

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, August 17, 1972

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

### QUESTIONS

#### SHARK FISHING

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Recently, mention has been made in the press and on radio, and questions have been asked in this Chamber, regarding the Victorian Government's decision to ban the consumption of shark in that State. Can the Minister say whether he has been able to arrange anything with the Victorian Government to alleviate the position of shark fishermen in South Australia? If the Minister has been able to do this or has any plans regarding this matter, will he give the information to the Council?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No doubt honourable members are well aware of the problems that have been created by the Victorian Government, which has banned school sharks over a certain length. Although this action has affected about 95 per cent of the export of shark from this State, I believe, as a result of information I received this morning, that shark was still selling on the Melbourne market this morning, because the necessary legislation had not been introduced. I suggest that all honourable members read a press statement attributed to Mr. Rossiter (Victoria's Minister of Health), which contains considerable information. The step I have taken is that I have made a certain recommendation to the Victorian Fisheries Minister (Mr. Hamer) on behalf of our shark fishermen. It is only a suggestion on my part, but I hope that Mr. Hamer will reply to me as soon as possible. I have suggested that all gummy sharks caught in South Australia have the head left on but be gutted, and that school sharks under 41in. long (and this clears up the point I mentioned to the Leader the other day that I was not sure whether the 28in. was with the head and tail on or off, but it is the latter) should have the head left on.

Only sharks of a minimum length of 36in. can be taken in Victoria. I have asked the Victorian Minister to allow fishermen to leave on the heads of sharks over 36in. long, mainly

to distinguish between the gummy shark and the school shark; it is the latter that presents the problem regarding the mercurial compound.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In reply to the question asked of him regarding the shark fishing industry and the ban placed on the sale of shark in Victoria, the Minister said that in that State sharks with 2.5 parts per million mercury content had been detected, whereas all the South Australian figures showed a maximum of only 1 p.p.m. mercury content in sharks caught in South Australian waters. Can the Minister inform me of the origin of the shark caught in Victoria which showed a 2.5 p.p.m. mercury content?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will try to ascertain that information for the honourable member. The information that has been made available to me in the last few days indicates that there is much variation in the mercury compound in particular types of shark. Indeed, it varies with the age, species and sex of the shark; the male shark seems to contain the majority of mercury compound.

#### WILLIAMSTOWN SCHOOL CROSSING

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 Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to the underpass which has for some time been mooted for the Williamstown school and which will go under the road that presently separates the school from the main playground. This matter was, I believe, at one stage within the province of the Minister of Education but finally got within that of the Minister of Roads and Transport. The position is, as I have explained to the Council before, that because of the poor vision in the area it is dangerous for children to cross the road to get to the main playground. There have been plans for an underpass. The urgency regarding this matter arises because the road is shortly to be reconstructed. As it has been redesigned on the present site, the underpass will still be necessary, and it is desirable that this work be done before the road is reconstructed. Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain from his colleague

the situation regarding this necessary safeguard?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply when it is available.

#### GIFT DUTY

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Treasurer.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: It was announced in the Commonwealth Treasurer's Budget speech on Tuesday evening that the Commonwealth Government would as from yesterday lift to \$10,000 the limit for the imposition of gift duty. As the State gift duty legislation, when it was introduced some years ago, was tied in all respects to the Commonwealth legislation, except that the State's rates were slightly higher than those of the Commonwealth, will the Government now seriously consider lifting the State limit to \$10,000?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not want the honourable member to put his question on notice, although it involves a matter of policy. I will take it up with my colleague and bring back a reply to the honourable member as soon as practicable.

#### TRAFFIC LIGHTS

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to the question I asked recently about traffic lights?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague reports as follows:

A two-phase set of traffic signals was installed at the intersection of Greenhill Road and Goodwood Road in January, 1970. It was considered undesirable at that time to provide additional phases to cater for right-turning traffic because of the extra delays that would be caused to all motorists, particularly during off-peak periods when the demand for such turns is low. Since the major right turns are at right angles to each other (from Goodwood Road south and from Greenhill Road east), four phases would be required, which would add further delays. The intersection is being kept under observation and appropriate corrective action will be taken as and when warranted.

#### ABATTOIRS

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on August 15 regarding the cost of Mr. Ian Gray's report on the abattoirs?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: An account has been received from Mr. Ian Gray, the consul-

tant, for the sum of \$7,957.12, representing his fees and expenses in connection with his investigations up to May 31, 1972. I expect that a further account will be submitted at the conclusion of his assignment.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Is Mr. Gray's account in writing or is it a verbal account?

The PRESIDENT: Does the Minister wish to reply?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the large amount of money which has been mentioned as Mr. Gray's account for his report, will the Minister now expect a written report and, if one is submitted, will he be good enough to consider making it available to honourable members in due course?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No.

#### WHEAT QUOTAS

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Can the Minister of Agriculture say what quantity of wheat has been allocated to the contingency reserve under the wheat quota agreement for the coming season; if no quantity has been set, what has caused the delay?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The answer to that question is 250,000 bushels. That figure was conveyed to me by one of the members just recently.

#### SYNTHETIC RUGS

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On August 10, I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding false labelling brands on synthetic garments. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am informed that inquiries by Department of Labour and Industry inspectors at Rundle Street stores indicate that none of the rugs branded as shown in the newspaper cutting has been offered for sale in those stores, nor have any been offered to their buyers.

#### WOOL PROCESSING

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I desire to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: My question concerns a survey conducted regarding the processing of wool in New South Wales. For many years it has been contended by growers that the processing of wool in Australia would be of benefit to the wool industry.

Recently a survey has shown that a very comprehensive plant suitable for installation within a country area, such as Port Augusta, could be established at a cost of \$2,000,000. It would employ about 150 people. Will the Chief Secretary ask the Premier through his industrial development branch to make a full appraisal of the report from New South Wales of the Ningham wool scheme, prepared by Mr. R. A. Donohoe and Mr. H. Bethell?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes.

#### LOTTERIES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I ask leave to make a short explanation prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Recently, I was informed that no facilities were available in Penola for the purchase of lottery tickets. On inquiry, a local storekeeper was told that a licence for the issue of lottery tickets had been allocated to Penola, but still no facilities are available there for the purchase of tickets. Will the Chief Secretary examine this matter to see whether an arrangement has been made and, if not, can he arrange for lottery tickets to be available in Penola as there is quite a distance between the towns in that area?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have no authority to inquire into what happens in the allocation of lottery tickets; that comes within the portfolio of the Premier and Treasurer. However, I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a report as soon as possible.

#### TEXTILE PRODUCTS DESCRIPTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (OATH)

Read a third time and passed.

#### SUPPLY BILL (NO. 2)

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

For many years it has been customary for Parliament to approve two Supply Bills so that the current financial commitments of the Government may be met during the period between July 1 and the assent to the Appropriation Bill following the Budget debate. The Supply Act approved by Parliament in March last provides authority to the extent of \$60,000,000 and, given a normal flow of

expenditures, it will cover the day-to-day requirements of the Government till the end of August. However, this year there is an unusual combination of pay days for the Public Service, for the Education Department and for the Hospitals Department, which has the effect of increasing expenditures in July and August above the normal trend. This is just a matter of timing within the year which is superimposed on the steady long-term upward movement in levels of expenditure. The result is that the appropriation given by Supply Act (No. 1) is expected to be exhausted with about one week of August still to go, and accordingly it is desirable that a second Supply Bill should receive assent on Thursday, August 24.

This Bill now before the Council, for \$60,000,000, is expected to suffice until the end of October, as the flow of expenditures in September and October should be at rather lower levels than in July and August, because of the timing of pay days. If the debate on the Appropriation Bill proceeds in accordance with the normal timing, that Bill will receive assent before the end of October, and a third Supply Bill should not be necessary. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of \$60,000,000. Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries and wages that may be awarded by a wage-fixing body.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): It is customary for two Supply Bills to come before Parliament during a session, although I think this second Supply Bill has been introduced in this Council slightly earlier than corresponding Bills have been introduced in previous years.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is because of the extra fortnight's pay, to which I referred.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I believe that the Chief Secretary has given a reasonable explanation as to why this second Supply Bill has been introduced earlier than is usual. Because the usual procedure is being followed in other respects, I support the second reading of the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

There is perhaps little need for me to enlarge on the reasons why this Bill concerning shop

trading hours is introduced, as the subject has been discussed exhaustively in each of the sessions of this Parliament. When a Bill to permit shops within the metropolitan area to open until 9 p.m. on Fridays was before the Council in the last session, there appeared to be no objection to that proposal. Most of the debate related to the Government's view that, when shops were permitted to open on Friday nights for the convenience of the public, the extended shopping hours should not be applied in a way that would be detrimental to the working conditions of shop assistants.

Shop assistants are one of the few groups of employees who still do not work their 40-hour week in five days, and it is in the Government's view only reasonable that they should get the benefit of the same working conditions as day workers in other industries. The Government cannot accept that shop assistants should be regarded as second-class workers and be expected to work under conditions inferior to other employees. The means by which the ordinary hours of work of shop assistants were to be regulated was the point on which there was the disagreement between the Council and another place in the last session that caused the Bill to be laid aside.

The Government now reintroduces this Bill in a somewhat amended form in an attempt to overcome the objections raised in the last session. Clauses 1 to 4 of the Bill I now introduce are in substantially the same form as the Bill that was laid aside, but clause 5 provides for two alternative schemes for the working of the ordinary hours of work, in addition to that included in that Bill.

Once the decision is taken that Friday night shopping should be provided, it is clearly necessary that the legislation should also concern the ordinary working hours of shop assistants. In the past, industrial tribunals have ruled that shop assistants should be required to work in ordinary time on the days on which the legislation authorizes shops to trade. Shop assistants have not been granted a five-day week until now because the law authorizes shops to open on 5½ days. It is therefore necessary to include in this Bill provisions relating to the ordinary working hours and conditions of shop assistants.

To consider the Bill in some detail: clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act proposed by the Bill to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. It is clearly desirable that some time should elapse between the passing of this measure and the

formal introduction of the extended hours. This period will enable shopkeepers to make the appropriate arrangements for late night shopping and, should they desire, to enable applications to be made to the Industrial Commission as provided by the new sections enacted by clause 5.

Clause 3 is intended to ensure that a place or yard used for the purposes of selling goods will be a shop for the purposes of the principal Act. This is not altogether clear from the present context of the Act, and it is intended to resolve a question that has arisen as to whether, say, secondhand car yards are shops. Clause 4 amends section 221 of the principal Act that deals with closing times for shops. The amendment proposed by paragraph (a), in effect, provides that the present closing times will apply in shopping districts outside the metropolitan area. Subsection (1a), proposed to be inserted by paragraph (b) of this clause, provides that, in general, the closing hours for a shop situated within the metropolitan area will be 5.30 p.m. on week days other than Fridays, 9 p.m. on Friday, and 12.30 p.m. on Saturday. Subsection (1b) of this amendment provides, in effect, that butcher shops will close at 5.30 p.m. on every week day and 12.30 p.m. on Saturday except that, where a butcher shop is conducted in conjunction with any other kind of shop, say, as part of a supermarket, that supermarket, if it is situated in the metropolitan area, may remain open until 9 p.m. on Friday, so long as the part that is a butcher shop is kept closed to the public between 5.30 p.m. and 9 p.m. on Friday. It will be seen then that the closing hours for butcher shops operated exclusively as such are unchanged by this Bill. The amendments proposed by paragraphs (c) and (d) effect similar alterations to the closing hours of hairdressers' shops which, in the ordinary course of events, is 6 p.m. on week days.

Clause 5 proposes the insertion of a number of new sections in the principal Act, and it may be convenient to deal with these in sequence. Section 221a is intended to cut down the rather wide definition of "shop assistant" in section 5 of the principal Act. The effect of this "cutting down" will be to restrict the application of the definition to the persons who are "shop assistants" in the popular sense of the term and who are employed either in a full-time capacity or a regular part-time capacity.

Section 221b provides that "ordinary hours of work" of shop assistants will be worked

only on the five week days and will cease at 5.30 p.m. on Friday or, in the case of hairdressers, at 6 p.m. on Friday. In its terms, this section does not apply to shop assistants employed in an exempted shop. If the ordinary hours of work of a shop assistant are determined by reference to the scheme set out in this section, it follows that hours of work after 5.30 p.m. on a week day or on Saturday will be remunerated at overtime rates. Sections 221c and 221d prescribe two alternative systems of determining "ordinary hours of work", and either system may be applied by the Industrial Commission:

- (a) on the application of an employer of shop assistants; and
- (b) where the commission is satisfied that it is the "genuine desire" of the shop assistants concerned to have their hours determined by reference to the designated alternative system.

Section 221c sets out in a somewhat modified form the proposal discussed at the conference of managers of the Houses last session, that is, for ordinary hours to be worked over a five-day week between Monday and Saturday inclusive but in such a way that they will not exceed 80 hours in a fortnight. In that case, a minimum of a 50 per cent penalty rate would be payable for all work done after 5.30 p.m. on Friday and any time on Saturday; this will permit employers to operate under what has been described as the "roster system". Section 221d provides for the time of cessation of the ordinary hours to be 5.30 p.m. on Monday to Thursday and 9 p.m. on Friday, with a penalty rate of not less than 50 per cent applying to work done in ordinary time between 5.30 p.m. and 9 p.m. on Friday. By implication, any work done on Saturday will be in overtime.

Sections 221c and 221d both provide that in all cases 6 p.m., which is the present closing time of hairdressers' shops, will be substituted for 5.30 p.m. in respect of hairdressers. Section 221e provides for a postal ballot to be held where necessary to determine the "genuine desire" of the shop assistants concerned. Although this provision is, I feel, self-explanatory I draw the attention of honourable members to subsection (4) of this section which provides, in effect, that, for the purposes of applications for the introduction of one of the alternative schemes, the "genuine desire" of the shop assistants concerned will be that of a simple majority of the valid votes cast.

Section 221f provides that an order providing for either of the alternative schemes shall have a life of not less than two years, but leaves the way clear for further or other applications on its expiry. To sum up, unless the Industrial Commission makes an order, the scheme set out in section 221b will be applied to determine the "ordinary hours of work" of shop assistants. If the commission makes an order during the currency of that order, the appropriate alternative scheme will apply.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 16. Page 800.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support the Bill. It is pleasing to see South Australia's financial state as defined by the Treasurer and that, in keeping with general growth, the funds that have been available to the State through Loan Account channels have been increasing in keeping with the need for expansion in the various departments of the Public Service. This growth is illustrated by the Treasurer's statement that the programme approved by the Australian Loan Council for the year just completed totalled \$122,290,000, whereas the programme approved by the council for the 1972-73 financial year is \$134,628,000, which is a healthy increase.

Added to those figures are the normal adjustments, such as added indebtedness to cover discounts, payments and resources, and the final sum made available to South Australia in the financial year just concluded totalled \$145,111,137, and for this financial year the figure has increased to \$159,528,000.

One should express some appreciation to the Commonwealth Government for the additional \$4,390,000 granted to the State in February of this year. The Treasurer also said that the State received an unexpected contribution of \$910,000 from the Commonwealth Government to assist with the construction of school buildings.

From the overall point of view, therefore, the Loan Account is in a healthy state. However, the Government must be careful indeed how it spends every dollar and cent of these capital funds.

I intend to refer to only two matters contained in the Loan Estimates, the first of which deals with the railways loan account

and the methods by which such moneys allocated this year shall be spent. Incidentally, the railways loan account is a most revealing document in that it discloses that the railway accommodation to the State (in other words, the indebtedness of the department to the State through the Loan Account) was \$140,237,433 at June 30, 1972. In anyone's language, that is a large sum of money.

In the last session this Parliament gave to the Minister of Roads and Transport control over the Railways Commissioner and his department and I hope that, as a result, the Government will implement certain measures that show that a businesslike approach is being made to the whole problem of loan indebtedness and that the general running of the railways is receiving its close attention.

The line under the railways section that interests me particularly is the allocation of \$496,000 for the Port Stanvac to Christies Beach railway extension. This plan was approved by a special Bill, as the Minister said in his speech in the last session of Parliament, and work will now proceed.

The point of the railways being at Port Stanvac and in that general industrial area leads me to question once more the possibility of standard gauge railways being constructed, designed or planned, when measures such as this are being considered, for the general industrial areas within metropolitan Adelaide. On July 18 this year, when opening Parliament, His Excellency the Governor said:

South Australian Railways officers, together with a group of consulting engineers, are preparing a master plan for the new standard gauge railway to link Adelaide and its major industries with the existing Australia-wide standard gauge network.

As a result of that part of His Excellency's Speech, on July 19 I asked the Minister whether Chrysler Australia Limited at Tonsley Park was included in that plan. In reply, the Minister said that, although he could answer the question himself, he would prefer to obtain a reply from his colleague. I received the following reply earlier this week:

When the present Government came to office, the present Minister of Roads and Transport found that the previous Minister had agreed with the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport that no standard gauge rail connections of any kind were to be made to South Australian industry. It was only owing to strong efforts by the Premier and the Minister of Roads and Transport that connections are now to be made available to Mile End, Elizabeth and Woodville industrial complexes. The matter of a line to Chrysler Australia Limited at Tonsley Park was strongly

pressed with the Commonwealth Government, but not agreed to by it.

I make the point again (and I have referred to it previously) that the statement that I as a previous Minister of Roads and Transport had agreed with the Commonwealth Government on the Maunsell plan (of standardization without any connections of any kind to South Australian industry) was not true.

I went into the subject in great detail in a speech I made in this Council on July 21, 1970. It is reported at pages 107 to 111 of *Hansard*, and I do not intend to go into the detail again.

However, the brief position was that the previous Government was willing to accept the Maunsell plan only on the condition that the Commonwealth Government agreed to the construction of a spur line into the industrial complex at Elizabeth. At that stage, the Commonwealth Government would not agree to that, so the matter was deadlocked prior to the last election.

The question goes a little deeper than that now, in that, although the Government included in His Excellency's Speech a statement that the standard gauge railway was to link Adelaide and its major industries (and, although I quote that expression from the Speech, I hasten to point out that I am not in any way criticizing His Excellency—I am criticizing the Speech the Government prepared for him), the Minister has subsequently said that Chrysler Australia Limited at Tonsley Park is not included in the plan. The information given in His Excellency's Speech is, therefore, plainly wrong.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Does it say "all major industries"?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will repeat it for the honourable member. The expression was, "for the new standard gauge railway to link Adelaide and its major industries".

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But not all major industries.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member splits hairs to that extent, he is going to great lengths to try and defend the Government, which has given misleading information in His Excellency's Speech. There is no doubt about it. If the honourable member can stand up here and say that he does not believe that Chrysler Australia Limited at Tonsley Park is one of this State's major industries—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I didn't say that at all. I said, "Did it say 'all major industries'?"

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member is playing with words. That, I claim, was a major misrepresentation of fact. The hard fact of the matter is that the Government has not arranged for spur lines to go into major industries, such as Chrysler Australia Limited at Tonsley Park.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The hard fact is that it did better than you did in negotiating with the Commonwealth.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Let us look at this matter, because this accusation has been made previously. The position in relation to the present deal made with the Commonwealth was, from what I can ascertain (because I am the first to admit that there has not been very much information made available to honourable members regarding the details), that the additional spur line which the present Government has gained (and I take this information from a newspaper article printed on Wednesday, June 30, 1971) is the spur line into the Woodville area from Gillman. This means the Government has decided to give this kind of preferential treatment to one industry. I wonder whether that is fair.

But that is not all. I believe, from the information I have, that the Government agreed to the scrapping of the new and modern freight yard planned at Islington. I remember having discussions with the Maunsell advisers in this matter, and they were the best consultants to be found in the world for this major railway planning.

They told me most strongly that by far the best proposal for freight handling and a freight yard was to start from scratch with a new yard constructed on modern lines and to world standards, in the Islington area, so that in the long term greater efficiency and economy could be brought to bear on the major area of railway operation, long-haul freight.

It seems that the Government has traded that proposition for a deal to expand the existing freight facilities at Mile End. The Mile End proposal was not in the Maunsell report.

I remember, too, discussing with the Maunsell people the question of a possible extension of the standard gauge to Mile End, and I recall the fears expressed to me regarding costs of signalling, costs due to congestion and so on, and the difficulties of total re-organization which would have to be faced if a major project was undertaken at Mile End. We must bear in mind in relation to this plan for a major link-up of standard gauge, as

with all railway planning, that modern standards, those comparable with the best in the world, offer long-term economy and efficiency, and this must not be overlooked. We might be able to cut costs here and there by patching and by doing jobs to a plan not based on world standards. We might get through in the short term, but in the long term it could be more expensive.

I want to see a businesslike approach in all matters connected with railway improvement, development, and organization. This applies particularly in the area of long-haul freight, because there lies the future profitability of the South Australian or any other railway operation.

It seems that we will not be getting standard gauge to the Hallett Cove area, where much of the major South Australian industry is developing. We need think only of the oil refinery at Port Stanvac. Surely that is a major industry. It is now proposed to extend the line to Christie Downs, a proposal which I fully support, and which was part of the M.A.T.S. plan.

It was, indeed, one of the many proposals of the M.A.T.S. plan which has been grasped by the Government while at the same time it has told the world at large that it is scrapping the plan. I noted with interest on page 151 of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report the following sentence regarding this proposed line:

The Hallett Cove line will continue to provide rail passenger service. The line should be double track between Brighton and Port Stanvac and extended to Christie Downs.

It is pleasing to see that part of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan being implemented by the Government.

I refer to a matter dealt with yesterday by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris concerning Loan money being spent on transportation research. The honourable gentleman made the point that Parliament should be most careful to see that Loan money was spent for purposes which had always been looked upon as Loan projects; in other words, capital works and expenditure of that kind. Matters of research and the general costs of running the State should be borne out of revenue money.

The same approach was made by the Government last year under this same heading. At that time objection was raised in this Council. I remember saying in July of last year that Loan funds should be put into State assets, having in mind that these gradually appreciate in value and adjustments are made

for depreciation, and so on. Generally speaking, the capital of the State stays under that one heading.

I said then that it was improper that \$500,000 of Loan money should be used for this purpose. I was pleased to see, however, that of the \$500,000 allocated last year by Parliament, as requested by the Government, only \$32,570 was spent. I had hoped that the Government had decided that money other than Loan money should be spent on research, or perhaps had seen fit to spend not quite so much on research and might have gone to the Highways Department to talk with the Commissioner, to ask whether any of the Commonwealth money allocated to the Highways Department, which is earmarked specifically for research and cannot be spent for any other purpose, was available.

I had hoped that the Government might have been able to obtain some funds from that source so that the new senior departmental officer could carry out some research work. Apparently that is not the plan, because this year the Government has again come forward with this proposal to spend \$500,000 on transport research.

On August 24 last year I criticized the apparent acceptance in totality by the Government of the Breuning report, which advocated an initial plan to spend \$5,000,000 over five years for this work. It also advocated the setting up of a group of about 12 professionals of diverse backgrounds in engineering, economics, social science, electronics, and so on.

I warned 12 months ago that this was completely unrealistic considering the stage of development the department had reached. I hoped some check might be made and that we would be willing to crawl before we walked in this area of vast Loan expenditure. At that time a gentleman was about to arrive here and it was hoped he would accept the position that was offered. I am referring to Dr. Alston who, I believe, either arrived or gave notice (if he arrived; I am not certain) that he did not want the job after all. The Government then set about a programme, not of having another look at this plan and the advisability or otherwise of going on with the Breuning Report recommendations but of continuing with this plan, and it has now appointed another gentleman Director-General of Transport.

It worries me considerably that the Government proposes to spend \$500,000 in this current year simply to carry out research on transport. I am not saying that research is not a continu-

ing matter or that it must never be looked into; but I am saying that, by allocating Loan money of this volume, the Government is not acting responsibly. As we know, the Government has a master plan for transportation, a plan that has recommended such items as the implementation of the rail rapid transit system for metropolitan Adelaide, and included in that is the much-needed underground system in the King William Street area.

Yet, rather than pursue that plan and carry out feasibility studies that come within it, the Government seems to be going into all kinds of areas such as working out some means of developing high-speed transportation corridors when it should know that every motorist in this State who wants to get to the outer fringes of Adelaide quickly is crying out, not for a great number of freeways but for a minimal number of them to be planned, announced, established, and built. We cannot seem to get any admission from the Government that it is prepared to go ahead with this underground railway, which is needed so much, and the subsequent rail rapid transit system, which this city, as every other comparable city in the world, must have.

I heard with much interest that the present Director-General of Transport mentioned on a programme known as *Focus* that basically he approved the idea of an underground railway running through the city of Adelaide. That was most encouraging. There is no reason why the Government should not come out into the open and say whether or not it will proceed with that plan. The city badly needs it. The city and the people should get behind the Government in schemes of this kind, but they cannot do so unless there is an announcement that that scheme is going ahead or that an alternative scheme is being considered.

We have some plans on the drawing board and the Government is asking again this year for \$500,000 of Loan funds for this purpose. I appeal to the Government to tell the people of South Australia whether or not this last major item in those sections of the M.A.T.S. plan that were previously agreed to should be agreed to. I ask the Government to indicate its intentions in this matter.

I summarize the position by saying that I think I have every justification for raising the two points I have made. I do not think the Government should misrepresent the story of the standardization of planning, as it has so disrespectfully done in the Governor's Speech on this occasion. The truth came out in the

answer to a question when the Minister was forced to say which major industries were involved. Undoubtedly, the impression gained by everyone from that Speech was that a major industry, such as Chrysler, was included in that plan.

On the second matter, I remind honourable members that Dr. Breuning came here for four weeks, with one assistant, and that cost the State \$9,000. His report was accepted by the Government and introduced and approved in another place, and the Government is pursuing it and is saving all these funds for it. If the Government is to carry on with implementing

Dr. Breuning's recommendations, I ask that in future it look at the Revenue Account and take the funds from there, because that is the better course. A far better course still would be for the Government to review the whole thing and learn, in this area of transport, to crawl before it walks. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 3.16 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 22, at 2.15 p.m.