

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 27, 1969

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

## QUESTIONS

## DERAILMENTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Following a number of railway derailments, a committee was set up to examine the question of derailments in South Australia and to investigate the need for something to be done in regard to the matter. At pages 19 and 20 of the report which was brought down by that committee and which has been laid on the table of this Council, reference is made to a Matisa track recording car, and it quotes the Chief Civil Engineer of the New South Wales Department of Railways as saying, on July 17 last year, that the Matisa car was the best aid in existence for the inspection of permanent way. The report also states that that officer, in October, 1964, had said:

The marked decrease which has occurred in the number of derailments due to track defects over the last two or three years is attributable in no small degree to the regular use of this track recording trolley.

Of course, those remarks related to the New South Wales Railways. The report goes on to say:

These cars augment and quantify information gained from other sources by recording the geometry of the track in respect to:

- (a) twist (the difference in superelevation of the rails over the wheel base of the car, 33ft.);
- (b) gauge, either tight or wide;
- (c) alignment and curvature;
- (d) superelevation; and
- (e) surface irregularities.

While recording these track dimensions on strips charts, the cars do not indicate underlying causes of defects which must be ascertained in the field. Properly programmed, the cars are used:

- (a) to highlight defects that require immediate attention;
- (b) to plan work programmes for maintenance staff;
- (c) to check overall improvement or deterioration of track over periods of time—impossible of easy quantitative determination by other means.

I have read in the report that both New South Wales and Victoria have these cars. The New

South Wales car, naturally, operates on standard gauge and the Victorian car on broad gauge. The committee investigating derailments was told by the Chief Commissioner for the Victorian Railways that he would willingly make a Matisa car available to the South Australian Railways for the purpose of a trial over the South Australian broad gauge system, and he said also that the Victorian Railways would offer the staff to operate the car and to interpret the results of those operations. My questions to the Minister are: (1) Can the Minister inform this Council whether any programme has been set down for the expenditure of the \$600,000 announced in the Loan Estimates as a special betterment grant to be spent on main railway lines? (2) Does this programme include the purchase of a Matisa track recording car? (3) Is it intended in the meantime to accept the Victorian Chief Commissioner's offer of a loan of such a car for a trial period on our broad gauge system?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government received the report of the committee on derailments and then I, as Minister, had to proceed with certain necessary machinery laid down by the Railways Commissioner's Act. The first thing for me to do (and the honourable member will understand this because he was the former Minister) under (I am speaking from memory) section 95 of the Act and under the amendment introduced by the former Labor Government was, as Minister, to ask the Commissioner for his proposals on the policy he intended to put in train in regard to this matter.

It is true that the derailment report advocated the purchase, and therefore the use, of a Matisa car. When I asked the Railways Commissioner for his proposals, he doubted whether there was a need for the purchase of a Matisa car (again, I am speaking from memory), the capital cost, according to the report, of such a car being \$50,000 to \$60,000. The Commissioner doubted the wisdom of the purchase of a vehicle of this kind and advocated that he should proceed to make some arrangements with the Victorian Railways to use their vehicle instead of purchasing one.

Having received the Commissioner's proposals, the Government and I considered them. I then went back to the Commissioner and asked him for more detail of those proposals. I received that detail only this morning. The Commissioner this morning handed me a long submission, which included the detail I had sought. I have not so far had time to read it. Whether the Commissioner substantiates further his opinion that a Matisa car

owned by the Victorian Railways should be sought on hire or under some other arrangement for use by the S.A.R. I do not know.

Consequently, I cannot at the moment say whether we intend to purchase such a car or whether we intend to come to some arrangement whereby we can use the Matisa car owned by the Victorian Railways. However, in the next week or two we shall come to some definite arrangement and then I shall be able to tell the honourable member whether or not we shall be purchasing or simply borrowing or hiring a vehicle from Victoria.

In regard to the \$600,000 expenditure from the Loan Estimates that the Government has set aside for rehabilitation of the line in this current year, the part of the Commissioner's proposals that the Government immediately accepted was that the rehabilitation programme costing about \$8,500,000 should be put in train immediately and spread over a six-year period. The Government has accepted that and, as part of that \$8,500,000 rehabilitation programme, this current year's portion from the Loan Estimates (I emphasize "from the Loan Estimates") is \$600,000.

The honourable member is seeking detailed information regarding how that money will be spent. Here again, the proposals that I first sought from the Commissioner were (because he had to prepare them in a hurry as we wanted them quickly) in a fairly broad form. He did not submit to me all the detail that he then had in mind. Once again, this is part of the request that I sent to the Commissioner when asking for these details, and his reply has been handed to me only today.

When I have studied his reply and when the Government is in a position to publish the details of how that \$600,000 will be spent, I shall bring the information back to the honourable member. In general terms, however, the rehabilitation of the track from Murray Bridge to Serviceton is receiving priority.

#### COPPER MINES

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: In the early days of the province of South Australia the Kapunda copper mine was a very rich mine and an important factor in the beginnings of this State. In view of progress that has been made in methods of mining and of extraction of the basic metals, the residues of a number of old deposits have recently come under

observation. This work has been going on at Kapunda, Burra and other places. Can the Minister therefore say what progress has been made in this regard at Kapunda?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Drilling programmes have been carried out at Kapunda by mining companies, and the work that has been done discloses a deposit in the old Kapunda workings of about 6,000,000 tons of .7 per cent copper. The tests that have been carried out so far do not indicate that the mining of copper at Kapunda would be an economic proposition. However, the Mines Department is continuing to carry out tests on the vital question of recovery and, although the work being done does not indicate at present that mining can be carried out economically there, we hope that the investigations into the working of these low-grade deposits will continue. Although I cannot say we are hopeful of solving the problem of extracting the low-grade copper at Kapunda, we are at least working on it.

#### GAWLER RAILWAY STATION

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My attention has recently been drawn to the condition of a portion of the Gawler railway station known as the parcels and freight office. This building, which will obviously need renewal, is in a bad state of repair. The old fluted iron ceiling is starting to fall, the walls are damp and fretting, the floor is very rough and the lighting inadequate. Immediately adjacent to this room is the former Gawler railway station post office, which was rented from the railways by the postal authorities. This room is in a much better condition and is also in a better position for the public. It is now closed because it has been relinquished by the Postmaster-General's Department. Will the Minister ascertain whether the Railways Commissioner would be prepared to close the existing freight and parcels office and make the old post office available for this purpose?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thank the honourable member for his interest and his suggestion, which I will refer to the railways authorities.

#### ELIZABETH BUS SERVICE

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: On July 29 the Minister informed the Council as follows:

It is probable that the service instituted will be operated by a private bus operator, whose buses are within the 8ft. limit . . . I share the honourable member's concern at the possible hazard of the 8ft. 6in. wide M.T.T. buses ever being used on the Main North Road or like facilities outside of the built-up areas, where speeds are high and lane widths are generally 11ft. or less.

First, can the Minister say what has happened with regard to this service? Secondly, can he explain why the M.T.T. should be permitted to sell many outmoded buses to outside operators and then arrange for them to have permits to allow them to operate in competition with those who have to comply with the law in respect of the width of vehicles? Thirdly, can the Minister say whether tenders are being called for the purchase of these buses and, if they are not being called, can he say what the terms of sale are? Fourthly, is it Government policy that all Government or semi-government bodies financed by the Treasury should purchase or dispose of equipment by tender?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall ascertain from the M.T.T. the exact details of its method of disposing of buses it no longer requires. Regarding the earlier part of the honourable member's submission, I point out that the operator who runs the feeder and internal services in Elizabeth has, in fact, bought some buses from the M.T.T. that were no longer useful to it, and those buses are 8ft. 6in. wide.

I am very hopeful that those buses will not be used on the new service that the operator will conduct to Adelaide via the Main North Road. In fact, I have gone so far as to instruct the M.T.T. to advise me whether those buses are the buses that Transway intends to use, because I will want to look at the question again if that is the case. I shall obtain the other information requested by the honourable member and bring down a report.

#### TOURIST FACILITIES

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: In view of the growing importance of the tourist industry to this State, will the Minister representing the Minister of Immigration and Tourism ascertain whether consideration is being given to constructing suitable buildings with barbecue and toilet facilities along some of our main roads to encourage tourism and travel?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will obtain a reply from my colleague.

#### STATE BANK REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1969, together with balance sheets.

#### RAILWAYS STANDARDIZATION AGREEMENT (COCKBURN TO BROKEN HILL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

#### ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 26. Page 1166.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I rise to speak to this Bill, which has been explained in some detail by other speakers. As has been remarked before, it is essentially a Committee Bill. The second reading explanation given by the Minister indicates that the Bill has been presented because of problems that arose following the Millicent election last year. However, I do not believe that the Bill as it stands will overcome all problems likely to arise in a close election, whether it be a general election or a by-election, because other disputed points arose in the Millicent election that would certainly have led to an appeal and to the establishment of a Court of Disputed Returns irrespective of the matters contained in the Bill.

Following that general comment, I would like to refer to one or two of the clauses contained in the Bill. Clause 4 relates to the keeping of joint rolls, and the explanation of the amendments refers to the present method of printing the electoral rolls by a computer. I am not clear why that amendment is necessary because such a system is already operating efficiently, and there was no question prior to the last election whether the Act authorized that method of printing the rolls.

Clause 19 has been referred to by previous speakers, and it refers to witnesses who may be "apparently over the age of 18 years". I do not object to the age as such, because I believe the more convenient it is made to enable a person to lodge a postal vote the better it will be for all concerned. However, I cannot understand the use of the word "apparently". The Bill does not specify whether the age of 18 years must be apparent to the person lodging a postal vote or to a court established to decide whether that vote was a formal one. I find it difficult to understand the use of that word in its existing context.

As was stated by the Minister in his second reading explanation, a wide category of persons eligible to witness postal votes exists at present. I do not object to the age being 18, but my objection relates to the word "apparently", which I think merely confuses the issue. It is difficult for anyone to judge the age of a young person these days, and if a witness is to be "over the age of 18 years" then let it be stated in that way and delete the word "apparently".

Clause 20 repeals section 81 and inserts a new section. I should like to ask the Minister a question about the inclusion of the provision for illiterate people to have someone else voting on their behalf. Throughout the Act we have references to people whose sight is so impaired that they cannot vote without assistance, and we have the provision that a person appointed by the elector shall mark the elector's vote on the ballot-paper in the presence of an authorized witness. Not only in this clause but also in other parts of the Bill we find amendments which in many instances make provision for a person who is illiterate, but it seems that the Bill actually excludes the previous reference to people whose sight is impaired.

I can also visualize many other categories of people who, for physical reasons, may not be able to record their own vote. One need mention only the people in hospital following traffic accidents. There are any number of instances where people have difficulty in physically recording their own vote, and why we should have this deletion of "a person with impaired sight" and the inclusion of the word "illiteracy" is a question I should like answered. There is no definition of "illiterate" or "illiteracy" in either the Act or the Bill. Therefore, I question whether the word "illiterate" will cover all these categories of people, whether these others are to be excluded.

I believe that clause 25 is the clause which is causing members most concern. The Hon. Mr. Geddes spoke at some length, and I believe very effectively, on this matter yesterday when he pointed out the difficulties associated with the necessity to have postal votes in the hands of a returning officer by the close of the poll. I believe that any alteration to this Act should be an endeavour to assist the people voting. I have no doubt that the amendment as proposed will make it easier for the Electoral Office, for returning officers and for a Court of Disputed Returns; but is this Act designed to help the voter, or

is it designed to make the process easier for those conducting the poll?

We have in South Australia a compulsory voting system, under which those enrolled for House of Assembly districts are compelled to vote under pain of a fine if they fail to do so. I must say that I do not agree with the principle of compulsory voting, for I consider that it tends to cause complacency amongst members in so-called blue ribbon seats. I believe it also tends to encourage all political Parties to bid up prior to an election in order to gain the support of some people in our community who are not interested in the vital issues of the day. I do not believe that it leads to good Government.

However, that is another question. The point is that at present we have compulsory voting, and therefore I believe that we should not put anything in the Act which tends to disfranchise people who are enrolled to vote at State elections. I think the amendment proposed in clause 25 will do just this. I consider that it is a negative approach to a problem that occurred not only during the Millicent election but also at other places where we have had close elections, because it is saying, in effect, "Well, let us close the poll at a certain time and postal votes must be in by that time if they are to be counted."

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Isn't that done at local government elections?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I cannot answer that. In any event, voting at local government elections is voluntary, so there is a difference in the circumstances. In addition to that, local government comprises a comparatively small area, so here we are dealing with an entirely different situation.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: I was only talking about postal votes.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: We face the situation where many of our post offices close on Saturday morning and others work reduced hours, and I think it is probably inevitable that we shall see the day when post offices will not open at all on Saturdays. I believe that a more positive approach to this problem of ensuring that people, who through force of circumstances have to vote by post, are not disfranchised would be to either look at the possibility of having a poll other than on a Saturday (I believe that voting takes place in England on a Wednesday and in other countries on other days of the week) or to make arrangements

with the postal authorities, through the Commonwealth Government, for an officer to be present in a post office at the close of polling and to collect, frank and deliver those postal votes that are in the post box at that time.

This could be done quite easily in most instances by having a distinctive type of envelope. I believe there are many positive alternatives to this problem, rather than just disfranchising people who cannot get their postal vote in the hands of the returning officer by the close of the poll. There are many instances where people, through force of circumstances, do not have the time to vote. For instance, a mother may give birth to a child on a Wednesday when the child is not expected for another fortnight. I have already instanced the case of people in hospital as a result of accidents. There are many types of emergency that could make it physically impossible for people to vote and get the postal vote in the hands of the returning officer at the time prescribed in this Bill.

Regarding clause 33, I have a question for the Minister to answer when he replies to the second reading debate. The concluding words of new section 128 (1) are as follows:

... but that officer may not reverse any decision relating to the acceptance of any ballot-paper for further scrutiny pursuant to that section.

I believe I know what this means, but it seems somewhat confusing and perhaps even contradictory compared with the earlier part of the provision, and I should like the Minister to get a clear explanation from the Draftsman of the meaning of that new section.

Clause 40 deals with the size and placing of posters during an election campaign. This matter was covered fully by the Hon. Mr. Rowe, and I agree that the present limits placed upon the size of posters are adequate and serve their purpose. If we have no restriction on size, we shall certainly reach the situation where enormous posters will be placed at every vantage point, and that will not be in the best interests of the community at large—or, for that matter, of the election itself.

This Bill effects a radical change in the constitution of the Court of Disputed Returns, in that it largely takes responsibility out of the hands of Parliament itself. This will probably streamline the procedure, and it could satisfy many people. I am not sure that this continual passing over of power that we see in many items of legislation is always a good

thing. However, this will certainly streamline the hearing of evidence, judging by our experience of recent sittings of the court. Clause 48 amends section 177 of the principal Act as follows:

(a) by inserting after paragraph (c) of subsection (1) the following paragraph:

(ca) with the consent of the parties to the proceedings, to receive evidence on affidavit or by statutory declaration.

Section 177 defines the powers of the court in examining witnesses. Can the Minister say why these words are included? If we are to lay down rules to allow the court to receive evidence on affidavit or by statutory declaration, why is it necessary to write into this provision that the consent of the parties to the proceedings must first be received?

As some amendments may be made to this legislation other than those contained in the Bill, I will support the second reading.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### 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 26. Page 1175.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): We have before us the problem of considering the final recommendations of a study which has been going on for about nine years. Despite this fact and despite the views of the various experts and skilled people who have contributed towards this study, we have all been confronted by innumerable annoyed, dissatisfied and (in a few cases) irate people. Great change will always hurt some and help some. This is, of course, inevitable. Our duty, as elected representatives, is to see that we provide for the greatest possible good with the least possible harm and damage to the welfare (particularly of minority sections) of the community.

I well remember how, through the 1950's, the Government of the day was frequently accused of failing to have vision and failing to plan for the new living and technical requirements of the future. This, in fact, was not true, but Governments are always being criticized not for what they have done but for what, in somebody's opinion, they have failed to do. However, the Government of that day, being far-sighted, set in motion the necessary

series of operations, the fruit of which we see today in the study before us. Honourable members will remember how that Government, as a first step, called upon the Town Planning Committee for an intense study of Adelaide's present and future requirements as a metropolitan area. This was completed and submitted, in 1962, to the then Minister (Hon. C. D. Rowe).

It was, as honourable members will remember, a report on a study in depth of the requirements of the metropolitan area of Adelaide, its people, their welfare, their recreation, and their transport, both present and future. The groundwork of knowledge and information having thus been collected and produced, the next requirement (and I will remind honourable members that it was by popular demand) was a transportation study of Adelaide's requirements for the rest of this 20th century.

This transportation study was produced and presented in 1968 by a collection of those believed to be the best of the world's experts and South Australia's leading experts in transport. I repeat that these not only were the international planning experts but also represented the best of the State's skill and knowledge—the Highways and Local Government Department, the Adelaide City Council, the South Australian State Planning Office, the Municipal Tramways Trust, and the South Australian Railways. This was a mighty labour. The result, which the members of this Council have all studied very closely and seriously, could not possibly be called slipshod; nor could it be said that those who laboured on the task failed to look into the future.

The great problem which has arisen from the recommendations of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study and which is before us today is the effect that its implementation would have upon many individuals, their properties and their present way of life. In fact, so much animosity to the plan has become evident (not a little of it stirred up for political reasons and even for local government political reasons) that public antipathy threatens to destroy with the bad much of the great good that could come out of this work.

But, as a representative of those who have not a voice in the Council, I must present to the Government the objections and fears of many thousands of people who are frightened, variously, of losing properties for which they have a personal affection (and the love of one's home is deeply ingrained), of losing the value of assets, and of losing a pro-

portion (and usually a large one) of their life's work and savings. Therefore, I request the Government most carefully to examine the plan before the implementation of any part of it that will destroy property; beauty, and the way of life of any of our people. Above all, I request the Government to be very wary of going beyond essentials where damage to the rights and welfare of any individual is involved.

Typical of many letters I have received is one which I shall now quote in part. It concerns the desirability of re-routeing the Noarlunga Freeway at the Darlington Interchange. My constituent says:

There is so much vacant land in this area (maps N15 and N16, M.A.T.S.) it is indeed wicked that for the sake of a little thoughtful planning another route has not been found, using vacant land instead of houses, on which to build a road. The very thought of a freeway taking one home, not to mention the 900 homes which will go in the Marion council area, is serious cause for alarm and will have a traumatic effect on the residents for many years to come. One has only to live under the weight of the thought of a promised freeway to know the anxiety and sadness experienced, and we people have had this for the past year, and now again for the next six months. We are being told that we will be compensated at market value. Market value is not replacement value.

Later in the letter she states:

Their homes are not substandard: they are well kept, near-new brick homes in a delightful position with a marvellous view—a view that will never be noticed by speeding motorists on a freeway.

That letter pinpoints what I said a few moments ago, and it is typical of the objections and fears of many thousands of people who are frightened of losing their well-loved homes, their assets, and their life's work and savings.

I am not a person who believes that stagnation for the sake of personal conservative interests can be supported as a general policy, but I believe that, where a minority has to give up something it desires for the sake of the majority, it is incumbent upon those who rule to make the sacrifice as light as possible in every way. I believe the Government will be well advised to act quickly in dispelling the fears of those who will be called upon to make sacrifices, and to be as generous as possible in the recompense it provides.

Considerable pressure has been exerted in some quarters for a recasting of the M.A.T.S. plan with a view to incorporating and enforcing the use of a much wider range of public transport facilities at the cost of facilities for the general range of motor vehicles. Until I have seen a well-reasoned statement of this

proposition on economic grounds, I think we should treat such proposals with care. Adelaide is fortunate to a degree, to the extent that we are planning our public transport at a time when we still have surface areas and surface lines through many semi-open, low-elevation and old building areas, where surface transport routes may be laid down at a reasonable cost. We must realize that in many cities in the world the placement of arterial public transport systems has been left so late that the making of such routes through dense commercial areas has been financially prohibitive and they have been forced to the extremely expensive alternative of underground tunnelling operations of both public and transport routes. Adelaide is still young enough and sufficiently spread out to make this unnecessary.

I have been on vast underground networks and have seen the modern development of whole shopping complexes underground, but this form of troglodism is far from my ideal of a healthy life. We constantly speak of our high standard of living, of our shorter working hours and of our greater leisure time, but what does all this mean? To the average person it means very largely the possession of a car to go to sport, to pull a trailer-boat, or simply to tour the country. All of this spells more motor vehicles, for which provision must be made.

If ever the value of what was an enormous expenditure on the Mount Barker road was evident, it was last Sunday when heavenly spring weather took literally thousands of people to those parts of the Adelaide Hills which are gay with wattles, ericas and other bush flowers, and which are free from quarry scars. The Highways Department could be proud of the success of its planning and work in this area, which has brought many appreciative comments from motorists and from people who live in the vicinity. However, if we once understand that provision must be made for more and more motor vehicles, then we must also accept a completely new concept in the provision of highways.

It has been suggested in the amendment before us that the M.A.T.S. plan should be studied afresh, this time by the State Planning Authority, with a view among other things of substantiating the proposition that "the M.A.T.S. Report does not make adequate provisions for the development of transport movement in metropolitan Adelaide." I should have thought that most of the complaints on the present plan we have heard to date indicate

that it has already gone too far in that direction. The amendment further suggests that reassessment of the M.A.T.S. plan is necessary to ensure "a properly integrated plan for roads and public transport development", which seems to me to be precisely what we already have, and that was produced not only by the State Planning Authority but also by other experts.

The other recommendations in the amendment are equally well taken care of under the M.A.T.S. plan. However, there are two points on which I wish to make strong representations to the Government: first, that it should at all times attempt to keep as low as possible the number of houses affected by the plan and, secondly, that the conditions of compensation, where that is to be required, should be clearly specified to each individual as early as possible so that they do not continue to have the agony of mind and of indecision regarding what they should do for the best for themselves and for their families. I particularly urge that the damaging aspects of embargoes on alterations or additions to properties and of indecisions about values should not be unnecessarily prolonged. If re-routing or reshaping of some freeways is necessary to alleviate extensive individual suffering, then let the Government show its understanding of human problems and its willingness to listen to the humblest plea for mercy.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I have listened with much interest to this debate, some of which has no doubt been based on common logic. However, attempts have been made to raise doubts in people's minds, so as to make them emotionally disturbed. This is a dangerous situation to create, because when this happens one cannot expect people to adopt a logical approach on what is an important matter.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They haven't got you emotionally disturbed, have they?

The Hon. L. R. HART: No, I am not that type of person. It is easy to understand why people worry about how this plan will affect them, because any plan that is projected far into the future, particularly a plan which effects considerable improvements and which will undoubtedly benefit a great number of people, must cause anxiety in some people's minds. This type of projected plan will undoubtedly draw its share of criticism. If one looked at some of the improvements which have been effected recently and which have had their share of severe criticism, one would understand the magnitude of the

criticism that is being levelled at present. Honourable members will remember the criticism that arose when the Moreton Bay fig trees were removed from Victoria Square, and, more recently, when the road system around Victoria Square was redeveloped. Also, much criticism was levelled at the construction of the median strip in King William Street. However, if anyone suggested that that median strip should now be removed, that we should alter the road system in Victoria Square, or that we should put back the Moreton Bay fig trees, a similar amount of criticism would result.

When development first took place at Elizabeth there was criticism that we were taking up a large area of good agricultural land. If we go on to the hills above Elizabeth today and look down on that city, we realize that only a very small area is involved. The M.A.T.S. plan has been criticized on the ground that it will mutilate metropolitan Adelaide and that huge areas will be disturbed. When, however, we consider this plan in relation to the whole of metropolitan Adelaide, we find that only a very small proportion of the area is involved.

Colonel Light had critics, but the only criticism we can make of him is that perhaps he did not plan far enough afield. Under any plan there must be some mutilation of existing areas. The Highways Department works under a continuing five-year plan, under which developments are taking place and buildings are being mutilated. We can see an example on the Main North Road near the Regency Road intersection, where there are at present many empty shops; the fronts will be carved off these shops and a slice will be taken off a hotel. We are not, however, being inundated with objections from the people affected because of the mutilation taking place. Why?—possibly because there are no politics involved in the matter. This mutilation has become accepted by the people because they have known for a long time that the Main North Road will be widened and that eventually they must be caught up in acquisition.

The same situation will occur in connection with the M.A.T.S. plan: once people know that eventually they will be in the line of the plan they will become reconciled to the fact that acquisition will inevitably occur for the betterment of the whole of metropolitan Adelaide. There are some effects that we cannot deny: by 1986 Adelaide's population will be about 1,250,000; Adelaide will continue to grow; and there is little likelihood of any

significant increase in high-density living, except perhaps in areas where transport is not a major problem.

Critics go to great pains to compare Adelaide with overseas countries, but it is very difficult to do this in respect of transport problems because Adelaide is bounded on one side by a mountain range and on the other side by the sea. It has been admitted that freeways are very good for connecting cities, but there is no major city nearby with which Adelaide can be connected.

The question of the Noarlunga Freeway has been raised several times during this debate. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said that he could not see any necessity for this freeway and that perhaps we could widen South Road, Morphett Road, Marion Road and Brighton Road; the freeway would end on the outskirts of Adelaide. We can liken this situation to a stream: when it nears the coast it branches out into a delta but, when it floods, the whole of the delta is flooded.

If the freeway ended in the way that has been suggested and if it branched out into a number of smaller outlets, the whole area would be flooded with traffic. If, however, the freeway is carried through the city and we connect the north of the city with the south of the city, there will not be a bottleneck. Much of the traffic using freeways is not destined for the city: it passes through the city. Unless we provide facilities for traffic to go through the city the whole transport system will become clogged up.

Australia is a long way behind other countries in the provision of roads. Only 13 per cent of Australia's huge road mileage is classified as highway, and we have few freeways. Only 11 per cent of South Australia's road system is classified as highway, compared with 17 per cent of the New South Wales road system (the highest percentage in the Commonwealth). In Australia the average number of motor vehicles a mile of road (classified as highway) is 65, in South Australia the average is 61, in Victoria it is 88 (the highest), and in Western Australia it is as low as 36. Of course, if we concentrate these vehicles into a thickly populated area we get a much higher density. Only 19 per cent of Australia's huge road mileage is sealed; in this respect we are far behind other countries.

Adelaide can benefit from the mistakes made elsewhere, because our plan is not simply to provide for the present: it is essentially to take care of the foreseeable future. Because traffic



conditions are not critical at present, some people regard the M.A.T.S. plan as extremely lavish. We are all agreed that a transportation plan should be financially feasible; for this to be so, some compromise may be required, and the plan must be flexible enough to enable any such compromise to be made. Over the next 20 years it will probably become necessary to fit in with trends that develop, and it may be necessary to extend the plan over a longer period; no doubt this will occur if there is difficulty in providing the necessary finance to complete the scheme in time.

The business world wants to know where it is going and what the future planning is. In recent years several representations were made to me regarding two of our main thoroughfares (the Main North Road and the Grand Junction Road) because median strips were to be constructed on them. Businesses had moved from the centre of the city to the Main North Road and, in some cases, to Grand Junction Road. Most of these businesses were fairly heavy industries. I do not suggest that the median strips were unnecessary but when they were constructed it became virtually impossible for these businesses to have access to their properties.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not the case on the Main North Road.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes, it is; I beg the Leader's pardon. If he talks with representatives of Freeman Motors Limited on the Main North Road he will find that this is so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You said the Gepps Cross corner, north.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am not talking about that; I am talking about the Main North Road. I know it is in the honourable member's electorate, but I travel on it practically every day.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Well, obviously the honourable member does not know it. North of Gepps Cross there is no trouble, and it is only a tuppenny-halfpenny secondhand car yard that is involved. The honourable member has not got his facts right; that is all it is.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Whether it is a 3c business or not, the fact is that this firm was denied access to the property.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They were not.

The Hon. L. R. HART: And to get over this, the company took out an injunction against the Government in order to prevent the construction of the median strip. The Leader will remember that the median strip was not continued for some time in that locality, and at the present time it is not

completed but several rumble bars have been provided in front of the firm's entrance. The point I am making is that business needs to know what is likely to occur in a particular area in the future so that it can make provision either to cope with problems in that area or shift to another where it could be properly accommodated.

That is why it is necessary to project such a plan into the future. It has been said that it is necessary to upgrade our public transport system, and no doubt over the ensuing years the public transport system, in particular the railways, will be used considerably more than in the past. However, how can people be made to use a public transport system? That is a problem the whole world over, and some countries even provide a free public transport system yet still cannot get people to use it to the desired extent.

It must be remembered that people must be brought to a rail centre in order to use railway transport: only a small percentage of people live near enough to a railway line to take advantage of the service, while any co-ordinated connecting service is never satisfactory. That can be seen in areas where such a service operates in conjunction with the railways. If a connecting service were half a minute late the train would have gone, entailing a probable waiting period of about half an hour. If railway lines are extended, this would no doubt cause more devastation and possibly require more compensation than would be involved in providing freeways.

It has also been stated that no provision has been made in the plan for the development of transport of the future, and here it would be necessary to know what forms future public transport systems would take—whether underground, airborne or conventional road-type transport. I know that public transport can move large numbers of people cheaply, especially at peak periods, but what about off-peak periods? It is still necessary to provide public transport during off-peak periods, but how often do we see a train with only one or two passengers in an off-peak period?

It must also be remembered that the majority of travel is other than to a place of work. Only 33.7 per cent of people use private transport for travelling to and from work, while only 45 per cent of people use public transport for that purpose. Therefore, how is it possible to make people use public transport more often? I know that the Labor Party is opposed to an "open road" policy, and no doubt that Party would increase the

level of taxation in order to force people to use a public transport system for both passenger and goods traffic.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In all of this debate I have heard no mention of the movement of goods, which is just as important as anything else.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is true; most arguments are based on the assumption that people use public transport in order to get to work, and that is why I have mentioned the percentages involved, which indicate that fewer than half the people use public transport to get them to their places of employment. As the Chief Secretary has mentioned, a huge volume of goods is conveyed by road and it is conveyed in that way only because it is convenient to use existing forms of road transport.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone said it would be interesting to see how country members voted on this matter; he said it would be interesting to see whether country members had sufficient intestinal fortitude to reject the motion and support the amendment. I assure the honourable member it is not through any lack of that ingredient that I support the motion; it would be an easy way out to support the amendment and defer the matter of our road transport system for further investigation and report at some time in the indefinable future, a report that could be just as controversial as the present one.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Does the honourable member agree with his colleague representing the District of Light in another place that we spend too much money on our railways now?

The Hon. L. R. HART: My colleague from Light is entitled to his opinion, and I do not think it necessary to involve him in this debate. Opposition to any subsequent plan would merely come from a different cross section of people. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone also expressed concern as to what country people would think about the huge expenditure of money in the metropolitan area. I can tell him what country people thought when he, as Minister of Roads and Transport, was responsible for laying on the table a regulation on August 23, 1966, which had the effect of increasing grain freight rates by up to 33 per cent. Also, I can tell him what country people thought when he introduced the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: No doubt I could get petitions from country people in this regard, as the honourable member does.

The Hon. L. R. HART: No doubt, and the honourable member could probably get some of the same people to sign a counter petition.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is that happening?

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is fashionable to sign petitions at the moment. The Commonwealth Roads Act stipulates that 40 per cent of funds provided to the State has to be expended on rural roads. Considerable pressure is being applied at the present time to have this formula varied to allow the State a discretion how this money should be spent, and it would be interesting to know where the honourable member and his colleagues stand in that matter. It has been said that country people will be paying for these freeways.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: And railways.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Country people will be happy to use the freeways.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What about the railways?

The Hon. L. R. HART: They use the railways when it is convenient to do so, but they will be happy to use the freeways. Most of a country person's costs are involved in transport. If efficient transport is provided, no doubt freight rates to country areas will be reduced. It is easy for a transport vehicle to lose an hour or two through traffic congestion once it reaches the metropolitan area. The community pays heavily if goods and merchandise cannot be transported easily, quickly, and cheaply throughout the whole of the metropolitan area.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris provided several tables dealing with fatalities and road accidents. I do not think he dealt with the figures I have before me relating to fatalities, particularly dealing with the rate for every 10,000 registered vehicles. A table that I have gives the fatality rate for every 10,000 vehicles registered in various countries. In New Zealand it is 5.2; in the United States of America 5.5; in the United Kingdom 6.1; in Canada 7.2; and in Australia it is 8.1. It will be seen that the rate in Australia is far higher than that in most other overseas countries, and this is no doubt contributed to by the fact that we have a poor road system.

In South Australia in 1964-65 there were 19,000 road accidents reported, in 4,900 of which medical attention was required, and there were 117 fatalities. The Chief Secretary, in referring to these details, indicated how our hospital system has been clogged up with people injured as a result of road accidents.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill queried whether some of the money used in the provision of roads in this country should be diverted to general revenue. In speaking in this strain, he was no doubt referring to moneys collected by the Commonwealth Government. When we look at this matter we find that Government collects more from road users than it spends on roads at present. In 1967-68, the Commonwealth and State Governments between them collected \$670,000,000, and the total expenditure on roads by the Commonwealth Government, the State Governments and the local government bodies was only \$605,000,000. The balance of \$65,000,000 went into general revenue.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: All the money collected at State level is spent on roads.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I realize that, but the money that is going into general revenue is still collected from the motorists through petrol tax. I am not convinced that any worthwhile benefits have resulted from bringing the M.A.T.S. Report before Parliament. There has been considerable debate (much of it emotional) and much criticism, but there have been very few concrete suggestions about how the plan can be improved. The suggestion is that we withdraw it for further investigation and come up with a further plan. However, as I said, no doubt that plan would result in just as much debate and just as much criticism and possibly further considerable delay.

It has also been suggested that Parliament should have a greater say in how the moneys available to the Highways Department should be spent, and this may have some merit up to a point. Parliament does have some say in relation to projects such as bridges and various other things. However, it does not have any say regarding the priorities of any department. For instance, Parliament does not decide the priorities in which hospitals, harbours or reservoirs are built. Such projects may be investigated by the Public Works Committee, but that committee only investigates a particular project.

If we were to let Parliament investigate the provision of the road system, what would it investigate? It certainly does not investigate the priorities; it investigates only a certain project. Also, would it have to decide whether a road should be constructed of metal or concrete, or whether it should be sealed? I do not entirely agree with the idea that Parliament should be entitled to debate the plans that are envisaged by the Highways Department.

The amendment to the motion states that the Metropolitan Transportation Committee should

annually make a written report to each House of Parliament on the programme of work in implementing the proposals contained in the report which are accepted from time to time by the Government. Is it expected that every annual report provided by the committee is to be debated in Parliament? No doubt it would be debated on the Loan Estimates, and perhaps it would be brought up during the Budget debate; but would it be debated as a separate item? I do not see that this suggestion has any great merit, for I cannot see that it would improve the situation with regard to our transport system.

The one matter that I think we are all agreed on, and the one that is probably concerning more people than any other, is the question of compensation. Some members have made the point that there should not be any legal costs involved in cases where people have to establish property values in relation to compulsory acquisition. Well, unless a claim goes to compulsory acquisition there are no legal costs anyway. If the Highways Department, which is the acquiring authority in most cases, is able to negotiate privately with the property owner, there are no legal costs involved. Therefore, I do not know just how we can alter this situation.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield dealt with this point at some length. In fact, the honourable member spent most of his time at Glenelg and St. Peters. Obviously, everything is all right in Central District No. 1, because there is no complaint from there: most of the complaints he found were in Central No. 2. In fact, if the honourable member had not had a couple of fairly long letters to read he would not have had much in his speech at all.

However, I have some support for the points that he raised in regard to compensation, particularly on the question whether it should be based on market value or replacement value. I do not think it is necessary for me to reiterate what the honourable member said in relation to these matters. This is something that will no doubt have to be decided by the court that will be set up to hear the appeals. However, if what has been suggested is to occur, it may be necessary to alter the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, because this principle would then apply not only to acquisition under the M.A.T.S. plan but also to all acquisition.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield also quoted some extracts from the Christian Life Movement pamphlet that was circulated to all members.

One or two little paragraphs in this pamphlet that the honourable member did not read are rather interesting. The first one states:

The right of the individual to own particular property is not an absolute one, however, and must be subject to the overriding common good of the State.

I believe that we all concur in this view expressed by the Christian Life Movement people. The next paragraph states:

We affirm therefore that the State has the authority, and may even have the duty, to deprive individual citizens of particular property if the State deems it necessary for the common good. In exercising this authority or duty, however, the State must exercise justice and understanding in its approaches and structures.

I think we all agree with those sentiments also. As I said, the honourable member read several letters criticizing the M.A.T.S. plan, and perhaps it would be refreshing to members if I were to read some reports praising it. I have one here from the Royal Automobile Association which states:

M.A.T.S. Report: timely view of city needs. As a blueprint for Adelaide's future, the M.A.T.S. Report is a timely and rational interpretation of the city's transport needs.

This is the view of the Royal Automobile Association council, after careful consideration of the report. Because present traffic conditions are not yet critical, this may tend to make the proposals seem lavish. But conditions in other cities amply demonstrate the need for progressive thinking in providing motorized accessibility.

The M.A.T.S. proposals give Adelaide the promise of well-balanced transportation which will enable the city to keep its pride of place as a well planned and efficient capital. Community values have been given special attention, with apparent efforts to minimize encroachment on parks, open spaces and public places.

This has itself caused hardships to some citizens, but with proper attention and consideration, these should be capable of being satisfactorily resolved. Final details of specific projects will necessarily be subject to amendment if only by reason of change in population growth or transportation modes. The plan includes a recommendation for a Transportation Planning Group and the R.A.A. considers this should be representative of all interests allied to such a far-reaching project. The M.A.T.S. scheme complements the Development Plan prepared by the State Planning Committee some years ago, and will enable the concept of living envisaged in that plan to materialize by providing fluidity of movement, which is indispensable to the type of low-density development which the people of Adelaide so obviously desire.

We must realize that, unless we do something about the present road congestion in this city, which will intensify as time goes on, we shall cause some stagnation in this State. It is estimated by traffic engineers that the congestion on Australian roads at present costs this country about \$1,000,000,000 a year, and this is the type of money that this country cannot afford.

The future growth of traffic will demand a major development of our transport facilities. Increased leisure time and its profitable use are concerning many people today. There is a demand for more open spaces as people find themselves with more leisure time and more money to spend on leisure and motor cars for getting about. If we do not act now, we shall have not only a traffic but also a social problem. I support the motion.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 3.44 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 28, at 2.15 p.m.