LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, August 14, 1969.

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

QUESTIONS

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I refer to the proposed report that the Minister mentioned when he introduced his motion on M.A.T.S. dealing with the Metropolitan Transportation Committee. He said at that time:

The Metropolitan Transportation Committee will make annual reports of its work and progress and these will be tabled in the same manner as other departments and agencies table reports in Parliament. In this manner Parliament can peruse and be informed of the co-ordinated planning of the various transportation agencies as they proceed and implement stage by stage the co-ordinated transportation plan for metropolitan Adelaide in the future.

Does the Government intend that this annual report shall include not only the past, current and future activity of the various transportation agencies but also the proposed Estimates of Expenditure on M.A.T.S. proposals of the various agencies for the forthcoming year so that, when it is tabled, Parliament can scrutinize and discuss such information?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes; the Government gives the undertaking that that will be done.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In view of the reply of the Minister of Roads and Transport to that question, can he say whether those reports, when they come before Parliament for discussion, will be declared vital issues?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT REVISION COMMITTEE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about the Local Government Act Revision Committee and the bringing down of its report?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Local Government Act Revision Committee has completed all investigations and the final report is now being written. It was expected this would be completed by July 31, but recent and current illnesses of members and the magnitude of the task have resulted in further delays. I am currently discussing the matter with the Chairman in an endeavour to obtain a new estimated date for completion of the report.

KULPARA-MAITLAND ROAD

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to a question I asked a few days ago about the Kulpara-Maitland section of the Yorke Peninsula Main Road?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Kulpara-Maitland section of the Yorke Peninsula Main Road is being maintained in a satisfactory condition. However, the wearing surface is nearing the end of its useful life and a programme of re-sealing is planned for the next two or three years. Work will commence on a 10-mile length during the coming summer.

COLEBROOK HOME

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Local Government obtained from the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs a reply to my recent question about Colebrook Home?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The reasons for the Government's refusal to renew the lease for Colebrook Home were disclosed by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in a Ministerial statement to the House of Assembly last Tuesday. My colleague has asked me to read this statement. The first person pronoun in the statement is the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs; he states:

I refer to the questions asked me in the last few weeks by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Onkaparinga in the House of Assembly concerning the decision of the Government not to renew the lease of Colebrook Home.

I had previously declined to say why the Government had made this decision and I did not do so in answer to questions. I had two reasons. First, although the lease is due to expire on October 31, 1969, and is not to be renewed, I have made an offer to the United Aborigines Mission Inc. to allow it to continue to occupy the premises after that date and until they are required for other uses. I did not want to prejudice consideration of the offer.

Secondly, I was anxious to avoid public criticism of persons who have worked long and hard in the interests of Aborigines, even though in my view their efforts have not been effectively directed.

However, I acknowledge the public criticism which this course of action has brought and now feel obliged to make this statement setting out the reasons for the decision.

I understand that Colebrook Home was first commenced in 1924 at Oodnadatta. Later, premises were obtained at Quorn, and Colebrook Home was in operation there until 1944. Whilst at Quorn it was under the control of Sisters Hyde and Rutter, who gave motherly care and guidance for the children, many of whom have distinguished themselves in the general community.

In 1944 Colebrook Home took over its present location at Eden Hills. Over the years the standard of care has deteriorated and conditions that passed prior to the war as satisfactory are no longer up to the required standard.

With few exceptions the superintendents of the home, whilst highly motivated and possessed of evangelical fervour, have had no training for the position of a superintendent of a children's home. Since 1944 there have been many changes of superintendent and since 1960 no superintendent has stayed longer than two years. This necessarily has a disturbing effect upon the children who already have experienced considerable disturbance in their lives.

In 1962 the home had 20 children, all maintained by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. At present there are 11 with five being maintained by the department. For a number of years it has worked towards reducing the inmate population and the children have been placed with foster parents or in other institutions. It is felt that the remaining boys could, with a little effort, also be placed out in a short time. However, the Secretary of the mission, in his possessiveness and uncooperative attitude, has thwarted the welfare officers in their efforts to achieve this.

The Secretary is Pastor Samuels, of the United Aborigines Mission Inc., by which the home is conducted. It is an organization entirely separate from the Federal United Aborigines Mission. I shall refer to this later. Much of the present ineffectiveness of the home as such is due to the attitude of Pastor Samuels for the following reasons:

(1) He controls the superintendent too rigidly and is not able to keep staff, and actively discourages their discussing problem inmates with welfare officers;

(2) He is loath to permit visits between children and their natural parents; and

(3) He is unable to institute a healthy programme of child care with suitable recreation, etc. There is strong emphasis on religious exercises to the exclusion of the broader cultural, vocational and personality needs of the child. I emphasize, however, that the religious convictions themselves of those responsible for the home are not a factor relevant to the decision.

The home is not licensed under section 162a of the Social Welfare Act, subsection (1) of which reads as follows:

> No person shall keep or conduct a place as a children's home in which more than five children under the age of 12 years are at any time received, cared for, maintained or trained apart from their parents or guardians unless he is the holder of a valid licence in respect of such place granted to him under this section and he complies with such terms and conditions (if any) as are specified in the licence or are prescribed.

At present there are five children under 12 years of age at the home so the mission can operate as an institution without the need to be licensed. On June 15, 1966, the General Secretary of the United Aborigines Mission Inc. applied for Colebrook Home to be licensed as a children's home pursuant to section 162a. Before amending legislation came into effect on January 27, 1966, there was no requirement that children's homes in South Australia should be licensed.

The home was inspected by an officer of the Social Welfare Department in June, 1966, and again in April, 1967. Following the second inspection the General Secretary was informed by letter that the Director of Social Welfare was not prepared to issue a licence under section 162a of the Social Welfare Act. He was further informed that pursuant to section 162a (i) the home should not be used as a place in which more than five children under 12 years of age may be received, cared for or maintained. I point out that this was well before I became Minister and during the period of office of the last Government.

On March 4, 1969, a fresh request was received from the United Aborigines Mission Incorporated for Colebrook Home to be licensed. No action was taken by the Social Welfare Department on that request pending notification to the authorities of the home that its lease was not to be renewed. At no time has Colebrook Home been licensed as a children's home. Apart from the dissatisfaction with the United Aborigines Mission Incorporated in its management of the home, the premises at Eden Hills are unsuitable for the purpose. They were built in about 1915 or earlier as a retreat for inebriates and consist of some 26 rooms with four suitable as dormitories and other rooms suitable for staff and offices. Because of the layout of the buildings effective staff supervision of more than a small number of children would be difficult and costly.

The buildings are in very poor condition. The toilet and ablution block has been so badly damaged by white ants that replacement at an estimated cost of $10,000 is needed. It is estimated that other renovations and repairs necessary to restore the buildings to reasonable condition would cost about $13,000. I mention that a term of the lease is that the lessee keep the premises in good repair. Expenditure of about $23,000 to place these old buildings in order is considered to be unjustified especially as the design makes them inconvenient and unsuitable for use as a children's home.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Rubbish!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The statement continues:

Even if the necessary repairs were done the premises could only be used as an institution accommodating a maximum of 28 children. This by present-day accepted standards of child

care is far too many. It is generally agreed that children should live in cottage homes in groups of not more than about 10 or a dozen. The Colebrook property is just over 16 acres. Obviously the property and the buildings on it are far too large indefinitely to be used for this purpose.

At its meeting on Monday, July 1, 1968, the Aboriginal Affairs Board discussed Colebrook Home. The minute is as follows:

> The board received an application for the following financial assistance for the Colebrook Children's Home:
>
> | | $ |
> |---|---|
> | 20 cub. ft. refrigerator . . . . | 531.71 |
> | No. 6 Metters stove (48in. x 24in) . . . . . | 314.00 |
> | | $845.71 |
>
> The board was advised by the Director that United Aborigines Mission Inc. lease expires on November 1, 1969, and the Public Buildings Department has referred to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs the question of the future of Colebrook, as the United Aborigines Mission Inc. has also requested from the Public Buildings Department that the toilet block be completely renovated at a total cost of $10,000. The board decided to recommend to the Minister that the lease of Colebrook Home to the United Aborigines Mission Incorporated should not be renewed and that the requests for renovation of the ablution and toilet block, as well as for a new refrigerator and stove, be declined.

The recommendation was subsequently conveyed to me. Many years ago, I believe in 1947, there was a division in the United Aborigines Mission.

The Federal United Aborigines Mission operates in several of the other States. In South Australia it is completely separate from the United Aborigines Mission Inc. which now runs Colebrook. The Federal United Aborigines Mission runs Tanderra Hostel for girls at Torrensville and Kali Hostel for boys at Westbourne Park. Sisters Hyde and Rutter, whom I mentioned earlier, left Colebrook at the time of the split to establish Tanderra. They have now retired. At present 12 girls are living at Tanderra. It is full with a waiting list.

Kali is a hostel for secondary school boys at Westbourne Park, started this year. Because alterations to the building are not yet completed there are only three boys there but its capacity will be 11. Besides these, the Aborigines Advancement League runs the Wiltja Hostel for 15 girls at Millswood.

It will be seen, therefore, that there are other hostels for Aboriginal boys and girls in and about Adelaide well run by other organizations. Eventually the decision which has been taken is a matter of judgment based on the knowledge and observation of officers of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and the Department of Social Welfare over a long period. It is profitless to canvass separate incidents.

I should add that the home is situated in my own district. I live at Eden Hills within about half a mile of Colebrook. I have visited there on occasions ever since becoming the member for the district in 1955. I therefore have personal knowledge of the home. This confirms the advice given to me by the two departments and the Aboriginal Affairs Board. I am also fortified by knowing that my predecessors as Ministers of Social Welfare were the first to refuse the licence. I believe that their opinion of the home was broadly the same as mine.

I know that the Legislative Council Select Committee has reported favourably on Colebrook and its work. With respect, I cannot accept its recommendations on this point. Necessarily its time was limited and it had a tremendous amount of work to do to cover its terms of reference. I understand that members made one visit to the home and subsequently had a discussion with Pastor Samuels in his office. I cannot prefer its views to those to contrary expressed after consideration over a much longer period.

Personally, I still hope that the United Aborigines Mission Inc. will remain at Colebrook until we require the property. It is better for it to be used for some purpose rather than to be empty. I do not know how soon it will be required, nor the use to which it will be put. It is likely to be for the Department of Social Welfare or the Department of Aboriginal Affairs or both.

I again make the point most definitely, Mr. President, that the first person pronoun used in that statement is the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, the member for Mitcham in another place.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: That very lengthy statement is, in the view of several of us who have seen—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member must obtain leave if he wishes to make a statement. He cannot debate the matter.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave, Mr. President, to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The very lengthy statement that we have had put before us (through the press, before the Minister had the courtesy to send it to us) is, I think in the opinion of most of the people who are aware of this institution and its working, very much skidding around the truth. In order to bring the true position out, I will confine my questions to the matter of the maintenance paid to Colebrook Home for the Aboriginal children there.

I think this will put the matter in its proper perspective. Will the Minister obtain for this Council the following information: what is the rate of maintenance paid to Colebrook Home for each individual child; how many children are at Colebrook Home at present, and what are their ages; and how many of these are being maintained by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall obtain the information that the honourable member seeks. The honourable member indicated that there might have been some discourtesy by my colleague towards him. However, I refute the suggestion that there was any discourtesy or any suggestion of discourtesy on the part of my colleague.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 880.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): This is essentially a Committee Bill, and I believe that more value will be gained by discussing it in the Committee stage than at the second reading stage. However, the value of the second reading debate in this case (as indeed in most other cases) lies in drawing honourable members' attention to the more interesting and important, although not necessarily controversial, provisions of the Bill, thus giving honourable members sufficent time to study the 55 clauses contained in the Bill.

The reason for the Bill is obvious. The present Act is somewhat outdated and, in some cases, not sufficiently effective or clear in its intent. It was last amended in 1955. A series of very close elections in various districts commenced in 1956—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The honourable member's statement is incorrect; there have been later amendments than 1955.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am subject to correction on that, although I was under the impression that the last amendment was in 1955.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There have been two amendments since the last consolidation.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: As I have said, a series of very close elections in various districts, commencing in 1956 and continuing in one electorate or another through to the most recent election, have served to highlight the deficiencies and uncertainties of the present Act, particularly with regard to postal voting. One has only to recall the close contests in the electorates of Murray, Frome, Chaffey, and again in Murray, together with the most notable one in Millicent, to realize the truth of this statement.

It is necessary to set out as clearly as possible, with an absolute minimum of possibility of confusion or uncertainty, the procedures to be followed in postal voting, in a recount, in a case of disputed returns, and also in general matters relating to an election. This the Bill sets out to do with some measure of success. It is not a Bill to be hurried through this Chamber, and whilst I intend to return to some of the more important provisions, there will be other matters of importance brought forward by other honourable members, and one or two of them were touched on by the Hon. Mr. Shard yesterday. I may mention at least two such matters today.

Turning now to a consideration of the Bill in detail, I believe that many of the 55 clauses in the Bill deal wholly or mainly with the advent of decimal currency. In most cases, in the process of converting to decimal currency, penalties have been stepped up to double, and in some cases more than double, the previous amounts. Despite the changing value of money, in some cases at least these penalties appear to be high enough, and possibly in some cases they could be considered excessive. It is not my intention to comment further at this stage on this matter. There are amendments consequent upon the introduction of the combined computerized roll, such as the removal of the word "Assembly" twice occurring in section 18 of the principal Act, and also the repeal of section 39 of the principal Act, which deals with alterations to be made to the rolls by hand and which are not applicable to a computerized roll.

Whilst I do not approve of a combined computerized roll because it effectively removes, to all intents and purposes, voluntary voting for this Council, it is, nevertheless, an established fact. It is water under the bridge, as it were, and, if we are to be saddled with this type of roll, these amendments are logical enough. Other alterations, which appear to me to be reasonable, have been made as to the time of day at which certain things are to take place—for instance, advancing the hour at which a writ can be issued from 5 p.m. to 12 noon, and the hour

until which postal vote applications may be received from 6 p.m. to 5 p.m. These moves are in accord with present-day practice, and no objection can be taken to them. In recent close by-elections, and particularly the one at Millicent, much time was spent establishing or seeking to refute the claims of some people to be considered as authorized witnesses to postal votes.

In clause 19 it is proposed, in my view, to go to the other extreme in making everyone over the age of 18, or apparently over that age, eligible to be a witness. It is interesting to hear the support forthcoming for this clause as, had it obtained in 1968, there is little doubt about who would have won the Millicent by-election. Be that as it may, this clause goes too far. The same sort of comment may be expressed about this clause as that expressed by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill some time ago, about the possibility of giving votes to 18-year-olds, when he said that, next, 16-year-olds, 17-year-olds or even 15-year-olds would want the vote; the variation is that in this case 15-year-olds, 16-year-olds or 17-year-olds would be able to get away with witnessing the documents provided they were big enough to appear to be over 18. This is a suspect clause, which I do not favour. It should be amended to provide that an authorized witness shall be a person whose name appears on the electoral roll for the State or country in which he resides. Then, at least, we would have only those people recognized as adults in their own land being eligible to be witnesses.

Clause 20 repeals section 81 of the principal Act and enacts a new clause on postal voting procedure. Generally speaking, I would agree with the Hon. Mr. Shard's comment that it is clearer, and simplifies the matter. I am pleased to be able to agree with my honourable friend from time to time. Clause 25 amends section 86 of the principal Act. It provides that only postal votes in official hands at the close of the poll shall be counted. Previously, as the Minister has said, votes received up to seven days after the close of the poll could be counted. I wonder whether it is necessary to make it as stringent as this provision does. It means that, if only those postal votes received up to the close of the poll are to be counted, the person having a postal vote must vote before the day of the poll.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Isn't that the very purpose of the postal vote?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am just wondering whether it is necessary that a person should have to vote before the day of the poll, whether he should be forced to vote then, because if he voted on the day of the poll and that postal vote was received from the post on the Monday, would that be a disadvantage? There has not been very much argument about it in Commonwealth elections.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They have never been close. See how you go with a close election!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Commonwealth Government procedure does provide that anything that comes in on the Monday following an election is accepted. As we see a little later in the Bill, there is another provision that sets out to conform to the Commonwealth provision, and in this case it would do no harm if we conformed to the Commonwealth provisions.

Clause 30 relieves the State Returning Officer of the necessity of asking for reasons for failure to vote. It amends section 118a, which relates to compulsory voting, with which I do not necessarily agree. It relieves the State Returning Officer of the necessity of having to ask for reasons when he knows that the person has good and valid reasons. This will save time and money; I see no objection to that provision.

Clause 34 eliminates the conditions and limitations that have been imposed upon the expenditure by candidates for elections. Here again I would raise no objection. I believe the situation today is vastly different from when these conditions were imposed. There is no particular reason for retaining the limitations in the Act, which are largely outmoded in today's world. I would not oppose that clause; nor would I raise any objection to clause 38, which relates to screening electoral matters in cinemas because, after all is said and done, in these days we see a considerable amount of election material on our television screens, so it is anomalous that it should not be possible for electoral notices and advertisements to be shown on cinema screens.

Clause 40 deals with the size of the posters that may be exhibited in public places. It provides for a considerable increase in size, from 120 sq. in. to 1,200 sq. in., a very big increase. One of the reasons given by the Minister for this was that it was equivalent to the Commonwealth position. I have no particular objection to it except that I do not think these posters should be placed in close proximity to each other. If we are to conform to Commonwealth practice in this matter, I see no reason why we should not conform to Commonwealth practice in the receival of

postal votes. Clauses 42 to 53 refer to the Court of Disputed Returns. It is now proposed that we get rid of the present provisions whereby the court comprises four members of Parliament, from whichever House the dispute occurs in, and the junior puisne judge, and provide that in future the court shall comprise the senior puisne judge (or the next in line if he is not available) and no members of Parliament. I see no objection to this: in fact, I agree that probably the same decisions that were reached after the last protracted sittings of the court would have been reached had it comprised a judge on his own and no members of Parliament. My honourable friend the Leader, with whom I have been getting on very well lately, mentioned yesterday and today that he intends during the Committee stage to move an amendment to provide for first past the post voting. This would be a retrograde step. In the last 18 months we have heard much about the question of gaining a majority of votes.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: In the first past the post system, minorities are not provided for.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is so; I am coming to that later. With a system of first past the post, a Government can be elected by a minority. This can be seen in council elections, where a very small proportion of ratepayers elects council members. This situation will probably be seen in Great Britain (where there is voluntary voting) in 18 months' time, when droves of electors will probably stop away from the polls rather than vote for a certain gentleman. In these circumstances a Government can be elected by a minority of the people.

My colleague Mr. Hart referred, by interjection, to the fact that minorities cannot be provided for or given any say under the first past the post system. From a purely selfish standpoint, perhaps the Hon. Mr. Shard and I, as members of the two largest political Parties in the country, might have a vested interest in having no concern for minority groups; personally, however, I cannot go along with this attitude.

Whilst some of the minority groups would differ considerably from my views and those of other honourable members, I believe in their right to be heard and in their right to have a say. Consequently, I could not in any circumstances support first past the post voting. In fact, I believe it is high time that there was preferential voting in all elections in this country, including council elections, so that newcomers to our country would be less confused. This Bill is essentially a Committee Bill, and I reserve the right to deal with it clause by clause during the Committee stage. I support the second reading.

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

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 12. Page 803.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I support the second reading but, when the Bill reaches the Committee stage, I intend to move a minor amendment. During the last session, when the principal Act was considered by this Council, I spoke at some length about the history of railway standardization in South Australia and referred to some unsolved problems associated with work which is subject to the agreement to which this legislation applies. I am informed that quite satisfactory progress is being made on the work of laying the main connecting line between the Crystal Street station and the recently completed standard gauge line to Cockburn. This part of the work is being undertaken by the South Australian Railways Department. The problems to which I referred are dealt with in the following paragraphs of Part II of the schedule to the principal Act:

3. (*c*) the construction at Broken Hill of such facilities as the Minister approves as being necessary to provide service to customers in place of facilities the use of which will not be appropriate to the operation of the railway;

(*d*) the conversion to standard gauge for use in conjunction with standard gauge railway operations between Port Pirie and Broken Hill of such private sidings as are approved by the Minister for that purpose;

(*e*) the conversion to standard gauge for use between Port Pirie and Broken Hill of such privately owned rail tank cars as are approved by the Minister for that purpose;

These paragraphs were included in the schedule to ensure that every effort would be made to retain for the South Australian Railways Department those customers in Broken Hill who had their own private sidings on the narrow gauge Silverton Tramways Company railway system. These matters are very important to South Australia. I do not know what the most recent figures are in regard to freight revenue from this source received by the South Australian Railways Department, but I was informed a year or two ago that it amounted to $180,000.

I shall be interested to hear from the Minister what progress has been made in these matters, which are subject to negotiation and to the Commonwealth Minister's approval. From experience, I know how necessary it is to keep up the pressure on the Commonwealth Government in such matters, if the State is to be properly considered. Can the Minister inform me whether satisfactory alternative arrangements have been made for the freight customers who were served by the private sidings in the Sulphide Street and Beryl Street areas?

There was also another problem associated with the standardization of the line from Cockburn to Broken Hill, but we have not heard much about this matter in recent months. At present the Silverton Tramways Company acts as agent for the South Australian Railways Department in the Broken Hill area. That company shunts freight consigned to merchants on to private sidings on the Beryl Street branch line of the company's system. It also shunts empties and picks up concentrates and ore-laden waggons from the mining companies' sidings. These waggons are then assembled by the Silverton Tramways Company and delivered to the South Australian Railways Department at Cockburn.

The company has co-operated well with our department for many years in this type of operation, and I hope the system will remain efficient when the changeover to standard gauge comes about. We all know it has now been decided under this agreement that the Silverton Tramways Company will no longer operate over the main line from Cockburn to Broken Hill and that, because of this, the company was offered an *ex gratia* payment. Statements have been made by representatives of the company that they did not think much of the amount offered to the company and that litigation was possible, but we have not heard much about this problem in recent months.

I am aware that the New South Wales Railways Commissioner has said that the New South Wales Railways would not be prepared to take over the shunting job on the mining leases. It has also been said that there is not likely to be any connection between the Beryl Street sidings and the standard gauge, and the South Australian Railways Commissioner is not interested in undertaking shunting operations on the mining leases. When the changeover to standard gauge is effected, this problem of shunting on mining leases will become urgent. Can the Minister therefore inform me what has been done to solve this problem?

When introducing the Bill on Tuesday, the Minister referred to the Broken Hill to South Australian Border Railway Agreement Act Amendment Act of New South Wales, which was assented to in April this year. He said the New South Wales Act conferred on the South Australian Railways Commissioner the necessary powers to enable him to operate, control and manage the railway. The Bill before us has the same purpose. However, a comparison between the New South Wales Act and the South Australian Bill (although they profess to do the same job) shows that one Bill is slightly different from the other, in that some of the provisions in our Bill go into a greater degree of specialization than does the New South Wales Act. However, I suppose that is only to be expected.

Clause 2 does all these things and a little more as well: I refer to the authority to operate, control and manage the railway. I can understand the need for most of the subsections of proposed new section 4a, subsection (1) of which appears in broad terms to do what is most necessary. New section 4a (2) more specifically describes the area of the Commissioner's authority envisaged by this Bill.

I have heard honourable members comment on the involved nature of some clauses that come before us on occasions. We have seen a great number of them, and some have even managed to get into the Statute Books. New section 4a (2) is one such section; it took me a long time to make much sense out of it. I think perhaps some draftsmen try to blind us with science with some of the complicated clauses that they put before us. That new subsection provides:

> Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, 1936-1965, but subject to any law in force in New South Wales, the South Australian Railways Commissioner in or in relation to the operation, control and management of the railway . . .
>
> (*b*) shall have and may exercise and enjoy the powers, authorities, privileges and immunities (other than the powers conferred on him by section 84 of the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, 1936-1965) as he has and may exercise and enjoy in the operation, control and management of railways within this State and in the exercise and enjoyment of the powers, authorities, privileges and immunities conferred upon him by this paragraph he shall perform and be subject to the same duties,

liabilities and obligations as he performs and is subject to in the operation, control and management of railways within this State.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did you find out what it meant?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I assume I did.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But you are not sure.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think it could be said in fewer words. Members are used to this sort of thing, having had to put up with it for many years, but the man in the street who tries to work it out will be in real difficulty. I will later move an amendment to proposed new section 4a (2) (*d*) (i). In my opinion it is necessary to cover the terms and conditions of employment and of workmen's compensation of people working outside of their own State. Having been associated with the South Australian industrial movement, and realizing the difficulties that have been experienced in obtaining compensation for people who have been injured in such circumstances, I can understand why these people should be protected. We must ensure that they will not receive lower wages because they come within the ambit of provisions operating in another State.

If a man has to leave one State to perform more onerous work in another State (and the mere fact that he must go to another State would make the work more onerous for him), he shall not, if this Bill passes, especially in relation to proposed new section 4a (2) (*d*) (ii), receive any greater wage than the rest of the people employed in the same sort of classification in South Australia. I can understand why he should not receive less than he would receive in this State, but if he goes to another State at the direction of the Commissioner, and this proves onerous to him, he or someone on his behalf should be able to use the conciliation and arbitration system to obtain something for doing this work. I do not like an Act of Parliament to provide that a certain rate shall be paid to an employee and that he shall not receive any more than another person with the same classification, irrespective of whether a district allowance or living-away-from-home allowance is being paid because he is working in another State. I do not like to see something put into an Act of Parliament that will prevent the system of conciliation and arbitration applying. Therefore, when we get into Committee I shall move an amendment to cover this. I support the second reading.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 878.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I support the second reading of this Bill. Clause 2 corrects an error in the Twelfth Schedule of the principal Act setting out the divisions for sheep districts. It seeks to change the reference to the 30th degree of longitude to "30th degree of latitude". I believe that the word "longitude" has been in this Act since its inception in 1933. Obviously, in order to make the sheep comply with the Act, efforts have been made to get them to walk sideways. However, as they have not been able to do that, the Government has now decided that it should alter the Act by substituting the correct word. I have no objection to that, and in any case it will not be so hard on the sheep in future.

Clause 3 merely repeals section 7 of the Brands Act Amendment Act, 1955. This section was a transitional provision to give protection to mortgagees who held liens over wool branded with black branding fluids. As a result of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization's bringing out a special formula for a soluble fluid which enabled markings to be removed from the wool, the principal Act was amended. However, at that stage the use of black paint was prohibited. I understand that although the C.S.I.R.O. brought out a black paint which had this soluble fluid in it, some people did not always use that type of paint: they used other paint which resulted in a certain wastage of wool. I consider that it was necessary to have this transitional power in the Act at the time. However, as the Minister of Agriculture has said, it is no longer required. As I agree with that, I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

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

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

(Continued from August 13. Page 885.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): As we have the anomaly of having the same motion before each House of Parliament at the same time, I preface my remarks with the question: is this a House of Review?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You were never fooled by that description, were you?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I wonder what would happen if we had an amendment in one place and a completely opposite type of amendment in the other, or if one House opposed the motion and the other accepted it. The Government, at the insistence of this Council, asked that Parliament be given the right to express an opinion in relation to the M.A.T.S. plan, and this right has been given to Parliament. However, to my knowledge, never before in the history of the South Australian Parliament have we had the same motion before each House at the same time.

I wonder what it is sought to achieve. To me, it is an innovation whereby the beliefs of the House of Review and the principles that we believe in are being thwarted because of this action. How can the Government make a firm decision if one House arrives at a different decision from that arrived at in the other House?

Regarding the motion itself, to sort out the emotional from the practical and the problems of today from the predicted problems of tomorrow is not an easy thing for us or for many other people in the State to do. It is difficult to follow the thinking of the Government or the Highways Department in its entirety when on the eve of the introduction of this debate we have the suggestion that the Noarlunga Freeway is to be deferred and that the Hills Freeway is to be altered in some way. Then, to add more confusion to the pot of brew being boiled, we have the announcement from the Adelaide City Council of plans to make a road from the North Adelaide area across the park lands to the southern extremity of Adelaide. Therefore, within a matter of three weeks we have these announcements of changes in relation to this transportation problem.

We are being asked by the Government to acknowledge the "general principles underlying the report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study". If the Government gets this acknowledgment, will this mean that the planners will be in a position of greater strength to bulldoze their ideas of where freeways and expressways will go, using as an excuse the very fact that Parliament—the people's elected members—has said that it accepts these general principles?

The Minister of Roads and Transport has said in the past that this is more of a service plan, not to be confused with town planning or with development of the metropolitan area. However, as the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study involves so many problems, including where and the way in which the people will work and play and live, surely there must be a correlation between planning and development and the transportation of the people. Surely the questions of where people live and how they get to work have to be considered.

If the decision from Parliament is favourable, will this mean that the opportunity that the public wishes in order to raise objection—sometimes legitimate, sometimes perhaps frivolous, but nevertheless objection—to this plan will be lost? Will it mean that John Citizen will be denied by the department some of his rights? Parliament or Government must always remember that it cannot answer for its successors. Therefore, I wonder whether it is wise for this House to agree to the general principles of this motion as they have been outlined unless we have an assurance that a Bill will be introduced by the Government spelling out the problems of compulsory acquisition and also the problems of the responsibility of Government to the people in relation not only to this matter but also to all major roadwork programmes for the future of the State, as well as for Adelaide.

I travelled on freeways during my tour of parts of the United States of America last year, and I felt privileged to have been able to see at first hand some effects of freeways. We hired a motor car at Seattle in the north-west of the United States of America and drove for over 1,000 miles down to San Francisco over many roads, but mostly on freeways. When we took delivery of the car it was at a place within a five-minute walk of the centre of Seattle, a city of 3,000,000 people. Within 10 minutes of taking delivery of that vehicle we were away from the humdrum type of road, the normal road of any city, with traffic lights, pedestrians, motor cars, etc., and we were out of that atmosphere on a freeway, moving across the suburbs at about 50 miles an hour.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Driving on the right-hand side of the road, too?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I was driving on the correct side of the road. I was always worried while in the U.S.A. as to which was the correct side, which was my right-hand side. Fortunately, the American right-of-way rule is the same as ours—right of way must be given to the man on the right. If honourable members can imagine leaving our General Post Office, driving down Flinders Street, then

after 10 minutes' driving entering a freeway, they can understand the situation as I found it. In addition, others are travelling through their respective suburban areas and doing so at their leisure; it is easy for them to commute and travel to their work under that system.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Did it take the honourable member 10 minutes to get on to the freeway? The freeway did not come within half a mile of the post office?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The freeway came so close to the centre of the city that it was only 10 minutes away; I suppose it would not have been more than three miles away. I remember crossing two major intersections during that journey, and that is about the distance from the city centre to the freeway. We stayed for some time in the city of Portland, in the State of Oregon in the U.S.A., at a suburban home about 20 miles from the place of work of our host, which was almost in the city centre. This man drove me over the two alternative routes he could use to reach his work; one route was by way of ordinary suburban roads, winding through various parts of the city, and that journey of 20 miles took 1½ to 1¾ hours, although it was made in the afternoon and not at the peak traffic hour. The other route was by way of the freeway, and it took about five minutes to reach that freeway, while the total time taken for the journey was about half an hour.

I am impressed with freeways; they are effective, with fast movement of transport, although I agree that bottlenecks can occur. I remember an instance in America when I heard on my car radio that a person had had a puncture, or a blow-out, on a "clover-leaf" on one of the freeways; the helicopter pilot broadcast to motorists that there was a bank-up of over five miles. This was of great interest to me; why should one vehicle cause a bank-up of over five miles, even though this was during peak-hour traffic on the freeway, or on a road just off the freeway? General comment was that engineering of the freeways was not always as good as it should be. I make that point because in my opinion much of the engineering for roadways in South Australia is not as good as it could be. If we are to have freeways, then they must be carefully planned in order that minor bottlenecks do not become major ones simply because the mechanics of road-building are not of a high standard. That should apply whether roads are freeways or ordinary types of road.

With all the problems of M.A.T.S.—where does it go, when is it to start, is my house to be affected, etc.—I think I shall mention a further experience on my American tour. We went to see Niagara Falls and stayed at Buffalo in Canada. Because the river containing Niagara Falls divides America and Canada, we saw at close hand the difference between the Canadian side and the American side. On the Canadian side was a plentiful supply of modern motels, modern shopping centres, together with massive supermarkets and an air of prosperity; it was a Mecca for tourists.

However, on the American side, only five minutes away, were few hotels while the shops were not of the type an average tourist would want to enter. After asking questions we were told that the freeways planned for the American side of Niagara Falls had been beset with problems of the type, "Where would it go—here, there, or yonder?" The planners could not make up their minds and, because that was so, business interests were not prepared to build in the area unless a freeway was established to feed the shopping centre. They would not erect skyscraper hotels or shopping centres if the planners could not decide where to place the freeways.

That was one of my observations, and I think it should be remembered here, in all the emotion of the problem, that if we are to have any form of fast transportation around the city, those plans must eventually go further for the benefit of those people not only directly affected but the whole commerce of a very large area. It was on the American side that we saw outside one very small motel-hotel type of establishment the sign "Single beds for honeymoon couples" and maybe that was the reason for that type of development: they had one bed for those who wanted to spend their honeymoon there.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Twin beds, I suppose!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Anyone who travels often on the Gawler to Gepps Cross dual highway must realize that this form of transportation is efficient, especially when leaving that highway and entering a single road. Traffic can move quickly on a dual highway. The danger spots on an ordinary road are the cross roads; with freeways, that is eliminated. As has been said by the expert as well as by the layman, elimination of cross roads is one maior traffic hazard causing concern, because accidents at cross roads cause a tremendous loss of life and injury to many

people. Some people have thought, "Let us not worry about freeways: let us put everyone into buses, whether they be maxi buses or just buses, for the transportation of people." From my observation, man changes his mode of transportation from the cradle, to crawling, to walking, and to other facets of his movements by slow degrees. In this society (whether it be an affluent one or not I am not too sure) everybody seems to have a motor car, and cars are increasing in number. The average age of the adult population of Australia at present is 29 years or under. I cannot see the *laissez faire* life of the average Australian youth .today suddenly changing because he has an efficient or computerized bus service; I cannot imagine a youth taking his girl out on a public bus service.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But the honourable member has been talking about people going to work and coming home by car.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Yes, we are worried about that—going to work and coming home. If a person has a motor car, to him it is a prestige symbol and he will use it until he is no longer able to get the wretched thing into the city. This is the experience not of me but of people in cities overseas who have found it difficult to get people to travel by bus: they give them free tickets, yet they still prefer to go by car. It is not until a city gets clogged up that a change is made. Then the city dweller moves out to another area which, in turn, gets clogged up, too, by the same people.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What do you mean by "adult population"?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: A person over 18 years of age.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The average age of the population in Australia at present is under 29.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You said "adult population".

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Perhaps I used the word in the wrong place. Public transport is a problem not merely of supplying efficient and comfortable buses, or any other sort of bus, but of getting the people to use them: there must be fantastic planning so that the man in the outer suburbs and beyond, living away from the city, can drive his car to a suburban car park and catch his bus, tram or train, using the one ticket for all forms of public transport. For instance, he could catch his train to King William Street, where he would then get into a private or M.T.T. bus, using the one ticket all through to get to his place of work. There must not be divided control so that every time a person gets into some form of public transport he needs to buy another ticket. Public transport should be closely co-ordinated in all its aspects, but I do not see this coming in the next 10 to 20 years, with youth at the helm, as it is. The young man will not suddenly want to leave his car at home and use public transport, while he maintains his present attitude of *laissez faire* to so many things in life. However, it will come. One thing comes first, and one thing that is coming first is the modern type of freeway.

To sum up, I favour correctly planned freeways similar to those outlined by the M.A.T.S. scheme, but I do not favour altogether the way in which the matter has been handled so far. I voiced some of my objections earlier and pointed out on the eve of this debate that variations of the plan had been announced. It may be necessary to announce them but it does not make the position as clear-cut and simple as it should be. It is not clear how the plan is to be implemented so there is a genuine fear among the people of the country, despite the assurances given by the Minister and his department, that country roads will not get all the money they are entitled to once the M.A.T.S. plan gets under way. With all due respect to the Minister and his Ministerial statements (this is not a personal slander), people cannot see clearly how we can spend millions of dollars in the city and at the same time not take something from funds that would otherwise be spent on country roads. It is difficult to dispel those fears.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The new five-year plan envisages much more money being spent on metropolitan roads.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I am well aware of that point, and so are many of the country people.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: That is not the fault of the Minister.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: No, nor of the department, but I say again that, in spite of these assurances given by responsible people, it is hard for the people in the country not to ask: "Yes, but how can we be sure?" My point is that now is the time for the Highways Department to come under complete governmental control. It should present its budget to Parliament for Parliament to consider it; it should be similar to that of the Education Department in every respect, and Parliament should have

the privilege and right of debate and query, question and answer. That is the only way in which we can curb this present spread of bureaucracy in departments becoming so great that, when it comes to trying to ascertain facts, it is difficult to do so. If we believe in the institution of Parliament, I suggest respectfully that, especially in view of the M.A.T.S. proposals, the Highways Department should come under closer scrutiny by the Government.

Compulsory acquisition is, to me, the key to success or failure of the whole scheme. The machinery for acquisition of property must be so simple that John Citizen, the man in the street whose home will be acquired, can understand exactly what the processes will be. This is so important that, if John Citizen, the man on the minimum salary range who has difficulty in making ends meet under normal conditions, is worried about the price he is offered for his house, believing that it is not realistic, the Government must be prepared to say that he shall be given free representation at a tribunal-type hearing to ensure on his behalf that his house is acquired at a fair and reasonable price. He must be able to go into his new house relatively free from any increase in the debts that he may have had when living in his acquired house. John Citizen is the innocent person in the whole matter. The M.A.T.S. plan is so complex and so difficult to understand that the man whose home is affected and is compulsorily acquired should understand that he can get free and quick assistance if he wants to raise an objection to the price he is offered for his house. The Government should consider easing the receipts tax on money paid in compulsory acquisitions under the M.A.T.S. plan.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It should be free altogether. Why should he have to pay a tax?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: That is what I have just said. I think the Government should consider that there should be no receipts tax on this money.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You did not say that.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: There should be an easing, if not a total removal, of stamp duty and all other duties connected with these transfers of property. As I said at the beginning of these remarks, compulsory acquisition is the key to the success or failure of the whole scheme because, if the people in the city and the suburbs are to understand how they can get these things done, there must be some means by which it can be spelt out to them simply, quickly and at no cost to themselves. There is no greater fear than that of sickness or of losing the roof over one's head, no matter how poor or how wealthy one may be.

Since 1962 departments and experts have been working, planning and dreaming in connection with the M.A.T.S. plan, and I compliment them on their efforts. The credit goes not to any one person but to many people. I have no doubt that they tried to do a good job, and it is up to us to decide whether the job they have done is what we want. I should like to conclude by reading the following passage from Colonel Light's *Brief Journal*:

> The reasons that led me to fix Adelaide where it is I do not expect to be generally understood or calmly judged of at present. My enemies, however, by disputing their validity in every particular, have done me the good service of fixing the whole of the responsibility on me. I am perfectly willing to bear it; I leave it to posterity, and not to them, to decide whether I am entitled to praise or to blame.

Those words are fairly prophetic, in that this Parliament has a degree of responsibility to posterity, as have the department and the Minister in charge.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I support the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Bevan. I listened with interest to the speech of the Hon. Mr. Geddes, some of whose remarks were in line with my own thinking. Consequently, I now believe that the honourable member will support the amendment. In my speech during the Address in Reply debate I spoke about the confusion caused by differing statements issued by the Premier and by the Minister of Roads and Transport in regard to the M.A.T.S. plan. I said that I wondered how the debate would be handled. We eventually found that it would be handled simultaneously in the two Houses.

Since the Premier has said that this is a vital issue, what will happen if it is carried in one House and defeated in the other? Which is the paramount House? We always say that we have the power to carry the things we want to carry by the force of numbers that we have in this Council; we always say that this Council can impose its will on the other House. I hope that this is so, because I believe the majority of honourable members here will vote for the amendment, not the motion.

When I read in the press what happened in another place last night, I was disgusted at the way things went. It appeared that the Premier was determined to have the M.A.T.S. plan approved willy nilly and regardless of the wishes of the people. I have noticed in

Hansard in the last few days that the majority of members speaking on this matter in another place supported the amendment but opposed the original motion. In fact, quite a number of Government members would not stand up and support the original motion. Then occurred the disgraceful circumstance of the debate continuing in another place on the basis that documents were signed, even, saying that pairs would be given in regard to certain people in connection with this matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In connection with this matter?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Yes.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: A book is signed by the Whips on such matters.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: On matters of confidence?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: On the matter of this actual motion; it was signed that there would be a pair in regard to certain people in connection with this matter. The Premier agreed to pairs for the Hon. Mr. Loveday, who is representing this Parliament at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference. The only exception related to a constitutional matter, and Opposition members in another place went ahead on the basis that this motion was not to be classed as a vital matter and that pairs would be given.

Then, I am told, in the last sentences uttered by the Premier when closing the debate he told the Opposition that this would be a vital matter and that there would be no pairs. Consequently, there was no opportunity for anyone to do anything about it. Subsequently, because of complaints from the Opposition and because of the reasonableness of some Government members—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is going too far in his criticism of another place, which is not under our control. The honourable member should confine himself to the motion.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am sorry if I have transgressed, Mr. President. How will this matter be dealt with in this place, in view of what has happened elsewhere? How will honourable members feel when dealing with this motion here when they know that their Party has said, "This shall be a vital matter"? How will country members act in regard to this matter? I have already heard the Hon. Mr. Geddes speaking as though he will not support the motion, so I am looking forward to seeing what happens when it comes to a vote.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not think the Hon. Mr. Geddes spoke that way.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think he did—he criticized the motion.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It was constructive criticism.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: He said that we should have another look at some of these things. I point out that, if the motion is carried, we will not be able to have another look at them. How can we deal with matters of this nature on this basis? What is the use of bringing the M.A.T.S. plan before this Parliament if the Premier in another place says, "This will be a vital issue"?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I had a request to bring the matter here.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: The Government was invited by your Party to do that.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, but the issue was decided before it came here—through the Premier's saying, "This will be a vital matter," and through his relying on the Speaker—

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: The Labor Party asked that the matter be debated.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: —to carry it on his casting vote.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Is that why you didn't bring it in?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The M.A.T.S. Report was not ready then. The Premier said, "We will ensure that, whatever people say in another place, the matter will be carried because we will call it a vital issue and then the members will be lined up. The Speaker will be lined up so that he will vote for it, and in that way we will get it carried." Is that how the Government should act?

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That is what your Party asked for.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member also asked for it, but did he do so knowing that it would be carried anyway, irrespective of what anyone said? Do honourable members opposite think that because it might be carried in another place, which is said by some people to be the paramount place, it must be right, irrespective of what happens here? I thought the honourable member was doing the right thing in asking for this matter to be discussed in Parliament, but if he knew the Premier would say that it was a vital issue and, as a result, would line up the Speaker to carry the vote, I am not so sure about it now. Why bring it here at all on that basis?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It was the request and the challenge of an Opposition member that caused this to happen.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am not objecting to the matter being brought here, but let us deal with it fairly and squarely, so that it will stand or fall on the vote of members according to their conscience, not having been told to vote against the amendment because it is a vital issue.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It was made a vital issue because Mr. Hudson asked for it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is right.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It was never asked to be dealt with as a vital issue until it was made one. At that time some people were doubtful how the Speaker would react to an equal vote because they thought he might have expressed something outside the House (and, indeed, I heard that he did), and the Government thought it would tie him up and to make doubly sure the Government saw to it that there was no chance of a pair being granted. I cannot see how the matter can be carried in this place, because the four Labor Party members as well as four Government members represent the metropolitan area. Therefore, there must be 12 country members in this Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What effect will that have on them?

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Don't the country members want freeways?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Your constituents will read what you are saying. Country people are saying that these enormous sums of money are being spent in the metropolitan area and not in the country. As the Hon. Mr. Geddes said, we have had assurances from the Minister regarding the sums of money to be spent in the country and, like Mr. Geddes, I have heard that these assurances have not satisfied the country people, who realize that in the past they have not had as much done for them as they should have because of the lack of funds available and because of the big works that have been undertaken in the metropolitan area. If the Highways Department is let loose on this glamour-type programme it will want to continue with such work in the metropolitan area and, once again, the country will miss out. Of course, the country people realize this.

Another interesting matter is the Minister's inconsistency regarding the railways. He has said that the railways must be efficient or else he will not let them run. As a result, he has closed various country passenger railway services—

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That you didn't have the courage to close.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable Minister should not say that; perhaps I had sufficient sense not to do it.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: I supported the closing of the Willunga line.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: At least we were prepared to examine what the Railways Commissioner put to us regarding country passenger services. However, the present Minister was no sooner in office than he caught sight of this aspect and thought this would be a good way to get his name in the paper. He therefore implemented the whole programme. Surely he would not have cancelled all these railway services if he had had any sense. He should have examined the results of the cancellation of one service before he proceeded to cancel others. However, he saw fit not to do so. Country people are having their rail passenger services taken away from them, yet we are going to spend enormous sums of money on railway development in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Where will we get the money?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No-one needs to tell me that the metropolitan passenger services are losing money and, of course, they will do so in the future. In this respect, the Government's policy is inconsistent, because it is asking the country people to subsidize services in the metropolitan area. There is an ominous silence from the Government regarding where this money is to come from, and this leads one to believe that a special tax will be levied to provide the funds. Money must come from Loan funds as well. The country people are being taxed to provide a railway passenger service for the people in the city that they themselves are denied.

As a result of money coming from the Loan funds, country people will suffer, too, for this will mean that less money will be spent in the country on hospitals, schools and education because such money is earmarked for providing passenger services in the metropolitan area. These are reasons why at least 12 Government members here should vote for the amendment and not for the motion.

It is extremely important that we have another look at these plans, especially that part dealing with public transport, because I am not convinced that the right thing is being done in this regard. The Hon. Mr. Geddes has said that eventually the cities will be crowded out, to which the Chief Secretary interjected that everyone would have to shift somewhere else. Of course, that would be really lovely for Adelaide. The freeways will crowd out the people from the city, which will become a large parking area. Also, all the businesses will have to shift out elsewhere. Indeed, today business people are shifting out of Adelaide and establishing themselves in other areas.

Honourable members should not kid themselves that freeways will return these people to the city. They will go further and further out, which is why we must examine the M.A.T.S. plan more thoroughly. We are looking at the city and saying, "Give them wider freeways and bring them all to the city", but eventually we will find, as has happened in other countries, that one can only drive on the freeways as fast as the slowest man, and eventually everyone gets to the same pace. What will happen close to the metropolitan area? It will take people half a day to get from their home to their work and half a day to get home again. This is what could happen as a result of crowding the city. Therefore, I say there must be more provision for public transport.

The criticism I made of the Minister in regard to railways was from the point of view of honourable members' country constituents. I hope that he, too, will look at it from this angle. I consider that the country people will be providing railways for the metropolitan area while at the same time they are losing their own railways. I think I have said all I need to say in regard to this matter. I shall be interested to see, as a result of what the Premier in another place has done and as a result of the Government's calling this a vital issue, whether the country members in this place have the intestinal fortitude to vote with the Opposition against the motion.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.2 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 19, at 2.15 p.m.