

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 19, 1977

The House met at noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. E. Connelly) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr. A. F. R. Dodd) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.8 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Speech of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.36 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

[Sitting suspended from 12.40 to 2.15 p.m.]

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that this day, in compliance with the summons from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which I have obtained a copy, which I now lay on the table.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITION: ABORTION

Dr. EASTICK presented a petition signed by 103 electors of Light, praying that the House would urge the Government to take urgent action to amend the legislation relating to abortion, and to limit availability only to those circumstances where the future life of the mother or the likelihood of abnormality at birth of the child were proven to the satisfaction of not less than two medical officers.

Petition received.

PETITION: CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Dr. EASTICK presented a petition signed by 178 residents of South Australia, praying that the house would urge the Government to introduce, without delay, stringent laws with appropriate penalties which would protect children from abuse by pornographers, and take action to prohibit the sale of all pornographic films, books and other material which include children.

Petition received.

PETITION: PANORAMA ROAD CLOSURE

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a petition signed by 139 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would disallow the regulation which closed O'Neil Street, Panorama.

Petition received.

PETITION: SHOPPING HOURS

Mr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 2 374 citizens of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to enact legislation to remove all restrictions on trading hours except between the hours of 1 p.m. on Saturday and 12 midnight on Sunday.

Petition received.

PETITION: SCHOOL STAFFING

Mrs. BYRNE presented a petition signed by 20 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government not to reduce ancillary staff hours in individual schools; to appoint ancillary staff to schools with less than their full quota; and to implement the recommendations submitted by the South Australian department for the national survey of educational needs.

Petition received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Barossa Water Treatment Works,
Kingscote Area School Redevelopment,
North Haven Primary School,
Reynella East Primary School,
West Lakes Shore Primary School,
Whyalla Community Welfare Centre.

Ordered that reports be printed.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion, without notice:

That this House condemn the Government for its total failure to provide adequately for the transport needs of metropolitan Adelaide, and for its long record of broken promises in this regard, and call on it forthwith to resign, and that such suspension remain in force until no later than 5.45 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. TONKIN: I move:

That this House condemn the Government for its total failure to provide adequately for the transport needs of metropolitan Adelaide, and for its long record of broken promises in this regard, and call on it forthwith to resign. The record of the Dunstan Government since 1970 has been characterised by broken promises, mismanagement, waste, and neglect. Detailed research into Australian Labor Party policy speeches, press and Ministerial statements and other sources, has revealed an enormous volume of promises, actual or implied, made at various times to persuade the voting public that things actually were happening in South Australia under a Labor Government.

Mr. Langley: You haven't done much—

Mr. TONKIN: As the records clearly show, to the embarrassment of the member for Unley, most of these things have not happened. On careful examination, it is clear that there has never been any hope of their happening when promised, although they have been attractively described by Government spokesmen at the time. The most amazing part of this elaborate exercise in public deception is that the Government has been able to get away with it for so long. For more than seven years the people of South Australia have been fed a diet of false promises and improbable prospects, and it seems that, for a time, the media has been just as mesmerised as has been the consuming public.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Who wrote this?

Mr. TONKIN: We all tend to believe what we want to believe. Perhaps that is the Attorney's main problem; he has others. In recent times, however, the media has begun to probe and question, and gradually the facade is being stripped away; the promises are being matched against actual performance and found wanting. Nowhere in this whole sorry exercise have promises and proposals flowed more thickly than in the field of public transport, and nowhere have achievements failed more dismally to match promises than in this field.

Several options were open to the Opposition in moving this, the first no-confidence motion of this session, but it was because of the outstanding lack of achievement in public transport that this subject was finally chosen as a vehicle to highlight the Government's appalling performance generally. A great deal of detailed and damning evidence remains on which to base similar motions dealing with almost every other aspect of this Government's activities, but we shall leave that for the future.

Let us look at the sorry state of public transport in South Australia and the sorry story that has been told. In 1970, in the policy speech, the Australian Labor Party announced that it would withdraw and revise the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, on the ground that its proposed implementation was ruthless and did not take into account newly developing mass transport technology. The Labor Party has been unremittingly critical of the MATS plan, particularly as it was largely based on a planned network of freeways that it said would cut (and I quote) "large concrete swathes" through the suburbs and would split communities.

Perhaps, in retrospect, it was as well that South Australia did not go totally into freeway development but, after seven years, most people, stopped bumper to bumper on Wakefield Road, or across the Hilton Bridge, or in any one of a number of other similar situations, would welcome any development that got them moving. As for freeways cutting swathes through the metropolitan area and splitting communities, what does the Minister of Transport think is happening now with our main arterial roads? Let us look at the estimated average daily traffic figures for 1976 put out by the Highways Department Traffic Engineering Section. The average daily traffic for Main South Road was 55 000 vehicles; for North-East Road, 30 500 vehicles; for Lower North-East Road, 15 300 vehicles; for Main North Road, 38 200 vehicles; and for Anzac Highway and Greenhill Road, 49 000 vehicles. This is the kind of traffic that has built up. The Minister is creating clearways which have much the same effect as freeways. He is acquiring land on either side of roads and widening arterial roads.

The volume of traffic now proceeding along those arteries is making life for the residents who live adjacent to those areas every bit as bad, or even worse, than the Minister himself projected when he so bitterly criticised the MATS plan. By his inactivity, he has created exactly the same situation that he said would come from freeways: indeed, the situation is much worse, because there is not the control that freeways have. The traffic situation has become steadily worse. The delays have become intolerable. The growing outer metropolitan areas are starved for metropolitan transport, and we are little further forward than we were in 1970.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you now advocating freeways?

Mr. TONKIN: If the Minister wants to take up the question of freeway development, I refer him to several comments I will make later that will embarrass him. He

does not know where he stands on freeway development: he does not have a clue. In fact, he has no idea where public transport is going in this State. He is totally and absolutely incompetent, and devoid of ideas.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Tell us where you stand.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable Minister that he will have an opportunity to reply in rebuttal later in the day.

Mr. TONKIN: Throughout the entire period of seven years, the Minister of Transport has performed (and I use the word advisedly), and that is all he has done. The only better performer in the Government is the Premier, who is an acknowledged thespian. He may deserve praise as the best actor the State has ever had as Premier, but he will certainly go down in history as being the most appalling manager this State has ever had as Premier. The Minister, in order to dupe the public into thinking something positive has been done, has made the most extraordinary statements.

Mr. Keneally: Which ones?

Mr. TONKIN: Never fear, they will come forward in some detail. Analysed in the fullness of time, they were, to say the least, ill-advised, and in fact, in some instances, quite ridiculous. They are so ridiculous they would be funny, if it were not for the very serious implications that lie behind the absurdities. My colleagues will later deal with the detailed analysis of these statements, and the gaping voids that exist where achievement should be. I wish to deal only with a few token examples.

The first of the Virgo flights of fancy occurred in 1971. At that time, Dr. Breuning had been engaged to provide a report on the MATS plan, and a very engaging report he prepared, too. Let us consult the *Advertiser* of January 30, 1971, in which a report stated:

A transport system out of the space age is envisaged for Adelaide. This is the essence of the long-awaited Breuning transportation report issued yesterday by the Minister of Transport. Mr. Virgo said the Government had decided to adopt, with one exception, the recommendations of the report, which placed emphasis on upgrading and developing public transport and flexible planning. Adelaide could be one of the first cities in the world to develop viable alternatives to the over-use of the private car in the city.

Mr. Nankivell: Who said that?

Mr. TONKIN: That was the Minister in January, 1971, and it was an important story that was covered fully. The report continued:

The transport corridors, to be incorporated in the Metropolitan Development Plan and displayed in public soon, are as follows:

South: Noarlunga Freeway alignment.
North-West: Port Adelaide Freeway alignment.
North: Salisbury Freeway alignment.
North-East: Modbury Freeway alignment.

Necessary connections around the west and north of the city: the alignment through Hindmarsh, across the north of North Adelaide and connecting to the north-east corner of the city.

The Minister announced that the Government would legislate to set up a rehousing compensation committee to deal with resettlement of families who suffer because their houses were needed.

That was probably the most significant and reasonable thing that the Minister said at the time. As well as preparing the ground for the dial-a-bus fiasco (and I am not sure whether it was the member for Salisbury or the member for Albert Park who in this House said "dial-a-prayer"), the Minister also stated:

Adelaide will not be committed irretrievably to the freeways set out in the MATS plan. In the next few years Adelaide could see the evaluation and trial of such transport systems as dial-a-bus, aero-trains, linear induction trains

and automatic vehicles. This will mean the immediate preparation of plans to improve time tables and the comfort and ease of public access to our present bus services and railways.

Mr. Becker: Time tables? They don't exist!

Mr. TONKIN: Well, that was in January, 1971, and the Minister, having spoken about futuristic transport, went on to give a strong impression that something was being done immediately. The fact that the something was the upgrading of time tables and the improvement of comfort on existing services did not matter: his statement gave an air of authenticity to the proposals. The public got the strong impression that something was being done to bring these rather exotic and space age services within reach. One must give the Government credit, and the credit I will give it is that this was a superbly designed confidence trick—nothing more.

Mr. Becker: It was a bit of a Disneyland type of thing?

Mr. TONKIN: Well, all these things could possibly occur at some time but they have to be paid for and planned for. They will not come just because the Minister wants them to come. So successful was his confidence trick that the Minister in May, 1971, felt impelled to go a good deal further and, once again, he was not seriously challenged. A report appeared in the *Advertiser* of May 27, 1971. This was a significant period and one which had a great bearing on the Government's image at that time. The report stated:

Moves to introduce a 300 m.p.h. hovertrain transport system to South Australia were initiated in London this week by the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo). Mr. Virgo said, "I'm hoping we shall be able to find a way in which South Australia may share in the development of the hovertrain. South Australia is a State that has always been very interested in pioneering, and if we were the first in Australia to install a hovertrain we would be exceedingly happy. I am returning home more convinced than ever that we should promote public transport." Mr. Virgo said his faith in the Breuning report in South Australia had "not changed one iota".

This was another of Mr. Virgo's flights of fancy in public transport promotion. What the people of South Australia wanted was less promotion and more action. To be fair, let me say that a leader writer in the *Advertiser* had apparently discarded his rose-coloured spectacles, and wrote as follows in an editorial on July 13, 1971:

Since the MATS plan was discarded by the Government over a year ago, a few fragmentary glimpses have been given of a possible substitute. A more coherent and comprehensive statement of policy, together with the setting of clear objectives, is now due.

This more coherent and comprehensible statement of policy, which was then due, was something that the Minister could not give. Soon afterwards he made his classic statement, which I think all of us who were here at the time will always remember, as follows:

I would like to think that well before Christmas (that is, 1971) we will see dial-a-bus in operation in South Australia.

I believe everyone knows about the ultimate fate of dial-a-bus, and how the Government left its implementation to a private operator who, against intolerable difficulties, could not succeed. It allowed the experiment to proceed in spite of advice from an expert committee that it was not the appropriate time or place to try dial-a-bus. The cost to the Government (and this announcement had to come from the member for Henley Beach and not from the Minister, who had vastly under-estimated the cost to the community) was \$31 473·24.

Mr. Dean Brown: How long did it last?

Mr. TONKIN: I do not believe that it lasted more than a week. Dial-a-bus will be examined in closer detail by one of my colleagues. The whole episode did nothing to enhance the reputation of the Government or the Minister. Further statements will also be examined by my colleagues, who will deal with the electrification of the suburban railways system (the Minister said that the first electric train would be running by 1977), the underground railway work (to commence in 1976), the development of the railway station, and many other topics which should make quite interesting listening.

I will return now to statements made in 1971 about the MATS plan freeways. It is interesting to compare statements made on November 17, 1971, with those made on March 29, 1976. Someone somewhere obviously had his wires crossed, because the reports differ considerably. On November 17, 1971, the following was reported in the *Advertiser*:

Metropolitan Adelaide's freeway routes have now been adopted in what is expected to be their final form. The routes as amended have become an authorised development plan with the stamp of approval of the Executive Council and as such have legal backing for the first time.

The proposals comprise:

A north-south route west of the city of Adelaide extending from near Dry Creek in the north to Noarlunga in the south.

Routes serving Port Adelaide north-west along Port Road and west from the Levels.

A route north-east towards Modbury along the River Torrens valley and north to Hillbank.

Necessary connections around the city of Adelaide.

It has a familiar ring about it, because it has been put forward before. The reports of March, 1976, are a contradiction, too. On the one hand the *Advertiser* of March 29, 1976, states:

The South Australian Government has officially abandoned the MATS plan for the city of Adelaide and north-eastern suburbs. From today a team of sociologists, urban planners and traffic engineers from the Transport Department will undertake a fresh 18-month review of total transport concepts for the area.

What has the Minister been doing all that time? The report continues:

The Transport Department has no preconceived notions of what is the correct answer to public transport investment in the north-eastern suburbs. Possible locations, as well as the nature of the system—bus, tram, rail, etc.—are considered to be completely open. In fact, one possible option is that no action should be taken at all.

On the other hand, on the same day (and this is where the wires seem to have got crossed), the *News* reported as follows:

The South Australian Government was still buying land on freeway routes recommended in the MATS plan, the Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo, said today. This was an indication that the freeway system of the MATS plan for metropolitan Adelaide has not been ruled out. Mr. Virgo told a press conference that a decision on whether or not freeways would go ahead would be taken by the Government of the day at that particular time.

That statement is incredible. What are the Government's plans for freeways and transportation corridors? It is not enough for the Minister to ask by interjection where we stand on those questions. We want to know where the Government stands. We are not getting any indication on these questions from this incompetent Minister. Queries raised in the editorial in the *Advertiser* in 1971 were no closer to clarification in 1976. Just what has the Government been doing in this time? I am not surprised that the Minister is leaving: he cannot take it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Far too much private conversation is going on. It is getting difficult to hear the Leader.

Mr. TONKIN: I realise that the Minister of Transport does not want to hear this, but hear it he will, and there is more to come. It is possible that the Minister and the Government will try to fall back on the old defence of trying, by implication, to blame the department for their own failure to take positive action. Let me make clear that in our opinion the department has performed its duties admirably, and the extent of its extreme and bitter frustration because of Ministerial and Government reluctance to take positive action is becoming more and more widely known to members of the community.

In October, 1973, the Minister tabled in Parliament what was then known as the Scafton report, and the Government is now doing everything it can to forget it. The Minister was most enthusiastic. It gave him much more to say, and he needed more to say to prove that something was happening. On October 5, 1973, the *Advertiser* stated:

Adelaide's five-year transport plan would be followed to the letter, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday. The five-year plan included:

Extensions to the Christie Downs railway, a two-mile branch line to West Lakes, electrification of the entire urban rail system, and improvements to the Glenelg tram service and all public transport rolling stock.

A rapid transit line to Modbury (\$56 600 000).

A new rail link with Modbury (\$88 500 000).

Rail or rapid transit extensions to Aldinga (\$20 000 000).

That has a vaguely familiar ring about it. I think we heard a similar statement a few weeks ago about Monarto. The article continued:

A possible international airport at Monarto.

Mr. Virgo said freeway proposals under the MATS plan had been virtually scrapped.

That does not tie up with what was said in March, 1976. The Minister has not ever really been definite about freeways. He does not know his own mind. The article of October 5, 1973, continued:

However, the department was still acquiring land on a voluntary basis from people wishing to sell property on the original MATS freeway routes.

In other words, the freeway proposals were virtually scrapped but the Government was still buying up just to be on the safe side. The article continued:

The paths could still be used as transportation corridors. In the Assembly, Mr. Virgo said no decision had been reached on the actual route of the proposed city underground rail subway.

Mr. Dean Brown: But he was starting in 1976!

Mr. TONKIN: Indeed he was. The media took the Scafton report seriously indeed, as it was well entitled to do. It was made by a highly qualified officer, heading a most competent department, and it was released by a Minister who said that it would, with one exception, be followed "slavishly". What else should they believe? The editorials of both daily newspapers reflected public opinion. The editorial in the *Advertiser* of October 5, 1973, stated:

The comprehensive report from the Director-General of Transport (Dr. D. Scafton) tabled in the State Parliament this week has confirmed already known Government priorities for improving Adelaide's public transport services. It contains the firmest indication we have yet had that the city will eventually get the much discussed underground railway, and a proposal that tunnel works should start in 1976. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo), fresh from another look at transport developments overseas, has endorsed the plans and priorities "to the letter". Most of the plans put forward in Dr. D. Scafton's report, including the underground rail link, seem eminently desirable. We

are promised in the initial five-year programme the Christie Downs rail extension, a branch line to West Lakes, improvements to all public transport rolling stock and electrification of the suburban rail system. This is an impressive list—indeed it was—

and the priorities which it indicates may be well justified. It remains, nevertheless, a disappointing feature of the report that it offers so little prospect of the drastic improvement needed in M.T.T. bus services. As every day passes, peak hour congestion increases on roads leading to the city. He should have been able to look into the future and see what was happening nearly four years later. The report continues:

The Government's basic policy of concentrating on improving public transport instead of providing freeways and other means of catering for more and more motorists has won general public approval. The problem is that the policy has not yet been put into practice. The "high priority" Modbury rapid transit line, we now learn, is scheduled to be started in 10 years time and completed about 1991. Some other method of speeding traffic flow from the still growing north-eastern suburbs will be essential long before then.

The *News* editorial of the same day, October 4, 1973, stated:

Adelaide can now take a real look at what is ahead for its public transport. Dr. Derek Scafton, the Director-General of Transport, has outlined a 30-year, \$400 000 000 plan to the State Government. It is exciting, imaginative and, for the most part, realistic. But his plans for a city underground, with work beginning in 1976, are now definite and acceptable. So too are other projects, like the Christie Downs rail extension, the West Lakes branch line, electrification of the suburban rail system, and improvement of M.T.T. buses.

There was no doubt in anyone's mind at that stage that the projects were definite and about to go ahead as announced. That was four years ago, but it was not to be.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What was the date?

Mr. TONKIN: It was, if the Minister had been listening, October 4, 1973. I am surprised he was not aware of that date. I would have thought that he would be well aware of it.

Mr. Dean Brown: I wonder when the five-year plan will start.

Mr. TONKIN: I don't think it has started.

Mr. Dean Brown: I get that impression.

Mr. TONKIN: I think most people do. No-one can expect the media, the Opposition or the general public to have anything but the most extreme cynicism for anything which the Government may now announce. Plans have been drawn up by the department: it is a Government which has failed to act. The ring bus route was announced in August, 1974, as expected to operate in December, 1975. In May, 1976, an almost identical press statement was made, almost word for word, promising the ring route buses before Christmas, 1976. We still have not got them. The ring route may well come, and we hope it does, and soon, but what can restore the Minister's credibility, in the light of what has happened? He has no credibility left at all. Now we have yet another study, the North-east Transportation Study, and one of the most startling points to arise is that one of the options being considered is no action at all on transport in the North-eastern suburbs.

It is four years since we were promised a start on the King William Street underground, a two-mile branch rail link to serve West Lakes, the electrification of suburban rail services, a rapid transit line to Modbury, a new rail link to Monarto, a rail link to Aldinga, and so on, and we have not seen anything at all. The policy has been announced, but it has not yet been put into practice. Pressure on the roads for more car space has grown and

living conditions because of traffic noise have been made virtually impossible, yet we see no positive steps towards a solution. We have had words on some fanciful press releases but no action. We have had the same press releases trotted out at intervals of a year or two, and until now the public of South Australia has swallowed it all. Let me say that the public of South Australia has had a guts full and is not going to take any more. By its obsession with Monarto and its total lack of planning for inner urban redevelopment, the Government has forced people to seek houses farther and farther out in the metropolitan area. Not only has money been wasted on Monarto, but it has been wasted in providing services to an expanding metropolitan area which would not have needed to expand at all if proper planning procedures had been adopted. If we ask the people in the outer metropolitan area what they think of their public transport services, they will confirm, better than anyone else, just how little words, promises, and flights of fancy are worth. They are very conscious of being neglected.

Certainly, some things have been achieved. Undoubtedly, the Minister will talk about the new buses, although they are behind schedule, and the Christie Downs railway, which is fine, although not electrified, and the Bee-line bus which is operating, although apparently we are not going to have the east-west bus service.

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

Mr. TONKIN: The Minister did, in the last session, quite clearly in answer to a question. Surely these are developments that we would expect anyway. We have to keep our bus fleet up to date. We cannot keep on grinding the same old buses along the roads interminably. I have a 30-page document setting out the Government's seven years of broken promises on transport, and my colleagues will be ventilating the matters contained therein.

The entire exercise has provided a salutary lesson. No matter what this Government promises for the future, its promises will be regarded now with grave suspicion, and rightly so. It has proved that it does not deserve the confidence of the people of this State. As a public relations exercise, it has held at bay for a remarkably long time public demand for better public transport, but now the entire exercise of appearing to govern by public relations activities, rather than by solid and real management and achievement, is being exposed for what it is, a shabby political trick to deceive and mislead the people.

One last example I will use is that reserved bus lanes were promised by this Government in 1973. When some research was made into the site of these reserved bus lanes (because the Premier, in May of this year, said that they had been introduced and had been in operation for a considerable time), we found, after some searching, one example. The reserved bus lanes out of the city to speed the flow of traffic to areas such as Grange, Ingle Farm, and so on do not seem to have materialised, but there is one such lane running from East Terrace along the wall of the Botanic Garden to Hackney Road. This does not seem to me to be doing very much to improve the traffic flow for buses along the Lower Main North Road or the North-East Road. I do not know what is the distance of this lane, but it would be less than half a kilometre. It has "Buses only" written on it.

Mr. Millhouse: But it is not the only one.

Mr. TONKIN: The honourable member is quite right. After some further research, apart from the western side of King William Street, which did not seem to work particularly well and which is not in operation now, we found another one. I was pleased to find it. Travelling

south along King William Street and along Peacock Road, when one comes to the intersection of Peacock Road and Greenhill Road one sees that there is a traffic island and a "Turn left at any time with care" lane. If one does not turn left but goes straight ahead to the intersection, some 20 metres, one finds a notice on the road saying "Buses only". One could not fit half a bus on that piece of lane, yet the notice says "Buses only". That is a perfect example of how this Government operates. It has sent someone out to paint a sign saying "Buses only" on 20 m of roadway so that it can say that we do have lanes for buses only. That is what the Government has been doing with so many of its promises. It is a public relations exercise and nothing more, and when the Government's promises and claims are analysed they are seen to be worth nothing.

All the promises, all the propaganda films being churned out at the taxpayers' expense, and all the A.L.P. front organisation's campaigns of non-political advertising will be of no use in arresting the rapidly increasing slide in the Government's ratings and credibility. It is a richly deserved slide. The Government does not deserve the confidence either of this House or of the people it has misled. Accordingly, I move the motion, which calls on the Government to resign forthwith, because it no longer enjoys the confidence either of this House or of the people of South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): One of the major failures of the Labor Government in South Australia (and there have been many) has been in the area of public transport. Although the Leader has dealt in some detail with the wide canvas of this matter, I shall pursue some of these matters in more detail. It is basically the Government's fault, but the Minister, as the man in charge of the development and provision of transport in this State, must bear the major part of the blame for the lack of performance by the Government in this area. I think he has shown about as much finesse in managing his department as an elephant playing a grand piano.

Mr. Abbott: You've had experience at playing pianos, have you?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We have. The Minister has from time to time made public pronouncements of futuristic modes of transport that he hoped to implement here, but nothing has eventuated. The earliest memory that the Opposition has of the Minister's involvement in public transport was, I think, approaching the 1970 election, when the present Government was in Opposition. He waxed loudly, eloquent and long on the evils of the MATS plan.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And the public supported us.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I remember the emotionalism he tried to stir up on that occasion to destroy the plan, simply because it had been developed largely by a Liberal Government. Unfortunately for the Minister, having completely repudiated the plan, he has had to go about implementing several of its recommendations. I will briefly quote, with regard to public transport, what the MATS plan had to say. The plan was a most comprehensive report, compiled after much research and many man-hours of work by many people in the State, including many public servants. Page 176 of the report states:

The importance of a balanced transportation system cannot be over-emphasised. Many billions of dollars have been spent in North America since World War II for construction of urban highways through and around major cities, but it has become clear that highways alone cannot meet all transportation needs. Public transport is more than a supplementary service to highway transportation.

Properly planned, it can be a positive means of directing and shaping urban growth in accordance with community development goals. It is a means of providing social and economic advantages that would otherwise be denied certain groups in the community. The recommended plan makes use of the combined advantages of both the private automobile and public transport models. Each system has an important function to perform. The automobile offers the advantage of door-to-door service and it is not tied to schedules or pre-selected routes. It is indispensable for many kinds of travel. Public transport, however, is ideally suited for the mass movement of people to and from high density areas, especially during peak hours.

I have quoted that passage lest people should be confused into believing that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Plan involved solely the provision of freeways, but it did not. It was a most comprehensive plan for the co-ordinated development of transport for metropolitan Adelaide. The Minister was at great pains to destroy the plan. Part of his programme was to seek to destroy the plan, which he did not do, because he is now seeking to implement many of its provisions.

Mr. Tonkin: He painted himself completely into a corner.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: As my Leader has said, he painted himself completely into a corner. One of the schemes devised by the Government to try to discredit that comprehensive plan was to invite Dr. Breuning from America to spend a month's holiday in Adelaide with one of his colleagues (I think it was in August, 1970) in order to write a plan to supersede the MATS plan. The slim little volume that I have here is a copy of Dr. Breuning's report. It is an interesting essay written by Dr. Breuning and Mr. Anthony Kettaneh on their return to America, after they had been in Adelaide for a month, to outline the Government's future policy for public transport. The first term of reference was as follows:

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.

The second term of reference was as follows:

Report on what work needs to be done to provide that South Australia will develop experiments in new systems of public transit with the aim of providing an additional base for industry in this State.

I do not know what that means, and would be pleased if any member could explain it to me. I am not sure what "develop experiments in new systems of public transit with the aim of providing an additional base for industry" means. Does that mean that we are to have an industry based on experimentation in transport? That is how I read it. Whatever it means, I cannot understand it. The following statement is the sort of comment made by Dr. Bruening in his report, which was to supersede the MATS plan:

Adelaide in 1970 is a pretty city, ringed in green. From high above South Terrace on a bright 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 footraces. On week days at five o'clock the intersection with King William Street sometimes backs up for a block or two, but in 10 or 15 minutes that passes.

This is an interesting essay on Adelaide and its environs by Dr. Bruening and his associate after spending a pleasant month in the city, and this is the report on which the Premier and his Ministers have hung their hats and is the master plan for the development of Adelaide's transportation. Under the heading "Implementation", we have a few more pearls of wisdom from the report as follows:

The crux of our approach is *flexibility*; is the deliberate staging of decisions so as to continually maximise and multiply the available options. The great leap forward may be fine for kangaroos, but human progress proceeds step by step, as indicated by the Chinese proverb, a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step.

Apparently, it is on those pearls of wisdom that we have based our transportation policy in South Australia since late in 1970. The visit was in August and the report appeared a month or two later. The Minister has based his thinking and public pronouncements in relation to public transport on that report. The only thing with which we can really agree is that the Government has been flexible. It has been so flexible that none of the Minister's pronouncements have come to fruition. That is what I define as flexibility.

Mr. Slater: None!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: None that I shall mention, because I cannot call any to mind. The Minister tried to overkill the MATS report in his eagerness to discredit the section that referred to a freeway which, as he said, would cut a swathe through his electorate. Considerable effort went into preparing the MATS report. It is probably the most basic report on which the Minister from time to time makes pronouncements.

What is the end result of all this playing politics by the Minister regarding our transportation needs? I shall refer to four aspects of public transport on which the Minister has made public statements. From time to time he has gone into print and has made statements about the electrification of the rail system in South Australia. Reference is made in the MATS report to a rapid rail transit system. The Minister obviously, after his initial heresy, was converted to that view. He has made numerous statements about the electrification of Adelaide's metropolitan railways. In June, 1971, in the *Advertiser* he stated:

Automatic or computerised electric trains, with feeder services, were the best long-range plan for Adelaide. He considered that Adelaide eventually would decide in favour of automatic or computer operated electric trains.

In November, 1971, the Minister was reported as follows:

The Minister forecast last night that an electric railway where practicable and exclusive bus lanes would provide the rapid transport system for metropolitan Adelaide. It was one showing a balanced transport system, the other components being a good arterial road system and a modern collector and distributor system using dial-a-bus or PRT (personalised rapid transit).

That statement is not out of keeping with the recommendations of the MATS plan, but the Minister there again forecasts an electric railway. On June 2, 1973, the Minister was reported as saying:

Part of the Government's plan to make rail travel more appealing to commuters would include the electrification of some cars. It was hoped that the Christie Downs extension would be electrified by 1975.

Of course it is now 1977 and I have seen no signs at all of electrification. A month later, the Minister was reported as saying:

Double-decker trains could be operating on the Adelaide-Christie Downs railway line by July, 1975. They will be introduced in a \$22 700 000 project to electrify the entire Adelaide to Christie Downs railway service. The Government at present plans to have 36 cars, 18 power units and 18 trailers, operating by the middle of 1977. It wants to have four spare units to swing into the system in case of breakdowns. An overhead electrification system presented fewer problems than a third rail. If sufficient funds were not available to complete the scheme by the middle of 1975, it was expected most of the scheme would be completed in the following financial year.

That is next year. On July 28, 1973, he stated:

High-speed electric double-decker trains could be—
In a report of the announcement made in the *Advertiser*, on the following day, a new detail was that the trains would be capable of travelling at 112 km an hour and might be air-conditioned. The report continued:

. . . they would reduce the Christie Downs trip to Adelaide to 40 minutes.

It was also hoped that trains could be built at Islington. Then, in the *Sunday Mail* a month or two later in 1973, it was stated:

Almost certain electrification of the Adelaide-Elizabeth rail line was announced yesterday by the Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo. This would follow electrification of the Adelaide-Christie Downs line.

The same thing was reported in the *News* the following day. In 1974, it was stated that the electrification of Adelaide's metropolitan rail system would be carried out at a cost of about \$15 000 000 and could be completed within seven years. Work on the three—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Not "would be" but "could be".

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The difficulty is that it all "could be" but none of it "will be".

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's not a broken promise.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: "Could be concluded in seven years," talk about living on a hope and a prayer and trying to delude the public of South Australia! The article continued:

Work on the three metropolitan lines, Port Adelaide, Gawler and the Adelaide Hills, after the \$15 000 000 electric railway between Adelaide and Christie Downs was completed.

Mr. Tonkin: Was that "could" or "would"?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It said "would begin". In 1975, things were going to happen. We were going to be able to whip down to Christie Downs in 40 minutes in an air-conditioned, double-decker electric train. On July 2, 1975, the *Advertiser* stated:

The development of Adelaide's urban transport system over the next five years is expected to cost the State Government about \$130 000 000.

The same day the *Advertiser* quoted Mr. Dunstan as saying:

The capital costs for development of the system would be about \$26 000 000 a year. It was hoped to have the first diesel train on the Christie Downs line late this year and to have the first electric train running in 1977.

We know that the Government has not produced the goods. The whole story of electrification is one of the announcements that have deliberately misled the public. There is not a vestige of a sign that any of Adelaide's railway services will be electrified in the near future. The Leader dealt briefly with the Government's record in relation to the dial-a-bus fiasco. The *Advertiser* of January 30, 1971, stated that Mr. Virgo, Minister of Transport, had said:

Adelaide could be one of the first cities in the world to develop viable alternatives to the over-use of the private car.

In May of the same year the *Advertiser* quoted Mr. Virgo as saying:

One of the first things he would like to do when he returned to Adelaide was instigate a study area for dial-a-bus.

On August 5, Mr. Virgo was reported as saying:

I would like to think that well before Christmas we will see a dial-a-bus in operation in South Australia.

The *Advertiser* on December 31, 1971, quoted Mr. Virgo as saying:

A confidential and expert report to the Government says dial-a-bus services are not the complete answer to metropolitan Adelaide's transport needs.

The Government was having some doubts about it. On March 24, 1973, two years later, the *Advertiser* quoted Mr. Virgo as saying:

The world's biggest dial-a-bus system would begin operating in Adelaide in June. Initially, the service, which would be named dial-a-bus, would be operated by 14 buses, each with 12 seats. People living within the service would be able to dial a central number and go to any destination within the covered area. A bus would be at their doorstep within half an hour.

On July 26, 1973, the *Advertiser* quoted Mr. Virgo as saying:

A committee of transport specialists advised the South Australian Government 12 months ago that any dial-a-bus system in Adelaide would be unsuccessful.

The *News* reported Mr. Virgo as saying that the dial-a-bus project had cost the Government about \$3 000 or \$4 000. On August 15, 1973, the *Advertiser* reported Mr. Broomhill as stating:

The State Government has spent \$31 473.24 on the dial-a-bus project.

On March 28, 1976, the *Sunday Mail* quoted Dr. Scrafton as saying:

South Australia could see more dial-a-bus experiments, bus lanes, and a general upgrading of existing public transport systems during the next decade.

On May 9, 1977, the Premier was reported as saying:

The State Government itself never promised a dial-a-bus service.

That is an interesting saga in the history of the performance of the Minister of Transport in relation to public transport. I have much more information to give, but time will preclude me from using it all. I had intended to quote the interesting story about the railway station development. The Minister has really been building castles in the air over the modest building we have at the Adelaide terminal. The Minister has said that the site would be used for building a hotel, squash courts and a stadium to seat 8 000 people, and so the story goes on. I hope one of my colleagues will have time to deal with that. We have had excursions from time to time into fantasy land. Dr. Breuning came from overseas to excite the appetites of the public in relation to modernistic and way-out schemes. The Minister has been in the act in his public pronouncements in this area. At one stage I can recall it being said that we were going to run our cars on cactus juice. The Minister said publicly we would be able to develop cactus juice in South Australia as an alternative form of fuel. In June, 1977, the *Advertiser* reported on cactus as a possible fuel source in the following way:

One of the most exotic schemes that could be considered is "personalised rapid transit". This enables a traveller to dial a destination and be automatically transported at up to 48 km/h in miniature cars over an electric rail network. The really big question is: Can people take it?

The Minister was reported as saying:

We can produce the system, but, when people are being whizzed over complicated interconnected intercrossing tracks at 48 km/h without personal control, will the human psyche take it?

The article continued:

The Transport Department also has engaged a botanist to do a literature survey of a small cactus, *euphorbia lathyris*, which exudes a latex-like substance from which volatile fuels could be extracted.

This is the sort of thing the Minister has been saying over a period of seven years. The *Advertiser* of May 27, 1971, stated:

Moves to introduce a 300 m.p.h. hovertrain transport system were initiated in London this week by the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The article quoted Mr. Virgo as saying:

I am hoping we shall be able to find a way in which South Australia may share in the development of the hovertrain.

If the Minister has forgotten this, maybe he should vet what his press officer issues. In the same article Mr. Virgo continued:

South Australia is a State that has always been very interested in pioneering, and if we were the first in Australia to install a hovertrain we would be exceedingly happy. I am returning home more convinced than ever that we should promote public transport.

The article stated that Mr. Virgo said his faith in the Breuning report had "not changed one iota". Mr. Jones, the Federal Transport Minister, got into the act, but I have no time in this speech to mention what he said. In the *Advertiser* of September 19, 1975, it was stated:

An improved railway from Adelaide to Murray Bridge with some sections allowing speeds up to 160 km/h (100 m.p.h.) is forecast in a South Australian Railways report. The report on the study has been named "project Peregrine". . . . Project Peregrine advocates two alternative plans of surface tracks deviating from the existing line and using tunnels only where unavoidable. These are broadly estimated to cost \$70 000 000.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you know why they have not gone ahead?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Tell us in the reply; I want my remaining six minutes. The other aspect of the Government's performance with which I wish to deal briefly is transport charges in South Australia. When the Premier was in Opposition in September, 1968, he said the following in relation to the Budget speech:

The Treasurer may find it necessary to get extra money for hospital expenditure in South Australia, but let us not conceal the fact that this \$2 tax is a straight impost that goes into the Treasury and is not designed to improve insurance:

That was a proposal to charge \$2 duty on insurance to raise revenues. This appears at page 1159 of *Hansard*, 1968:

A \$2 impost on every car owner in South Australia is a flat-rate impost that falls much more heavily on the poorer people of the community than it does on the others.

What has been the record of this Government since it came to office in 1970? This is now the most expensive State in the Commonwealth in which to buy an ordinary household car. We took out the figures this morning.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I thought you were talking about public transport.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We are talking about public transport and the Government's record and about a vote of no confidence in the Government in relation to the performance of the Minister regarding transportation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The motion deals with public transport.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister may attempt to distract me from the point, but I say that this is another aspect of the Government's performance in relation to transport in this State. I quote the charges levied in the States of Australia in relation to the purchase of an average household car. I have just read to members how the present Premier decried the fact that there would be a \$2 charge on stamp duty on the purchase of a vehicle. The average household car is the Holden Kingswood 202, which costs \$6 042. The same thing would apply to the other popular makes. In Sydney the total charges, including registration, third party insurance and stamp duty, for

buying that new car are \$260. The stamp duty is \$120 there. In Melbourne, the second highest, the total charge is \$328. In Brisbane, that city much maligned by the Government, the total charge is \$162; in Adelaide it is \$331. I will now give the details: \$62 for registration, \$89 for third party insurance, which comes to \$151; and then stamp duty is \$180—by far the biggest slug of any State in the Commonwealth, by a Government that says it looks after the poorer people. In Perth, another city under a progressive Liberal Government, the total charge is \$131. The Premier said in another Budget speech I recall, when complaining about the possibility of there being an increase in sales tax on motor vehicles, "This is aimed at the poorer people of this State. We are going to tax the tall poppies. We look after the little fellows." There are many people in this State, including those that the Government may like to call the poorer people, who may aspire to owning a Holden Kingswood sedan and, if they buy one, they will find that, under a Labor Government, they will pay well above the charges of any other State in this Commonwealth.

In conclusion, I say there are many other areas where the Minister has been flaunting before the public his high-falutin' schemes for public transport in South Australia. The Government has failed to produce the goods. Unfortunately, members of the public do not have long memories. We trust this debate will serve to remind them of what the Government has been saying during its tenure of office. The Government's record is appalling. The House should carry this motion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): It is rather difficult to know how to answer a charge that is not substantiated, but I will at least attempt to make a few points. Perhaps the Leader can take some notes so that when he replies he can tell us whether it was the pressure of his back bench this morning that demanded that the member for Gouger be removed immediately or another person be appointed shadow Transport Minister because the member for Gouger had been defeated in a ballot. Whether or not that is the reason for the motion this afternoon I do not know, because in the light of such a weak case there must be something that has not been stated this afternoon.

Mr. Tonkin: Whose case is the weak one?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the Leader will sit quietly and listen, which obviously he will not do, we will do our best to answer him. He said he was levelling this motion at the Government—and, incidentally, it is the amended motion that I presume we are concerned with and not the original one given to me, and it was based on broken promises, mismanagement, and neglect over seven years.

Mr. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that the Leader says "Hear, hear!" because I hope that in the reply he can produce the information he failed to produce when he moved the motion. He relied almost entirely, throughout the whole of his speech, on articles that the *Advertiser* or the *News* had printed. If there was not a newspaper in this State, I doubt whether the Leader or his research assistant would be able to produce a speech at all. I am not responsible for what the newspapers may state.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Have you finished? I think the position was made abundantly clear and the sham of the whole debate was exposed when the Deputy Leader started reading loosely from his press reports. The Leader was more astute but, when the Deputy Leader was speaking, time and again he was saying that the Minister had

forecast that something might, would, or could happen, but at no stage did either the Leader or the Deputy Leader come out and point to one positive statement that had been made or one promise that had been unfulfilled.

Let us go back to the policy of the Government, and I invite every member to go to the Parliamentary Library and read the policy speech which the Premier of South Australia delivered to the people and which the people endorsed. Let us look at what the Premier said in 1973 on transport and traffic planning, because in 1975 in the last policy speech transport did not feature, as we were in a continuing process. The Leader laughs: he has to, to cover his own stupidity. This is what the Premier said:

Now to improve Adelaide's public transport system we will undertake the construction of a double-track suburban rail-line to Christie Downs, with provision for express services.

Has not anyone heard that that has been done? The Minister of Education's electors know it has been done. The speech continues:

Subject to the Bureau of Transport Economics evaluation, the commencement of an underground subway through the city of Adelaide . . .

Why was it not done? Surely I do not have to spell it out, even for the Leader. It is obvious. Then the policy speech continues:

The introduction of express bus routes . . .

Has that not been done? For the information of the Leader, I point out electrification has not been carried out because of the now adverse report of the Commonwealth Government. Members opposite are not laughing now.

Mr. Tonkin: You are blaming the Federal Government.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will come to the Federal Government in a moment, brother, and you will wish to hell you had not raised it! The next point raised in the Premier's policy speech was:

Improvements to metropolitan bus operations, including a pilot city centre distribution system.

Even the Leader could not be so dishonest as not to acknowledge that the Bee-line bus service is operating and is successful.

Mr. Tonkin: I wasn't, was I?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, the Leader was not, but that was about the one honest thing that he said in his speech. The Premier's policy speech continued later:

New reforms in the control, financing and administration of transport, including a programme of public participation in transport planning.

It is the first time that public participation in transport planning has ever occurred, and it is going on right now. I only wish that the one sensible member of the Opposition, the member for Torrens, was here, as he knows what has happened within the NEAPTR plan, because he has been kept up to date. He appreciates what is being done. He appreciates that the people of this State are, for the first time, engaged in participation in transport planning. Yet we have the Leader standing and saying, although every one of the items of the Premier's policy speech has been effected, that this Government stands condemned for breaking promises. The Government has fulfilled every one of those promises, and the Leader ought to know that. If he does not, he ought to sack his research assistants and get some new ones.

Let us now turn to what I think was the basis of his criticism, the MATS plan. The Deputy Leader had a little bit of a stir about this, too, but both he and the Leader fell into a trap, and I hope other speakers (including

the member for Gouger if he speaks) do not fall into the same trap as did the Leader and his Deputy. When the Labor Party was in Opposition in 1968-70 it made its position quite plain about where it stood in relation to the freeways and expressways mentioned in the MATS plan and proposed for the built-up areas of Adelaide where substantial demolition of property was involved. We went to the electors on that policy. I do not think that it ought to be necessary to remind members opposite that the Labor Party was returned with a large majority in 1970.

I thought my Ministerial statement about this matter was reported in *Hansard* in about February, 1971, after we had had a good look at the problems associated with the building of freeways and expressways as proposed in the MATS plan, but I cannot find it. The Government made a policy decision, which I announced, that said it would not proceed with the building of any of the freeways or expressways proposed in the MATS plan for a period of at least 10 years where those freeways or expressways involved the substantial demolition of property. That is not what the Leader or the Deputy is saying. They are still trying to run around suggesting that the Government rejected the MATS plan in its entirety. That is a complete and deliberate lie. What the Government rejected was the building of freeways and expressways. Indeed, there is a gentleman in this House at the moment who debated this question with me on the A.B.C. That is the fact of the matter.

Mr. Gunn: You're not being honest.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Eyre can do what he likes, but he cannot get away from the fact that that was the policy the Government announced in February, 1971. It has steadfastly followed that policy entirely.

Mr. Gunn: Absolute nonsense. You're not telling the truth.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member can say "absolute nonsense": that is about the level of his mentality. I am telling the honourable member what is the policy of this Government, and I defy him to point up one instance where it has deviated from that policy. The honourable member can read every *Hansard* he wishes, and he will see that the Government has not deviated from that policy. Let us look at the patronage of members on the other side. Clearly, the Leader wants freeways to be built, but he has not got the guts to say so. Let us not forget one very important point, which the member for Mitcham will remember because he was then a member of the Liberal Party. Sufficient political pressure was put on the then Government (and the member for Mitcham was then Attorney-General in the Hall Government) that it withdrew the Hills freeway because it was intended that it would go through seats held by Liberal members. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. Millhouse: Well, we withdrew it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I remember a Saturday morning, in company with the member for Mitcham, the now President of the Legislative Council (I think he was with us), and I think the Hon. Mr. Hill, when the Mitcham council took us along a street (I do not know its name) and pulled the bus up saying, "Have a look at those lovely homes. That is what your Government is going to knock down". The Government then withdrew it. It was all right to put a freeway down in the Labor areas, the working-class areas, but it was not all right to intrude into the money areas. That is the policy that the Leader is following today. He did not say where the Government stood,

and I challenge the shadow Minister to state the Opposition's policy. Will it go ahead and build these freeways if returned to Government, or will it not? The public is entitled to know. The Government has made its position plain; it will not build those freeways or expressways until at least 1981, if then. With the money position the way it is, that date can be put back at least five, and probably 10, years.

Mr. Tonkin: And you are content with that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. I am pleased that the Leader made that interjection, because he now confirms what was still a lingering doubt in my mind, that in fact the Opposition, if it was returned to Government, would build these freeways. I think that the people ought to be told that if the Tonkin group got into power there would be a freeway through the north-south that would cut a swathe through North Adelaide.

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader.

Mr. TONKIN: I have been misrepresented by the Minister, who is putting into my mouth words that have not been said.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader will have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. Tonkin: I thought it would be better to get it on record.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If this is objectionable to the Leader, he has a very simple way of getting out of it by simply saying where the Opposition stands. It will not say that. He will not say that. In fact, he is too dishonest to admit that a Liberal Government would be forced to build those freeways. Only one good thing would be on the side of the public, and that is that with the reduced funding from Canberra they would not be able to afford it. It seems that even age does not take away from members opposite the pleasure that they apparently get (and it is a strange sort of pleasure) from ridiculing Dr. Breuning. If any member opposite (and I say this with due respect to each and every one of them) ever aspires to have the knowledge and ability that Dr. Sieg. Breuning has, particularly in the transportation field, he would be a credit to South Australia. Of course, whether or not members opposite agree with what Dr. Breuning says is their decision. That is their right, but why must members opposite, such as the Deputy Leader, delight in reading only a few words of the lighter part of the report?

Mr. Goldsworthy: I didn't have time to read it all.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the Leader did not have time to do so, let me refer to him some of the points in the report, because I do have the time. The policy recommendations made by Dr. Sieg. Breuning include:

(1) Foster public transportation in the central city and the near suburbs.

Is that a policy that the Leader and his colleagues would not support? The Government has accepted and adopted it. Is the Opposition saying that it would reverse that policy decision?

Mr. Nankivell: There's nothing new in it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Be that as it may, it was never done by a Liberal Government. To date, we have introduced certain features, and there are others to come, that foster the use of public transport. The best example of that is the transfer ticket. The former Liberal Government never introduced a transfer ticket in order to foster the use of public transport. It did not keep fares down to

foster public transport. To the contrary, the Liberal Government kept increasing fares. However, I will come to that aspect later. Policy recommendation No. 2, which presumably the Leader rejects, is as follows:

Develop promising transit innovations to improve service to the user.

Do members opposite reject that, too?

Mr. Nankivell: What does it mean?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I suggest that, if the honourable member cannot—

Mr. Nankivell: I am not silly.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member could have fooled me.

Mr. Nankivell: You've fooled me for a long time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Policy recommendation No. 3 was as follows:

Provide road and highway improvements to keep pace with growing demands.

Is that a policy that is also rejected by the Opposition? I have referred to three policies which any sensible Government would endorse but which the Leader and his Deputy are rejecting.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I don't know what they mean.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If that is so, it is a fairly good reason why you ought not to be in Government. Indeed, I doubt whether you ought to be in Parliament.

Mr. Tonkin: What grounds have you got for saying what you've said? You're not prepared to answer, are you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Goldsworthy: They're just half-baked words.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Policy recommendation No. 4 was as follows:

Prepare for future high speed routes by continuing acquisition of land as it is offered.

That is exactly what the Government is doing. Is that why it is being condemned? Are we being condemned because a former Liberal Government put out some maps called the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, and put a cloud over certain properties, thereby depriving the owners of proper access to the full market? Because the Government now comes in and rescues those people, is it wrong? That is a policy that is rejected when the Leader says that he rejects the Breuning report. One could go on and refer to various organisational and policy recommendations, not one of which this State does not need. Despite this, we get the childishness of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition talking about Dr. Breuning in the way that he did.

Of course, dial-a-bus could not be left out of this little contribution. Why is it that members opposite, especially the Leader and his Deputy, persistently refer to it in the incorrect way? Why does not the Leader stand up in this House and speak the truth? He knows it: he has been told it before, and I will tell it to him again. My department undertook a comprehensive study of the operation of dial-a-bus in Adelaide. Before that, the Director (who, unfortunately, has also come in for some unfair and unjustified criticism today) and I, having looked at dial-a-bus operations in three other places, found in every case that economically they were not a goer, and we started from that base. We returned here and said, "Notwithstanding that, we think that there is scope for us to have a further look at this scheme of transport," which we did. The professional people, not the politicians, returned to me with a firm recommendation that the scheme would not financially support itself.

Mr. Chapman: You dial a prayer instead of a bus!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That statement illustrates the stupidity of the honourable member. He ought to concentrate on his m.v. *Troubridge*.

Mr. Chapman: I need to, while you own it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member wants it to be returned to the Adelaide Steamship Company, the Government would be pleased to get rid of it.

Mr. Chapman: All I want you to do is stick to the point.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: And all I want the honourable member to do is sit down and keep quiet. Let me now return to the matter of dial-a-bus and stop this stupid and malicious talk that has been going on.

Mr. Nankivell: Who is being malicious?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader and Deputy Leader referred to it—

Mr. Chapman: They asked a series of questions, and we're waiting for the answers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A gentleman then came into my office and said that he wanted to give dial-a-bus a go. We talked to him and told him about the report, in reply to which that gentleman said, "I do not believe that the academics have the answers. I ran a parcel pick-up delivery service and I believe that they are wrong." We then said to him, "Look, take the reports away and have a look at them. The facts are there to speak for themselves." When he returned, the gentleman said, "Will you please give me the opportunity to prove that the academics are wrong?" Was the Government wrong in doing that?

Mr. Venning: Yes.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member can say that; he is entitled to his own point of view. However, I do not believe that the Government was wrong in so doing.

Mr. Chapman: What authority did he have to advise the Government on dial-a-bus?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The gentleman concerned did not advise the Government. If the honourable member had been listening, he would have heard me say that this man came to the Government and said, "Please, will you let me run a dial-a-bus?" The Government advised him against it: he was not advising the Government. However, he wanted the opportunity to prove that the academics were wrong, and the Government gave him that opportunity.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And you had already rejected the idea, having first promoted it: he was a step behind you.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: My officers had strongly recommended to me that the scheme should not proceed because it was not economically viable. That was the situation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: So your first pronouncement was nonsense.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member had better keep quiet, because what he is saying is absolute nonsense. The Leader made an unkind reference to the report of the Director-General of Transport, delivered to me in September, 1973, and titled *Public Transport in Metropolitan Adelaide*. The Leader claimed that many of the projects mentioned in that report had not been delivered. I wonder about his eyesight; I think he should see an eye doctor. He referred to the Modbury rapid transit line's not having been built. If he were to read page 34 of the report he would find that, in dealing with the Modbury rapid transit line, the Director-General of

Transport said that this should have the highest priority, and that it should be commenced in 1983-84 and be completed in 1991. I have been criticised because we have not yet started that project, but the Director-General has recommended it should be started in 1983. The Leader made that point. It is unbelievable.

Mr. Tonkin: I don't want to upset you, but I did read that bit out.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Then why is the Leader criticising the Government, saying that it has broken promises in relation to the north-east area? We heard a good deal about the Government's having promised (I think the Leader used that word, but the Deputy Leader was a little more accurate when he said that the Minister had made a forecast) that the Christie Downs line would be electrified. I think one of those two speakers said that I hoped it would be done by 1975, while the other said that I hoped it would be done by 1977. We commenced the construction of the Christie Downs line on the basis that there would be electrification and that there would be new cars (the Australian Urban Public Transport train was the common train being developed nationally to try to reduce costs). Two officers were sent abroad because of the differing views on whether the electrification should involve alternating current or direct current. Subsequently, we engaged consultants to advise us. We were operating in concert with the transport authorities in Brisbane, who were looking to electrify their system. Unfortunately, by the time all these deliberations had been finalised, there was a drying up of Federal funds.

Mr. Nankivell: What year was this?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I want the honourable member to listen carefully. It was in the financial year 1975-76, the last year of the Federal Labor Government. I am not trying to cover up. I am not like the Leader, who automatically claps his hands every time Fraser cuts South Australia out of something. I acknowledge that we did not get from Canberra, in the last year of the Labor Government, what we had hoped to get; we have certainly got a lot less in the two years of the Liberal Government, with little prospect of getting any more. It is for this reason only that electrification has been shelved. Neither the Leader nor the Deputy Leader referred to the comment I have made publicly and also in this House that the electrification project has been deferred because of the withdrawal of Federal funding.

Mr. Chapman: By the Labor Government and subsequently by the Liberals?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Precisely. Next time he is seeing his Federal colleague and looking for funds for the Kangaroo Island runway, the honourable member might put in a word for the rest of South Australia. The offices of the Leader have never been used for that purpose; indeed, they have been used to the opposite effect.

Mr. Chapman: We got a better deal this time than we got previously.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased if that is the case. I would be the first to applaud it. Unfortunately, too many people on the Opposition side want to play Party politics instead of looking after South Australia. It is refreshing to hear the honourable member speak in that way. We have been accused of increasing charges. I do not know what has happened to the Leader's staff, but apparently he has not caught up with the press statement I made this morning stating that fares have been reduced considerably in the southern suburbs.

Mr. Chapman: Did you get a whisper that there was going to be an attack upon you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am waiting for that attack to happen. It has not happened yet. When is it to be? Cabinet decided yesterday to reduce fares in the southern suburbs by from five cents to 30 cents, depending on the length of the trip. Does that support the view of the Leader that our charges are too high?

Mr. Nankivell: They must have been. That is why you reduced them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We reduced them because we said that there should be no disadvantage simply because of private operators.

Mr. Tonkin: So they were too high?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Of course they were too high. We would not have reduced them otherwise. What a stupid question for the Leader to ask.

Mr. Chapman: It was a good point that the endorsed Liberal candidate for Mawson brought to your attention a couple of weeks ago.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Mawson, the Minister of Education, has drawn to my attention over a period the problems associated with transport in that area.

Mr. Millhouse: He is not the only one to have done it. I have done it.

Mr. Mathwin: We have all done it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think the member for Glenelg has done so.

Mr. Mathwin: You didn't know there was a parking problem at Flinders a couple of months ago.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Is that true? Not only have we reduced the fares in that area, but we have introduced a new feeder bus which I hope will provide the level of service that the honourable member for the district has been seeking.

Mr. Tonkin: But can we depend on its happening?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the Leader sits quietly and relaxes, everything will come to pass. The trouble is that he wants to jump around and to make all sorts of wild accusations about broken promises. He does not say what those promises are. He talks about mismanagement, but I do not believe that he is justified at any stage in talking of mismanagement in the transport industry. We have some tremendously capable people managing our transport services. He spoke of neglect. We do not know which areas of neglect, and we do not hear much about that. Many improvements in the public transport systems of South Australia still are needed, and no-one, not even the member for Glenelg, can give one instance of where I have stated that we now have satisfied all our needs. Indeed, we are still patiently waiting for the new buses to come off the assembly lines of Pressed Metal Corporation so that they can be put into service. They are coming off all too slowly, but at least they are coming off now, and concurrently we are able to do two things. One is replace many buses which we took over from the private operators and which are more than clapped out. They are causing a problem by failing to turn up or by being late. They are the cause of the transport system not being reliable.

Mr. Tonkin: Rubbish!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader can say that that is rubbish. How silly can you get? A bus breaks down and does not turn up, but breaking down is not the cause of its not turning up! I wish the Leader would keep quiet or go outside the Chamber, because statements like that are quite foolish.

Mr. Chapman: It seems that you bought a bit of a pig in a poke, if they were clapped out buses, as you have described them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Does the honourable member suggest that we leave those areas without services until we get new buses? That is a situation that cannot and should not be tolerated, even from a Liberal Government, and we certainly would not do it. I would have expected the Opposition to produce something worth while today. Parliament has not met for several weeks and I would have expected that in the intervening time the Opposition would have been able to produce a case worthy of answering. However, the case that has been presented today is quite hollow. There is no foundation in any points that the Leader or the Deputy Leader have made.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's taken a long time to answer no case!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It has given me the opportunity not to try to answer a case but to put facts before the Opposition that I otherwise would not have had the opportunity to put today, and I thank Opposition members for that opportunity.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): We have heard possibly one of the poorest speeches delivered in this House by the Minister of Transport and I am sure that the speech has been of that calibre because the Minister has not the answers to the challenge placed before him this afternoon by the Leader and the Deputy Leader. The Minister referred to the policy of the Labor Party in 1973 and then implied that nothing was mentioned about transport in 1975 because it was already good enough. The Minister concluded by saying that many improvements were needed. Why did not the Government introduce the improvements in that 1975 policy speech? One part of the policy speech stated:

We will upgrade public transport, providing a circular inter-suburban bus connection and an east-west Bee-line service in the city.

We have been talking about broken promises. If that was in the policy speech of the Labor Party in 1975 we could take it as a promise, but neither of the two aspects has materialised. A Question on Notice was asked by the member for Heysen on April 12 (page 3301 of *Hansard*) and replied to by the Minister. The question and answer are as follows:

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Will the Minister of Transport take the necessary action to extend the service of the Bee-line bus to enable people to travel to the Royal Adelaide Hospital from both the railway station and Victoria Square and, if not, why not?

2. What is the cost of providing the present service to the community?

3. What would be the cost of extending the service to the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The Bee-line bus service could not be extended from the railway station to Royal Adelaide Hospital without adversely affecting the present standard of service and, as the main purpose of this service is to provide a public transport link between the major passenger transit terminals at Victoria Square and Adelaide Railway Station, it would be impracticable to extend the service to the Hospital. Public transport between Victoria Square and Royal Adelaide Hospital is already available on the St. Peters, Paradise, and Newton bus services.

In the policy speech, therefore, the Minister said that he would do this and on April 12 this year he explained how impracticable it would be. I ask how much thought had gone into that policy statement by the Minister.

The second thing was the circular intersuburban bus connection, but before I deal with that I should like to comment on the position of the bus service in metropolitan Adelaide at present. We are all aware of the unsatisfactory service. As a matter of fact, the Minister admitted a few moments ago that buses operating broke down and services could not be maintained, because of the standard of the buses. I suggest that this is mismanagement, and one of the points that the Leader has mentioned is mismanagement by this Government in the area of public transport. I should like to trace some of the history of the buses. Apart from quoting newspaper reports, I will later mention and accept what the Minister has said regarding quoting from newspaper reports and I will quote from other sources. A report in the *Advertiser* of September 22, 1976, stated:

"Dead" buses have gone to new roads. Three years ago, hundreds of "retired" MTT buses filled large storage depots at Wingfield and Northfield—gathering dust waiting for buyers. The buses had reached the end of their economic life by the MTT's standards and were pulled off the roads by the dozen when the present new buses arrived. The traffic manager for the bus and tram division of the State Transport Authority said yesterday: "We haven't had a spare bus for a long while. They were sold fairly readily to interstate buyers, private operators and the like. We don't expect to have any available for another 12 months or so."

He said some buses would be available after new Volvo vehicles arrived late this year, but not in the quantities of three years ago. The STA looked for 12 to 15 years service out of a bus so it would be years before such a surplus occurred again.

If the Government had foresight, these buses would not be sold and some could have been used satisfactorily now. In order to get the new buses produced, Freighters Limited was taken over by the Government in conjunction with Leyland (Australia). A report in the *News* of April 12, 1976, stated:

GIANT S.A. BUS DEAL

In a multi-million dollar deal announced today, Leyland Australia is to take over Freighter Industries bus-building complex at Royal Park. Leyland will take over about 70 existing orders held by Freighters . . . The State Transport Authority contract involves body-building work on 66 Leyland Swift chassis and 310 Volvo chassis.

Time went by, and questions were asked of the Minister as to when the buses would be ready for service. On December 2, 1976, I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy the following question:

In the absence of the Minister of Transport, I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy whether approval has been given for the design of the body frames for the new buses being built for the State Transport Authority for service in the metropolitan area and whether any of these new buses will be commissioned for service before Christmas. On September 21, the Minister of Transport said that approval for the design of the body frames had not yet been given and, therefore, it was not possible to provide any information on the delivery of these buses. On October 6, the Minister said that there was hope that some buses would be commissioned for service this year, so I ask what progress has been made in providing the new buses.

He replied:

My recollection is that the answer to the two questions is "Yes" . . .

Approval had been given for the body design, and also buses would be produced prior to last Christmas. I am not using a newspaper report for my information this time, but am quoting from a letter signed by the Minister and dated January 10, 1977, which states:

I refer to the question you asked in the House on December 2, 1976, with regard to the new buses being built for the State Transport Authority. The design of the

body frames for the new Volvo B59 chassis has been resolved and the body frames are now being built. Five frames are in the course of construction and window assemblies, seat frames and other materials are being delivered to the Pressed Metal Corporation bus body factory at Royal Park. With such a major contract for 310 bodies to be mounted on bus chassis, of which the body-builders have had no previous experience, there are many design features which must be thoroughly investigated and resolved during the initial bus body construction. These matters are now being resolved and the work is progressing satisfactorily. Due to the Christmas holiday period, the first complete bus is expected to be delivered at the end of February. From this time onwards, there will be an increasing build-up in the deliveries with a rate of four or five buses a week expected to be achieved by the end of June, 1977.

(Signed)

Yours sincerely,
Geoff Virgo,
Minister of Transport

The Minister said that the body-builders had had no previous experience, yet I come back to the news release of April 12, 1976, that Mr. Andrew, who was involved with Leyland Australia, had said that Leyland's two bus plants (A. B. Denning, in Brisbane, and Pressed Metal Corporation, in Sydney) were significant forces in the Australian coach and bus-building market. He said that the additional capacity now available to the Leyland group would reinforce the company's overall prominence in the bus market. Here we have a firm with interests in Brisbane (and we all know the fame of the Denning bus body-builders), and we have the Sydney experience, yet the Adelaide firm did not have the experienced body-builders to get the buses out.

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

Mr. RUSSACK: That is how I understood it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was a new type of body that had never been built in Australia before, hence they had no experience in this type of construction; that was the point being made.

Mr. RUSSACK: I accept the Minister's explanation. A bus was delivered on February 23, 1977; in fact, it was driven off the line by the Premier. But apparently since then there has been a break-down in the production of these buses. A report in the *Advertiser* of June 16, 1977, under the heading "STA hit by delay in supply of new buses", states:

It would be some time before improved bus services could be provided in all areas of need, the General Manager of the State Transport Authority's bus and tram division (Mr. F. R. Harris) said yesterday. Mr. Harris said the authority was faced with many demands for additional and improved services, especially in new housing estate areas.

These demands had to be met on a priority basis. The authority had 377 buses on order, but only seven had been delivered. Because of delays in the supply of new buses it had not been possible to withdraw some old buses previously operated by private companies before the take-over by the STA.

Along the line, there has been mismanagement and, apparently, misstatements concerning the delivery of these buses, which should have been out months ago, so that the services to the public would not be in the state they are in today, and there would not be the breakdowns.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Whom are you criticising?

Mr. RUSSACK: I am criticising the Government, which is responsible to see that provision should have been made.

Mr. Allison: The buses were ordered in 1974.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes, on December 21, 1974, a news release announced a \$10 000 000 order for 310 Volvo buses, yet two and a half years later only seven have been put into service. The *Leader* (which has north-eastern circulation)

of July 13, under the heading "Bus service extended to Plaza, Modbury Heights", states:

The State Transport Authority has extended its service to Tea Tree Plaza and Modbury Heights on bus route 544. Tea Tree Gully M.P. Mrs. Molly Byrne said State Transport Minister Mr. G. T. Virgo had informed her of the extended service. She said the service would be extended via Ladywood Road, Brunel Drive, Roebling Street, DeSassenay Crescent and MacAdam Street to Ladywood Road returning to Tea Tree Plaza via Ladywood Road and the present route. Mrs. Byrne said the extension had been brought on ahead of schedule due to the completion of necessary roadworks. "No additional buses are needed to extend the service," she added. "Further bus service improvements can be expected as the Government takes delivery of more of its fleet of new Volvo buses currently under construction."

I draw the next paragraph to the attention of the House and ask the Minister whether there have been any new negotiations made with the bus body-builders:

Mrs. Byrne said following recent successful negotiations with Leyland Australia the Government anticipated all 376 new buses would be on the road by mid-1978. During the delivery period improvements to services will be made in outer areas and at the same time, ageing buses prone to frequent breakdown will be replaced.

I recall that on one occasion, when I challenged the Minister about the roadworthiness of these buses, he accused me of being a scaremonger, yet now the Minister has admitted that this is the actual case.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They are not unroadworthy, and I refute entirely any suggestion that they are. You ought not to be making those sorts of statement.

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

Mr. RUSSACK: Again, I am not basing my remarks merely on a newspaper report, because I was at the opening of the Morphettville bus depot and heard the Minister announce that Adelaide would get a new bus ring route service by July or August. True, the Minister covered himself because he did not say in which year.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is it August yet?

Mr. RUSSACK: Even if it is not yet August, the Minister is at variance with some of his officers. I refer to the following report:

A circular bus route by-passing the city centre and giving suburb-to-suburb transport will begin by August. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) said this yesterday at the opening of the \$5 500 000 Morphettville bus depot. The new route will take in the Arndale shopping centre and follow Torrens and Regency Roads, Hampstead and Muller Roads, Poole Avenue, O.G. Road, Payneham Road, Portrush, Cross and Marion Roads, Henley Beach, Holbrooks, Grange, Crittenden, Findon and Woodville Roads.

The service will operate at 15-minute intervals and link 30 existing bus routes, 27 schools, four major shopping centres and the Glenelg tramline. Mr. Virgo said he was confident it would begin in July or August.

I now instance a contradiction, because a report quoting Mr. Harris states:

The new service will not start until about 375 new Volvo buses have been delivered. Mr. Virgo said the first of the new buses was due off the production line this month—about 12 months behind schedule. There have unfortunately been delays by the manufacturers over which we have no control, but those difficulties have now been rectified.

What is the true position? Is the Minister correct that the ring route service will commence operation in July or August (I understand that the Minister meant this year), or will this service be delayed until the 375 Volvo buses come off the line? Both statements cannot be correct. Is another broken promise on its way? It well could be. I leave the question of the buses at this point,

but I have dealt with this matter in detail because I am certain that misleading statements have been made and that the public has been hoodwinked regarding the delivery of these buses and the introduction of new services.

Mr. Tonkin: It's all a public relations exercise.

Mr. RUSSACK: True. On October 6, 1976, during the debate on the Appropriation Bill, I asked a question concerning funds being set aside for transport research. Although it involved the sum of \$99 900, I thank the Minister for the additional information he gave me. Transport research projects are now proceeding at a cost of about \$1 000 000.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is that bad?

Mr. RUSSACK: It is not bad, provided the results are there and provided that they are implemented and that the people, the travelling public, benefit from that research. It is about time the Government implemented some of these results if it really means what it says. I refer to the North-East Area Public Transport Review, costing \$300 000. I hope that that money will not be wasted and that a good solid public transport system in that area will come from this review. The Leader referred to an underground railway in Adelaide. The central city underground link investigation has cost about \$10 000; urban bicycle track facilities, \$10 000; air-cushion vehicle development, \$20 000; and a pilot bus location system, \$100 000.

The Government has spent about \$960 000 in transport research from Loan funds. From general revenue we find that \$8 000 was spent on a public transport map, \$49 000 on scholarships and fellowships, and \$14 500 (only a third of the actual cost) on a State Transport Authority management study.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You would have to support all of those.

Mr. RUSSACK: True, provided the results are there, but the public is now not getting the services that it should.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you saying that we should not support scholarships at Flinders University?

Mr. RUSSACK: No.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What are you saying?

Mr. RUSSACK: I am telling the House what the Government is doing at present in relation to expenditure. Part of the reply given to me, under the heading "Central City Underground Link", states:

Various studies in connection with this project have been aimed at assessing the physical problems and construction costs. Preliminary investigation of geological and other subsurface conditions have been completed for relevant areas in South and North Adelaide, and the most recent study, completed in early 1976, examined alternative locations and routes and their estimated cost. This led to the conclusion that for the immediate to medium future the cost of such a scheme would be well beyond likely available resources. As a result, further work in this area will be devoted to investigations of alternative means of achieving city centre distribution.

Other results: the bus operations studies on ways of improving bus efficiency and speed of operation are beginning to bear fruit, as evidenced by the minor improvements to the King William Road, Greenhill Road intersection which were specifically designed to improve bus operation.

However, there has not been much improvement of bus operations in metropolitan Adelaide. I could refer to other matters concerning mismanagement, for instance, the

withdrawal of rolling stock or carriages from suburban passenger lines, thus causing people to have to stand. A report of March 18 states:

The South Australian Government announced a multi-million dollar plan yesterday to upgrade the metropolitan rail fleet. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) said the plan was long-term and was aimed at improving passenger comfort and service efficiency on suburban runs. He said tenders for 13 new railcars for suburban runs had been called last week. The new cars would replace old carriages which had been taken out of service for safety reasons. It was likely the new cars would come into operation next year. Mr. Virgo said part of the plan included the replacement of engines in the existing motorised metropolitan fleet. Mr. Virgo said he did not know how long the programme would take or what the final cost would be.

I suggest that the Minister should know what the final cost would be, or at least the estimated cost, and should know when the programme would be completed or at least under way. This is the point that we are bringing out: mismanagement by the Government and especially concerning transport. The Leader referred to the Cavan bridge. We had been told that this would be commenced by July 1. I pass the site frequently, but I have not seen any work being done on it. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): This has not been the best debate that has ever been held in this Chamber, but I guess it has not altogether been the worst either. Its mood has varied. I do not know that I am starting off the best way that I have ever started, either. However, I should like to put it into some sort of context, especially when people refer to promises, by quoting from the *Advertiser* of February 18, 1947.

Mr. Becker: How many years ago is that?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Opposition has led us through a somewhat historical excursion, and I do not see why I should not reply in kind. The *Advertiser* of that date reported on the then Premier's (Mr. Playford, as he then was) policy speech delivered at Birdwood. It is interesting to see what that gentleman had to say about transport, and I quote:

The standardisation of railway gauges would afford a unique opportunity for the electrification of suburban passenger services, because it would be possible to use standardisation funds. In conjunction with the electrification of suburban services, it was considered necessary to duplicate the Goodwood to Marino and the Woodville to Henley Beach lines. The establishment of an electric railway between the Adelaide station and Glenelg was also considered necessary.

I wonder whether they were promises being made at that time. In terms of what honourable gentlemen opposite regard as promises, clearly they were promises made 18 years before that Government left office. Some of the work in question was done, because I am well aware that the Goodwood to Marino line was duplicated.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was duplicated only as far as Brighton; we took it further.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Minister of Transport reminds me that I am being rather over-generous to that Government. It did not complete that programme, but some duplication took place: let us be fair. However, there was no electrification of suburban services, no new electric railway between Adelaide station and Glenelg, nor was there standardisation of railway gauges. That was beyond the ability of the Playford Government on its own to be able to deliver. We are aware of what happened to the standardisation of railway services: the Chifley Government went out of office and the matter was conveniently forgotten, and the funds available under that standardisation

programme, if the then Mr. Playford is to be believed, were also conveniently forgotten. All of this has a familiar ring to it. It is obvious that no South Australian State Government will be able from its own State resources to electrify suburban services. The Minister of Transport has indicated how it was that the funds suddenly were no longer available for the electrification of the present metropolitan services.

What my colleague has said has further credibility added to it by the experience of those forbears of honourable members opposite. It always amazes me that Opposition members are willing to demand all sorts of upgrading of services, but when statements come from Canberra about cutting down public expenditure, and when statements are made which lead to less money being made available to the States, we hear absolutely nothing. In a different context, I have on three occasions called publicly for the Opposition to make some sort of statement of its position in regard to funds for education, but we have heard nothing from it. I do not expect to be allowed to go on in that vein, but I draw the attention of the House to how vital are the decisions of the Loan Council in the provision of public facilities, and to the way in which recent decisions of the Loan Council in the past two financial years have not been in any way condemned by the Liberal Party in this State. At the recent Premiers' Conference the Loan Council was told by the Commonwealth that only 5 per cent more money would be available for public expenditure programmes in the capital area this financial year than was available in the past financial year. That 5 per cent has to be predicated against an inflation rate that will be at least 10 per cent and can be as much as 15 per cent.

Mr. Becker: You don't know: that's not true.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Does the member for Hanson really suggest that in this financial year inflation will be less than 10 per cent?

Mr. Becker: I don't know, and neither do you.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course it will be more than 10 per cent. Last year when inflation was well above 10 per cent, and something like 14 per cent, the States received an extension of only 5 per cent in their Loan raisings. In two years we see something like a reduction by one-fifth in State effort in the capital programme. If there is any area that is more subject to the effects of public financing than public transport, I do not know what it is. If Opposition members want the answer to the question why more has not been done, we should consider the decisions of the Loan Council. We should remember that decisions of that council have no impact on the Federal deficit.

I am well aware that the Liberal Party generally has a phobia about the Federal deficit, but Loan Council decisions have no impact on the Federal Budget and its deficit. The decisions simply control the amount States can borrow that they must be able to repay from their own resources, yet in the last two financial years the States have been limited to a 5 per cent increase, in money terms, in their capital programmes, leading to a real reduction of effort of about 20 per cent overall. Consider what that has meant in terms of public programmes generally, the building of education facilities, the building of hospital facilities, and particularly in the provision of public transport. However, that is not the only area of capital funding available to the States. For some time the Commonwealth Government (and this has sometimes been the subject of adverse comment from the Liberal Party in this State) made funds available to the State in the form

of special purpose grants under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution. We welcomed this, because it enabled us to initiate several programmes, but that, too, has been drastically slashed.

I have figures that can be made available to the House if members do not believe what I am saying in this connection. Generally speaking, the funds made available to the States have declined over the past two years, particularly in connection with capital programmes. What do members opposite really want us to do? Do they believe there should be massive diversions of funds to cover these sorts of deficits, because there certainly has not been the additional money to enable us to take this action? What about the payments for the buses about which so much has been said? Is it not true that the present Fraser Government reneged on an undertaking in connection with those buses? The result was that in the last financial year it was necessary for this Government to find \$22 000 000 from the surplus to pay for these buses. If that funding programme had been continued by the Commonwealth, \$22 000 000 would have been available to this Government to enable other initiatives to be carried out for public transport. I have often said in this House that many transport problems are partly subject to non-transport solutions. Many things cannot be done in the city in relation to the provision of any form of transport because of the way in which the city has developed. The whole matter of planning is vital to public transport.

We have listened for some time to the Opposition in an effort to get some idea from it what it believes should happen in connection with planning. This afternoon we got a brief hint. I want members to listen carefully, because I believe I have unearthed a new policy initiative from the Opposition. I am not sure that the Opposition meant it. I rather feel that the script writer of the Leader of the Opposition threw in this sentence because it made the story sound good. If I am wrong and if, in fact, this is a new policy initiative from the Opposition, I am willing to apologise and I think the people ought to know about it. The Leader said that the State Government had ignored inner urban redevelopment, and the effect of this had forced more people to live on the fringe of the metropolitan area, increasing the costs to the community for the provision of public transport services; I heard the Leader say that. Does any member deny that that was said?

Mr. Russack: We had a motion on that matter last session.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There was no suggestion in anything put forward by the Opposition (and precious little was put forward) that there should be an aggressive policy of inner urban redevelopment for Adelaide.

Mr. Allison: We had a motion on that matter last session.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I recall it, and little came forward from the Opposition that was positive. Is the member for Mount Gambier saying that in that debate his Party put forward positive proposals for inner urban redevelopment? The Opposition did not do so. Is this a new policy initiative that we have got from the Opposition? It involves a movement away from the whole concept of the bungalow on the block of about .1 hectare and the traditional type of subdivision.

Mr. Becker: What's this got to do with transport policy?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Leader introduced the matter. If the Opposition really wants to force people to live together more closely in inner Adelaide, it should

say so. The only people who have been supporting any sort of inner urban redevelopment in the last few years have been members on this side of the House. When I was Minister in charge of housing certain things were done; for example, I refer to the Home Park developments by the Housing Trust. I can recall the member for Glenelg criticising this, because of the advantages that he thought accrued as regards the concept of people living in the normal suburban subdivisions, involving a further expansion of metropolitan Adelaide. The Opposition needs to sort itself out on this aspect of the problem. If the Opposition wants inner urban redevelopment, that will affect the ability of the community to be able to provide transport services. At the same time, it will do some violence to what appears to be the clearly expressed preference of people to be able to live in the traditional bungalow on a block of about .1 hectare in a subdivision.

Where is the Commonwealth Department of Urban and Regional Development and its programmes? One of the great initiatives of the Whitlam Government was to try to get far more resources allocated to our cities and their fringe areas. This initiative has been done away with completely, and it has not been handed back to the States. The finance is available nowhere from the Commonwealth, either indirectly through the Loan programme or directly through the Commonwealth Department of Urban and Regional Development or any other department.

I stress what the Minister of Transport has said in relation to the State Government's programmes for providing further transport facilities, particularly for people in outer metropolitan areas. The two railway extensions in South Australia over the past 20 years have both occurred when a Labor Government was able to cut the ribbon and enable these things to happen; I refer to the Tonsley spur line and the extension to Christie Downs. References have been made to the Scrafton report. Is the Opposition aware that land has been reserved and acquired so that the Scrafton report can be proceeded with? Is it aware that this report is not simply gathering dust? The Government has committed money for the development of some of the facilities mentioned in the report. After hearing the Leader or the Deputy Leader, one would assume that they knew nothing about the acquisition and reservation of land for this purpose.

I am pleased that additional transport facilities will be available to my own constituents. When the State Government was forced to take over Briscoe's bus service, it took over a service with a significantly higher fare structure than that of the Municipal Tramways Trust or, as it is now known, the Bus and Tram Division of the State Transport Authority. Of course, it is not a light decision to agree to reduce fares, because of the impact it has on other Government programmes, but the decision has now been taken. In addition, a feeder bus service will soon be available that will allow people to move from Morphett Vale East through the main shopping centre of Morphett Vale and on to the Christie Downs railway line at Lonsdale if they want to do so. I believe the Minister said in his press release that this service would be available in two weeks or three weeks. This will be a great facility that will allow people to come in from the eastern side of Morphett Vale to do their shopping in the Morphett Vale area. In addition, the House should be aware that a bus depot will be established at Lonsdale to enable the southern area to be one of the centres providing bus services.

If one searches through Government reports back to 1970, one finds that public transport in this State was

unco-ordinated. At that time reports were made by the Highways Department, the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board, the Metropolitan Transport Committee, the Metropolitan Tramways Trust, the Commissioner of Railways, and the Transport Control Board. There was no overall or partial co-ordination of these instrumentalities providing for urban transport. Now, of course, in the State Transport Authority, we have the machinery for proper co-ordination to take place. The authority is a tremendous advance, and this planning tool is now available to the Minister of Transport in a way that was certainly not available to his predecessors. We have moved to provide a greater co-ordination of the various instrumentalities which, collectively, provide public transport in the metropolitan area.

Adverse comment was made about the public transport map that shows the various bus routes available in Adelaide. That map has been so successful that the State Transport Authority is issuing yet another print of the map to ensure that sufficient maps are available so that people can move easily around the Adelaide metropolitan area. I wonder how often members have had to catch a bus in another capital city and have tried to work their way through the various routes and time tables that might be available in those capital cities. It is important that all these routes be set out, because there is little point in having a transport facility unless people know how to use it effectively. As I was saying, we do have effective co-ordination in providing transport facilities to metropolitan Adelaide. As some of the resources about which we have talked gradually become available it will be possible to upgrade these facilities further.

That is a far more constructive approach to the problem than the approach that was made by the last Liberal Government in South Australia of which we have any knowledge, the Hall Government, and its commitment to the private motor car and to massive urban freeways. I was appalled to hear the Leader say that he regarded a clearway and a freeway as the same. Members can check the *Hansard* pull tomorrow to see whether I am right, but I am sure he said that. A vast difference exists between the clearways programme and the building of freeways. A major difference, apart from traffic differences, is in cost. If members opposite wish to see further upgrading of public transport in South Australia (and surely everyone wants this, as it is the move to the future), we cannot simply pile more and more motor vehicles on to the roads: we must use more efficient means of moving people to and fro around our cities. For that purpose it is important that the programmes that were initiated by the Whitlam Government should be revived to ensure that our cities are revitalised so that people can live in a decent urban environment. If members opposite wish to do anything in this regard, I suggest that they put whatever pressure they can on their colleagues in Canberra to ensure that the cities do not again become neglected areas as they are again becoming as a result of the dismantling of these programmes.

Mr. Mathwin: The Whitlam Government put the axe on it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That Government started—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg and the honourable Minister of Transport are both out of order. The honourable Minister of Education has the floor.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have tried to demonstrate to the House that one just cannot print money and expect facilities to be provided immediately. One must have the ability to raise public

finance so that these capital facilities can be provided. Decisions made by the Loan Council in the past two years have had a disastrous effect on the ability of the States to do these things. Furthermore, with the dismantling of programmes through which special grants to revitalise our cities were made available during the time of the Whitlam Government through the Department of Urban and Regional Development and other instrumentalities, such as the Cities Commission (all of which have gone), there seems to be no prospect of increased funds.

Finally, the Leader said that, as a result of this and other problems (which he did not specify but which he promised would be specified later in the session), support for this State Government was falling rapidly. That is nonsense. I wonder whether members of the Liberal Party have had an opportunity to peruse the *Age* of July 9 at page 4 at the so-called *Age* poll. That poll makes it perfectly clear what is the current state of support for Parties in South Australia. It is as follows:

In South Australia, where support for the Australian Democrats—

that is a new Party about which we are not too sure in South Australia but perhaps the member for Mitcham will tell us more about it later—

was 7.4 per cent, the Labor vote rose fractionally from 51.6 per cent to 51.8 per cent. At the same time the Liberal/National Country Party vote—

that is the Eastern States' designation, which I know is not quite relevant here—

fell from 40.1 per cent in March to 35.2 per cent.

If we assume that the "don't knows" divide their vote in the same way as the others, the State of support for the Parties, according to the *Age* poll, is 54.9 per cent for the A.L.P., 37.3 per cent for the Liberal Party, and 7.8 per cent for the other group, the Australian Democrats or whatever they call themselves. This report shows that what the Leader was saying about the decline of support in this State for the A.L.P. is utter nonsense, as is much of what he said about State transport.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to comment briefly on what the Minister of Education said about buses and how those costs could be reduced and services within the metropolitan area improved. As much as he and the Minister of Transport attacked private operators and the type of buses they were using in the metropolitan area before the Government took them over, I would say that those buses were on time, they seldom broke down and that they gave no trouble to the private operators when they used them. The Minister made the accusation that the buses bought by the State Transport Authority from the private operators caused the authority trouble through break-downs, so that they did not turn up at the appointed time. Those buses were not "clapped out" as the Minister said, because the private operators kept to their schedules, and the complaints now being received by the State Transport Authority about these services were not received by private operators. The Minister can laugh, but that is a fact. Often drivers of the privately operated services carried out their own maintenance and cleaned the buses themselves.

The Minister of Education said that the Government was forced to buy those buses. He asked what was the alternative. The Minister in charge of this area knows the alternative because he discussed it with his departmental officers at the time. He knows that in Victoria a different system operates and that the Government offers a subsidy to private operators to enable them to continue their

services. The false and rotten accusation made by the Minister of Education against private operators charging higher fares is a disgrace to any Minister, whether he be the Minister of Transport or the Minister of Education. The private operators are not subsidised. The State Transport Authority is subsidised from general revenue to the extent this year of over \$10 000 000, and maybe over \$12 000 000. Let us be honest about this. The State Transport Authority's fares are subsidised by the general taxpayer of this State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you suggesting they should not be?

Mr. EVANS: No; I am saying it is a rotten accusation to make against the private operators that they do not operate efficiently when they cannot make their services pay. That is the rotten accusation the Minister has been making in this House for two years, and the Minister of Education, who I believed had a few more principles than that, set out the same platform today; he should be ashamed of it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know that what you're saying is untrue.

Mr. EVANS: No, it is not; it is fact. Let me give some examples in that same field when we talk about a public transport system conducted by the State Transport Authority under the present Minister of Transport. If a high school had wished to hire a bus to go from, say, Unley High School to the Chinese Art Exhibition on North Terrace a few weeks ago, the fee from the State Transport Authority would have been \$45; from the private operators it would have been \$32. If geological students at that high school wanted to hire a bus to go to Victor Harbor, the State Transport Authority's first price was \$145, but with pressure put on it it quoted a special price of \$125. The high school is within another State department and it is within the curriculum of the school that the geology students must do this work. The private operator wanted \$95 as against \$125 as a special price by the State Transport Authority. I suppose the Minister will say they are clapped-out buses. In the case of a Virginia visit for geological students from the same school the price was \$70.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who got the job?

Mr. EVANS: In some cases, because the private operators do not have the buses available, they are forced to go to the State Transport Authority, which rips off our State schools, and in many cases the parents of the students have to pay the full commitment. Many of the students come from poor families who need some support, and they are the ones to be ripped off by the State Transport Authority. For biology students to go to the Coorong, the State Transport Authority's bus cost \$260; the private operator's charge was \$180. Let us be honest.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who got the job?

Mr. EVANS: The Minister can ask what he likes about who did the job. These are prices quoted by the State Transport Authority for children in this State; it is a deliberate rip-off, compared with the prices of private operators. The Minister can yack on for all he likes. He has a relevant letter in his office. His own colleague, the Hon. Anne Levy in another place, received the same information on the same day as I and the member for Mitcham received the information about Unley High School, because there is concern about the matter. In the case of the children who wish to go from Enfield to Salisbury College to participate in sport and wish to go at 3.30 p.m., the figure is about \$50 for

the return trip for a State Transport Authority bus. How can parents meet that sort of cost? It is unreasonable, and the Minister knows it.

Recently, teachers at Salisbury Primary School have waited to see whether the State Transport Authority's buses turn up to take the students home, but they do not arrive; so the teachers wait around until 4 o'clock, but there are no buses at the appointed time. What do the teachers do? They cannot let the students start walking home because in our society today there is so much fear by the parents about lack of security; so they have to organise private transport to take the students home because the State Transport Authority bus did not turn up. That was unheard of when the private operators conducted those services. The Minister laughs; he thinks it is funny, but I assure him that the teachers and parents are concerned that students are being left at schools without facilities to get home, when the State Transport Authority's services should be available to them.

Dr. Eastick: In Salisbury it was after 5 o'clock the other night.

Mr. EVANS: That is another case. I had phone calls from people in Salisbury who were concerned about that situation. If this was not a general debate, I would not be raising it because it is out of my field; but in a general debate like this where we are talking about the neglect of the State Government in the transport area, I have pointed out neglect in that field. I want to show how there are double standards. When the Minister of Works (the Deputy Premier), who has much power in the Labor Party (he is called the corporal or colonel), wants an extra two buses to Athelstone in a peak period, they are provided but, when other places want buses in the outer areas at off-peak times, they get none.

Let me go through some of the areas where there are no night services from the State Transport Authority buses. Before doing that, perhaps I should refer to the following statement that the Minister made on August 28, 1974, about a 12-mile suburban run planned for buses around the outer areas of Adelaide:

A 12-mile route is planned for a new bus service circling Adelaide which will begin operating by October next year. He said that at least 23 buses would be used on the service and that they would run about every 15 minutes. Twenty months later, on May 19, 1976, the Minister made almost the same statement, that there would be a big boost to the city's public transport. This was in the *News*. The Minister may say that the *News* reports are not accurate, but I believe this article to be as accurate as was the one of August 28, 1974, in the *News*. On May 19, 1976, we find that the Minister's press secretary was short of a news item, and the Government needed publicity again, so they came out with the following statement:

Major improvements will be made to Adelaide's public transport system in the next year. The changes will be made as new buses now being assembled come into service. Among the improvements planned by the Government are a suburban bus service circling Adelaide on a continuous 19 km route, a second Bee-line bus service in the city running on an east-west route; a simplified two-tiered fare system for buses,

and so it went on. Those things have not eventuated.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're opposed to them all, are you?

Mr. EVANS: I am not saying I am opposed to them: I am saying they are not available. In the *News* of January 3, 1973, the Minister gave the public the impression—I use that expression because he hates to say that he definitely promised them—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Did I?

Mr. EVANS: I am not saying that; I am saying his intention was to give people an impression and, if a businessman did that today in any field, the Attorney-General would be the first one to get on to him about misrepresentation. Here, the Minister can do it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You'll have a hernia in a minute, the way you're going on.

Mr. EVANS: I may if I have to keep looking at the Minister. He believes he can get away with misrepresentation; he believes that he can do it day in and day out, and that any criticism is unfair. He said on January 1, 1973, that Adelaide would get an all-night public transport service. We can look at some of the areas involved: from the city to Hillcrest Hospital, at varying intervals, with no Sunday service.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is the same as when the private operators gave it to us; we did not hear any complaints from you when they ran it, though.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister said that the people could look forward to an all-night public transport system by the State authority. I am now looking at the State Transport Authority's latest schedule of services, not at the private operators, so let the Minister pipe down for a moment and accept that I am talking about the representation he made to the news media to inform the public of what he intended to do. We find that he says in relation to the service from the city to Felixstow there are hourly services, no service at nights or on Sundays.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Another private operator.

Mr. EVANS: The State Transport Authority is organising all this. For the service from the city to One Tree Hill, weekdays and rush hours only; from the city to Redwood Park, every 50 minutes, no night service. Then, if one wants to move into the area of the member for Mawson—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Far too many private conversations are being conducted in the Chamber. The honourable member for Fisher must be heard.

Mr. EVANS: If one refers to that area and the southern areas, one finds that they, too, are neglected. Public meetings of residents who are concerned at the lack of suitable public transport in the area have been held there. The Minister has tried to help remedy the situation to some degree by lowering fares, and no-one is complaining about that. However, he should do the same for other areas that believe they are disadvantaged by high bus fares. I refer, for instance, to the Mitcham Hills and Stirling areas and areas to the north of the city. The Minister should, if he is genuine, help those areas also.

Having heard about the public meetings, the Minister thought that there was a possibility that the Willunga train line could be reopened. He therefore set up a committee to examine the feasibility of that proposal. His statement was made for one purpose only: to cover the Minister's tracks until after the next election. That is exactly what it was designed to do, because there was no sincerity in that statement. The Minister knows that he has no intention of opening up that line. He is merely hoping that the people down south will believe that it is a possibility. However, I assure the Minister that the people concerned have heard this promise too often, and they cannot trust him any longer. If those people want an example of how the Minister cannot be trusted, I refer to the statement made by the Minister today that, when the freeway proposals

were put up by the Liberal Party, many people were left in doubt regarding what would happen to their houses. The Minister said that the Government of which he is a member had removed the cloud that hung over those people.

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

Mr. EVANS: Oh no! The Minister said that the Government of which he is a member set out to remove that cloud. I will give a more recent example. On Sheoak Road, Upper Sturt, there is a house construction of which has just been completed and the retail value of which is \$51 000. That house has never been lived in. The Minister's department was contacted before construction of the house commenced, and the potential builders were told that there were no problems: they could build the house there. The house has been completed for two months, and its owner now wants to sell it. The person concerned wrote to this very honourable Minister's department and asked, "Can I sell this house? Is there any reason why I must disclose to the new owner provisions relating to the Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan Act or any other Act?" The person concerned received a reply comprising one full page of what might happen in the next 15 years, which would mean, if it did happen, that a new road would take about 2 metres of the front wall of the new house. The final paragraph stated:

There is no infringement of the road widening Act or no Act that we know that will be detrimental to the home in the meantime.

So, what happened thereafter? The very thing about which the Minister spoke earlier, that is, people having a cloud over their head and losing equity in their property, is happening right now. I must point out that this house was built after advice was sought from the Minister's department. Now, the owners of this brand new house, who do not now want to live in the area, cannot sell it because no-one wants it. The Minister is false and dishonest in his approach if he believes that he can keep doing that sort of thing to people.

The people in outer metropolitan areas do not want to hear from the Minister's airy-fairy statements about dial-a-bus, hovertrains or some other form of futuristic transport. Those sorts of schemes may be carried out in other countries which have greater needs than ours and which, in many cases, have much greater financial resources, and certainly with as much technical expertise as we in Australia have. If such schemes are left to those countries, we will reap the benefit thereafter without squandering our money.

However, there are practical areas in which we can help the disadvantaged outer fringes of Adelaide. Any member of the Labor Party who represents an outer metropolitan area would understand the disadvantages suffered by its residents. Let us examine those disadvantages in relation to public transport. In the main, it involves young married couples with young families who cannot afford to be paying off a house or owning two motor cars. Therefore, if one partner is working, the family motor car must, because of the lack of public transport, be used by the working partner. As a result, the non-working partner who looks after the family must stay home with no means of getting to any point in an emergency, except by taxi or in a friend's vehicle. There is no other way for those people to travel, because they are virtually devoid of any decent public transport system.

Waste and neglect have occurred in this area, money having been spent on futuristic ideas instead of on the everyday mundane and practical things. I personally believe (and I have not discussed this matter with all my colleagues) that, when the Government spent money

on putting air-conditioning in buses, instead of buying other buses to put on the road and thereby provide an additional facility for the public, it went in the wrong direction. We do not need to buy big Volvo or Dennis buses. We could have bought the smaller types of bus used by private operators for the outer fringe areas, because those buses have advantages, the first of which is that they are not as wide as the State Transport Authority's regular buses. They do not, therefore, take up as much room on the narrow streets on which they must travel in outer areas. Consequently, they do not cut to pieces council roads, many of which were not meant to be used by the authority's heavy buses. Those buses are all overweight when fully laden, although under a special provision they are permitted to operate. The buses carve community roads to pieces, to the disadvantage and at the expense of ratepayers. Had we not provided air-conditioning on buses run by the State Transport Authority but instead had provided additional buses of a size similar to the type of bus used by private operators, these people would have had a transport service by now.

The people whom we are disadvantaging are those young people in the lower income group. If a family is rich enough to afford two motor cars, it is not disadvantaged. The people who have been disadvantaged are those whom the Australian Labor Party falsely claims to represent. Here is proof that it does not do so. That Party has neglected those people, having promised them at every election that it would improve their public transport service. However, it has not done so to a satisfactory standard, and all of us, including the Minister, know that.

There has, therefore, been mismanagement on the part of the department over which the Minister has control, in that the department has not maintained the buses that were taken over from the private operators. Those buses are continually breaking down, as the department admits. Private operators did not experience the inconvenience of such breakdowns. The Government has neglected general public transport within the State.

The Deputy Leader mentioned the cost of registration and stamp duty on new vehicles, such as the Holden Kingswood, and compared the figures with those in other States. The purchase price was \$6 042. In Sydney, the total figure for registration, third party insurance, stamp duty, and so on, was \$260, in Melbourne it was \$328·90, in Brisbane \$162, in Adelaide \$331, and in Perth \$131. Because of the lack of public transport, some people are compelled to use private motor cars. The Government is attacking the person in the lower income group, particularly the person on the outer fringes who has no public transport at his door. Such families need a motor car, and in some cases they need two cars. They have been slugged; the rip-off is against them by a Government falsely claiming to represent them. It does not do so; it rips them off at every opportunity, talking about helping them, although it never does.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I thank you, Sir, and honourable members for having facilitated this debate, and I thank my colleagues who have used so effectively the material supplied. I should like to place on record my complete and absolute dismay at the poor performance put up in defence by the Minister of Transport. It is about the equivalent of the performance he has put up as Minister.

Mr. Becker: Pathetic!

Mr. TONKIN: Absolutely pathetic. The Minister of Education, who rushed in and tried to defend him, did not help. There is not very much I can say about the remarks of the Minister. He said, first, that we relied on newspapers only. May I say that the Minister relies totally on newspapers to put misleading impressions to the people of South Australia. It is only right that we should examine those papers.

Mr. Becker: Would you say he is a headline hunter?

Mr. TONKIN: Not necessarily; he is just someone who is prepared to put up a misleading impression for the people of South Australia. On his own admission, he has not made any promises and he did not really mean any of the things he has said. Half truths can often be more dangerous than outright lies, and the Minister knows that well. He put all sorts of words into the mouths of Opposition members because it did not suit him to face the facts. He talked about free-ways and clearways and said that he would not do anything involving demolition of houses and property, and yet he has systematically gone on acquiring properties and saying that, in some magical way, a rapid transit system will not involve the demolition of those properties.

The object of the exercise is to make certain that the Minister keeps open all the options without doing anything. That is all he has done. He knows, and I know (because I have seen, as he has, some of the transport developments in other countries) that private firms in other countries, large corporations, would have been delighted to come to Adelaide and could have been invited to Adelaide in 1971 by the Minister if he had taken the trouble to do so. They would have examined the situation and would have been happy to survey and make a quote for the form of public transport system they manufacture. Whether or not that system would have been suitable, whether a light rail system or any of the less futuristic and more practical schemes available would have been applicable in South Australia, and in Adelaide in particular, is another matter, but no action has ever been taken in that respect. We have a department with a Director-General who is remarkably talented; I know that. For the Minister to try to wriggle out of his own incompetence by accusing us of saying anything to reflect on the Director-General is about true to form for the Minister. I suggest that he should look at *Hansard* in the morning.

I will not have words put into the mouths of Opposition members. It is not for us to say what we would do at this stage but for the Government to defend what it has not done. Obviously, the Minister has used every trick of the trade in trying to defend an impossible position. We are supposed to feel guilty because we are attacking the poor fellow. Perhaps he will say that the attacks have been malicious! We have made allegations without any foundation, he says. Basically, he is the one who has been making allegations without foundation, asking questions, and wasting time. It comes back to the proposition that the Minister says he really did not make any promises. If we take away the parade of weak excuses, the bombast, the innuendos, the confusing and misleading statements he has made, and the false imputations, all we have left is the statement that he really did not make any promises at all. That was all he could do.

The Minister said we should sit down and relax for a while and everything would come to pass. That sums up his philosophy in the transport field and the philosophy of this Government. In the meantime, presumably, he will go on making statements. Apparently he does not mean and has never, on his own admission, really meant

any of the things he has said in the press. That is not good enough. It is the biggest confidence trick ever played on the people of South Australia. There are others, and we intend to expose them, too. In the circumstances, I strongly urge the House, and particularly those fair-minded and honest members (if any) of the Government, to support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Coumbe. No—Mr. Abbott.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker and Messrs. Arnold, Dunstan, McRae, and Russack.

Library: The Speaker and Messrs. Allison, Broomhill, and Simmons.

Printing: Messrs. Max Brown, Harrison, Slater, Vandepeer, and Wotton.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1978.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply, out of the general revenue, the sum of \$190 000 000 to the Public Service for the year ending June 30, 1978. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$190 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill, which, together with the detailed Estimates of Expenditure for 1977-78, I expect to present to the House in a few weeks time. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill, also for \$190 000 000, was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. The Bill now before the House is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until the latter part of October, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is usually complete and assent received. The Bill provides the same kind of authority as has been granted in the Supply Acts in previous years.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 5.47 to 7.30 p.m.]

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That a committee consisting of Mr. Broomhill, Mrs. Byrne, and Messrs. Dunstan, Langley, and McRae be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, and to report today.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

4. We join in Your Excellency's expression of regret at the premature vacation of the office of Governor of this State by Sir Douglas Nicholls and with Your Excellency wish him a long and happy retirement.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

I think that I speak for everyone in expressing my sorrow at the sad resignation of Sir Douglas Nicholls. I do wish him and Lady Nicholls best wishes for the future. I also express my high regard for the way in which His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor has carried out his duties. He has been a diplomat of some renown and it speaks volumes for him that, with such aplomb, he took over the duties of Sir Douglas Nicholls at the time of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and carried out those duties so excellently. I join with His Excellency in recording the appreciation of this House for the services of the late Sir Glen Pearson, Mr. Tom Stott and Mr. Geoffrey Clarke, and join with him in expressing sympathy to their families.

This motion provides an opportunity to discuss some issues of general importance which I propose to canvass briefly. In my speech, I shall deal with matters both of the past and of the future and, if I might, before beginning, I will refer to a matter futuristic that has come to our attention today, namely, the new electronic bell system. It seems to me that, while giving due credit to the Public Buildings Department for its excellent efforts in this regard, it is to me something of a cross between the theme song of *Planet of the Apes* and a dentist's drill. I think that, if we were covered by workmen's compensation (and we are not), the Government could face a grave case of noise-induced hearing risk.

Mr. Tonkin: It's definitely a medical hazard.

Mr. McRAE: I see I have some strong support. This electronic wizardry places you, Mr. Speaker, in a potentially marvellous situation, because I can think of you ringing the changes, as it were, on various occasions. For example, today at the opening of Parliament, why not have bells with the theme from Hail, Hail the Gang's All Here? Or, if we have a very dramatic division, why not the opening bars of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony? After all, if we have a particularly sad division, why not one of the intermezzos, perhaps from Cavalleria Rusticana? The mind boggles at what you now have at your disposal. As for your eminent counterpart in the other Chamber, what could possibly be more appropriate than a Gilben and Sullivan song from *Iolanthe*? After all, the words themselves (up in the air sky high, sky high) probably

suggest many things to many people. I shall be interested to see what developments we get.

Some seven years ago the Labor Government returned to office with the largest majority it has ever had in this State, with resounding public support and with great confidence in what could be achieved. The last seven years may well be regarded as one of the most significant periods in the history of this State. One would have to turn to the 1890's to find such a volume of legislation which has changed the whole style of life and which has provided a new sense of community planning and development and aid to the underprivileged. Not since the 1890's has there been such visible evidence of public building. Hospitals, schools, Government offices, cultural centres and a huge road programme are all present for anyone to judge as they wish. The whole social fabric has been changed by new approaches to recreation and entertainment in clubs, hotels, restaurants, and the like. The whole field of industrial law has been changed, and in particular in workmen's compensation, very much for the better.

Planning (while it is true that it has been somewhat bogged down in detail), is nonetheless a great advance on what existed before. In one sense that is not difficult, because an absolute minimum existed before, and in some cases nothing. Anyone who lives or works in the outer suburbs can easily contrast regions of an earlier time (for example, Para Hills with its total lack of facilities) as against new regions with their excellent sense of planning.

Historians may remember Sir Thomas Playford for changing South Australia from a rural economy to a mixed economy, and Don Dunstan for his great achievements in the field of urban planning and development. So, too, there have been achievements in education, community welfare and, of course, complete new departments have been created in fields such as the environment. I would suggest, therefore, that South Australia, in that brief time, has been changed beyond recognition in material resources and lifestyle and that many of the problems which plagued earlier generations in the fields I have mentioned have now been removed. No Government and no people can, however, stand on past achievements. We, as Australians, seem to have reached a critical point in our history.

There are many indications that this is so, in particular inflation and unemployment existing side by side at very great levels. At the same time there is a sense of confusion, sometimes bewilderment and resentment in the community. Moreover, a number of issues confront us at this period that threatens to divide us. The uranium mining question has a built-in capacity to split the community apart.

So, too, the tax structure is such that many working in and taking the risk of private industry bitterly resent the huge tax payments they make to the Treasury and demand that this be reduced at any cost, including the cost of breaking up the social welfare programme. This resentment seems ever more to spread throughout all wage-earners, and it is true that Australians do pay huge taxes. People point to the unintended effect of Medibank. This programme was designed to provide for the 1 000 000 people estimated in the early 1970's to be living below the poverty line in Australia.

It has achieved a social security never present before, but it has also provided a yet further increase in the earning capacity of the medical profession, which was in any event one of the richest sections of the community to begin with. This programme is now extended to dental

care and, while this is in itself a good thing, consequently the same sort of result I predict will occur. In a nutshell, whereas before 85 per cent were provided for reasonably at their own cost privately and the remainder shabbily at public cost, now we are all provided for at our cost and the cost per person has escalated frighteningly. Unfortunately, progress of this sort by providing guaranteed incomes tends to increase greed rather than decrease it. Practitioners who were before happy to work in Government hospitals for part of the time for little or no reward in return for the wide range of cases and research facilities now demand enormous fees as well.

The extension of the legal aid programme is seen by many to have a similar result. It is lamentable that professions which did have a sense of sacrifice, and very truly showed it, should be changed so quickly for the worse. And, meanwhile, a younger generation has now arrived on the scene. This generation shows an appropriate demand for the high level of security of employment and income we have promised but, unfortunately, cannot so easily provide. At the same time, there has been an alarming increase in vandalism and, still worse, crimes of personal violence in the community, particularly amongst the young.

Thus, while there is an enormous demand, and a legitimate one, for public housing, guaranteed levels of income and increased social welfare programmes, there is also tremendous pressure for reduced taxation. It is obvious that all these Government programmes can continue only at the cost of continued high levels of taxation and perhaps increased levels. These conflicting demands will also provide a potential split in the community, and I suggest that all these issues tend to be highlighted because of a massive blow to community confidence and self respect.

Australia has experienced inflation and unemployment before, but perhaps never with the same awareness that our capacity to solve the problem is heavily reliant on other countries and regions. Until recent times Australia was isolated from the rest of the world in a way that most people thought was quite splendid. Australia maintained its own programme of development and social reform while totally ignoring the whole of South-East Asia and, for that matter, the whole of the rest of the world except to the extent trading and defence alliances required it. But now we find ourselves squarely a part of the Asian region. To exist, we have to export, and we can no longer export on our own terms. If we want guaranteed trade with Japan we have to accept imports from Japan or Japanese manufacture in Australia. But that is a minor factor compared to the development of Asia itself. Until recent times Western countries piously supported development in Asia, all the time knowing that all that would ever happen would be a continuation of the system by which two-thirds of the world starved while being exploited to maintain minimum standards for the white one-third.

That is no longer the case, and increasingly we will find that rising community standards in Asia will have their impact on us. So far we have had only the petty annoyances of tea shortages or increased prices. Even then many of us felt amazed that the natives (as we have been educated to regard them) can now afford to drink most of what was a reduced crop. But most of Asia, quite rightly, now demands that the living standards of its people be increased and the misery reduced. Our pious statements will now be found out. It is likely that our

living standards will have to be cut to accommodate the living standards of our neighbours. I say that that is self evident given that human resources are finite.

The reduction of standards would have occurred anyway if we had been genuine in what we said but, of course, we were not, and even now our grants to our neighbours are frighteningly low. We simply are too small and weak to continue our arrogant display of wealth in the midst of so much suffering. I think we need to reassess ourselves to regain confidence and composure, not to mention to regain our achievements. The starting point for community reassessment lies in realism and in getting a perspective in world history and geography. It must be acknowledged that Australia is in a most strategic position and that all of the great power blocks have more than considerable interest in our future for that reason, and also because of our great mineral wealth.

We need to acknowledge that Australia is part of the world and that it inevitably has duties and responsibilities which will be made much easier if we develop coherent internal policies now. Our current inflation and unemployment are largely due to shifts in international capital and investment and it is necessary that we decide now on what terms we ought to, and can, deal with countries wanting to invest.

Mr. Evans: You are saying that people who buy from us cannot afford to maintain our standard of living.

Mr. McRAE: No, I am saying that we have to accept the reality that, in order to increase the living standards of the whole of the world, we will have to cut our living standard. I am saying that you cannot increase the living standards of the whole world uniformly, while Australia still maintains its standard.

Mr. Evans: It's the same thing.

Mr. McRAE: Then I will not pursue it, and I continue by pointing out that we should begin by thoroughly understanding that our future development lies in accepting a responsible role politically and socially in the Asian region, and that in itself means a huge increase in aid to countries on our doorstep. The cost of this, however, may be more than offset by increased stability and understanding in the region. It is also necessary that investment policies gradually be enunciated which will ensure that we do not become a mining pit for the rest of the world. In the long run, it is far more important to gain employment security rather than to take royalties.

If others want our minerals then we should insist that they manufacture here, at least in part, and provide employment here with built-in safeguards. The proposed petrochemical works at Redcliff is surely an example of what to do. The last five years of our history have seen a series of events which have had a great short term impact but an even greater long term impact. The advent of the Federal Labor Government in 1972 coincided with a massive downturn in the Australian economy. Much of what that Government promised, and set out to do, was in the long-term interest of the country, but the hard fact is that too much was sought to be done too quickly.

And so, as investments declined and unemployment increased and wage movements, in real terms, slowed to a halt, the tax burden became more and more apparent. What we promised to pay on yesterday's capital does unfortunately assume no future reduction of asset. However, I disagree with those who maintain that the main burden of our problem is wholly economic. That is real enough but, if that is all it was, then I say we could cope

with it without too much turmoil. The real problem lies, not in the people's pockets, but in people's minds. There seem to be five very real problems.

First, whatever the rights and wrongs of the Kerr episode, it demonstrated only too clearly the fragile nature of our Constitution. That document is, after all, an artificial attempt to marry American Federalism with British constitutional law, and the marriage has gone perilously close to divorce.

Mr. Millhouse: It has lasted for over 70 years.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, and I very much support the Constitution. I am merely saying that whatever the position regarding Sir John Kerr, whether he accepted Mr. Whitlam's advice or did not, he would have been viciously attacked by one political group or the other. Therefore, I say that that marriage has gone perilously close to divorce. The system can work only in its present form if conventions, which form an essential part of the British system but which are never written into a document are, in fact, universally accepted and honoured. Australia cannot afford Parties, politicians or anyone else who tampers with the Constitution. There is a vital need for the Constitutional Convention to be properly used and not abused. Politicians who cannot see that will earn nothing but the contempt of future generations.

Secondly, the constitutional crisis has destroyed the Australian myth that politicians are honest. As children and young adults we were taught, and came to believe, that while our politicians might be incompetent or muddled or even, in some cases, a bit of a joke, they were at least honest. When we said "honest" we meant honest with money and honest with us. We meant that whether their ideas were right or wrong we could at least, in general, believe the facts they told us. All that has been crushed by the constitutional dispute (and not helped by Watergate), and it is both Parties, not just one. The lying, the cheating, the misleading of Parliament, the misleading of the people, jobs for your friends and worst of all the manipulation of the basic institutions of a democracy have blackened the credibility of every politician. That, of course, is not fair, but it is true, and that sort of blow to people's honest beliefs, however silly, is terribly serious, and politicians have a responsibility, not to themselves, not to their Parties, but to the nation to put that right.

Thirdly, amid the pressure of taxation, inflation and unemployment, there is a very genuine possibility that people who do have a job but are under these pressures will break with every Australian democratic tradition and aim for two communities. My fear is that we could become another America with one community for prosperous people and another for the discards. That unjust situation must surely not be allowed to be contemplated but I truly fear that Mr. Fraser's attitude is to take advantage of prevailing community unrest and try to manipulate a breakdown of the social welfare system.

I certainly agree that people must no longer think of the Government as "they" and public money as "theirs". We should think of public money as "ours" and be on our guard against abuses. I would say that the British Prime Minister, Mr. Callaghan, could almost have been talking of Australia when he said, "We've been living for too long on borrowed money, borrowed ideas and borrowed time."

Fourthly, there can be no doubt that community morale is reflected in the crime rate. It seems to me no coincidence that offences like vandalism and offences to the person have increased markedly of recent years. I do not accept that this increase is mere coincidence. I consider it to be

part of the value that society places on respect for the law. Unfortunately, we have gone through a phase where we switched from over-disciplined homes and schools to the opposite. But every parent and every teacher must recognise that the crime statistics are simply the sum of a large number of individuals. These individuals once had the opportunity of respecting the law and authority and, if they did not, the odds are that they were never taught to do so in the home or in the schools.

In some cases our system of punishment has been so easy that it has not acted as a deterrent and I believe that, especially for crimes of violence, punishment needs to be heavier, but balance must prevail as there comes a point where severity ceases to be a deterrent. Balance is all, and we should reconstruct, for example, our basically excellent system of juvenile courts in a few directions, rather than destroy it. In the long run, if you want a lawful society, you can achieve it only by teaching people minimum standards.

I should further add that, while any person may in conscience break the law if he takes the punishment, people who advocate breaking the law on these grounds ought, in all justice, to make quite clear that punishment can be expected and also admit that if they are public figures they may get off more lightly and with less trouble than any of their followers.

Fifthly, there is the question of major division in society. I have already mentioned the question of the community's attitude to taxes. In the immediate future we face the massive problem of uranium exports. Unquestionably this will tend to split the community. Unfortunately, the extremists will take advantage of the sincere view of others, just as they did during the Vietnam war, and attempt to provoke violence and hatred. Indeed, they have already done so. Certainly those without jobs will resent those with jobs, like us, telling them that they have to give up work or give up the opportunity for employment. Because the Labor Party and the Liberal Party take a different viewpoint, many citizens will see the issue as merely Party political. It is amid this sort of controversy that society is further placed in jeopardy.

I say that there ought to be a referendum for the whole Australian people and that the minority in that referendum accept the wishes of the majority. There must be a proper opportunity, of course, for a public debate with equal scope for the "Yes" and "No" cases. Having identified what I consider to be the significant problems, I suggest that there are three points to make. First, since in my view much of this problem lies in public confidence, it is useful to recall that Australians have been at their worst in good times and at their best in bad times. No matter what we like to think, the image of the Australian in other countries over the last prosperous decade is of a person more brash, loud-mouthed, and arrogant than a Texan tourist. On the other hand, we recall the enormous courage and ingenuity of the settlers who opened up a very harsh land and of the farmers who made it produce. We can also recall the courage and foresight of the trade union leaders and Labor leaders who looked to a just society, and not least we should not forget the Armed Forces who in North Africa, the Middle East, New Guinea and the Pacific were a byword for determination and ingenuity. Everything that those men were capable of we are, too.

Secondly, I note with great pleasure that a move toward stability in the Constitution has been made with the appointment of Professor Sir Zelman Cowen as Governor-General. I think he may well be able to help in this area. Again, as I have noted, a Constitution is a piece

of paper and, just as in the 1890's people were able to unite together to form the Constitution, all Australian politicians, State and Federal, have a duty to be big enough to put the community ahead of Party and personal ambition to achieve necessary reform of the Constitution.

While on this note, might I also add that the expressions used by politicians against one another have a great impact on public confidence and expectations. If a politician accuses his enemy of conspiring to defraud the Treasury, as in the loans affair, or of conspiring illegally to bring down a Government, as in the Kerr affair, let it be understood that this smears every politician, not just his enemy. People will assume that, if one or more politicians are guilty of such a crime, then so will every politician be guilty. No doubt it is good for the ego of a person who thinks of a witty way of dragging his opponent into the gutter, but he should not forget that he is likely to retain some of the attributes of the gutter himself. Quite frankly, people are sick of posturing and gesturing, and it is time that common sense and logic prevailed.

Thirdly, I deal with the danger which I believe faces the social welfare system. That system is a heritage of trade union and Labor belief in a more just society. It cannot, however, work without a redistribution of income; it is simply impossible for the poorer to get richer while the rich get still richer.

Medibank is one of the most expensive of these welfare programmes and it is so because it is so capitalistic. Not all doctors, but some influential ones, apparently, take the view that their earning power must always be unaltered. Many other doctors, however, would be quite prepared to treat pensioners and other underprivileged people at a concessional rate and, in order to introduce some notion of public responsibility, we should be aiming for just such a thing in the field of medical aid, dental aid, and legal aid. Indeed, it was not so long ago that lawyers, under the legal aid scheme, were being paid 20c in the dollar of half the fee; today, it is 90c in the dollar of the standard fee.

Mr. Millhouse: In the past, they were sometimes not paid at all.

Mr. McRAE: Yes. Nowadays, it is not really a sacrifice; at least, I do not think it is.

Dr. Eastick: Particularly when they walk out part way through.

Mr. McRAE: If a person does that, he is a disgrace to his profession. I do not know of anyone who has done that. Unless we can be flexible and think of some way of reducing the burden on the taxpayer, the whole programme is in jeopardy. I do not want to appear to be over concerned with medical aspects of social welfare, but I think it is one way in which I can attempt to make my point. I feel very much that Mr. Fraser has it in mind to have one more Budget on the old lines, hold an early election late this year or early next and then cut the social welfare programme. He could save hundreds of millions of dollars simply by cutting indexation of pensions. Unless people are aware of the current problems and are prepared to think them through, we cannot progress. Public confidence and public involvement in overcoming these problems (if that can be secured) is half the battle. I believe that by leaving the dream land and facing these nightmares with the light of day we can and will overcome them, but short of that they will cause immense difficulties and sorrow.

So, in the next few years I believe that the Labor Government in this State, by providing a realistic lead in these matters of constitutional reform, public confidence, and public responsibility and by finding a solution to the problems of ensuring the continuation of programmes of social justice, will achieve just as much as it has in the last seven years. It will not be an easy time, and lack of money will stop many innovations. However, much can be done which does not require money and much can be done to use money more efficiently. In terms of legislation, this will be a time of much necessary but non-cost reform. That can be seen in the programme outlined by the Lieutenant-Governor.

I look forward to this Parliament (which in the past has led Australia and the world in many things) using its confidence and ability to help overcome the problems now facing Australia and our State.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, which was delivered by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. W. R. Crocker, because of the premature vacation of office of the Governor of this State, Sir Douglas Nicholls. It is regretted that, because of ill-health, his five-year term of office was foreshortened, denying him the opportunity to show his ability and potential. He was a remarkable man, and I did not realise how outstanding he was until I read *Pastor Doug.* by Mavis Thorpe Clark, a biography of his life to that date. When he took the official oath of office on December 1 last year he became Australia's first Aboriginal Governor, a symbolic recognition that the Aboriginal people are assuming their rightful place in Australian society.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Molly, have you read the book entitled *Kerr's King Hit*?

Mrs. BYRNE: No, I have not. His premature retirement was the culmination of a long and distinguished career filled with struggle and achievement. He was born at the Cumeruogunga Mission Station. In his early life he took an interest in sport, the activity that marked his entrance to serious football. His fame as a footballer put him in contact with many white Australians, and he became accepted by them. Later, he became the friend of a Church of Christ clergyman, and this friendship led to his involvement with the church and his commitment to becoming a pastor. Recognising the social and legal subjection of his people, he sought to have it removed not by upheaval but by constantly fighting for equal rights and opportunity wherever the social or political order threatened his people. He became involved with the Aboriginal advancement and rights movements.

In 1972 he was made a Knight Bachelor, Australia's first Aboriginal knight. It should be said that in all his work he was ably supported by his wife, who worked very hard indeed in the background. It could also be said, in the nicest way, that he rose from a mission boy to be Governor, a truly outstanding achievement, but an honour both he and his wife certainly deserved. When Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls took office they faced the formidable task of succeeding Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant, and did so with success simply by being themselves. I am sure that I speak for all South Australians when I say that we wish them a long and happy retirement.

As has been said by the mover of the motion, the Lieutenant-Governor is a distinguished South Australian and comes from a pioneering family that settled in South Australia more than 130 years ago. In his career he has

been scholar, soldier, diplomat, and author. He returned to South Australia to retire, but it can be said that because of his heavy public involvement he has not done so. That he has done the contrary has been to the benefit of our State.

In the Speech His Excellency states that, since the last opening of Parliament, four former members of this House have unfortunately died: Sir Glen Pearson, Tom Stott, Geoffrey Thomas Clarke and Howard Huntley Shannon, three of whom served in this Parliament during the time I have been here. Sir Glen Pearson served for 19 years, Tom Stott for 37 years, Geoffrey Clarke for 13 years and Howard Shannon for 35 years. To be in Parliament and in public life for such a long time speaks for itself and, on behalf of all members, I express sincere condolences to their relatives. When I first entered Parliament, although Sir Glen Pearson and I were on opposite sides of the House, twice he took me aside and gave me some advice. Of course, I greatly appreciated that advice and still remember it. It is interesting that, when I was a child attending primary school at Mylor, Mr. Shannon visited the school as the member of Parliament for that district.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech shows that, as in the past 12 months, the Government intends this session to continue its programme of reform, progressive administration and concern for the people of South Australia. The progress that has been made in community welfare, consumer protection, environmental affairs, legal reform, education, hospitals and health has given our State a quality of life that is admired. The Labor Government's achievement in raising South Australia's status from a backward State to one that has led Australia in many of the above spheres has so substantially improved the lives of South Australians that some people forget how much has been done. I am sure that the Liberal Party would not wish people to make comparisons.

The forthcoming year will be a crucial time for all Australians, as two vital and inter-related issues affect us all. The economic policies of the Federal Government are creating more and more unemployment, and it is starving the State Governments of the financial ability to provide adequate community services for its people. In addition, continual efforts have been made to take away what the State had achieved under previous administrations. The importance of Federal-State relations hinges on the fact that, while the national Government has the major role in formulating and implementing policies that will shape our community, State Governments are responsible for most of the services that affect people's daily lives: schools, hospitals, public transport, sewerage, community welfare, the police and road building are some of the areas of State Government responsibility.

For that division of responsibility to work effectively to the benefit of people living in the States, there must be co-operation and balance between the States and the Federal Government. The Federal Government's policies are producing unemployment, no security of employment, and a reduction in the level of services that can be given to the people in the States. Unemployment in Australia is already at a level of 5.4 per cent of the estimated work force. Should anyone doubt those figures, I will quote from a report that appeared in the *Advertiser* on July 9, as follows:

The number of jobless in Australia rose by 11 610 last month to 332 793 At the end of last month there were 332 793 unemployed—5.4 per cent of the estimated labour force of 6 200 000.

The personal and community cost of this tragic situation is high, and it is particularly devastating among our young people. The South Australian Government has tried to help unemployed people to the limit of its resources. In the past 15 months, \$17 000 000 has been spent on providing jobs for people that will benefit both the person and the community. Through local councils and Government departments the State Government has funded community projects that have given work to thousands of men and women. This past year alone more than 3 000 people have been given jobs under the State unemployment relief scheme. The scheme is to be expanded to cope with the growing number of people who are being thrown out of work by the policies of the present Federal Government. Recently, our Premier announced that an extra \$14 500 000 would be made available for unemployment relief. This extra money will make it possible to increase the number of people employed under the scheme from 1 100 to 1 500, and will help ease the trauma of unemployment for more people.

Apart from legislation enacted during the past 12 months, the State Labor Government has been busy administratively and has regularly made announcements through the Premier and Cabinet Ministers on behalf of their departments. Also, the following actions were taken: the Minister of Community Welfare appointed a Community Welfare Advisory Committee to inquire into problems of vandalism in South Australia; a Royal Commission was set up to inquire into South Australian shopping hours; a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the non-medical use of drugs; and a Royal Commission was set up to inquire into the administration of the Juvenile Courts Act. They are a few of the actions that were taken. In addition, many announcements were made by the Premier and the Ministers in relation to a variety of matters, and improvements were undertaken that affected the people of this State, but I do not wish to go through them now because they are far too numerous. Again, I mention that, when necessary, Ministers have been prepared to stand up and speak out on behalf of South Australia.

Judging by the list of legislation proposed, this session of Parliament will be as busy as the last one. In 1976-1977, in the second session of the Forty-Second Parliament the House of Assembly sat for 65 days. In 1975-76, in the first session of the Forty-Second Parliament, it sat for 45 days; in 1974-75, in the third session of the Forty-First Parliament, it sat for 74 days; in 1973-74, in the second session of the Forty-First Parliament, it sat for 69 days. I make that comparison. In quoting the figure of 65 sitting days in the last session, I wonder how many nights we sat. I daresay that, when the statistics are finalised and the book that is produced by the Clerks showing those statistics is presented to us, we shall be able to find out. I am pleased it has been decided that we shall sit for three weeks and then rise for one week.

I refer now to the Bills statistics of the last session, which are as follows:

BILLS

Introduced in House of Assembly	100
Lapsed Bills restored in House of Assembly	2
Received from Legislative Council	32
Total considered	134

Fate of Bills considered:	
Passed both Houses—	
House of Assembly Bills	92
Legislative Council Bills	26
	<hr/>
Negated in House of Assembly	4
Negated in Legislative Council	3
Laid aside in Legislative Council	3
Ruled out of order in House of Assembly	1
Current at adjournment—in House of Assembly	6
	<hr/>
Total	*135

* Land Commission Act Amendment Bill divided into two Bills in Legislative Council—(No. 1) passed both Houses and (No. 3) was negated in Legislative Council.

Referring to the proposed legislative programme, I am glad to see that the matters of off-road vehicles, environmental impact statements, adoption of children, residential tenancies, contracts, juvenile courts, consumer affairs, second-hand goods, and many other matters are included in a long list. Although it is not yet known what is proposed to be included in this legislation, I think we can anticipate the contents. I refer now to some parts of His Excellency's Speech that interest me, as the member for the Tea Tree Gully electorate. Paragraph 6 states:

Storage balancing tanks are being constructed to service the Morphett and Yatala Vales areas.

I am pleased that that is included because it is needed to supply water to some of the new subdivisions. Regarding the water treatment programme, the Speech states:

However, the works at Hope Valley are nearing completion and as a consequence a filtered water supply will be available from late October to 60 000 households in the metropolitan area of Adelaide. A further 50 000 households will receive such a supply in early 1979 when the Anstey Hill works are commissioned. In all, seven works are contemplated.

As the Anstey Hill treatment plant is vital to my electorate, its commissioning is eagerly awaited. Paragraph 12 states:

The effect of my Government's policy of expanding the electoral base of local government will become apparent in the ensuing year and my Government will continue to further its policy of encouraging local government to be responsive to and representative of its whole community.

I think the South Australian Government's introduction of universal franchise for local government elections so that every resident who is on the State electoral roll is now entitled to vote in council elections is one of this Government's greatest achievements; it is something I did not expect to see in my lifetime. Paragraph 17 states:

At the present time over 100 000 adult South Australians are enrolled in vocational, academic and personal enrichment programmes conducted by my Government's Department of Further Education and this number is placing considerable pressure on that department's resources. The Government will continue in its efforts to make facilities in this field as widely available as possible. In the metropolitan area special attention will be given to those areas north-east and south of Adelaide.

That is not elaborated on. As the Tea Tree Gully electorate is situated in the north-eastern suburbs, I trust it will mean some additional facilities will be provided to benefit that area. Paragraph 19 of the Speech refers to the implementing of the noise control regulations, and I look forward to that being completed. The next State election will be the first in South Australia's modern history to be fought on fair and equitable boundaries that put both Parties on an equal footing. The Labor Party can be proud that the objectives which it has worked for since the Party's formation at the end of the last century and which have been opposed by the conservative forces in this State for all that time have at last been achieved. The systems that actively discriminated against Labor in both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council

have been changed to the point where our constitution is now recognised as democratic. Again, I say I never expected to see that passed in my lifetime, either; it is a great achievement for the Government.

Dr. Eastick: What's the method of preselection in the A.L.P.?

Mrs. BYRNE: It is fairer than yours.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members continue to interject in this manner, I shall proceed to name them. The honourable member for Tea Tree Gully must be given the opportunity to second this motion.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Tea Tree Gully electorate, which I represent, is to be divided into two seats, Newland and Todd, and I look forward to this event. I do not want to let this opportunity pass without referring to some of the problems within this electorate, which have been caused by rapid development, and in an expanding community there is always an increasing requirement for additional facilities such as transport, kindergarten and/or child-parent centres, the widening and reconstruction of main roads and making intersections safe, etc. When the opportunity arises later in the session, I will expand on these matters, as I have done in the past. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I am pleased to be a part of the present State Labor Government under the dynamic leadership of our Premier, Mr. Don Dunstan.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ASSEMBLY BELLS

The SPEAKER: It has been reported to me that an honourable member missed a division because he could not hear the bells ringing. The honourable member claims that he was in the Liberal Party room at the time. An investigation has revealed that someone had deliberately tampered with the bells. I point out to all honourable members that, as this is a new system, it will perhaps take some time for everyone to become accustomed to it. If any member considers that the bells are too loud or too soft, I will, if he tells me the area about which he is particularly concerned, have the bells adjusted by the experts. If bells are to be tampered with in this manner, I think everyone can see what the effect will eventually be.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): Like all members, I am pleased that we are now in the third session of this Parliament. The way things are going, there is no doubt in my mind, or in that of the people of this State, which Party will be on the Government benches after this session. Indeed, it has been noticeable in this House, especially since the last Parliament, that the Opposition here is in disarray. This has been further illustrated in recent weeks in relation to the preselection ballots for the seats of Goyder and Murray.

Having returned from his oversea trip, the Leader of the Opposition noticed one thing: that he did not know anything at all about what was happening regarding the

agreement between the Liberal Movement and the Liberal Party. I assure members opposite that they have probably done another good service for me during the course of their campaigning in my district. They have called me many names: this sort of thing gets back to the member in the end. However, I assure members opposite that their actions have not been successful, and that I am quietly confident this time, having travelled around my district. I know that Mr. Wotton has noticed this. He probably has his spies out, for which I do not blame him. I should tell members opposite that yesterday I went down a street in Unley that was full of Liberal Party supporters and, for the first time, everyone took my card. One can see, therefore, that the Party on the Government benches is doing quite well.

Mr. Allison: But you know—

Mr. LANGLEY: The honourable member will get his turn soon. What he said recently, as reported in the press, has rebounded on him already, as the honourable member well knows. I should like to refer to a report headed, "Boundy wins Liberal Goyder ballot" in, I think, the *Advertiser* of July 5. I do not intend to read the entire report, the same thing having been reported several times. However, part of the report states:

Mr. Boundy, a former member of the Liberal Movement, won by 31 votes to 29. After the ballot, at Port Wakefield, Mr. Russack said he would contest the next State election as an Independent.

Mr. Evans: You're reflecting on the member for Pirie.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not. I am merely stating what was reported in the press. I intend to stand by it, just as the honourable member always does. He said the ballot was not representative of the feelings of the electorate and that it was a restricted ballot. That is what Opposition members always agree with. The report states:

... it was conducted under a "restricted ballot under the terms of a special arrangement worked out between the Liberal Party and the L.M. at the time of the merger." Mr. Boundy said: "Geographically it was probably natural that I won."

I congratulate him on winning. The report continues:

"But I think more importantly my win shows that country people understand the importance of the merger," he said. "This was the last step in the conditions agreed to under the Liberal-L.M. merger. The merger is now successful and complete."

I do not know what Party members opposite belong to. Many members on that side have been in the Liberal Party, in the Liberal Movement, and then back to the Liberal Party. I do not know where they will go next. Perhaps they will join the Democrats of the member for Mitcham.

Like other members, I feel sorry that someone has to win and someone has to lose, but in the preselection for the District of Murray an interesting statement was made by one of the contestants. On July 11, he is reported as having said that 32 delegates represented 5 500 electors in Heysen North and 26 delegates represented 11 270 in what was left of the old seat of Murray. In what is the outstanding statement of the year, he said that this was most undemocratic. Members opposite have never believed in one vote one value. They have voted against that principle at all times, and here we have one of their own members saying that the situation was undemocratic. It is a perfect set-up.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: The member for Eyre may say what he likes. He will have an opportunity to refute this statement. It is in quotation marks, so it must be truthful. The member for Eyre is no certainty for the next election.

I cannot work out the policy of members opposite. They do not vote for one vote one value, but when it hits home it is quite different. It is undemocratic! I have heard everything. When the relevant Bill went through this House everyone on the other side opposed it.

Members interjecting:

Mr. LANGLEY: They say, of course, that there is no split in the Liberal Party, but then they stand against one another. That is how undemocratic it is. Mr. Matheson, from the Country Party, has had something to say about what is going on. The member for Fisher had his say this afternoon, and I did not interject, as he is doing. I come now to one of the most important aspects of the matter. I should like to see the faces from here on of the member for Mitcham and others. In the last election held, the member for Mitcham was first past the post, the Labor candidate was second, and the Liberal candidate was third.

Mr. Whitten: What happens if the Labor Party runs third?

Mr. LANGLEY: Where would they want the preferences then? One could imagine what the members in these districts would be saying. They would be wooing the preferences of the Labor Party, which will control the seat.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The member for Rocky River knows that.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have had so many reports from people in Wallaroo and other areas that I think the member for Rocky River should be concerned about his seat. From the way in which Mr. Matheson speaks, the member for Rocky River might not get the Country Party preferences. Mr. Matheson is not too happy with the set-up at the moment. The Liberal Party has too many old players. Some members of the Opposition have been there too long. During the speech by the member for Tea Tree Gully, a rather rude remark was made about our members of Parliament regarding a plebiscite. If members opposite think that the unions control the election of members of Parliament here, I assure the House that there are more non-union members of Parliament than union members on the Government side. If members opposite can prove me wrong in that, I will be pleased to admit defeat, and what I have said applies also to members of our Cabinet. We run horses for courses. There is no doubt about that, and it has been detrimental to the Liberal Party.

Mr. Becker: But you—

Mr. LANGLEY: Today a note happened to come into my hands through a supporter of the Labor Party. I assure the member for Hanson that we have at least one supporter in his district. During the Address in Reply debate, I will have the opportunity to reply to his—

Mr. Whitten: Untruths.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. Some of the things that he has said here are a long way from the truth.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about the Glenelg preselection?

Mr. LANGLEY: I will not say any more about preselections, but the case of Glenelg would be one of the best of all time. The member for Glenelg said that the first collegiate was crook. Then they had another and he won. That shows that the Liberal Party does have crook ballots. I am pleased that the member for Glenelg won the plebiscite or collegiate. I will be pleased to see him back: I have nothing against him, but what I have said shows that their ballots are crook.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I wished to deal with another topic, but I am prompted to say something as a sequel to what the member for Unley has said. We in this House all know that the Labor Party, the Government, has managed to get its electoral redistribution through, and we know that any analysis of the boundaries shows that there is a strong bias in favour of the Labor Party. When we examine the voting pattern, it is clear that the Labor Party can win Government in this State with well under 50 per cent of the vote. The exercise indulged in by the member for Unley reminds me of the vultures coming in for the pickings. Members opposite knew perfectly well when they enacted this legislation that they would wipe out several country districts, and they knew well that this would throw friend against friend in the Liberal Party. It is not to their credit to come in at this stage to pick the bones. The Labor Party can teach us plenty about preselection.

We know what the member for Playford (Terry McRae) did when he was under threat from the left wing. He was forced into getting some of the heavies from the Labor Party to help him in the preselection. He was able to turn up with a union secretary with about 30 000 votes in his pocket, another person had about 30 000 in his pocket, and the poor sucker (I think his name was Harrison) had only 5 000 votes. So much for one man one vote and one vote one value! We know how the Labor Party rigged its elections. We do not have to go far back in your memory, Mr. Speaker. We remember the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for the city of Port Pirie at the last election. A man called Jack Phelan had the preselection votes in his pocket but, unfortunately, they were not much good to him in winning the seat. The seat was won by an Independent. The Labor Party, being so democratic, kicked him out of the Party. The Premier said, "Ted Connelly, you're on an ego trip. You're no good to us." What did they do? They booted him out of the Labor Party. He stood as an Independent and won the seat, and now you, Sir, grace the Chair as Speaker. The Labor Party can teach us plenty: we are learning from masters.

The United Farmers and Graziers organisation graciously invited the Premier down to open its conference yesterday and, being civilised, gave him a good welcome. However, I noticed that, when visiting members of Parliament were asked to stand up, there was a row of Opposition members, but no-one from the other side stood until the Premier turned up with his usual retinue. I think the Minister for the Environment was in tow.

Mr. Rodda: The cheer squad came along.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. They came along to listen to what he said, and then promptly left. The member for Rocky River was alongside me and, during question time, I was sorely tempted to question the Premier closely. However, the wiser counsel of my colleagues prevailed, so we let questions come from the floor of the meeting. The Premier put over a most phoney story in opening the conference, and I shall briefly outline the kinds of thing he said. He said that one of the values of being a politician was that one did things and they then became point-outables.

Mr. Rodda: Like Herefords.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. He pointed out the things the Labor Party had done. The point-outables in this case were a new school here and there. He pointed to a new school in the Eyre District and was able to point to the

Safcol installation in the South-East. He could also talk about the opening of the State Bank branch at Port Pirie. Those were the point-outables, and it was a weak show. He got on to health and hospitals and said that his Government was spending more per capita around the State (that record is so old that it is getting cracked) and how this flowed to country people. He talked about abolishing land tax (and what a big deal it was) and said that it was his Government that had abolished it. However, he failed to say that South Australia was the last State to abolish it. Then he made what I consider to be a most unfair and misleading reference to the record of the Government on succession duties, and went back to the time of Sir Thomas Playford to make the comparison. I think his words were, "Even Sir Thomas Playford wasn't prepared to make the concessions that my Government has made", and he gave Sir Thomas a nice little pay-out at the opening ceremony. It was an unfair exercise, because there was no element of truth in what he was saying, if we compare what was happening to succession duties in Playford's time with what is happening at the present time. There was not one vestige of truth in the impression he was seeking to give that gathering yesterday. I should like to quote briefly what was the Premier's record in succession duties during the Playford era. First, I refer to the Budget debate when the Liberal Government was in office. Our present Premier then had this to say:

Let us consider what is being done in this Budget. Where this State has to raise additional finances, in the view of members on this side those finances should be raised in progressive taxation.

I will not continue at length with that reference because I will not have time, but the report continues:

What is more, the incidence of death duties in South Australia falls more heavily on the smaller estates than it does in other States, and less heavily on the larger estates.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And the loopholes are a scandal.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: And so it goes on. One of the Labor Government's first actions when it came into office in 1970 was to introduce a Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill. I have a lengthy quote I wish to read from the Minister's second reading explanation. The Bill was designed to close the loopholes and raise about \$6 000 000 in revenue. Now the Premier has compared the past position with what his Government did.

Dr. Eastick: Was that at the same time as the tall poppies letter?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it was about that time. Yesterday, the Premier was trying to put over how much his Government had done through legislation for farmers in relation to succession duties. He said that even Sir Thomas Playford would not do that. After assuming office in 1970, one of the first Bills introduced—the architect was the socialist former Minister of Education, who studied at the London School of Economics, who waxed eloquent publicly about the need to reform succession duties and close loopholes—was to slug the community to the extent of about \$6 000 000. Although I have not time to read the *Hansard* reference, I refer honourable members to 1970 *Hansard* at page 2426 and to the Premier's second reading explanation dealing with how they would close the loopholes and how there would be aggregation of succession (there is a section on aggregation). He said that the people who were going to be caught to raise revenue were those with estates greater than \$35 000; in other words, the rural community. Yet

the Premier has the gall to go down to the meeting of the United Farmers and Graziers yesterday and seek to denigrate Sir Thomas Playford merely because he was unwilling to make concessions to the rural community.

The Premier himself was whingeing, the then Minister of Education and former member for Glenelg (the Hon. Hugh Hudson) had been complaining and whingeing about the fact that succession duties in this State were too light, and one of the first actions of a Labor Government on coming into office was to slug the community generally and the rural community particularly.

Mr. Nankivell: It was a succession duty and not an estate duty—that was the concession that Playford made.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: True, and any amelioration which has occurred since that time and to which the Premier has referred has been the result of concessions that have occurred in other States. The Labor Government in South Australia has been well out of step with what has happened in other States. I can accept the Premier's going down yesterday to put over his phony story, but to drag in Sir Thomas Playford unfairly was, I believe—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): I rise to address the House on the subject of housing and the role that the States and the Federal Government should be playing in this area. I speak on this subject as there have been many comments in recent months by members opposite and by certain Federal Parliamentarians that give the impression that this Government is not properly looking after the housing needs of its citizens. Therefore, rather than paying direct attention to the many allegations that have been made, it seems more appropriate for me to judge the performance of this Government by more objective standards. Honourable members doubtless remember that last year was designated by the United Nations as the International Year of Habitat. It was so named so that an international forum could be called on the housing issues facing countries around the world. As a result, a large gathering was held in Vancouver in 1976, with delegates from most countries meeting to discuss the responsibilities of Governments, communities and individuals in relation to housing.

Australia took part in the conference, and among those present were the Director of the South Australian Housing Trust (Mr. Alex Ramsay), a member of the trust, Mrs. Wendy Sarkisson, as well as the Director of the Environment Department, Dr. Grant Inglis. I mention these people particularly as they, as much as anyone, were able to judge the standards set by this Government in connection with housing. They were able to compare the work being done by other countries and analyse differences in approach and philosophy. All agreed that this Government and its agencies connected with housing have a particularly good record in comparison with similar Governments in other developed countries. How do we match with the official decisions of the international conference in Vancouver which produced a 181-page report? I do not intend to give a blow-by-blow report of the way in which South Australia has met the objectives set in that report, but I have extracted a portion that is particularly relevant. Recommendation B9 is as follows:

Expected population growth and migration mean that urban expansion will be the most common and universal development challenge. However, urban expansion can take the form of urban sprawl, and it is then costly, wasteful and ecologically destructive. Urban expansion

should be planned within a regional framework and co-ordinated with urban renewal to achieve comparable living conditions in old and new areas.

It cannot be doubted that South Australia feels the pressures of urban expansion to a very high degree and, therefore, the way that that problem is tackled determines whether we have uncontrolled urban sprawl or cities that can be lived in. When I read this recommendation I could not help comparing the public housing approach of this Government with that adopted in some other States. That brought to my mind a quotation from Frederick Mackie, an early traveller in South Australia, who made the following comparison between Melbourne and Adelaide in 1854:

The quiet stillness of Adelaide is quite striking after the bustle and hurry of Melbourne. Now that we have left that filthy place, I cannot but feel astonished at what man will forgo for the acquisition of wealth. He will sacrifice every comfort and imperil his existence.

That was more than 120 years ago. Today, if that traveller were to return to make another journey, he would be faced with the monstrosities of high rise on the one hand and well planned inner city developments, such as Manitoba, on the other hand. He would have to compare sprawling suburbs with the pleasing beauty of new estates being built by the Housing Trust in Christie Downs and Elizabeth East, to mention only two. Why should there be this difference? I suggest that the answer lies in the fact that this Government put into practice, long before Habitat was held, the important principle under-

lying the Habitat conference: that people matter, that men and women have to live in the houses with which we provide them, and the quality of their lives partly depends on the environment that the community provides.

That, to me, means a lot more than whether the local residents have to worry whether they have to walk over dog droppings on their way to their front door. The Opposition must surely be searching for issues if an Opposition member believes that such an issue is all he can talk about on the national media. We must look at the social environment that covers the creative lives of the people. Unlike other State Governments, this Government refuses to build dormitory suburbs that are supposed to store the work force like battery chickens in preparation for work in dark satanic mills. One has only to read the annual reports prepared by the South Australian Housing Trust, the South Australian Land Commission and the South Australian Government report to the Habitat Conference on controlling the price of land for development to realise that this Government is tackling successfully the Habitat injunction and providing a better way to live. All that despite the constant obstruction of members opposite who would seek to give the people of South Australia lower living standards in their pell-mell rush after the *laissez faire* of anti-development.

Motion carried.

At 8.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 20, at 2 p.m.