

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 19, 1969.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

ELIZABETH BUS SERVICE

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: On July 29 I asked the Minister whether he would seriously consider allowing the Municipal Tramways Trust to extend its services to the Elizabeth area, because this would relieve the M.T.T. employees of their worry that their jobs might be jeopardized. The Minister replied:

I will consider the points raised by the honourable member when I further deal with this matter and when I take the question of the Adelaide-Elizabeth bus service to Cabinet.

During the Address in Reply debate I pointed out that such a reply merely meant that the Minister had no intention of granting the service to the M.T.T. and, according to a report in this morning's *Advertiser*, this appears to be the case. Therefore, I ask the Minister: (1) why will the M.T.T. not be operating the service? (2) what will be the additional cost to the Government as a result of the loss of revenue to the Railways Department that will come about because of people travelling by bus instead of by rail? (3) will he assure the Council that there will be no retrenchment of bus conductors after the introduction of one-man bus services in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask the honourable member to put his question on notice.

BATTERED CHILDREN

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Since there has lately been an increasing incidence of the so-called battered child syndrome, will the Minister of Health ascertain whether the psychiatric and other facilities are adequate for the treatment of obviously distressed and ill parents?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think we have all followed with some interest the controversy on this matter in the newspapers. I will consider the matter and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

CEDUNA COURTHOUSE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture obtained from the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 31, which related to the increased cost of the proposed Ceduna courthouse?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My colleague reports:

New courthouse accommodation at Ceduna is to be included in a police station and Government offices building complex. The increase in the estimate of cost, necessitating reference to the Public Works Committee, is due to the inclusion of increased cell accommodation during the preparation of design documents and the up-grading of the estimate for air-conditioning and general cost increases. The Public Buildings Department is about to make a submission for forwarding to the Public Works Committee.

PORT PIRIE CROSSING

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In February of this year Mr. Doyle, the Assistant to the Railways Commissioner (Mr. Fitch), was quoted in the newspaper as saying there would be warning lights at the railway crossing on the Mary Elie and Ellen Street intersection at Port Pirie, where the new standard gauge line will go right across a very wide road. However, last week Mr. Fitch said there would not be any warning lights at this crossing. Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain the true position in relation to this matter, and will he at the same time endeavour to see that warning lights are installed at this crossing?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall find out all about this matter and make representations to the Railways Commissioner on the point raised by the honourable member.

PARKING

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Minister of Local Government, from his wide knowledge of the Adelaide City Council, say whether there is any real reason why disabled people should not, after proper application, be granted immunity from parking regulations?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I had a wider knowledge of the Adelaide City Council when I was a member of it than I have at the present time. However, this matter has been given some publicity in the last few days, and I have undertaken to discuss it with the Town Clerk of the council in the next day or two. When I have done that I shall bring back a reply for the honourable member.

BRINKWORTH POLICE STATION

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to my question of August 15 in relation to the Brinkworth police station?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The necessity for the closure of Brinkworth police station once Snowtown becomes fully operative has not been specifically considered. However, it is true that concentration of personnel at one centre with mobile patrols operating throughout adjoining districts has provided better service to the community and on a more economic basis than the maintenance of some one-man stations. It is intended in the near future to make a survey of every district throughout the State, taking into account all factors which have a bearing upon the policing necessity of each area. Quite obviously Brinkworth will be included in such a survey and its requirements statistically and factually evaluated.

CITRUS INDUSTRY

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In the "Letters to the Editor" column in yesterday's *Advertiser* there appears a letter from a Mr. Carroll of Loxton who made three references to problems in the citrus industry. He said:

We are receiving, in many cases, 17c a case net returns . . . If a portion of our fruit is juiced, we wait three months for the money . . . I have in my possession a nil return, which means that my packer in Loxton was paid 83c a case for packing my fruit, and I received nothing.

Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether, in his opinion, this would be a true reflection of the problems of the citrus industry at this point of time?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member has asked me three questions in one. In the first instance, I have no doubt at all that some people engaged in the citrus industry would show a nil return, or a return of 17c. However, I do not think it is true that the correspondent could show, over a period of marketing, a consistent nil return or a return of 17c; I would think that somewhere about 85c to 90c would be about average. With regard to juice fruit, this is a matter entirely between the person who delivers the fruit and the company that receives it; indeed, they are the terms upon which the former sells the fruit. There is an old saying that you

cannot take the brecks off a highlander. If the money is not there, it just cannot be obtained. The Citrus Organization Committee has been through a difficult period recently, and many of these problems have been ironed out. I only hope that much of the pettiness and personal animosity can be put aside in the interests of the industry. If this happens, the industry will be able to work much better in the future.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my supplementary question regarding Government priorities and preferences in contracts?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The place of manufacture is the deciding factor and the determining fact on the preference being applied in accordance with Government policy. The Supply and Tender Board has received no policy directions regarding local ownership as distinct from local manufacture and does not consider that factor in awarding or determining contracts. The board points out that it would be difficult, if not impracticable, to apply such a policy, as this would require much effort and time in determining which companies were wholly or partly locally owned.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 14. Page 960.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill, which comes to us directly as a result of the Mill-cent poll at the last State election and the subsequent proceedings that were taken as a result of the incredibly close result in that poll. As all honourable members know, the result of that poll was challenged: this resulted in the setting up of the Court of Disputed Returns for the House of Assembly, which court in due time proceeded to hear a petition and, after looking into the procedural aspects, also a reply, which was virtually a counter-petition from the successful candidate.

It seems to me that on this occasion an opportunity was taken by all parties concerned and by the court to look into the difficulties that were lying beneath the surface in an Act that had served our State for some time. It resulted in a really penetrating scrutiny of

all those difficulties. We are indebted to the President of that court (Mr. Justice Walters) for his painstaking judgment and the way in which he set out to explore the legal implications of all the difficult matters placed before that court. It was, of course, a lengthy and expensive hearing but it was only in that way that we could really see for ourselves what was involved. Having taken some small part in the proceedings of the recount at the Millicent election, I realized there were difficulties confronting the returning officer in Millicent that he could not be expected to get to grips with satisfactorily.

The Government is to be congratulated on removing some of the more difficult sections of the Act and setting up by this Bill a new Court of Disputed Returns. In spite of all the good work that was done by the court after the last election in connection with the dispute in Millicent, I am pleased to see the changes now proposed by this Bill—the constitution of a proper court presided over by a judge and the procedure laid down clearly in the Statute for delivering a petition and replying to those matters concerned in a disputed return. I am also pleased to see an improvement in connection with the postal vote, because practically all the difficulties encountered at the election to which I have referred arose from postal voting. It was obvious that the provisions of the existing Act for postal voting were antiquated and needed substantial revision. They have now been substantially revised and I am pleased to note that the rather ridiculous position that existed of having to try to find an authorized witness within certain categories has been removed, because, as the court pointed out, just about everybody could be a witness but it was necessary for the votes to be certified and the actual status of the witness to be shown on the postal voting certificate. That has been removed, which is a good thing.

I notice that this Bill makes no change in compulsory voting. Section 118a of the Act states:

It shall be the duty of every Assembly elector to record his vote at every election in the Assembly district for which he is enrolled.

I wonder why the opportunity was not taken (and I should like to suggest this to the Government) to introduce a reform that I think is long overdue in this State—the making of voting for the House of Assembly voluntary for those persons who are 70 years of age or more. If I was asked to argue the merits of voluntary voting and compulsory voting,

I would come down solidly every time on the side of voluntary voting. However, I realize that many practical difficulties exist, and I also realize that it would be extremely difficult for one State alone to introduce a system of voluntary voting when a compulsory system exists in all other States and in Commonwealth elections. A system that causes confusion in the minds of voters should not be introduced; but other aspects of the question must be examined because there is no doubt that voluntary voting is right in principle. There is nothing undemocratic about it. Australia provides almost a unique example in the world with its method of compulsory voting. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that many difficult problems would be created for all political Parties if voluntary voting were introduced. It would mean a return to the system existing prior to 1942, and it is interesting to note that compulsory voting has applied in this State only since that year.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: There would not be many blue-ribbon seats, would there?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No. It would mean that all political Parties would need to go out for the vote, to go back to the days when money had to be expended on organizing the vote on an election day.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It would be necessary to get a horse and buggy to get them to the polling booth.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: It was a common practice when I was a lad for transport to be provided.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: This could be minimized by the Act, though.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Of course. These things could be taken care of, but no attempt has been made in this Bill to bring back voluntary voting, and I agree that it could be a problem. I return to my original suggestion about voluntary voting for everybody aged 70 years and over, because it seems ridiculous that elderly people and sick people should be compelled to vote. Such people are at times too shaky to place a number on a ballot-paper. I saw examples of this in the Millicent by-election, with some numbers so shaky that they were obviously made by people of advanced years. I make that suggestion, although I do not know whether the Government has considered the matter. I believe it has some merit, and perhaps the Minister may comment upon it in his reply or in Committee.

I turn now to the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins last week that this is really a Committee Bill, which is surprising because it is not a big Act that is being amended. Many sections are being altered in order to make changes in penalty, but I agree with the Hon. Mr. Dawkins that it is mainly a Committee Bill.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What is the reason for increasing the candidate's deposit by 100 per cent?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I suppose it is necessary to keep up with changes in money values. I do not think the honourable member need worry because it will not affect him. I agree that 100 per cent is a considerable increase in the deposit. I do not know whether the honourable member would like to see certain candidates discouraged from nominating, but I certainly would not like to see this. I do not think that a deposit of \$100 would really discourage any candidate.

I have already referred to the important changes effected by this Bill—the change in the system of postal voting, the reconstruction of the court and other changes that have been found necessary over the years. I commend the Government for removing from the principal Act the provisions dealing with limitations on electoral expenditure. Having on two occasions struggled to fill in the form provided for in the Fifth Schedule to the principal Act, I realize what a hopeless task it is to try to complete that form accurately and honestly. Having looked right through the Bill and carefully noted the alterations it makes to the principal Act, I believe that we can support this Bill wholeheartedly. It is obvious that much work has been done on it in another place both last session and this session. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 14. Page 962.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I support the Bill. As the Minister pointed out, there was a misprint in the principal Act that referred to the 30th degree of longitude. Of course, in these days of confusion it is most prudent of the Minister to sort out the direction in which we are travelling. He has done this with many matters under his jurisdiction, and we are grateful to know that we cannot go north to the 30th degree of longitude. However, a couple of my friends

in this Council are still arguing whether we can travel in this direction. This is a simple and very necessary amendment.

Clause 3 repeals section 7 of the principal Act. People nowadays are no longer allowed to use black paint to brand their sheep, but section 7 was a transitional provision for those people who had mortgages on sheep that were already branded black at the time regulations were brought in to outlaw that type of branding fluid. When the leaders of the wool industry return from overseas they always have some complaint to lodge with the grower organizations that, unless we do something better with our wool, we shall be unable to sell it. We have made several changes but we have not made great inroads into the problem of selling our wool in times of rising costs. Since it has been proved to the industry that black brands are no longer desirable, this Bill meets the wishes of the people in the wool industry, so I have much pleasure in supporting it.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): This is one of a number of Bills that will have to be brought up to date for the purpose of consolidating the Acts concerned. Many Acts contain mistakes and, before they are consolidated, they must be brought completely up to date and unnecessary provisions in them must be eliminated. When a person applies for a registered brand he is allocated a position and a colour. He probably has a choice of colour if the position and the colour have not already been allocated to another person.

I believe that, prior to 1955, about 55 per cent of people applied for the black colour; the colours then were black, red, blue and green. However, because of the tar brands then being used, it was estimated that Australia lost 2 per cent of the value of its wool clip. When the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization invented a new formula that was made available to the manufacturers of branding fluid, it was necessary that the black brand be eliminated because it was impossible to distinguish between a black brand that consisted of tar material and a black brand that was made under the new formula.

The problem with brands made under the new formula is that they do not have the lasting qualities that the previous brands had. Therefore, it is necessary that a sheep breeder brand his sheep two or perhaps three times a year in order that the brands remain legible. Of course, this adds to the breeders' costs. Unless the sheep are branded sufficiently frequently

there is a greater possibility of sheep stealing occurring; this crime is a major problem today. It is necessary that the effects of tar brands should be eliminated from the wool clip because of the cost of hand picking, particularly in relation to the high quality woollen clothes that are now being manufactured. Also, it is necessary that the wool clip be presented in a fashion that does not increase costs, because of the competition with synthetics. However, the producer is still faced with this problem of the present-day brands being too easily scoured from the fleece and of the necessity for him to continue to brand his sheep periodically throughout the year.

I trust that the C.S.I.R.O. will make further investigations into the manufacture of sheep-branding fluids to try to find a fluid which will perhaps have a greater lasting effect but which at the same time will be capable of being scoured from the fleece during the scouring period, when certain chemicals are used. As other honourable members have said, this is not a Bill of great moment; it merely brings the Act up to date. With those few remarks, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Minister of Roads and Transport:

(For wording of motion and amendment, see page 883.)

(Continued from August 14. Page 969.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I rise with great sadness to debate this motion. I had high hopes that we would get a genuine expression of opinion from the Parliament on the merits or demerits, or perhaps a bit of each, of what is known as the M.A.T.S. plan, but instead I find that the matter has deteriorated into a Party political issue of the worst sort. This is very sad indeed, because it seemed on the motion carried by this Council that we would hear what members really thought of it. It started off this way, but unfortunately in another place the Labor Party turned the matter into a political issue and asked that it be declared vital. This was acceded to, and that was the end of any possible independence of action. The Party political whips got cracking, and thus the value of the debate was reduced to nothing.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Government hasn't accepted the Labor Party's

challenges before; it has been challenged to resign a couple of times.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Perhaps this would not be altogether unexpected. Members have read the language in which the motion is couched; it had all the signs that this would happen, because a more fatuous sort of motion would have been hard to conceive. Where have we got to now with the M.A.T.S. plan, and where does the Government stand? I should like to know this, because I find no difficulty in confessing that I am completely confused and confounded as to what is going on, and I imagine that this applies to many other members.

Many matters have been deferred. What does "deferred" mean? Does this mean that as soon as the tumult and the shouting have died these matters are again to be thrust upon us; does it mean they are to be lost; or what does it mean? I do not know, and I am dissatisfied with the fact that matters are deferred. This is an inconsequential sort of word, and it is meaningless to me. It seems to me that this debate—although this particular facet of it will cease—will go on for a considerable time in various other ways. A week or two ago, on a Friday, the following announcement appeared in the newspaper:

The State Government has decided not to proceed with some of the more controversial Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals. These include the metropolitan section of the Hills Freeway, which would have run east of the Fullarton Road, and the Goodwood-Edwardstown rail link proposal. The Premier (Mr. Hall) said yesterday changes would cut \$60,000,000 from the estimated cost of road works.

If this means what I think it means, it is great news. It is wonderful news, I think, for the citizens of Adelaide. Certainly, it is wonderful news for those whose houses and whose very living were threatened by this concrete monster of a freeway. I hope it means what I think it means. A certain portion of the Noarlunga Freeway, on the west of the city, has been deferred also. In this case it has not been announced that it will not be proceeded with: as I understand it, it has been announced that it will be deferred.

These two items are the matters to which I take exception, because I consider that freeways in those positions are unnecessary, that there are satisfactory alternatives, and that not only will those freeways interfere with the basic living of thousands of people but that they will also be a blot on the landscape of Adelaide for generations to come. So, it is with some satisfaction that one assumes that

alternatives will be found for one and that the other at least has been deferred. I hope that means that the department will attempt to find some satisfactory substitutes.

There are many alternatives to this M.A.T.S. plan. I know that the department has been trying to terrify us by various stand-over tactics. It has told us that we do not know what we are talking about, and that if we challenge anything we ought to suggest a substitute. Although we do not claim to be experts on these matters, we do claim to have a little common sense occasionally, and it is that which we are exercising. We look to the Highways Department to find the substitutes for us. It is not up to us to do the job for it, and the department should be made clear on that aspect.

I consider that the department has come out of this argument very badly indeed. I have gone to some trouble to investigate the financial aspects of the matter, because I believe that is in my line. I find, or at least I think I find, that the whole question of Commonwealth-State financial relations, about which we have heard so much in recent years not only from the South Australian Government but also from other States, comes into account here. I have gone to much trouble (and an economist has done much work on this matter) to try to test whether, as has been suggested, the States are being starved of finance by the Commonwealth Government.

Many people, including myself, have this idea; for this reason I set out on a jaunt of my own, as it were, with expert assistance to try to ascertain whether it was so. The economist with whom I have been associated on this matter also set out with the idea that probably the States were not getting their fair share of Commonwealth money. However, our investigations did not support this. This was a great surprise not only to me but also to the economist.

I have also found that other people have been investigating the matter in a similar sort of way and have come to similar conclusions. An article by Kenneth Davidson that appeared recently in the *Australian* highlights the central points of this submission, and his conclusions were, first, that the demand for services provided by the States was growing at a faster rate than the growth in the gross national product and, secondly, that Commonwealth assistance to the States was growing only at about the same rate as the gross national product was growing. Unless something different is done, or expected to be done, I

imagine we would not normally expect Commonwealth assistance to the States to grow at a faster rate than the growth of the gross national product. If this is so (and I have confirmed that it is in one or two areas, so I think it is so), what is the trouble with Commonwealth-State financial relations? We know something is wrong because we know that all States are short of money, and we know that in a general sense they appear to be behaving reasonably in their expenditure. Therefore, what has gone wrong?

I think the Highways Department has kindly pinpointed this for me because, after my investigations, I consider that what has gone wrong is that these tagged grants are going direct to the department, which has achieved an autonomy that it should not possess; that the Government has not sufficient control over the department; and that the latter demands to be free to spend these tagged grants, whatever the financial condition of the remainder of the State is: that is, that it shall spend these grants on highways and ancillary matters.

Let us examine this matter in the light of actual money. The announcement by the Premier, which I mentioned, about the freeway to the east not being proceeded with also involved a statement that this and the other matters announced would save no less than \$60,000,000. Yet we have had wailing and gnashing of teeth over the last three or four years because of total deficits of about \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000. In this instance, in only one hit \$60,000,000 is saved.

We are told that unless we spend this money we will not get it. Well, something is wrong here. Why should the Commonwealth Government be telling us where we have to spend this money? According to my reading, the Commonwealth Government has even gone to the extent of telling us that we can spend so much of these grants on metropolitan arterial roads, so much on country arterial roads and so much on other country roads.

I do not claim to be any sort of expert on this matter, but I have gone far enough into it to think that the matter must be investigated much further. As I understand the position, we have also tagged certain revenue of our own to the Highways Department: I refer to motor registration and licence fees, all of which goes to the Highways Department and cannot be spent on anything else.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: So does the ton-mile tax!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think this is outmoded and needs alteration. This might have been all right when the system started years ago, but is it right in 1969?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: This is motorists' taxation. You are not suggesting that it should be used for general purposes, are you? It's a sectional tax.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I certainly am suggesting that.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What will the R.A.A. think about this?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Then why have a sectional tax?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I will explain that to the honourable member, who ought to know it. When these taxes were introduced and allotted in the way they were, only a small percentage of the community had motor cars, but what is the position now? Every family has a motor car. We are all involved in this, so the day has gone when one can say that this is a sectional tax. It is a tax on everyone and this money should be used for the best purposes, not merely poured lavishly into one arena of expenditure when others are starving. Everyone has a motor car and is paying this tax.

I am a motorist and I certainly do not want all the petrol tax channelled into roads. I wonder how many other motorists feel like I do: I should think the bulk of them would. Certainly, I do not want this done when the State Treasury has to scrape the bottom of the barrel to get enough money to cover other areas of Government. A couple of severe taxes were imposed during the last session, one of which was the gift duty tax. I was brought up to think that gifts were honourable and decent things for people to make and not something to be penalized. Even worse, a stamp duty was introduced that not only involved people in the payment of money but also involved their wasting much time trying to assess what stamp duty they must pay—a tax that the State Treasurer himself has admitted is bad law. He is reported in the paper as having said this, and he has never denied it. A bad law should be got rid of at the first possible moment, and I am now suggesting ways in which it can be got rid of. This is a bad law and we are all suffering from it. Do we want to have our petrol tax, our licence fees and our registration fees channelled into roads only, so that we shall get these bad laws imposed on us? I do not believe that any thinking persons would hold with that concept.

I started by saying that the debate on M.A.T.S. had deteriorated to such an extent that I felt it had become worthless. That is my opinion. I said much about M.A.T.S. previously, recorded in the last volume of *Hansard* at page 3506. If any honourable member wants any more details of what I think of M.A.T.S., he can find them set out there; I do not propose to weary the Council with repetition.

I want to try to make some contribution to this debate by suggesting something really important that I believe has emerged from the matter and should be attended to. In particular, two freeways have been mentioned. However, I do not want it to be suggested again (and it never should have been suggested) that anyone thinks that the whole of the M.A.T.S. plan is bad; of course it is not. A large proportion of it is good planning, especially the details of it, but there are alternatives to these freeways. We have only to compare other cities with far greater populations than the population that M.A.T.S. provides for to see how they have fared. What is a city for? Is it to be a pleasant place in which to live or a place that one merely whizzes through in motor vehicles at the greatest possible speed?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We could do with a few more clearways, couldn't we?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes; I agree with that. There are alternatives to some of the M.A.T.S. proposals. I have had the assistance of several people in this matter, and I could make suggestions myself, but that is not my job. I believe it is for the department to find the proper solution to these matters, but there is one other important thing that emerges from the financial aspect: in my opinion, there is no doubt that there is an imbalance in the M.A.T.S. plan between the motor vehicle and public transport. I do not think the Minister has denied that he would like to spend more money on the public transport side of the plan. I have even heard on the grape vine that one of his officers has said that it is doubtful whether the King William Street subway can be continued with, because of lack of finance.

Most growing cities in the world have partly solved their transport problems by going underground; this is something that we shall have to do here sooner or later but with the present system of Commonwealth grants I do not think the State is in a position to do this. This is all the more reason why we should get a new arrangement with the Commonwealth Government or at least rearrange our own

motor vehicle finances so that we can spend more money on the public transport sector of the transportation plan and thus have the wherewithal for a properly balanced plan instead of one grossly loaded in favour of motor vehicle transport because, as I believe, money is not available for the public transport part of the plan.

I repeat that I can find in the M.A.T.S. plan no element or suggestion of any forward thinking at all. The plan is purely and simply based on the transportation methods of today, not tomorrow, in respect of which forward thinking is needed. As I suggested in my previous speech on this subject, we should set a pattern for the future; certainly, cities should be planned for city transport. However, I do not want to dwell on this because I know I am before my time in this thinking, and one does not get any marks for thinking too far ahead! However, one can say quite clearly that no attempt at an assessment has been made in M.A.T.S. (at least, no attempt that I can find) of what will be the transport of the future for which the M.A.T.S. plan will have to cater.

I have heard talk in the past of "horse and buggy thinking". The late Dr. Evatt was one person who used to bandy this idea around, that certain people were thinking in the horse and buggy age. M.A.T.S. is redolent of internal combustion thinking while we are about to live in the space age, and I think the fact that the framers of the M.A.T.S. plan have not looked ahead and tried to see what the transport of the future will be like (because the roads will still be there under this plan) is a tragedy. The plan should be forward looking; it should be attempting to say what sort of transport will have to be catered for; but, instead of that, we find thinking merely in terms of, perhaps, 1965—not even 1969.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Did you read what Mr. Ambor, who, I believe, is a competent person to talk on this motor age, had to say about that?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: No; I did not read his opinions.

The Hon. C. R. Story: He was making predictions for the next 20 years or so.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am afraid I did not see that. Perhaps the Minister would be good enough to give me access to that.

The Hon. C. R. Story: A very good newspaper known as the *Advertiser* printed it today.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I thank the Minister for the reference; I will certainly accept his suggestion. However, this must be an integral part of the matter. The planners of the past have been accused of not seeing far enough ahead (I believe Colonel Light has even been accused of not thinking of the motor car) but we are in a unique position today to see what can happen, because there are already available many inventions that will become cheaper and capable of being applied to transport to reduce the size of it and thus the demand on the roads, the underground railways, or anything of that nature. I take heart from the fact that the Government has made alterations to the M.A.T.S. plan. It appears to have decided to seek an alternative to what I call the eastern suburban freeway; it is having a look at this freeway.

I strongly recommend to the Government that it should attempt to find suitable alternatives for the western freeway because I have no doubt at all that they are available. This debate started (or at least the previous debate started) out of a question I asked the Minister, Mr. Hill, and he replied to me:

I do not know whether the honourable member confuses it (as some other people have been confusing it) with a town or a development plan. There is very little difference between a master plan for transportation in metropolitan Adelaide and a master plan over the next, say, 20 years for other services such as electricity, water reticulation, sewerage, . . .

With the utmost respect, I think that that approach is splitting hairs, or splitting or confusing words because, whether the Minister likes it or not, M.A.T.S. is a plan superimposed on a town plan and thus becomes part of the town plan. The trouble with M.A.T.S., the fundamental problem with the plan, in my opinion, is that it is purely and simply a traffic engineer's plan and not a town planner's plan. It is entirely wrong, in my opinion, that the traffic engineer should rule our lives and our living; there are other considerations, other things in life, and my recommendation is that before any further part of this plan is proceeded with it should be referred to some sort of committee for decent living. Who the members of such a committee would be I am not in a position to enumerate; certainly I would expect such people as town planners, architects, landscaping experts . . .

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about farmers?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes, one would expect that a cross-section of the community would serve on that committee

and, above all, I would expect one or two of its members to be ordinary people who live ordinary lives and who would exercise ordinary common sense in determining what priorities should be given; where transport transcends the interests of the ordinary, quiet, suburban home dweller; where the rights of the home dweller should be kept in priority to demands of transport; and where plans should be trimmed so as to offer the least interference with the living of the people while giving the best possible service in the way of a plan for the future.

I sincerely hope that the other freeway will not be proceeded with as, I now assume, the eastern freeway is not to be proceeded with either. I believe we have a very happy set-up in the north and south roads of the metropolitan area and those are the ones obviously under contemplation on the western side of Adelaide. If any honourable member went to Sydney and looked at the new South Head Road (which I see about every two months)

and observed the volume of traffic carried by that road, he could then imagine that a widened South Road, a widened Marion Road (and that is proceeding now to great advantage), a widened Morphett Road, and a widened Brighton Road should carry all the traffic one could possibly conceive being required in that area for a very long time, because the city is circumscribed by St. Vincent Gulf on the west, with ranges of hills further down and then, of course, ultimately the sea. I am very glad indeed that the Government has made changes to the M.A.T.S. plan, and I express the hope that it will go further, particularly with a re-survey of the western freeway, and act in a similar manner with regard to that freeway.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 20, at 2.15 p.m.