

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 21, 1970

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

QUESTIONS**FIRE BRIGADES COMMITTEE**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Some time ago the previous Government set up a committee to inquire into and report on the financial arrangements for fire brigades in South Australia. I point out that under the Statute local government contributions in South Australia vary from 12 per cent for some councils down to less than 1 per cent for others. Can the Chief Secretary say whether this committee is to continue with its investigations?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There has been some talk about this committee. I do not want to say anything definite at this stage, but there has been some approach by other councils to be represented on the committee. My colleagues might be able to help me on this question. My impression is that the committee is continuing with its work. However, if the Leader repeats his question tomorrow I will be able to give him a definite answer.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the committee set up to inquire into agricultural education has yet reported to him? If it has not, can he indicate when the committee might do so?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have notified the committee that I would like to obtain a report as soon as possible. The committee wishes to go to several places in other States to have a look at agricultural colleges there. I hope that when the committee completes its investigations in those States it will be able to wind up its inquiry and that we will be able to get something from it soon.

WATER STORAGES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Last week I had reason to travel past the Warren reservoir on my way to Mount Pleasant and I was most concerned at the very low state of the reservoir at this stage of the year. Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from his colleague whether it is intended to use the existing offshoot pipeline from the Mannum main to supplement the Warren reservoir itself or whether it is considered that it will be possible to provide the necessary amount of water entirely by the Swan Reach to Stockwell main? Also, can the Minister obtain for me the present storages of the Warren, South Para and Barossa reservoirs in relation to their capacities?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague, the Minister of Works.

GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Previously, I asked the Chief Secretary whether he could give me any information about the proposed new Government secretariat, about which some publicity was given. Has he a reply to my question?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I assume that the honourable member was referring to the policy secretariat within the Premier's Department when he referred to a Government secretariat. If that is so, the information he seeks is: (1) The officers of the policy secretariat will be members of the staff of the Premier's Department. (2) The permanent head is the Secretary of the Premier's Department, and there will be direct liaison with the Public Service Board. (3) Their work and responsibilities will be to investigate and make recommendations on the implementation of matters of policy affecting Government departments.

GEPPS CROSS SALE YARDS

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: Last week, the Minister of Agriculture, in reply to a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Springett about the quality of meat from the killing works in South Australia, volunteered the following information:

I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that South Australian meatworks were not concerned in any way with the recent ban on the export of meat from Australia. The meatworks here that have export licences were given a clean bill of health by the inspectors concerned. Recently, at an

Agricultural Council meeting at Mount Hagen, it was pointed out that if some of the interested people who were responsible for the export of meat came to South Australia and inspected the abattoirs operating here, they would perhaps be surprised at their hygienic condition and cleanliness. We in South Australia must be concerned at all times about the problems that face the export of meat, to America particularly, which is such a lucrative market but, at the same time, I assure honourable members that our abattoirs fulfil their obligations admirably.

First, the reply given by the Minister did not answer the question asked by the Hon. Mr. Springett; secondly, it was rather unfortunate that this reply is not according to facts. I think the Minister has misled the Council with his reply as regards the situation at the killing works in South Australia. As I understand the position, admittedly no meat from those killing works was involved in the American ban on meat from this country but, once the ban was applied, it automatically applied to all killing works in Australia, irrespective of their facilities being used. Also, I understand that there will be no automatic relicensing of the killing works in Australia: each killing works will be licensed provided it meets the specific requirements laid down by the American authorities. I understand further that alterations are being effected to the killing works at Gepps Cross and I have heard that there has been some activity on some of the chains on Saturday mornings which would indicate that all is not well with the killing works at this centre.

Does the Minister still maintain that the killing works at Gepps Cross will, without further modifications, qualify for an export licence because of their previous clean bill of health, as the Minister stated, when the present ban is lifted by the American authorities? If not, when is it anticipated that the works will qualify for an export licence for meat for the American market?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I definitely did not have any ulterior motive and I did not try to mislead the Council in the information I gave. I do not think anyone can say exactly what conditions the Americans will lay down for any export abattoirs in Australia. It seems to me that the Americans do not want our meat to enter their country, for some reason known to themselves, and they are prepared to put every obstacle in the way of Australian abattoirs and meat exports from Australia to America. When I gave the information to the Hon. Mr. Springett I was speaking about the situation that applied during the period of the meeting of the

Agricultural Council held at Mount Hagen, New Guinea. On that occasion it was pointed out to the council that many Australian abattoirs were closed, but it did not affect South Australia then.

Of course, the position changes from day to day with changes in the American scene, because apparently they think they can say one thing one day and something else the next day. So, it is now very difficult to ascertain exactly what conditions the Americans will lay down in respect of our meat exports. I assure the honourable member that, as far as I and the Government are concerned, we will have to meet the requirements. There can be no shirking this responsibility if we want to export meat to America: we have no alternative but to comply with the regulations that the Americans lay down. If necessary, modifications will have to be made to the Gepps Cross abattoirs. I will seek further information on this matter and let the honourable member have it.

RECEIPTS TAX

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Chief Secretary obtained from the Treasurer a reply to my question of last week about the receipts tax?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The extent to which the State duty is invalid is limited to where the payments concerned are considered to be excises, because they are for new goods produced in Australia. In these circumstances taxpayers must decide whether they should refuse or continue to pay the duty. If they refuse payment they will still have to make returns relating to those other payments which are not in the nature of an excise. If, then, the Commonwealth Bill, which is to be resubmitted next month, becomes law the taxpayer will have to make payments of duty previously omitted. If they continue to pay the duty in respect of new locally produced goods they have been assured that they will receive refunds if the Commonwealth Parliament does not pass the Bill with operation retrospectively.

In answer to the specific question asked by the honourable member, the State does not have the power to enforce payment of duty in relation to moneys received by primary producers or their agents or by dealers marketing their products, in relation to the sale of wool, sheep, cattle, grain or other items of primary production. The duty does, however, continue to be payable in respect of all other transactions including services of all kinds, fees,

commissions, interest, dividends, rents, payments and repayments of loans and other debts, and all payments for land, real property, secondhand goods and imported goods.

MEAT STANDARDS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I concluded my question of last week about meat standards by asking, in simple terms, whether, if the meat is not good enough for America, it is good enough for South Australia. Can the Minister of Agriculture assure the Council that killing centres where meat is prepared for public distribution are completely free from viable infection?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier, a reply to my question of July 15 regarding the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study and the appointment of Dr. Breuning in that regard?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have received the following report:

The Government and the Labor Party have always held that the M.A.T.S. plan should never have been presented to the public in its present form. It has meant (and still means) great inconveniences to people on projected freeway routes who are not sure whether their properties are to go or lose value generally. We believe that the plan should have been studied by the previous Government with a view to assessing a more effective role for public transport and a less ruthless cutting up of parks, gardens and suburbs. Furthermore, since the M.A.T.S. plan is based on criteria that does not take into account the newly developing mass transit technologies, it is obvious, necessary and right, that further planning and expert revision are needed to incorporate them into the plan.

The M.A.T.S. plan, it must be remembered, is a 20-year plan designed to have about 35 years effectiveness, and transport systems will change a great deal in that time. They will change far more radically than they have in the last 35 years. It is no use spending millions of dollars on massive freeway systems now, when such systems are already regarded as becoming obsolete in comparable American and European cities.

The Government has therefore engaged Dr. Breuning, who is Vice-President of Social Technology Systems and who was formerly professor-in-charge of "Project Transport" at the world famous Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as a consultant to work with officers of the State Planning Office, the Highways Department, the Municipal Tramways

Trust and the railways, through the agency of the Metropolitan Transportation Committee, on a preliminary study of the changes that will need to be made to the M.A.T.S. plan so that we do not find ourselves building transport systems that ignore the new technologies. Further, since prototypes are already available, and since there is in the United States of America an enormous research effort now being made into public transit systems that are an effective alternative to private transport, Dr. Breuning will also be able to investigate the practicability of developing and manufacturing the new systems in South Australia, using the State's present skill industries and industrial base.

None of this means that within two years or so South Australians are going to be able to dial up the computerized mini-buses, or walk onto the moving footways, or travel on the monorail capsules, that are envisaged by the planners of the United States Government's Department of Housing and Urban Development. Such systems and all their many variations will take many years to develop into city-wide systems. Nevertheless, planning provision for city-wide systems must be made now, just as the possibility of manufacturing and installing small and efficient currently available or technically feasible units must be investigated now.

Dr. Breuning has been engaged by the Government to undertake a month's definition study into these matters. He and his associate have already made a preliminary survey of the necessary work needed for a revision of the M.A.T.S. plan, and on August 2 he and an associate specialist in transport engineering will arrive to continue their work on a far more detailed basis. The costs of these studies amount to \$(U.S.)12,000, covering transport, accommodation and fees for the team.

The engagement of Dr. Breuning is the first step in the Government's major reorganization of Adelaide's future transport planning. We intend to see that the mistakes made in other Australian cities, and in similar cities overseas, will not be made here. We can do this in South Australia with the M.A.T.S. plan as it stands with considerable ease, since the basic data in the plan on traffic movements and on urban development and population growth remains fixed. It is now a matter of finding the best scheme of planning to suit that data.

More than 75 per cent of the M.A.T.S. plan is data upon which any future system of planning has to be based, whether it be a ruinous and gigantic net of cement and iron freeways such as the Opposition is demanding, or the integrated systems planning the Government is undertaking. And the Government is doing this to ensure that Adelaide is not, and will not need to be, cut up and jammed up with a freeway system that is the product of poverty-stricken imagination and tardy administrative knowhow. There will be, it seems, several freeways built in the metropolitan area in the future, but nothing as ultimately damaging to the life and design of this city as that which the previous Government tried to force upon us.

HILLS FREEWAY LIGHTING

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Recently quite a number of my constituents and others have approached me regarding the lighting of the Hills Freeway, particularly near Crafers. Their remarks were more complimentary than derogatory, but while being complimentary they expressed astonishment that, notwithstanding the fog problem, these lights go off at various times; very often, as honourable members would know, the fog problem can be just as bad at 10 o'clock in the morning as it can be at 3 o'clock in the morning. This periodic lighting is probably due to the fact that time factors are used in controlling the lighting. In view of the excellent lighting set-up, it would appear that this matter should be investigated immediately. I have brought up this matter with the Minister informally, and he may already have some information for me. Can he say whether the Government will regard the matter not as a long-term one but as one of immediate urgency and see whether some action can be taken while the fog menace is with us?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member did me the courtesy of letting me know that he would probably be asking this question today, and I have some information from my colleague for him. The lights on the Hills Freeway are activated by a timing device, as the honourable member indicated he thought was the case. They are operated between 5.15 p.m. and 7 a.m. It is recognized that fog does occur outside of this period and investigations are currently proceeding in order to determine whether the lights could be satisfactorily activated by a photo-electric cell or similar device. The effectiveness of the lights during periods of dense fog is also being investigated.

PORT GILES

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 14 regarding surcharges on commodities shipped through Port Giles?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have been advised by my colleague that as the law stands at the moment there is no surcharge or levy on other commodities shipped through Port Giles.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister a reply to my question of July 14 regarding Port Giles?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have been advised by my colleague that section 132a (2) of the Harbors Act, 1936-1969, provides that the Minister of Marine may, with the approval of the Governor by notice published in the *Gazette*, revoke the surcharge. The approval of the Governor's Deputy in Executive Council has been given to revoke the surcharge applicable to Port Giles, and notice to this effect appeared in the *Gazette* on Thursday, July 16.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On July 14 I asked a question of the Chief Secretary concerning the appointment of the advertising firm of Hansen Rubensohn-McCann Erickson Proprietary Limited by the Government. Has he a reply?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As is standard practice with advertising agencies, there is no contract with the agency. Any work done by the agency is subject to satisfactory performance in the Government's view. Normal agency rates apply to any work done.

MINING LEASES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked last week concerning mining leases?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. It is not the intention of the Government to ask the Auditor-General to inquire into all special mining leases issued during either the last two years or the last five years.

GEORGE'S CORNER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On the Port Pirie to Port Augusta highway there is an intersection immediately east of Port Pirie called George's Corner, where a number of fatal accidents have occurred. I understand that the District Council of Pirie has requested the Highways Department to redesign this corner in order to minimize the road toll there. Can the Minister obtain for me an explanation of how long it will be before the Highways Department can make the necessary alterations to this corner?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT STAFF

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked him recently concerning an increase in staff in the Local Government Office?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Local Government, informs me that he has not approved of any increase in staff for the Local Government Office.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked recently concerning gauge standardization?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member will be aware that the report prepared by Maunsell & Partners concerning the South Australian Railways gauge standardization project was a report made to the Commonwealth Government and to the South Australian Government. This report is not one that should be tabled because it would then become a public document. My colleague the Minister of Roads and Transport is quite prepared to allow any member access to the report should he desire it.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question concerning local government elections?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I believe the question that was asked was whether the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee would be tabled in the Council. The reply is that it is intended that the report will be tabled in both Houses of Parliament in due course. The report is in the process of being printed. It is the intention of the Government to make copies available free of charge to all members of Parliament and to councils in South Australia. Additional copies will be available for sale through the Government Printer.

FATAL ACCIDENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On July 16 I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing his colleague in another place, concerning a fatal accident at Tranmere. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am advised that this matter is to be the subject of a coronial inquiry and that no comment can be made at this point of time.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Government Tourist Bureau (New Building),

Port Augusta (Augusta Park) Primary School,

Port Augusta (Willsden) Primary School.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 16. Page 72.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I congratulate His Excellency the Governor's Deputy upon the manner in which he opened the first session of the Fortieth Parliament. I express regret at the illness of His Excellency the Governor and sincerely hope that he enjoys a speedy and complete recovery.

I congratulate the new members from both Parties who were elected at the last election, the Australian Labor Party on its election victory and the new Ministers on their appointment. Especially do I commend those Ministers in this Chamber. I commend those former members whose Parliamentary service ended with the last Parliament. Some retired voluntarily, some were forced to retire because of the age rule in the Australian Labor Party and some failed to gain preselection. They all did their duty well.

Particularly do I commend the Hon. Mr. Bevan for his political and Parliamentary career. He gave a lifetime of service to his Party. Finally, he deservedly reached high office in this Parliament. He was a conscientious Minister and a loyal Party man. It is most unfortunate that he is now on the sidelines. It is unfortunate, too, that the Hon. Mr. Banfield did not receive promotion as a result but, if there is fairness in his Party's future planning, his chance will come.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was not sought.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I did not say it was. I congratulate also the Hon. Mr. Casey, who appears to have settled in very well. I hope that with experience in this Chamber he will appreciate fully the great work of, and the

contributions made to our Parliamentary system by, this Chamber. Only by such experience can one recognize fully the need for this Council to remain in that Parliamentary system and never to become simply a rubber stamp of the other House.

I thank honourable members and the Parliamentary staff for the help and co-operation they gave me as Minister in the two years of the last Parliament. I thank all members of the Public Service with whom I came in contact, especially those in the departments that came within my administration, for their assistance and service. The same appreciation is extended to the various boards, associations and committees involved with roads, transport, local government, road safety, town planning and other work with which I was associated.

Naturally, a Minister becomes involved in much social activity, mostly within the metropolitan area. For the hospitality and friendliness extended to my wife and me on such occasions, we were and will forever remain most grateful.

I saw more of the country areas of the State in those two years than I had ever seen before. My wife and I called upon councils throughout Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula, the Lower, Mid and Upper North, the Upper Murray, the South-East, Kangaroo Island and elsewhere. With Highways Department staff we travelled on all the main outback roads and tracks and discussed road problems with station people on the Eyre Highway, along the 700 miles of the Stuart Highway, along the Birdsville and Strzelecki tracks, in the Gawler Ranges, beyond Tarcoola, in the opal towns and in other remote areas.

The manner in which we were welcomed everywhere, particularly by councillors and their wives and station owners and managers and their wives, reflected unforgettable kindness and generosity. One learns to appreciate and admire the character of such people by personal contact. We thank them most sincerely.

In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I will speak on three main headings that have been referred to in various paragraphs in the Speech. The first general heading to which I refer concerns rail standardization. Paragraph 7 of His Excellency's Speech, dealing with rail standardization, states:

My Government does not accept the recommendations contained in the report on a feasibility study previously undertaken for the standardization of the railway line between Adelaide and Port Pirie but supports a scheme proposed by the Railways Commissioner which

is more economic and will ensure that South Australia's main industrial centres are connected with the standard gauge line.

I am sure that honourable members will be pleased that the major project of rail gauge standardization was completed earlier this year. I refer to the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line. It was on April 19, 1963, that Sir Thomas Playford received word from Sir Robert Menzies that the Commonwealth Government was agreeable to proceeding with the standardization of this line.

The actual work started on October 7, 1963. The cost of the project was \$52,000,000, plus, I believe (and here I speak from memory) about \$13,000,000 for rolling stock; 350 miles of track was constructed. The magnitude of the project can be judged by the fact that it included 300 bridges or culverts, 4,500,000 cub. yds. of earthworks, 50,000 tons of rails, 850,000 sleepers and 3,000,000 dog spikes.

The first standard gauge freight train moved from Broken Hill to Port Pirie on January 16, 1970, and a short while later the Indian Pacific passenger service passed over the line. The next major project that now faces the State is the standardization of the gauge north of Adelaide to join with this new east-west line. On March 18, 1964, Sir Thomas Playford wrote to Sir Robert Menzies seeking Commonwealth approval for the construction of a standard gauge railway between Adelaide and Crystal Brook. The overall proposal has been actively pursued ever since.

Sir Robert Menzies suggested a further investigation into the subject. This was to be carried out by the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner in consultation with the South Australian Railways Commissioner. As a result, the South Australian Railways Commissioner produced a plan to provide for an integrated standard gauge system north of Adelaide, and the Labor Government of 1965-68 approved and forwarded this proposal to the Commonwealth. It sought the Commonwealth's approval to the scheme.

It is very interesting and particularly important for members to note that that proposal did not include standard gauge connections to General Motors-Holden's at Woodville, Chrysler's factory at Tonsley Park, or the west side of the Port River. Also, it did not include a proposal to run a standard gauge spur line into Elizabeth.

Soon after the Hall Government came to office in 1968, the Railways Commissioner submitted a rather similar plan, and asked that the Hall Government approve the plan and

forward it to the Commonwealth Government for approval. In his report to me in May, 1968, the Railways Commissioner said that standard gauge connections to Woodville, Chrysler's, and the west side of the Port River would not be practicable, while one to the G.M.H. factory at Elizabeth would be extremely costly.

He went on to say that, consequently, traffic from these locations to New South Wales would move by broad gauge to Peterborough for bogie exchange to standard gauge. This traffic, he said, would not move on standard gauge, either through Port Pirie or through Gladstone, because of the greater mileages involved.

I had a very close look at the proposal, and as a result further discussion took place between the Railways Commissioner and the Government to see whether a line to Crystal Brook would not be a better proposition than the proposal to take the line to Port Pirie. However, as a result of submissions by the Railways Commissioner, the Government in 1968 agreed to the Commissioner's proposal, and it endeavoured to obtain the Commonwealth approval of it.

Until the Railways Commissioner saw the Maunsell report about two months ago, he consistently maintained his attitude that it would not be practicable for spur lines to be built, as I have explained. His intention until he saw the Maunsell report was that not only was Sydney traffic to come down and be bogie exchanged at Peterborough but traffic from the locations of General Motors-Holden's at Woodville, Chrysler's factory and the west side of the Port River was to move by broad gauge to Peterborough for bogie exchange to standard gauge, even after the construction of the standard gauge line from Adelaide to Port Pirie. He told me quite emphatically that this traffic would not move on standard gauge, either through Port Pirie or through Gladstone, because of the greater mileages involved.

However, as a result of the Commonwealth's refusal to accept the plan put forward in 1968, the Commonwealth and South Australia agreed, at the suggestion of the Commonwealth, that the independent survey by Maunsell & Partners be carried out. Incidentally, that is what it was intended to be—a completely independent survey. There was never any intention for a Railway Commissioner's plan to be prepared, either before or after the Railways Commissioner had seen the Maunsell report, and the two studies to be compared.

The Railway Commissioner's report mentioned in paragraph 7, as I have said, arose only because, out of courtesy, I forwarded the Maunsell report to the Commissioner for his comments. I never at any stage instructed him to prepare a plan using it as a base, or using it for any purposes upon which to prepare an alternative plan. I simply sought the Commissioner's opinion of the feasibility study report before discussing the matter in Cabinet.

In May of this year, we agreed to accept the Maunsell report, provided the Commonwealth would include a spur line to the industrial complex at Elizabeth. The Commonwealth Government supported the report but would not agree to this additional work. So, final agreement could not be reached with the Commonwealth prior to the election.

The main points of the Maunsell feasibility study report, of which I made rough notes, may be summarized as follows. Fast through goods trains will virtually all travel to and from New South Wales on the new line, which will be one of world standard. Estimates for 1974 (estimated time of completion) and 10 years thereafter have been considered by the experts. A new line is proposed, generally speaking, parallel to the old, with some deviations to improve curvature. This is a distinct difference between the previous proposals and the Maunsell report, in that the previous proposals recommended conversion of the existing old line.

The proposed new line leaves the old alignment just north of Red Hill and joins the east-west line just east of Crystal Brook. The redundant section from Red Hill to Port Pirie would be abandoned. The Snowtown-Kadina line is to be converted and a new standard gauge line built between Kadina and Wallaroo. Other associated branch lines would remain broad gauge. The line as it nears Adelaide, travelling south, leaves the present alignment of the existing railway somewhere near Two Wells, and passes west of existing residential developments until Dry Creek is reached.

In the metropolitan area a new freight terminal for both gauges is proposed at Islington, and new marshalling yards are proposed at Dry Creek; a spur line is proposed to Gillman to serve the Port Adelaide area, with access to certain key industries on the east of the river, and to provide access to proposed industrial areas that could be developed alongside the new line. A spur line to the abattoirs and sale yards at Pooraka is proposed.

A spur line into the north end of the Islington railway workshops area is proposed. Access is proposed to the Adelaide railway station.

The experts indicated some fears that the signalling on the new line between Crystal Brook and Broken Hill might need investigating by 1981, when they claim 15 to 16 trains a day, compared with about six or seven trains today, will be using it.

Grade separations are proposed at all major crossings. The approximate costs estimated in the Maunsell report for construction are \$30,400,000, being \$14,500,000 in the country and \$15,900,000 in the metropolitan area; grade separation costs are \$1,800,000; locomotives and rolling stock, \$7,900,000; and engineering costs, \$2,400,000—making a total of \$42,500,000. To this, an estimated escalation figure of about \$5,000,000 has been added, making a grand total of about \$47,500,000.

The Maunsell report also recommended that the administration of the project for best economical and efficient completion ought to be looked at very carefully. I personally discussed the Maunsell report and the Railways Commissioner's subsequent submission with the Senior Railway Engineer from Maunsell & Partners, who was in charge of the preparation of the Maunsell study, and at the same time there was present the senior officer from the Department of Shipping and Transport who, I believe, is in charge of rail standardization in that Commonwealth department.

I read the submission by the Railways Commissioner to these officers, and the engineer from Maunsell & Partners commented upon and discussed with me the Railways Commissioner's submissions. We discussed in full the question of the spur lines, and I pointed out to both officers that the question of spur lines was one that was causing our Government considerable concern. Maunsell's engineer stressed the high cost of construction and maintenance of spur lines, and also indicated the trend today for factories to have their products forwarded to common freight yards by forwarding agents for loading at such freight yards. Some industries would need products loaded on both broad and standard gauges.

I think it is fair to say that both men were impressed by our strong need for a spur line into the general industrial complex of the relatively new city of Elizabeth. Subsequently I was advised by Maunsell & Partners that in their view a very quickly prepared and rough estimate of the cost of a spur line to Elizabeth would be about \$900,000.

Subsequently the Premier wrote to Canberra, and stated in effect that South Australia would agree to the Maunsell report if the Commonwealth would include the spur line into Elizabeth. We were mindful of the great need, in the interests of the State, to finalize the plan, as talk had been going on since 1964, and the State's need for joining Adelaide to the standard gauge system was extremely urgent. I also realize that if secondary industries to the south not joined by spur lines could afford them or if the South Australian Railways could afford to build and maintain them, if it became practicable for them to be constructed, then the State might finance them. Also, the Commonwealth Government might be asked to consider such spur lines at a later date. As a result of my discussions with Maunsell & Partners, I firmly believe that they will never be required. I also believe that heavy secondary industry for the balance of this century will tend to develop along the Gillman-Elizabeth axis in the metropolitan area. Incidentally, Whyalla and Wallaroo will develop tremendously as country industrial centres as a result of standardization in the years to come.

I went to Canberra in May and pressed for acceptance of the Maunsell report, together with one important addition. I mentioned whilst in Canberra the Railways Commissioner's objections, and of course the senior departmental officer who was present at the Adelaide interview had reported to his Minister. Incidentally, I understand that the Department of Shipping and Transport feared that the estimated cost of the Elizabeth spur line would be about \$2,000,000, because the proposed main line was planned to travel west of Salisbury in the Maunsell report, and its realignment adjacent to the existing track through Salisbury might have to be considered, with consequent overways, signalling and other additional costs, to bring it nearer Elizabeth.

The long and regrettable history of bickering over standardization in Australia goes back beyond Federation itself. It is extremely difficult to reach decisions. Without giving my reasons at this stage, I say emphatically that the new State Government has no possibility whatsoever of having the present Railways Commissioner's submission accepted by the Commonwealth Government. However, using the Maunsell report as a foundation, it might achieve success and I hope it does, because this is an extremely important and urgent matter for the State.

I have dwelt upon the subject at some length to inform honourable members of the

position, and I now come to the unpleasant matters relative thereto. On television, prior to going to Canberra for the Premiers' Conference, the Premier said, when discussing rail standardization, that the Maunsell report had been accepted by the Commonwealth Government and by the previous Government of South Australia. As far as the previous Government of South Australia was concerned, that statement was untrue. Again, later in that telecast, he said that these proposals had been accepted by the Commonwealth Government and by the previous State Government. Again, as far as the previous State Government was concerned, that statement was untrue. Also, he said that the Commonwealth was at no point made aware of the true position; he was dealing with the Railways Commissioner's submissions, and in this respect his statement was untrue. I simply want to make the point that such irresponsibility does not go unnoticed.

I move from that very important question concerning South Australia to the general subject of town planning, which was referred to in His Excellency's Speech in paragraphs 17, 18 and 25. There has been in the last few days considerable criticism of the State Planning Authority, the Director of Planning and the composition of the authority. Much of the criticism has been centred around the general question of the hills face zone. Actions and decisions of the Director and the authority were my responsibility for two years, and I take full responsibility for those actions and decisions. Regarding the control of land subdivision in the hills face zone, I point out that the Planning and Development Act provides that both the Director of Planning and the local council must approve applications to divide land into allotments. The Act also states that if the land lies within certain localities defined in the Metropolitan Development Plan, the State Planning Authority shall submit a report to the Director, stating whether the proposal to divide the land conforms to the aims and objectives of the plan. The hills face zone is one of these prescribed localities.

If the authority reports that the application does not conform to the aims and objectives of the plan, then the Director must refuse the application on behalf of the authority. Both the Director and the council exercise their other powers in relation to the application and a right of appeal exists against any of the three decisions given. The authority gives public notice of applications to subdivide the land. It did not have to give this notice prior to late 1969 but, as a result of several deputations to

me from interested parties within the Hills area, parties who had formed associations and who did not have adequate notice from their local councils that proposals to subdivide land were under consideration by those local councils, I insisted that the authority publicize these applications so that the maximum public scrutiny of the matters could take place. As from December 9, 1969, that publicity was given.

I think it is important that we know exactly what is meant by "hills face zone". The Metropolitan Development Plan describes the hills face zone as being all the land on the face of the Mount Lofty Ranges overlooking the metropolitan area. The zone extends about 60 miles from Gawler in the north to Sellick Beach in the south, with an average width of about two miles. Therefore, there is about 120 square miles of land in this very large area known as the hills face zone. The development plan recommends that the natural character of the face of the hills should be retained and not spoiled by small-scale domestic development. The guidelines that are set down for the authority to consider in this question are further amplified at page 77 of the development plan report, which states:

The natural slopes of the foothills and the wooded character of the face of the ranges rising to Mount Lofty provide a pleasant contrast to the suburbs on the plains and give Adelaide a special character. It is very desirable therefore that the face of the ranges and the skyline as seen from various points in the metropolitan area should retain a natural character and should not be spoiled by small-scale domestic development.

I am sure that all honourable members agree emphatically with that statement. The Planning and Development Act, however, never envisaged that there would be no development whatsoever in the hills face zone. It was intended that development be minimal and that the approvals given must conform to the aims and objectives that I have taken some trouble to explain.

This recent criticism of the Director and of the State Planning Authority seems to have stemmed from a Mr. R. C. Caldicott of the Town and Country Planning Association who, I understand, is the Director of Research within that association. He made statements such as these in the press recently on July 14:

We have on the State Planning Authority two members with real estate interests.

He also said that the authority was overweighted with vested interests. On July 16, talking of those on the authority, he said:

These are the wrong people, the wrong disciplines. It is not planners who are planning the State's future environment.

I was very pleased to read the Premier's comment on this point, and I commend him for it. He said, in effect, of Mr. Caldicott, "If you have accusations against people on the authority, make them, and if you do not have accusations, then keep quiet."

I think it is proper that we should just consider the responsible men who comprise the authority and the various departments and interests that they represent. First, in regard to the two people that Mr. Caldicott referred to in the press, might I say that they are two people of the highest character and good faith, as are the institutions that they represent. On the authority there is the Director of Planning himself, and no-one will question his qualifications as a planner. As I have said before in this Chamber, he is an extremely capable and dedicated officer, and I have a very high opinion of him.

On the authority we also have Mr. Beaney, who is well known to us as Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, a man who, if he is not a planner himself, has fully qualified and expert planners within his department. Then there is Mr. Johinke, the Commissioner of Highways, a qualified planner himself and one who has qualified planners within the staff of his department. Also on the authority is the Surveyor-General.

Then we have Mr. Johnson, the Secretary to the Minister of Roads and Transport. We have also Mr. Dridan, the Chairman of the Housing Trust, who has qualified planners on the staff of the trust. Then there is Mr. Roche, representing the Adelaide City Council, on the staff of which there are highly qualified and capable planners.

Representing other facets of local government on the authority are Mr. Bowey and Mr. Holly. One represents the rural section of local government in this State and the other the metropolitan section apart from the city of Adelaide. There are two people who represent those people involved in private practice, if I can use that expression. Representing the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures is Mr. Branson, and representing the Real Estate Institute is Mr. H. F. Gaetjens.

This is an extremely responsible body, and it is unbecoming and completely improper for

accusations to be made by Mr. Caldicott or anyone else, implying, as he and others might do, that there are faults and involvement of vested interests in this authority. This does not mean that the authority should not in some respects change with the passing of time. I understand that the appointments to the authority come up for review in mid-1971. I am of the opinion that there is a need for a representative of the various conservation interests in this State to join the authority at some stage, and I think that in mid-1971 the Government of the day should consider including a responsible representative of that kind.

In endeavouring to rebut criticism, I again stress my very high regard for the Director, for the authority and also for the officers of the State Planning Office who, of course, are not involved directly with the authority's work. From my experience, I can say that they are all extremely dedicated officers, and apart from their usual routine work that they carry out in the department they have been involved with extremely important and progressive planning and decisions in regard to planning over the past two years.

The authority has been carrying on the work regarding acquisition of open spaces in metropolitan Adelaide for the future use of the ever-increasing population of the metropolitan area. In about two years, the Government has made available to the State Planning Authority a figure in excess of \$500,000, and the authority purchased about 560 acres of land in locations such as Athelstone South, O'Halloran Hill, Happy Valley, Cherry Gardens, Aldinga, and in the Onkaparinga estuary at Port Noarlunga for public reserve purposes.

The State Planning Authority is currently negotiating for the purchase of other land totalling, I understand, an area in excess of 1,250 acres. Incidentally, although a local government matter, the Government made available in the last two years a sum totalling about \$467,000 to local councils, and when it is remembered that the councils themselves contribute, this means that almost \$1,000,000 has been spent in purchasing such areas for recreational purposes within particular local government areas. One of the larger purchases recently agreed to by the authority was 352 acres of land for the Black Hill Regional Park reserve above Athelstone, and eventually this reserve in the eastern foothills will cover about 1,200 acres.

The previous Government also financially assisted the Mitcham council's purchase of

about 150 acres of land in the vicinity of Windy Point, and this particular subject has received some publicity in the last week or two. That purchase will provide an almost unbroken chain of open spaces in the hills face zone linking the national pleasure resort at Shepherds Hill with the Windy Point area. In addition, we allocated part of the area known as the Islington sewage farm (83 acres) to the State Planning Authority for open space purposes. The total value of that 83 acres was estimated at \$581,000, or \$7,000 an acre.

I noticed from His Excellency's Speech that the Government has intimated that it intends, in effect, to increase land tax on some owners of land in metropolitan Adelaide to finance further purchases of this kind. I point out that there was never any need to use revenue for this particular purpose. The last Government continued to secure finance for the authority by way of debentures, and since the implementation of the Act three loans secured by debentures have been arranged. Also, in addition to these loans there has been a constant inflow of contributions to the Planning and Development Fund from subdivision, resubdivision and strata title activity. The details of these show an increasing flow of money going into the fund, and the total contributions to the fund from those particular sources have been \$268,415.

Land for the authority has not yet been acquired compulsorily, for there has not been need for such action. All the sellers have been willing sellers. The credit balance in the fund at April 30 (that was about the time when I lost contact with such detail because of the election arrangements in May) showed a sum of \$293,635 in credit. The fears that were expressed in this Chamber in 1966 and 1967 that there would be a great need for funds for the acquisition of these open spaces have never come to fruition. Rather, the position in practice has been one in which people instead of offering property for sale have favoured holding their rural land and, no doubt, continuing with their work upon it. So there has never been a great need to look around for more money.

Had the authority rushed in and purchased a far greater area of land, it would not have had the resources, nor would there have been the need, for it to be further developed as open spaces, for this general plan of acquisition of open spaces for metropolitan purposes is a long-term plan. So we are in credit with the funds at present and there is a further pool of money in the Public Parks Act reserves, which

could be used from time to time should the need arise through some unexpected purchase being required to be made. Hence, one wonders whether that is a wise proposal of the Government, but no doubt further debate can take place on that matter in due course.

Perhaps the most serious comment or criticism that has been made about the hills face zone embraces the difficult matter of quarrying in the Adelaide Hills. It is a matter that the authority has never tried to side-step; nor did the previous Government ever try to put this question away in the drawer for another occasion.

The position has been that the State Planning Authority has powers, under section 41 of the Planning and Development Act, to control changes in land use and the erection of buildings and structures in the hills face zone of the Metropolitan Development Plan, but the precise powers conferred in that Act relating to power to control the extension of existing quarries is now an issue before the Supreme Court. Pending the decision of that court, the authority has felt unable to proceed further with the control of extensions to existing quarries in the hills face zone. It is pointed out that the authority has the power to control the commencing of new quarries.

There is a committee of the State Planning Authority that deals with extractive industries such as these, and this committee is looking deeply into this whole matter. It is of interest to note that one of the purchases of the State Planning Authority in recent times has been 181 acres of land in the Tea Tree Gully area upon which a quarry is being actively worked.

This was the first purchase by the Government of an open space containing an active quarry, and it may well be that in due course this will be the only really effective way in which over a long period of time quarries that face the metropolitan area at present in the hills face zone may be done away with. Some working out may have to take place and then the existing scars could be rehabilitated under the supervision of the State Planning Authority and such areas as the flat floors of these quarries may be able to be used for recreational and sporting facilities. If that procedure could take place with the passing of time it would be a positive means by which the natural beauty of the hills could be restored.

I thank the Director of Planning, too, for the great interest he has shown in a proposal I endeavoured to pursue over the past two

years concerning the general matter of stobie poles in the suburbs of Adelaide. Before the last Government went out of office, it agreed to introduce regulations under the Planning and Development Act to give discretionary power to both the State Planning Authority and councils to require developers of subdivisions and resubdivisions to put electricity cables underground and so do away with the need for stobie poles in new areas. I believe that in residential areas we must develop new suburbs and new housing estates uncluttered by the conventional stobie poles.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Have you ever attempted to ascertain the cost of underground installations?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes; I am coming to that in a moment.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It would be nice to be satisfied on that.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It is difficult to satisfy the honourable member.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This is a difficult and important question. I believe we are reaching a time when new housing estates must not have conventional stobie poles erected in and around them. As we seek to improve our quality of life, the visual environment within residential areas must become as important as roads and footpaths. The regulations I mentioned require plans for undergrounding to be approved by the Electricity Trust. I hope the new Government will proceed with those regulations.

As regards the question asked by the Hon. Mr. Banfield, I have been endeavouring to make some progress on this point in the last two years. A pilot scheme at Wattle Park involving about 270 allotments and where some 130 houses are already built was under consideration. The cost factor is a big problem, but there is some evidence that costs will not be as great for such a project in the future as was thought to be the case a year or two ago. I have been perturbed that the Electricity Trust's estimates may be higher than they should be for this kind of work, and it appears to me that a full independent inquiry should at some stage be made to check these estimated costs.

I was pleased to read that the whole matter of the committee on environment set up by the previous Government will be pursued by the new Government. South Australia was the first State in Australia to initiate a full-scale investigation into the pollution and contamination of our air, water and land resources. This means, of course, a complete investigation into

our total environment. I know the committee, under the chairmanship of Prof. D. O. Jordan, will continue to apply itself to its task as it has in the past.

I have mentioned under this general heading of town planning some of the matters that I think it is important to emphasize when one reads the criticism that has appeared in the press lately. I think there has been strong reason for emphasizing the responsible approach and the splendid work done by the Director of Planning, the State Planning Authority and the State Planning Office in this State. There are many other matters of great importance to the State in which the Director of Planning has been involved.

For instance, there is the question of replanning Victoria Square. The Director of Planning is taking a very active part on that committee. I believe that regional plans have been practically completed to cover all the rural areas of the State.

The Director is very interested in the proposal to develop a very long walkway known as Flinders Way. The Director gave excellent service on the committee set up to investigate local government at Whyalla. At my instigation a short time ago the authority agreed to set up a community values committee and members of the authority produced a splendid report regarding the redevelopment of Hackney.

In connection with the M.A.T.S. Report, in the past few weeks nothing short of a chaotic situation has been experienced both by those who have been involved in planning metropolitan transportation and by those in the suburbs whose properties may be acquired and who are concerned about the future. Regarding the conflict and the misunderstandings that have been generated by announcements concerning the M.A.T.S. Report since the present Government came to office, I was pleased to hear this afternoon an effort made to give a rather full explanation of some of these matters. In due course, I shall be pleased to study that reply closely. No responsible Opposition could let the position go without a very serious query.

It is necessary to refresh honourable members' memories by touching on some of the important facets of this lengthy question. The history of this matter goes back to 1962, when the report on the metropolitan area of Adelaide and the metropolitan area of the Adelaide development plan was presented to Parliament. That plan showed an extensive system of public transport facilities and free-ways, but it was soon realized that a more

detailed study of these facilities was necessary. Consequently, the Playford Government formed a joint steering committee to examine the need for a comprehensive transportation study. In 1964 the Minister of Roads authorized the commencement of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study; the study followed the terms of reference drawn up by the joint steering committee.

It is most important to mention that the steering committee required that, amongst a group of world-famous expert consultants, a firm of Australian transport engineers be included. As a result, the firms of de Leuw, Cather and Company (of Chicago), Rankine and Hill (of Sydney), and Alan M. Voorhees and Associates, Incorporated (of Washington) were commissioned as a consortium to prepare this report. This group comprised the most competent transport engineers that our South Australian officers could find in the world and, at the same time, our officers insisted that an Australian firm should take part and, in fact, that firm took a very active part, especially in the final development of the plan.

So, the preparation of the M.A.T.S. plan proceeded throughout the years 1965, 1966 and 1967. In August, 1967, the implications of the study were explained to the Dunstan Government, which directed that the final report should be published before February 1, 1968. The Dunstan Government was very anxious to obtain it: an election was planned for March, 1968. However, it was impossible to prepare the report by that time. The experts thought the report could be prepared by February 15, 1968, if the then Government was willing to agree to a further expenditure of over \$31,000. Approval was given for that expenditure, because no doubt it was deemed a very urgent matter. However, this deadline was not achieved, and it was not until August, 1968, that the study was submitted to the Hall Government.

After an extensive period, during which ample opportunity was afforded members of the public to discuss and make representations on the plan, the issue was submitted to Parliament, which approved those proposals that the Government was prepared to accept. Several items were deferred for further investigation and review by the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. The development plan proposal was for 82 miles of freeways. The M.A.T.S. proposal reduced that to 61 miles of freeways, of which the Government finally approved about 50 miles of freeways. The total cost of preparing that study was about

\$700,000. The estimated cost of the works in the report was about \$574,000,000. The cost of the work approved by the Government and Parliament was about \$507,000,000.

I turn now to the new Government's stated policy concerning freeways. In this connection, I wish to quote the following remark of the then Leader of the Opposition (now the Premier):

Freeways from north to south, to Tea Tree Gully, to Port Adelaide and Glenelg will be necessary.

I point out that the extent of that freeway proposal was greater than the freeway proposals that had been approved by the previous Government. Neither the previous Government nor the M.A.T.S. plan had ever envisaged a freeway to Glenelg. I was interested to hear this afternoon the concern expressed about the problems of re-establishing people who are faced with possible acquisition of their houses. I cannot help asking myself along which route the Government plans to align the freeway to Glenelg. Does it plan to align it along the Glenelg tramline? A possibility under investigation has been to retain that tram and finally run it along the proposed underground route down King William Street. Does the Government plan to place the freeway down Anzac Highway? Let us imagine for a moment the damage to the adjacent properties that that would bring, because all frontage properties to the highway would have to be acquired to make way for the proper road reserves and to provide such things as noise buffers. Or does it propose to place the freeway somewhere else through residential development; and on whose advice was this proposal and promise made? What experts have been consulted in that regard?

These are some of the worries that concern me, members of the Opposition, and people outside of this Council. Not only that, there is the question of policy and promises that were made concerning freeways. I quote from a protest newsletter prepared and sponsored by the Marion and Darlington divisions of the M.A.T.S. Revision Committees sent to me, I think just prior to the election:

A recent important meeting was held. Mr. Keen as a ratepayer—

Mr. Keen is the Mayor of Marion and has every right to convene a meeting as a ratepayer, and I am not offering any criticism of him—convened a meeting of representatives of all freeway affected groups with Mr. Virgo, M.P., shadow Minister of Roads and Transport, on May 12. At the request of our committees, Mr. Virgo has supplied an extended policy statement as follows:

Notwithstanding the Hall Government's approval of the M.A.T.S. plan and their stated intention to implement it, a Labor Government will withdraw the plan because we do not believe that a massive concentration upon elevated freeways will produce eventually anything other than a city cut up and jammed up with private motor cars. The withdrawal of the M.A.T.S. plan will automatically rescind the instruction given to the Metropolitan Transportation Committee by Transport Minister Hill requiring them to consider alternative routes for the Noarlunga Freeway and, accordingly, the suggested alternatives currently being considered by this committee will not be proceeded with. . . .

That is an emphatic promise. I ask the plain and simple question with which today's reply was concerned: is the M.A.T.S. plan withdrawn? I still have not received a reply, but members will appreciate the conflict and confusion that exist at the moment concerning this whole question. Added to it is the matter of the expert who is to be brought over here from the United States of America. I offer no criticism of Dr. Breuning at any professional or personal level. I have not been told what experience in the preparation of transportation plans for cities of comparable size and features to Adelaide he has had, but he is to come here to make some kind of report, depending on the instructions he is given on arrival.

This whole question concerns a plan which has been prepared by American and Australian experts whose qualifications are unquestioned. If that is not sufficient reason for some criticism, we have the rather comical situation in which Dr. Breuning admitted that he was not sure whether he had been retained. Some advice had been given to him by telephone and, apparently, the Minister of Roads and Transport had forgotten to send the necessary letter. However, that Minister has been busy, because there have been two conferences outside this State that had been arranged previously, and I do not want to be unfair to him. But we certainly need some clear and detailed explanation of what is going on.

The most startling admission since the whole M.A.T.S. plan was dreamed of came on July 9 when the Premier was quoted in the *Advertiser* as follows (and I have no doubt that he was properly quoted):

The Premier said last night that M.A.T.S. was a 35-year plan and transport systems would change a great deal in that time. It is no use spending millions of dollars on massive freeway systems now when they are already regarded as becoming obsolete in comparable American cities.

The point is that the Premier is making an admission that he believes the M.A.T.S. plan is a 35-year plan. The M.A.T.S. plan is a 20-year plan and everyone, right down to the thousands of schoolchildren who have been writing projects about it, knows that it is a 20-year plan that was started in 1966 and planned to encompass the following 20 years to 1986. Throughout the introductory sections of the M.A.T.S. Report is repeated this date of 1986, and the data on the investigations and all the figures are estimated up to 1986.

We go right back to one of the fundamentals of the proposal when we consider the period of the plan. If it were a 35-year plan there would have been a completely different report. I had talks in Sydney with the New South Wales Minister concerning his plan that took in the period until the turn of the century. If a plan of that kind were prepared, the forecasts of modes of travel in years so far distant would have to be taken into account, but our plan was a practical plan to overcome the problems that exist now in metropolitan Adelaide.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why did you come out and say that you were going to shelve some of the plan?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Because we did not agree with some of it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You had a further "think" about the question.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We had some regard for the welfare of the people who were concerned.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You weren't concerned.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We did not rush in before the experts looked at it and say, "We will build freeways to Glenelg."

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You rushed in and cut out one of the freeways.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, we cut out some of the freeways and reduced the length of the freeways. I am glad we did. However, the Government has already promised to increase the length of the freeways; yet we heard today from the Chief Secretary the explanation that came from the Premier or from the Minister of Roads and Transport about all the problems associated with freeway growth. I come back to this point: it was a fundamental premise that it be a 20-year plan, and for this reason consideration was not given to long-term forecasts of

dial-a-bus and press a button and the capsule will come, and that kind of thing.

Consideration was given to the terms of reference of the planning, and that was to cope with the traffic problems of this city for the period of time when it can be reasonably expected that the conventional motor car will remain with us. Surely we all agree that it is a reasonable expectation of time that the conventional motor car will remain with us until about the year 1986. That is only 16 years from now.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You don't believe the Jules Verne stuff we saw in the paper the other day?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, I only believe that if I am asked to cast my mind forward to the turn of the century. I am quite happy and willing to do that, provided that I see freeways built now to cope with the congestion that Adelaide motorists are experiencing now, and provided also that I see public transport systems as proposed in the plan and approved by the Government starting, construction being under way to help Adelaide people in their problems of commuting from the city and back and so forth.

But here we have this smokescreen with the Premier trying to wriggle out of a situation in which the Labor Party finds itself, a plan to take attention away from the realistic and the practical needs of Adelaide motorists and turn it to the future. We should all know that transportation projects are not fixed and static things.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You are talking about motorists?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am talking about motorists, and I intend to cover presently the whole question of public transport. Surely it is a damning criticism of the Premier's knowledge of M.A.T.S. that he goes to the press and says that M.A.T.S. is a 35-year plan, when we all know that it is not. His whole concept of M.A.T.S. and his whole appreciation of it is grossly affected by this time period that is involved. I would suggest to him that he should forget politics and go back and get on with the job of implementing the road improvements and the public transport proposals that are outlined in the report.

Here I touch upon this public transport aspect because I know that the Hon. Mr. Kneebone is very keen to hear about it. First, there is an urgent need for the proposed underground railway to be constructed. The rapid rail transit system proposed in M.A.T.S. and approved by the Government would have been

the most modern transportation system for shifting large numbers of metropolitan people that could be found in the world for a city of our size and features.

The previous Government, in accordance with its expressed plans, had gone forward and was in a position to obtain a feasibility study into the detailed work concerning this King William Street underground, and if we want to turn our minds to feasibility studies this is the urgent one because Adelaide needs a rapid rail transit system and it needs its underground down King William Street, which would be part of that system. I hope that if the Government proceeds with that it will include an Australian, if not a South Australian, firm among the consortium which could be arranged from the best brains in the world, who specialize in studies of underground and rapid rail transportation systems, and I hope that that group would be involved.

In that study, too, I believe a complete investigation should be carried out into the possibility of future electrification of our suburban railway services. I believe that that has to come, and the sooner the question is looked at in complete depth and is looked at by experts other than our senior departmental officers, the better it will be for the city.

So in regard to this question of M.A.T.S., the whole sorry business, I think, should be put right. Dr. Breuning has no doubt some knowledge of future thinking on public transport requirements that might be needed towards the end of the century, but we must keep our feet on the ground; and while he looks at our problems and while he tells the Government that retains him about capsules and dial-a-bus and that mode of transport, the Government of the day has a clear responsibility to proceed and build improvements and facilities for the people and for the motorist and for those who wish to travel on public transport today.

Under this general subject, in paragraph 20 of His Excellency's Speech the reference was made to an investigation into further control over the Railways Commissioner and his department and the Municipal Tramways Trust Board and the M.T.T. generally, and I shall watch announcements from the Government from time to time with great interest. I hope, however, that the Government will consider continuing an investigation which I had put in train into the possibility of a metropolitan transport commission being established here in the future.

I believe there should be a marriage between the M.T.T. and the suburban passenger services of the South Australian Railways. We have the position at present (I will quote the most recent figures announced, namely, for the year 1968-69) that the M.T.T. operates at a loss of \$41,000 a year, and it operates in this metropolitan area side by side, if I might use that expression, with the suburban passenger services of the South Australian Railways, which showed a working loss in this suburban passenger area in 1968-69 of \$3,314,000. If debt charges are added to that figure, the loss comes to about \$4,400,000.

A union of that kind, especially to co-ordinate the knowledge of both departments (if I might call the M.T.T. a department), to co-ordinate buses and railway vehicles (as is proposed in the M.A.T.S. Report, incidentally) is highly desirable, in my view. I agree, too, that a great deal of investigation must take place, but I think that public transport in this metropolitan area would be far better served

if such a co-ordinated transport commission could be introduced. I believe that the aggregated losses that I have just mentioned could be reduced if such a policy was adopted.

I thank honourable members for being so patient with me. I have talked a little longer than I normally do. There are many other matters in His Excellency's Speech upon which I would have liked to touch, particularly one which deals with questions coming under the heading of local government, but I know that there will be ample opportunity later in this session for much to be said concerning the Government's proposals on local government. Again I congratulate and thank all those people that I mentioned earlier. I support the motion.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.6 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 22, at 2.15 p.m.