up the valley the smog would come and wondered whether it would reach his house; he breathed a sigh of relief when it dropped 1,000 feet or so. This is the sort of thing that a freeway system, in the absence of effective pollution control devices, will introduce. I say that we should avoid it at all costs. Let us retain these transport corridors; they can be used for various purposes, and I hope they will be used in a way which will provide flexible transport systems, which will, in turn, solve our commuting problems. However, let us not have a freeway system at this stage. There may be many ways, traffic solutions or non-traffic solutions, by which we can avoid them.

I conclude by congratulating the Minister on his attitude to land acquisition in obtaining these corridors. This aspect has been referred to in debate, so I should like to quote the Minister's press statement on the matter, which illustrates the humane attitude he has adopted in dealing with this difficult problem. He

said that, as these corridors would not be required for at least 10 years, if even then, no restrictions would be placed on home alterations or improvements or on the sale of any homes on any of these future transport corridors. He continued:

However, if any owner whose home is in one of these corridors chooses to sell his home and is unable to do so, the Highways Department will be a willing buyer, without asking for the proof of hardship that was required by the previous Government. The department will also continue to purchase vacant allotments along the routes. The Government also recognizes that, when home owners decide to sell their property to Government departments such as the Highways Department, the existing rules are not always satisfactory. They do not take into account the social problems that may occur, and in some instances the market valuation is not sufficient to enable a person to purchase and resettle in a comparable house. As a result, financial hardship has often occurred. To deal with this problem, the Government intends to introduce legislation for the establishment of a rehousing compensation committee, which will have the authority to deal with resettlement of families who suffer because their home is required by society.

I congratulate the Minister on that statement. One does not install an air-conditioning system in one's home when the foundations have only just been laid. One cannot divorce the problem of shifting people around from one place to another from what sort of city one really wants and, since the debate is still continuing regarding the sort of metropolitan Adelaide we really want, and because many of the hard decisions regarding the sort of city we want have yet to be made, I say that we should adopt the philosophy of the Breuning report, which is not a wait and see policy but one of experiment and innovation, and of getting in on the ground floor on these new developments and applying them as the pattern of future Adelaide becomes more discernible. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): The present Government's decision to halt progress on the M.A.T.S. plan will have a tragic effect on the rural and metropolitan areas of the State alike. I know of no State or community that is as centralized as is South Australia. Members know that all Governments have been anxious to see further decentralization, but geographical and other factors have made it clear that, as far as can be foreseen, Adelaide will be the largest centre of population in this State, and to have an efficient transport system in Adelaide is vital. Perhaps that word is over-used, but such a system is vital to South Australia's

economic health. It is tragic to see what is called, almost in a sort of grim cynicism, a philosophy of action, which is to do nothing about freeways for the next 10 years and, indeed, nothing of any kind except gather information and wait and see what develops. I listened to the Minister's deplorable speech in support of this motion and I listened, too, to the member for Mawson in what could almost be called a deplorable speech in his weak support of a policy of doing nothing. He quoted all sorts of facts that seemed to have no relevance to the debate. He quoted from Mr. Hart, the Director of Planning, in support of his case. Does the honourable member realize that Mr. Hart was a member of the joint steering committee on M.A.T.S.?

Mr. Hopgood: That is the irony of it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Hart has been one of the important people in developing this forward looking plan, yet the honourable member quotes him in apparent ignorance of that fact.

Mr. Hopgood: Not at all.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member ought to study not only parts of the State's history but all of it. He should recognize that the so-called uneconomic railway lines that he criticizes have done a tremendous job in developing the State. There is a network of railway lines in South Australian country districts which, although uneconomic (and they are getting more uneconomic as the years go by), have nevertheless contributed tremendously to the development of those districts. We would have large areas of South Australia without any communities worth mentioning if it had not been for that network of railway lines that our forefathers put in with a considerable eye to the future. Because those railway lines are now uneconomic, the member for Mawson uses them as an example of a mistake at the time. It is ridiculous to criticize those railway lines in the way the honourable member has done. He went on to talk about migration and the increase in population. He said that the rate of migration should slow down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Mawson made a side swipe or two about the Prime Minister. No member of the Labor Party can hope to obtain advancement in South Australia unless he is prepared to attack the Prime Minister in every speech he makes. If a member of the Labor Party does

not demonstrate an insensate hatred of the Commonwealth Government, he will not advance within the Labor Party. The Minister of Roads and Transport hinted that every accident on the Eyre Highway was the full responsibility—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Will you please ask the honourable member whether he can tell me what relevance accidents on the Eyre Highway have to the motion before the House?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should confine his remarks to the motion before the House. The Eyre Highway has no relation to that motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will not pursue the reference to this country road, but I will pursue the point that the efficiency of Adelaide's transport system is important to country people, who do not want the industrial centre choked with traffic. My constituents do not want to have to cross over 100 intersections between Darlington and Gepps Cross and, incidentally, they do not want, any more than anyone else, to run the risks involved in travelling on roads that are four times as dangerous as freeways. I think the people of South Australia deserve something better than a philosophy of inaction, which is all it can be called. We have waited for this Breuning report for a long time. At one stage I thought it might be coming from America by raft; it seemed to be due next week, then the next week, and then the week after that. However, the report finally arrived and was studied by the Government over a long period and then finally released. The final result after all those labours was a small and inactive mouse, probably a dormouse.

It seems that Dr. Breuning has not absorbed the lessons that the M.A.T.S. plan demonstrated. With deference to the member for Mawson's doubt about figures, I consider that the M.A.T.S. figures are the best we have collected. Although the member for Mawson may point out that someone in the 1920's was wrong in his estimation of population 30 or 40 years later, I can only say that, whilst it is agreed that experts can never be sure of forecasts, the data collected by the M.A.T.S. officers is of the highest order. Dr. Breuning does not seem to realize that by 1986 Adelaide's population will be about 66 per cent more than it was when the study began.

We know from this report that the vehicle miles will have increased two and a half times (from 4,000,000 miles to 10,000,000 miles) by 1986, and that, unless some action is taken,

serious choking of the city's trafficways will be unavoidable. Everyone knows that, but Government members will not admit it: they have listened to this opiate of Dr. Breuning's that Adelaide still has time and that a 15-minute traffic delay occurs only occasionally. There was not a 15-minute delay a few years ago; that came upon us quickly. Everyone in the House knows that for almost the whole of the week preceding Christmas it is difficult to drive through the centre of Adelaide. Indeed, at times there have been traffic delays of not a quarter of an hour but over an hour.

Mr. Hoppood: Did you say "delay" or "backed up"? An individual may not be delayed for 15 minutes.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Dr. Breuning said Adelaide still had time to do nothing about freeways. I do not agree with him, and I know that the proponents of the M.A.T.S. plan, the experts who undertook the first study, do not agree either. I was one of a number of Cabinet Ministers who met Mr. Dondanville (one of the principals of De Leuw, Cather & Company) when he was here on one of his visits, and he stressed that if something was done then there would be time but that if a delay occurred there would not be time. He was a most impressive man to meet. I wish Government members had met him or that they were prepared to heed what he said.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Where is he from?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister does not appear to know that Mr. Dondanville was the head man in the company of De Leuw, Cather and Company, which produced this report.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I know that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Then why does the Minister ask such stupid questions? This man was most insistent that Adelaide was fortunate to have time to do something, but he insisted that we should do it then and not wait. This report says that there is time and that we should wait 10 years and see what happens. The report says there may be technological developments that we can use. We know that in 10 years the technological developments that Dr. Breuning is thinking of may have taken place and it may be possible to use them, but his advice at that time would be to wait another 10 years because further new technological developments would make the developments known at that time obsolete. That is the story of all development: we cannot wait.

The Breuning report is a gentle and graceful essay about Adelaide. It has less action in it than *Peter Rabbit* or *Mrs. Tiggy-Winkle*, or any of the other books by Beatrix Potter. Dr. Breuning refers to the importance of the vital momentum in the development of Adelaide. Vital momentum, if it is moving at all, will come to a rapid stop and slip backwards for 10 years before we get around to grappling with this problem. He has referred to high-speed corridors (I do not know whether he received Government instructions on this); the word "freeway" has been vetoed. Dr. Breuning does not print the whole terms of reference that he was given, but prints only a couple of the terms. These terms have been referred to often in *Hansard*, and some of the important terms Dr. Breuning has left out, including the paragraph referring to Government policy. He thought only two paragraphs were worth printing. Although we are to do nothing about so-called high-speed corridors (I call them freeways), he recommends that we continue to acquire land for them. That is the very thing that the Minister, when a private member, spent most of his time in this House criticizing: he criticized the previous Government for acquiring this land. Objections by landowners to the M.A.T.S. plan have been in this connection. Obviously not all people want their land acquired, and this is the objectionable aspect. Landowners are not interested whether a freeway is built on their land: they are interested to know whether their land will be acquired, and apparently the Minister will continue to acquire it.

Dr. Breuning refers to flexibility and says that it is the keynote of his report. "Flexibility" is a funny word to use to describe inaction. Flexibility is not the same as inaction, and he is really suggesting inaction. These 15-minute delays will infinitely worsen in future years and, by 1986, leaving aside this freeway question, there will not be much movement in the busy time of the day. I am pleased with one observation that Dr. Breuning has made, because I agree with it entirely. I refer to his statement that Adelaide citizens do not want to give up their suburban life, and I say that high density living is one of the things menacing Adelaide. It is one of the things that will spoil Adelaide, and it will be forced upon us if we do not act in some way along the lines of this M.A.T.S. report, although not necessarily exactly. If we do not act now in general principle along these lines, we will bring in high density living.

As everyone knows, there are objectionable features about high density living. No-one minds a block of flats for professional families, people without many children, or perhaps people on high incomes who can afford to have these fairly luxurious flats. However, modern high density living, which replaced slums in London, is most unpalatable. Lifts must be designed so that vandals cannot interfere with them, but the design has not been very successful. The highest of these buildings I visited comprised 43 storeys, and tenements of this type can rapidly become most unpleasant.

We have all read of the problems in the cities of the United States, where the police have no hope of apprehending criminals once they get into these tenements, and we know of the hostility of occupants to the administrators of law and order. We do not want that sort of thing in Adelaide. Everyone likes to have a back garden. The first thing that every migrant seeks when he goes to the counter at the Housing Trust is a block of land of his own. If honourable members do not believe me, they can ask officers of the trust, who will tell them that it is correct.

Almost without exception, people who come here to live want their own block of land. All persons may not keep their back yards tidy, but some do. Some persons garden, whilst others misuse the yards, but nevertheless the back yards are the people's open spaces. We do not want high density living in Adelaide. I do not object to some people living in some conditions, but we do not want to extend this type of housing. However, that is certainly what we will get if we get choked traffic conditions.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You would oppose high rise flats in the city of Adelaide, would you?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No, of course not. The Minister is only fiddling around with interjections.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have just said that I am not against every case of high density living, but the general trend should not be encouraged. I have heard Ministers move motions previously and have heard Opposition members criticize them. Perhaps I qualify for criticism by the Minister, but the Minister's speech on this motion was one of the most undignified speeches I have heard. He asked the House to endorse the action of the Government (action, as it is

called) in regard to Dr. Breunings report. The Minister also set out to produce a qualification, and in doing so, set upon the Opposition as if he were moving a motion of no-confidence in us. He went straight out and attacked the Opposition, irrelevantly and ineffectively, too. He went as far as to say that the Leader of the Opposition's word was not worth taking.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Nor is it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When I took a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, you ruled it was not out of order for the Minister to say that the Leader of the Opposition's word was not worth taking. I say that the Minister's word is not worth taking. He set out to instruct the new members of the House in some factors of the history of the M.A.T.S. plan, and to instruct them his way. In doing so he seriously misled them, and if they listened to him and did not check what he said they would have got a wrong impression of the story. The Minister said:

The facts are that on January 6, 1965, the then Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Yeates), with the authority of the then Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) engaged the firm of De Leuw Cather and Company to carry out an investigation into Adelaide's transportation problems.

That is correct. I took a part in the Cabinet decision that led to that action, and it is something about which I am pleased. I believe that the report will, if allowed, do something good for all of South Australia. The Minister continued:

On June 28, 1968, that firm submitted its report (now commonly known throughout this State as the M.A.T.S. Report) to the Hall Government. It is unnecessary for me to remind members that the Labor Government was elected on March 6, 1965, and that it remained in office until March 2, 1968, so that the report was ordered by the Liberal Government and received by it, and the Labor Government paid for it. I therefore hope that we will not have any repetition of the untruth we have heard in the past that this report was ordered by the Labor Government.

The report was ordered by the Playford Government, but the Minister left out an important part of the story. The date on which the Minister said this report was presented, namely, June 28, 1968, was the date, or thereabouts, on which the printed report became available, nearly a year after the printing of this report had been ordered by the Labor Government. The cost was to be about \$700,000. In this House many times the Premier has found it advisable to say that his Government did not know what was in the

report. The minutes of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study joint steering committee do not support that the Government did not know what was in the report. The minutes of this committee of August 8, 1967, under the heading "Final Report", stated:

It was resolved that the Premier and Minister of Roads be invited to attend a meeting of the joint steering committee to discuss: (1) the implications of the final report; (2) the printing of the final report.

At a subsequent meeting held on September 12, 1969, again under the heading "Final Report", the minutes stated:

The Chairman reported that, when arranging the meeting with the Premier and the Minister as decided at the 37th meeting, the Premier had decided that the meeting should be with Cabinet. Messrs. Yeates and Flint attended this meeting at 2.15 p.m. on August 21, 1967, and the implications of the study were explained. A direction was given for the final report to be published before February 1, 1968. The consultants were subsequently requested to submit a quote for the report to be printed by that date.

However, the consultants could not complete that report by February 1, 1968, and it was not until after the change of Government that the report finally arrived.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Do you know what it cost?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: About \$600,000 or \$700,000, and it was ordered by the Labor Government.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was not ordered by the Labor Government, and you know that statement is untrue. You just admitted that Sir Thomas Playford ordered the report, and you were a member of his Cabinet.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The study and report were ordered by the Playford Government, of which I am proud to have been a member, and the printing of the report was ordered by the Labor Party after it had had the implications of the report explained to it by Mr. Yeates (then Commissioner of Highways) and Mr. Flint. Let us not be told that the Labor Government did not know what was in it, as though it was a sealed parcel. To plead that is complete humbug, and it is no good Government members proceeding with the fictitious story that it had nothing to do with them. Many copies of the report were submitted to the Hall Government which, after studying it, decided to release the report, a decision that was bitterly criticized by the Labor Party.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: And rightly so, too.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: A couple of Ministers say that that was rightly so.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Some years ago I was a member of the Public Works Standing Committee, which was examining sites for schools and other projects. Plans were shown to the committee giving the outline of projected freeways and arterial roads. Those outlines, which were available to members of the committee, were in the possession of the Highways Department for years and were worked on from time to time. Indeed, they were polished up in M.A.T.S. It is inconceivable that after a short time a person interested in the subject could not have found out whether a specific property was in the path of a freeway. The persons that could ascertain that information were obviously those professional men who were connected with the matter: the people handling many transactions. Those people could have ascertained this information legitimately by a simple process of deduction.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Land agents, for instance.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, land agents also.

Mr. Curren: Murray Hill and Company, for instance.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: What was that?

Mr. Curren: Murray Hill and Company.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to nail a nasty smear that has been frequently made by the Minister, who used to make nasty, untrue allusions about my colleague, the then Minister of Roads and Transport. Apparently, the member for Chaffey has seen fit to chip in on this occasion. My colleague has proved himself to be a man of complete probity, and I absolutely disavow any nasty, smearing attempt to criticize him. I do not mind criticism on grounds of lack of judgment, but on grounds of integrity it is a dirty trick to make that smear. I have heard other Government members, particularly the member for Ross Smith, make what I would almost call a sneaky allusion to land agents in general. The honourable member has indeed shown an ungenerous nature in this regard. The fact is that land agents, particularly members of the Real Estate Institute, have done South Australia a great service in the way they have conducted their business. Be that as it may, anyone in the business would soon

know where freeways and arterial roads were to be constructed, and anyone not in the business would be unlikely to have that information. How is the poor householder to get on if he does not know how the value of his house will be affected by some public action, whereas other people do know? That is the type of situation that would have occurred if this report had not been released.

The hatred engendered in this House, particularly by the Minister of Roads and Transport, about releasing the report is nothing to the hatred that would have been engendered if we had not released it. The Labor Party had ordered so many copies of the report to be printed that the cost increased to about \$750,000, yet the Labor Party criticized the release of the report! The Minister had the effrontery to say that the word of the Leader of the Opposition was not worth taking but, from what I have shown in connection with the minutes of the joint steering committee, I believe that the Minister's word is not always worth taking. He can ask for that statement to be withdrawn if he likes.

If the Government does not act on this plan for years our industrial situation will become very serious indeed. The amount of commercial traffic will, by 1986, increase by about 80 per cent, whereas the population will increase by 66 per cent. The member for Mawson may be correct when he says that the forecasts are inaccurate, but they are the best we can work on; indeed, they are better than mere instinct. We know that more money per head of population will be spent on sorting out Melbourne's transport problems than will be spent here. If the Breuning report is implemented public transport will be developed through a wonderful system of public education, press publicity and advertising, but action—none! In the M.A.T.S. Report public transport was strongly emphasized; the only reason why the total expenditure on public transport was to be considerably less than the total expenditure on road transport was that we already had the basic network of a good public transport system.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And we had no way of financing expenditure on public transport, either.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We know that the M.A.T.S. Report stresses public transport. What does Dr. Breuning say about it? He does not say much. Dr. Breuning makes some recommendations (organizational, and so on), and then deals with what he calls

"action recommendations". If these recommendations represent action, his meaning of "action" is different from mine, just as the phrase "philosophy of action" is complete nonsense, the two words in question opposing each other. Dr. Breuning's action recommendation A-1 is "develop a high-quality information programme for public transportation"; that is a nice thing to do, for we like information. Action recommendation A-2 is "collection of pertinent information of transit demand" and relates to collecting more information, which is no doubt a good thing.

Action recommendation A-3 is "review suburban rail services for potential user and economic improvements": I suppose that is useful but I do not know whether it can be called action. Whatever it is, if the Railways Commissioner is not doing that now he should be, although I believe he is doing something in this regard. Action recommendation A-4 is "continue arterial and street improvement as rapidly as feasible". I should think the Highways Department is doing that as fast as it can and that it would do it much faster if it could go ahead with the M.A.T.S. plan. Action recommendation A-5 is "develop local improvements on locations where bottlenecks are developing". That is so obvious that one asks why it has not been done before. The obvious answer is that the Highways Department is spending as much money as it can to do just that.

Action recommendation A-6 is "acquire access rights to arterial roads and expressways where feasible": what does "where feasible" mean in the Minister's eyes? Does it mean someone else's district? His idea of acquiring land will be to acquire it somewhere else. To call that an action recommendation is just a ludicrous misuse of the word "action". Nevertheless, we well know that under the M.A.T.S. plan this action would necessarily have to be taken before any roadmaking took place. Action recommendation A-7 is "reserve right-of-way for future high-speed corridors". I do not know how much action is in that recommendation. In discussing this matter, Dr. Breuning says the decision on the type of facilities should be "deferred until such time when the design for these facilities must begin", and that is expected to be 10 years hence. I disagree, for the time is now, not 10 years hence.

Action recommendation A-8 is "dial-a-bus demonstration project": we know that in due course there may be some technological developments which, if we wait for them, we will be frightened to implement, in case they become

obsolete. That has been clearly demonstrated and must be obvious to anyone. One cannot merely sit down and wait while a difficult situation becomes critical. Then comes action recommendation A-9 ("rail-bus feasibility study"), followed by action recommendation A-10 ("bus service on exclusive right-of-way or reserved lanes"): I do not know whether that is the bus service Dr. Breuning proposes to cut out in the outer-suburban areas and, incidentally, I did not hear the member for Mawson comment on that point.

Action recommendation A-11 is "development programme for automated vehicle operation". If a programme for automated vehicle operation were developed it would not solve any problem at present. I am not against research: in most forms of activity it is necessary and desirable. However, it should not be used as a substitute for action. Action recommendation A-12 is "land acquisition model and assembly of supporting data". I have now read all the action recommendations and all I can say is that there is not one bit of action in them. They have less action in them than is in the tale of *Mrs Tiggy-Winkle*.

By picking out Dr. Breuning to give it a report, which I think it anticipated reasonably accurately before asking for the report, the Labor Government has grossly impaired the future of South Australia. This does not only affect the metropolitan area, as country districts depend considerably on efficient transport in the metropolitan area. Money is available, as everyone knows. Over the years, what is recommended in the M.A.T.S. plan has been shown to be feasible. As freeways cannot be built quickly, we know that a long-term programme is involved. Many years will pass before the first freeway can be used. If work is delayed for 10 years chaos will result. I hope that if this chaos does result people will place the blame where it lies—on this Government.

In 1962, the Parliament passed the planning legislation providing the authority for the M.A.T.S. Report, which was commissioned by the Playford Government. As I have shown, the Labor Party ordered the report to be printed, knowing what it contained. The following Government released the report and endorsed it, as it still does. The present Government has turned its back on the M.A.T.S. plan, so we have had this sorry story of inaction in South Australia. Is it any wonder that people from other States sometimes think that we are a little queer in South Australia? People from the Eastern States wonder what

on earth we are doing. We cannot decide to take what is offered to us in relation to the Dartmouth dam, and we cannot decide even a simple matter of transportation. What we would do in this connection would be cheaper per capita than anything that the Eastern States could possibly contemplate. The M.A.T.S. plan is efficient, having been worked out by the highest authorities. Now this Government—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! The honourable member has less than one minute left to speak.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: —has simply brought in a new man to spread opiate over the whole thing, and we have nothing more than a philosophy of inaction. I oppose the motion and support the amendment.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): It is not hard at all to criticize the Breuning report, nor is it hard to criticize the motion. However, it is not difficult to support the amendment. In moving the motion, for 15 minutes the Minister spoke of nothing but past history. He dragged up the history of the M.A.T.S. Report and all the things that went on inside and outside of this House. He got wound up, as he does at times. He took a little stopping occasionally, but he was on insecure ground and he knew it. All things considered, I do not suppose he did a bad job of moving a motion of this kind when he had such a flimsy basis on which to do it. I am not qualified to speak of things earlier than this session, but if we want to bring up errors in the past we can speak of the statement that the Minister was reported to have made on July 8, 1970, that Dr. Breuning had been engaged by the Government to undertake this study and that he had spent a month working in the United States on the project. However, the *News* of July 10 last reports:

The American transport expert (Dr. Breuning) said today that he was puzzled by reports that he had been summoned to work on this project.

People, especially politicians and Ministers, who live in glass houses should not throw stones. I am sorry that the Minister has seen fit to leave the Chamber. Perhaps if we were to have some explanation, we could have had it while he was present. The Deputy Leader passes this matter by saying it is merely by the way, but I think it is part of the important history of the M.A.T.S. plan and the introduction of the Breuning report. I am not casting any aspersions on Dr. Breuning's ability and do not intend to do so. I think his work speaks for itself, and the quality of this report,

if Dr. Breuning wishes to be judged by it, certainly speaks for itself.

I think the Leader has called it a gigantic practical joke, but I would call it a gigantic confidence trick. It begins by quoting the M.A.T.S. Report. I will not read any further extracts from the Breuning report, because we have heard all the relevant details. The Minister denigrates the M.A.T.S. Report, but Dr. Breuning says he used its findings and depended on them. I cannot avoid quoting this beautiful passage from Dr. Breuning's report:

We did not conduct opinion polls—the issues are far too complex for that—but we listened and we learned, and, in the end, a coherent picture emerges.

They listened for only three weeks, and there is much difference between three weeks and three years. Emphasis has been placed on the fact that this was intended to be a preliminary report on what to do next with the M.A.T.S. plan. I should have thought that, having got the M.A.T.S. plan, the basis for discussion and planning, perhaps the Government might go ahead and do something about it. Perhaps the Government does not agree with all of it: it may be that it can go ahead with only part of it. However, this is not so. This is a preliminary report that tells us what to do next. We are to do nothing next! We have appointed an expert and published a report, at considerable expense no doubt, and I look forward to hearing what is the total cost of the report. We have a Government that can sit back and do nothing with a clear conscience, if it has any conscience. This Government has made many monumental mistakes in its first few months of office—mistakes it would be pleased for the people of South Australia to forget. I think the Government is depending on the fact that the people will have forgotten by the time of the next election. Having made mistakes, the Government resorted to a referendum on one occasion and even with a referendum to guide it, it did not come out of the matter too well, either. The Government has stopped making decisions but, instead of saying, "We have stopped, we will not make any decisions", the Government now has a report and can wave it in the air and state that the report tells it to do nothing. This is the Government's excuse for posterity, and it hopes it cannot be blamed for anything now because it has a report. This is the sort of Government under which South Australia is now suffering. This report serves the Government's purpose. It is no more a

revision of M.A.T.S. "leaving the way open for the maximum use (within the financial competence of the State) of developing flexible systems of public transit" as is *Peter Rabbit* or *Mrs. Tiggy-Winkle*.

Nevertheless, I am not decrying any of the technological advances that have been referred to in the report: they are excellent. Whatever else Dr. Breuning is, he is an excellent user of the English language, that is, supposing he wrote the report. I presume he did. Certainly he must be responsible for it, but he attains to great heights of English literature in some parts of the report. The only advice I can give the people of this State (and I sincerely hope they follow it, or be helped to follow it by one of the newspapers), is that everyone in the State should read the report carefully. These high-sounding phrases, these wonderful ideas, all add up to hot air and an expensive excuse for the Government.

I go further and say that this report could well have been a *pro forma* with all the relevant details of Adelaide filled in, and with all the nice little added references to girls in mini skirts waiting outside the City Hall (mark you, Mr. Speaker, the City Hall, not the Town Hall). He refers to the south park lands and uses all of these touches of local colour to prove that he has been here. This report could have been produced from a map and reports sent to him in America. This is what the people of this State have paid for, but I am not sure yet how much. All this wasted verbiage to tell us that something might happen and that we should sit on the fence, wait for 10 years and do nothing. It finishes with an exhortation to let us then proceed. It does not tell us to proceed to do nothing, but we are to proceed to wait and see! It would be amusing (members opposite have been laughing, particularly the Minister) if it were not so tragic. Not only are we in a situation where we cannot afford to throw money around, but the fact is that we are running out of time.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You are!

Dr. TONKIN: That is wishful thinking on the part of the Minister, because I still have much time left. I think, basically, we have to consider what we are getting for our money. We have not yet been told what the cost will be, but what are we getting for it? Nothing but a mass of words that do not mean a thing. I do not blame Dr. Breuning and his company entirely, because I have no doubt that he was told carefully what he was to say: not exactly in words, but he was given guidelines and an idea of what we could afford,

what the State was doing, and how we hoped to proceed in this or that direction. I only hope it was forward and not backward. I do not really blame Dr. Breuning, for he probably had very tight limits within which to work. However, this is an expensive way of getting the Government off the hook. The Government is trying to appear to be honouring its election promises to review the M.A.T.S. plan. Members may recall that when this Government came into office the new Minister of Roads and Transport undertook to review the M.A.T.S. plan. There was almost an instant review. Indeed, the review was announced on the Monday, and the Minister had completed the review by the following Friday. In this respect, I could be wrong: it may have taken a day or two longer. Nevertheless, it was indeed a short review, which did not satisfy the people of South Australia. It was not until then that we heard about the Breuning report.

The long and short of this report, apart from its telling us to wait for 10 years and do nothing, is simply that the M.A.T.S. plan should proceed as it is. Only the names have been changed. The latest report refers to high-speed corridors. I suppose the Government thinks that sounds better than freeways. Who is to know whether, after 10 years, we may have to instruct the authorities to build freeways down the high-speed corridors, which have been so carefully acquired, just as if the M.A.T.S. plan was being implemented? What is the difference? It seems to me that this Government is adopting a policy of wait and see and hope for the best. I am continually amazed to find that the Labor Party is becoming more and more conservative, for it is always pointing to matters in its little book. Indeed, it is getting worse than the old Tories. It is behind the times, and it has no vision.

An interesting statistic was published in the press yesterday; it was stated that the number of cars in the Australian community had increased by 6.2 per cent, as opposed to an increase in population of only 2.2 per cent. We have heard much from the member for Mawson about Adelaide's projected population figures. This just goes to show how completely hedged in people can become, and how little they understand the true nature of the population crisis facing us. Not only is our population increasing at about 2 per cent compound each year, but so also are car registration and driving licence holder levels. If one looks at last year's *South Australian Year Book* one finds

interesting graphs that are going up almost in a vertical line. We are running out of time.

The present generation is another thing that we have not considered. On her 16th birthday, my daughter went to the local police station, took out a licence form and sat for and passed her theory examination. She did this as soon as she was qualified to do so. As soon as she could do so thereafter, she sat for and passed her practical driving test. She considers it her right at the age of 16 years to drive a motor car. She will, as soon as she can save enough money, buy herself a motor car and drive it, and in this respect she is not alone.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Good luck to her!

Dr. TONKIN: I agree, because this is what young people regard as their right nowadays. When people say that we must upgrade our public transport system, we should reply that this should certainly be done but that the public must be educated to use public transport. It is no good providing it if people are oriented towards using their own cars and moving to town and across town and into the country in their own cars. What we are dealing with now is a generation that is not used to public transport to any extent at all.

Mr. Hopgood: When they take two hours to get home they will think differently.

Dr. TONKIN: That is a very good point. I think the Labor Government is perhaps hoping that the inconvenience of traffic congestion, which it is not trying to overcome, will force people off the road. Of course, the Government knows perfectly well that increasing the registration and licence fees will not keep people off the road, and they are good sources of revenue. Perhaps the Government is hoping that the road toll will keep people off the roads; I hope that is not what the Government is hoping.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You were a bit sensitive yesterday.

Dr. TONKIN: I hope I am always sensitive to people's problems; I will speak for people at every opportunity. As I have said many times in this House, my Party cares for people, and it really shows it. We must do our best to educate people to use public transport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Mawson said that when the Lockheed Electra aircraft came into operation it was rapidly superseded and, as a result, there was a colossal waste of money. Nevertheless, that aircraft carried

many passengers whilst it was in service. Let us suppose that we get the dial-a-bus system and monorails and other modern modes of transport in 10 years' time. Of course, as the Deputy Leader pointed out, we probably cannot afford them. But will this help us in five years' time? Will we have instant dial-a-bus and instant monorail? Do we wave a magic wand and cause them to appear? Knowing the activity of Governments generally, I believe that it will take a certain amount of time for these systems to be planned and built and installed. If they are started in 10 years' time, I do not know when they will be operating; they will certainly not be operating instantly.

As far as I can see, the Breuning report does not change the routes of the freeways, whether they are called freeways or high-speed corridors, and it certainly will not make any difference to the people of Adelaide unless those high-speed corridors are utilized as quickly as possible. We are running out of time. The Minister has adopted an extremely cynical attitude to the whole business. I do not think the people of South Australia deserve this treatment. The Government has done nothing except provide a scapegoat for the future, when transport and industry could come to a grinding halt. Then, perhaps in 10 years' time, the Government (probably it will be the Opposition by that time) will wave this little piece of paper and say, "We did not mean to do it; we got a report." That will not help the people of this State, who have not received value for money. "A gigantic practical joke", the Leader said; "a gigantic confidence trick, a swindle". If this is the M.A.T.S. plan and the report says "Defer it; let's wait and sit on the fence for 10 years", for goodness sake let us be honest about it and call it the M.A.T.S. plan and say that the Government is not going to do anything about it but just let it proceed. The no-decision Government! The no-action Government! Posterity will judge.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): We are now being asked to endorse a motion by the Government in the most peculiar phraseology on one of the most important subjects to come before the public in recent years. This matter has engendered much public controversy and debate. The way in which the Government has moved the motion is, to say the least, rather peculiar. If the motion had stated, for instance, that the House should endorse an action which does such and such and which is definitive, we would have had some basis for discussion, but we are now being

asked to debate this important subject on a most nebulous phrasing of the motion. I am referring only to paragraph (a) of the motion; we are not dealing in detail with paragraph (b), for that has been covered previously, and I do not think there is much controversy about it.

All we are being asked to do is endorse a "philosophy of action", and this has been canvassed by speaker after speaker. What is this philosophy of action? I do not know whether you know, Mr. Speaker; I certainly do not, and I am sure someone had to explain to the Minister for half an hour what "philosophy of action" really meant. I am sure it is not the Minister's own phrase, but he has plenty of advisers. What I think the Minister is saying is, "Let's adopt the Breuning report." What is the Breuning report?

Mrs. Steele: Nebulous!

Mr. COURCEL: I listened to the Minister giving his explanation yesterday, and I have read his speech carefully. Some parts of it were not terribly attractive to read, because unfortunately the Minister has a peculiar habit, no matter what subject he discusses, of bringing personal venom into his speeches. I vividly recall when the Minister, as the member for Edwardstown, was seated in the back bench so distinguished now by the presence of the member for Frome, and when he became quite embarrassed, having continually asked questions, and got into a controversy about the 1962 plan and the 1968 plan. I recall how the people of his district reacted and how he tried to unload the plan on to the Sturt River. The then member for Glenelg (Hon. Hugh Hudson) reacted rather violently to the Minister's suggestions at the time, and the Minister got into some difficulties.

This report is a face saver for the Government and for the Minister in particular. I studied the *Hansard* pull of the Minister's speech to see what this report was about and what we as a responsible House were expected to vote on, but I looked in vain. I defy any member of this House to look at the Minister's speech and see what we are asked to vote on. I challenge any member on either side of the House and also you, Mr. Speaker, to find in the Minister's speech the matter on which we are really expected to vote.

Mr. Simmons: It's in the title.

Mr. COURCEL: Yes, but nowhere else. One has to go to about the fourth page of the *Hansard* pull to find any reference to the Breuning report. There the Minister refers to

one or two things that have been done, and I do not cavil about that. He then suggests categorically in his straight-forward and vehement way that the Breuning report is the panacea for all the problems of transportation in metropolitan Adelaide. In other words, he says that this will supersede the M.A.T.S. Report and that we will have a brand new scheme. He asks the House to endorse this. We are asked to vote on a course of action that is based on a preliminary report, as is indicated in the report.

We are also asked to vote on a report that describes itself as a step beyond previous studies rather than as a revaluation. In fact, if one reads the report, one sees that it does not damn the M.A.T.S. plan at all. I have read the Breuning report so many times that I can almost recite parts of it from memory, but I have not been able to find where it damns M.A.T.S. I do not want to comment on the extraordinary verbiage of the report. Although the report introduces some new ideas, it does not in any way supersede the M.A.T.S. plan as revised and presented to the House by the previous Government. I noticed one or two rather odd references in the Breuning report. For instance, whereas we have been dealing with the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study in the past, the Breuning report refers to the city of Adelaide and says little indeed about the metropolitan area.

Dr. Eastick: Perhaps he didn't get out of Adelaide.

Mr. COURCEL: I think he got out as far as Walkerville, where the Highways Department building is situated. Dr. Breuning says we must have freeways (high-speed corridors, as he calls them) not only to provide access but also to divert traffic from the city so that, for instance, people from the area of the member for Tea Tree Gully do not need to go through the city of Adelaide when travelling to the area of the member for Mawson. That is the basis of the M.A.T.S. Report, which provides for such deviations. For instance, the North Adelaide connector would allow this type of travelling to take place. I point out that the M.A.T.S. Report recommended the widening of arterial roads, and Breuning touches on this. He also refers to upgrading public transport; M.A.T.S. had a section on that subject. To my knowledge, the Highways Commissioner still has power to build these freeways about which we have been talking; in fact, money has been voted by Parliament in this connection.

Dr. Breuning, in his report, made much comment about the rapid rail transit system, but there is not one mention, except a very oblique reference at one point, to the ingenious rapid rail system under King William Street, dealt with in the M.A.T.S. report. This was an integral part of the rapid rail transit system, and here is Dr. Breuning talking about upgrading public transport in the same way as the M.A.T.S. Report did but not saying anything about connection with the rail system. He talks about how the rail system can be improved and, perhaps, cut out in some places.

He also talks about how public buses should be upgraded and he makes the definite statement that, in some outlying areas that are not lucrative, they should be cut out altogether. That is what Dr. Breuning says. That does not go down too well with members of this House, especially members who represent the areas in that category. The fact that Dr. Breuning, in his report, mentions only obliquely (in passing, almost) the underground subway seems to me a rather glaring omission. I wonder why he did not make some reference to this, either adverse or complimentary.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: To what?

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister has not been listening.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I have. Obviously, you have not read the report, it is in there.

Mr. COUMBE: I have said that there is an oblique reference in there. The Minister was not listening to what I was saying, because the connection of rapid rail was an integral part of the M.A.T.S. report. I come now to a question touched upon in both reports. We now compare the M.A.T.S. report and the Breuning report (and Dr. Breuning's report really is another version of the M.A.T.S. report) on the question of industry. At page 9, Breuning says that the system today is coping adequately with the demands placed upon it and can do so for some time yet. Well, I ask members if they have been on our main roads in South Australia in the rush periods between, say, 8 a.m. and 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. and I ask them sincerely whether they really believe that the system is coping adequately today with the traffic on the roads and is likely to do so for some time to come, as Dr. Breuning says.

Let us consider the Anzac Highway, the Port Road, the Main North Road or the Main North-East Road. At certain times of the day, in peak periods, it is impossible not only to drive across the Main North Road,

other than at traffic lights, but also to turn left into the stream of traffic. Crossing the road is hazardous for pedestrians, also. Both the Breuning report and the M.A.T.S. report state that we should retain our arterial roads, and I completely agree with this concept. We should consider industry and commerce in this State. Dr. Breuning says that we should do nothing for 10 years about providing high-speed corridors. How does that comment compare with the figures so dramatically illustrated by the member for Alexandra about the traffic engendered by industry and commerce, and how does it compare with what Dr. Breuning says on page 10, as follows:

Summarizing the picture, some factors crystallize as crucial requirements to which the transportation system must respond:

3. Providing adequate access and circulation for industry and commerce and their continuing decentralization.

Today, we find that industry and commerce are having a terrific load placed on them because of the inordinate delays encountered on some of our busy highways. Dr. Breuning refers to low-density housing: this means housing going farther out, and the people living there who wish to come to the city to work having farther to travel, so that if no freeway is provided they must travel by bus or train, thus taking longer to reach their employment and incurring more cost. The American experts were reported in the newspaper as saying that they concurred with some of the bases of the M.A.T.S. plan and the need for high-speed communication between the north and south of Adelaide and the connection of residential areas with industry on the fringe of the city. Obviously, they realized the need for some form of planning. The longer we wait for these developments envisaged in the M.A.T.S. plan the more expensive they will be. What we build tomorrow will escalate in cost in 10 years: I am referring not to the acquisition of land but to the construction costs.

Mr. Hall: It would double.

Mr. COUMBE: It could treble in 10 years.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The cost of freeway building could treble, yet your Leader said in the House two years ago that the cost would not increase.

Mr. COUMBE: In what time?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: In the 20-year period. Check *Hansard* and you will find that what I say is correct.

Mr. COUMBE: Nothing in this report indicates for what we have to vote: there are no details or any information about what is going

to be done. All we have is this report, which I believe is not worth the paper it is written on, although it has a most attractive cover. The longer we wait, the more expensive this scheme will be to the State. Further, hundreds of South Australian residents along possible routes and areas adjacent thereto are uncertain where these high-speed corridors are likely to be constructed. On the other hand, the M.A.T.S. report, as approved by the previous Government in 1969, set out more definitely where these areas would be so that the people concerned would have ample time to know what was going on and to make arrangements accordingly. However, if we accept this motion, there will be more uncertainty than ever in the minds of more and more people, as the Minister and the Premier have both said that we must have these (to use Dr. Breuning's term) high-speed corridors. Even the Premier, in his last policy speech, used the term "freeway" and said that we must have some of them. There is no doubt, therefore, that they are necessary.

I am concerned that, since the Breuning report has been published, the people of this State, particularly those in the metropolitan area, have been led to believe that all their problems in relation to transport have been solved. That is just not the case. This motion, and the report before the House, will not ease their minds. Members know as well as I do that the freeways or high-speed corridors will have to be built. The district of the member for Tea Tree Gully will have the benefit of one of these before long, and I hope her constituents will make full use of that freeway, which eventually will cut part of my district in halves. Be that as it may, I firmly believe that freeway is necessary.

A freeway to Salisbury is also to be built. We do not know what is to happen to the freeway intended to go through the district of the Minister of Roads and Transport. Perhaps it will be conveniently dropped. It may well be completely cut off from the city. However, it will eventually have to be built to the city or to the connectors. It might even go through the district of the member for Peake, if he is lucky.

The motion requires us to endorse the Government's adoption of a philosophy of action contained in the Breuning report. This motion should be contrasted with the specific details spelt out in the M.A.T.S. proposal, which was before this House in 1969. That proposal set out categorically and definitively

what would be done and what would be deferred. This is the first time since I have been a member of this House that I have seen a motion like the one now before the House; we are asked to endorse a philosophy of action contained in a report which, after all, says nothing. I defy any member to say where this report says that certain roads are to be built and what is to be done. All the Minister has said is that he will set up certain departmental organizations and that research will be undertaken, but this aspect was covered to some extent in the M.A.T.S. report. The Minister has said that certain other things will be done, and we will look forward to them with interest. In the meantime, will we continue to muddle along and see perpetuated for at least the next 10 years the horrible carnage on the roads? To his credit, the Minister is trying in another field to reduce the carnage on our roads, and I would have thought the Minister would be the first to agree to some measure of highway improvement which would reduce the carnage on our roads. That carnage is increased because of the junctions on our roads; there are not enough roads with limited access.

Mr. Payne: I thought that most fatalities occurred on country roads.

Mr. COUMBE: I agree, but many accidents occur in the metropolitan area. We are supposed to be talking about a metropolitan scheme. I cannot support the motion as it stands, because it is a blank cheque. Because I have a sense of responsibility, I am not in the habit of writing blank cheques. I will not support the motion, because I consider that by supporting it I would be doing a disservice to the people of my district and to the people of South Australia. I am referring not only to people in the metropolitan area, because everyone in South Australia has to pay for this and everyone travelling to the city from some part of the country has to travel on roads that lead to the centre of the city. Everyone travelling from the north comes through my district for some reason or other and wears out the roads in my district. Be that as it may, this matter really concerns me and, as the motion is moved in such a nebulous fashion based on such a nebulous report, I cannot support it. When the Breuning report was published, I eagerly obtained my copy (and copies were sent to all members with the compliments of the Minister), thinking that there would be some useful contribution to our road problem. We knew full well that when Dr. Breuning came here

he was given a copy of the Labor Party's policy speech and told what to report on.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's a complete lie, and you know it.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister denying that Dr. Breuning was given a copy of the A.L.P. policy speech?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He was not given a copy of any policy speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must cease interjecting, and speakers must address the Chair and not encourage interjections.

Mr. COUMBE: Very well, Sir. I seriously suggest that the terms of reference given Dr. Breuning were so narrow and restricted and so deliberately drawn that he had little option but to bring in the report that he, in fact, brought in.

Mr. Hall: He said he made a local survey.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. Dr. Breuning was not given a free hand; he had to work within a narrow limit, as defined in the preface of the report, which was carefully drafted by members of the Government, so he was restricted in this way. I am certain that the Minister did not get the results he wanted. He wanted to get off the hook, but the recommendations in the report have not got him off the hook. The Minister still has the M.A.T.S. plan in essence and is now trying to unload it on the public and this House. He is trying to put up a smokescreen, telling us that this is panacea of all evils. That will not work any more than some of the other hare-brained schemes which the Government has put forward and which the Minister, in particular, is planning to introduce. The motion is couched in such vague terms that I will not support it, because otherwise, speaking on behalf of my own constituents and the people of South Australia, I would be doing them a disservice.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): When the Minister introduced this vaguely termed motion, I heard little concerning the Breuning report. Instead I heard the history of the M.A.T.S. plan, attacks on the previous Government and personal attacks on some who are members at this time. Since I have been a member, I have learned that, when the Minister rants and raves, he has little to say. Having listened to his speech and having read it again this morning, I can say only that it was nothing but a smokescreen. The first 15 minutes of his speech was devoted to the M.A.T.S. plan. The members for Mitchell and Mawson referred to the M.A.T.S. plan, and did not say much about the Breuning report. I do not

know what the Government thought it would get in this report. I contend that it got what it asked for and paid for, and that is little indeed.

I intend to speak not about the M.A.T.S. plan but about the Breuning report. The Minister referred to the history of M.A.T.S.; those events took place before I became a member, but the Breuning report has come about since I became a member. The first reference to it was the following report in the *Australian* of July 8, 1970, as follows:

An American transport expert, Dr. S. E. Breuning, has been engaged by the South Australian Government to help redesign Adelaide's transport system. The State Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) yesterday said that Dr. Breuning had already spent a month working on the project in the United States.

I ask members to note that remark. The report continues:

There was no-one in the world more competent to prepare a report on urban transportation.

That is a sweeping remark indeed. The report continues:

When Dr. Breuning arrives in Australia in two weeks, with two other Americans, he would be told to keep the State's finances in mind when making his report.

The *Adelaide News* of July 10, 1970, contained the following report:

American transportation expert Dr. S. Breuning said today he was puzzled by reports that the South Australian Government had summoned him for advice on Adelaide's traffic problems.

Yet the Minister had said that Dr. Breuning had already spent one month working on the project in the United States. Apparently Dr. Breuning did not know that. The member for Torrens said that the terms of reference were too narrow, and I agree entirely with that statement and with the reasons the honourable member gave for his view. The Government did not dare allow an expert into this State to make an unrestricted investigation into Adelaide's transport problems for fear that he might have come up with recommendations similar to those in the M.A.T.S. plan, which had been prepared by a panel of experts from this country who knew the city and its problems. The Government did not dare bring in an oversea expert at some expense and take the risk that he would make the same recommendations as those in the M.A.T.S. report, so these terms of reference were drawn up. On page 3, Dr. Breuning states:

M.A.T.S. was a three-year (1965-1968) comprehensive study which undertook some very extensive data collection of various kinds.

I do not see that that remark ties in with what the Minister said, which was that Dr. Breuning implored the State Government not to go ahead with M.A.T.S. I can find no reference to Dr. Breuning's really castigating M.A.T.S. He continues:

Consequently, we have used the massive data which were collected by previous studies but have carefully avoided further compilations or reiterations.

Later in the same paragraph he states:

We have emphasized breadth in our approach, as against detail in depth.

After reading the report with much interest, I consider that his comment "We have emphasized breadth" is simply another way of saying that it was a superficial, shallow study that did not come to any definite conclusions. Dr. Breuning continues:

The reordering of pieces and parcels of those studies as charts and tables of supporting data for our work is an unproductive academic exercise.

I think this whole report was an unproductive academic exercise. In fact, as I think the member for Bragg said, we could have saved much money by giving Dr. Breuning, if we insisted on retaining him, a street plan of Adelaide and a few statistics of population growth. If we had, he could have written the whole thing in his office in Massachusetts.

Mrs. Steele: That probably would have been just as effective.

Mr. CARNIE: It would have been just as effective, and I understand that the fares and accommodation charges for Dr. Breuning were more than \$3,000. Dr. Breuning says that transport will grow as the people wish it to grow, and at page 3 he states:

We did not conduct opinion polls—the issues are far too complex for that—but we listened and we learned, and, in the end, a coherent picture emerges.

The member for Mawson has accused the Leader of the Opposition of attacking Dr. Breuning for his literary ability; he has said that this is not important. I, on the contrary, compliment Dr. Breuning on his literary ability because remarks like those that I have just quoted mean very little, and there are many such remarks throughout the whole report. I think Dr. Breuning is a profound psychologist, in that he tells people what they want to hear. I think the sentence I am about to quote is a classic example of this. It states:

The university complex will have grown in size and prestige to become the foremost on the continent.

I do not think that has anything to do with a transportation study of the city of Adelaide. I should like to know on what basis Dr. Breuning makes that remark. As far as I know he did not study (it certainly was not in his terms of reference) the university system of the city of Adelaide or compare it with the systems in other States. He would not have had time to do that, but this is the kind of thing that people like to hear. That statement sounds good and people say, "This is fine", and they think that, if he is right on this, he is right on everything else. As I have said, obviously the doctor is a clever psychologist. Another example of his literary ability is the following statement:

Good planning updates its data at each step.

That is an elementary conclusion: I think anyone could work that out. The member for Mitchell and the member for Mawson mentioned the case quoted by Dr. Breuning of several airline companies buying turbo-prop aircraft, only to see those aircraft superseded by jets. In the entire report this is the only argument Dr. Breuning brings forward to show that forward planning can be wrong at times, and the members for Mitchell and Mawson seized on this one point.

I turn now to the policy recommendations. I will not refer again to his talk about City Hall and girls in minis, because that has been mentioned. It is just padding to the recommendations, which, after all, are what he was paid to give. I came to the recommendations with some anticipation. The first policy recommendation was, "Foster public transportation in the central city and the near suburbs." In his comment on this recommendation he said, "Full buses make a profit; empty ones lose money." It takes much education to arrive at that conclusion! Dr. Breuning said that consideration should be given to providing no service to future outer neighbourhoods and suburbs. I will not comment on that remark; I will leave to members' imagination what it means or what the public would think of it. In policy recommendation P-3, under the heading "Provide road and highway improvements to keep pace with growing demands", we come across another classic example of Dr. Breuning's verbosity when he states:

Some of the arterials are already loaded to capacity during rush hours and further traffic will tend to extend the rush-hour duration.

Honourable members should think about that sentence. Dr. Breuning continues with a solution when he says that these overload conditions will be alleviated by widening arterial roads and improving bottleneck locations. If that problem was put to a first-year high school student in South Australia he would give the same answer. Freeways are covered by Dr. Breuning in policy recommendation P-4. Throughout the report Dr. Breuning refers to freeways as high-speed routes or corridors, which are the same thing. In this section he speaks of the questionable need for freeways and states:

Decisions as to the type of facilities to be built should be delayed as long as feasible. In the meantime, the land needed for these routes should be acquired whenever convenient to do so.

If there is a questionable need for freeways, why acquire land on the freeway routes? Dr. Breuning deals further with freeways in his action recommendations, in which he says:

It was not possible for us in the limited time, nor were we asked to study and comment on the freeway location in detail.

I bet that they were not asked to study freeways. In fact, I suggest that Dr. Breuning was specifically told to curb or cut down comment on freeways as much as possible, because the Labor Party policy speech stated that it would abandon freeways. The Labor Party could not risk having an expert come here and state that freeways would be the best solution. Dr. Breuning pays a tribute to the M.A.T.S. plan when he says:

Alignments for some of these corridors have been worked out in the M.A.T.S. Report and in subsequent discussions and public hearings. We recommend that these rights-of-way be reserved as transportation corridors for future high-speed facilities.

Dr. Breuning's action recommendations are prefaced by "The recommendations made so far will lead in time to a flexible transportation development programme." These recommendations are purely theoretical recommendations on what is essentially a practical problem, but there are no firm recommendations in this report. Action recommendation A-3 deals with the review of suburban rail services for potential users, and economic improvements. Dr. Breuning begins this section by saying that the South Australian Railways, like most other railroads the world over, is experiencing increasing difficulty in providing attractive commuter passenger services. Yesterday, members heard the Treasurer, when announcing measures to be taken to curb the deficit in this State, announce increases in

rail fares and freight rates. If the Railways Department is already running at a loss because it cannot compete with road transport, increasing its fares and freight rates will only drive more business away. If it cannot compete with road transport now, increasing costs will not enable the department to do so in future. The worst section in this recommendation regarding the South Australian Railways appears in the last paragraph, which states:

We recommend, therefore, that the South Australian Railways collect the necessary information on passenger service, train operations, and cost structures, to serve as a basis by the department of new development for future improvement decisions.

Surely the Railways Commissioner and his staff already carry out these investigations. Surely this is an integral part of running a railway transport system. This paragraph is typical of the whole report: it either recommends something that is automatically done (and, I am sure, has been done for some time) or it states the obvious. Indeed, this paragraph is an insult to the able people administering our Government departments, particularly in this case the Railways Department.

Action recommendation A-8 deals with the dial-a-bus demonstration project, an aspect that had to be included, although Dr. Breuning deals with it fairly briefly. Most people know the history of dial-a-bus. When Leader of the Opposition, the present Premier returned from America and attacked the M.A.T.S. Report by referring to futuristic programmes he had heard of in America. At the same time, he quoted certain people who said that freeways were no good, that they should not be built, and that the plan should definitely not proceed. I remember, however, that the Premier was careful not to name any of the experts that told him this. Knowing this, Dr. Breuning would have to make recommendations in his report concerning, or referring to, dial-a-bus services, and this he did because the Premier had to be vindicated. I should like now to refer to Dr. Breuning's summing up, in which, speaking of his report, he states:

Conversely, we believe that a careful reading will indicate that the broad policy questions have been answered and firm guide lines established.

As the member for Bragg has said, that position applied before, when the M.A.T.S. Report was issued. That report covered broad policy questions, and firm guidelines were established, although this was done in far greater depth than it has been done in Dr. Breuning's report. It was an extensive study in depth, whereas

Dr. Breuning's study is a shallow one and a complete waste of money for the State. Dr. Breuning also said:

We recommend that attention now be directed to finding out how to attain these objectives.

Surely, when Dr. Breuning was retained most people in this State thought he was to find out how to achieve these objectives. If that was the idea, this report, which gives no firm guidelines at all, is a complete farce. I oppose the motion and support the amendment.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I oppose the motion and support the amendment. Dr. Breuning visited Adelaide briefly but was as far astray in his impressions as are people who come here from overseas for a fortnight and then go home and write a book on Australia. The Government chose a man who would prepare a report that would suit it. During an overseas visit the Premier found that Dr. Breuning was investigating the dial-a-bus system in conjunction with the Ford Company. So, the Premier asked Dr. Breuning to present a report on Adelaide's traffic problems. Such a request reminds me of a farmer who wants to buy a bull but, instead of going to the Agriculture Department for advice on the best type of bull, he goes for advice to the owner of a Hereford stud. The Government has displayed the same sort of naive attitude in connection with its invitation to Dr. Breuning to prepare a report, because he was already experimenting with these transport systems.

We have a very vague report from him because he had great difficulty in pleasing the Premier, satisfying his conscience, and promoting the transport systems he was interested in. When Dr. Breuning came to Adelaide he possibly saw many taxi-cabs and said, "This is the dial-a-bus system." If a person telephones a taxi-cab company tomorrow (provided it is not a rainy day and there is no mix-up) he will, in effect, be dialling a bus: transport will be provided for him within a reasonable time. Since five passengers can travel in a taxi-cab, travel by taxi is not much dearer than travel by bus, and it is much more convenient. If someone at 48 Henley Beach Road dials a bus and says he will be the only passenger, when he is half way into the city someone may dial a bus and ask for transport to Lockleys.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Have you been in the sun lately?

Mr. McANANEY: My dear Minister, this is sound logic, based on many years of practical experience. I was travelling on freeways in Germany in 1934 when the Minister was

possibly a teenager, running around Adelaide and making as many silly statements as he makes now. Anyone who has been to Melbourne and Sydney knows the extent of the rail services provided there and knows that the roads just cannot cope with the traffic. According to Dr. Breuning, we should wait until we are in a devil of a mess and then start building freeways. I travelled about 450 miles one day from Sydney to Orbost, taking three hours to travel the first 50 miles and eight hours to travel the next 400 miles. It is necessary to have somewhere for a dial-a-bus or glorified taxi service to operate. Surely a car travelling on a freeway at 60 miles an hour is not polluting the atmosphere as much as is a car travelling at present along, say, South Road, having to stop and start at every 20 yards.

Los Angeles is held up as an example of the failure of freeways, but freeways are still being constructed there. A motorist can travel 60 miles out of Los Angeles in an hour, but that does not apply on the South Road. We all become irritated when caught in a traffic jam; it took me an hour to go from South Terrace to Parliament House the Christmas before last, and that is what will happen every evening at peak periods if someone does not take action and do something about the problem. I have a report here relating to a series of exhaustive tests held by Britain's Ministry of Transport's Roads Research Laboratory. This Government is spending much money on research that has already been undertaken elsewhere. If the Government were smart, it would take advantage of that research, instead of duplicating it and becoming more involved in a deficit.

In his explanation of the financial situation today, the Treasurer did not fail to say that every \$1,000,000 he goes over his Budget account means \$1,000,000 less is spent on roads from Loan account. The Commonwealth Government graciously handed out to the States last July \$26,400,000, which was the biggest increase the States have ever had. This is similar to giving a child \$10: he goes mad and wastes it, and it is far better to give him \$1 from which he will get value. An article in the *Advertiser* of August 4, 1970, states:

In a series of exhaustive tests held by Britain's Ministry of Transport's Road Research Laboratory, it was found that traffic creeping along at 10 m.p.h. can double a car's normal fuel consumption, while driving at constant speed as a freeway allows will reduce consumption by about 20 per cent. An interesting

point brought out was that driving at 60 m.p.h. on a freeway was most economical, but to drive at this speed on any other type of country road would cost about 15 per cent more than if you travelled at 35 m.p.h.

This would be one way to solve the pollution problem. The M.A.T.S. plan included a reference to public transport in the way of express buses to transport people to the city, with people from outlying areas travelling to pick-up points. The M.A.T.S. plan is flexible. It has been said that the previous Government voted \$560,000,000 to be spent on the M.A.T.S. plan, but that is entirely ridiculous. The only motion passed was that we accepted the principle of the M.A.T.S. plan. As the Minister knows, many millions of dollars is being spent on the M.A.T.S. plan this year in respect of road widening, which accounts for half the total expenditure. In the motion, we did not commit \$560,000,000: we merely accepted the plan in principle.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You weren't going to do the job: you were just accepting it in principle.

Mr. McANANEY: The initiative and drive of this Party started planning in Adelaide in 1962, when the first legislation was introduced. This was at a time when Sir Thomas Playford travelled the world and brought new industries here. In those days, the population of Adelaide was growing by 3 per cent each year. In 1965, we had a population recession along with a financial recession. The member for Mawson is interested in my batting average, but I do not think a person has a batting average until he has been out once, and I am always not out.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): A batting average has nothing to do with the motion.

Mr. McANANEY: It was introduced in the debate by the member for Mawson. The M.A.T.S. plan is flexible and, if the need is not there, it can be deferred, but we must have a plan that we can use as a guide. As the Labor Party found in Great Britain and as it finds whenever it introduces its rigid economic planning, rigid planning is no good. What is needed is the flexible planning of free enterprise. In 1962, we developed a plan to benefit South Australia, a plan that was obviously needed, although it was not needed quite so quickly, because of the drop in population between 1965 and 1968. The population started to build up again in 1968.

Mr. Coumbe: Why did it drop between 1965 and 1968?

Mr. McANANEY: Many migrants could not get jobs in the building industry. The Premier at that time told Great Britain not to send any more migrants here, because we could not cope with them and were not efficient enough to provide necessary services. Naturally, some migrants came to Australia, but they were told that it was no good coming to South Australia, because they could not get jobs here.

Mr. Jennings: And there was a drought, which the member for Rocky River said was caused by the Labor Government.

Mr. McANANEY: That is right. The member for Mawson quoted population trends but only mentioned the places that did not live up to expectations. He mentioned the Modbury area, which we have a delightful lady representing, although I do not think much of her politics.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's not what your Party said about her in the election campaign. Your Party got into the gutter down there, too.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: All that the member for Mawson was saying was that population has not grown as quickly as it should have grown and, therefore, the M.A.T.S. plan is out. Surely, in any scheme, we must have planning. When I was Chairman of the Strathalbyn council many years ago, we could not get our overseer to plan his activities, so one day we created a plan for him. At the next meeting he said, "Mr. Chairman, your plan did not work; on Monday the front-end loader broke down, and on Tuesday something else broke down."

We must have a flexible plan that can be adjusted to changing circumstances. Dr. Breuning has come up with the dial-a-bus idea and that fits perfectly into the freeway plan. I do not think Dr. Breuning says that we do not need a north-south freeway, or whatever he calls it. That is absolutely essential, as every Government member knows. If it was not for the bureaucracy that we have got ourselves involved in regarding the Victor Harbour railway line, I think the line would have been closed by now. The Minister of Transport would not give the Public Works Committee an extension of time to consider that matter. The present Minister has been asked and has not yet acceded to the request.

That is one railway that ought to be closed. All the traffic from that area is going by road and will come down the freeway from Mount Barker to Glen Osmond. How long will it

take, if we do not have a freeway, to get that material from Glen Osmond to Port Adelaide? At certain times, it will take two hours, whereas with a freeway system, avoiding the necessity to come through the city, there would be a big saving in time, reduction of pollution, and again in every other respect. I think Dr. Breuning spoke to a limited group of people who had set ideas that we must have a dial-a-bus system. He did not go to the experts who had spent three years on the work. The Labor Party carried on the plans started by the Liberal Party, but it was not prepared to accept them. The Government brought Dr. Breuning from America, so it is stuck with his plan. He was given an A.L.P. policy speech. They are the people who paid him, and no doubt he would take notice of that speech. Why the speech was given to him is beyond my comprehension, because he was supposed to develop his own line of thought and make an impartial decision. Mr. Hart (Director of Planning) at a symposium on the effect of modern technology and industrialization on leisure stated:

Land bought today for what were now called freeway routes would always be needed for moving people and goods more efficiently. Whichever vehicle was used, rights of way would be needed.

With the M.A.T.S. plan we had a basis for future development, and if we do not have that sort of basis for whatever system of transport is suggested there will be a period of many years when the traffic of Adelaide will become snarled. We are being asked to support a motion, but what does it mean? The Minister made no effort to tell us. He told us how many votes he received at the last election. At any election, many issues are involved, but can it be said on any particular issue that the people thought this way or that? We admit that the Labor policy was accepted by more people than accepted the Liberal policy. I hope that Government members will tell us what we are voting for on this motion.

We more or less expect that widening of roads will continue, but where is land to be acquired and what plans are to be carried out immediately? Are we to wait 10 years before anything is done? Despite the Labor Government, there will be an increase in the number of people living in Adelaide in the next five years, and many young people are marrying and requiring houses in the outer suburbs. This means that more people will be travelling on our roads. The number of passenger services being provided now is dropping, so it

can be seen that more and more people are using their own cars in preference to public transport. Dr. Breuning suggests that public transport should have more right of way on our roads. However, buses block traffic even now. Indeed, often they do not pull into their authorized stops completely on certain roads, and one has difficulty in passing them without one's vehicle protruding on to the wrong side of the road. Surely we must have freeways on which dial-a-bus services or our present bus services can speed along and, therefore, provide an attractive service to the public. In this respect, Dr. Breuning's philosophy seems to be quite different from that of this Government.

When leaving Australia, on his way home to America, Dr. Breuning said that Governments should not have anything to do with transport. He said he believed that private enterprise should run the transport systems, in which case the resultant more efficient systems might attract more traffic. It would be better for the public if private transport, instead of, say, the railways (which makes losses and has to be assisted by the Government) were responsible for providing transport. Why should the State run a service that cannot compete with a reasonable alternative? If the dial-a-bus services want to compete with the private motor car, they will have to provide a sufficiently attractive service to lure one away from using one's own vehicle. If such services were to be run by the Government, they would not attract people away from their own cars.

At present, private buses, which are forced to run around the outskirts of Adelaide, appear to be doing reasonably well. However, if they are doing really well, they are faced with the threat of being taken over by the Municipal Tramways Trust. If the latter makes a loss, the Government has to assist it. The private bus lines, on the other hand, are placed in the difficult situation of having to run profitably in the more remote areas where the population is more sparse. However, they must be paying their own way, otherwise they would not stay in business. The Liberal Party in this State had the drive and initiative to plan for the future of Adelaide and the whole of South Australia. It had a fresh report made by experts, who presented the M.A.T.S. plan, which was not very much different from the 1962 plan. It had to be flexible enough to meet the changing needs of the people. Without a freeway system, the dial-a-bus system would be just as much a problem in peak periods as private

cars would be. Of course, in the middle of the day we would need only one-quarter of the number of buses we would need in peak periods. So, in these circumstances the dial-a-bus system would be more expensive than a system whereby each person drove his own car. Possibly, with cheaper methods of excavating, we will eventually get an underground railway system in Adelaide. Of course, the cost would depend on trade union tactics.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The member for Heysen.

Mr. McANANEY: We may as well have trains running along the line as have employees playing cards in railway sheds.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should confine his remarks to the motion.

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Speaker, I point out that the railways are mentioned in the report.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must link his remarks with the motion.

Mr. McANANEY: This matter is very much linked with the report. In the Minister's area there are to be over-the-top railway crossings. I understand the cost of those crossings will be \$2,000,000 and I do not know how it fits in with the M.A.T.S. plan. It would appear that Dr. Breuning really likes the M.A.T.S. plan, but he has fiddled it around in an endeavour to fit in what he has read in the Labor Party's policy speech. The State Government is apparently planning to redesign two of Adelaide's most dangerous and congested level crossings.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who said that?

Mr. McANANEY: It is in the *News*, that infallible paper.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in taking notice of interjections.

Mr. McANANEY: I cannot see who made the statement, but it is attributed to the Government. The report states what will be done and contains a diagram, and it relates to the areas of Oaklands and Ascot Park, presumably in the Minister's district. There has been much argument in the House about who is responsible for a statement made by someone under the Minister's control, but I think we have determined here that the Minister is responsible for such statements. As the Highways Commissioner apparently made the

statement in question, it is part of the Government plan, and I ask this question—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in asking a question. Question Time ends at 4 o'clock.

Mr. McANANEY: This seems to be getting away from the plan needed for Adelaide. I have another report, taken from the *Advertiser*, which relates to the "high cost of botched planning", a situation that I think we are beginning to experience. We have had a good plan that can be adjusted to the changing needs and requirements of the people. The Minister has objected to having an embankment for a freeway, yet he has advocated a plan involving an embankment for the railway line in the area to which I have referred. That would not be necessary if a freeway existed. I think we have advanced sufficient evidence in this debate for opposing the motion, without getting away from the subject matter, which is so vague, anyway. No-one on the other side has succeeded in explaining what the motion actually means or what the Government plans to do in the next five years. The Highways Commissioner may make statements and decisions without telling the Minister, but if we wait for 10 years to provide the facilities in question we shall have botched planning that will cost much money to rectify.

Surely, we must plan for the future benefit of the people of South Australia and provide suitable roads on which they can travel at a reasonable speed without causing the pollution that is being caused at the moment and, in addition, save hours and hours of time. I repeat that the cost of freeways is about the same as the cost of widening an arterial road, yet a freeway can carry much more traffic than an arterial road can carry. The widening of an arterial road is expensive. The Main North Road should have been widened five years ago, yet the land has not been acquired, although this road is a vital lifeline. I support the amendment, strongly opposing this nebulous motion, which no-one has been able to explain. Let us hope that someone will explain it better than the Minister has done.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 25, at 2 p.m.