

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 2, 1969.

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

QUESTIONS

NORTHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Has the Minister of Local Government obtained from the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the path off Redward Avenue, which gives access to Northfield High School?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am informed by my colleague that the Public Buildings Department has undertaken a review of the programming of the sealing of the access-way from Redward Avenue to the Northfield High School. It is expected that private offers will be sought in two to three weeks and that the actual work will be undertaken in October, 1969. Concrete pavement is proposed, as this is considered the most suitable form to meet the particular requirements.

GRAIN

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In view of the conflicting reports about the estimated yields of the coming cereal harvest in this State, can the Minister of Agriculture tell me the state of the State, by divisions, in connection with the prospects of the cereal harvest?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will make a statement as soon as possible on the state of the State.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I have been informed by several people, some of whom are particularly well qualified to know, that the two-year agricultural course at the Urrbrae Agricultural High School has, despite certain limitations, been very valuable indeed. In cases where country parents in particular might be likely to take their children away from secondary school after three years, it is very valuable if the children can remain at school to complete this two-year course. Will the Minister ask his colleague to discuss with the Minister of Agriculture, in view of the importance of the agricultural side of the matter, the

possibility of establishing similar courses to the Urrbrae course in strategic country high schools?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer this matter to my colleague, the Minister of Education, and I am sure that she will, in turn, confer with the Minister of Agriculture.

ABORIGINES

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: A leader in this morning's *Advertiser* referred to the recent visit to Australia of a Mr. Brown, a member of the Black Power movement. This leader dealt with the possible effects of the introduction of this movement into Australia, and the writer was of the opinion that for the Aborigines or their supporters to resort to violence would be disastrous. I agree with the writer on this point, although there is a long history of violence done to the Aborigines and, I suppose, violence done by the Aborigines to white people also. Even now in this supposedly enlightened age we have heard of allegations of violence towards Aborigines. In the last paragraph of the leader, the writer states:

If we do not want Black Power in Australia—and we certainly do not—it is our responsibility to do away with all the remaining discriminations, injustices and inequalities which give rise to the Black Power mentality. This is not simply a matter for Government. It is a responsibility which every citizen must recognize and accept.

I agree with this final statement, although I consider that at least in this State the Government has been given a lead by the recent report of the Select Committee on the welfare of Aboriginal children. When the committee met Aborigines, one of the first things said to its members by many of the Aborigines was, "Can you guarantee that any action will be taken as a result of your investigation, otherwise what is the use of telling you what we think; the report that you make will be pigeon-holed, anyway." It took a good deal of coaxing to get some of these people to overcome their apathy towards the committee's work. We have seen what the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs thinks of the committee's recommendation in one instance at least.

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member is rather tending to debate the question.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am coming to the question now, Mr. President. I refer to Colebrook Home, and I should like the Minister to answer the following question: is he going to treat the rest of the committee's recommendations in the same cavalier fashion and, in view of the fact that Aborigines were at last convinced that they should come to the inquiry and talk to us, what further action will he take in regard to the committee's recommendations?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I doubt whether my colleague in another place has treated any of the report in a cavalier fashion, as has just been claimed by the honourable member. However, I shall refer the whole matter to him and bring back a report for the honourable member.

SHELTERED WORKSHOPS

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I was pleased to see in this morning's *Advertiser* a report by the Chief Secretary that the Government had decided to pay a subsidy of \$2.50 for people working in sheltered workshops. Can he say whether this amount is to be in addition to the present amount being given to these workshops for payment for supervisors, etc.?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are a super-optimist.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There seem to be two questions here, one from the Leader about a super-optimist and the other the question that the Hon. Mr. Banfield has asked. Perhaps in reply I can outline the situation in South Australia with regard to sheltered workshops.

Bedford Industries has for a long time, as most honourable members appreciate, received a direct Government grant of \$2.50 for each employee in the workshop. This has not applied to other workshops in this field in relation to either the mentally or the physically handicapped. The present policy being adopted is that all these workshops shall be on the same basis, and over and above the \$2.50 special allocations will be made for specific purposes in respect of these workshops. These will vary from year to year as the needs of the organizations are presented to the Government. The position is that the \$2.50 will be paid to all recognized workshops in this field but other grants will be made to the workshops for specific purposes.

VETERINARY SCIENCE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Minister will recall that I have from time to time asked questions about the need for the establishment of a Chair of Veterinary Science at a South Australian university. I believe that the Australian Universities Commission has taken evidence in all States of the Commonwealth on the need for the establishment of an additional Chair of Veterinary Science in one of the States. From previous information, I understand that a Dr. Farquhar, an officer of the Department of Primary Industry, was loaned to the Australian Universities Commission to take evidence in the various States, and that South Australia prepared evidence that it submitted to Dr. Farquhar. Is the Minister in a position to indicate whether an additional Chair of Veterinary Science is to be established and whether there is a possibility of its being established in South Australia?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is a fact that another Chair of Veterinary Science is to be established in Australia. A report, unfortunately, got out recently stating that the new chair would be at the New England University. This is not so as no decision, to my knowledge, has yet been made. We do know that the case put forward by this State was very well received and those responsible for putting it forward were complimented upon the manner in which the evidence was presented and upon the material. The present position is that no decision has been made. We are very keen indeed that the school be established here.

We believe we have a just claim for it as the numbers of cattle in our northern areas particularly are constantly increasing, we have the abattoirs here which will provide the facilities for the northern areas to channel out stock, and the Department of Primary Industry now requires a veterinarian to be present in all killing works, which is absorbing many veterinarians. We will, without doubt, face a great crisis in the veterinary services that we can provide to the southern part of Australia if we do not in the near future have more facilities. I hope that we shall get the school in the southern part of Australia.

SALE OF M.T.T. BUSES

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I believe the Minister of Roads and Transport has a

reply to my recent question about the disposal of Municipal Tramways Trust buses.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Municipal Tramways Trust is arranging for the direct Elizabeth to Adelaide bus service to be operated by Transway Services Pty. Ltd., under licence. I understand from the General Manager, Municipal Tramways Trust, that Transway Services Pty. Ltd. does not propose to use 8ft. 6in. wide buses on this service.

The M.T.T. has a permit from the Road Traffic Board to operate 8ft. 6in. wide buses. Private bus services operating within the trust's prescribed area are regarded as part of the trust's services, operated under licence. The reason why one particular bus service happens to be run by a private operator rather than the trust itself is principally historical. For these reasons, the Road Traffic Board has approved the issue of permits to allow the use of 8ft. 6in. buses sold by the M.T.T. to private operators for operation within the trust's prescribed area on routes prescribed by and under the control of the trust.

Buses 8ft. 6in. wide no longer required by the trust have been disposed of by private sale. Fifteen 8ft. 6in. wide buses have been sold for \$4,500 each. One bus was sold for cash. The remainder were sold on 10 per cent deposit with the balance to be paid over a period of 57 months with interest at 6 per cent per annum on the amount outstanding—a bill of sale over the buses plus a personal guarantee were required as security for this transaction. This sale was made in accordance with the trust's policy of fostering the development of bus services in areas which may not otherwise be adequately served.

The trust assesses whether it is better to dispose of equipment no longer required by private sale, public tender or public auction, and acts accordingly. Whichever method is used, the attention of prospective purchasers may be drawn to the equipment available by advertising in newspapers or trade journals.

ELIZABETH BUS SERVICE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: On August 19 a report appeared in the *Advertiser*, which I suppose came from the Minister of Roads and Transport, and it read in part:

The buses would travel along the Main North Road from Elizabeth, which would mean that all areas adjacent to the proposed

route north of Frost Road would be served and buses would run express between Frost Road and Adelaide.

Since that time I have received a number of inquiries regarding the position of people living in the northern suburbs as far out as Pooraka and people south of Frost Road who wonder whether they will be able to board such a bus service and be set down at Elizabeth. Many of them would like to do this because they have married children living at Elizabeth whom they like to visit. Can the Minister say whether provision is to be made for passengers to be picked up and set down south of Frost Road on the proposed Elizabeth bus route?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Stopping places for buses on the proposed Elizabeth bus route have not been fully established. Passengers will be permitted to leave buses on journeys to Adelaide and board them on journeys to Elizabeth in the area of the express bus operation. However, passengers will not be permitted to journey wholly within this area; that is to say, passengers will not be picked up on inwards journeys or set down on outwards journeys between Frost Road, Brahma Lodge, and Adelaide.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

At its meeting in June, 1969, the Australian Loan Council adopted a total new borrowing programme of \$758,000,000 for State works and housing. This is an increase of \$48,000,000, or almost 7 per cent, above the 1968-69 borrowing programme of \$710,000,000. South Australia's share of this year's programme, determined on the proportion that has applied in recent years, is \$103,920,000, of which \$21,250,000 is to be borrowed in accordance with the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, leaving \$82,670,000 available for the normal works programme.

The \$21,250,000 for housing is \$1,750,000 more than the \$19,500,000 so allocated last year. The rate of application for loans is now increasing in line with the general improvement in the economy, and it is desirable to provide more funds to meet demand and avoid long waiting periods for loans, with the associated problems of bridging finance.

Further, the Government wishes to support a Housing Trust programme for increased rental accommodation. After providing for advances of \$9,750,000 to the trust there will remain \$11,500,000 of new borrowings to be distributed through the Home Builders Account. This is expected to be supplemented by about \$1,700,000 of net recoveries from interest and from repayments of previous advances, so that the total new moneys available for distribution from the account will be some \$13,200,000. Of this it is proposed that \$11,480,000 be advanced to the State Bank and \$1,720,000 to building societies to support an increased programme of lending to individual house purchasers. These are increases of about 15 per cent beyond the 1968-69 allocations.

Repayments and recoveries of expenditures from Loan Account, some in respect of earlier years' outlays and some corresponding to current outlays, are expected to reach a total of \$18,500,000, which would be about \$2,600,000 above the 1968-69 recoveries. This increase is expected to arise almost entirely from variations in large and unusual items. Taking into account the new borrowings of \$82,670,000 for general purposes and the probable repayments of \$18,500,000, it can be seen that the Government expects to have available in 1969-70 more than \$101,000,000, apart from balances held at June 30, 1969.

After a careful review of the detailed programmes submitted by departments, including requirements for work already in progress, a broad assessment of the capacity of departments and contractors to plan and carry out new works, and an estimate of the probable commitment which would follow in 1970-71 and future years from the commencement of works this year, the Government concluded that it should plan a general 1969-70 programme at a level sufficient to absorb fully the funds currently becoming available, but that it would be wise to reserve most of the Loan balance held at June 30 last. The latter balance, \$12,477,000, had increased by \$6,819,000 during the year from the \$5,658,000 held 12 months previously, the build-up having occurred because of unexpected repayments and some temporary deferment of payments under large contracts.

The programme proposed in the Bill now before the Council totals \$101,716,000. This will require all funds becoming available during 1969-70 and make a small call, of about \$550,000, on the funds held from previous

years. Excluding an appropriation of \$1,061,000, which is part of an accounting rearrangement in respect of funds already invested in assets relating to the West Lakes Development Scheme, the 1969-70 programme now proposed would entail expenditures about 16 per cent greater than actual payments for the Loan programme of 1968-69.

As I have indicated, the Government considers it prudent at this stage to hold in reserve practically the whole of the Loan funds accumulated to the end of June, 1969. It is quite clear that of the balance of \$12,477,000 so held we must continue to hold \$7,905,000 as an offset to Revenue deficits which had been actually incurred and were outstanding at June 30, 1969. Further, the very difficult problems of the Revenue Budget seem likely to continue. As yet the Commonwealth has not given any firm undertaking to make additional general purpose grants during this year, nor has it yet given any indication that it is prepared to support a rearrangement of the financial agreement expiring next June in a form which will give the States real relief. Therefore, although we have carefully controlled our expenditures and increased taxation, the prospect at the moment is for a deficit situation. In addition, there could be seasonal factors involving primary production and water supply, and marketing problems which would adversely affect movement of grain. Almost certainly there will be wage and salary awards that will increase Revenue Budget expenditures. For any or all of these reasons it is necessary to hold Loan funds to ensure that cash is available to meet the Government's accounts.

Another important consideration is the future effect of our carrying out this year a capital programme about 16 per cent above last year. Many projects to be commenced must carry over into next year, and the maximum increase in new funds that could be safely estimated in 1970-71 would not exceed 7 per cent. It is desirable that a reasonable volume of accumulated Loan funds should, if possible, be carried forward into 1970-71 to supplement the new funds becoming available, so that a steady rather than a disjointed increase in capital programmes may be achieved over a period of years. Whether the uncommitted balance of Loan funds presently held will be sufficient to enable continued steady development at the rate now being proposed will depend largely upon possible requirements for any future revenue deficits.

The programme of semi-governmental borrowing approved by the Australian Loan Council in June totalled \$372,000,000, comprising \$364,500,000 for normal annual purposes and \$7,500,000 for special requirements. The latter figure includes up to \$5,500,000 for specially approved borrowings towards financing the South Australian natural gas pipeline. South Australia's share of the normal annual programme is \$19,130,000, and of this \$10,000,000 is to be allocated to the Electricity Trust, \$4,250,000 to the Housing Trust, \$350,000 to the pipelines authority, and \$4,530,000 to the larger local government borrowers. For local government bodies and statutory authorities wishing to borrow individually not in excess of \$300,000 this year there is no aggregate limit. Under these arrangements the State Bank proposes to borrow \$300,000 this year, as in earlier years, to assist in financing the loans to producers scheme. The Electricity Trust and the Housing Trust will continue to supplement their capital provisions with internal funds such as surpluses, capital recoveries, and their normal maintenance and depreciation provisions. I will now give honourable members a brief review of the main Loan works and purposes for which the Bill provides.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES, \$650,000—The State Bank, which administers the Advances for Homes scheme on behalf of the Government, also handles the detailed allocation of a large part of the moneys which the State borrows at a concessional rate of interest under the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and which it makes available through the Home Builders Account. State Loan funds now form only a very small part of the bank's home-lending programme. The \$650,000 proposed this year from general Loan funds will be used in financing the purchase of houses constructed by the Housing Trust, mainly in country areas. Because of arrangements with the Commonwealth, the Housing Agreement moneys are not available to finance the purchase of Housing Trust dwellings. In 1969-70 the bank is likely to have available for lending a total of about \$14,000,000. This will be derived from new borrowings under the Housing Agreement, State Loan funds, repayments of previous advances, and use of balances on hand. This year loans are being approved under the Housing Agreement out of the Home Builders Account upon new houses at the rate of 32 a week as compared with an average of 28 a week in 1968-69, and loans upon established houses at the rate of three a week instead of two a week last financial year.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS, \$1,400,000—It is proposed that about \$1,700,000 will be available in 1969-70 to enable the bank to continue to assist in financing capital extensions by co-operative enterprises. A sum of \$1,400,000 is to be provided from Loan Account and \$300,000 will be raised by way of new semi-government loans.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS, \$120,000—This amount is proposed to enable the bank to make advances to settlers for farm buildings and houses, land clearing and pasture development, and for farm water supply improvements.

ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, \$600,000—Advances of State Loan funds are required by the State Bank from time to time to provide additional capital for the bank's normal trading bank services for primary producers, for secondary industry and for commerce. It is expected that certain funds held on deposit at the bank will be drawn upon heavily during 1969-70, particularly by the Municipal Tramways Trust, which has been holding funds temporarily at the bank pending their use in the re-equipment programme which will proceed at an accelerated rate this year. The Government proposes that \$600,000 be advanced from Loan Account this year to recoup in some measure this withdrawal of deposits and so support the important and expanding general banking functions of the State Bank.

STUDENT HOSTELS, \$300,000—The purpose of loans under the Student Hostels (Advances) Act is to assist in the financing of accommodation for students, mainly country students, at educational institutions. Loans are made on a long-term basis and on conditions comparable with loans for housing purposes. It is estimated that \$300,000 will be required this year.

ROADS AND BRIDGES, \$200,000—A provision of Loan funds of \$200,000 is proposed this year in case it should be necessary to supplement the funds available to the Highways Department from State motor taxation and from contributions under the Commonwealth Aid Roads legislation. The Government intends to ensure that this State qualifies for the maximum matching grants available from the Commonwealth Government. To attract those grants in full, and to cover temporary variations in the impact of acquisitions, it may be necessary to make some short-term advances of State Loan funds.

SOUTH - WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE, \$2,600,000—The drainage scheme was commenced in 1960-61 and the first stage is estimated to cost almost \$8,000,000. All of the

funds required are being provided by the Government in the first instance and then half of the cost, apart from a special contribution of \$1,000,000 being made available by the Government towards costs associated with work in the lower reaches of the river, will be recovered subsequently by instalments from the local authorities whose areas will benefit. As it is desirable that the scheme be completed as quickly as possible, a substantially increased allocation of \$2,600,000 has been set aside in 1969-70.

OTHER URBAN DRAINAGE, \$750,000—To assist councils in the disposal of floodwaters, the Government provides \$1 for \$1 subsidies up to approved limits for the construction of suitable projects for main drains. Councils are responsible for finding their quota of one-half of the funds required and for carrying out the actual work. A sum of \$750,000 is provided in 1969-70 to continue work on many schemes already approved and to commence new schemes in the metropolitan area and in country towns as approved during the year.

PUBLIC PARKS, \$300,000—This provision continues the existing arrangements for the purchase of land for public parks and recreation areas and for grants to local government authorities to assist them in the purchase of open areas to be used for such purposes.

LANDS DEPARTMENT—BUILDINGS, PLANT, ETC., \$440,000—The amount proposed for 1969-70 has been increased substantially following approval for the purchase of specialist machinery for the Mapping Branch of the Lands Department. This is an initial part of the programme to install the Mapping Branch in the new Government Printing Office building to be constructed at Netley, and to re-equip that branch.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, \$430,000—Proposed expenditures in 1969-70 include the following: the sum of \$40,000 to complete a new pumping station at Cadell. (The building has been completed and suction and delivery lines are being installed. The scheme is estimated to cost \$120,000); \$40,000 to complete the construction of an overhead storage tank at Barmera to replace the existing tank which is no longer capable of meeting requirements, and \$10,000 to extend the reticulated supply to the East Lake area; and \$204,000 for reconstruction and replacement of old channels with pipe main. Of this latter figure, \$95,000 is required for portion of the main channel at Cooltong.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE, \$300,000—Of the \$300,000 provided this year, \$198,000 is for the construction of additional subsidiary drains in the Western Division, \$82,000 is for the completion of stop banks at Bool Lagoon and cleaning-up operations along the Mosquito Creek inlet channel in the Eastern Division, and \$20,000 is for various minor works.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST, \$250,000—The Renmark Irrigation Trust Act provides for the Government to finance the cost of constructing a pumping station at Renmark together with rising mains and ancillary works up to a total amount of \$1,120,000. Two-sevenths of the amount advanced is to be by way of grant and the remainder by way of loan repayable by instalments by the trust. The Act also provides for Government grants not exceeding \$1,000,000 in total to be paid to the trust towards the cost of rehabilitation of the irrigation works and the provision of additional drainage work. The earlier proposals for the pumping station and ancillary works are being revised following an overseas visit last year by representatives of the trust.

A provision of \$150,000 is expected to be required this year for work on the pumping station and rising mains, and the agreed annual payment of \$100,000, up to the limit of \$1,000,000 set down in the Act, is provided towards rehabilitation of the irrigation works and for additional drainage works.

AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, \$2,450,000—For 1969-70 a total amount of \$2,750,000 is proposed—\$2,450,000 to be provided from Loan Account and \$300,000 from Commonwealth advances under the Softwood Forestry Agreement. The more important provisions are as follows: \$450,000 to meet the cost of recurring maintenance services involved in forest establishment and development; \$919,000 for preparation of land and planting; \$373,000 for the purchase of land suitable for forestry as it becomes available; \$58,000 as a further contribution to the National Sirex Fund for research purposes; and \$145,000 for the construction of a new regional office at Mount Gambier.

RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION, \$7,700,000—The requirement this year for the Way and Works Branch is \$3,380,000, the main appropriations being: \$1,860,000 for sundry works such as track re-laying, bridges and culverts, signalling and safety devices, minor buildings and improvements to yards as they are required; \$20,000 for the completion of fencing for the new railway from Ceduna to Kevin; \$120,000

for the purchase or construction of houses for employees; and \$780,000 for plant and sundries. A special provision of \$600,000 is made for the railways undertaking this year as a first contribution toward a special programme of betterment of permanent way adopted in accordance with the recommendations of an expert committee that inquired into derailments. The special programme will also require additional revenue appropriations for overtaking deferred maintenance of the permanent way upon the main railway lines.

For Rolling Stock Branch items, \$4,320,000 is required in 1969-70, the more important provisions being: \$419,000 for progress payments for nine diesel-electric locomotives; \$626,000 for work on nine suburban railcars; \$216,000 to complete five joint stock brake vans and spares; \$168,000 to complete three joint stock lounge-cafeteria cars; \$655,000 for the construction of 50 louvre vans; \$645,000 for work on 42 flat waggons; and \$236,000 to continue the programme of modifications and improvements to freight vehicles. The conversion to 4ft. 8½in. gauge of the existing narrow gauge railway from Port Pirie to Broken Hill and the extension of the 5ft. 3in. gauge from Terowie to Peterborough, the funds for which are being provided initially by the Commonwealth Government under standardization arrangements, are proceeding satisfactorily. Further progress requiring expenditure of about \$9,200,000 from Commonwealth funds is proposed during 1969-70. A sum of \$643,000 is provided from Loan Account for the provision of six diesel-electric locomotives and spares for 4ft. 8½in. gauge, for the conversion of six diesel-electric locomotives from 3ft. 6in. gauge to 4ft. 8½in. gauge, and for sundry items of rolling stock.

HARBOURS ACCOMMODATION, \$4,725,000—This year's provisions include the following: \$650,000 is provided to continue work on the provision of berthing facilities for interstate container and roll off traffic, the scheme consisting primarily of a wharf for a 430ft.-long vehicular container ship, dredging, paving and associated works; \$850,000 is required for further work on widening and deepening the river channel between the Outer and Inner Harbours; \$90,000 is proposed to continue the construction of a swinging basin opposite No. 3 Dock, Port Adelaide; \$1,037,000 is provided for further work on the provision of bulk loading facilities at Port Giles, additional funds having been allocated this year, so that the new port may operate as from May next, instead of October-November as previously

planned; and \$1,253,000 is proposed to commence work on dredging and other port improvements at Thevenard to allow larger vessels to engage in the export of wheat and gypsum.

WEST LAKES DEVELOPMENT, \$1,061,000—Negotiations were carried out over a long period with respect to the possible development by the Government and private enterprise of the area of about 1,650 acres of low-lying land around the Upper Port Reach. As a result of those negotiations, a firm arrangement has now been made with Development Finance Corporation Limited, and the Government proposes to introduce enabling legislation as soon as possible. At that stage full details will be given to Parliament. In the meantime it is desirable to bring together in the one account the records of past expenditures and the outstanding liability of the South Australian Housing Trust, the Marine and Harbors Department and the Lands Department for the land, which is the subject of the special arrangement. The appropriation of \$1,061,000 from a new loan account to recoup the accounts of the three authorities will in itself have no net impact on Government finances.

FISHING HAVENS AND FORESHORE IMPROVEMENTS, \$225,000—A sum of \$225,000 is proposed this year for work on a number of projects to provide improved facilities, the more important being \$39,000 to complete extensions to the jetty at Cape Jaffa, \$54,000 for the construction of a landing structure at Coffin Bay, and \$20,000 to commence the reconstruction of the slipway at Robe.

WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, \$30,965,000—The more important provisions for 1969-70 are as follows:

Metropolitan Waterworks, \$10,559,000—An amount of \$912,000 is proposed to continue work on the provision of additional pumping plant for the Mannum-Adelaide main. This work will provide for the optimum capacity of the main. Also, \$4,683,000 is provided for further work on the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main, which will augment the metropolitan water supply by pumping water from the Murray River and lifting it through three pumping lifts for discharge into the Onkaparinga River. The estimated total cost of the scheme is \$25,250,000. Another scheme designed to improve the supply of water to the metropolitan area is the Kangaroo Creek reservoir, which is estimated to cost \$5,300,000, \$1,166,000 being provided for progress work

this year. Funds are also provided for extensions and improvements to the water supply at Braeview, Elizabeth, Modbury, Salisbury, and Torrens Island and Gillman areas, and for fluoridation equipment at various reservoirs to provide for the eventual fluoridation of the metropolitan water supply.

Country Waterworks, \$8,337,000—The sum of \$575,000 is proposed to continue the construction of a pipeline that will connect the Tod trunk main near Lock with Kimba. Water will be drawn from the Poldra Basin, and the main will provide an assured supply to the township of Kimba as well as to extensive areas of farm lands. The estimated total cost of the scheme is \$2,264,000. An amount of \$1,051,000 is set aside for further work on the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla main, which is nearing completion. All mains work has been completed. Work will continue this year on construction of pumping stations and installation of pumping and ancillary machinery. The scheme is estimated to cost \$30,750,000. The sum of \$1,260,000 is provided to continue work connected with a main from the Murray River at Swan Reach to Stockwell. During 1969-70, it is proposed to complete storage tanks and continue construction of three permanent pumping stations. The estimated total cost of the scheme is \$8,000,000.

An amount of \$2,250,000 is proposed to continue the construction of a trunk water main from Taillem Bend to Keith. The full scheme, including branch mains and services from the trunk main to enable full development of about 2,800 square miles of farming and grazing lands, is estimated to cost a total of \$14,000,000. The Commonwealth Government has agreed to provide a special grant of \$6,000,000 under the National Water Resources Development Programme to assist with the scheme to enable it to be completed by 1973 instead of in the 1980's. The expenditure proposed this year will include the expenditure of \$1,500,000 of Commonwealth funds which are expected to be received and which are included in the estimate of Loan repayments. The enlargement and replacement of the old Tod trunk main to improve supply and increase capacity to meet future demand is proceeding satisfactorily, and \$750,000 is provided this year for further work on the scheme, for which the estimated total cost is \$6,500,000. Provision has also been made for water supply schemes at many other country areas.

Metropolitan Sewerage, \$6,389,000—The sum of \$625,000 is provided for the virtual

completion of the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works, which is estimated to cost \$24,375,000. All contract works on the civil structures and machinery installations are nearing completion, and it is expected that the treatment works will be in full operation by 1970. An amount of \$840,000 is required to continue work on the Christies Beach Sewage Treatment Works, which are necessary to cater for the extensive housing development taking place in the south coast area. The estimated total cost of the scheme is \$2,500,000. The sum of \$1,000,000 is proposed for reconstruction of sewers in 1969-70. Of this amount, \$400,000 is for further work on the reconstruction of the south-western suburbs drainage area to cope with increasing outflows, and also to serve the sewerage of Blackwood and Belair which will commence this year and \$400,000 is included for the reconstruction and replacement of many old trunk sewers in the western suburbs. Funds are also provided for other reconstruction works, for sewerage of many new housing areas, and for treatment works and pumping stations.

Country Sewerage, \$2,275,000—The sum of \$350,000 is provided to continue work on the extension of sewerage facilities to Gawler. This comprehensive sewerage scheme is estimated to cost \$3,620,000. An amount of \$450,000 is proposed for further work on the sewerage scheme at Millicent, which is necessary to protect underground water supplies and to meet the demands of rapidly developing housing and industrial areas. The estimated total cost of the scheme is \$1,350,000. The sum of \$500,000 is proposed for a scheme to provide sewerage facilities for the town of Murray Bridge to prevent pollution of the Murray River. The scheme is estimated to cost \$1,800,000. A further amount of \$400,000 is proposed to continue work on the sewerage scheme at Whyalla, which is estimated to cost \$4,650,000.

Other Works—A special provision of \$440,000 is included in the appropriation for Waterworks and Sewers towards the development costs of that portion of the old Islington sewage farm area, which is to be sold for industrial use. The proceeds of sales of land will be credited to the Loan Account, Waterworks and Sewers, as received, and the Government considers that the development costs such as surveys, roadworks, and water and sewer services are therefore a proper charge against that account.

MURRAY RIVER WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS, ETC., \$400,000—Provision has been made for the State's contribution of \$400,000 towards the cost of capital works being undertaken in terms of the River Murray Waters Agreement. Of this amount, \$113,000 is required towards purchase by the River Murray Commission of a new derrick boat.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, \$27,800,000—

Hospital Buildings, \$10,700,000. The main proposals for 1969-70 are:

Royal Adelaide Hospital—The sum of \$3,526,000 is provided to continue work on the rebuilding scheme for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, including a new wing for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. The estimated total cost of the complete scheme is \$26,200,000. The greater part of the proposed expenditure in 1969-70 is for work on a new nurses' home and the new wing of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital—An amount of \$2,000,000 is proposed for further work on major additions at the hospital involving a new ward wing, an additional floor over the existing ward block, extensions to the outpatients' block, and a new pharmacy. The scheme is estimated to cost a total of \$8,500,000.

Strathmont Hospital—The sum of \$2,800,000 is provided to continue the construction of the new Strathmont Hospital and training centre for the intellectually retarded. The estimated total cost of the hospital is \$6,600,000.

Modbury Hospital—An amount of \$400,000 is proposed to continue work on the first stage of the new hospital at Modbury to serve the north-eastern suburbs. Stage I of the scheme consists of the main hospital building, a nurses' home, accommodation for resident medical staff, a boiler house and workshops, and is estimated to cost \$9,600,000.

Port Augusta Hospital—The sum of \$250,000 is provided to commence construction of new buildings at the Port Augusta Hospital to provide modern accommodation for patients, a new kitchen and dining room, nurses' home, boiler house and laundry, and other service facilities. The new buildings are estimated to cost \$3,450,000.

Port Pirie Hospital—During 1969-70 it is proposed to commence work on the redevelopment of the Port Pirie Hospital, which is to be undertaken as two separate projects. The first project is estimated to cost \$1,331,000 and comprises a children's and maternity ward

complex, nurses' training centre, administration accommodation, bulk store and mortuary. The second project comprises a geriatric ward of 60 beds and a new nurses' home, and is estimated to cost \$1,517,000. The sum of \$150,000 is provided this year to commence work on the redevelopment scheme, and \$33,000 is provided for cooling and re-roofing of the hospital kitchen.

School Buildings, \$13,800,000—For 1969-70 the proposals for school buildings and associated works total \$13,800,000, and it is intended that these funds will be applied as follows:

	\$
Work under 22 projects with a total value of \$12,722,000 for new schools or major additions to schools, and teachers colleges which were in progress at June 30, 1969	5,715,000
The commencement of 30 projects with a total value of \$6,896,000 for new schools or major additions to schools, technical colleges and adult education centres	1,715,000
Minor new buildings	1,270,000
Prefabricated buildings and transportable units	1,140,000
Flexible school units	230,000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences for school purposes	1,200,000
Minor works, including grading and paving of school yards, fencing, roadways, toilets and facilities, furniture and equipment, subsidized works, additional samcon schools and preliminary investigations and design . .	2,530,000
	\$13,800,000

Included in the proposed expenditure are technical colleges, science laboratories, teachers' colleges and libraries projects towards which the Commonwealth will continue to contribute unmatched grants in accordance with its legislation.

Police and Courthouse Buildings, \$800,000—An amount of \$55,000 is provided to commence work on the third stage of the development scheme for the Police Training Academy. This stage is estimated to cost \$380,000 and consists of the provision of two additional dormitory units to provide sleeping accommodation for 100 cadets. An amount of \$205,000 is proposed for work on new police stations at Blanchetown, Burra, Elliston, Gladstone, Lameroo, Maitland, Meningie, Para Hills, Port Wakefield, and Snowtown. The sum of \$5,000 is provided to commence the construction of divisional headquarters at

Whyalla, \$50,000 is provided for alterations to the old Police Headquarters, and \$100,000 is to provide accommodation for the establishment of intermediate courts.

Other Government Buildings, \$2,500,000—The major proposals for 1969-70 are:

Agricultural College Department—An amount of \$245,000 is provided to commence work on remodelling the wine cellars at the college to provide improved demonstration and laboratory facilities for oenology students. The project is being financed by Commonwealth grants for technical training.

Agriculture Department—The sum of \$60,000 is required to complete a new laboratory and offices at Loxton Research Centre, and \$90,000 is required to commence work on additional facilities for the fumigation of fruit at Mile End.

Public Health Department—The sum of \$220,000 is provided for the establishment of dental clinics at various country schools.

Department of Social Welfare—The sum of \$60,000 is required to complete additions at the junior boys training school at Lochiel Park, and \$25,000 is required to complete additional accommodation at Windana Remand Home.

Government Printing Department—The sum of \$100,000 is provided to commence the construction of a new printing office and mapping branch at Netley. The estimated total cost of the scheme is about \$4,550,000, and it has been designed to incorporate the most modern facilities for all printing purposes. Adjacent to the new printing office will be located the mapping branch building, comprising photogrammetry and cartography production areas together with ancillary training facilities.

Prisons Department—The sum of \$150,000 is required to complete work on the rehabilitation centre at Northfield designed to accommodate 46 women prisoners and to replace the existing inadequate accommodation at the Adelaide Gaol.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST—As has been the practice in recent years, it is not proposed to make provision for direct advances to the Housing Trust from Loan Account in 1969-70, and accordingly the Bill does not include an appropriation for the trust. The greater part of the trust's new money will be provided from funds borrowed under the provisions of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement at a concessional interest rate. For this year the allocation proposed is \$9,750,000.

The trust will also borrow part of its requirement of new money direct from lending institutions, and \$4,250,000 of semi-governmental borrowing authority has been set aside for this purpose. This will give total new moneys of \$14,000,000 in 1969-70, compared with \$13,210,000 in 1968-69. In addition, the trust has available for expenditure its balances on hand, the use of funds recovered from the sale of houses and other internal funds, as well as its surplus on current operations. From all sources it will have funds capable of financing a capital programme of \$24,320,000.

The trust has continued to be particularly active in the provision of housing of reasonable standard in the country and, of a total of 1,898 completions last year, almost half were in country areas. Of the 1,342 houses under construction at June 30, 1969, over 55 per cent were in the country. The major part of the trust's activity in the country has again been at Whyalla to meet the needs of industrial growth. The general dissection of the trust's capital programme of \$24,320,000 planned for 1969-70 is \$9,400,000 for rental housing, \$3,500,000 for rental-purchase housing, \$8,690,000 for houses for sale, \$625,000 for flats, \$1,655,000 for shops and industrial premises, and \$450,000 for miscellaneous items.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA—LOAN TO, \$6,000,000—During 1969-70 the trust proposes to spend \$23,720,000 on capital works. The sum of \$6,000,000 is to be provided from State Loan funds, \$10,000,000 to be raised by the trust from financial institutions and the public, with the balance of \$7,720,000 to be met from the trust's internal funds. The main proposals this year are: \$6,970,000 is provided for further work on the Torrens Island power station. Of this, \$6,220,000 is for Section A, which is planned to have four turbo-generators each of 120,000 kilowatt capacity, with associated boilers and ancillary equipment, \$600,000 for the first stage of Section B, and \$150,000 for design and preliminary site costs for a gas turbine installation. The sum of \$910,000 is required for virtual completion of the extension of the 275,000-volt transmission system to Cherry Gardens and Happy Valley substations.

The sum of \$1,140,000 is provided for progress payments on the reinforcement of 132,000-volt supply to the Adelaide Hills and Lower Murray areas and the South-East. The sum of \$430,000 is set aside for final payments associated with the present stage for the reinforcement of supply to

the Mid-Northern areas. The sum of \$410,000 is required for the acquisition of the Port Pirie electricity undertaking, including final payments for the establishment of a works depot. The sum of \$2,040,000 is proposed for transmission lines and associated works to augment and improve supply throughout the State.

The sum of \$2,810,000 is provided for the purchase of large transformers, circuit breakers, and other major items of equipment. The sum of \$3,280,000 is required for extensions and improvements to the medium and low-voltage sections of the general distribution system. The sum of \$1,280,000 is set aside for extensions to rural consumers not previously connected to the trust's system. The sum of \$870,000 is proposed for the purchase of transformers for the general distribution system and rural supply. The sum of \$950,000 is required for the purchase of meters and control equipment.

LEIGH CREEK COALFIELD—The \$1,524,000 proposed in 1969-70 is to be met wholly from internal funds, and the Bill therefore does not include an appropriation; \$1,351,000 is provided for a new walking dragline excavator, which is necessary to increase the rate of overburden removal, as coal reserves are being worked at gradually increasing depths, and \$173,000 is provided for plant, machinery, vehicles and minor works.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, LOAN TO, \$1,500,000—Parliament was informed 12 months ago that the total cost of planning and constructing a 22in. pipeline to carry natural gas from the Gidgealpa-Moomba area to Adelaide was estimated to be close to \$40,000,000. Capital funds drawn to June 30, 1969, were \$31,784,000, and it is likely that cumulative expenditures by the end of 1969-70 will be well within the earlier estimate at about \$38,500,000. Some further expenditure to increase the capacity of the pipeline by installing compressor stations is anticipated during the following years.

Excellent progress is being made by the contractors constructing the pipeline and the earlier target that gas should be supplied to the consumers in Adelaide before the end of 1969 seems certain to be achieved. The pipeline and its equipment are being financed by a special loan of \$15,000,000 from the Commonwealth Government, by semi-government borrowings under a special approval of \$20,000,000 given by the Australian Loan

Council, by borrowings within the normal semi-government programme, and by some supplements of State Loan funds as necessary. The proposed advance of \$1,500,000 of State Loan funds in 1969-70 is primarily to cover a temporary need pending receipt of funds from semi-government borrowings already arranged. A repayment during the latter part of the year of \$1,000,000 of these State funds has accordingly been included in the estimate of Loan recoveries.

FESTIVAL HALL, \$700,000—The Government has reached agreement with the Adelaide City Council in respect of the construction and financing of a festival hall at Elder Park. The council is to be the constructing authority for the project, which is expected to cost closely \$4,600,000. The present broad proposals for finance are that the Government will make a total grant of rather more than \$2,900,000, the council expects to provide almost \$1,400,000, and it is hoped that some \$300,000 may be raised by public subscription. To avoid a heavy impact on Loan Account in one or two years the Government has planned that its contribution be spread over four years.

The first annual payment of \$700,000 was set aside in a special Deposit Account last year and this Bill provides the second annual contribution of \$700,000. The council is now going ahead as quickly as practicable with preliminary planning.

I would point out that the Government also must provide for the indirect costs in supporting the festival hall proposal. It will be necessary for the Railways Department to move certain buildings to clear the hall site and to make arrangements for replacement buildings.

UNIVERSITY AND ADVANCED EDUCATION BUILDINGS, \$5,000,000—This provision is for grants towards new buildings and associated site development and major items of furniture and equipment for the University of Adelaide, for residential colleges affiliated with the university, for the Flinders University of South Australia, and for the South Australian Institute of Technology. The \$5,000,000 proposed is required to complete projects approved for the triennium ending on December 31, 1969, and to cover expected progress on works expected to be approved for the first six months of the triennium 1970 to 1972. All university and institute projects are subject to the recommendation of the Australian Universities Commission or the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education.

For the Institute of Technology, expenditure will be mainly for site development and the construction of new buildings at The Levels. The \$5,000,000 comprises both State and Commonwealth contributions, the Commonwealth grants being credited to Loan Account as repayments when received.

NON-GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL AND INSTITUTION BUILDINGS, \$2,400,000. The major building projects at non-government hospitals and institutions for which grants are proposed this year include:

Burnside War Memorial Hospital—A grant of \$200,000 towards a 29-bed expansion.

Calvary Hospital—A grant of \$166,000 towards a new surgical wing, recovery room, central sterile supply, air conditioning, and accommodation for an additional 29 beds.

Helping Hand Centre—A grant of \$90,000 to assist in the building of a 100-bed infirmary for chronically-sick aged persons.

Kuitpo Colony—A grant of \$120,000 towards a rebuilding scheme at this institution.

Lyell McEwin Hospital—A grant of \$94,000 towards the cost of a new nurses dining room, pharmacy, staff amenities, and alterations to the kitchen.

Maitland Hospital—A grant of \$150,000 towards rebuilding of the hospital.

Murray Bridge Hospital—A grant of \$152,000 towards extensive alterations to increase the bed capacity by 15 beds, and the construction of a new nurses home.

Queen Victoria Hospital—A grant of \$160,000 towards completion of the fifth floor of a new wing.

MINES DEPARTMENT, \$300,000—This sum is provided this year for capital items to be used in the programme of exploration and development of the State's mineral resources. The sum of \$48,000 is required for the construction of new administration and workshop buildings at the Naracoorte depot, and \$252,000 for new and replacement vehicles, minor additions to buildings, and for the purchase of replacement and additional plant and equipment.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHOOL BUSES, \$330,000—This sum is proposed this year for the purchase of additional and replacement buses for the transport of schoolchildren in country areas.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, \$900,000—The Automatic Data Processing Centre has been set up to process commercial-type work

and to perform calculations of an engineering and scientific nature. The centre came into operation in September, 1965, and since that date has undertaken the processing of quarterly water and sewer accounts, teachers' salaries, agriculture herd statistics, electoral rolls, motor vehicle registrations and drivers' licences, records associated with the receipt of and liability for receipts duty under the Stamp Duties Act, and maintenance of a common property valuation file. Preparatory work is continuing for the processing of land tax records and for the establishment of Education personnel, property and pupil data files. Planning has progressed for the processing of stores records, and many other smaller projects are awaiting implementation. The present equipment is now engaged almost to its capacity, and the purchase of new equipment to upgrade the centre's installation is necessary if further development in data processing is to continue. The Government has approved the purchase of new equipment to allow for this further development and to permit the eventual phasing out of the original equipment at the end of its economic life. The sum of \$900,000 is provided for the purchase of additional equipment in 1969-70.

I turn now to the clauses of the Bill. Clause 3 sets out the moneys which make up the Loan Fund. Clause 4 provides for borrowing by the Treasurer of \$82,670,000. This is the amount of South Australia's allocation for works and purposes arranged at the June, 1969, meeting of Loan Council. Clause 5 provides for the expenditure of \$101,716,000 on the undertakings set out in the Schedule to the Bill. Clause 6 makes provision for borrowing and payment of an amount to cover any discounts, charges and expenses incurred in connection with borrowing for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 7 makes provision for temporary finance if the moneys in the Loan Fund are insufficient for the purposes of the Bill.

Clause 8 authorizes the borrowing and the issue of \$40,000,000 for the purpose of financing Loan undertakings in the early part of next financial year until the Public Purposes Loan Bill for 1970 becomes effective. The authority of this clause has been limited to \$30,000,000 in each of the last three annual Bills. With increasing borrowings and increasing Loan expenditures year by year, it is necessary from time to time to bring the figure into line with current requirements. The Government proposes that the authority for the early part of next financial year be extended to \$40,000,000.

Clause 9 gives the Treasurer power to borrow against the issue of Treasury bills or by bank overdraft. The Treasurer possesses and may exercise this authority under other legislation, but it is desirable to make the authority specific year by year in the Public Purposes Loan Bill as is done with other borrowing authority. A clause in this form was first included in a Public Purposes Loan Bill in 1961 and it has remained unchanged since then. The authority to borrow against Treasury bills to finance temporary Revenue deficits within a year is used consistently and the Government proposes that it should not be altered. The authority to borrow by way of overdraft for limited periods is necessary because the Treasury, in endeavouring to earn as much interest as practicable, arranges for most of the State's cash balances to be held in fixed deposits. Accordingly, the current account balance is held to a relatively low level, and in these circumstances it is possible for an unusual combination of very large payments to cause a very short term over-drawing.

Although this authority is very seldom used, the Government considers it would be desirable to have the maximum increased from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 to give a greater margin against an unforeseen coincidence of heavy payments. Further, examination of the changes in timing and flow of funds indicates that an over-drawing could now happen at the end of a month as well as within a month. Therefore, it is proposed that, instead of requiring repayment by the end of a calendar month, the clause should require repayment within seven days. It is most unlikely that any over-drawing would last more than a day or two.

Clause 10 deals with the duration of certain clauses of the Bill. Clause 11 directs that all moneys received by the State under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act shall be credited to a special account to be paid out as required for the purposes of that Act. Clause 12 provides for the Bill to operate as from July 1, 1969. I commend it for consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

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 28. Page 1303.)

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I address myself to this motion with considerable reluctance, for several reasons. First, after considerable pressure by indignant members supported by indignant minor planners and affected members of the public, the Government agreed that it would approve a full discussion of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan in Parliament. Having said this, it then produces a long rigmarole of about 600 words asking this Council to acknowledge legislation which it has already passed and to agree that that legislation contained all the necessary safeguards against virtually all contingencies which might arise out of any transportation planning in the future. The motion goes on to suggest we endorse the general principles underlying the M.A.T.S. proposal, which, of course, in the vaguest manner possible covers everything in the study; but then it hedges and sets out a long list of individual items to be approved, many of which will come up for final discussion long after the majority of honourable members have departed beyond the confines of metropolitan Adelaide; this is followed by specifically excepting certain items in the study found to be generally unpopular.

The motion then proceeds to suggest that "this Council is of the opinion" that certain reports should be made annually and, further, that the Government should look at the existing legislation on the compulsory acquisition of land. Not to be out-done, the ex-Minister (Hon. Mr. Bevan) has moved a lengthy amendment virtually condemning the study from various angles. Secondly, the motion, while obviously permitting the widest scope for debate, puts the question in a form of "take it or leave it". I may, and in fact do, agree with a very large part of the study, but if I do not agree with, for example, some of the exceptions, or that annual reports should be made before or after the work is contemplated (or partly done), I would appreciate it if you, Mr. President, would direct me how to record a proper vote by an Aye or Nay. If I vote "aye", I will be charged by all and sundry with supporting the whole motion unconditionally, unless one reads the whole of my speech at a later date; if I vote "nay" I am apparently totally opposed to the study.

Having thus left honourable members to ponder not only what they will do but what I will do, I would advise them.

At the moment, it is my intention to move an amendment to this motion, which is now available to honourable members. The amendment purports to endorse the necessity of an overall co-ordinating plan, but it leaves out the many lines of detail on which, obviously, various honourable members find themselves in disagreement; they are, therefore, in the same position as I am. It does not, however, leave out the clauses which confirm our approval that the Government shall report annually on major projects which they contemplate under the study and it also leaves in our approval that the Government shall look closely into the present compulsory Acquisition of Land Act. By supporting my amendment, honourable members can find themselves giving a general approval of the Government's attitude but significantly refusing to endorse all or any of the specific projects mentioned in the motion. I will proceed to debate certain aspects of the study and points that have been raised by various honourable members.

First, I find myself in entire agreement with much that other honourable members, and particularly the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, and later the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, have said, that all interested people in these plans must regret the disgraceful Party political angle that has developed. I do not wish to enter into the finer points as to when the plan was or was not available to certain people, and I deplore the language associated with that discussion; but let me say definitely that all honourable members must realize that parts of the study, at any rate were available to many people long before the actual tabling of it in the Council. I now pose this question to my friend the ex-Minister (Hon. Mr. Bevan) of the Labor Party: had this \$600,000,000 study been available to the Labor Government (if it was not, I say "had it been") what would the Minister have done with it?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You do not want me to tell you here, do you?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Would his Party have pigeon-holed a project of this magnitude which its Cabinet had authorized to be printed in other States at a considerable cost to the taxpayer? The Labor Cabinet approved the printing of this plan at a cost in excess of \$28,000, but two honourable members by speech and interjection using the term "lie"

(not the usual Chamber music we are accustomed to here) were members of a Cabinet that approved this expenditure on something that they now say they never saw. Such an approval, on their own statements, demands more than a cursory explanation.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We had no alternative; what are you talking about?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: May I say emphatically that the original presentation and publicity associated with the study was suicidal, and it undoubtedly provided the biggest bag of organized chaos I have ever encountered in my political life. Critics far outnumbered the people who might be affected, and planners sprang up faster than mushrooms after the first rains. I would have expected keen planners to take an interest in such a mammoth exercise, but the fantastic variations in their outlook, often grossly parochial, led me to regard most of them with considerable distrust. Some, however, were worthy of scrutiny and I shall touch upon a few later on. But, let me return to my criticism of much of the publicity which resulted in this unfortunate motion. What would one expect, when the Government was crying poverty on the one hand and regretting the need for awkward taxes, then producing an apparently grandiose plan costing nearly \$700,000,000, on the other hand? Never mind the time factor of 18 years or what real money might be available: this sheer sum produced a wave of emotionalism throughout the State. The Government was on the "mat" all right and hastened to advise us that objections would be heard and a reasonable time given for making them.

What happened then?—everybody started looking at the whole of the plan instead of the plan as a whole. What psychology! What a story from the public relations point of view! The Town Planner (Mr. Hart) pointed out in one of his excellent addresses that (and I quote in part) "The Transportation Planning is composed of four well defined phases: data collection, analysis and forecasting, development of a plan and, finally, implementation." The first three, as we see, are for practical purposes completed, but obviously both analysis and forecasting must be continually revised and brought up to date. We have the background plan which, of course, will be reviewed and revised every time the implementation of a further portion is contemplated and it is then, and then only, that the members of Parliament of the day should be asked to record their opinions. The fact

is that we have to have an overall plan and no-one will be entirely satisfied with any specific one (even if he lives elsewhere). But we embraced a cross-section of experts including world-wide ones of experience, and we have, in my opinion, a pretty good basic plan.

You know, Mr. President, it does not really take an expert to see the basic needs for adequate transportation in this comparatively small city of ours. Freeways on the east and west, running north and south, a crossover proposal and the careful design and usage of our existing wide main roads, with the widening of some of the narrower ones, are necessary. My own opinion is that we do not need to bring the freeways almost into the city but should spend far more thought on the mechanics of public transport and parking, including, of course, high speed rapid transit either above or below ground. The plan has taken some years of concentrated research. It cannot all be useless, and it should compare more than favourably with the many more hasty thoughts upon it. As I said when I was Minister of Roads, we cannot afford to build roads to park on, and this is still one of the worst flaws in our present set-up. Thus, even today I question if we are making the best use of what we already have.

I am somewhat wary of part of the paragraph on page X of the study which deals with recommendations on legislation. I refer specifically to local government, and while certain powers will be essential to deal with a specific project in a local government area I think any such power should have strong safeguards; otherwise we shall find our local government bodies becoming mere rate collectors still responsible for only the tiresome and restrictive part of their activities, which of course any Government is happy to leave with them.

A year ago the Minister spoke of an experimental run on clearways—the Anzac Highway, probably the clearest highway we have, a double carriageway with few intersections—yet despite the apparent improvement on this route we still have not done anything about the North, North-East, or Unley Roads because we are frightened of annoying a number of traders for a few hours a day, often before their premises are open or after they are closed.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That is not the reason at all!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: These things cost a Government virtually nothing and yet we will not get on with it. What we do about width of vehicles only aggravates the problem by bad example. We keep harping on safety factors—why don't we go in for reflectorized number plates, recognized and approved by police and public alike? Why do we not deal with incomplete lining of lanes on many of our city main roads allowing people, particularly motor cyclists, to overtake on the left at random? This is commonplace.

Talking of progress, why do we not experiment with some form of mini-buses—open all along the side like the old "toast-rack" tramcar? What about trying them on short commuter services? If necessary they could be tried by tender for a short period, but at least these things should be tried. It is interesting to notice that quite a number of companies drive their employees at lunch time to certain lunch centres while gangs of various departments also seem to give a form of taxi run into the metropolitan centre before departing to their respective depots.

Of great interest is the map 4-5 on page 34 of the study. This reveals that in 1965 average speeds around Adelaide were still almost fantastically high. Why the worry, beyond that of progress, and increased density? Is it not the "on time" when arriving at a place that causes congestion? We all know the chaos of trying to get 5,000 vehicles into a few gates (too few as a rule) at a sporting fixture, such as at the Adelaide Oval, plus emptying of public transport and private vehicles. Not much can be done about the latter, but some authority should be given to compel far more rapid entry off roads; exit is not so important as it spreads the flow.

People would not be human if they did not become emotional when genuinely affected, either in mind or in purse, by any planning activity, but beyond that do not let us become too emotional. I do not want to see miles of concrete bastions and grade separations ruining the aesthetics of our city, but—and let there be no mistake about this—no-one can go on using up more and more of the day in travelling the same distance, and the people as a whole realize this. Further, this is borrowed time and we cannot afford it in our economy—transportation is far too great a percentage of our cost structure already.

It will be noted that in my opening remarks I mentioned that in the first instance we are being asked to acknowledge that the principles

of the new study are already covered by, and safeguarded under, the Planning and Development Act of 1963-67. It seems an extraordinary idea to ask Parliament to endorse a new Act passed only two years ago. Next there will be a resolution asking us to endorse the Gift Duty Act passed last year. We certainly need an amendment to that. It appears to me somewhat amateurish, to say the least. The Planning Act of 1967 was very comprehensive and received very close scrutiny. It appoints the necessary officers and boards, it deals with land subdivision, acquisition, compensation, and many other matters. Is it now suggested that this Act is queried? I do not think so.

People are worried because the new study sets out some dozens of projected activities that affect either their purses or their personal ideas, coupled with a fear of the astronomical finance figures that have been bandied about everywhere. This is the crux of the Government's trouble—too many details, and finance—forgetting the need of an embracing plan. Everyone wants a proper plan—their plan. It is not the legislation at all—it is the details that produce the arguments; some sound and some hopeless, and worse, parochial.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill seemed concerned about the Highways funds, and again I would suggest he was appealing to emotion to a great extent. Does he realize that the Commonwealth Aid Road Act funds which the Commonwealth Government makes available are largely based on an expectation of what the States will provide themselves, and that until this year portion of the funds have depended on our making additional matching money available?

Sir Arthur appears to think that the total figure is outside the scope of our funds as anticipated at present. I thought the Chief Secretary gave an excellent explanation of the financial position and I feel certain that the problems of inflated money, increased costs, etc., will be met as they have been met in the past. When we find that over 30 per cent of our gross national costs arise in transport, then allocations per annum both in Commonwealth and State spheres are by no means unreasonable.

Sir Arthur Rymill further says that "tagged grants are being handled autonomously". I cannot accept that the general motorist, both commercial and private, is prepared to see that these special taxes which have always been specifically appropriated to the road funds should be treated otherwise.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That is the point of my argument.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Then that lets the honourable member out. Does he realize that in many other countries, not only are Federal petrol taxes imposed, but both State and borough ones also—nearly all for roads, especially in the lower echelons? This is the tag of the great road federations "Roads do not cost, they pay", and incidentally I have never been aware of transport companies, in the main, making huge profits—a great percentage of carriers go bankrupt often due to high running costs on mediocre roads.

Regarding the fears expressed by some of our country members, that the country allocation will suffer, I can only say that I am satisfied that the Highways Department will not plan on these lines at all, nor will any Government permit it. On the other hand, I deprecate very strongly the suggestions of certain members of the Labor Party that the country electorates will suffer—these are disgraceful statements and cannot be substantiated by anybody. I suggest that a study of the schedules in the Commonwealth Aid Road Act would ease the worry in the minds of many people who have been concerned about country allocations. The Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, 1969, is considerably different from the Act covering the previous five years. I should be quite happy to lend my copy of the legislation to any honourable member wishing to see the schedules. The amounts for each State in each year are set out very clearly, together with the type of road that the money must be spent on.

I would, in fairness, remind honourable members that because, a few years ago, of the backlog in our huge country roads system, and the inability of the modern car to overcome those hazards, the then Government was forced to place far greater emphasis on providing even access roads all over the State while the metropolitan area had in many instances to put up with what it had.

Are honourable members aware that the city of Adelaide is explicitly excluded from the Highways Act by section 2 of that Act and that for years the only contribution given it was a paltry £20,000 for the maintenance of the outer boundaries of the park lands? But we all use the city streets, by and large, wherever we live.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It was at its own request.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Originally. It might have been appropriate, Mr. President, for me to say personally that I have great admiration for the continued upgrading of this city's streets and they are certainly a credit to the planners and officers concerned—admittedly they started with a very good M.A.T.S. when they had a "Light". As seven members have already said, it is for the administrators to set up the details, but here I want to sound a word of caution regarding administration. The Minister had advised us that, if we turn down M.A.T.S. unreservedly, we place his department in the position of having nothing (in the city) to offer for approval to the Federal Minister under the requirements of the new Commonwealth Act—this, of course, means the Federal bureau.

The State Governments must, within reason, adhere to the terms of the aid funds, but—and I emphasize this—it is beyond all reason to expect that we should submit specific plans for arterial roads around Adelaide to the Federal body—few of its officers have any details of this city's requirements whatsoever, and any knowledge they may have is obviously dependent on the plans submitted to them from here. I resisted this attitude for some four years as a State Minister and I still do. As a member of the International Roads Federation and the Australian Roads Federation I supported the formation of the Federal bureau but only for it to have co-ordinating powers in an advisory capacity to the Federal Minister—and now we have a huge bureau of planners and engineers, in most cases duplicating reports that are already available. This method must be opposed and changed within the Federal bureau itself and I trust the Minister will bear my remarks in mind when he attends his next conference.

Regarding freeways, I would congratulate the contributors to the conference held at the university last November. I have read their work with great interest, particularly a paper by Mr. Platten and his remarks on the American set-up. I cannot agree with him entirely—it seems futile to suggest that the United States of America is done with freeways—what I think he wishes to convey is that far more thought is being given now before developing freeways within the city areas, and there I agree with him. But as connecting links between adjacent cities—both near and far—they are of inestimable economic value—and why?—because they meet the first inescapable law of transportation—that the most satisfactory traffic way is one of restricted access

on its own right of way—the London tube, the railway reserve to Glenelg, the one-way tunnel or bridge, not forgetting the old canal. I know that Los Angeles was regarded as somewhat of a white elephant of freeways but a recent poll showed that two to one of the people wanted them.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And more.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I accept that. Regarding acquisition and compensation, the Government can only consider compensation justified where property was held by the affected owner when the plan was made known—speculation must be rejected absolutely. When notice under the plan has been served, the Government must set aside part of the planning finance to settle immediately. A price is negotiated, and if an owner is prepared to accept the Government's first offer it must settle forthwith.

The problem of adjacent land is far more complicated. I know from personal talks in Los Angeles and Dallas that properties, particularly associated with the artisan or middle income group, often appreciate in value if in close proximity to a merging ramp on a freeway, thus permitting a very rapid transit to a factory or work-place quite remote but situated near a freeway—thus imagine Brighton and Lonsdale. In other words, no general application is good enough—each case taken on its merits.

I met a friend yesterday who said, "When will you get on with this plan? I have a magnificent old house that is too big for me, and I cannot get a buyer. Under the compensation arrangements, at least I will get a fair price and I hope I will get plenty of compensation for grandma's tears as well." This man has certainly moved with the times; he is inspecting the latest flats.

I repeat that we have a fantastically detailed study which has taken a lot of thought and provoked even a greater amount around it. I know full well that many amendments will have to be made in the light of development and I approve of the Government's resolve to examine further the legislation dealing with acquisition and compensation and I believe that it will find it necessary to set up a special office to deal with this, keeping court procedures out of it wherever possible, but may I add a word of advice—he who pays quickly pays best—protracted negotiations inflame many to annoyance and anger.

My amendment still leaves in the clause about the annual written report. This is already being done on our present schemes and done very well, but I sincerely trust for any Minister's sake that we are not going to debate individual lines on the estimates of each piece of road planning—how can the member for Mount Gambier vote on the Lock to Streaky Bay road or the Woof-woof by-pass, and *vice-versa*.

Regarding the portion of the motion that my amendment will omit, namely, paragraph (b) (ii); which contains certain specific proposals and certain exceptions, some of either I may agree with, I find it distasteful and in fact impossible to give a fully considered opinion on them. Therefore, I cannot vote for a motion containing them. In all sincerity, I think that the Government and the people on further consideration will find that most honourable members of this Council will have come to a more satisfying decision by supporting the amendment I shall now move. Therefore, I move:

To strike out all words in paragraph (b) (ii) of the motion after "out" and insert "therein and subject to the safeguards referred to in this motion".

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I second the amendment. I am very pleased to speak to this motion for several reasons. I think I have listened to the whole of the debate, and I want to say that the tone of the debate and the basis on which it has been conducted illustrate again the value of this Council and the serious consideration it gives to matters that come before it. Without reflecting unfairly on anything that has occurred elsewhere, I want to say that I have not heard a better debate on any matter for a long time. I congratulate all members who have spoken, because they have obviously done a good deal of homework and treated the matter with the seriousness it deserves.

I think confusion arises in the minds of many members of the public because they are inclined to think that this plan is something that has happened just since this Government came into office when, in point of fact, it has been on the drawing boards for many years. I think people should appreciate that the present situation in which we find ourselves has arisen because of the ground-work that was done not only by the Labor Government but also by the Playford Government before it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It started in 1962.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes. It was in 1962 that the Town Planning Committee published proposals for the future development of metropolitan Adelaide. That was when this present situation was first started. That was known as the 1962 Development Plan, and it has been carried on from there by each of the respective Governments. The proposals in the 1962 plan contained provisions in broad terms to meet the transport needs and the public transport services for the future. The plan contained measures to increase the capacity of arterial roads, and it also envisaged 97 miles of freeways. Therefore, it was as long ago as 1962 that the Adelaide Development Plan was public property, and that started off the course that has been followed since then.

When the plan was made available, the transport authorities of the day considered, because of the issues that were involved, that that was not sufficient: they considered that a detailed and intensive study should be made to ensure that proper value was obtained for the huge expenditure of money involved in the proposal. The matter was then controlled by a joint steering committee consisting of the Director of Planning, the Railways Commissioner, the Commissioner of Highways, the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust, and the Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide. Therefore, there was a pretty broad base on which to follow this matter through.

These people apparently considered that overseas consultants, with experience in transportation planning, should be engaged to ensure a design of a type of transport facilities to meet the demands that were to occur in South Australia. I need not mention the names of the consultants because I think they are well known, but they were, I think, world experts in this particular field and they were people who had done a good deal in the provision of development plans in overseas countries. There were certain binding principles that they were required to follow, and I think it is worth while placing on record what those principles were. The first was that the transport plan had to be designed to serve the city as envisaged in the 1962 Metropolitan Development plan; secondly, the transportation plan had to be practical and achievable; thirdly, the plan had to be within the financial resources expected to be available; and, fourthly, the plan had to influence future development in the metropolitan area in such a way as to preserve and enhance the social and economic welfare of the community as a whole.

I emphasize that last instruction to the committee. Therefore, the instructions to the overseas consultants were not only to produce a few concrete freeways but also to have a look at the aesthetic and social demands of the community as a whole. That committee set about its work and it reached five particular conclusions. The first was that the population of metropolitan Adelaide could be expected to increase from 750,000 to 1,250,000 in the next 20 years. The second conclusion reached was that the average number of separate trips made on a week-day could be expected to increase from 1,386,000 to 2,651,000 by 1986. The third one, which I want to particularly emphasize and about which I will say something presently, is this:

The proportion of total trips made by public transport has been rapidly declining in recent years; at present 19 per cent of all trips are by public transport, and if the present trend is allowed to continue this figure can be expected to drop to 9 per cent by 1986.

I understand that the planners decided that if a better system of public transport could be developed, and if it could be made more expeditious and so on, this 9 per cent figure that they estimated for 1986 could be increased to about 14 per cent. The question I want to ask her is this: is the proposal to spend so much money in providing expeditious public transport justified in view of the fact that it will only lift the percentage of trips made by public transport from 9 per cent to 14 per cent? I think this is something we should look very carefully into to see that we are getting value for our money, because as the financial position of people improves and as our economy becomes more buoyant and develops further, everyone seems to want to travel in his own transport. I think that unless we have some compulsory legislation we will not get people to travel on public transport no matter how attractive we may make it nor how quickly it will operate. Therefore, I am not satisfied that by spending all this money on public transport we will achieve the objective of increasing the figure from 9 per cent to 14 per cent.

This leads me to say that I am not satisfied that the underground proposals for King William Street are necessary. They may be necessary in the very distant future, but I cannot see that they will be necessary within the next 20 years. That is one reason why I feel I am not able to support the motion as it stands at present, because, as I understand it, this motion does approve the construction of the King William Street subway to connect

the two main lines to the north of the city with the two main lines to the south, and to provide for the necessary modification of rolling stock. At this stage, nobody can reasonably cost that matter. I was interested to see that even the other day we moved the underground railway by a few chains from one place to another, because it would interfere with the festival hall. Much more preparatory work must be done on this.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is the other way round—they are going to shift the festival hall.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: They would have better luck with shifting the festival hall because it has been shifted a few times already. Many people think it would be a good idea to design the festival hall on wheels, so that we can move it where we like! In the case of some of the big development works, we are trying to make decisions too quickly. Obviously, the decision to construct the festival hall on Montefiore Hill was made before adequate consideration was given to all the alternatives, and now we are stuck with the Montefiore Hill site and a decaying building there, which does not add lustre to the surroundings.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Tell that to the Highways Department and it will put a freeway through it!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am not in favour of that suggestion. It would appear, also, looking at another matter, that it may be (I do not put it more strongly than "may be" at this stage) that we started on the Chowilla dam project before we completely satisfied ourselves whether or not that was the best project. I understand I may have an opportunity to vote later on whether or not the correct decision was made on that but I am not committing myself at the moment. I do not want to get into any interstate argument with anybody about it. There are two interests concerned in the festival hall site and the Chowilla dam, where we have tried to make progress too quickly. I cannot envisage where the proposed railway under King William Street will come up to ground level again towards the southern portion of Adelaide but, wherever it comes up, it will disrupt the landscape, in some respects. It will not add to the beauty of Adelaide, and I do not think I can vote for that at present; nor, if I remain in Parliament sufficiently long, will I want to be told in X years' time that in 1969 I voted for the underground railway in King William Street and be tied to that.

The study also found that at present in metropolitan Adelaide there are 198,000 cars, representing 2.75 cars for every 10 people, but by 1986 the figures are expected to reach 443,000 cars, representing 3.80 cars for every 10 people. That indicates that there will be a larger number of motor cars to be accommodated on our roads, and it also leads to the conclusion that we shall have to be careful before we spend too much money in the hope of attracting more people to public transport. The recommendations made by the M.A.T.S. people were as follows:

(1) A balanced and co-ordinated plan for the development of bus and rail services, normal type roads and freeways to supplement the normal roads in areas where these will be unable to provide reasonably for future traffic.

(2) The transportation plan to be fully consistent with the general principles established in the authorized Development Plan (as approved by Parliament) and within the financial resources expected to be available.

(3) The implementation of the proposals to be co-ordinated in a manner that will ensure that each component of the total system is developed in correct balance with the other components.

It was proposed by the M.A.T.S. people that the plan be implemented over a 20-year period, and I think their costing of the works is based on that assumption. That assumes that our rate of economic development will continue to be more or less as it has been in the past. I find it difficult to estimate what the position will be in regard to economic development in South Australia. I know that after 1965 there was a slackening in the rate of our economic development, which meant that we had to readjust contracts let for the building of further generating capacity in our Electricity Trust stations, because it was found that the load on the Electricity Trust undertaking did not increase as fast as had been anticipated. So that in 1965 we had to readjust our thinking because the progress was not as fast as we had anticipated it to be.

Whilst I am optimistic about the future, as we have not yet discovered the mineral wealth that has been found in other States and we are suffering from some disadvantages from which the other States are not suffering, I find it difficult to assume the amount of progress it is suggested will occur in the next 20-year period. Therefore, while there must be long-range planning, I want to make sure that we do not commit ourselves to a plan of development involving large amounts of money that may not be necessary. In this connection, I believe that the total

cost of preparing the development plan and of the M.A.T.S. plan, and so on, has reached the rather startling figure of \$699,000.

One cannot accept the fact that that amount of money has been spent on engaging experts in the field and that we have not got some value for it. Obviously we have, but that does not prevent me from making some criticism where I think it is justified. In assuming that these things are necessary, the M.A.T.S. people have assumed that there will be a great increase in high-rise development close into the city of Adelaide. This, of course, is the story applying to other cities in Australia but I am not one who would encourage this kind of development. High-rise development appeals to certain people without children and to other people perhaps busily engaged in their work but, in my opinion, it is not the kind of living we should encourage for young people, and particularly young people with families.

I am not very concerned about spending large sums of money purely to encourage high-rise development within the city of Adelaide or in the near-city areas; I would much prefer to spend the money in the suburban areas to provide adequate shopping centres and work places for people in those areas so as to ensure as far as possible that the average person did not have to come to the city areas either to conduct his business or to go to his work, and this I understand was the principle followed in South Australia when Elizabeth was designed and developed. The idea at that time was that there would be adequate and proper housing facilities in the area, together with all items necessary in the way of social amenities in an environment of that kind, and work provided for the people in the area in order to avoid the expense of travelling to and from the city.

I think every fair-minded person realizes that Elizabeth has developed along lines in the same way as land was acquired at Tonsley Park, together with other land south of Adelaide, the idea being that people living in those areas would be provided with adequate shopping facilities and employment. I want to do all I can to encourage people to live in these outer suburban areas as well as providing employment for them in those areas in order to avoid the problem of transport to the metropolitan area and also to avoid, to some extent, the demand for freeways and the tremendous expense involved in their construction.

Up to a point the Government has recognized the truth of this argument. For example, the Electricity Trust has built its head office at Eastwood on the southern portion of Adelaide, and I believe it has found that the parking facilities available there have proved to be of greater value than any other at a city site. In addition, the Highways Department has established an excellent building outside the city area, and that arrangement seems to be working very satisfactorily. I look to the time when perhaps other departments (for instance, the Agriculture Department) will be able to function just as efficiently in a modern building somewhere in the inner suburban area, thus avoiding the necessity of having people travelling to and from the city. I think this principle should be encouraged.

Having said all that, in a large measure the M.A.T.S. plan affects many individuals. It affects their outlook on life, it disturbs their future, and it in turn creates much heart burning and emotionalism. I have great sympathy with those adversely affected by the M.A.T.S. proposal. I do not think I could be accused of being unfair if I mentioned that I might be personally affected by the proposed developments. I may also be affected to some extent with my economic interests, but I hope to condition my personal views and possible upsets by realizing that it may be for the good of the community, which should be the overriding consideration. I know it has been said that in some instances while the Government has stated that further compulsory acquisitions will be postponed until some matters are cleared up, in fact acquisitions are still proceeding. I have had occasion to look at this matter, and in these instances the acquisitions now being completed were started some time ago. The parties concerned have been proceeding in the belief that they would receive certain payment for properties so acquired; it would have been a great upset to them if those acquisitions had not been allowed to proceed.

The other point put to me is that whilst the Government has stated that it will still give consideration to the route of one of the proposed freeways, it is at the same time going ahead and acquiring land in the area. The answer to that criticism is that the acquisition was started some time ago, but because of the interests of the parties such acquisition must proceed. Secondly, just because a piece of land has been acquired does not mean that that site will necessarily be decided upon for the freeway. As an illustration, I draw attention to the festival

hall property, which was acquired but which was not the site finally decided upon for that hall.

I believe that the Minister and the Government have acted honestly in this matter, and I believe they will continue to do so by giving every possible consideration to those people adversely affected by the proposed plan. That raises a problem mentioned by Sir Norman Jude regarding compulsory acquisition. I understand that the Government has established a committee, and I believe the Solicitor-General is one of the members of the committee, although I forget who the other members are. That committee is examining the question of the present Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act in order to see what amendments are necessary to ensure that people will receive adequate compensation where properties are either acquired or adversely affected because of disturbance caused by the proposed M.A.T.S. freeways. I think that is one of the most serious aspects of the matter, and if an Act can be established that ensures adequate compensation to the people concerned, then I think one of the greatest problems will have been overcome; but it is a matter of great magnitude.

Another problem is that of the person owning a home that is perhaps 30 or 40 years old, although it is entirely satisfactory for that person's needs. Such a home may have a capital value of from \$7,000 to \$8,000, whereas to re-house the occupants an amount of \$10,000 to \$12,000 may be necessary. Because of their age, such people may be unwilling to move, and probably they would not have sufficient capital to provide themselves with a new home; thus a great problem is posed. Secondly, consider the position of an industrial concern that may have premises 30 or 40 years old, again satisfactory for their purposes, and possibly likely to continue in that way for a further 20 or 30 years. If such an organization were required to move to another location it would have to erect completely new premises at probably twice the cost of the value of the existing premises.

Those are matters the committee must consider, and I believe adequate compensation must be provided because I do not believe the individual should be disadvantaged purely for the sake of the benefit of the community. The community wants the advantages of the M.A.T.S. plan, and therefore it must be prepared to pay the cost.

I think it is necessary and reasonable that this huge project should be brought back from time to time so that responsible members of Parliament may give the matter consideration, because there are aspects of the plan that I do not think I could support at the present time. I have mentioned the underground railway in King William Street, and I further mention the North Adelaide Connector. If the freeway through the eastern suburbs is not to proceed, then I think it becomes doubtful whether the North Adelaide Connector is necessary. I do not know the answer, and consequently I am not prepared to vote for a motion that asks that approval be given to that North Adelaide Connector.

I believe we must be prepared to spend a good deal of time in Parliament as the plan progresses and judge each situation as it arises in order to determine whether it is necessary or not. On the other hand, I do not think we can sit back and do nothing about the matter. We would not be doing justice to Colonel William Light, who established Adelaide on such an excellent basis in the beginning, if we did not do so, and consequently I cannot go along with people who say in a bland fashion "Keep our options open", which seems to me to be saying that we will do nothing. I am not prepared to be placed in that category. I believe this plan is necessary, and I believe it must be taken step by step. If we are patient and accept our responsibility it will be possible to see that this plan is brought about in such a way that we can achieve the desired result without spending unnecessary amounts of money and without doing things that may not appear to be necessary in the ultimate outcome.

Before concluding I want to say that I used to go to political meetings years ago when the cry was that more money must be made available for roads, and that all moneys that came from motor taxation must be applied to the roads. I accepted that at the time because I realized that our roads, particularly our country roads, needed urgent attention. Whilst I accepted it, I never accepted the principle that taxation should be for a specific purpose, because this abrogates the responsibility of Parliament. I do not favour a particular tax being levied for a particular purpose.

I remember that many years ago in the Commonwealth sphere a social service tax was used expressly to provide social services, and we got into a mess in connection with

that tax. With the huge increase in motor taxation and road transport, possibly the time has come when we must consider whether, having regard to the overall requirements of the community, we are still doing the right thing in applying all this money that comes from roads to road development. I am not prepared to adopt the principle that, because over the next 20 years \$X million is to come to us from road taxation, that money must be spent on roads. It must be looked at in relation to the overall needs of the community.

I realize that there is Commonwealth legislation connected with this matter and that we are at present tied to certain expenditures by virtue of that legislation. However, as part of our responsibility as legislators, if we think that this practice is outmoded, an approach should be made to change it. I support the amendment of the Hon. Sir Norman Jude, and I go along with the general principles set out in the M.A.T.S. plan, but I reserve the right to look at particular aspects of it when the time arises.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Roads and Transport): I thank those honourable members who have made contributions to this long debate for the material they have submitted. It was on August 7 that I moved the motion standing in my name, so this matter has not been rushed in any way and every honourable member has had adequate time to carry out research and investigations. We have heard speeches by four former Ministers of the Crown, two of whom held the portfolio of Minister of Roads. I realize, too, that the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has always taken a great interest in traffic matters, particularly in regard to the Adelaide City Council area. Because of the amount of research conducted and because of the contributions made, it has been a very worthwhile debate indeed.

I will first discuss the two amendments that have been moved, I will then discuss the claims and counterclaims that have been made in regard to previous Governments in connection with this study, and I will then reply to precise questions that have been put to me and I will deal with requests for assurances that have been made. The Government does not support the amendment of the Hon. Mr. Bevan, which states:

(a) that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report does not make adequate provisions for the development of transport movement in metropolitan Adelaide.

This statement is correct if "adequate provisions" is taken to mean keeping exact pace

with the demands of travel. It can be acknowledged that in this sense the provisions are somewhat inadequate; the reason for this is contained in one of the two basic goals in the study, as follows:

The plan should be within the financial capabilities of the community. Compromises may have to be made, therefore, between the ideal and the obtainable.

Because of the need to keep within the financial capabilities of the State, the proposals have been developed in the full knowledge that there will be a gradual reduction in the quality of traffic service (particularly in so far as road traffic is concerned). As a State we will be unable to afford in the future the high level of traffic service we enjoy today. This must not be regarded as a failure of the plan—it is intended. The Hon. Mr. Bevan's amendment continues:

(b) that the plan should be withdrawn and referred to the State Planning Authority for reassessment to ensure:

- (i) a properly integrated plan for roads and public transport development,
- (ii) that any plan is financially feasible,
- (iii) that the destruction of homes and other property is minimized;

The concern of the South Australian State Planning Office is overall development proposals. It is proper that, in developing these proposals, regard should be had to transportation. Regard was had to transportation when the 1962 development plan was prepared. There is no justification for assuming that the planning office is more competent in the detail planning of transportation, particularly the co-ordination of roads and public transport development, than the transportation agencies themselves. The State Planning Office was a participating agency in the M.A.T.S. In regard to the second point (that any plan be financially feasible) I draw honourable members' attention to the statement I first made concerning the manner in which plans were fashioned to fit into a budget.

In mid-1968, when the study was completed, the estimate of the cost of road proposals exceeded the estimate of funds expected to be available for roadworks in the metropolitan area. The latter estimates were prepared prior to the announcement of the details of the new agreement between the Commonwealth and the States under which Commonwealth grants are available to the States for roadworks. Under the new agreement with the Commonwealth, road grants to South Australia in the next five years will be substantially increased compared with the grants received during the past five years.

Accordingly, it is now evident that the roadworks proposed in the study for the first five years at least can be financed without any increase in State motor taxation or any other form of taxation and without detracting in any way from planned expenditure on rural roads. While the future of Commonwealth grants beyond the next five years is not known, estimates of revenue for roadworks based on present trends suggest that all the road proposals recommended in the study can be adequately financed without any increase in present rates of taxation.

The financing of improvements to public transport services, unlike the financing of roadworks, is dependent on allocation of Loan funds or on funds from State general revenue. It is therefore not possible, in the case of public transport, to prepare reliable estimates of funds expected to be available. The expenditure proposed in respect of public transport is considered to be reasonably within the financial capabilities of the State.

At this stage it is not anticipated that any increase in taxation will be required for this purpose. The various proposals and suggestions put forward in the M.A.T.S. Report concerning possible additional revenue for the implementation of the transportation plan are not accepted by the Government. I stated this earlier when I introduced the motion and I repeat it, because the matter was raised during the debate.

Considerable mention was made during the debate of the overall question of freeways, and it was submitted that freeways in the United States of America have been a mistake. I submit that they are not a mistake. In some cities in the U.S.A. there have been isolated examples of large-scale development of public transport. It is interesting to note that in every case these proposals were for the development of public transport where systems of freeways had already been developed. It is agreed that in some U.S. cities there has been unbalanced emphasis on freeways and now, as a consequence, there is particular emphasis on public transport. It is not accepted that the development of public transport means in every way that freeways are a failure.

My information is that in the U.S.A. at present there are more freeways under construction and on the drawing boards than has ever been the case before. The M.A.T.S. plan aims to avoid unbalanced development of freeways or any other single element of the transportation system.

We need to learn from mistakes that have been made overseas, and develop our total transportation system as a fully integrated comprehensive system. This is the very essence of the M.A.T.S. plan. I cannot stress too strongly that, while there has been an impression in this Council and among the public that the emphasis on the plan is on freeways, it is a balanced transportation plan.

I repeat that errors have occurred overseas, particularly in America, where they built freeways without beginning with a balanced transportation plan. Because of that emphasis the whole system got out of balance, and there are moves now to introduce public transport as a second step, so to speak, but we are not making that mistake here.

We are learning from these errors and are planning, at the initial period, a balanced system that incorporates public transport, as well as freeways and widened arterial roads, and the transport system we hope to implement is one of rapid rail transport and improved bus services.

In the Hon. Mr. Bevan's amendment, he emphasizes "that the Government should proceed forthwith to amend legislation on compulsory acquisition of land so as to ensure just compensation for persons affected by the proposals." This matter is in hand. I have explained to the Council that a committee has been set up to examine this whole question so that the Government will be sure that the best legislation will be on the Statute Book in regard to acquisition. When it receives the committee's recommendation it intends to act on them.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Will this be backdated? What about acquisitions going on at present?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: People who find themselves in hardship, that is, those who have to sell yet cannot sell on the open market because of the plan, go to the departments involved and, after processing the degree of hardship represented, the departments negotiate and purchase these properties.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But that is on present-day valuations. Let us assume that we get legislation that will be on a more equitable basis of compensation. What consideration is there for people who have already been involved?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member is advocating that it is high time the Act was changed, why did he not change it in

the three years that his Government was in office? This Act applies to all Governments and departments involved in acquisition.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But that does not answer my objection.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government acts under the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act. I believe that the terms and conditions of that legislation are very good: they have served this State very well, but the present Government is examining the whole question to see whether the provisions can be further upgraded to fit them into present-day conditions, relative to acquisition. In supporting the Hon. Mr. Bevan's amendment, the mover and other honourable members referred to the need to plan flexibly, which is taken to mean capable of being changed, but how does one plan flexibly, other than to announce plans and say, at the same time, that these plans may be changed in the future?

Where freeways and other major road or public transport facilities are to be introduced in built-up areas, many properties are affected. Property owners have a right to know, with as much reliability as possible, the precise effect on their properties. To plan flexibly would be contrary to this. In the undeveloped areas, to plan flexibly, that is, to allow for subsequent change of the plans, would destroy the confidence of owners of rural land.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about Marion at present?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will deal with Marion in full as I proceed. Consider the position of a farmer on the fringe of the city who is told that a flexible freeway may pass through his property? The question of flexibility, while it may be a sound and attractive point, must be looked at carefully. The great advantage of long-range planning (the pay-off from the costs we are now incurring) is that everyone will know what provisions are to be made for transport and will be able to proceed with confidence.

Certainly we must accept that conditions will change and that, despite the embarrassment it will cause, it will no doubt be necessary to vary the plan from time to time. For this reason, it is a recommendation of the M.A.T.S. Report that the forward planning be maintained on a continuing basis. All planning, whether it be general development planning or transportation planning, must be subject to periodic updating, according to changing circumstances.

The Government has shown considerable flexibility in allowing time for public consideration and comment on the proposals. It is now that we must be flexible in our consideration of the proposals and take care to ensure that they are correct before they are adopted.

It is now over a year since the proposals were released. The Government has been flexible in allowing a large number of variations and insisting on further review of certain proposals, for example, the Noarlunga Freeway, to which the Hon. Mr. Bevan has referred, and it has been criticized for being too flexible in respect of the number of deferments of and amendments to the plan.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude's amendment appears to me to be very little different in its effect from the original motion; indeed, the intent of the two seems to be the same. As honourable members know, the Government has adopted a policy for the 12-month period of being extremely frank about this whole study proposal. Honourable members will recall that the method we used to promote it was a method that was new to politics here in South Australia: it was democratic participation in its fullest and most modern sense. We said to the people, "Here is the whole report; nothing has happened; we want to know what you think about it; we have not as yet made up our minds."

In keeping with this principle of disclosure of all information and the introduction of as much detail as we have been able to include in all matters relative to the proposal, the Government included the detail in this motion, and that is the detail to which the Hon. Sir Norman Jude takes some objection. This is apparent by the fact that he has moved his amendment. Because we, as a Government, want to be consistent on this question of being as frank and open as possible in endeavouring to provide as much detail as we can, the Government prefers its own motion to Sir Norman's amendment. In fact, I think it is fair to say that the amendment gives the Government far more scope and power to act than does the motion itself.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: I am trying to help you.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I always like help from the honourable member, but on this occasion I am trying to point out that whilst I respect his intention I consider that there is no need to have the detail culled out of this motion. For instance, some of the detail his

amendment has taken out is the fact that the proposals except the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway and make the alteration to the Goodwood-Edwardstown rail diversion.

These are major changes that the Government introduced, and the Government feels duty bound to put them into its motion in black and white. The reason why I say there is very little difference in the two approaches is that both approaches deal with principles. The Government, in paragraph (i), seeks an endorsement of general principles, and in paragraph (ii) it seeks approval in principle to a major portion of the proposals; Sir Norman Jude's amendment is maintaining the approach of agreement in principle. Therefore, there is not very much difference between the motion and his amendment.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: They are the same but they are different.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Nevertheless, in intent they are the same. The Government would prefer to continue with its policy of writing in wherever it is possible, and of making public wherever it is possible, as much detail about the major proportion of the proposals as it has done. Therefore, the Government cannot support the Hon. Sir Norman Jude's amendment.

There have been some quite serious claims and counter claims during this debate concerning the knowledge that the former Government had of the M.A.T.S. plan, and because of the heat that was generated and the seriousness of this matter I thought it desirable and indeed proper to have a look at the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Joint Steering Committee's minutes of its various meetings. I find in the minutes of the 37th meeting held on August 8, 1967, under the heading "Final report" the following minute:

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

Then at the subsequent meeting held in the following month, on September 12, 1967, again under the heading "Final report", the minute reads as follows:

The Chairman reported that, when arranging the meeting with the Premier and the Minister as decided at the 37th meeting, the Premier had decided that the meeting should be with Cabinet. Messrs. Yeates and Flint attended this meeting at 2.15 p.m. on August 21, 1967, and the implications of the study were explained. A direction was given for the

final report to be published before February 1, 1968. The consultants were subsequently requested to submit a quote for the report to be printed by that date.

I followed the matter up a little further and I found that verbal discussions were held with the representatives of the consultants and it was determined that a deadline of February 1, 1968, could not be achieved: the earliest date that the completed report could be available was assessed at February 15, 1968. In a letter dated October 25, 1967, the consultants submitted a proposal providing for the completion of the report by the middle of February.

The consultants' proposal involved: (1) the retention of the consultants' resident representative in Adelaide for an additional period and the assignment to the study of additional senior consultants; (2) the transfer to the consultants of certain work which it had previously intended to undertake by departmental resources; and (3) the printing of the report under the supervision of the consultants by a Sydney printer.

The additional costs incurred for consulting services on account of these variations amounted to \$31,316. The incurring of this additional expenditure resulted in some reduction in the cost of departmental resources devoted to the study. The consultants encountered difficulties in completing the report, and the February 15 deadline was not achieved. Supplies of the printed report were received in August, 1968. The claim for additional charges for consulting services arising from the delay in completing the report was rejected by the department, and the consultants' account has now been settled on the basis of the charges quoted in relation to the February 15 deadline.

The former Government cannot escape the responsibility of knowing what was in this report. The senior officers from the study went into the Cabinet room, as I have disclosed, and the implications of the study were explained. I suppose some debate can be generated on the degree of information that was given by those officers at that time, but when any Government is faced with an outgoing of the people's money to the extent of \$700,000 (the cost of the study) and when that Government in Cabinet discusses the report prior to its printing with the senior officers of the study group, that Government cannot claim that it did not know what was in the report.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I still deny it and I still say that you are bandying words. I am quite prepared to face anybody you like to name in relation to this.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I submit that the Government understood what was in it—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Get out of it!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: —that it had it, and wanted it, on the date I have mentioned, because it wanted to use it for election purposes.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The Premier said we had it on ice.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have not heard my claim denied, yet it is strange when we examine the politics of this question over the last 12 months. In my view, the former Government sought the report to assist it in its election campaign.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Some assistance!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: And, when it came forth and was made public by another Government, it was immediately criticized by the former Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It still assisted us in our campaign!

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You will not get many votes as a result of it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Perhaps it was an error in political judgment at that time. However, let us deal with the hard facts. It was six months after that Government had passed its planning and development legislation. The Government was riding reasonably high in the metropolitan area in the matter of planning. It was holding itself out as the champion of town planning, and this was a major planning project; but it shows how insincere the Opposition has been in the past 12 months in criticizing this plan when those facts, as indicated by this report, must, in my view, be true. So I support my Leader, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, when he claims that the then Government knew about the plan.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No; that is not fair. You were having a discussion on two different things; you know that that is only bandying words around.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Who is playing politics now?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: You asked me—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is impossible to get any details from a discussion like that in Cabinet.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Was the Minister prepared to spend \$700,000 of the people's money during those three years when he did not know on what it was being spent?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We were awaiting that report from the planners, and you know that is true.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Every Government must be responsible for its departmental work; every Government is responsible for any committee work or study that takes place during its term of office. We had a similar position with the Local Government Act Revision Committee; it was a big job that the committee was doing. Yet it had been sitting for some years when we came to office. What did we do then?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You disbanded it when you came into office and then brought it back again.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We asked the committee what it was doing. We had a close look at its activities. We satisfied ourselves that its work was either worthwhile or not worthwhile. At least, we checked and found out what the committee was doing, because we were responsible for its work. So I make the point that the Labor Party has a lot to answer for on this matter of whose plan this is and whether or not the Labor Party knew what was in it or what was not in it.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: How could we study the plan if we did not know that it had been printed?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The printing of the work is a different matter from the report itself.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You accused us of knowing what was in the plan before we had it printed.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes; I make that claim: you knew what was in the report because the officers went into your Cabinet room, and the implications of the report were explained to you.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: In a quarter of an hour!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know how long they were there.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You do not even know the implications of it now.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is even more serious, if the Labor Government was prepared to give the green light for the spending of \$600,000,000 after checking it for only a quarter of an hour.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We did not give the authority; we asked for it to be printed so that we could study it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Surely, that shows irresponsibility. The printing was sought in a hurry at an additional cost of \$31,000, which did not seem to matter.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: How could we study it otherwise?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: You could have studied it by asking your officers about it, and checking on all the information they had at their disposal. However, I support the contention of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that the former Government knew what was in the plan.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can't get out of it that way.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It knew all about the plan; it supported it for three years in its preparation.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We do not deny that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did you want the Government to repudiate the contracts?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If you were completely dissatisfied with it—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How could we be dissatisfied with it if we did not know what it was?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will not proceed any further with that matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are not doing very well. You should know where you are going.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If members opposite want to have a little discussion about it—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Audible discussions are out of order.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will move on to the matters with which honourable members dealt when making points in their speeches. The Hon. Mr. Bevan claimed that the plan was no longer an integrated plan because of the changes and alterations the Government had recently made to it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It has been deferred.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The plan as it stands, with some deletions and variations, is a well-integrated and comprehensive plan for transportation for metropolitan Adelaide. Not only are the arterial road and freeway proposals integrated but the road plan generally is integrated with public transport proposals.

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

A vital component of the public transport system is the proposed King William Street subway, the development of which is considered essential if we are to encourage people, particularly from the outer areas, to use the railway service.

The variation made by the Government, aimed at reducing the number of homes and other properties affected—that is, the adoption of the existing rail route rather than the proposed deviation in the Edwardstown-Goodwood area—in no way affects the basic principles underlying the co-ordinated public transport system.

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

A number of arterial road proposals have been subject to review and some minor variations have been made. Generally speaking, these variations have been as requested by councils, and they have for the most part involved relatively minor changes in alignment of new road connections. In almost every case the alternative that has been adopted serves essentially the same purpose as the original proposal.

It is only a matter of picking the actual alignment most acceptable to all parties concerned. Again, I cannot accept that the variations that have been made and are likely to be made as a result of further investigations

of a number of matters which have not yet been finalized are significant in affecting the total plan of the metropolitan area as a fully integrated plan.

It has been announced that two major proposals are not acceptable to the Government. These are the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway. These proposals were generally listed for implementation in about 15 to 20 years' time.

It is the intention of the Government to await the proposals of the State Planning Authority for revision of the metropolitan development plan before deciding on what alternative provisions may be required in the areas which these two proposals were intended to serve. There is no question that arterial road widening under the metropolitan road widening scheme must continue in these areas but, as there are no other major proposals associated with the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway and as this work is not likely to be required for some 15 years, there should be no concern about the deletion of these proposals affecting the effective integration of the transportation proposals covering the entire metropolitan area.

The Hon. Mr. Bevan then went on and made some comments concerning public transport. He asked whether or not the study took into account some of the latest technological developments in public transport, and some other honourable members raised this matter also. That aspect was carefully considered. Immediately prior to, and during the course of, the M.A.T.S. study departmental officers travelled overseas for the express purpose of studying the latest developments. The engagement of prominent United States' consultants also ensured that knowledge of the latest technological developments in the United States was available.

It is not accepted that the development of public transport means in any way that freeways are a failure. My information is that in the United States of America at present there are more freeways under construction and more freeways on the drawing boards than has ever been the case at any time prior to now. The M.A.T.S. plan aims to avoid unbalanced development of freeways or any other single element of the transportation system. We need to learn from some mistakes that have been made overseas and develop our total transportation system as a fully integrated comprehensive plan.

This is the very essence of the M.A.T.S. plan. It should be recognized that society does not change rapidly in response to technological development, especially in relation to such matters as transport, which have a profound influence on our whole social structure. It is most unlikely that any transportation facilities built within the next 20 years will suddenly become obsolete. It is the recommendation of the transportation study that the objective of the plan is to meet changing circumstances.

The Hon. Mr. Bevan dealt with the question of the disturbance to industry in the Thebarton area and thereabouts. In the area immediately west of the city of Adelaide there will be considerable disturbance of industries. In some cases, at least, relocation and re-establishment is expected to be of considerable benefit to the industries concerned. In some cases the present sites are inadequate to allow for future expansion.

Ample notice will be given to allow for adjustments to be made. The department is prepared to purchase some properties in advance of the time they will be required and allow present owners to remain as tenants in order to assist the companies concerned in meeting capital requirements for relocation.

The Chairman of the State Planning Authority has also informed me that an approach has been made by the Chamber of Manufactures for an investigation to be carried out on the relocation of industry presently situated in the Thebarton-Hindmarsh areas west of the city which are affected by the transportation proposals. This study has just begun, and the State Planning Authority will be closely co-ordinating its activities with those of the Highways Department and the councils concerned.

Members must appreciate that the relocation of a particular industry is a matter of consequence to the firm itself, and many aspects have to be considered relating to alternative sites. It cannot be assumed that any area which the Government may wish to make available at the Islington Sewage Farm, for example, would automatically be acceptable to all those displaced from sites they presently occupy to the west of the city of Adelaide.

The Hon. Mr. Geddes stated:

The transportation study involves so many problems including where and the way in which the people will work and play and live . . .

It is right that these matters must be considered, but the proper place for these to be considered is in the preparation of the Development Plan. The transportation plan is a specialized plan concerned primarily with transportation. It is not for transportation planners to assume competence in general planning matters. The M.A.T.S. plan is based upon the authorized Metropolitan Development Plan, and is designed to meet the transportation needs arising from that plan.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone made the general contention that the M.A.T.S. proposals would result in greater congestion in the central city area, but in fact the M.A.T.S. plan, if fully implemented, will substantially reduce congestion in the central city area. Without the M.A.T.S. proposals, a large proportion of the traffic within the central city area will be traffic that desires to pass through without having any business in the area. It is estimated that by 1986 the M.A.T.S. plan will divert approximately 68,000 vehicles daily from the central city area to the freeways, which are designed to provide convenient by-pass routes.

It is interesting to note that in the original M.A.T.S. plan, contrary to the opinion of many, the freeways do not come into, nor do they cross, the city of Adelaide proper. The main complex of freeways is simply, in broad, general terms as shown in the plan, two principal north-south routes, one on either side of the city and, in fact, not touching the periphery of the city except at the point at Hackney where the Modbury Freeway flows in and there is the expressway that joins up with the Hindmarsh Interchange via the North Adelaide Connector.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said that he was "completely confused and confounded as to what is going on". The position, I submit, should not be too confusing, and I deal with some of the matters that he mentioned. The railway line at Edwardstown will follow the existing route rather than being diverted. The Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway are deferred to allow the whole question of transport requirements in these sectors to be examined in conjunction with a revision of the Metropolitan Development Plan.

The Noarlunga Freeway in the Marion area is deferred for six months to allow investigation of alternatives as sought by a large number of local residents. Here I also refer to the original interjection of the Hon. Mr. Bevan. I point out that the views of those local residents will be taken into account and respected by the Government.

The Government has made it very clear that it accepts the need for a freeway in this area, and many others accept it, too. I might add that the vast majority of people who have come to see me in delegations and in other ways, together with other people vitally interested in the Noarlunga Freeway, agree that a freeway is necessary in the south-western suburbs. The question in dispute at present is its exact route.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is contrary to what you said earlier this afternoon; you said that you were taking the people into your confidence, yet they are still left up in the air waiting for some definite plan to come along as to just where it is to go.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is true that the people in that freeway area will not know where the freeway will go as yet. But what would the honourable member have done in a similar position? Would he have used strong-arm methods and simply said, "This is where it is to go"?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: No. I would have examined the proposition before bringing it to Parliament.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member examined it as far back as September, 1967. The Government has opened up the plan in order that people might investigate it for themselves and criticize it. We have encouraged comment and criticism, and I believe that this was the best thing the Government could have done. I would do it again, because I believe the Government should take every opportunity to allow people to see what is going on with forward planning, and to see whose property and life are likely to be affected.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You had to be forced to bring the plan down here for discussion.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I took it out to the people; that is where the plan was taken—to the very individuals affected by it. A number of projects affecting the arterial roads are being studied, and some variations may result. These are generally of a minor nature in relation to the plan as a whole, and do not significantly affect the principles of the plan. It must be expected that throughout the whole 20-year period there will be continual re-examination and minor variation of much of the detail of the plan.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill made reference to "this concrete monster of a freeway", and he was referring at that time to the Hills

Freeway. Reference to the M.A.T.S. Report will indicate that very little of the Hills Freeway and even less of the Foothills Expressway (if ever built) will be of elevated structural type (as seems to be the impression). These roads are intended to be constructed generally in a cutting or on earth embankment, and in both cases the sides will be gently sloping and appropriately landscaped with liberal planting of trees and shrubs. The general appearance of the freeway reserve will be that of a park land.

It is only at interchanges or where it is necessary for local roads to cross that concrete bridge-type structures are intended to be used. In certain areas (for example, Thebarton) the Metropolitan Transportation Committee has been requested to consider elevated concrete construction, this being desired by the local residents and the council.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said that he hoped the department would attempt to find some satisfactory substitutes (he was referring to the Noarlunga Freeway). The Metropolitan Transportation Committee will be asked to recommend a route it considers most desirable following its re-examination of all practical alternatives. It is not a matter of finding the best substitute for the present proposal. If the committee feels that the present proposal is the most desirable it must be free to submit a recommendation to this effect. The honourable member then said:

We look to the Highways Department to find the substitutes for us . . . the department should be made clear on that aspect.

As reported in the M.A.T.S. Report, a number of alternatives to the various major proposals have been studied and the consultants and the Joint Steering Committee have recommended proposals which, in their opinion (after considering alternatives), are the most desirable. This is proper and was expected. Is it now suggested that the proposals should be abandoned and the Highways Department suggest substitutes, even if in the department's opinion these are less desirable than those that have been recommended? Some information on alternative proposals is given in the M.A.T.S. Report and more detailed information on this is available and has, in fact, been made available to a number of inquirers.

It should be noted that the original recommendations were put forward by a committee representing the Municipal Tramways Trust, the South Australian Railways, the Adelaide City Council, town planning and highways interests. The concept that substitutes for these

should be found by the Highways Department is not condoned. It is not desirable for that department or any single authority with specialized interest to develop, on its own, major transportation proposals that have repercussions on the other forms of transport and on general town planning matters.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill also made the point that there was an imbalance in the M.A.T.S. plan between the motor vehicle and public transport. In the course of the study an extensive investigation was undertaken on the factors that influenced the choice between the use of the private car and public transport. Based on the findings of this investigation, an assessment was made of the public transport patronage that could be expected with various levels of improvement.

It was found that, beyond a certain level, additional expenditure (even very considerable expenditure) could be expected to attract only very few additional patrons. In the particular circumstances that will apply in metropolitan Adelaide within the next 20 years, further expenditure on the improvement of public transport services beyond that recommended (\$107,000,000) would be grossly ineffective and could not be justified by sound economic analysis.

It is also considered that the level of expenditure recommended for the improvement of public transport services is the maximum that is realizable within the financial resources likely to be available for the development of this element of the transportation system.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That was one of my complaints.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member wanted more money made available.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That very thing was one of the bases of my argument: too much money was available for highways work and not enough for public transport.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: At this moment I do not want to go into great detail about the financial allocations. It is, however, an interesting point in the debate on public transport *versus* highways work that, whilst the public transport sector showed expenditure of \$107,000,000 and the Highways Department \$436,000,000 (which figure has now been reduced to about \$400,000,000) the public transport expenditure proposals would have been considerably increased had the existing railway system not been as it is in metropolitan Adelaide.

The experts who advocated the planning of the rail rapid transit system have found to their delight that the city already has two southern suburban lines and two northern suburban lines. I had a study made of what the costs would have been had the railway system not been suitable or not been in existence (thereby making it necessary to acquire property and lay tracks) and the estimate was \$88,000,000.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I would have expected that it would be greater.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It might have been, but this figure was given to me by departmental officers. So, the overall figure for public transport could well be \$200,000,000, compared with about \$400,000,000 for highways work.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan referred to the advantages to country people of a co-ordinated plan for city transport and the effect on South Australia's competitive position in the industrial sphere. Commonwealth legislation provides for the expenditure of Commonwealth grants on urban arterial roads amounting to \$59,400,000 in the next five years (setting aside the amount that will be required to be spent on these roads in the next 20 years). There will be additional expenditure from State resources.

It is vital that we have a comprehensive plan for roadworks that is properly co-ordinated with plans for public transport development to ensure that this money is spent to the greatest advantage. The M.A.T.S. plan should not be regarded as a cause of expenditure. In a large metropolitan area, transportation cost is a very significant factor in the industrial sphere.

The importance in this area of maintaining free-flowing traffic and avoiding acute traffic congestion cannot be over-emphasized. South Australia must take every opportunity to maintain and, if possible, extend the cost advantage presently enjoyed by our industry.

I was very pleased to hear several speakers introduce this very important matter of the savings in cost to both commerce and industry and to individual South Australians—not only in the metropolitan area but all over the State—when these plans are finally implemented. The figure is expected to be about \$60,000,000 a year, a very large saving in cost to the people of this State.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan then sought two assurances from me; one dealt with the question by the Hon. Mr. Geddes whether the Government was prepared to include cost estimates

in the annual report that it had previously undertaken to bring to Parliament from the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. Not only is the committee required to give some resume of its past activity and current work but it must explain the future programme and it must include the cost estimates that are involved in that programme.

The Hon. Mr. Geddes asked whether this was so and, on behalf of the Government, I gave that undertaking, and I now give it again for the benefit of the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan wanted an assurance that the proposed legislation setting up a land valuation court would be introduced in this session. The Government intends to introduce it this session if it is at all possible. I inform the honourable member that Cabinet has approved of the drafting of the Bill, and the matter is with the Parliamentary Draftsmen in conjunction with the Attorney-General's office at present, and I am very hopeful that it will be introduced this session.

It is very difficult, of course, to give a complete undertaking, because the programme of the Government can change from what we expect it to be; we can get extremely busy as the year progresses, with a good deal of legislation which we intend to introduce and which we have already advised that we will introduce. We place importance on the need for this legislation to be placed on the Statute Book, and that is the exact position of that matter.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: What about my query relating to the compulsory acquisition of land?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thought the undertaking that the honourable member required dealt with the setting up of the land valuation court. Regarding the other matter of amendments that the Government considers are necessary to the present compulsory acquisition of land legislation, I explained in my introductory remarks in August that this whole matter was in the hands of a committee. This committee has called for opinions from various people and various associations that are interested in this subject, and it has consulted His Honour Mr. Justice Else-Mitchell, the judge in charge of the court in New South Wales.

The final report of the committee will include the recommendations that the committee thinks the Government should introduce to change the legislation on acquisition.

That report has not yet been presented to the Government, so it is very difficult to undertake, in any unqualified way, that the Government will blindly accept the recommendations of that committee.

However, it is fair to say that the recommendations the committee brings down will receive the most earnest consideration by the Government and, if the Government is of the opinion that the current legislation can be improved so that the rights of the individual can be even further assisted, the Government will implement the change.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It is the costs that are worrying people.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The question of costs is an issue that has been raised by at least one member of the committee. It is thought that the costs involved will be less under this new system. I think the two questions of the amending of the legislation concerning acquisition and the setting up of the court are very closely related, so we are not in any way at cross purposes in this discussion. Of course, we are not in a position to give an unqualified undertaking until we see the committee's recommendations, but I give the assurance that the recommendations of the committee will be given every possible consideration.

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and some other members commented on some general matters in regard to road funds, and of course the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, too, was involved with this question. There has been mention of the need to divert funds from roadworks to other purposes. It should be noted that the Commonwealth Government exercises control in this respect in that the State is required to spend certain funds on roads from its resources in order to qualify for the Commonwealth grants. We are presently meeting this requirement but not by any substantial margin.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill made some points on this subject which appear to be directed at the diversion of funds at the Commonwealth level. It should be borne in mind that the Commonwealth made an extensive study of road needs throughout Australia and considered these needs in comparison with the needs in other competing areas before deciding on the general level of the current Commonwealth grants. After this investigation, which involved economists of the Commonwealth Treasury as well as economists in the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads and the Department of Shipping and Transport, the

decision was made to increase the allocation to roads throughout Australia by more than 50 per cent as compared with the previous five years.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield made some claims regarding the proposed extension of Brighton Road, Glenelg. He suggested that statements by Mr. Tan at the public meeting and by Mr. Flint subsequent to the public meeting conflicted with advice from Mr. Hart given recently. I think that was the claim made by the honourable member. The M.A.T.S. proposal is to extend Brighton Road at the northern side of Anzac Highway for a considerable distance before linking with Tapley Hill Road.

At the public meeting, the engineer (Mr. Tan) stated that he was prepared to recommend that the proposal should be further studied. Mr. Tan was authorized by the department to make this statement. On the day following the meeting, or thereabouts, the Executive Engineer (Mr. Flint) confirmed to the council that "this particular proposal will need to be varied". An item published in the *Advertiser* on January 31, 1969, following the public meeting, reads:

The mayor of Glenelg (Mr. C. W. Anderson) said today he was delighted with the decision to reconsider the proposal, though it was not yet known what route the proposed connecting road would now follow.

In the letter to the council from Mr. Hart, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee, the council had been advised that the matter was currently being reviewed and that the views of the council relative to alternative routes would be considered. These statements are all valid and correct. There is no conflict or disagreement. Mr. Tan recommended as indicated. It is proposed to vary the proposal from that shown in the M.A.T.S. Report (as stated by Mr. Flint). The alternative has not been finalized; it is still under investigation as stated by Mr. Hart.

Then the Hon. Mr. Banfield requested me to assure the Council that the assurance of the Highways Department officers regarding the Glenelg North area would be adhered to. This assurance can be given. The honourable member made a claim regarding war service loans: he said that it was certain that the people concerned would not be able to get another such loan. The department has been advised verbally by the War Service Homes Division that in normal circumstances where property is acquired by the Government the owner will be permitted to transfer existing war service

home finance to another property. I have written to the authority to clarify this position and in an endeavour to get that undertaking in writing.

Referring to the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway, the Hon. Mr. Banfield said:

Land acquisition along those routes will be continued. What does that indicate other than that the Government has made up its mind on the matter?

The acquisitions are proceeding along this route on the basis of hardship only. The Government respects the position of individuals in all matters relative to this study, and where people cannot sell property because of the plans that have been announced, whether they have been accepted or not, the Highways Department treats with these people and endeavours to come to agreement with them if they are suffering hardship so that they can sell and get a fair market value for their property.

Referring to the deferment of the Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway, the Hon. Mr. Banfield said:

It is significant that it is in Burnside and Mitcham, so ably represented by L.C.L. members.

I refute the implication there. The Hills Freeway and the Foothills Expressway were the only freeway proposals introduced in the M.A.T.S. plan that were not recommended in the Metropolitan Development Plan. The Metropolitan Development Plan transportation system was designed for 1981, whereas M.A.T.S. is designed for 1986.

On page 266 of the report on the Metropolitan Area of Adelaide (Development Plan), routes generally along the alignments of the Hills Freeway and Foothills Expressway were indicated with the following notation, "Direction of traffic flow, for which provision may have to be made after 1981." All other freeways and expressways now recommended were included in the Metropolitan Development Plan (acknowledging changes in detailed alignment).

As these proposals gave rise to considerable criticism, it was decided that it would be proper for the general principle of these facilities to be considered in the context of a revision of the Metropolitan Development Plan (as already applies to all other recommended freeways). The honourable member then referred to a letter from the St. Peters council, which said:

. . . that the widening of and other improvements to arterial roads should be proceeded with as quickly as possible . . .

If the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Bevan is adopted, all such work would necessarily cease pending further consideration by the State Planning Authority. The entire metropolitan road widening proposals and all other arterial road proposals of the department are incorporated in the M.A.T.S. plan. He then said:

I believe nobody could suggest that the plan, from an engineer's point of view, is not an ideal one.

This view is not supported by the department. The plan is far from ideal from an engineering point of view. It is considered the most satisfactory compromise, considering social, aesthetic, economic, and engineering factors. In many instances, a more satisfactory and cheaper "engineering" solution could be found. I submit that the community must have this compromise and must never bow to engineers' requirements alone. That is my view; it is the view of the Government and it is the view of the senior officers in the Highways Department.

The Hon. Mr. Rowe said today that he was not happy about the proposals for the underground railway system. I was sorry to hear him take that view because, in my opinion, it is one of the most important proposals within the whole scheme. The sooner we can introduce a rail rapid transit system for metropolitan Adelaide, a rail system that will be as good as can be found in the world for a city of our size, the better.

As I have already mentioned, we are blessed in the present system with having two routes spreading through the southern suburbs and two routes through the northern suburbs. We must link those lines by a common connector beneath King William Street. If we do that and upgrade our rolling stock and effect other improvements, we can introduce this modern facility that Adelaide needs and must have. I place as much importance upon that proposal as I do upon any other proposal in the whole M.A.T.S. scheme.

I have endeavoured to answer the points that have been raised by honourable members in this long debate. I repeat that the Government does not support either of the amendments moved, and I have given my reasons for that. I was sorry to hear the Hon. Sir Norman Jude talk about all the confusion and worry that he believes the community has had to suffer because of the way in which this scheme has been promoted.

As I have already said, we made this whole plan available to the public. We wanted the public to participate in all the discussions that naturally would flow from a study of it. It was the method by which we chose to make it public, and I believe that all large departmental plans of this kind should be taken out to the people as soon as possible so that the Government of the day, whichever Government it may be, can hear what the individuals concerned have to say about them.

I repeat my appreciation of the representations that have been made and the lengths to which people have gone in their investigations of the whole scheme. I share the concern of the individual property-owners who are directly affected and who do not want to sell their properties. Particularly am I gravely concerned about the welfare of old people and others who will find the problem of re-establishment a very severe social problem. Every effort will be made by the Government (and I am sure I can speak for any subsequent Government on this) to assist these people with their problems so that they will not encounter the difficulties they are fearing, understandably, at present.

I express my appreciation, too, of the experts who took a great interest in this whole matter. This has proved to be, at least to some people, a most exciting exercise. We have provided information to them willingly and many of their submissions have received serious consideration from the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. I did not expect that they would agree with the planning consultants, because it is not unusual for experts to take an opposite view from other experts. Nevertheless, we have appreciated the assistance we have been given by perusing their suggestions, some of which have been accepted.

Finally, I make the point that, whilst there has been much comment and criticism and whilst many people are seriously affected by this vast study that has been going on for so long and has cost so much money, the people who will use our public transport and modern roads in the future will appreciate the services that will then be available to them. When these roadworks and public transport facilities are built and implemented the position will be different from having those things only on the planning board.

We should use comparisons with other cities of a comparable size with Adelaide in respect of people's transport needs. A classic example

is Auckland, New Zealand, which compares with Adelaide. Adelaide has 800,000 people and Auckland has 600,000. There are 30 miles of freeways in Auckland, and more are being planned for the growing population.

If we implement these changes and concentrate, if possible, on public transport and try to encourage people to use it, if we widen our arterial roads, as we intend to, and reach the point where they cannot take more traffic, we will put the extra traffic on to the proposed freeways, and the whole balanced transport plan will be brought to fruition to the economic benefit of the State and for the social welfare and in the best interests of the people as a whole.

The PRESIDENT: The question before the Council is the motion of the Minister of Roads and Transport, to which the Hon. S. C. Bevan has moved an amendment, shown on page 2 of the Notice Paper. The Hon. Sir Norman Jude has moved another amendment, which has been circulated to honourable members this afternoon. As a test vote, I shall put a portion of the first part of the Hon. S. C. Bevan's amendment—namely, to leave out all words after "House" down to and including the passage of the proposal as set out in paragraph (b) (ii). The question will be put in the form that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the question.

The Council divided on the question:

Ayes (13)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill (teller), Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, and C. R. Story.

Noes (5)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan (teller), A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan's amendment thus negated.

The PRESIDENT: I now put the first portion of the Hon. Sir Norman Jude's amendment, namely:

That all words in paragraph (b) (ii) after the passage "of the proposals as set out" be struck out.

Amendment carried.

The PRESIDENT: I put the second part of the Hon. Sir Norman Jude's amendment, namely:

That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted.

Amendment carried.

The PRESIDENT: The final question is that the original motion, as amended, be agreed to.

The Council divided on the question:

Ayes (13)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill (teller), Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, C. D. Rowe, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (5)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, A. F. Kneebone, Sir Arthur Rymill, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Motion, as amended, thus carried.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.59 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 3, at 2.15 p.m.