

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 25, 1968

The House met at 12 noon pursuant to proclamation, the Speaker (Hon. T. C. Stott) presiding.

The Clerk (Mr. G. D. Combe) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

After prayers read by the Speaker, honourable members, in compliance with summons, proceeded at 12.8 p.m. to the Legislative Council Chamber to hear the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. They returned to the Assembly Chamber at 12.45 p.m. and the Speaker resumed the Chair.

SPEAKER'S COMMISSION

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor a Commission under the hand of His Excellency and the public seal of the State empowering me to administer the Oath of Allegiance or to receive the Affirmation necessary to be taken by the members of the House of Assembly.

COURT OF DISPUTED RETURNS: MILLICENT

The SPEAKER laid on the table a copy of the minutes of the Court of Disputed Returns, together with evidence, in the matter of the petition of Martin Bruce Cameron against the return of James Desmond Corcoran as member for the District of Millicent.

Ordered that petition, cross petition, procedural orders, and judgments of the Court be printed.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Clerk to read the relevant extracts from the final judgment.

The CLERK (Mr. G. D. Combe): The extracts are as follows:

In the circumstances, the Court declares that the respondent was not duly elected, and further declares, the Hon. D. N. Brookman dissenting, that the petitioner is not entitled to the seat and that the election is wholly void. And the Court orders the same accordingly.

No order is made as to the costs of the proceedings; each party will bear his own cost.

Independently of the other members of the Court, the President desires to add the following observations:

An unfortunate result has been brought about by official errors which have clearly affected the outcome of the election; and the parties to the petition have been put to substantial expense through no fault of their own. In the case of an "independent" candidate, or indeed of any qualified elector, presenting a well-founded petition, the burden of costs thrown away by

the avoidance of an election because of official error would be almost intolerable. The likelihood of such a person having to assume the expense of litigation, in circumstances like those existing in the present case, might well deter him from obtaining justice for the electors affected by the disputed return. On this topic of costs, I respectfully share the views expressed by Barton J. in *Blundell v. Vardon* (1907) 4 C.L.R. 1463, 1480, and by the Court of Disputed Returns in *Hawke v. Jettner* (June 11, 1927). If I had possessed the powers given to the New South Wales Court of Disputed Returns by section 172 of the Parliamentary Electorates and Elections Act, 1912-1965 (N.S.W.), I should not have hesitated to recommend that portion, at least, of the costs of each party to the petition be paid by the Crown. I respectfully invite the attention of the Legislature to the views which I thus have expressed.

NEW MEMBER FOR MILLICENT

The SPEAKER: I have to report the receipt by me of the return of the writ issued by me for the election of a member to serve in the District of Millicent in place of James Desmond Corcoran, whose election was declared void, by which return James Desmond Corcoran was certified to be duly elected. I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to introduce Mr. Corcoran so that he may come to the table of the House and take and subscribe the Oath of Allegiance.

The Oath of Allegiance was then administered to and subscribed by Mr. Corcoran.

COURT OF DISPUTED RETURNS: CHAFFEY

The SPEAKER laid on the table a copy of the minutes of the Court of Disputed Returns, together with evidence in the matter of the petition of Arthur Reginald Curren against the return of Peter Bruce Arnold as member for the District of Chaffey.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Clerk to read the decision of the Court.

The CLERK (Mr. G. D. Combe): The President stated that it was the order of the Court that the petition be dismissed and that the petitioner pay to the respondent the sum of five hundred dollars (\$500) for his costs of and incidental to the petition.

DEATH OF HON. FRANK WALSH

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I move:

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Francis Henry Walsh, a former Premier and former member for Goodwood and Edwardstown in the House of Assembly, and place on record its appreciation of his meritorious public services, and

that as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased gentleman the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I know that all the members of this Parliament and the public of South Australia were indeed sorry to learn of the passing of Mr. Walsh and are very conscious of the long period of service he gave in this place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): In rising to second the motion, I point out that all of us who knew Frank Walsh knew him to be a man who was devoted to public service in South Australia, who was determined to see that the things he believed in and fought for were carried out, and who, in his personal relationships with all who came into contact with him, was concerned to ensure their personal welfare. There was no more kindly man in personal relations that one could have met in this place than Frank Walsh. As Leader of my Party, he led us to victory against severe odds after a very long time, and in the Government which followed he made the mark (a mark that will always be there in South Australian history) of a man who achieved a great deal in a short time.

Numbers of the great developments which will take place in the years to come (and which have already been referred to today) are the result of the diligent work and devotion to service of Frank Walsh. He was an outstanding leader for this State, a man admired and liked by all who knew him, and all of us who knew him and worked with him undoubtedly mourn his passing, as do all the people in this State.

THE SPEAKER: I, too, support the motion, having been associated with the late Frank Walsh for many years in this Parliament. The remarks of the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition are only too true: Frank Walsh was to all of us a really down-to-earth, true Australian. He was very sincere, he had his heart in the right place, and he helped everyone. he could in the high office he formerly held; and as the member for his district he worked diligently for the people he represented. His passing will be greatly regretted.

Indeed, the suddenness of his death came as a tremendous tragedy, particularly because, having reached the retirement age set by his Party, he was not spared sufficiently long to enjoy the retirement of which he was so deserving. I was very sorry to learn of his death, and I trust that Mrs. Walsh will be able

to bear up under the strain that has been placed on her by the passing of her husband. For many years to come, Frank Walsh will be remembered by those of us who are members of Parliament. We regret his passing and convey our deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.]

DEATH OF FORMER MEMBERS

THE SPEAKER: It is with profound sorrow that I draw the attention of the House to the deaths of the following former members of the Parliament of South Australia: Hon. E. D. A. Bagot, member for the Southern District in the Legislative Council from 1938 to 1941; Mr. R. W. R. Hunt, member for Victoria in the House of Assembly from 1933 to 1938; Mr. C. J. D. Smith, member for Victoria in the House of Assembly from 1938 to 1941; and Mr. J. F. Walsh, C.B.E., member of the House of Assembly for Thebarton from 1942 to 1956 and for West Torrens from 1956 to 1965. As Speaker of the House, I express the deepest sympathy to their respective relatives. In tribute to their services, and as a mark of respect to their memory, I ask members to observe a minute's silence.

Members stood in their places in silence.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of the several sums for all the purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure by the Government during the year ending June 30, 1968.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer) moved:

That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech and a supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): On the last day on which this House met, a petition was presented to the House by scores of thousands of people resident in South Australia praying that this House would forthwith proceed to a redistribution of electoral districts in this State, and that a general election be held on the basis of that redistribution. Although a great many people in South Australia in a short time had indicated what were their feelings on this score, at that time the Government chose to pass over the petition and from that time onward we have had no consideration by the

Government of the views that have been forthrightly expressed by South Australian citizens and by people throughout Australia who are concerned with the maintenance of democracy in this Commonwealth.

Some very strange statements have been made on this score by the Premier and members of his Government. Since the State election, members on this side have been charged with having been satisfied with the existing electoral arrangements in South Australia. It was stated that the existing electoral arrangements were not satisfactory to members on the Government side but that they were our fault because, according to the Premier, we had been intransigent and unprepared to compromise. Members on the Government side know how false are those statements: they cannot begin to believe them. I do not know why they should even think that they can convince South Australians of the truth of them.

Mr. Lawn: They proved that last Saturday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I shall deal with last Saturday in a few minutes, but first I wish to go back over the events before last Saturday. I have been a member of this place now for more than 15 years, and in no Parliament in which I have sat has the Labor Party not endeavoured to take some step to bring the Constitution of South Australia back to the original basis laid down for it in 1856: that is, that the basis upon which members ought to be elected to this Parliament should be of districts containing substantially equal numbers of voters to elect each representative to Parliament. Sir, the Labor Party has put up not one measure on this score but a whole series of measures designed to seek the utmost agreement in this area to try to effect adequate representation of the people of South Australia in this Parliament. In every Parliament we have put forward measures on proportional representation or for redistribution. Indeed, being unable to get any sort of decision on compromise from the Liberal and Country League in South Australia, we moved for an inquiry regarding a more just electoral system in South Australia, and L.C.L. members even voted against that.

In 1955 the L.C.L. Government redistributed the districts in South Australia upon the 1936 basis and they have had the gall and effrontery to tell the people of South Australia that we on this side agreed to that redistribution, although they know perfectly well that those statements are complete falsehoods. I was suspended from this House

because of what I said about the measure that was brought in to instruct a commission and about the motives of those who put forward the proposal. Even though in that very Parliament we had two measures containing our own views on electoral redistribution, members opposite have told the people of South Australia that. In 1955, when the report of the Commissioners was made and when that Bill for the alteration of the Constitution was introduced, we had only two alternatives, which were the existing 1936 distribution and the one then proposed by the Commissioners. The one proposed by the Commissioners was only marginally better than the 1936 distribution but, if we had voted against that 1955 proposal, we would have been left with the 1936 distribution, which was what the L.C.L. wanted us to adopt.

Because we took the lesser of two evils (having made clear what our principles were), members opposite have said that we supported this and that the proposal was passed through the House without objection from us. I do not know what level of intelligence members opposite assign to the people of South Australia when they say these things that they know are so completely untrue. In the last Parliament, we had endorsed by the people of South Australia a proposal for the distribution of electoral districts in South Australia so as to provide a 56-member House, 26 seats to be retained in that area of the State presently electing 26 members and defined by an L.C.L. Government as the country area of South Australia. We introduced a measure that would retain 26 seats in that area in order to ensure that there would be no lessening of the service given to those people by a reduction in the number of members elected from it. Just two days before polling day at the last State election, the L.C.L., knowing that we would not then have an opportunity to reply, inserted full-page advertisements in all country newspapers, saying that we intended to provide for only 17 country seats in South Australia. Members opposite knew perfectly well that that was false, because they had before them all the material, yet they were going out to the people of South Australia intending deliberately to mislead them when we had no opportunity to reply before polling day.

When these things were explained to the people of Millicent, those electors exercised their mind quite effectively about what kind of pup they had been sold at the time of the State election, and I shall deal with that

matter later. During the last Parliament, we introduced a Bill that was passed in this House with a constitutional majority. However, when it went to the Upper House it was summarily rejected. At no stage during the whole of that Parliament did the L.C.L. introduce a proposal, although ample private members' time was available to introduce anything relating to electoral redistribution in South Australia. Further, when our measure was before Parliament the then Opposition offered no compromise and proposed nothing themselves although, as I have said, it had ample opportunity to take action during that three years.

We were in the position that, if we had another general election and were returned with a majority in this House, we could have invoked the deadlock provisions of the Constitution, and I, as Leader of the Government, had made clear that we had every intention of doing just that. Now, during the last election campaign, we suddenly found that the Liberal Party was saying, for the first time, that it was not happy about the existing redistribution. That Party proposed that something be done about this and charged us with having made only one feeble (and that was the word used) attempt at reform during our period of office. Members opposite were the knights in shining armour, trying to get some fairer form of electoral redistribution in South Australia! If our attempt was feeble (and I do not consider that it was), at least it was an attempt. Honourable members who are now on the Government side of the House did precisely nothing but later said, "We propose a new electoral scheme."

We have heard all sorts of comments about this electoral scheme. We had from the Premier a series of statements that the proposal was for a 45-member House, with 20 country seats and 25 city seats. After the election this was reported as being a proposal for 25 urban districts and 20 country districts. Then we heard that there were to be 25 seats in relation to the industrial interests and 25 in relation to the rural interests. We were also told that there was to be no differentiation between country seats and the quotas to elect members. Then, a few days ago we heard that country seats were not to be divided up and given the figures that had previously been stated by the Premier. That clearly meant that there was to be a differentiation between numbers of voters to elect members to this Parliament from seats outside the metropolitan area.

What precisely were we to believe was the scheme of electoral adjustment put forward by the Government? It was very difficult to discover. We had always been prepared to consider a reasonable compromise, and at the time of the election we had asked for an endorsement of the scheme which we had put forward to this House and in respect of which we had been offered no compromise whatever by the other side of politics. That scheme was the basis of our policy. We did not get from the people of this State the overwhelming endorsement that was necessary to enable such a constitutional change to be made because we have been at a signal disadvantage in South Australia in that, in order to take office, we must get over 12 per cent more votes than our opponents get, although we certainly got a substantially greater vote than did the Government, and a bigger vote than had any existing State Government in any other State in the last 10 years. However, we did not receive enough to get our proposals through or to beat the existing unfair electoral distribution. We therefore offered a compromise, in order to get some improvement for the people of this State; that we should have a 48-member House, with instructions to the Commissioners (who were to draw the boundaries for the seats) that would be substantially those given to the Commonwealth Electoral Commissioners—

Mr. Clark: That was a very real compromise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and this would give compulsory weighting to country areas with a difference of about 25 per cent between the number of people required to elect a member to Parliament in a country district compared with the number required to elect one in a metropolitan district.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite will hear something about the details of the proposal in just a moment as I intend to say something about it. The requirement in country areas was for at least 10 per cent below the quota in city areas. That was mandatory, and went up to 15 per cent; so there could be a variation from 10 to 15 per cent below the quota. In the metropolitan districts the quota (taking into account the number of people in the metropolitan area) would have to go above the quota, given the number of seats provided, and it would have to rise to 15 per cent above the quota in certain cases.

Mr. McAnaney: There are twice as many people in Adelaide, so you would have to halve that number.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has not done his arithmetic on that, but members opposite generally are not particularly good at arithmetic. The Leader of the Government has been dashing around the State—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —saying that people did not get the vote in proportion to the figures quoted in newspapers, but rather less than that. He worked it out that the Labor Party received 50.7 per cent of the votes, the L.C.L. 40 per cent, with another 4 per cent going elsewhere. However, when those figures were added up, they did not come to 100 per cent. In fact, the Labor Party received 52 per cent of the votes, the L.C.L. 43 per cent, with 4 per cent going to others. The remaining percentages, when divided up, came to less than 1 per cent.

We put forward that proposal in a spirit of compromise, prepared to get something effective done for the people of South Australia, because that was clearly what they wanted: a fair electoral system, with the Government of the State resolved on the basis of such a system. Immediately after the election, however, the Premier accused us of being intransigent. He said we were responsible for the electoral situation, although we had continually tried to alter it, and he said we had not co-operated by discussing any reasonable compromise with the Opposition.

He asked us to be flexible and compromising, so we put forward a compromise, a compromise which the Commonwealth Liberal member for Angas (Mr. G. O'Halloran Giles) got up and said was a reasonable compromise basis to work on—and he is not one of our members! Mr. O'Halloran Giles, a former member of this Parliament, said this would be a reasonable basis for redistribution and we said, "Yes, we think he is right. We are prepared to discuss it on this basis." Members opposite were silent about what he said, although I do not know what they said to him in private because he said nothing more about it thereafter.

Mr. Hudson: They said plenty.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: However, after we had put forward this compromise the Premier's only reply was that he would

not discuss it with us, and that he would introduce his own proposals in this House. We could not get him to discuss what should take place. A round-table discussion between interested political parties is not something new here. Indeed, where there is a knotty problem to be solved, it is a sensible way of going about things, and I was disappointed that I could not arrange any sort of discussion with the Leader of the Liberal Party. Then, Sir, after they had taken office, members opposite refused me the right in this House to introduce a Bill that I had prepared on the basis of the compromise I had announced. As the Leader of my Party, I had that Bill prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman and printed by the Government Printer. Of course, it was a matter confidential to us, and to me as the Leader, until such time as it was introduced in this House; but I was refused the right to introduce it on a vote of this House.

I then received from the Attorney-General the following letter:

A few days ago I remembered that, several times between March 2 and April 16, you had expressed the intention of introducing at the earliest possible moment a Bill on electoral reform. I also remembered your attempt on April 17 to suspend Standing Orders to introduce a Bill to amend the Constitution Act. As such a Bill must have been prepared while you were still in office, I made enquiries for the docket.

I have now been informed by the Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, in the absence of the Parliamentary Draftsman, that—

"The instructions for the preparation of the Bill appear to have been received by Dr. Wynes orally and the Bill had been printed and forwarded by him to the Premier's Department in Docket No. P.D. 4/1968 on April 16, 1968. This docket has since not been returned to this Department and, so far as I have been able to discover, there are no papers relating to the Bill in this office."

I have also made enquiries in the Premier's Department and find that the docket is not there. I conclude therefore that docket No. P.D. 4/1968 is still in your possession. I write to ask for the return to me of it and its contents at your earliest convenience.

I replied as follows:

Thank you for your letter of May 7, 1968. Instructions were given to the Parliamentary Draftsman for a Bill on Electoral Reform. The Bill was prepared and printed and forwarded to me in a Bill file and the docket P.D. 4/1968 was included in that file. The docket contained a few hand-written notes to the Parliamentary Draftsman and a draft copy of the Bill which had been considerably amended. The material was taken from the docket for discussions with my Party as it was, of course, an important and confidential

matter affecting Party members. The docket therefore did not contain any material at the time we left office and you assumed it, and I return it to you—

which I did. Continuing:

Naturally enough the Bill was confidential to my side of the House until it was made public.

You voted to prevent it from being made so, and the Premier has declined publicly to discuss the matter with me. As far as I am concerned, the matter is in the same position as material provided by the Parliamentary Draftsman to your party when in opposition. In the office of Attorney-General, I always studiously refrained from enquiring as to the contents of any docket from the Parliamentary Draftsman's Department containing material which had been prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman on a confidential basis for your side of politics.

I do not consider that you are entitled to material which is being prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman for us. I must decline to give you any such material. If however, the Premier or any Ministers officially authorized by the Government thereto wish to discuss with me the possibility of a reasonable compromise proposal on electoral reform, I shall be happy to take part in such discussions.

Mr. Langley: Have you had an answer yet?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not yet, but the next thing I knew was that the Attorney-General appeared on a television programme and produced what was apparently a photostat copy of the Bill.

Mr. Lawn: He had not read it: that was obvious from his remarks.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Quite so. He got the reading of the Bill messed up and, obviously had not read it carefully. I did not mind the publication of certain of the contents of the Bill, because I had already talked about them publicly, and there was nothing new in that; but what I do take up is what has happened in this matter. It was later announced by the Attorney-General (and I heard him on the radio) that he had obtained this Bill from the Government Printer.

Mr. Lawn: Wouldn't that be a confidential document?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it would be.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Rats!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Material prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman or by the Government Printer for a member to introduce in this House has always been treated by this House as confidential to the member until it was introduced.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That's what you say. Did that happen in your time—to see whether we should introduce them? Are you saying that? If you are, it is absolutely absurd.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Everything is confidential to a particular member until it is introduced and is obviously—

The SPEAKER: Order! Conversation between members is definitely out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —privileged to that member as a member of this House. For a Minister of the Government, in breach of that privilege, to go to the Government Printer to obtain material that was prepared for a member to introduce is clearly a gross breach of the privileges of that member. What are we faced with here? Are we to take it that the attitude of the Government (and that is what it seems from this action) is that, when we have material prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman or the Government Printer, its members will go to the draftsman or the printer and demand what has always been treated previously as confidential information? In other words, we cannot rely on the officers previously available to this Parliament, because if we do we will have the Attorney-General spying on us through the back door.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You're getting hysterical.

Mr. Hudson: He is not.

Mr. Lawn: Why did you do it anyway?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Because I wanted to know what was in the Bill: he had not said so in his campaign.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! Interjections are out of order, and I do not think the Leader needs any assistance in the speech he is making. He is handling it very well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I assure the Attorney-General and other members opposite that I do not intend to leave this matter here: action will be taken as soon as possible in this Parliament to call to account those who are guilty of a breach of the privileges of members. When we came to the Millicent by-election, the Premier, having announced that he was not going to have any discussion with us and having accused us of being intransigent, uncompromising and not prepared to do anything that would achieve a reasonable improvement in the electoral system, asked publicly for a mandate from the people of Millicent for his 45-seat proposal (whichever one of them it was that they were

going to vote for). He said that if his member were elected in Millicent he would take it as a mandate to put through the proposal without compromise and that he did not intend to compromise upon it. He added that if, in fact, the Labor Party member was elected in Millicent he would take that as an endorsement of the Labor Party's 48-member seat plan. We fought the election in Millicent on this basis. Many times the Leader went out and talked about the electoral situation that would result in South Australia if our proposal were put into effect or if their proposal was put into effect. Indeed, they had their candidate appear on television with an entirely fictitious map that was supposed to represent our electoral scheme. It was a complete figment of the Liberal Party's imagination and had no basis of fact, but they plugged it. At every meeting that the member for Millicent (my deputy) or I addressed we plugged the electoral situation that would face the people of Millicent and South Australia if the Liberal Party candidate were elected. We said, "Here, the situation facing the people of the State and the people of Millicent is that, if you give your vote for the Liberal Party's plan, that plan will mean that they can stay in office with an even smaller percentage of votes than they now have, and that they will be there for the next 30 years."

Mr. Nankivell: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is perfectly true. This was the issue at Millicent and, indeed, there would not have been a meeting that we addressed where the situation facing the people of Millicent as to electoral redistribution was not put to them, and where the proposals of each Party were not outlined in considerable detail. We had, of course, made it clear what our proposals were, and what instructions would be given to the Commissioners, but the members of the Government had not, and we were able to cite the various statements made by the Premier on this score. Right up to the last moment the Liberal Party plugged this as being the thing they wanted people in Millicent to think about, and I am sure that the people of Millicent did think about it. The Liberal Party had people racing around Millicent wearing little badges with the magic number "20" on them, because they wanted 20 seats in order to get their scheme through the House; but the people of Millicent were not prepared to give the Premier the mandate he asked for. Then, contrary to the things he had said at the outset of the campaign as to the basis on

which he was seeking a mandate and as to his view of what the position would be if that mandate were refused, the Premier said that the whole election of Millicent simply revolved about the character and personality of the Deputy Leader. It is a good character and personality, too, but the reason why people voted for Des Corcoran is that he knows—

Mr. McAnaney: They were frightened to say "Vote for Dunstan".

Mr. Langley: He was down there all the time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I addressed far more meetings in that district than the Premier did.

Mr. Corcoran: Far more effectively, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was not a town in the area where I did not speak and, indeed, there were towns where I had not intended to speak but I was invited to visit them, which I did. In Beachport, for instance, we had a good meeting, and the vote showed the result. I am sorry: there is **one rural** area where I did not address a meeting. I turned up at the Premier's meeting, but he had broken the meeting up before I could say a few words. It was quite clear what the people of Millicent were voting for. They voted to get the things for which people have already petitioned this Parliament: that is, an immediate electoral redistribution and the holding of a general election in South Australia on a fair electoral distribution (a fair electoral distribution that will allow a majority of citizens to elect the Government they want and to reject a Government they do not want); an electoral distribution that will not allow, between the voting support for the two Parties, the disparity which now exists in South Australia and which allows the minority Party to take office. That could not happen, despite the words of the Premier about electoral districts in other States: it could not happen in any other part of Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: It nearly happened in Western Australia in March. Get your facts straight!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have looked at the figures, but the honourable member has not.

Mr. McAnaney: Have you read the papers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have read the papers, whereas the honourable member obviously does not bother to read them (and I have known this of him on many previous occasions). I suggest he look at the final figures in Western Australia, and I suggest that, like the member for Angus who, although he

put forward a sensible proposal, did not bother to check the New South Wales figures, he ought to look at those figures also, because in that case the distribution produced a result that was close indeed to the general voting support which either Party had in the State.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I assume the Leader is referring to the Commonwealth member for Angas?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I agree that the member for Angas in this House is always meticulous in the preparation of his material and figures, and I wish he would teach the member for Stirling a few lessons. The result of all this is that people in this State of every political persuasion are anxious to see immediately a redistribution of seats in this House and the holding of general elections on that basis, and I believe that that is entirely in accord with the things that were said in the Governor's Speech at the opening of the first session of this Parliament, when he said:

The result of the recent election has aroused widespread comment in South Australia and elsewhere and it is evident that all people concerned with the future of this State are dissatisfied with the present distribution of electorates in South Australia and that persons of every political persuasion believe that action is urgently necessary to obtain a redistribution of electorates to ensure effective representation of the people in the House of Assembly.

That was the view of the overwhelming majority of people in this State: it was not merely something that was written for the Governor. Those were his personal opinions, as the Premier well knows, and he was giving voice to the view of the overwhelming majority of the people in this State.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You haven't any right to say that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I have, because it was communicated to me that that was his view and that it would be communicated to the Premier.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You wrote the words.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly wrote the words, and the Governor indicated to me that he would put this to me personally, that he would also put it to the Leader of the Opposition, as he then was, and that this should be taken into account by everyone who was involved in the situation in this State. That was part of his duty as Governor concerned with the future of this State, as he then was.

The Government is now in office with a small minority of the people of this State supporting it. It has chosen to keep the House not sitting for a considerable period, and it now intends to sit only today and tomorrow and then to adjourn for a considerable period. We have urgent business before the House in the way of electoral distribution which ought to be taken into account immediately by the House. This is something the people in this State want to get settled, and settled promptly on a fair basis.

Mr. McAnaney: They want to get industry going again, first.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In consequence, we on this side are determined to do everything in our power to give effect to the clearly expressed wishes of the people of this State, and so we shall act accordingly in this House. We believe that it is necessary that government should be carried on and, therefore, we will not obstruct the working of government. We will, of course, take the opportunity to give expression in this House, as is our right, to the views of those people who put us here, and we require time in which to do it; but we will try to facilitate the working of government. In consequence, in the granting of pairs in this House it is the Opposition's attitude that Ministers will be granted pairs for essential Government business and, as a result, if the work of this House is not completed by the time the Premier and the Treasurer have to leave tomorrow for the Loan Council, naturally we shall grant them pairs for all purposes, so that they may attend that most important meeting.

Concerning pairs for members who are sick, we do not want to put members in the position that they have to come into the House in the extremity of illness in order to record a vote to save the Government. We do not want people carried in here on stretchers or to impose unreasonably on the needs of members when they are in extremities of illness (or when members of their families are, for that matter); but in each case of illness we will examine the situation according to the particular case and the surrounding circumstances, and we will negotiate for pairs in appropriate cases in this way. But we give no undertaking that we will simply abstain from using our strength in this House in circumstances where it may be possible for us to force the Government to account to the people if it does not carry out

the terms of the petition that has been presented to this House on behalf of so many scores of thousands of people in this State.

It has not been the practice of the Labor Party while it has been in Opposition to go in for carping criticism of the Government. We do not believe that everything that the Government does is necessarily wrong, although that seemed to be the attitude of members opposite when they were in Opposition. But, in consequence, while numbers of things have happened since the Government took office about which we could have said something publicly, we wanted to give them an opportunity to begin to make a showing on the things which they said to people prior to the election on March 2 were the basic policy on which they would govern South Australia.

We were told at election time that they were going to get South Australia moving again and three main matters were referred to. They said they would get South Australia moving again by building the Chowilla dam. This statement was without qualification: there was no question whether they would do their best to get the dam built—they would build it! Secondly, they were going to get South Australia moving again by improving the employment situation in the State, because they said that, as people here would have confidence in the Liberal Government, industrialists who might have been thinking of doing something else in the way of rationalizing their concerns would not do that, whereas they did not have confidence in the Labor Government. Thirdly, they said they were going to get South Australia moving again by improving the situation in the building industry.

As the Government has now been in office for some time, I believe we should look at each of those matters. Regarding Chowilla dam, on the last occasion Parliament met I immediately asked the Premier whether he intended to retain and maintain the instructions I had given to Mr. Beaney on behalf of the Labor Cabinet: that, if there were a move to defer the Chowilla dam for some other major storage or to defer it indefinitely, he was to vote against the proposition on the River Murray Commission and we were to go to arbitration about it. Certainly originally it had been necessary to get reports about salinity and its effects regarding Chowilla dam because, had we gone to arbitration without getting at least an interim report on the salinity, the arbitrator would have sent us back to get that information before he completed his inquiry.

Before the April meeting was held, the interim report of the salinity consultants was available. It was clear from the reports of our own engineers and from the evidence assembled that we were in a position to put evidence before the commission to show that Chowilla was a safe proposition for all concerned and that the up-river States would get from it the benefits that it was designed to provide for them. In these circumstances we had to insist upon our right to Chowilla, not as a mere alternative to some other Murray River storage but as something that was the pre-eminent right of South Australia, for we had traded other rights in order to get Chowilla, as Sir Thomas Playford pointed out feelingly to this House more than once. I could not get an undertaking from the Minister or from the Premier. One rambunctious and sabre-rattling statement appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser* to the effect that the Premier intended to fight for Chowilla; two Ministers, as well as the Commissioner, were sent off to the meeting, and South Australia's end was to be kept up. In fact, what happened was that instructions to the Commissioner were clearly withdrawn: they could not have been maintained or the decision could not have been what it was.

We are now in a position that the Chowilla storage is simply being looked at by the River Murray Commission as one of the alternatives in Murray River storage. It is not being looked at as though we had a pre-eminent right to it, as was the position South Australia had always maintained to that date. Until then it was not a question of alternatives—we had a pre-eminent right to that storage above any question of alternatives being built elsewhere. As that is the pass that has now been reached, if at some stage in the future (and it is a little hard to see how it will happen now) a dispute on the River Murray Commission is, in fact, created, we will be in a hopelessly weakened position to go before the arbitrator. What has happened in relation to getting South Australia moving again in building the Chowilla dam is that, instead of building it, the Government has sold the pass on the dam. The Premier said we did this in order to bring political influence to bear. The political influence we have seen the Premier bringing to bear in Canberra so far on this subject has not been very effective: we are certainly getting nothing out of it. He went on to see Sir Henry Bolte and we saw a fighting statement appear on the front page of the *Advertiser* that the Premier would prefer Chowilla dam to something else: he would

like it better. That election proposal about getting South Australia moving again has just not come to anything: we have been sold out on that one.

The next proposal was that South Australia's employment would improve, the argument put in this case at election time being that such confidence would be felt in the Liberal Government that inevitably employment would improve because investors would be prepared to proceed and industrialists to expand. This has not happened. After the Government had taken office, some works closed down in South Australia and people were thrown on the employment market. I do not say that was the Government's fault. Unlike members of the L.C.L. when we were in office, I take some note of what are the causes of this change in employment and do not simply ascribe it to the Government because it happens to be in office. However, the things the Government assured the people of South Australia would be allowed to occur because it took office just did not happen. Because the Premier was at the helm, the industrialists did not alter their view about employment in South Australia and the rationalization of their plant. I am afraid he did not give them the confidence that he told the people at election time he would be able to do. We now have a level of unemployment in South Australia of 1.7 per cent of the work force, which is above the average that applied for the whole period of the Labor Government and which used to drive members opposite to an absolute frenzy in this place from time to time. The Attorney-General used to get up here and nearly have a seizure on the back bench, being upset about the unemployment situation in South Australia, when a smaller percentage of the work force was unemployed than is the present case.

The Government intended to do something about the building industry, and it appears to have done one thing that we did not do. I waited for some time with bated breath to see what marvellous plan it would produce to get South Australia moving again in the building industry, for we used to have constant complaints from the Attorney-General and other members opposite about the state of that industry. We were told that something had to be done about this. We did some things for which the building industry had asked and we were interested to see what magic plan the Government intended to produce to get South Australia moving again in building. It has done one thing that we did not do: it has increased the maximum loan available from

Government supported sources. I am sure it has done this against the advice of the Under Treasurer, for I know what advice he constantly gave to me on this score. He advised me that if we did, in fact, increase the maximum sum of the loan no more money would be available to go around in this connection, and that the previous experience had been that, when an increase occurred in this way, the extra money was frequently needed to finance not housing but furnishings. In consequence, he believed (and he repeated this to me many times) that it was wise to get the maximum spread of loans to see that the maximum number of people received loans rather than to reduce the total loans by increasing the maximum sum available. However, apart from that (and so far that does not seem to have had much result in relation to building applications or approvals), nothing has been done. The announcements of an alteration in the proportions of expenditure by the Housing Trust on various classes of housing are the same announcements as were made many months before by our Government.

Mr. Hudson: With one exception.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What was that?

Mr. Hudson: That they will build more rental houses and fewer houses for sale.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We had announced, before the honourable member who just interjected became Minister of Housing, that we would build more rental houses, so I do not know that there is much variation in that regard. What is going to get the building industry going, and where is the plan? We have not heard of one. In the first 50 days of office of the Labor Government a whole series of announcements of our plans was made, and we gave effect to many of those plans during our term of office. The people of this State had every reason to be confident and excited about the future, because we were carrying out reform plans that we announced clearly during this period.

What has come from the present Government? Why are we not hearing about the things it intends to do to get South Australia moving? We want not nice words but specific proposals, which we have not had. True, the Premier has now become Minister of Industrial Development. However, the Industrial Development Branch was already attached to the Premier's Department, so I cannot see that this has significantly altered the situation. It is another title but it does not add anything administratively to the scheme of things.

What else is being done in the way of industrial development that had not already been undertaken by us? We had set up the Advisory Council on Industrial Development and the Industrial Development Branch and had brought in consultants to advise on industrial development and the potential for industrial development. What is the plan for getting South Australia moving that the Premier talks about? We cannot see it. In consequence, those people in South Australia who voted for the present Government cannot but be somewhat disappointed about the non-performance of the promises it made at election time.

I consider that this House must proceed immediately to get on with the business of electoral distribution and have a general election upon that basis so that any uncertainties in Government may be resolved and so that the people may have a clear and effective voice in this Parliament. I intend to do everything I can (and my Party will support me) to see that moves are carried into effect in this House to get just that. If the Government is not prepared to do anything reasonable about electoral reform, it will have to be called to account at the earliest possible moment, and we will do our level best to call it to account and let the people judge.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support my Leader's remarks. I think that one of the advantages that South Australia lost at the last State election was that it lost the State's best advocate at Loan Council and in discussions on Chowilla. In these days of greater centralization in Canberra, South Australia needs the sort of advocate that the Leader of the Opposition is. He has clearly and ably shown his ability as an advocate this afternoon. In fact, he has done it so well that little has been left to say in support. However, I shall say a few things, particularly about the matter that he dealt with first. Irrespective of what the Premier has said, this matter was the main issue at the by-election in Millicent. The position is strange. The Liberal and Country League said, in the Millicent campaign, that we were trying to hide the fact that I was a member of the Labor Party. However, I do not think anybody in the Millicent District did not know to what Party I belonged, but this is the type of thing the Liberal and Country League has been doing on occasions such as this. Such actions only reflect on the intelligence of the electors and, because of those actions, the result on Saturday was quite clear. Govern-

ment members said, "Corcoran does not want known that he is a member of the Labor Party."

Mr. Ryan: You are proud to be a member of it.

Mr. CORCORAN: I do not think I need say that, because I have already said it in Millicent and I have told the people why I am proud to be a member of the Labor Party. The main reason is its humanitarian principles and honesty. Be that as it may, Government members said, "Because Corcoran is a good fellow, or everybody thinks he is, they have to build the campaign around him, as they have done." I was supposed even to have "buried" the Leader of the Opposition, because I did not want him to be seen or heard! What rot! Indeed, it was a wonderful opportunity for the people in the Millicent District to get to know what sort of person the Leader of the Opposition, the people's Premier of this State, was. Many people were pleased to get that opportunity.

As the Leader has said, he addressed many meetings in the district, almost as many as I addressed, and those meetings were well attended by people who were extremely interested in what we said. Because of the intensive campaign that was conducted and the issues that were at stake, people listened with much interest and thought about the matters that were put before them. Whilst Government members said, amongst other things, that we were not clearly explaining our proposal regarding electoral reform and that our proposal would result in the loss of a seat in the South-East, at least we were prepared to state our proposal and to make clear that it provided for terms of reference to be placed before an independent commission which would not be required to report back to Parliament and the findings of which could not be altered by the Government to suit itself. We were more concerned, of course, about the Government's proposals in this regard because we knew that, if the Government won Millicent, it could implement its proposal.

Mr. Clark: Do you think it would have done that!

Mr. CORCORAN: I am certain it would. However, we could not find out what the Government's proposals were. They would only be in the Bill.

Mr. Ryan: They might be confidential!

Mr. CORCORAN: They are certainly confidential at this stage. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, the Premier has

excelled himself on this occasion by the inconsistency of his statements on this matter. We did not know what to say about the proposal because we did not know enough about it.

However, we knew about the only proposal that the Liberal and Country League had actually voted for; it was during the 1963-64 Parliament, not very long ago, and we knew what was involved in that. We heard the statement that no country city would be divided. The L.C.L. even took a bit off Mount Gambier the other night and called it Birdland. However, the bird flew and the action of the L.C.L. backfired. Actually, we wanted to be sure. Of course, everyone knows what happened: not one vote was counted anyway, and it was just a waste of time. However, when I heard how it originated I understood why it happened the way it did. The honourable member for Light had a lot to do with it.

Mr. Ryan: No wonder it was messed up!

Mr. CORCORAN: I know many people (indeed, the people of South Australia generally) are grateful to the electors of Millicent for the decision they made last Saturday, not because I was elected, but because of the arrogant attitude of the Premier in saying he would consider this as a mandate to do something that would affect every person in South Australia. He was going to ask about 4,000 people in Millicent District to decide this issue for the remainder of the State. As we all know, if the decision had gone its way, the Government would have perpetuated itself in office and we would not have been able to change Government for 30 years. The fact that the Government would not have been acceptable to the people—

Mr. McAnaney: Do you really believe that?

Mr. CORCORAN: Of course I do, and the honourable member can get up on his feet later and tell me where I am wrong.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McAnaney: You are great on figures.

Mr. CORCORAN: I have not mentioned figures. I have said what would have happened. I said that the people of Millicent made a wise decision last Saturday, and I believe, because they made that decision, it is fair and proper now for the Government to consider a conference with the Opposition on this matter. I was given to understand that immediately after the Leader of the Opposition (or the Premier as he then was) made the

announcement of the compromise plan, Mr. Hall (the then Leader of the Opposition), agreeably surprised with our action, said that he thought it was a good thing and that something useful could come of it; but he did not continue with it. Even now, in spite of Saturday's decision on which he was prepared to place so much weight, he is not prepared to compromise.

Mr. Hudson: He has gone back on his previous statements.

Mr. CORCORAN: There have been so many of them that it is difficult to know which one he has gone back on. I believe the Leader has dealt with this matter in great detail.

Mr. McAnaney: When did he go into detail? He missed out detail altogether.

Mr. CORCORAN: The honourable member would not have understood the detail outlined by the Premier, but it was outlined.

Mr. McAnaney: What about when he was talking to Barry Jones?

Mr. CORCORAN: I do not want to get involved in *Encounter* and take on the Government's chief spokesman who appeared on that programme, but I want to mention (and I wonder whether the Government treats politics seriously) statements such as the one emanating from the chief Government spokesman over *Talk Back* that the Millicent election was unfair because two Labor men were standing against their candidate! If he expects the people of the State to believe something like that, can anyone rely on him? I wonder whether the honourable member said it facetiously.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: No. There was an A.L.P. candidate and there was a D.L.P. candidate.

Mr. CORCORAN: That shows the people of this State how much credence can be given the honourable member's statement. We know that the entry of the D.L.P. candidate was not to win the seat but to defeat the A.L.P. candidate.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I don't know what his object was.

Mr. CORCORAN: The honourable member was even foolish enough to give the D.L.P. his second preference, and this made it clear.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It's a great pity that the A.L.P. can't heal a split in its own ranks.

Mr. CORCORAN: Does the Minister consider the people of this State so naive politically as to believe his statements?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: The split between yourselves and the D.L.P. is so—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Minister may speak on this matter later.

Mr. CORCORAN: I come now to something a little more serious, although that was serious enough. Certain Liberal canvassers (responsible people in responsible positions) came into the District of Millicent and went around quietly and effectively bringing out the old bogey of Communism. They quietly told people, particularly new citizens, that "this fellow is associated with the Communists".

Mr. Clark: That is their usual tactics.

Mr. Hudson: "Subject to the influence of Communism".

Mr. McAnaney: How would the new citizens know?

Mr. CORCORAN: They had a good instructor.

Mr. Clark: An old, experienced member.

Mr. Hudson: He is not an old man.

The SPEAKER: Order! Conversations are not allowed. The honourable member should address the Chair.

Mr. McAnaney: Perhaps the honourable member needs help.

Mr. CORCORAN: I do not need to be helped out by anyone. I express my disgust to the House on this matter. They are not playing the game fairly when they try this sort of tactic, which is not appreciated by any fair-minded person and which is designed to be nothing short of character assassination.

Mr. Clark: A despicable action.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, something that will not do them any good and I am glad it will not. I hope it will prove in the long term to these people that this sort of thing does not pay.

Mr. Casey: Do you think you got through to them?

Mr. CORCORAN: To be fair and just in the long term will always pay. I know it was not the L.C.L. candidate, and yesterday, at the declaration of the poll, I expressed complete satisfaction with his action. I am sure that, if he had known at the time what was going on, he would have objected to it, and I will go so far as to say that the Premier would have too. I hope the Premier is, as he stated in the newspaper, having the matter inquired into, because I will want to know from him the result of that inquiry. Indeed, as I am interested to know what will turn up in this inquiry, I will help by supplying him with evidence, if he so desires.

Mr. Clark: With names too?

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, but I do not think we need to go into that at present. I express my utter disgust at the tactics used and the way they were used. We are all concerned with the future of this State, and there is no particular point in the Premier's remark about getting the State moving. We know much has to be done, but I am as concerned as is the Leader of the Opposition that at present this Parliament is not working as it should be working. Apparently, we are to sit for a couple of days and then adjourn, but we do not know when Parliament will meet again.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You should read the newspaper.

Mr. CORCORAN: I have been busy for the last couple of weeks—even busier than you.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It is July 23.

Mr. Lawn: And finish on October 23.

Mr. Clark: How many times will that date be altered?

Mr. CORCORAN: Many necessary things, particularly in my district, need attention, although much attention has been paid to my district during the last few weeks. I am pleased to note the promises that have been made, particularly about the fishing industry and other matters, and I am looking forward to their being carried out. I want Parliament to sit so that this can be done, and that the transports that came to Robe and Beachport last week (I do not think they came to Port MacDonnell) will not this week carry back the stuff they brought. I do not want that to happen: I want to see that necessary things in my district are carried out. I conclude by saying how happy I am to be back in this place.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): It gives me much pleasure to join my Leader and to welcome back the Deputy Leader, and to agree with their remarks. I had the privilege of being in the Millicent District during the past few weeks, and I concur completely in their comments concerning the campaign, although I shall add to what has been said. With the member for Millicent, I was greatly disturbed and disappointed at the tactics adopted by the Liberal and Country League in an endeavour to smear a person whose name and reputation in the District of Millicent is beyond reproach. For members of the Government Party to suggest that the honourable member or any other member of the Australian Labor Party has any truck with Communism is getting down into the gutter. If these are the tactics

employed to win elections I suggest that the sooner some people get out of it the better.

I wonder how much of the vote that this Party lost at the election in March was caused by the same tactics? However, these tactics were not exposed then as they have been this time in the Millicent District. Full marks must go to the member for Millicent for his fine performance during the election campaign, and full marks must be given to everyone who assisted him. It is completely ludicrous for the Premier and others, and for the defeated candidate (and I do not wish to be unkind to him, because I believe he played a good role throughout), to say that the result on Saturday June '22 was a personal victory for Corcoran and not a victory for the Australian Labor Party. This statement is without foundation and savours of a rather childish attitude.

This campaign was started on the basis of electoral reform. The Leader of the Opposition, who today should be the Premier as he had 54 per cent of the electors support him on March 2, opened the campaign in Millicent by saying that the main issue in the election was electoral reform. The following evening the Premier said the same thing, and for our part we carried it through with electoral reform being the major issue. Of course, there were other aspects—fishing, road transport, and, finally, in the later stages someone prompted the candidate to throw in the abolition of the Legislative Council. Indeed, I think we might have finally convinced him that the Legislative Council should be abolished. Also, there was the question of the candidates themselves. The Government Party had cards showing "Cameron and family", whereas we emphasized Des Corcoran without the family. If one considers our propoganda and newspaper advertisements it will be found that we did not depart from electoral reform as our main objective, and we never suggested that the great name of the Australian Labor Party should be hidden. The net result was that 52.5 per cent of the people of Millicent wisely chose Des Corcoran to continue to represent them as member for the District of Millicent.

I wish to say something about the regrettable circumstances that arose yesterday concerning this by-election. I believe that what happened in this case is an indictment, and that the Attorney-General, as Minister in charge of the Electoral Act, should seriously consider this matter in order to prevent its recurrence at any future election in South Australia. Most members have some know-

ledge of the fiasco that occurred on Friday evening before the election, when at 5.15 p.m. the Returning Officer for Millicent informed our Party that a mistake that had existed for years had been discovered and that electors in an area on the outskirts of Mount Gambier were, in fact, included in the District of Millicent. I think the Government Party knew some time before 5.15 p.m., although I am not criticizing the Returning Officer for this, because he did an exceptionally good job. Several members opposite became just as wet and cold as I did, as we rushed to this area to try to influence this section of voters.

This happened at 5.15 p.m. on Friday. However, about half an hour later we received further information that not the complete area was involved but only part of it. We had already told the people that they were not only entitled to vote but were required to vote because of the provisions of the Electoral Act, and for these people it was not a matter of going just around the corner to a polling booth. Their nearest booth was four or five miles away, at Moorak. About 80 of these people travelled to the polling booth on Saturday, many, I am sure, at inconvenience to themselves. One person I spoke to on Friday said that he was leaving later that night and would not be back until Monday morning, and he therefore asked for a postal vote. This was at 7 p.m., yet the Act provides that no postal vote application can be received after 6 p.m., although the Electoral Department can alter the roll, presumably until 8 p.m., the closing time of the poll.

The Act contains no provision for an actual time, but section 32 gives the Registrar the right, irrespective of the issue of the writs, to go on altering the roll. I hope that the Attorney-General is prepared to go and tell all the people of this area, which is commonly known as Birdland, and to which the Deputy Leader referred just now, that despite the efforts made he was responsible through his administration, or lack of it, for the fact that not one vote of those people who travelled four to five miles (80 of them to Moorak) was counted, because they did not comply with a stupid requirement (or an interpretation) of the Electoral Act. That stupid requirement is that unless a request has already been made to the effect that the person concerned be enrolled on the Millicent subdivision he cannot be enrolled at the last minute.

It is just a question of how silly one can become with some of these interpretations or

directions. I have filled out many of these claim cards in my time, and I will plead guilty to never once having nominated the subdivision, because I believe that is the function of the Electoral Department. If those responsible do not know in which subdivision a person lives, how am I supposed to know? Surely, this is their job; they are responsible, and ought to be carrying out this function. In the first instance, to require these people (at inconvenience to themselves) to cast a vote at the eleventh hour, and then to go through much red tape and say that these votes will not be counted, is something for which the Attorney-General, as the administrator of the Electoral Act, should answer to these people of Birdland.

I refer also to another point which came out in the scrutiny and which is giving me much concern (and, again, I direct my remarks to the Attorney-General, as being responsible for the Electoral Act): people have applied for a postal vote certificate and ballot-paper and have filled in the normal application form, but have made no declarations concerning the grounds on which they make the claim. I understand that under instructions from the Attorney-General they are to be given a vote, and that means he is accepting the fact that applications made by males comply with paragraph (d), which states:

. . . that I will, by approaching maternity, be precluded from attending at any polling booth to vote.

I suggest that the Minister should ascertain who these people are, because they are terribly important. These people have, under instructions from the Attorney-General, been given a postal vote certificate but, in fact, the Commonwealth Electoral Office in similar circumstances returns the document, as it has not been filled in correctly and is incomplete.

Surely, that is the correct approach. After all, a declaration is involved, and I am wondering whether the Attorney-General in his legal practice would accept a half complete declaration on the assumption that those parts of it that are not crossed out all apply. I believe that the Attorney-General has a responsibility here to see that those people who have made such declarations should be made to account for them, and I suggest that we start off here with the person who is at present holidaying in Hong Kong and whose name happens to be Cameron.

I turn now to the enrolment card, because this matter finally caused the votes of the people in the Birdland area of Mount Gambier to be disallowed. I draw attention to

the claim card with the attesting signature on it, and I suggest that this joint claim card (used by both the Commonwealth and the State) should be carefully examined, because this involves the declaration relating to the claim that is required. I do not agree to the ruling given that if the document concerned has been addressed to the Electoral Registrar of the wrong subdivision it should become null and void. I believe that the black box on the card which is marked for official use by the Electoral Department in order to insert the name of the division and the district ought to apply equally to the subdivision. In fact, I suggest that less than 1 per cent of the population of South Australia would be able under normal conditions to nominate the subdivision in which they reside. These matters ought to be carefully examined.

I refer to a further matter concerning the Electoral Act and particularly to what occurred yesterday in the attempt, which was finally successful, to declare the poll. Unfortunately, some of my comments may be construed as criticism of the Returning Officer for the District of Millicent or, alternatively, the Returning Officer for the State, but I wish to make it quite plain that both of these persons carried out their tasks with complete satisfaction and most efficiently. However, they were greatly hampered by the instructions coming to them from Adelaide concerning how they should do certain things. In fact, it took about three hours to ascertain whether the Crown Law Office or the Attorney-General (I am not quite sure which) was prepared to allow the poll to be declared in less than seven days (because the Act provides that postal votes may be accepted up until seven days after the close of the poll). The other difficulty associated with this matter is that, provided the Returning Officer is satisfied that the outstanding ballot-papers will not affect the result, the Act allows the ballot to be declared with the concurrence of the Returning Officer for the State.

A suggestion exists that this refers only to ordinary ballot-papers and postal ballot-papers and does not include section 110a ballot-papers. The net result was that the whole matter concerning the latter ballot-papers had to be clarified before the poll could be declared. I think it is unreasonable that an attitude of this nature should be adopted, and I think that if the returning officers were allowed, without interference, to proceed with the tasks in front of them, this poll could have been declared much more

easily and with much less confusion than was the case yesterday. Unfortunately, many people had knocked off work in order to go to the declaration of the poll which, although advertised for 2 o'clock, did not take place until about 2.45, when all these formalities had been considered and when it was finally decided that section 110a ballot-papers would not be counted. I believe the situation has now been reached where it is imperative that the whole of the Electoral Act be thoroughly examined by those most competent to do so with a view to removing the many anomalies existing therein, particularly in relation to the declaring of polls. Regarding the transfer of people from one electoral roll to another at the eleventh hour at the recent Millicent by-election, I do not think anyone knows even now on which roll (whether Mount Gambier or Millicent) those people should be. For this to occur at such a late stage is unreasonable.

A further anomaly existing in relation to postal voting is that, although five grounds exist upon which a person can claim a postal vote, no real *bona fide* reason exists for a person who is required to work all day from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. (and, of course, this occurs) to apply for a postal vote certificate. The whole document should be burnt and another introduced, because I do not believe, in this instance, this matter involves the Electoral Officer, Returning Officer, or anyone else: if a person has a *bona fide* reason to have a postal vote certificate and is prepared to say so, he should receive the certificate and ballot-paper.

I turn now to the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition—electoral reform. I am disturbed, as he is, that Parliament will adjourn tomorrow and will not be able to deal with the most urgent business facing this State at present. During the last session a bundle of petitions was presented to the Parliament praying that urgent consideration be given to the matter of electoral reform. As the Leader said, and as I said earlier, this was a basic issue at the Millicent campaign, and yet Parliament will not consider it. The Premier has said he will not even have talks about it. However, at the start of the Millicent campaign he said that he would compromise if his Party lost that seat. He now says that he is not prepared to talk about compromise until the matter has been discussed in this place. I believe a pressing need exists for electoral reform to be fully discussed. We must attempt to get some public confidence back into the electoral system, because

confidence does not exist today. When a Government can be defeated although it has the support of 54 per cent of the people, something is wrong with the system. I should like to hear where Government members stand on this matter. Do they agree with the Prime Minister, who says that our guarantee of freedom is the ability to elect a Government which the majority wants and to dismiss it when the majority wants to do so, or do they follow their Leader, who does not subscribe to that view? Not only the Prime Minister, who is of the same political complexion as members opposite, but also the Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the Country Party expressed the view to which I have referred. This appeared in the press on June 7.

It would be interesting to see on State and Commonwealth levels what are the different attitudes to this question. If we believe in one vote one value on a Commonwealth level, how can we deny it on a State level? One vote one value has operated in the Commonwealth sphere since the Constitution was first enacted. An attempt at the Commonwealth level to alter this was made when the Commonwealth Electoral Act was amended only a couple of years ago. There has always been a provision where the Commonwealth Electoral Commissioners may depart from the one vote one value principle within a tolerance of 15 per cent, but they have never done it. They have always regarded the right of people as being the supreme governing factor in determining boundaries for the Commonwealth Parliament. It is ludicrous to say that there must be greater representation for country areas on the State level but that this is not necessary at a Commonwealth level. After all, we know that if we did not have a Commonwealth Government the States would be back in the position in which they were in the pre-1900 era when they all fought against one another. We would then be back in the days of passports at borders and people would have to report to a police station before moving from South Australia, for instance, into Victoria.

No-one has ever known or will ever know how to make out a logical case against the principle of the value of people. People are the most important consideration when it comes to determining representation, and, as has so often been said, as everyone must abide equally by the laws of the land everyone must have an equal say in the election of those that make the laws. It is to be hoped that when this issue is finally dealt with the

will of the majority will be effected so that, whenever 54 per cent of the people want to change the Government, their voice will be heard and acceded to irrespective of where they live.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I had hoped at this stage of the debate that we might have had a contribution from a Government member.

Mr. McAnaney: Give us something to reply to.

Mr. HUDSON: There is plenty to reply to: the matters raised this afternoon are of the greatest importance to the future of democracy in this State.

Mr. Lawn: Members opposite are not interested.

Mr. HUDSON: I should think they would have been interested in the consistency of the statements made by the Premier. Here we have a situation where, prior to the Millicent by-election, the Premier made it clear that if the Liberal and Country League won Millicent he would consider it an endorsement of his Party's plan, and if the Labor Party won Millicent he would consider it an endorsement of our Party's plan. However, immediately the by-election was over, the Premier retracted that statement, saying that it was only a personal victory for Mr. Corcoran and that electoral reform had nothing at all to do with it. I wonder whether the Premier was even in the Millicent District. We are told he spent some time there. If he did, then he must have known that electoral reform was the major issue of the whole by-election. It was certainly not shirked by the Labor candidate (and now member for Millicent), Mr. Corcoran. Every time I heard him speak he made electoral reform the principal issue. Also, he did not shirk the principle of one vote one value, at meetings or on television. If any elector of Millicent did not know where Mr. Corcoran and the Labor Party stood on the matter of one vote one value and on the amount of additional weight that could reasonably be given to country electors, then he could not have paid any attention to the speeches made, to the reports of those speeches, to the television segments and, indeed, to the television debate that took place. Most of that television debate between Mr. Cameron and Mr. Corcoran was taken up in dealing with electoral reform. Therefore, the Premier's statement that electoral reform had nothing to do with the Labor Party's victory at the Millicent by-election was a lot of hogwash and another example of the Premier's

saying one thing prior to an election and another thing afterwards. We have had other cases of that, and it is most disturbing. We have had it in relation to the Chowilla dam, with which I shall deal later. If the Premier continues this sort of performance, he will be providing a standard by which the people of South Australia will judge him as someone whose credibility cannot be accepted. If he persists in making statements, and later ignoring and either retracting or contradicting them, his credibility quotient with the people will fall to an all-time low. I now want to deal with the Attorney-General and his action in filching from the Government Printer a copy of Labor's Bill on electoral reform. The Leader of the Opposition has dealt with the abuse of privilege involved in that matter and I do not think it necessary to reiterate his remarks, but I fully support them.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Do you really?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. When did a similar breach of confidence ever take place previously? Is the Attorney-General prepared to tell this House that at any time he will order the Government Printer to provide copies of Bills prepared for members opposite and demand that they be shown to me?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I am prepared to get up in this House, as I hope I shall do later, and say that there was no breach of confidence.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Attorney-General says that, the Opposition can only say that it has no trust in him or in his administration of his department and that we have no assurance that he will not demand access to material that we require to be drafted by the Parliamentary Draftsman before it is presented to Parliament. Have I the right to demand from the Government Printer copies of Bills being prepared for the Attorney-General? This was a private matter, as the Attorney-General well knows. Further, the Attorney-General had the gall, on television, to misread the Bill and to be dishonest about it. Let me bring this home to the Attorney-General. I suffered his remarks again last night, because a friend of mine took them on tape, and the Attorney-General had read from the Bill to indicate that it required tolerances in country districts of from 15 per cent below the quota to 10 per cent above the quota. That was said, and it was not true.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I read it word for word.

Mr. HUDSON: The Attorney-General said that it provided for a tolerance of from 15 per cent below the quota to 10 per cent above the quota. That was incorrect, but he did not correct the statement then and has not done so since. The words used in the Bill are as follows:

... dividing the non-metropolitan area into electoral districts each containing a number of electors being (i) not less than a number equal to the quota less 15 per centum thereof; and (ii) not more than a number equal to the quota less 10 per centum.

It is therefore clear that country districts would all be below the quota by between 10 per cent and 15 per cent. That immediately implies that all metropolitan districts will have to be above the quota, because that is needed in order to provide an overall balance so that all electors are catered for by a number of districts equal to 48. Secondly, it is necessary because of a provision in the Bill that metropolitan districts shall be substantially the same in numbers as country districts.

Mr. McAnaney: The Leader was wrong in what he said today, wasn't he?

Mr. HUDSON: No, and I shall give the arithmetical details for the member for Stirling to absorb so that he will know what it is all about. If we divide the 610,000 electors in South Australia by 48, we get a quota of 12,700. A provision of 15 per cent below the quota gives 10,795.

Mr. McAnaney: You would have to take an average of 12½ per cent. You have taken the maximum, and you have been to a university!

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. HUDSON: We do not take an average in this case. If the honourable member listens, he may learn. The figure of 15 per cent below the quota gives 10,795 and 10 per cent below the quota makes the upper limit 11,430, so every country seat would have to comprise between 10,795 and 11,430 voters. Further, the metropolitan area of the State having been defined, we then get a definition of the non-metropolitan area, and there would be in that area about 186,000 voters, but the number cannot be stated precisely, because the matter is left to the commission.

Mr. McAnaney: Where do you get the 30-mile radius?

Mr. HUDSON: That would take us north of Gawler, to Strathalbyn as the crow flies, and well inland from Adelaide. The commission is required to define the urban areas in that radius of 30 miles, which radius is

adequate provision for the present metropolitan area as well as for future expansion. The radius was selected so that there would be generous provision for future expansion.

Mr. McAnaney: You are generous, you have about 20,000 more than there are.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling is, on occasions, a complete nincompoop. Not all that area within a radius of 30 miles is within the metropolitan area. If the honourable member sits down with the Attorney-General and goes through the Bill word by word, he will see that the commission is required to define those contiguous areas within a radius of 30 miles that are or, taking into account trend of population changes in future development, are likely to be used for residential, commercial or industrial purposes, or any combination of all or any of those purposes. That excludes much of the area within the 30-mile radius of the centre of Adelaide, so not all of that area would be in the metropolitan area. The best estimate I can make is that about all the residents of the Gawler District (about 39,000) would come into the metropolitan area, that about 12,000 to 15,000 from the Barossa District would come in (although, perhaps, that is excessive, but some portion of that district, comprising Tea Tree Gully, Highbury and Modbury would come in), that some of those in the Gouger District, namely, those in the subdivision of St. Kilda, would come in, and that those in the Morphett Vale and Christies Beach areas would come from the District of Alexandra. There might also be a few from the Onkaparinga District that would fall within the definition of "metropolitan area". However, defining it that way one finds there are about 186,000 electors in the non-metropolitan area of the State. The problem then is to find a whole number that will divide into 186,000 and produce an answer between the two limits of 10,795 and 11,430. The answer one would get for the quota would be 10,940, which would be the average number in each country district, and up to the 15 per cent tolerance would give 17 seats. This would give for the 31 remaining districts a quota of 13,680. Therefore, the average metropolitan district would cover 13,680 people, and the country districts would average 10,940 electors, a discrepancy of 2,740 or almost exactly 25 per cent greater numbers in each metropolitan district compared with a country district. The member for Stirling will admit, I hope, that the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon used the figure of 25 per cent.

This has to be worked out precisely. One cannot take 12½ per cent below the quota and 7½ per cent above: one has to work out precise numbers because there will be only one whole number that will divide into 186,000 and give an answer between 10,795 and 11,430. If the member for Stirling cares to do that arithmetical exercise, he will find he has made a mistake, which the Leader of the Opposition has corrected this afternoon. He will find also that the Attorney-General was dishonest on the *Encounter* programme. Either the Minister is a fool or he has deliberately misread the Bill. I prefer to think he is not a fool, which means he has misread the Bill. He said on *Encounter*, "It is just the principle of one vote one value and gives no weight to the country at all." However, that is incorrect. Later, in the same programme the Attorney-General said, "Of course, the only principle you can use is the principle of one vote one value, but because of the difficulties of representation of the country, some additional weight has to be given to the country." The inference was that this did not apply in the A.L.P. Bill, but that it does here: there is an effective weighting of 25 per cent, which is in line with what exists in the Eastern States, where metropolitan districts are 30 per cent greater in numbers than country districts. That is the average discrepancy, and that is the kind of discrepancy we propose here.

Therefore, the charges against the Attorney-General are two-fold: first, that he abused the privileges of members of this House by demanding from the Government Printer a copy of the Bill; and, secondly, that having obtained a copy of the Bill he proceeded to misrepresent it on television, and continued to distort it throughout the election campaign, attempting to use it to falsify the position before the electors of Millicent. I challenge any member opposite to demonstrate that on electoral reform the Labor position was not falsified by the L.C.L. before the electors of Millicent.

We have also been challenged in relation to the L.C.L. plan: as to whether it will not keep the current Government in power for 30 years. If the L.C.L. plan provided for 20 country districts substantially equal in numbers to each other, and 25 metropolitan districts substantially equal in numbers to each other, then it would not keep the L.C.L. in office until the next century. However, no member opposite has suggested that that is the plan. No-one knows the score, and the only statements we have heard are the Premier's and they make it clear that no country city should be divided.

The city of Whyalla already has 14,000 electors and within a few years it will have 17,000 or 18,000. Therefore, the Premier's remark that no country seat is to be divided means that Whyalla is to get a quota, within a few years, of about 18,000.

The only other thing we have to act on is Sir Thomas Playford's 1963-64 proposal which combined Whyalla with part of Port Augusta, combined Port Pirie with the remaining part of Port Augusta, and gave those cities quotas of over 12,000, when the average country quota was about 7,200: in other words, a gerrymander in a country area itself. What was said was that, if the metropolitan area was to be given more say because of the present circumstances, then the problem would be solved by crippling the effect of Labor voters in country areas wherever they are to be found by creating larger quotas for country industrial seats. Apparently, it is not enough to have a gerrymander as between city and country: we have to have another in the country area itself, which gives a greater weight to the country elector who tends to vote L.C.L. and lives in a purely rural area, and a lower value to the country voter who lives in a city and who tends to vote Labor. If that is not a weighted system to give an added advantage to the L.C.L., I do not know what is.

The member for Stirling and his colleagues may care to do the exercise and see what would happen under his Party's proposals if, instead of having four seats around Spencer Gulf each with about 9,300 electors, we are reduced to two country industrial seats each with a quota of 15,000 or 16,000 electors. If the same thing happened at Mount Gambier, with a higher quota there, the honourable member would find that the Labor Party could be confident of winning only three of the 20 country seats at any election. That would be the effect of the gerrymander in the country areas. Under a system such as that proposed by the L.C.L., where the Labor Party could win, because of the gerrymander in the country area, only three of the 20 seats, in order to form a Government we would need to win 20 of the 25 metropolitan seats and, to get a constitutional majority, we would need 21 out of the 25.

If members opposite are prepared to accuse us of saying things about their policy that they say are not true, then they should get on to the Premier and make him explain to the people that he will not introduce a gerrymander within the country area itself. Make

him tell the people of South Australia that he will not give less weight to the vote of country voters in industrial towns outside Adelaide merely because they vote Labor.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What about Frome?

Mr. HUDSON: There is nothing about Frome in relation to this Bill.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What are you getting at in your remarks?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I should not think the member for Frome would be happy about it.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member is capable of speaking for himself, but from talks I have had with him I think that you will find he will support this proposition.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: There was a release clause in the last Bill.

Mr. HUDSON: The Attorney-General has the hide of a rhinoceros. He knows that he has abused the privileges of the House and that he has been dishonest on television and dishonest on *Talk Back*, yet he comes back with a counter charge.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: As an old friend, how can the honourable member say that?

Mr. HUDSON: I said that the Attorney-General was either a fool or had deliberately misled the people on the *Encounter* programme.

Mr. Clark: And you don't think he is a fool.

Mr. HUDSON: I said I did not think he was a fool, and that brings us to a question of deliberate deception.

Mr. McAnaney: You used to win country seats—why not now? You won't win them in future?

Mr. HUDSON: Does not the honourable member remember what happened last Saturday?

Mr. McAnaney: What about Chaffey and Wallaroo? Are you still kicking the country people?

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members should keep conversation for the lobby outside, not in the Chamber.

Mr. HUDSON: I would not regard what the member for Stirling says as being conversation. It is a bull-like interjection that comes thrusting across the Chamber, and it is hard to ignore. However, if he divided 186,000 by 20, as would result from his Leader's proposals, he would get an average of 9,300.

Mr. McAnaney: You are wrong with your arithmetic this time.

Mr. HUDSON: If one divides 186,000 by 20 the answer is 9,300.

Mr. McAnaney: We are defining the new metropolitan area.

Mr. HUDSON: Does that go 30 miles east of Adelaide?

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! Under Standing Orders I do not intend to allow interjections. When he speaks the member for Stirling is quite capable of answering any allegation.

Mr. HUDSON: I doubt that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member doubting the Speaker?

Mr. HUDSON: No, but I doubt your assessment of the member for Stirling. I am not aware of any definition of the metropolitan area in the Town Planning Act that goes 30 miles east of Adelaide, so that would leave significantly fewer than 186,000 in the non-metropolitan area of the State. I should like to see the precise figures, because I believe that the people of Millicent and of South Australia were misled by the L.C.L. when they were told that, under its plan, the average quota would be 8,500 for country districts. It is more likely to be 9,300. If the member for Stirling tries a tentative distribution under what is likely to be his Party's proposal, he will realize full well that the Districts of Wallaroo and Murray would be cut up and that the District of Chaffey would have an additional number of electors, and in each case the effect would be to make it almost impossible for the Labor Party to win these seats.

Members opposite will find out our ability to win seats in Murray and Chaffey if we fight them on the same boundaries, but that also applies to the seats of Alexandra and Gouger. However, we are speaking about boundaries drawn up under the L.C.L. proposal and, because of the way they would be applied, we would have no chance in Murray or in Wallaroo. It is now up to the Premier to make a straight statement which he will not contradict later and which will be truthful and not mislead people. We have already had examples of contradictory statements by the Premier during the Millicent by-election, and we have a further example of considerably greater magnitude in relation to the Chowilla dam.

I believe that at the time of the last election the Premier knew full well the extent of the opposition in other States and in the Commonwealth Parliament to the Chowilla proposal.

He knew the provisions of the River Murray Waters Agreement, which meant that South Australia alone could not build Chowilla dam. He knows now (and he knew then) that the agreement of the other States and of the Commonwealth had to be obtained, yet he was prepared to say prior to the last election, "We will build Chowilla dam" and "Elect us and we will get on with Chowilla." The first thing he did as Premier was to withdraw the previous Government's instructions to Mr. Beaney to vote against any deferment or indefinite postponement of Chowilla which would have created a dispute on the agreement and forced the issue to arbitration. That was the only way we had of asserting our rights on the building of the Chowilla dam and it is the only way we have of preventing the other parties to the Chowilla agreement from repudiating that agreement. Last year, during the debate on the Chowilla dam, when the Premier was in Opposition his attitude was different. "We must not consider any alternative" was the line he took then, and his attitude is best expressed in the words of Sir Thomas Playford in that debate. The *Hansard* record of the debate states:

However, it has no right to say that some other proposition shall be substituted for Chowilla. Chowilla has been approved after two investigations by the commission. The commission has no right to say that it intends to consult a computer to ascertain whether the computer has another idea. The commission has a duty to carry out the agreement of 1963, which specifically provided for the dam.

Mr. Hall: There is no mention of an alternative.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. The works in the original agreement are set out in clause 20, which in 1963 was amended by paragraph 8 to include the provision of a storage in the agreement referred to as the Chowilla reservoir on the Murray River between Renmark and Wentworth, with a capacity of about 4,750,000 acre feet of water and with a roadway along the top of the containing dam, referred to in the agreement as the Chowilla dam, and with provision for vessels drawing 4ft. 6in. of water to pass. The commission is completely out of line when it talks about looking for substitutes, because it has no right to do that.

At that point the member for Angas interjected and said, "That is *ultra vires*." The Premier said earlier in the debate that we must do all we could to have the Chowilla dam completed and that alternative works should not be referred to, and the Treasurer made a similar claim. This was at a time when all that had happened was that the River Murray Commission had deferred the acceptance of any tender. At that stage it was still possible

that we might get the River Murray Commission to accept the tender, and the gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches were, one and all, screaming their heads off in this House about South Australia's right to the Chowilla dam—"We must insist on the agreement; we must create the dispute; we must not prefer an alternative of any description"! Government members used that line again in their election propaganda which made the people of South Australia believe that if they only elected the L.C.L. to power the Government would see to it that the Chowilla dam was built. However, as soon as the Liberal Party comes into power the story is different; as soon as it is in power we in South Australia vote for the repudiation of the River Murray Waters Agreement. We supported New South Wales, Victoria and the Commonwealth in voting for the deferment of Chowilla (an indefinite postponement of it) and for the investigation of an alternative site on the Mitta Mitta River.

When we read the speeches in the Commonwealth Parliament made by Mr. Fairbairn, Senator Scott or Senator Cormack, we see quite clearly that they have accepted the fact that the Chowilla dam is dead; they have accepted the fact that South Australia believes that the Chowilla dam is dead, because of the River Murray Waters Agreement. South Australia, under the instructions of this Government, voted for a deferment and for the investigation of an alternative. As the Leader of the Opposition made it quite clear this afternoon, by voting for the investigation of alternative works on the Murray River, we have weakened our case for possible arbitration should a dispute be created in future. As the Leader said, it is a little difficult to work out how that can be done, but should a dispute be so created our position in relation to any arbitration has been seriously weakened. What has happened about Chowilla is that the other States and the Commonwealth Government have repudiated the River Murray Waters Agreement, and South Australia has voted for that repudiation. The Premier stands up in public and makes it quite clear to the people of South Australia that his statements made during the election campaign meant nothing at all.

In fact, he now tries to tell us that he is really seeking to save the Chowilla dam politically. I suggest to honourable members opposite that they read some of the remarks made by members of the Commonwealth Parliament about the Chowilla dam, that they

really assess some of the opposition there, and see how far they will get with Chowilla by employing political means behind the scene. South Australia will never get Chowilla unless we fight for it and unless we do the kind of thing that Sir Thomas Playford did in order to obtain the Chowilla agreement in the first place. As he often explained in this House, it was only under the threat of action against the Commonwealth Government in relation to the diversion of the upper waters of the Murray River through the Snowy scheme (and therefore interference with South Australia's rights), and it was only by the serving of writs, that we obtained agreement to the Chowilla dam in the first place. If Government members think that the policy they are currently following, which is completely out of line with what they told the people prior to the election, will be successful, I suggest they have another think coming.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I suggest if Sir Thomas had been in power in the intervening three years we would probably have had it built by now.

Mr. HUDSON: That is a good suggestion; how he would have coped with the problem of increased costs is another matter. Nevertheless, the people of Berri applauded when one person on the platform said, "If only Sir Thomas Playford were Premier now, everything would be all right", and there were polite claps, including claps from the current Premier. I do not think that Sir Thomas Playford could necessarily have been regarded as the saviour now, or even as the saviour over the last three years, but I think the line he adopted originally, forcing the Commonwealth into the Chowilla agreement, was the correct one, namely, that these people would not go ahead with something which was so much in South Australia's interests unless they were forced into it. We are now saying that not only is the current Government's line wrong: it is completely contrary to what the Government told the people during the campaign.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Why didn't you follow Sir Thomas's line when you took over?

Mr. HUDSON: We did; we instructed Mr. Beaney to go ahead and create the dispute.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You let it go to sleep for two years.

Mr. HUDSON: That is not the case; the Treasurer well knows that serious problems existed in relation to it. Indeed, the Treasurer

last year said at page 1279 of *Hansard*, "However, I believe that the project started to lose momentum in 1962."

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I did not say that.

Mr. HUDSON: The Treasurer did; it is here in *Hansard*, and he never corrected that. I heard him say it, and I remember listening carefully to that debate.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I missed it in the proof, I am sorry.

Mr. Lawn: We heard him say that.

Mr. HUDSON: I remember hearing the Treasurer say it. He also said that the position had deteriorated ever since then and that it had been a continuous process since 1962.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the honourable member should address the Chair.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Treasurer knows full well that he made that remark: that the Chowilla project had experienced serious technical difficulties from 1962 onwards, and that those technical difficulties had to be resolved. Furthermore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the solution to these technical difficulties is one of the basic reasons for the increased costs of the project, and basically it is the question of costs that resulted in the other States and the Commonwealth renegeing on the agreement before the River Murray Commission. I regret that the pamphlet which the Government has produced, and which was announced with a great flurry last week (I presume to impress certain people in a certain part of the State), has not been made available to members. I hope it contains information that will instruct the Premier on some details in relation to the dam, because the Premier needs to do his homework on this matter. If he intends to argue the case for South Australia, he should know the main details of the proposals and the reasons why the other States originally agreed to them.

He should understand that the Chowilla agreement has advantages for New South Wales and Victoria, so long as the salinity of the Murray River around Mildura is not a problem. Basically, it was these advantages that led New South Wales and Victoria originally to support the scheme. The Chowilla agreement meant that South Australia's entitlement to Murray River water in a dry year could be supplied from the Chowilla dam and that, therefore, New South Wales and Victoria would not have to make the same releases from up-river storages as they make now in order to supply South Australia's entitlement.

Therefore, in a dry year building of the Chowilla dam would mean more water available for use in New South Wales and Victoria. Last year was a dry year and salinity at Mildura was a problem. Extra releases of water had to be made to maintain a flow at Mildura in order to solve that salinity problem.

If, in a dry year, water had to be released from up-river storages in order to maintain the quality of the water at Mildura, New South Wales and Victoria would cease to gain the benefit from Chowilla dam. It was that salinity problem in particular, and also the increased cost, that caused New South Wales and Victoria to ask for further investigations and a postponement last year of any acceptance of tenders, but at that stage no deferment of the whole project was made. The investigations since then and the report handed to the River Murray Commission (even if it is only a preliminary report) demonstrated clearly that the salinity problem could be solved, and the Commonwealth Government has already made available a significant sum (\$3,600,000) for two projects (one in the neighbourhood of Mildura and another, the location of which I have forgotten) to remove about 10,000 tons of salt a year that would otherwise go back into the Murray River. I am sure that the salinity consultants being employed by the commission will demonstrate that other projects can be carried out that will keep the salinity effectively under control in dry years.

I have not heard the Premier make any public statement putting clearly that, once salinity was under control, New South Wales and Victoria would get the full advantage they expected to get from the Chowilla dam through not having to maintain the normal flow of water past Mildura in a dry year because South Australia's entitlement could be supplied from the Chowilla reservoir. I believe that the basic facts involved in the Chowilla scheme are not fully understood by the Premier; I hope that his colleagues will see to it that he reads the pamphlet. I shall certainly look forward with interest to reading the pamphlet because I hope that it fully explains our position and that it argues the case effectively to convince people in the other States that, so long as salinity is controlled, they can expect to get the full benefits that they originally expected to obtain from the building of the Chowilla dam. We cannot hope to get their agreement to Chowilla unless we can convince them that they stand to get real benefits from it.

So far there has been a campaign to talk to our Commonwealth members. However, I invite members to read through the speeches of Commonwealth members from this State in the House of Representatives and the Senate and to see whether one of them effectively explains the case for Chowilla or whether one of them effectively explains that Chowilla means benefits for New South Wales and Victoria. Members in the State Parliaments of New South Wales and Victoria, and those representing New South Wales and Victorian districts in the Commonwealth Parliament, have stated, in effect, that Chowilla is just a South Australian project and that it has no advantages other than to South Australia. Of course, it has tremendous advantages for South Australia, but it has advantages to the other States as well and, so far, the true story of Chowilla has not been put across. I can give examples that make it clear that these members do not understand the position.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: One of the most damaging statements was made by the Minister for National Development himself.

Mr. HUDSON: That is right. Also, there is the statement of Senator Scott. I shall read one of the more vicious remarks made, and this came from Senator Cormack.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: He is wide out, too.

Mr. HUDSON: His is the standard type of argument that is commonplace in the Commonwealth Parliament.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I know what he said.

Mr. HUDSON: Does the Minister know this little gem? It appears at page 1336 of Commonwealth *Hansard*, as follows:

South Australia has become emotionally debauched by the word "Chowilla". Politicians are streaming all over South Australia—at least figuratively in my mind. Marching at the head of the caravan is someone carrying a great banner with the word "Chowilla" written across it. As the caravan nears a town its members chant, "Chowilla, Chowilla". So it has now become an emotional matter and not an engineering problem.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Don't you think that discounts the whole force of his speech, if there ever was any force in it? That is just rubbish.

Mr. HUDSON: Nobody effectively challenged him on it nor did anybody effectively challenge Mr. Fairbairn when he said that any project other than Chowilla would involve advantages at least as great as those afforded by Chowilla. These members have been going around saying this sort of thing,

and the Premier has not challenged them. He demonstrated clearly at a meeting in Berri, at which I spoke on the same platform, that he did not even understand the details of it.

Mr. Lawn: But he said it must go on!

Mr. HUDSON: He said that, but I assure the honourable member that I was not impressed. A further factor operating, particularly in relation to the Victorian members of the State Parliament or Commonwealth Parliament, is also illustrated by Senator Cormack when he says:

I must confess that when I went to Adelaide and saw hundreds of lawns being watered by sprinklers day and night and subsequently returned to Melbourne to find trees were dying and the great gardens of Melbourne had become parched deserts, I wondered what in the name of heaven was going on.

That is the kind of extreme opposition to Chowilla that can be run into in the Commonwealth Parliament, and not one member from New South Wales or Victoria can be effectively counted as a supporter of the project. Not one of the South Australian members has effectively put up the true arguments that can be put in favour of Chowilla. I shall be interested in this pamphlet when it is made available: I hope it is not a damp squib.

One other matter I wish to raise (and I am glad to see the Minister of Housing is in the Chamber, because it concerns him) is the reported statement of the Minister the other day to the effect that he saw no value and no real merit in the proposal announced by the previous Government to establish a Home Buyers' Advisory Centre. I hope he will reconsider his decision on this matter, first because it is simply not correct (as he suggested in the public statement he made in the *Advertiser* about two weeks ago) that the Housing Trust can effectively perform this function. It cannot perform the function of effectively advising people in relation to financial and legal problems involved in buying a house unless people are making legitimate inquiries about buying a house from the trust itself. This matter was fully discussed by Mr. Ramsay and me when I was Minister of Housing. If the trust provided these facilities generally to the public, advising certain people not to sign a particular private agreement drawn up by some private real estate agent because of onerous legal terms or because of the financial provisions involved, and if certain private agents and builders lost contracts to the Housing Trust as a result of advice which the trust had given to people who came along, we could imagine

the fuss that there would be. We can imagine the cry of unfair competition, a cry which has been raised on many other occasions. I suggest to the Minister of Housing that the trust is not in a position to give that sort of advice to the public generally unless members of the public come along to it and make legitimate inquiries about buying a Housing Trust house. I must say also that I was disappointed to see an announcement by the current Government the other day (I think it was announced by the Premier) that, while it was going to build more rental houses, it intended to reduce the building of sale houses by the Housing Trust. So far as the home buyers' advisory service provided by the trust is concerned, if the trust has fewer sale houses available it will get fewer inquiries, so its ability to provide this sort of advice for its own customers will certainly be less. I hope the current Minister and the Government will not be foolish enough to think that if the Housing Trust builds fewer houses for sale it will necessarily mean more houses built for sale by private builders not working under contract with the trust, because this will not be the case. The finance used by the Housing Trust in providing houses for sale and the mortgage finance made available to its customers are not interchangeable. So, if we reduce the number of houses built by the Housing Trust for sale to people, fewer houses will be built overall. That is a consequence, because some part of the finance that would normally be made available to the Housing Trust will not be available, and I suggest again that there should be further investigation into that matter.

The Minister of Housing in his statement to the *Advertiser* on this matter of the Home Buyers' Advisory Centre proposed by the previous Government also announced that one fault of the scheme was that banks already provided adequate services. So far as financial terms are concerned, in part they do, but they by no means provide adequate services. I have run into a number of cases (and I am sure other metropolitan members can confirm this) of constituents of mine (in this case) who went to the Savings Bank of South Australia and got on to the waiting list for a loan (they did not have the credit rating to go anywhere else but the Savings Bank of South Australia) and then purchased a house. They asked the Savings Bank to inspect the house to see whether it qualified for a Savings Bank loan. They were told that houses were inspected only when their turn came on the waiting list. This person (and this happened twice) went ahead and purchased the house with temporary

finance and, when his turn came for a Savings Bank loan and the house he purchased was inspected by the Savings Bank people, they said, "A house of this age and of this particular construction is not a house on which we can lend money." This person managed to keep up the payments involved in this case with a second mortgage and with temporary finance until his turn came with the Savings Bank. He was not able to keep his payments going permanently. The result was that in the end there had to be a forced sale of the house over his head, and it was sold at a much lower price than he paid for it. It was sold at auction. They were people who started off with some \$1,400 saved to put down on a house, and they ended up owing money.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: If you give me the confidential information on that case, I shall be happy to look it up.

Mr. HUDSON: This happened two years ago.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: If you give me the information on it, I shall be glad to look into it.

Mr. HUDSON: I shall be asking the Minister later to take up these matters with a view particularly to seeing to it that the banks (not just the Savings Bank of South Australia, but banks in general) provide a better service to prospective house buyers, because here we are dealing with what is to most people the biggest financial transaction they ever make in their lives.

Mr. Corcoran: The only one, for most people.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and if it goes wrong and they have dealt with a company that has landed them in what may be called a crooked contract from the legal point of view and they cannot get out of it, or if they find that ultimately they cannot get a bank loan and all this is the result of not having had proper advice made available to them, then the consequence is that they have "done" their life savings. I suggest to the Minister that, even if the Home Buyers' Advisory Centre was able to give advice to only a dozen prospective house buyers a year (and there would be many more than that) and even if it helped people only to make sensible financial decisions, it would be doing a good job and would fully justify the State's expenditure on establishing such a centre. I hope the Minister will reconsider what I think was a rash decision without a proper and full investigation of all the implications currently existing in house purchase.

If it was not a rash decision, it was a wrong-headed one. Perhaps the Minister will consider going to Victoria, because the Victorian Government has what it calls a Home Purchasers' Advisory Council which it established and supports and of which it is very proud. It provides a considerable service to the people of Victoria. If necessary, I am prepared to get the information from Victoria about what is done there, if that will help to convince the Minister. After all, they are all good, pure Liberals in Victoria; they are purer than the Liberals here. There is some pretence of "one vote one value" there.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: There are two Labor Parties over there.

Mr. HUDSON: The Attorney-General had better look out in future. He has to remember that he does not owe his position to Caucus, to a vote by his colleagues: he owes his position to "the boss"; loyalty to the boss is the No. 1 consideration. I am sure that back-benchers opposite must realize that in order to get promotion in the Liberal Party loyalty to the boss is essential, because he has tremendous power. Honourable members had better ask the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) about the boss's power if they do not believe what I am saying. The member for Albert (and this is my final grievance), one of the best educated and most able men in the Government Party, did not get a Ministerial position. I am sure that members opposite will agree with me when I say that he did not get it because he would not kowtow to the boss. Honourable members can laugh it off. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, know full well that every position involving remuneration that is occupied by a member of the Government Party is a personal appointment by the Premier, and that includes yours, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am prepared to take up the cases of the back-benchers who have missed out; in fact, we on this side will act as their union secretary! Members opposite ought to change the system because their Premier has too much power within the Party. If a man is given too much power, he will use it dictatorially. Power corrupts and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. Honourable members opposite should have had enough experience of the power used by the last Liberal Premier, Sir Thomas Playford: they know what they had to do in those days. They know what would have happened if they had not behaved themselves and if they had spoken out of turn. I thought they would change their system. In contrast with the Labor Party's system of

Caucus selection, the Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party appoints all the Ministers and the Chairman of Committees—and he would have appointed the Speaker if a deal had not been made. He also appoints the Whip and the members representing the Government on the Public Works Committee, and so on. I say in all sincerity to the new members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party: "You will have to watch your step if you want promotion, you will have to get on with the right people, and you will have to become friendly with the fellows that are friendly with the Premier; better still, get friendly with the Premier himself."

I have one other grievance: it is that the band outside Parliament House played *Under the Apple Tree* during the opening ceremony. I realize there are a number of people in South Australia who would prefer an apple-grower to the current Premier, but I think it is rather disloyal that the band should make this public.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): Unlike my valued colleague, the honourable member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), I am not surprised for two reasons that we have not had a speaker from the other side. The first reason is that the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader, the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo), and the member for Glenelg have produced a case or cases to which there are no answers. Secondly, I believe that the Government members, being as cowardly as they are, will wait until they think no more Opposition members will speak and then, knowing there will be no challenge, they will come in and reply. I compliment the member for Glenelg on the magnificent case he made out with regard to the Chowilla dam. I had intended to say a good deal on this subject, but I shall now make much briefer remarks.

We have a genuine grievance in that the Government has shown its lack of interest and its complete disregard for the many members of the public who signed a petition asking for a redistribution of electoral boundaries and a fresh election on those new boundaries. I am perturbed that the Premier has said that the Labor Party is satisfied, and has been satisfied, with the existing electoral system. I have been in this House for 18 years and have sat through six Parliaments, and I can say that there has not been one Parliament in which the Labor Party has not attempted to make the electoral system more just. To say that we are satisfied indicates that the Premier has an uncontrollable imagination. The Labor

Party has taken steps on every possible occasion to bring about a more satisfactory system. The Attorney-General has had much to say about two Labor parties, but if he were to interpret the initials "D.L.P." correctly he would find that they mean "De facto Liberal Party".

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What do they stand for, really?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Democratic Labor Party exists for one reason and one reason only: to assist the Liberal Party in preventing the Labor Party from governing.

Mr. Lawn: The initials really stand for "Disguised Liberal Party".

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The D.L.P. is as low as some of the Liberal Parties: it can be bought. We put forward our Bill previously for 56 seats, and we said then that there would be 26 country seats. As the Leader of the Opposition has explained, two days before the election the Liberal Party (this is characteristic of it) issued a false statement in the country press knowing full well that the Labor Party could not reply to it. This makes me believe that what I said previously is correct. Since that day we have had statement after statement from the Premier regarding the Liberal Party's policy on electoral redistribution. I was going to use the word "reform", but the Liberal Party's proposals do not represent reform. It is difficult to understand what the Premier means and what his intentions are; in fact, I do not think he himself knows what his intentions are. We achieved well over 50 per cent of the votes cast at the March 2 election, a greater percentage of votes than that achieved by any party that governs in Australia, yet we are denied the right to govern because of the electoral system.

I want to deal briefly with a subject that has already been dealt with by the Leader of the Opposition. I am sorely disappointed that damage has been done by the Attorney-General to the Parliamentary institution in South Australia. The first and foremost duty of a member of Parliament is to uphold the prestige of the Parliament of South Australia. We have enjoyed the public's confidence over many years. The Attorney-General has denied that he has committed a breach of confidence, but I am sure that he cannot substantiate his denial. He has put members of Parliament, particularly members of the Opposition, in a position where they believe they can no longer go confidently to the advisers made available to Parliament. I suggest that the

Attorney-General, in forcing the Government Printer to hand over this Bill, stooped to a lower level than that reached by anyone previously.

Mr. Lawn: Lower than Susie's tail!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Premier said that, if the Labor Party won the Millicent by-election, he would accept such a win as a mandate for the Parliamentary Labor Party to put into effect its Bill to amend the Constitution Act in order to provide for electoral reform, but as soon as the by-election was over he said that he would refuse to discuss the matter privately with the Leader of the Opposition. I can say frankly from experience that a great deal of progress was made when the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition got together frequently to discuss matters that were coming before Parliament. I had the honour and privilege of serving as Whip and as Secretary of the Parliamentary Labor Party under the late Leader, Mr. O'Halloran, and I know full well, as do many members who have been here as long as I, that Sir Thomas Playford, the then Premier, and Mr. O'Halloran frequently conferred and reached a compromise. Much of the credit for South Australia's progress during those years is due to those two men.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It's a pity he is not the Leader today.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is a pity that Mr. O'Halloran was not Premier at some stage. Morally, he was elected Premier many times but, because of the provisions of the Constitution, he was denied the right to serve. The policy of the Australian Labor Party was clearly put to the electors of Millicent, who voted overwhelmingly for it. But what do we find? The people of Millicent, charged with a responsibility with which no small section of the community ought to be charged, faced up to their responsibility and gave a clear decision that they wanted the policy of the Australian Labor Party.

The Government is doing nothing about the petitions to which I have referred. It is delaying and keeping the House out of session in order to protect itself and not be answerable to the people. We are to sit for only two days, yet the Leader has, on behalf of the Opposition, given an assurance that, when Ministers have to be absent on essential business, we will grant pairs.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That's a very sensible assurance to give.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am amazed! The Attorney-General says that it is a very sensible assurance.

The SPEAKER: He is out of order if he says that.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: He is always out of order, so I am not surprised. However, I am amazed at what he has said, because he never agrees with members on this side. Why cannot Parliament, when these Ministers are away, go on with urgent business that is desired by the people? Under the present Government, this is not a people's Parliament. We are denying to the people the right to express their will and to have passed the legislation that they desire. This practice will go on and I shall be amazed if the Government does not cut down the time of the sittings of Parliament. I understand that the Government will try to adjourn early, thus affording little opportunity for debate on matters. However, it will not find us failing in our duty to the South Australian people. We shall challenge the Government whenever we can.

The Treasurer said that we let the Chowilla project sleep for two years. This statement is unworthy of a Minister of the Crown. When I was Minister of Works we spent money and carried out our schedule to the limit in accordance with the agreement. We did not fall back on the schedule one iota. We went on with the experimental work and all necessary work and brought the project to tender by the scheduled time. We called for tenders, yet we are accused of letting it sleep. We know the sad story thereafter. The then Premier and I gave Mr. Beaney definite instructions that he must vote against any deferment that would involve consideration of another site. The present Government said, "If we are elected to power we will build Chowilla." One would have thought that the present Premier intended to do it himself with bucket and spade! He said that if he were elected he would send the Treasurer and the Minister of Works to the River Murray Commission, apparently to kick the door down and play merry something, but they did not go. I wonder why?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They played Murray Hill instead!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes. Chowilla has been deferred so that an alternative may be considered. We have been sold down the drain by the Government.

Mr. Lawn: Given away.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes. The strong position we built up has been lost. Ministers in other States and the Commonwealth have every reason to believe that this Government has just given up. I refer to the statement made during the election campaign: "Get South Australia moving again."

Mr. Hurst: Which way, though?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Backwards.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It couldn't go back much.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Rattlesnakes make their noise. I will do better than that, because I intend to say a few words about the Minister of Marine. We were told that the Party opposite would get South Australia going again, and the Premier said that his Party would solve unemployment. The Leader has shown what has happened in regard to unemployment. It is not the Government's fault, but Government members should not make these silly statements. I draw attention to a statement in last night's *News*. Before we left office, arrangements had been made with Associated Steamships Proprietary Ltd. for a feeder service to operate in connection with containerization. We had an agreement. When we were in office the present Government, then in Opposition, said that we were failing in our duty because we did not provide a terminal port at Port Adelaide. The Opposition told us that we were acting to the disadvantage of secondary and rural industry and that we ought to be ashamed of ourselves. However, we had an agreement under which the company to which I have referred would pick up cargo from Port Adelaide, take it to Melbourne and put it on the oversea container vessel, and the charge for transport to the port to which it was consigned would be the same from all Australian ports. The Minister for Marine is quoted in this morning's *Advertiser* as having said, in connection with the same matter, that the trade lost through Associated Steamships Pty. Ltd. would be minor. Who does he think he is kidding? Everything will be transported by rail and South Australian industry and primary producers will be at a great disadvantage, because freight will have to be paid from Adelaide to Melbourne. Is this getting South Australian industry going again? This good-for-nothing Government has let this slip through its hands. I said "good-for-nothing" and I meant it. It is a sheer puppet Government.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Puppet to whom?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I thought everyone would know: apparently, members opposite pretend they do not know.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You tell us and we will all know.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is a puppet to the invisible people of Ridley and it waits for its agent to pull the strings. Members opposite deny that, but their campaigners were rushing around Millicent and I know five people to whom they said, "Do you know what will happen if you don't vote for us? We will be under the domination of the Speaker."

Mr. Ryan: That is correct.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: These people complained bitterly. Shame upon them! I say, with more than a degree of sadness, that in the constitutional result of March 2 South Australia has lost the services of one of the greatest advocates that this country has produced—the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Don Dunstan. I agree with the Deputy Leader.

Mr. Clark: The people's Premier.

Mr. McAnaney: He may be Deputy Leader soon. Why did you give up?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I gave up from my own choice, and I do not wish to be Deputy Leader again. The Australian Labor Party will grow with young men as leaders and it will serve with greater vigour and energy. I went to the Loan Council with the then Premier. Members will acknowledge that this is the place where the political giants of Australia meet but, in a short time, not only did Don Dunstan win their respect but also he won the admiration of every member present at the Loan Council and the Premier's Conference. If the Government of today does not show some respect for the wishes of the people (which I believe it will not do) we will soon have the present Leader of the Opposition back in the Premier's position.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support the remarks of previous speakers and, on behalf of the 52 per cent of South Australians who voted for the Labour Party at the last State election, I speak on this grievance. A grievance can be debated by members at any time, and the majority of the people of this State are entitled to have their voices heard on such an occasion. After what has happened in the last two weeks it is obvious what the Government's attitude was then and is today. When reading the *News* of May 29 I was surprised to see that Mr. Hall was reported as saying that if he won the seat of Millicent he

would consider it as a mandate to introduce his electoral reform. That statement shows the arrogance not only of the Premier but also of members of the present Government, because throughout Australia leading political men in every State and experts at universities throughout the country quickly concluded that the Premier's statements were completely archaic, to say the least. Professor Geoffrey Sawyer, of the National University, is reported to have made the following statement:

It was outrageous that Mr Hall should impose on the electors of one small division "in an existing gerrymandered system" a responsibility which could only be discharged properly by the people of South Australia as a whole.

This gentleman knows the electoral system in this State, and he made his point clear. If members opposite do not agree that there is something wrong with the present system in South Australia there must be something wrong with their thinking. Mr. R. L. Reid, Senior Politics Lecturer at the University of Adelaide, stated:

In my view the L.C.L. plan would ensure itself a majority in the House of Assembly, provided the Party support did not fall below the extraordinary level of 40 per cent. What this means is that a minority of the voters could more often than not elect the Government.

It is time members of this Parliament used some sanity, as the people outside expect us to do, to arrive at some compromise or some reasonable understanding by getting together to formulate a plan that would give some semblance of sanity to representation of electors in this State. We are not living in the eighteenth century. South Australia prides itself on being the first State to bring democracy into Australia, but what do we find today? We find that the opposite exists. No matter what anyone in this House or outside says, the system in South Australia today is absolutely rotten and it is time that it was changed. Members of the Government have a duty to the people: although they have been elected by a minority vote they still control the Treasury benches, and everyone knows what that means.

Mr. McAnaney: And we know how low the State's finances are.

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member said that, not me. Prior to the Millicent by-election I spoke to the present Attorney-General. Meeting him on one occasion in the corridor, I said, "Excuse me, Robin, just exactly what are you going to do about electoral reform? What are your proposals?" He

smiled, but he could not tell me, possibly because he did not want anyone to know. I do not know whether he knows even today.

Mr. McKee: Sir Thomas hadn't told him at that time.

Mr. CASEY: I do not know whether anyone on the other side knows exactly what the Government's electoral proposals are, and I do not see anyone shaking his head. I was often asked by voters in Millicent, "What are the electoral plans of the L.C.L.?" to which I replied, "I don't know; I am afraid I can't answer that."

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You could have said "a gerrymander".

Mr. CASEY: Later in the election campaign, we heard the Premier referring to the fact that under his plan a number of seats would exist in the South-East and, although he had not stated his plan, I think he referred to four seats. However, he did not tell us how those seats would be made up but, of course, he said, "This will be done by an independent tribunal." How can an independent tribunal operate when the Premier already knows how many seats will exist? That just does not make sense. He was quoting the terms of reference yet was referring to the commission as an independent commission. He cannot have it both ways.

Mr. McAnaney: The commission always has a reference, whatever your Bill—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: I should like to impress on the member for Stirling that every electoral Bill passed in this House has been introduced by a Liberal Government.

Mr. Hudson: That is a misuse of the word "Liberal".

Mr. CASEY: Well, an L.C.L. Government. Not once has a Labor Government had the opportunity to give effect to electoral reform in this State. We have a member on our side of the House (and you are another, Mr. Speaker) who came into this Parliament many years ago. The member of our Party would be the senior member in service in this Chamber, and he can go right back to the days when we had proportional representation; he can recall how the single electorate system came into being and how the Playford regime altered the boundaries in 1955; he would remember how that was done in a particular way and why we supported the Bill. Of course, we did not support the terms of reference, but that was not explained during the Millicent by-election campaign. It was claimed by the Liberal Party and, specifically,

by the Chief Secretary that we supported the last electoral reform measure in this State. As the Leader explained, we had to support the second Bill, because it would have resulted in something a little better than the position that already existed. However, the Chief Secretary did not explain to Millicent voters that when electoral reform takes place in this State two Bills must be introduced: the first one relates to the setting up of the commission and to its terms of reference. We opposed this on the last occasion in every possible way but, of course, the Liberal Party says, "Oh, no; the Labor Party supported it." This is only a half truth. Let us have the truth of the situation. I am rather surprised that members opposite (and particularly the Attorney-General) can get away with this sort of thing. The Attorney-General may think momentarily that he can get away with it, but such statements will eventually catch up with him. Much has been said this afternoon about the meeting of this Parliament: I remember recently driving my car to the South-East and hearing a talk-back session on my car radio. I was interested to hear the Attorney-General (Hon. Robin Millhouse) answering questions.

Mr. Clark: Some of them seemed to be reasonably hostile.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, they were. One question was to this effect: "Mr. Millhouse, there seems to be a controversy among people outside that Parliament is not going to meet for quite some time," and the Attorney-General said, "Oh, no, that is quite incorrect."

Mr. Clark: The dates had been fixed four times.

Mr. CASEY: Yes; he said, "Of course, it is normal for Parliament to be opened, it goes into recess for a short time and, of course, we then come back into session. Parliament has been opened but, of course, the Government has changed, so we have to open it again. This is normal. We will, of course, carry on from there." What the Attorney-General did not say was that Parliament would not carry on from there at all, because we are to sit only today and tomorrow. He did not say Parliament would adjourn for a month.

Mr. Clark: We could sit longer.

Mr. CASEY: Yes.

Mr. Hudson: He didn't dare say they had to get rid of the Premier overseas.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much conversation. The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. CASEY: The Attorney-General is hoodwinking the general public.

Mr. Hudson: He thinks he is.

Mr. CASEY: He is attempting to hoodwink the public by making these statements over the radio. I take a dim view of this situation, because I think a man of his reputation—

Mr. Clark: The less you say about that the better.

Mr. CASEY: I have much respect for the Attorney-General—

Mr. Ryan: You're the only one.

Mr. CASEY:—but I think in fairness to the situation and to the general public, and as a Minister of the Crown, he should at least tell the whole truth rather than tell half truths. Another aspect referred to in this debate concerns just exactly what the Premier intends to do about electoral boundaries in this State. Specific reference was made in the *News* last week, quoting the Premier to the effect that the industrial towns of Whyalla, Port Pirie and Mount Gambier would not be interfered with, but any reference to Port Augusta was conveniently omitted. If we look back to the time of Sir Thomas Playford in the 1962-65 Parliament, when he introduced a Bill for electoral reform, we find that Sir Thomas wanted to split Port Augusta into halves, giving one half to Whyalla and the other half to Port Pirie. It seems rather a coincidence that these three towns (Whyalla, Port Pirie and Mount Gambier) should have been referred to the other day by the Premier, when he said they would not be interfered with, and that he did not refer at all to Port Augusta.

Mr. Lawn: Wasn't he going to appoint an independent commission?

Mr. CASEY: That is what we come back to in the end. How can he say all these things about what he intends to do and at the same time say that he will set up an independent commission?

Mr. Lawn: The answer is simple: he learnt from Sir Thomas, who told the House time and again that anything he told a commission—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: I am certain that the people of Port Augusta who read this article in the *News* will be horrified and will not forget that the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) went to great pains during the term of the 1962-65 Parliament to get thousands of people to sign their names to a petition to the effect that people in the area did not want to lose that seat. The seat should be retained because Port Augusta is a city. I believe the policy of the L.C.L. in this State is obviously to remain in Government by whatever means possible.

Mr. Hudson: Members opposite are not even embarrassed by the fact that it is a minority Government.

Mr. CASEY: That is the point. As I said initially, if we are to obtain sanity in this State and if people are to have an opportunity to choose the Government they want, they will not get it from a Liberal Government because that Party does not see reason: it differentiates between people; it considers how much money a person has; and it is putting people into societies, with a rural personnel, a country industrial personnel and city dwellers. How far will we go in this connection?

I have always said (and I should like to hear members opposite express their opinion on this) that I do not care where a person lives, what mode of work he does or what church he attends. We are all equal and we should all have a say in the Government of the country. Under the Commonwealth Constitution we get that say, but not under the State Constitution. Is there any significant difference between these spheres? The fact is that we are here to govern the people: it does not matter whether they are governed in the State or Commonwealth sphere. People should have a say in the Government, but members opposite are not prepared to give people that right. Unless members opposite change their tactics and thinking on this subject and realize that people are entitled to consideration, irrespective of what they do, where they live or what they believe in, then we will not get good Government in South Australia. The Government cannot expect people to sit back and be told, in a dictatorial manner, what they should do and when they should do it. Nobody would ever tell me what to do in that way: I should be the first to rebel against that. I am sure that if members opposite were faced with this sort of proposition and were not involved as they are in this place they would rebel against it, too. The system to date in South Australia has been rotten: it should be altered and it must be altered.

I was rather surprised that the Treasurer regarded as offensive the Leader's reference to the Governor. Of course, if he were still the Governor of the State we could not refer to what he said as that would be unethical but, now that he is no longer the Governor, I am not afraid to refer to some of the things he said. He was concerned about this matter and told members of this side that there must be electoral reform in South Australia. He would be the first to admit it now that he has left the State, although he could not do that whilst

he was Governor. I discussed a few other matters with him in a "man to man" way; he was quite approachable and a jolly decent fellow. He could see the situation that existed in this State and he was aware of events that have occurred throughout the world in these times. He did not want to see similar events occur in South Australia. However, if the Liberal Party continues with its current form of thinking on electoral matters, we will not get the confidence of the people in this connection but, rather, the opposite. People can be told what to do for so long but they cannot be told what to do all the time. Therefore, I urge the Premier not to be so arrogant and high-falutin. He is not as experienced in dictatorship as was Sir Thomas Playford, who was a dictator in his own right and who did a tremendous amount for the State. However, there should not be a one-man band. Thank heavens this Party does not operate in that way: we are a team as we always have been. I sincerely hope members opposite will operate as a team, although I do not think they are able to, because their Party's form of election is much different from ours.

Mr. McAnaney: You are a team under orders.

Mr. Clark: You are a disordered rebel.

Mr. Hudson: Who told the member for Stirling not to speak?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: It is a pity that members of the Party opposite do not realize exactly how and why the Labor Party was formed. Over the years it has had its ups and downs because it represents a great many factions. However, it has done a good job and still receives the overwhelming support of the people. I cannot see any faceless men around me nor have I seen any. However, I take exception to the fact that, when they are stumped on any particular subject, members opposite have absolutely no scruples at all about referring to members on this side as Communists.

Mr. McAnaney: You've not heard me mention that word.

Mr. CASEY: I will explain this. About four or five years ago in this Chamber a member opposite referred to members on this side as Communists. I took exception to this.

Mr. Lawn: Who was this?

Mr. CASEY: It was the Premier. When the bells rang to announce the dinner adjournment I was smartly out of my seat. Walking up to this gentleman, I said, "If you ever say that again—look out!" I told him that he

had Parliamentary privilege in the Chamber but that outside he did not. I see that he is nodding his head, which means that he agrees with what I am saying. That particular member has never referred to that matter again.

Mr. Freebairn interjecting:

Mr. CASEY: Apparently, the conscience of the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) is starting to prick him now, because he is beginning to interject.

Mr. McAnaney: I only feel sorry for you.

Mr. CASEY: When this report asked for by the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) is forthcoming from the Premier and much dirty linen comes out of it, I hope the people who have been responsible for any smear tactics of this nature during the Millicent by-election toe the line, because it is out-dated, outmoded and outrageous to think that men of the calibre of members opposite, who are supposed to be representatives in Parliament of the people of this State, can stoop to such tactics. I hope it never occurs again, either in this Chamber or outside. I say this sincerely because it is high time we acted as men and not as stupid individuals. If this sort of thing is to take place, I cannot believe that the electors will elect people of this nature.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): For the most part, I agree with the Leader, the Deputy Leader and other members who have addressed themselves to this debate. I congratulate the Leader on his presentation of the points he made and on the clarity with which he set out for the benefit of members our attitude towards the working of this Parliament in the months that lie ahead. I endorse all he had to say about our displeasure that the attitude of the Government seems to indicate that we shall not have an opportunity of sitting as frequently as we would like to in the interests of the State and of the electoral districts. That necessitates our taking advantage of this opportunity, as we go into Committee, to bring forward matters of importance which because of the time element cannot wait until the date suggested for the resumption of Parliamentary proceedings. I am sorry about that, because in these days more than ever it is essential that Parliament be kept close to the people as Parliament is representative of the people and, to the extent that we may fall short of that, that failing is of concern to the State and all those who have regard for the future of democracy.

I also support the Leader in his congratulations to Mr. Corcoran on his electoral victory in Millicent. Both the Leader and the

Deputy Leader have their explanation of the issues that were placed before the people at Millicent. Electoral reform has been a live subject in South Australia for as long as I have been associated with public life. When I came into Parliament in 1933, one of the first questions asked of the then Premier was what action, in view of the seething dissatisfaction throughout the State with the system of electoral boundaries and methods of election, the Government proposed to take in order to deal with a situation which the member regarded as unhealthy. That came from a supporter of the Government, the member for Barossa at the time (Mr. Crosby). He asked that question repeatedly, as a result of which a commission was set up. There were 46 members in 1933 when the population of South Australia was much smaller than it is today.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

There being a commotion in the Strangers' Gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order! If there is no order in the gallery, the gallery will be ordered to be cleared. We must have order in this House.

Mr. RICHES: Before the dinner adjournment I commenced to outline the history of electoral reform in South Australia as far as I knew it. I said that in 1933 there was a public outcry and public demand for electoral reform and, as a result, questions were raised in this House. A Royal Commission was set up and fundamental alterations were made to the way in which the people of South Australia would elect the Parliament from that time on. A system of electoral representation was instituted that caused concern thenceforth to every thinking person in the State who believed in democracy and who believed that Parliament should represent the will of the majority of the people and at the same time give a voice to the minority, but not at any time allow the minority to govern at the expense of the majority of the people. Electoral reform has been a live issue since that time. I want it to be understood that in those 35 years the Labor Party has never at any time subscribed to the present system of electoral representation.

There being a further commotion in the Strangers' Gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order! The gallery must understand that order and silence must be maintained. If that happens again I will order the gallery to be cleared.

Mr. RICHES: I was amazed recently—

There being a further commotion in the Strangers' Gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart will take his seat. I order the policemen to clear the Strangers' Gallery, please.

The gallery having been cleared:

Mr. RICHES: I think all members would regret the incident that has just occurred, but I think that perhaps we have brought some of it on ourselves. It ill behoves me to criticize the decision of the Chair, but I think it is a great pity that the gallery had to be cleared, particularly because some of those present in the gallery did come to listen and no-one could take exception to their behaviour. I was referring to the fact that during the last 30 years electoral reform has been uppermost in the minds of those concerned with democracy and with the way it works. It has been uppermost also in the minds of those who have been concerned that the Parliamentary system of government should be truly representative of the minds of the people, that the will of the people should prevail and that the rights of the minority should be protected.

As early as 1933, or probably before, there were 46 members in this Chamber representing multiple electorates. I refer to multiple electorates because of the statement appearing in this afternoon's *News*. I worked in multiple electorates. Representations were made to the then Government for electoral reform, a Royal Commission was set up and the system of dividing the State between city and country was introduced. I regret that that step was ever taken because I believe we are one people with one destiny. The city is dependent on the country and the country is dependent on the city, and no-one could live if a boundary were drawn around either section. We are interwoven: we are entirely dependent on each other for our livelihood and our very existence, and anything that seeks to divide city and country does a disservice to the State. I believed this in 1933 and I believe it today, and over the years I have voiced, as have other members of the Labor Party, my objection to this distinction.

We have protested on every conceivable occasion against the present electoral system. In every Parliament of which I have been a member this matter has been an issue. I can remember what the late Mr. O'Halloran said when he was Leader of the Labor Party. This afternoon one of the Ministers said that it would be a good thing if he were Leader of

my Party today. The member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) said it would be an excellent thing if he were Premier. I can remember his telling us when he was first appointed Leader that one thing that he would set his mind to would be the need for electoral reform and the need for South Australians to set their sights on a system that would be truly representative, and Mr. O'Halloran never lost an opportunity to bring that issue before the people of this State.

However, it did not receive the prominence in the press or catch the public imagination to the same extent as has been the case in recent weeks. Recent happenings have drawn the attention not only of the people of this State but also of people beyond our borders to the faults in the electoral machine, which has needed overhaul over the years. I was surprised when, during the Millicent by-election campaign, I heard statements that the Labor Party at one stage had been quite prepared to accept the present electoral system and had supported it in Parliament at one time. I then gave the lie direct, and I give it now. I have never supported the present electoral system under any consideration and I like even less the system that the Liberal and Country League Government sought to impose only two or three years ago.

More than the people of Millicent were interested in what happened last Saturday, as has been evident from the press, by events this evening, and as we will learn to appreciate in the coming days. People of the district that I represent were keenly interested in the result in Millicent because the Premier had said that, if the people of Millicent voted for the Liberal and Country League, he would accept that as a mandate in relation to the whole State for his Government in this place to carry out his suggested amendment of the electoral system. We were interested in that, because the L.C.L. in 1962 drew up a division of the State and was going to make itself safe by abolishing Labor-held seats here and there, as was provided in the Bill. One half of the District of Stuart was to go to the District of Whyalla and the other half to the District of Port Pirie. Thus, the District of Stuart was to be abolished altogether. Similar action was to be taken in other parts of the State. That proposal is not a matter of imagination: it was set out in black and white and the districts were shown on a map.

The people of my district objected to the proposal, as did the people in the Districts of

Whyalla and Port Pirie, and signed many petitions that were presented to this House. However, the fate of those petitions was the same as that of many other petitions that have been presented. It is quite a study to see how the machinations of the L.C.L. work. In 1933, the first thing they did was extend the life of Parliament for two years. They voted themselves two additional years in office and during the five-year period they drew up the system that divided the country from the city, having decided that the country was to have twice the representation of the city, despite the fact that 60 per cent of the people lived in the metropolitan area, and some of the proposals were ridiculous in the extreme. Then, the L.C.L. declared a seat vacant because a member sought assistance from the Farmers Assistance Department under debt adjustment provisions.

The Party then drew up the boundaries, as I have mentioned, on the basis of 13 districts and 26 districts. Later, the position became noticeable and a redistribution was needed. Whyalla had grown and was entitled to representation in Parliament, and there were also anomalies in other parts of the State. Another commission was set up but it was given the same instructions, and the Bill that established the commission and set out the terms of reference was opposed at every stage in this House. When the Government had the numbers here the Bill was passed, the commission was set up and the boundaries were drawn. We then had placed before us the new boundaries and had to vote for either those boundaries or the retention of the old ones. The new boundaries did provide for a new district at Whyalla and also provided for a better distribution than did the old boundaries.

They were the issues at the time. At that time Whyalla was in my district, as also were Woomera and Quorn, and the district extended to the borders of the Northern Territory and Western Australia. When the new boundaries were drawn giving Whyalla representation, we accepted them in preference to the boundaries then operating. New boundaries are necessary now. Elizabeth and the suburban areas have grown, Whyalla has become even bigger, and the whole State agrees that there should be a redistribution. Even the Government agrees but, as a political Party, it will determine how the boundaries are to be drawn. The Government, as a political Party, has determined that there shall be 25 districts in one part of the State and 20 in the other.

Apart from that, we do not know what will happen, but, apparently, the Premier knows how this so-called independent commission will divide the State, because I heard him tell the people of the South-East that Millicent and Mount Gambier would not be united, that there would be three seats in the South-East. He knows that much of the findings of the commission.

Mr. Nankivell: There are four districts in the South-East.

Mr. Hudson: The Premier said there would be only three.

Mr. RICHES: The Premier also defined the South-East. I think the time has arrived when we should ask ourselves where we go from here in electoral reform. I shall not repeat the details that have been given by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader. However, in view of all that has happened, and as the Government represents much less than a majority of the people, the Government should recognize that it is not in a position to impose its will on the majority, and there should be discussion of the matter at a conference. If such a conference were held in the good faith in which it should be held, there would be nothing insuperable in the problems, nothing that could not be ironed out.

The Leader of the Opposition has taken the first step in this matter by offering to attend such a conference, and I hope that the Premier will seriously consider attending also, because this conference has to be held at some time. I shudder to think of what could happen in the Committee stage of the debate on a Bill in this place. I have been here long enough to be able to give a record of some of the decisions reached when two sides are opposed in the Committee stage, and it is not a good record. I believe that the boundaries should be drawn not by any one Party and not to serve the needs of any Party but to serve the people as a State, and drawn in a manner that will ensure that, whichever Party is in power it will be there by the will of the people and to ensure that the people will always retain the opportunity to change the Government by the ballot box if they do not like the Government or if the Government ceases to represent the will of the people. In these days of change Governments will change, and I hope that it will always be through the ballot box.

So the suggestion that came from the Liberal member for Angas in the Commonwealth Parliament that perhaps the State Parliament could comprise 48 seats with four seats in

each Commonwealth electorate appealed to me as being sound and reasonable and one that was not capable of being manipulated by any Party. First, we know there are to be 12 Commonwealth seats in South Australia, but no-one knows what their boundaries will be. We know that the terms of reference from the Commonwealth Liberal Government to the commission that will divide the State into the 12 electorates are fair terms and will have to have regard to all things that we would suggest such a commission should consider. I have not heard anyone criticize the terms of reference of the boundaries commission, and no-one at this stage knows whether the resulting seats will favour Labor or Liberal. However, we know that if the terms of reference are followed they will largely represent the will of the people as expressed by the ballot box. It will not be possible for 38 per cent or 42 per cent of the people to dominate the remainder of the electors. Then it was suggested that an independent commission be set up in South Australia to divide each of those 12 electorates into four. No-one knows how those boundaries will be drawn and I do not know whether anyone can say that they would favour one Party or another. No Party would assist in drawing the boundaries and no Party be able to manipulate them for Party ends. It seemed to me that this was a reasonable and fair proposition and would commend itself to the people, as it would ensure that the Government of the day was closely in touch with the people and that Parliament would reflect the will of the people.

I endorse wholeheartedly the proposition for the 48 seats. I know that it represents an increase in the number of seats, but when I first came into this House there were 46 members and since that time the population of the State has doubled, the work of a member has multiplied immeasurably because of work associated with the assimilation of migrants and the settling into the community of many people from overseas, and housing problems were not with us then. A clear case exists for better representation of the people. As I believe the demand for an ombudsman demonstrates the need for people to be more closely in touch with their member, I ask that the suggestion should be considered.

I was interested to read in today's *News* a statement attributed to you, Mr. Speaker, in which you advocated proportional representation. According to the *News* you said that proportional representation had been one of the A.L.P.'s policy planks some years ago and

that the public should be told why it was removed from its policy. I advocated proportional representation. I believe it is good in theory but I do not like it in practice. I do not know why other members at a convention voted to change their minds because I only speak for myself, but I have seen it operating in the Senate and I have examined it operating in other places, and I am convinced that the single-electorate system, apart from a constituency like the Senate, is the preferable system of voting. I noticed that you, Sir, quoted some figures and stated:

Taking the last Senate election figures on a 45-seat basis with 25 central or metropolitan seats and 20 country seats—

I understand that this is the kernel of the programme favoured by the present Government—

and converting it to proportional representation the result would have been 24 A.L.P. seats and 21 L.C.L. seats.

I emphasize that point: had the last election been held with the State divided largely as the Government Party sets out and voting were by proportional representation the Labor Party would have had 24 seats and the Liberal Party 21 seats. Yet, Mr. Speaker, you who pointed this out have thrown in your lot with the 21-seat Party and you are keeping that Party in power and keeping in Opposition the Party that received sufficient votes for 24 seats. It seems to me to be a strange view and commentary on democracy.

Mr. Lawn: Contrary to the views of Sir John McLeay and of Sir Alister McMullin.

Mr. RICHES: I know that many speakers in other parts of the world have drawn attention to the situation in South Australia, and I know that recently some of our greatest leaders have drawn attention to the ideal of one vote one value, which does not necessarily apply in its entirety to the 48-seat proposal. Recently, the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister spoke about that principle as did the President of the United States of America, Mr. Johnson, who set out that amongst the four aims of American demands in seeking peace in South Vietnam there should be an election with "one man one vote". As that is one of the things for which we are fighting in Vietnam, it should be one of the things that we hold as an ideal and should work for here. I have said enough on the question of electoral reform.

The Premier has announced that the House will be sitting today and tomorrow, and then will go into recess for another three weeks.

Concern has been expressed in this debate at the negotiations that have been taking place concerning Chowilla. Surely, the Government will not let the House be dismissed without explaining its actions over Chowilla; surely, there has been enough said today to give evidence of the disquiet that must be in the minds of people who realize the importance of Chowilla to the future development of this State. I think the Government should answer the case that has been presented by both the member for Glenelg and the Leader concerning Chowilla, that is, that we have been sold out because we have compromised the State in relation to its legal situation concerning the agreement to build the dam. That has not been answered, and I think the people of this State are entitled to an answer before the Government thinks about going into recess in this session.

Last year Parliament devoted much time to debating the development of natural gas. The then Leader of the Opposition questioned the wisdom of bringing natural gas to Adelaide in 1969 and said he had been advised that sufficient consumption would not exist until 1970. Now that he is in office as Premier, does he still hold that view? Is he still pushing on with the natural gas project in order to deliver gas to the city at the earliest possible date, and is 1969 his objective? The Government, when in Opposition, also made much about the decentralization of industry, but I noticed not one word about decentralization in the Speech, delivered this afternoon by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor. It is completely omitted from the Speech. In view of the representations made by Government members when in Opposition last year and the previous year, I am concerned to know whether the Government will now consider decentralization of the manufactured pipes and off-loading of pipes to be used on the Gidgealpa-Adelaide project. With ships calling at Port Augusta from Japan regularly in order to take copper ore back to Japan, I suggest that an opportunity exists to bring manufactured pipes from Japan for this project and also that pipes could be manufactured in one of the Spencer Gulf ports as easily as in any other part of Australia. The pipes for the Morgan-Whyalla main were manufactured at Port Pirie, and no reason has been given why pipes for the Gidgealpa-Adelaide pipeline could not be manufactured at a point on the route where cartage of the manufactured article would be reduced, and where power and water—

Mr. McAnaney: Why didn't your Government do that? Sir Thomas Playford did the other one.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart.

Mr. RICHES: That is a gem. No pipeline authority had been set up in Sir Thomas Playford's day.

Mr. McAnaney: You are saying these pipes for the Morgan-Whyalla main were manufactured there; Sir Thomas Playford did that.

Mr. RICHES: Pipes for the Morgan-Whyalla water main were manufactured in Port Pirie. I raise this issue now because it is only now that tenders for the gas pipeline have been called, and now is the time to make representations concerning where the pipes should be manufactured. This is the only opportunity we have to make such representations, for the House will go into recess tomorrow and it will be too late to make representations when we resume. Indeed, that is one of the reasons why I am speaking to this debate. I previously brought this matter under the Government's notice and the reply received did not answer the representations in any one aspect.

Mr. Lawn: Do you know whether they are going to alter the route of the pipeline?

Mr. RICHES: The economics will not allow an alteration.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart is making the speech.

Mr. RICHES: I know that the present Government members had much to say last year about the route of the pipeline for no other purpose than to embarrass certain members through whose districts the pipeline would run. That was another move that back-fired. If the present Government can show that any validity at all exists in the arguments its members produced last year, and that it is economically possible to bring the pipeline to Adelaide via a different route, and if it can be shown that it is possible to lower the costs of the pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide and still supply gas here at a price that will ensure an economic success, no-one will be more pleased than I.

Mr. Broomhill: They claimed they were genuine last year.

Mr. RICHES: I have not heard any suggestion about the project since this Government has been in office, but surely if members opposite cannot do that, with all their words about decentralization and their concern that something should be done to lift industry in the gulf ports, they could give effect to the

suggestion to manufacture pipes or to off-load pipes coming from overseas at ports as near as possible to the centre of the pipeline. Although I do not hold myself out to be an authority on the matter and could be wrong about this, I am assured that such a suggestion is economically sound, and I should like it to be investigated by the Government.

Finally, we have been waiting at Port Augusta for many years for a hospital, for which a model has been made and an undertaking given by the former Premier that this project would commence next year. However, I saw no specific reference to this hospital in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech today. I take it that the present Government will honour the undertakings given by the previous Government, for that practice was followed when a change of Government took place three years ago. I should like to know whether the Minister concerned can confirm the undertaking that has already been given. I think that, if this procedure is not the accepted procedure, the people will not know just where they stand.

This State has gained much from the determination of one Government to honour undertakings given by a previous Government. Indeed, I noticed with pleasure in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech this afternoon that many of the works started or in hand at the time the previous Government went out of office are being continued by the present Government. I desire an assurance that among those works will be the new Port Augusta Hospital. I am speaking not only for myself but for many others who are just as determined as I am in this regard. I hope the Government will have regard to what we have had to say, especially as it does not seem that we shall have another chance to make these representations until the end of July or early August.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I have spent 15 years in Opposition in this House and three years as a member of the Government. During my 15 years in Opposition a motion similar to this one to have the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply has, I believe, been debated twice. In contrast to that, the present Government during its term in Opposition debated similar motions more than twice in the first 12 months the Parliament sat. I wish to quote what one member said on a couple of occasions: I know members opposite are disturbed and are not keen on this debate: they do not intend to participate and they are getting a thrashing. As their spirits

are sinking lower and lower, I say to them at the outset that if they wish to revive their spirits they should walk through West Terrace Cemetery at midnight tonight singing *I Will Never Be As Good a Ghost As You*.

Mr. McAnaney: We will be looking for you.

Mr. LAWN: I did not hear that interjection but, if the member for Stirling is seeking information from me, I say "Hear, hear", because if anybody in this House needs information it is the member for Stirling.

Mr. Jennings: If he goes to the cemetery he might frighten the ghosts.

Mr. LAWN: He would not be welcome in the cemetery. In opening the debate on a motion of this description, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) complained that during Question Time he had been given the information he sought and more. He explained that that was the reason for debating the motion for the House to resolve itself into a Committee of Supply. At page 1188 of *Hansard* for the year 1965-66, the present Attorney-General, who followed the Leader of the Opposition, is reported as saying:

I must say that I do not share my Leader's scruples in taking up the time of the House in debating the motion to go into Committee.

He made no apology. He continued:

I respectfully support what the Leader said about the difficulty of getting information in answer to questions.

The Leader actually said that he had received more information than he sought. The member for Mitcham continued:

I have had this difficulty time and time again.

That is just what we will suffer during the next three years.

Mr. Clark: It won't be that long.

Mr. LAWN: For the life of this Parliament then; I hope it will be only a short period. However, unlike the Attorney-General, I have a question which I have not been able to ask here because the House has not been sitting. That is one thing about which the Attorney-General could not complain in the last three years. During those years, the House of Assembly sat for twice the time the Playford Government sat and probably for twice or three times as long as this Government will be prepared to sit. It is not necessary to accept my word for this: it can be ascertained by looking at the *Hansard* volumes. During the 18 years I have been a member, during the term of office of the Playford

Government there were two volumes of *Hansard* for each year, whereas during the three years of Labor Government there were four volumes printed in each year. Those facts speak for themselves and cannot be denied. Since the election on March 2, I have been unable to ask the Attorney-General a question in this place, so I wrote to him on April 30 and I am still awaiting a reply. If I do not receive the reply by tomorrow morning, I shall ask the Attorney-General the question in this place tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Clark: Do you think you will get an answer?

Mr. LAWN: I saw him on the Barry Jones show, and that would be enough.

Mr. Burdon: What about *Talk Back*?

Mr. LAWN: I never heard him on *Talk Back* but I will come later to *Encounter*. On page 330 of *Hansard* for the year 1965-66 the Attorney-General is reported as saying:

The matter I desire to raise arises from Question Time this afternoon. My complaint is not that I got too much information but that I did not get enough.

Members opposite have complained that they got either too much information from the Walsh-Dunstan Governments or that they did not get enough. However, this Government will see that we do not get enough. This is June 25 and it is intended that Parliament will sit today and tomorrow. I understand this information was given to the Leader of the Opposition in a secret conversation, although the Premier said to the press that he would not have secret talks with the Leader. Since I have been a member (and the member for Hindmarsh, who was elected at the same time, will support what I say) these secret talks (if that is what they are called) took place time and time again between Sir Thomas Playford and the Hon. M. R. O'Halloran (while he was Leader of the Opposition), and were subsequently followed by similar talks between the Premier and the Hon. Frank Walsh, the then Leader. They were not anything to be sneered at, and they were not talks that were hushed up or in secret; but they facilitated the business of this Chamber. Apparently, with the object of facilitating the business of the House, the Premier went to the Leader of the Opposition three weeks ago and said that he would like this place to adjourn at 4 p.m. tomorrow so that he could go to Canberra at 5 p.m.

There being a commotion in the Strangers' Gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the gallery to refrain from clapping, otherwise action will have to be taken similar to the action taken before.

Mr. Nankivell: Why is the Premier going to Canberra?

Mr. Clark: We all know that; that is not the point.

Mr. LAWN: In reply to the interjection by the member for Albert, I may say that this afternoon the Leader told the Premier and all members that both the Premier and the Treasurer could have pairs. Therefore, no need exists to stop the business of the House simply because the Premier wants to go to Canberra to attend the Premiers' Conference and the meeting of the Loan Council. I do not suggest that he should not go: the reason for my statement just now was that the conversation on this matter took place in secret, a type of conversation the Premier said he would not have in regard to electoral reform. Therefore, he would not facilitate the business of this place by discussing a possible compromise on electoral boundaries, because he said he would not discuss that matter in secret: he said it should be discussed in the Parliament, implying that he does not hold secret talks.

However, he approached the Leader three weeks ago (just as the Leader sought his co-operation on electoral reform), seeking co-operation to facilitate the business of Parliament so that it could be completed in two days to enable the Treasurer and him to leave for Canberra at 5 p.m. tomorrow. Yet he says he will not be a party to secret talks on electoral reform. The Leader said this afternoon that the Premier and the Treasurer could have pairs. The Premier has implied in talking to the press (I cannot vouch for these statements, but I read this two or three times during the Millicent campaign) that, if the Government was one member short because of illness to that member (and he gave this as a reason why people should vote to enable him to have 20 members on the floor of the Chamber), the Opposition would take advantage and move a vote of no confidence.

Mr. Broomhill: Why do you think they wanted the 20 members?

Mr. LAWN: I will tell members what I heard in Millicent. This afternoon the member for Hindmarsh was very kind to the Speaker when he reported what he heard at Millicent. During the campaign at Millicent, I heard the following being circulated by Government members—"Don't worry about

Des Corcoran. The Government will look after him." I said, "Well, if that is what you intend to do, why are you worrying about the 20 members?" They said, "We do not want to be under the dominance of Tommy Rot." They did not say "Mr. Speaker". My reply was, "If they are so concerned about Des Corcoran and they are honest in their intentions of giving him a job, why haven't they given Gabe Bywaters a job? He has been unemployed." They said that had not struck them before, and they became doubtful whether it was a fact that if they voted for the Government it would look after Des Corcoran. They put all these things aside and they gave their decision on the facts and the issues placed before them. The issue was chosen by the Premier, and it was electoral reform. The people will not be caught by those sorts of things. As a matter of fact, the voting on Saturday last proved the high calibre of the people of Millicent. There was one of the lowest totals of informal votes that I know of—34. They even beat the Democratic Labor Party for the lowest vote: that Party got 51. Incidentally, someone this afternoon (I think it was the Attorney-General) asked what those letters really stood for, and I interjected (and I repeat it now in case *Hansard* did not catch it) "Disguised Liberal Party". They get their money and fight these campaigns with help from the Liberal Party or its supporters. At the last general election this statement was made by Mr. Posa, the Secretary of the Democratic Labor Party, before nominations closed for the Millicent by-election: "We do not know how many candidates we can put up; we do not have much money"; but the money came to light and big advertisements appeared. The D.L.P. can always find the money, particularly in places where their preferences might count. The Liberal Party thought the D.L.P. would get enough votes to pass on to the Liberal candidate and enable him to win. At the State elections they ran candidates in Murray and Chaffey where they thought that by so doing they would help the Liberal Party. They left me alone, for a change. This is the first time they have not opposed me since they have been in existence. I suggest also to the Attorney-General that "D.L.P." could well stand for "Deposit Losing Party".

Mr. McAnaney: The question is, what does it stand for, not what could it stand for.

Mr. LAWN: The "Disguised Liberal Party"—I have told the honourable member that.

That is how it should be used. It is definitely the "Disguised Liberal Party".

Mr. Corcoran: Tell us what the workers at Cellulose called it.

Mr. LAWN: I am not informed what the workers at Cellulose called it, for I did not attend that meeting. I heard it recorded on the news in Adelaide—at least, my wife heard it, and I understand that the candidate, Mr. Barnes, was appealing to be given a hearing. I do not know of any political meetings down in the South-East where either the Premier or some other member opposite or any member had to plead for the right to be heard. They went down there with a candidate they chose from Port Lincoln with money they were getting from the Liberal Party supporters, and the people who gave out the how-to-vote cards were imported from Victoria. There were two at Beachport and two more at Robe. They all came from Melbourne. I believe the same thing applied in Millicent, too. Is it any wonder why the system we have for elections here smells in the nostrils of honest democrats. This is only the lead-up to my first point (I have been side-tracked)—that the House will adjourn tomorrow.

Mr. Jennings: Not the way you are going!

Mr. LAWN: It has been said that the House will meet on June 25, and on June 26 until 4 p.m.; it will then adjourn until July 23 and the session will end on October 23, or at the latest on Wednesday, October 30.

Mr. McAnaney: Where did you get that from?

Mr. LAWN: Who made that interjection?

Mr. McAnaney: Where did you get October 30 from?

Mr. LAWN: If the member for Stirling will see me afterwards, I will wager with him that it will be October 23. Honourable members opposite know that as well as I do. As a matter of fact, some of them told me. The member for Stirling need not go white. He should remember Jeremiah 7 : 19, and he should be going red. He does not confuse me—he is only confusing his own face. I was dealing with the sittings of the House. As do other members of the House, from time to time I take schoolchildren through Parliament House—over 1,100 a year, on several occasions. Included in those parties are some school-teachers, because there has always to be present at least one schoolteacher. Often I am asked, "Why does Parliament sit on only three afternoons a week?" Of course, during the last three years teachers have said, "Mr. Lawn, would it not be better to sit five days

a week, in the mornings, instead of sitting through the night?" We were sitting all through the night on more than one occasion when we were in Government. I explained the working of Parliament, why we sit three afternoons a week and not the full five days. I could briefly give my reasons for justifying that but I could not justify the present Government's sitting for only two days in June, following the March election, then adjourning to July 23 and proroguing on October 23. I do not know whether the Government would have sat longer if it had won Millicent and it was not dependent upon the Speaker, but, as the Government is now, it does not want to be embarrassed by questions or by the continual criticism that can be levelled at its administration. I do not think there is any difference between the present Liberal Party opposite and what it was in the previous 15 years, when its members did exactly what their Leader told them. If the then master on the other side of the House (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) told them not to speak they did not speak. One member did, however. The member for Enfield and I told this member, Mr. George Hambour, during his second speech in this House that, as a result, he would not get his next preselection. During the first speech he wanted to wreck the Government, and in the corridors we told him he would not get the next preselection. He asked why and, having been told, laughed. When told that Sir Thomas would not let him get his preselection, he said that the people in his district, not Sir Thomas Playford, elected him. He said many more things about the Government than we did, and it was not long after when George Hambour, at Gawler, was complaining to a large group of people that Sir Thomas Playford had said that if he continued in that manner he would not win his preselection.

It appears that the present Premier, who is a protege of and was selected by Sir Thomas Playford to be his successor, will carry on in the same manner. When Mr. Nicklin won the Government in Queensland, Sir Thomas advised him on gerrymandering. Obviously members on the other side of the House have been told not to speak in this debate, because not one has spoken. I do not think I need to take up the time of this House justifying our sitting three afternoons a week.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Don't disappoint us!

Mr. LAWN: If the honourable member wants me to speak I will. If Parliament sat

all day five days a week, members of Cabinet would have to sit all night to attend to Cabinet business. Parliamentary committees have business to attend to, and they would have to sit at night, so we would not be saving night sittings for many members. These meetings function better during the day.

Cabinet sits all day on Mondays and at other times during the week, and on Fridays, Ministers familiarize themselves with their departments and see what is going on around them. However, if they had to sit here on five days a week, they would not have time to do these things. That is how I justify Parliament's sitting three days a week. I could not, however, justify our sitting on three half-days a week and being in recess for nine months of the year.

I have already explained the matter of pairs. I come now to the Millicent by-election. I will not go over it again completely, because it was covered by my colleagues this afternoon. However, I refer to a press statement in which the Premier is alleged to have said that the issue involved was electoral reform. He was arrogant when he said that if the L.C.L. won he would have been given a mandate for his policy, which he never satisfactorily explained. He also said at that time, according to the press, that if the A.L.P. won he would accept it as a mandate for the A.L.P. policy. We wait with interest to see whether the Premier will accept our compromise plan.

I come now to the Attorney-General's appearance on Barry Jones's television show *Encounter*, which I saw. After having a word or two to say, Barry Jones handed over to Mr. Millhouse. As honourable members will realize, the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition were two persons invited by Mr. Jones to participate in the show.

Mr. Corcoran: We don't know who was invited.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: I see what you mean: he may have invited the Premier. In any event, we know (although Barry Jones may not) that the Premier has refused to appear in a television debate with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Corcoran: You know why, don't you?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, I saw the two of them on television last year talking about 10 p.m. closing, and the Premier made such an obvious ass of himself that, when they were invited to go on again last year, the Premier admitted defeat and said he would not appear again. Therefore, he will not now go on television and debate with the Leader of the

Opposition. After Mr. Jones said a few words, he handed over to Mr. Millhouse who, to my surprise, immediately handed over to the Leader of the Opposition by saying, "I will ask the Leader of the Opposition a question." He asked the Leader a question comprising about ten words and the Leader then spoke for the next 10 or 15 minutes. The Attorney-General had an opportunity to speak then but chose not to do so.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It is the same thing today.

Mr. LAW: Yes, it is the same thing today: he does not want to say too much. Barry Jones asked Mr. Millhouse, "Will you tell us what your policy involves?" The Attorney-General replied, "I would like to ask a question of Mr. Dunstan first." Apparently he did not know what was the Liberal and Country League policy on electoral reform. He obviously did not know what ours was because, when the Leader of the Opposition explained our policy, the Attorney-General denied it, saying that he had a copy of the Bill. He also denied that there was a tolerance of 25 per cent; he kept on denying it by way of interjection until the Leader said, "Read the Bill." I must admit that he can read, because he read out that it provided for a tolerance of 25 per cent.

I discussed this matter with a couple of members this afternoon in the corridors, both of whom said it was not contained in our Bill. I said, "How do you know? The Bill was not introduced. When we attempted to introduce it, you refused us leave to do so. You don't know what is in it." They replied, "True, we don't know what is in it." Yet, when conducting a campaign at Millicent, they told the people what our policy was. The Attorney-General on the Barry Jones programme denied that there was a tolerance of 25 per cent, yet he read that out from the Bill when asked what the Bill contained.

I now come to something which the Leader referred to this afternoon and which perturbs me. I remember that on one occasion during 1965 (I am not sure whether the Speaker remembers or whether he was here, because he did not attend many sittings of the House then) there was grave concern among members of the then Opposition (the present Government) about being deprived of the assistance of the Parliamentary Draftsman. The member for Angas and other members will recall the discussion and argument that ensued; they pressed for the same privileges in respect of the Parliamentary Drafts-

man as had prevailed previously. The then Attorney-General (the present Leader of the Opposition) and the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) assured this House that members' privileges in respect of the Parliamentary Draftsman would be continued, and they were so continued throughout last session. If a member does not give the Attorney-General a copy of a Bill that the member intends to introduce, the Attorney-General will go first to the Parliamentary Draftsman and ask for a copy; if he does not obtain the copy in that way, he will then go to the Government Printer and demand a copy from him.

I wish to refer to some words of the then Speaker in 1965 when Opposition members protested against any rights being taken away from them. The Speaker at that time was the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches). In a part of the statement made at that time the Speaker mentioned the practice of members in referring in this House to the Parliamentary Draftsman, but I shall not deal with this. The Speaker said:

So that the functions of the Parliamentary Draftsman can be seen in perspective let me say that I fully realize that the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistants are servants of the Crown and answerable to the Attorney-General, and that they are not officers of Parliament answerable to the Speaker. However, they have always provided a service of inestimable value to all members of the House, and, as Speaker and custodian of the rights and privileges of each member, I am concerned that there should be no diminution of the advice available to members from officers of the Parliamentary Draftsman's Department. Accordingly, I should welcome now an assurance from the Attorney-General that there will be no curtailment of the services previously available to members.

That assurance was given by the Attorney-General, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will seek a similar assurance from the present Attorney-General that the same privileges will be available to members here, without the Attorney-General having the right to find out the contents of Bills prepared for individual members before such Bills are presented to this House. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that you are nodding, so I accept that you will ask for that assurance. Therefore, I shall not pursue this subject any further, except to say that at 2.40 p.m. today, while the Leader was speaking, an interjection was made from one of the front benches to the Attorney-General; the interjection was, "Why did you do it?" The Attorney-General was frank enough to reply, "Because I wanted to see what was in it." The reference was to a private member's Bill that had not been presented to the House

because the Government would not allow it to be introduced, but the Attorney-General was quite frank in reply to the interjector: he said, "The reason I did it was that I wanted to see what was in it."

I shall not pursue this matter further because I believe I have your support, Mr. Speaker, in regard to it. I do not wish to delay the House further, but I cannot make a strong enough protest about the intention of members opposite to keep this House out of session for nine months of the year. The previous Government kept this House in session practically throughout the year; at any rate, we sat for nine months of the year, and we often sat throughout the night. The proof is in *Hansard*: if one looks at the volumes of *Hansard*, one can see that they doubled in size in 1965, 1966 and 1967.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I regret that the House has been out of session for so long. There are 39 electoral districts in South Australia. Although one member may be unable to be present because of the sittings of a Court of Disputed Returns, the other 38 members should be heard in this House. I once took the Playford Government to task very severely because it had been out of session for seven-and-a-half months, and it would appear that the present Government intends to conduct Parliamentary business along those lines. My constituents have been asking me for several weeks, "When are you going to meet in the House so that you can air our grievances?" I have had to reply, "Well, when the Premier is prepared to call the House together." I was very disturbed to learn that the House was to be called together today and tomorrow and that it would then adjourn until some time in July; it will again be several weeks before I can make the voice of the people I represent heard in this House.

References have been made in the newspaper to the discussion of matters in dark corridors. I am not prepared to discuss things in dark corridors, but I am prepared to discuss them with a Minister of the Crown, and I do this from time to time. I do not believe, however, (despite the fact that we have access, when necessary, to Cabinet Ministers) that this House should be out of session for several weeks when there are grievances which should be aired in this House and which cannot be finalized within Ministers' rooms. I sincerely hope that the member for Adelaide was incorrect when he said that the House might rise early in October; I believe that once the House rises in October it will not meet for

several months, and I do not think this is good for the State. I have been waiting since May 8 to bring certain matters before the House. The present Government took office on April 17. A vital matter has cropped up that affects my district very much; it is the matter of trains. My constituents have been consistently asking me, "When will Parliament meet so that you can make our grievances heard in this connection?"

I extend to the member for Millicent my congratulations on his once again winning the seat so convincingly for the Labor Party last Saturday. I was in the Millicent District for a few days, although it was not necessary for me to visit the area because there were 400 local people working in the township of Millicent alone for the honourable member. I had no fears regarding his being returned to this House. Nevertheless, I was in Millicent and, because I was a primary producer before I entered Parliament, I took the opportunity of calling upon some primary producers. After calling on about six of them, I had no doubt about where they stood and about what would be the election result on Saturday last. They said that Des Corcoran's character and the work that he had done in the District of Millicent were beyond reproach. Because of his work, not only in connection with the workers in the mills but also for the fishermen and primary producers in the district, it seemed to me that most of the primary producers that I called upon intended to vote for the Labor Party.

It was reported in the *News* last night that the Premier had heard a person who was standing outside the Millicent polling booth and handing out Australian Labor Party cards keep reminding voters of Mr. Corcoran's family responsibilities and the need for him to have a job. What a joke that was! I saw the Premier arrive in Millicent on Saturday morning last. In a short time he presented himself at the Millicent polling booth, where he remained for most of the day. I was not handing out cards at the Millicent polling booth but I was talking to people standing around, and not once did I hear any person make the remark that Des Corcoran had family responsibilities and that there was a need for him to have a job. The Premier's statement regarding the handing out of A.L.P. cards was a complete lie; there was no foundation for it.

I say that because I was there and spoke to the Premier several times and for most of the time I was in hearing distance of the people

to whom he spoke (not that I was eavesdropping: I was standing there and, if people standing nearby speak, one cannot fail to hear). I assure the House that not once on that occasion was the statement to which I have referred made. If the Premier claims that the statement was made, I challenge him tonight to back up his statement and identify the person who was supposed to make these overtures on behalf of Des Corcoran. Since the return of the member for Millicent on Saturday, the Premier has stated in the press that the Millicent by-election was fought on personalities, not on issues that vitally affected the District of Millicent and the State of South Australia. Again, that is a misrepresentation of the truth and, in my opinion, is an insult to the intelligence of the people of the Millicent District.

I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that never before in the history of South Australia have the issues been more clearly understood by the people than they were before they went to the ballot box in Millicent last Saturday. The redistribution of electoral boundaries was the main issue in the by-election. Both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition made this plain during the campaign, and their statements at various meetings appeared in the press many times. I do not understand how the Premier could say, after the election, that the election had been fought on personalities, not on an issue.

During the few days I resided at Millicent I was vitally concerned about the reference to Des Corcoran by certain members of the Liberal Party as being a sympathizer with the Communist Party. I did not seek this sort of information but, as I have mentioned earlier, I had time on my hands, because there was no need for me to do any work: the work was being done by the loyal supporters of Des Corcoran who resided at Millicent. However, a person came to me and openly stated that a tradesman had called at his house and said that he had come direct from four different places and that L.C.L. people, or persons who had identified themselves as L.C.L. supporters of the candidate in Millicent, had intimated to them that Des Corcoran was a sympathizer with the Communists.

I do not think for a minute that this gentleman would have volunteered this information if it had not been given by certain people, so I say, "Shame on any member of the Liberal Party who would go to Millicent and try to degrade a man who has given such sterling

service to Australia." I do not think for a minute that the Premier would have condoned this action had he known about it. I have known the Premier for several years and, whilst I detest his politics (and that is mutual, I suppose), I do not think he would have condoned it. I am sure that, if he knew this was taking place, he would have reprimanded those who were spreading this story. Nevertheless, it was said and, if one says things like that, people who come from other parts of the world and have been under the domination of Communism become suspicious and afraid and will turn away from a good representative.

That is exactly what I fear happened in Millicent itself and in other parts of the District of Millicent during the campaign and was registered in the ballot box on Saturday. Because of what I heard in the district, I am confident that, if this had not been said and this campaign had been fought as the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition wanted it to be fought, Des Corcoran would have had a much larger majority than he obtained. Again I say, "Shame on those members who would lower themselves by trying to degrade a highly respectable man whose character is beyond reproach."

Mr. Riches: You aren't suggesting that members of this House did it, are you?

Mr. HUGHES: I am, because this gentleman told me that they were members of Parliament, that they identified themselves as such.

Mr. Riches: Did he give their names?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. I am not prepared to state their names but I am sure this gentleman at Millicent would be quite prepared to tell anyone who wanted to know. He told me that this tradesman had come to his place and identified them as members of Parliament. I asked whether they were young, middle-aged or old, and he said that they were young men.

Before the last general elections held on March 2, the main issue peddled around my district by the present Premier and my opponent was decentralization. The advertisements that appeared in the press confirmed it; their literature distributed around the district confirmed it; and the speeches made throughout the district also confirmed it. They stated that the L.C.L. Government would look after the interests of country people (that meant they were talking about the primary producers as well as townspeople) and, "We will give the country people preferential treatment."

Between 2,000 and 3,000 people swallowed the bait. One advertisement published in the towns stated, "We want work now and not lots of talk." The Premier on a telecast interview with my opponent and Senator-elect Young intimated that people required industry within the area to maintain employment. I have the script, because I used a tape recorder whilst they were giving the interview. I shall not refer to it, but the Premier said that industry was required in areas such as Wallaroo to maintain employment. Another piece of literature stated that it seemed as if we were going to lose the proposed nitrogenous fertilizer works because the Labor Party would not build the pipeline a few miles west of the proposed route. However, there was a great slip-up on the part of the Liberal Party when it dragged up the old bogey about the meatworks, and I think that Party was caused great embarrassment by some people from Wallaroo by putting this in their pamphlets. The Premier and his candidate were offering preferential treatment to people in my district, a country district. The Government took office on April 17, but on May 8 this year, a comparatively short time after it took office, the following article appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser*:

Some passenger trains to stop. Reorganization of rail services to save up to \$1m. a year was announced by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Hill) yesterday. Some country passenger services will be cancelled and others converted to co-ordinated rail and road services. In some instances road transport will replace rail services. Subject to an inquiry by the Public Works Committee, some country railway lines will be closed. Rail passenger services on Eyre Peninsula will be cancelled and not replaced by any departmentally sponsored alternative service.

Preferential treatment to the country! That is what we were promised, but when I tried to arrange a deputation on the matter I was stalled off at the Minister's office for up to 22 days.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: How long?

Mr. HUGHES: For 22 days.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You don't mean it!

Mr. HUGHES: Yes I do, but thanks to the Premier (and every member knows that I always give credit where it is due), with whom I discussed this matter, it was rectified within half an hour, and we were able to see the Minister of Transport within a few days. This is the preferential treatment that is supposed to be meted out to country districts! I will not read any more but merely draw attention

to the statement that certain rail services are to be replaced by road services, including the Adelaide-Moonta service, existing rail services to be cancelled and not replaced by any departmentally-sponsored alternative service including Moonta to Brinkworth. Cut them out altogether! No inquiries were made (and it is no use any member of the Liberal Party trying to tell me they were) in my district concerning whether the primary producer would be affected by this move in any way. It came out of the blue. It is a pity the elections were not held after this development, because 2,000 electors might have been tacked on to my majority!

On May 9, I sent a telegram to the Minister of Transport strongly protesting against any Government proposal to cancel the rail passenger and parcel service to the District of Wallaroo, and on May 24 last I introduced to the Minister a deputation representing people from the Kadina, Wallaroo, Moonta, Bute and Paskeville areas. Those present spoke to the Minister and protested strongly against the Government's proposal. On May 28, I presented the Minister with a petition signed by 1,300 people in the district (the signatures had been collected in two days; if those responsible had taken a week they could have obtained 3,000 signatures). If any member wishes to approach the Minister in order to examine the petition, he will find that it contains the signatures of many primary producers. The Minister saw fit to reply yesterday to the representations made by that deputation (I suppose he thought that he had better get in then, because he knew we would have an opportunity today to raise these matters). Unfortunately, however, it was not a particularly favourable reply.

Prior to the deputation, a meeting was called at Wallaroo and attended by between 300 and 400 people who represented every activity within the district, including people working in the local fertilizer works, business people from Wallaroo and Kadina, and representatives from the Bute farming area and from areas as far away as Melton. These people supported the protest against the cancellation of the rail service to the area. Although it had not occurred to me previously, the chairman's attention was drawn to the fact that this was a public meeting and that it had been called as such, and people wanted to know the whereabouts of other members of Parliament who represented the area. Only one member of the five representing the district was present, and I travelled 150 miles to be there that night.

It would have been just as convenient for one, or perhaps two, of the other four members in the Midland District to attend that meeting and either to explain the Government's policy on this matter or else to give some support. A motion was moved at the meeting asking that, before any action was taken on the matter, the four members from the Midland District (who are representatives in another place of the people I represent) visit the Wallaroo District and inquire as to its requirements. This meeting was attended by the farmers and businessmen of the community because of the service that the Railways Department offered in this connection.

Many statistics were presented to the Minister on that occasion but I will not weary members with all of them now. Members on both sides know (and I told this to His Royal Highness recently in the presence of the Premier who, although he smiled, did not deny it) that the Wallaroo District is one of the best grain-producing areas in South Australia. Everyone knows that the peninsula is an agricultural district with over 1,000,000 acres of barley and wheat-growing country. The existing rail service is vital in transporting expensive agricultural machinery to seed and harvest the crop. The harvest operation is such that the stoppage of a machine can cause a farmer to lose up to 1,000 bags of grain a day which, as can be appreciated, represents not only an individual monetary loss to the farmer but also a loss to the district and to the State generally. This would mean more to a number of members opposite than it would to my own colleagues, because I believe that only one of my colleagues is a primary producer.

Mr. Hurst: We have a fair interest in primary producers, though.

Mr. HUGHES: I know, otherwise I should not be supporting this request to the Minister of Transport to maintain this service and to enable primary producers to continue to operate in the way they have operated in the past.

Mr. Hurst: We would do more for them than the present Government does.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, because we are more sympathetic towards them. Members opposite are too busy with their own problems to worry about those of other people, whereas most members on this side (and I refer now to members representing country districts) look after the primary producer to the best of their ability. Some of us have had experience on farms, and we know what we are talking about.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HUGHES: I was certain I would receive a few interjections from the so-called North Terrace primary producers. It does not matter what members opposite say because I have an answer for them regarding primary producers in my area, whom I will support to the hilt on this matter. Our present rail service provides an excellent service in this respect as urgent machinery parts can be obtained within a few hours. For example, parts phoned for at 9 a.m. at Port Adelaide are railed from Glanville to Adelaide, make our rail connection at 10.10 a.m. and arrive at Kadina at 1.5 p.m., and parts phoned for as late as 4 p.m. are at Kadina at 9.5 p.m. Whether such a service is profitable to the Railways Department on a dollars and cents basis I do not know. It is the fault of the Railways Commissioner if he does not make the service pay; all I know is that the service is profitable to the primary producers and it is a gain to them, particularly in busy times. However, there were two agricultural machinery dealers on the deputation, which would surprise the Minister, I know, because they were two of the biggest farm machinery dealers on the whole of the peninsula. One of them said, "As an agricultural machinery dealer, I can personally vouch for the appreciating of your service by the grain growers of our district in the busy times. I doubt very much, Mr. Minister, whether any privately owned transport would be able to match these present services together with the suburban connections profitable to them. Although I have the utmost confidence in private enterprise, I believe that the State transport system should be flexible enough to cater for examples such as those I quoted today." One could say that the southern part of Yorke Peninsula can reap its farm lands without a rail service, as the honourable member for Yorke Peninsula would state, but I hasten to point out that in the busy periods the service that the South Australian Railways provides to the district is used extensively, directly and indirectly, by these farmers, as well as the machinery service shops, to supplement their road transport services. I do not know what it costs to run a Bluebird per mile when the rails are already laid but I am certain that, when the revenue earned by passenger and parcel freight is added to the service needed by the District of Wallaroo, any curtailment of passenger and parcel services will not be in the best interests of the district.

I now refer to page 37 of the 1966-67 Railways Commissioner's Annual Report, which indicates that 14 diesel railcars are employed on country services, compared with 82 on suburban lines. From page 82 of the same report it seems that the revenue earned on country passengers is \$1,800,000, compared with \$1,900,000 earned by suburban railcars. It can be seen from the same page that an additional \$1,000,000 is received from parcel freights and, if it can be assumed that most of that revenue comes from country areas, it seems that much more revenue must be earned by the 14 country passenger railcars than is earned by the 82 suburban railcars. In reply by letter yesterday the Minister said that this had perhaps not been interpreted correctly, and he implied that the amendment I have referred to concerning country districts took into account interstate rail travel. He said, "In referring to the evidence submitted by Mr. East, the revenue shown for country passenger services includes that from interstate movements, which represents approximately two-thirds of the total." If that were the case, why did not the Minister say so at the deputation? On page 82 the Commissioner said that revenue earned on country passengers was \$1,800,000, as compared with \$1,900,000 earned by suburban railcars. Yet the Minister later indicated that at least some of this revenue came from interstate trains. Why did he not know this when this was presented to him that morning? He knew enough to have it all published in the *Advertiser* on May 8, but that is typical of Cabinet Ministers in the L.C.L. Government: they are not sure of their ground, and that is one reason why they want to keep the House out of session. Don't you think, Mr. Speaker, that if you were a Minister of the Crown and you had made a statement to the press revealing all the proposed cancellations of rail services in South Australia you would have familiarized yourself with the earnings from country rail passenger services that were to receive the guillotine, and would know what the railcars were returning?

Once again, this item was never intended to be published in the *Advertiser* on May 8. How it got there I do not know. However, it is having a disastrous effect on railway employees in my district, some of whom have resigned to go to the Commonwealth Railways and others of whom have gone to Whyalla to work on the railways. It was brought to my notice three weeks ago that seven men had resigned from the railways in that area, yet during the period

of the campaign before the March 2 election the Premier and his assistants who went to that area were trying to stress that they wanted to leave the people in their employment. Yet, as soon as this Liberal Government assumes office, what happens? We are told there will be a cancellation of railway services. It will affect about 14 men at Moonta, another seven men at Wallaroo, and it could affect five men between Kadina and Melton. I am concerned about my district, because we can ill afford to lose these people, despite the undertaking given in the Minister's letter when he states:

While there will be no retrenchment of railway employees—and the Government is adamant on this—there must admittedly be some movement of railway personnel from the area.

I am concerned about the removal of personnel from the area, and so should the Government be concerned about it, but it did not show much concern: the first that the railway employees knew about it was when they read it in the *Advertiser*. What a nice way to tell the employees! That was also the first I knew about it. I was even accused in my own district of knowing all about it, and that I did not want to tell them. I want to tell this House now what I told the public meeting very convincingly (those at the meeting believed it): that I did not know a thing about it, nor did my colleagues. They read it in the newspaper, too, and so did these poor employees.

Some of these men are past middle age, and they own what they consider to be fairly valuable properties in the district. What are they going to do if they have to pick up their goods and chattels and go somewhere else? It seems strange to me that, although the Minister says there will be no retrenchments, these men are to be placed. On the face of it the same wages bill for railway employees will be paid. That is all poppycock; no-one will ever convince me that 20 or 30 men will be taken from one area and placed in another area. What the Minister did not say was that perhaps the men would be transferred to the Engineering and Water Supply Department or some other department. He did not say that they would be maintained by the Railways Department, and his undertaking does not console the employee who owns property at Wallaroo, Kadina or Moonta.

Mrs. Byrne: He will have to work at a lower rate of pay if he goes away.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. There will be a return to the situation that occurred when the

Playford Government was in power, when some men maintained two homes, one in my district and another in Adelaide. Government members talk about giving preferential treatment to the people in my district, but some of my constituents are wandering in the dark in the way that some people worked in the dark in the Moonta and Wallaroo mines. It is no joke when one has to deal with people crying at one's doorstep that they do not know what they will do. The life savings of one man in Wallaroo have gone into building a nice home for himself; he lost his wife in an accident three or four years ago. He thought that he would be able to settle down in Wallaroo, but he could now be transferred from Wallaroo and he would never be able to regain the sum he has spent in building this home. So, I believe the Government should reconsider this matter. The people in my district are much distressed and the farming community is much distressed. I referred to one of the farm machinery men in the township of Bute, and all members know how the people of Bute vote. There is no need for me to tell them that but, as I have just said, if the voting had taken place after this appeared in the *Advertiser* things certainly would have been different, because the people were up in arms.

This farm machinery dealer from Bute told the Minister that morning about this passenger rail service from Moonta to Brinkworth. For the information of members, I explain that it leaves Moonta, takes all the high school children from Wallaroo to Kadina and goes on to Brinkworth. On the previous night the Adelaide train goes to Moonta, drops all the parcels and machinery parts for the Bute area at Kadina. Next morning these are picked up and taken to Bute. As far as passengers are concerned, it is not a paying proposition. I agree with the Minister and the Government on that, but I am concerned about the service being rendered to primary producers on that particular line.

I should like to see the figures regarding the train from Adelaide to Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta. Perhaps the Premier will ask the Minister of Transport to make them available to me so that I may see what loss is being incurred on that line, because that train is practically full every night when it leaves the Adelaide railway station. People get out along the line as far as Two Wells and Mallala; from there on there is not a great deal of passenger traffic. However, on some nights the train carries up to four tons of parcel freight, which represents a pretty good return

to the Government. Although the train may be running at a loss, what business does not sell some items at a loss? Every businessman knows that he cannot sell at a profit every line in which he deals. He would be a good businessman if he were able to sell all items at a profit. It is not only the people in the District of Wallaroo that are up in arms; the people in other districts are concerned.

Mr. Ryan: Rocky River?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, Rocky River is one and the member for that district will support me in this, I am sure. The people in the member for Stirling's district are up in arms about the proposed cancellation of train services. The member for Stirling tells me that he has not been in his district for two years.

Mr. McAnaney: If you said that in my district, the people would laugh at you.

Mr. HUGHES: I often laugh at the honourable member, too, in regard to some of the things he tells me. I consider that the people of my district are justified in the protest that they have made to the Minister of Transport on this matter. Service to the people is involved, and if the Government wants to make the business of running a railcar to those areas pay it should do some homework on the matter. Service is not improved and the number of passengers is not increased by increasing the fares. If a better service is given, the people will use it.

One of the bugbears for some time (and I hold this against the previous Government also, not only against the present Government) has been that on Wednesdays one of those shaking Billies goes up and down the line and people are never too sure when it will be running. Apart from Wednesdays it is a good service. I returned to Wallaroo by train about two weeks ago on a Wednesday morning, and it was a shocking trip. A sick man and his wife travelled on this train and the wife told me that if she had known that this particular car was being used she would have waited until a later train. The answer is not to raise fares, but the Railways Commissioner and his staff should do some homework and give people better services so that the railways would receive more patronage.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think he wants to give people a better service?

Mr. HUGHES: Not at this time: he does not want to give them any at all. The railway staff in my district is one of my main concerns, because I wish to maintain as many people in Wallaroo as I possibly can. If people

leave Kadina, Moonta, and Wallaroo, the business people will suffer. It is not a laughing matter, as the Attorney-General may lead people to believe: it is a serious one. The present proposal strikes at a declared Government policy, namely, decentralization, which is the whole crux of the matter.

Mr. Riches: You won't see a word of that in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech.

Mr. HUGHES: No. Another thing that was not there was a mention of natural gas coming to Wallaroo, although the Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, had plenty to say about that.

Mr. Clark: That was before the election.

Mr. HUGHES: He criticized the Labor Party for trying to get it to Wallaroo, and his remarks were reported in the press. If the Government takes men from the country it will bring them to the city and this will cause a build-up in the city. Before the next election, which I hope will not be too far distant, the Premier and his colleagues will go to districts such as Wallaroo and tell people again that his Government will give them preferential treatment. At the public meeting a statement was made that this Government had hopped in early. The Government hopes that we shall have forgotten about its proposed action before the next election. I firmly believe it was never intended that the information should get into the hands of the press on that particular occasion. One of the advertisements splashed right across the local paper stated that the Government would look for new industry to commence in Wallaroo.

Mr. Clark: They looked for years.

Mr. HUGHES: For 32 years the L.C.L. Government has had the opportunity to look for industry for Wallaroo, but it failed. Indeed, the Government took it away. Anyone visiting my district will realize that it has become rehabilitated; it was just starting to get on its feet again when down came the guillotine in the form of the cancellation of railway services. The L.C.L. Government has had 32 years in which to make good its promises but it has not done so. The present Government also said it wished to improve the Wallaroo harbour and to have it used more frequently. It will be interesting for me, as the member for the district, to see what happens in connection with the harbour within the next 12 months and to see whether it is used more. Indeed, the harbour could be used more if further deepening were to take place and if perhaps the South Australian Co-

operative Bulk Handling Limited were to build more barley cells there, and so forth. But we shall leave that to the Government. At the Kadina meeting I answered the three issues that had been raised during the election campaign, namely, the Government's statements that it would look for new industry to commence at Wallaroo, that low-rental houses were needed for Wallaroo senior citizens, and that it wanted to improve the Wallaroo harbour and have it used more. People were asked to vote for the L.C.L. and thereby vote for the attraction of new industry to Wallaroo. A few months ago the Dunstan Government was instrumental in having a new industry established at Wallaroo but within a few weeks of the Liberal Government's taking office that industry closed. Although I do not know whether it has closed permanently, I know that the men have all received notice and have gone.

Mr. Venning: You cannot blame the Government for that.

Mr. HUGHES: I expected that, and I hope the member for Rocky River will speak directly, not by way of interjection, and be man enough to tell the House why that industry closed.

Mr. Jennings: He will make a speech in a minute.

Mr. HUGHES: I am challenging him now, because the member for Rocky River knows something about wheat and barley. We realize that he is a primary producer and that he also knows something about bulking grain, being a director of the company.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What about his predecessor?

Mr. HUGHES: I am challenging the new member for Rocky River to get up directly to tell the House about the situation. Although the industry to which I have referred has been closed, other industries were opened up during the three years the Labor Government was in office, and they have played a great part in the district, I am pleased to say. But if this is to be a continuation of the situation that existed under the Playford Government, all I can say is that we shall have other industries closing down. I am vitally concerned about this matter, because a start has already been made in this regard in connection with the railways. I hope this will not come to pass and that the Government will further examine the matter. The Minister was good enough in the final paragraph of his letter to say that he was happy to have discussions with representatives of areas affected by railway

rationalization and that the representations made by the deputation would receive full consideration at the "appropriate time".

The point I make is: when is the appropriate time? The Government announced on the front page of the *Advertiser* that certain things would take place. It did not say when this would happen or what alternative services would be used in connection with this matter. Finally we got out of the Minister of Transport that it would be conducted by private enterprise rather than by the Railways Department and, since then, he has also told me that the fares charged will be cheaper than those at present charged by the department. However, I make this point: if private enterprise can do this why can the Government not do it? If the Government is so concerned about closing the railway service why can it not give a better service and encourage people to use this service more frequently so as to make it pay? I believe this could be done if a proper effort were made.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): Opposition members have spoken on a wide range of subjects today, and I am sure they believe they have been able to give vent to their desires, politically, as much as they require. Any charge that the Government is trying to prevent Parliament from sitting is without foundation. A good reason exists why the time table for sittings has been chosen as it has. I shall explain again to members the reason in case they have not seen it in newspapers or personally discussed it. It has been generally accepted that neither Party wanted Parliament to sit whilst the by-election was being held in Millicent. As members opposite are silent, I take it that is agreed.

Mr. Hughes: It could have sat.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his speech.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It could have, but again I say that the Opposition agreed generally with that principle. It has been able to have its new member in the House for the debate today, so Parliament's not sitting has not been to the Opposition's disadvantage. I realize the Opposition was not to know this: the result was to be determined by a by-election, but I think that this position is generally accepted. Obviously the financial provisions that the Committee will consider this evening must be dealt with before the end of the financial year. Therefore, Parliament must sit for these two days. As members know, the Premiers' Conference and the meet-

ing of the Loan Council will be held on Thursday and Friday.

Regarding the adjournment until July 23, I point out that some firms should be visited in the United Kingdom and Europe, and one (perhaps two) in the United States of America. It is some years since a Premier of the State has gone to these places and seen firms in these areas. Before the end of the year (certainly before December, when possibly this session will terminate), it is necessary that the Premier of the State visit these places. I assure honourable members that I will be taking as short a time as possible to carry out this programme, which will indeed be heavy: it will not be a programme that will in any way envisage tourism. Therefore, it ill behoves anybody to say that this is anything other than a trip on behalf of the State, which is necessary at this time. Those are the reasons why the sittings have been arranged in the way they have been arranged and why we believe Parliament cannot commence again until July 23. The Government has no intention of subduing debate in this place. I gave the Leader of the Opposition a copy of the Supplementary Estimates yesterday afternoon so that he would have time, in view of the particular time table we planned for these two days, to study them before the Houses met.

Mr. Hughes: Cannot the House go on with the Address in Reply while you are away?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I believe I should be present when the House is sitting, as this is the first time the House is sitting with me as Premier. The honourable member will get plenty of opportunity to discuss these things later. After all, he has been speaking for a long time, and I do not criticize him for being vocal tonight. It is his opportunity in one of the freest speaking Parliaments. Good luck to him, although I do not agree with all that he has said. He has trodden on very dangerous ground in what he has said, particularly with reference to the fertilizer industry at Wallaroo. He should know that the Leader of the Opposition during his election campaign made certain statements at Wallaroo about the proposed visit of the principal of the firm that was going to manufacture fertilizer at Wallaroo, and it was stated that he would visit Wallaroo soon after the election.

Mr. Hughes: The Leader did not say that: I did.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Well, the member said it. On what basis did the honourable member say that?

Mr. Hughes: I have plenty of bases.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has no basis for interjecting.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In the light of what the ex-Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition, himself put to me, I reply that there is a letter from the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), written to the then Premier from New York, saying that he thought that this firm was affected adversely in relation to the fertilizer industry because the pipeline was taking the direct route. I will bring the letter to the House for the honourable member to see some day. This is how his Government decentralized industry in South Australia. Let him not talk too loosely here about what we might do, when there is evidence on the file that I can present to this House.

Regarding running the railways efficiently to attract patronage and therefore obviate the necessity to rationalize, the honourable member has just completed a term of office as a member of the Government in charge of this matter for three years.

Mr. Hughes: It did not reduce the railways.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Apparently, it did not make them attractive, either. We had the responsibility for them suddenly handed over, and within three months it is said that we should make them attractive. The honourable member's argument is just a lot of hot air. I respect his representations on behalf of his constituents, but this is another matter. I commend him for bringing their interests to the House, but I bring to his notice the fallacy of his argument. The series of speeches we have had tonight from the Opposition has been enlivened by the topics they have covered and by the friends and supporters of the Leader of the Opposition in this House—and not only those sitting opposite us. There are the people he has enlivened out in the front this evening, and I believe it is another illustration of the contempt into which this Parliament is being brought in South Australia by the actions of the Leader in this regard.

Mrs. Byrne: Why didn't you come out?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I was surprised (if we can talk about electoral reform, which I shall not discuss for very long) to find that the Leader of the Opposition said that he and I should sit down and fix this matter outside this House. He is a person who has made full use of this House in debating subjects year

after year, and he is renowned for being a good debater. Why does he want to take it outside the House when the Government will bring in a Bill, have it discussed at any length and adjourn it so that members can consider it for as long as they want to? Why should it be done behind closed doors or outside this House? It is one of the strangest statements I have yet heard a member make. I thought that the Leader was averse to having conferences with the Legislative Council, yet he used this as a reason why we should have a conference now. I do not think it is desirable to have the type of conference that we had last year, when the Leader went outside to get his orders from the A.L.P. machine. The obvious manner in which electoral reform should be settled is in debate here. The type of debate we have heard indicates how this issue of electoral reform has broken down the reputation not only of members but of politics in general in South Australia. There is no disagreement that issues must be settled. Much has been made tonight of the Millicent by-election: it has been fought all over again. I am sure if we had put up member for member we could have had a ding-dong fight over Millicent again, but that is finished and the A.L.P. has won it.

Mr. Langley: Why don't you go to the people now?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This is an issue which we have seen fragmented into little bits tonight. Little reasons have been given, pulling the question down into the mire. Accusations have been made against us. Indeed, one member was called a Communist. The L.C.L. was accused of having paid for the D.L.P. candidate to stand, and of having given our candidate \$3,000 to win the election. All these sorts of rumours and statements have been made.

In its election campaign the A.L.P. stated in black type the untruth that the L.C.L. would amalgamate the seats of Mount Gambier and Millicent. On the one hand that Party criticized us for not knowing our plan and of not putting it to the people, yet they knew enough to say that we would amalgamate those two seats. What a silly contradiction! We clearly stated the principles on which our scheme would be based, and I do not think we should re-hash the matter. Surely the publicity in the Millicent by-election fully put forward these points and the clear principles on which we said we would act.

I deliberately said that there would be no compromise so that there could be no misrepresentation of what we might do. We know now that electoral reform cannot pass through this House without the approval of both sides. That is a simple statement of fact. I am not hiding that fact, and it is futile to say that things have been hidden. The A.L.P. bears a heavy responsibility in distorting the basis on which we have brought our scheme in. Arguments have been put up and then knocked down. We have said this is one of the simplest schemes that has been promoted, and it has no tricks in it.

Mr. Hudson: Are there going to be higher quotas for cities such as Whyalla and Port Pirie?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member can speak on it in the House here, before the public—not behind closed doors. Anyone would think we were denying a debate on it.

Mr. Hudson: What amendments would you accept?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I could ask the honourable member what he thinks would be a compromise. We are not debating the Bill at this moment, and he knows it. Let us face the facts and examine the principles behind our policy. We will argue not the details (which must be put to the House at the earliest opportunity) but only the principles, despite the fact that there has been talk of an immediate election. Let us argue about the principles upon which the policy is based.

The Leader and other members of the Opposition would have citizens in other States believe that this policy is something horrid, different and undemocratic. I ask: by whose standards? We have selected a scheme, as I have said several times, that is about average by Australian mainland standards. It may be wrong in the minds of some people, but some people will disagree with any scheme. We are not saying that people must not disagree with our scheme, but it is wrong to maintain that it is a trick and that it has been framed on a low principle in order to gain an advantage for 30 years. There has been no such thought in connection with it. Indeed, the boundaries have not been drawn by me or by any member of my Party, so we are unable to say to members opposite whether there will be an advantage for 10, 20 or 30 years: we have not looked at it in that light.

Honourable members should look again at the situation in other States. Which States have similar problems in regard to area and

distance? They stick out a mile as being Western Australia and Queensland. What sort of representation and weighting of country areas do those States have?

Mr. Hudson: Thirty per cent, on average.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Nonsense; the honourable member knows that this is not so.

Mr. Hudson: It is, on average. Quote from the Queensland figures and give the average.

The SPEAKER: Order! the honourable member for Glenelg is out of order.

Mr. Hudson: I shall obtain my copy of that document, which is issued by the Premier's Party. Give the average.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member knows that the weighting in Queensland is quite substantial; in the metropolitan area the highest is 18,000 and the lowest 10,000. In provincial cities it varies from 16,000 to 10,000, and in the country it varies from 13,000 to 7,000.

Mr. Hudson: What is the average?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am not going to be led astray by the little mathematical tricks that the member for Glenelg always tries to play. The figures are there for him to examine. There is no trick about it.

Mr. Hudson: Will the Premier make that document available?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall make this page available.

Mr. Hudson: I should like the Premier to make the whole document available. It is put out by his Party.

The SPEAKER: This is not a conversation. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The facts regarding Western Australia are more extreme than those regarding Queensland. In Western Australia the highest figure is 30,000, ranging down to 10,000, in the city. In the country it ranges from 6,000 to 5,000. There are four special areas with quotas of 3,000, and three special areas with quotas of 2,000. These schemes are obviously more extreme than that which we are introducing. Members opposite may say the schemes are wrong: that is their belief and their privilege, but let us not say that the scheme we are bringing in is unheard of, different and immoral. Perhaps members opposite should go to the United Kingdom and observe the ratios there. The member for Glenelg would be occupied for many moons going through the 630-odd seats in the House of Commons, and he would find some surprising answers as to the necessity as seen by the United Kingdom for weighting outlying areas.

If the honourable member goes to the United States, he will be given figures which are surprising in the light of the oft-quoted Supreme Court decisions. The Congressional figures vary from as much as 500,000 to 300,000. When we select a scheme that is about average, we are told that the eyes of Australia are upon us and that it must be immoral. What rubbish!

Mr. Riches: Do you know any political commentator who says that it is an average?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I know that there are many tame political commentators around and I wonder how much inspiration some of the editorial writers in other States get from members opposite. The facts show that, if they criticize us, they must also criticize most of the remainder of Australia. This is what the Opposition carefully keeps out of the argument. They go as far, when they know that our country quota could never allow the amalgamation of Mount Gambier and Millicent, as to baldly state an untruth and say that the election has been won clearly on electoral reform. That sort of statement is an untrue representation.

Mr. Ryan: What do you base it on?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Those statements were certainly on the basis that, when you tell an untruth, you should tell a big one. There is little more to say in that regard. The details will be argued here, if we have anything to say about it.

Many other things have been said. The Chowilla business has been dragged into the political field again by the Labor Party, and we are supposed to have started this matter of accepting alternatives. However, it was the Leader of the Opposition who started this when he was Premier.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Rubbish!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: On August 15 last in this House he moved the following motion:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion without notice forthwith: That, in the opinion of this House, assurances should be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that whatever action is taken by the River Murray Commission concerning the Chowilla dam or any alternative proposal, South Australia will be provided with water in dry years to the extent intended to have been assured by the Chowilla dam project.

That was the sell-out. We argued all afternoon and after dinner to get that motion amended.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: To toughen it up.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes. The rot began in the weeks before, leading up to this

negotiation, this throwing away of the Chowilla scheme on behalf of South Australia. When we came into office, we found that the next meeting was all set up for the River Murray Commission to throw the project away. Yet members opposite talk in this House and outside about our not causing a dispute! The thing is to keep it alive, to continue negotiations to get it on some sort of viable basis again. *Hansard* will show the date when the rot first started on Chowilla.

We have also heard talk this evening about industry. I could not quite hear all that the Leader said. However, we have had some success with industry, in that there have been expressions to the Government of confidence because there is now in South Australia a Government that believes unashamedly in private enterprise as the best means of developing South Australia. This is an encouraging thought for industry in the State. I have a list of several industries that have announced that they are expanding or coming to South Australia.

Mr. Riches: Don't you think the Government might do something about it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: About what?

Mr. Riches: About encouraging industry.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I should have thought that the member for Stuart would read the newspapers and know there has been much activity by the new Government concerning industrial development. In the first two years of the Labor Government there was almost no activity of any use in this regard, but, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, under pressure from our side of the House at that time the Government started to organize departmental activity to promote industry. This activity still continues. I appreciate the renewed confidence in people's minds, and I hope and trust that this will be transmitted to factual development in this State. In the last few months we have seen an indication that more is happening, although I am not saying that the present Government is entirely responsible. Two industries will be announced within a week or 10 days—one a new one and one an expansion. They are not large, but they are valuable industries. We have had an announcement by Softwoods and Petbow; Lindeel Engineering Pty. Ltd., a small but important firm with which I was associated last year in launching a new corporation; General Binding Corporation, a bookbinding firm; and Beechcraft Corporation, a new industry at Parafield. These all add to our skills and new industries.

Mr. McKee: Are any going into the country?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Also, there is the Rigby Ltd. expansion into the old Rosella premises. Unfortunately, two industries—Davies Coop (S.A.) Pty. Ltd. and Rosella Foods Pty. Ltd.—have closed.

Mr. McKee: Are any going to Mallala or into the country?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No doubt the member for Port Pirie will contribute to the debate soon, although he has shown no signs yet that he will. The essence of what I am saying is that, whatever views are held on our electoral reform scheme, it is introduced wholeheartedly and on a proper basis, and compares properly with other schemes in Australia and other parts of the world. If we are to have disagreement, let us have it on a proper basis of a detailed scheme and not take a high moralistic attitude that will not stand up to examination. Let us have no more of what I believe does us no good; that is, of saying that this House has been delayed in meeting. It has not, in the context of the programmes that Parliamentarians have had to meet and will have to meet in the next few weeks.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): First, I should like to deal with the matter raised by the Premier on the question of the meeting of this House. There have been several delays through circumstances that we well understand, and because of these delays there is every reason why, by the provision of pairs which we are prepared to give to the Premier and to the Treasurer, this House should continue sitting to deal with urgent matters that have accumulated as a result of the circumstances wellknown to all members. Many have been aired this evening. Since I have been a member I cannot recall circumstances arising such as these, when we have been muzzled for so long and when there are so many important matters having a bearing on what the Premier and the Treasurer will have to say when they attend the Loan Council tomorrow. There has been no opportunity whatever to find out what the Government intends to do in its approach, for example, to the Loan Council and Premiers' meeting. I will raise a couple of the matters tonight, because the House ought to know whether the Government intends to continue some of the policies we started concerning matters important to this State, or whether it intends to drop them. We should be informed on these aspects, and I shall raise one aspect in particular, because of meetings which are to be held (other than the Loan Council and

Premiers' meeting): I refer to the meeting of the Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs in July. These matters are of great interest to members of this House, yet this is the only opportunity we are to get (an opportunity that is obviously too brief), and we will sit far into the night in order to say something briefly about these important matters.

I was struck to hear the Premier talk about the contempt into which Parliament is being brought by the Opposition. This, of course, is one of the most amusing statements of all time, because if anyone has brought Parliament into contempt in South Australia it is the L.C.L. The Premier went on to say something about the fact that it had been said that when a scheme was selected the eyes of the world would be upon us. Well, the eyes of the world are upon South Australia, because of the way in which the L.C.L. for over 30 years has refused to entertain democratic principles in this State. That is why contempt has been brought upon Parliament in South Australia. I meet Liberals all over the State who say, "This thing concerns us deeply; we vote Liberal but we are sick and tired of having it put to us that our electoral system is rotten"—and it is rotten. It savours almost of the rotten boroughs of England in years gone by when just a handful of people elected members to Parliament. Of course, this drift, although we as a Party have opposed it year after year, has gone on until now it has reached such proportions that people in every State in Australia are talking about it. This Parliament as an institution has been brought into contempt because it no longer represents the majority views of the people of this State.

I wonder, when I look around at the new members who have been elected to this Government, just how much political study they have undertaken to be supporting this sort of thing, because in this age of change surely they have only to look beyond the borders of Australia to see the effects of refusing democratic principles. There is evidence on every hand of the results of refusing democratic principles, yet members opposite still try to defend the policies that have been followed for over 30 years.

The Premier says he knows there ought to be a change. Well, why does he not come out and tell us the details? He has referred to the fact that he will not have discussions with the Leader of the Opposition, and when he was on his feet a few moments ago he said, "Why should these things be taken off the floor of the House?" but he forgot to remind us that he

referred to these discussions as secret discussions. He tried to imply that there was something sinister about the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition getting together in order to try to iron out some of the details before the matter came on to the floor of the House. There is nothing strange in preliminary discussions of this sort. It has been the practice of this House for years for the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to get together in order to save time when the Bill came to the Committee stage, to save many useless speeches, to get understanding, and to reach the compromise that is badly needed in this situation. The Premier says that he will not compromise. Of course, it is evident that he will not do so, even though the Labor Party won the Millicent by-election, because in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech today is included his proposition for 45 electoral districts. He is not prepared to entertain the idea we put forward and discussed, even though we won the Millicent by-election. In the *Advertiser* of May 30 is a report of what the Premier said, as follows:

If we win Millicent I will consider it an endorsement of our electoral plan. If we lose Millicent I will consider it an endorsement of the A.L.P. plan and, of course, we will then have to compromise to achieve electoral reform.

What do we see here? We see the plan that we would naturally expect to see had the L.C.L. won Millicent. What does the Premier mean? Does he not realize that this sort of twisting from one point to another must cause distrust? Why should we trust him when he says so many different things on different days? Why should we trust a Party which, for over 30 years, has refused electoral reform and which has set out year after year to divide this State into one group of people against the other—the primary producers against the rest? One has only to look at the last Bill on this matter brought before Parliament by Sir Thomas Playford in which he divided the State into three sections. Surely in this age of change we need co-operation amongst everybody in the community.

We are all inter-dependent but this old game of playing the primary producers against the rest of the community is still being played. It was done in Millicent for all it was worth. I went down to some farms and, on talking to people, I found that generally they agreed that, in Messrs. Corcoran and Cameron, they had two good fellows. Therefore, it was not a question of Mr. Corcoran's personality.

These people said that they were concerned about electoral reform. They had it firmly in mind that they would be let down the drain electorally by the Labor Party: that is what they had been told, as they have been told time after time. Every time this divisive role is played by the Liberal and Country League—"Divide them up and conquer them"—they say, "Arrange the boundaries so that we are sure of getting enough seats, and damn the overall majority. Why should we worry about democracy? Power is what we want." That is the essence of the L.C.L. thinking, as it always has been; if it was anything else that Party would have accepted reform of the Upper House long before now, but it is not satisfied with having all its barriers to democracy in this place: it wants the impassable one a little bit further up, just to make doubly sure.

Why should we trust anything which comes from the other side and which is not spelt out in detail—every word in detail? Why should we trust them? The Opposition cannot be given any historical evidence on which we should trust the Party opposite. We are realists. The former member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) said more than once that whatever he thought of the Labor Party at least we were realists, and we are. We know by experience and from history what the L.C.L. will do in any given electoral situation. The Premier spoke about a scheme that was good by other Australian standards, and he had something to say about the Queensland figures. I believe these figures are shown on a sheet produced by the L.C.L. and, when they are analysed, it is interesting to see what are the actual facts. For the 28 metropolitan seats, the number of electors is 362,000, an average of 12,930. For 12 provincial seats with an electorate of 169,000, the average is 14,080, and for 38 country seats with 356,000 electors it is an average of 9,368. This means that the metropolitan seats have 35 per cent above the country, and not double, as has been suggested. The 50 country and provincial seats combined have 525,000 electors, an average of 10,500, so that the metropolitan seats have 23 per cent above the country and provincial seats combined, and not double, as the Premier has suggested. It is high time he had a look at his arithmetic and that he came down with some detailed statements so that we could know precisely what he wants to do, because there is no reason why we should trust his statements, in view of the past history of

the L.C.L., unless he comes down and puts it right on the line in detail.

Mr. Ryan: No wonder he is not the Treasurer!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: He said he was not going to be led astray by the mathematical tricks of the member for Glenelg. Obviously, he was doing the mathematical tricks; that is obvious from his statement about Queensland. I was interested to hear some remarks from members on this side on the smear campaign conducted against the character of Des Corcoran, our colleague, on the Communist issue. If the Premier is to have an inquiry into what his members were doing and saying in this regard, he will have a very delicate mission, because I can well remember when he first came into this House that for a long time every time he got up to speak he endeavoured to give us a Communist smear in one way or another, until somebody whispered in his ear that he was being very silly and he should drop it. We have not heard it since. It is about time he whispered in the ears of his friends that they are silly and should drop it. They deny that they ever do such things, but it is done with delicate innuendo to leave the impression that there is something very sinister about every member of the Australian Labor Party, that he has some sinister connections in the background.

I have suffered from this in past elections and I had the experience on one occasion of the L.C.L. candidate who was opposing me apologizing afterwards for the actions of his Party organizers. He said, "I had nothing to do with it; I had no hand in it". I believed him, but the others were busy enough, so much so that people were ringing up from all directions wanting to know whether it was true about me, and, of course, leopards cannot change their spots. Then, of course, there was the offer to find a job for Des Corcoran if he was defeated. "Give a job to dear old Des; give the dog a bone." What a nice little bribe! They would not say how much they would pay him if they gave him a job—perhaps like the one they gave Frank Walsh, at \$500 a year, and expect him to live on it. They do not explain the details any more than they explain the details of their electoral proposals. Those things we suffer, and it is no good their denying such things. We get too much of it on every occasion.

The Premier started talking about untruths tonight. He addressed a meeting in Millicent

on Thursday last, I think it was, after which a member of the Millicent council came up to me (the Premier can deny this if it is not true) and told me that at the end of the meeting he asked the Premier how much of the revenue from the lotteries went to hospitals, and the Premier said, "\$7,000, and all the rest goes into revenue." The gentleman asked me whether that was true. I said, "No, it is not true. The Act lays down that all the money goes to hospitals." The Premier can deny that if it is not true, but this gentleman was a member of the Millicent Council and I have no reason to doubt him because he was concerned about it. When the Premier starts talking about untruths he should look at what some of his members said regarding members of the Labor Party, and Mr. Corcoran in particular, during the Millicent by-election campaign.

For far too long in Australia there has been a habit among members of the L.C.L. to talk about members of the A.L.P. as though they were a sub-species of the human race—as though they were not quite up to the mark in relation to other people. For example, the Attorney-General has taken action over this docket, but if someone had done the same to him he would have been in a frenzy of indignation and said that it was not ethical. We know what he did during the life of the last Parliament: he was up on his feet with the greatest of indignation if he thought the slightest unethical thing had been done. What does he think of his own moves in that direction? Does he think we are not the right sort of persons the sort of person that does not matter? Does he think we are a sub-species of the human race?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: No, I don't.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Then why does he act in that way? It is strange, but I have been introduced to only one new member, although I have met the new members many times in the corridors of this place. Why is that?

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Don't be catty.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: We get this sort of thing slung at us time and time again, and I think members opposite should get some of it back. There is good reason for telling them a few home truths. The by-election at Millicent has been a valuable exercise, as it has alerted the public in South Australia (as, indeed, the result of the election in March did) to something they will not forget. Of course, the Government wants them to forget, and we can

rest assured that the sittings of this House this year will be the shortest possible. One of the reasons for this will be to try to get people to forget and, of course, the Government is hoping that an excellent season will enable it to claim the benefits accruing from the season. Members opposite hope, in those circumstances, that the hue and cry about the electoral system will begin to die down.

I will deal now with one or two things which I consider to be of great importance to this State and on which I have heard nothing so far from the Government. I said earlier that there was to be a meeting of Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs in July, but we have heard nothing from the Attorney-General (who is also the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) about what he is going to do when he attends that meeting. As soon as he became Minister of Aboriginal Affairs he rushed off to Musgrave Park, in which he was greatly interested while I was Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. He was interested in a disturbance there and wrote to me saying how unhappy he was about the situation. Of course, I commend him for his great interest and for going there as smartly as he could out of concern, I am sure, for what was going on; but he returned to say that all was well. However, he still has not told us what he will say when he attends that meeting in July.

We all know that a new Commonwealth Minister-in-Charge of Aboriginal Affairs has been appointed, and that a referendum on Aboriginal matters was held. We know, too, that there has been great interest in the last few years regarding Aboriginal affairs, and it is obvious that some very concrete proposals have to be laid down in order that there may be a betterment of Aboriginal conditions. Before leaving office, I approved my Director's going to a meeting of Directors with a five-year programme for South Australia that would cost about \$5,750,000 at least and would cover the questions of pre-school education, secondary school hostels, transitional housing, conventional housing, children's institutions, institutions for working youths, transient hostels, and houses for the elderly. These are all very important matters involved in a five-year programme; surely we should have been given an opportunity to discuss them before the Minister goes there. I do not know whether he intends to support this programme, to alter it, or to drop it.

I understand from what the Director told me when he returned from the Directors' con-

ference that this was the most up-and-coming programme of any State in Australia. The Hon. G. G. Pearson, when Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, commenced making some valuable changes concerning Aboriginal matters, and this was followed up by the present Leader of the Opposition, who was architect of the legislation regarding Aborigines that is the envy of the rest of Australia. We do not want this situation to change: we want to continue to be regarded as the leading State in this connection. Unless this matter receives proper attention it will become a grave social problem in a few years and will involve this State in great expense.

The whole position was thoroughly analysed by the previous Government, and I hope that nothing less than this five-year programme will be put forward to that meeting of Ministers as the basis on which we should receive the Commonwealth help that is so necessary. This is one of the many matters that this Parliament should have been able to discuss properly. I shall not go into details tonight, but merely give a broad outline in order to indicate why this Parliament should be meeting and why these things should be discussed. I hope that the present Minister will realize that nothing less than this five-year programme should be put forward at the meeting of Ministers.

My successor as Minister of Education, upon her appointment, said that there would be an investigation into education. I wondered at the time whether this was merely a repetition of what the Premier had said during the March election campaign. What does an "investigation into education" mean? There are so many aspects of education: it is a vast subject. I wondered whether my successor, when she made that statement, knew what would be investigated. What aspect would be investigated? Who would conduct the investigation? What would our educational system be compared with? When I was Minister I attended meetings of Ministers and Directors and I found that we were regarded as one of the most advanced States, if not the most advanced State, in education, particularly in regard to teacher training and in regard to our curricula changes. In the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech today there was a reference to changes in curricula; His Excellency said:

My Government proposes to have made an examination of the State's education situation with a view to determining the best use of our resources and assessing the effectiveness of present curricula, teaching methods and departmental organization.

Let us consider this matter. We have very efficient senior officers in the Education Department. During the whole of my term of office all of these things were continually and progressively under the most careful scrutiny. We made many alterations to curricula, to teaching methods and to departmental organization. We commenced the first stage of a complete re-organization of the department. We started a revision of the Act and regulations, and this is also mentioned here. In other words, what is called an investigation appears to be merely a continuation of the previous Government's policy, as is so much of the Speech. We should, however, know more about these things and should have had an opportunity to discuss them more thoroughly than has been the case this evening. I see nothing here about pointing out to the Commonwealth Government that more money is needed for education, and I remind members opposite that, when we were in Government, none of them ever supported the campaign for getting additional funds from the Commonwealth for education. All I got was criticism for having raised the matter as I did. So, if the Government cannot provide better means for education, it has no excuse for saying it supported us in that campaign, because it never did. Of course, my successor will find that she needs all the money she can get, and then some.

I hope that, when the Treasurer goes to Canberra this week, he will remember one matter that has arisen in the last two or three days. The Government says that it is interested in decentralization, and it made a point of that prior to the last election. Well, Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited is extremely short of labour in Whyalla, and more housing is needed. The Housing Trust has done a magnificent job, having exceeded all expectations. However, if the trust could obtain more money, it could build more houses, and ample employment is available at Whyalla. Therefore, if the Government wants to step up employment and decentralization, here is the opportunity. Perhaps the Treasurer can get more money for housing by way of Loan money. Here is a place where the money can be spent, with immediate benefit to Australia.

Mr. Riches: It is the same story at Port Augusta.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, and all these matters are urgent. However, there will be no opportunity to discuss them thoroughly, because the House will adjourn.

There is no reason why the Opposition should put any trust in what has been said about the Government's electoral proposals until it sees precisely what they mean, and we have not yet got those details. The Premier has said that we are heading for a period of political instability. It is interesting at this stage to look back at what the *Advertiser* said on Wednesday, April 17, when dealing with Mr. Hall's becoming new Premier. The newspaper had stated:

This is a constitutional and properly Parliamentary solution to end the period of uncertainty, and it has come promptly with the sitting of the House of Assembly. This is satisfactory. Further manoeuvring and delay could only have worsened the situation which has already cast an unfortunate blemish on the reputation for stability which the State has for so long enjoyed. It has dangerously interrupted the smooth running of affairs . . . Further engagement in political tactics at this stage could only prolong the period of damaging irresolution. The sooner the State can settle down under firm, continuing helmsmanship again, the better it will be for all.

The Premier has it in his hands to tell us precisely what he means. We have won the Millicent by-election: the way is open for him to compromise. He can have discussions, which need not be secret: he can have them with the public sitting in if he wants to do that. These discussions could iron out all the details. He has all this in his hands and he can act with advantage if he comes out squarely with what he means and settles the question of electoral reform. We are ready to compromise but we are determined on one thing: that the electoral reform solution shall be one by which, if the people want to change the Government, they can do so, whether the Government be Liberal or Labor. The way is open and it is up to the members of the L.C.L. to put their house in order.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, the debate so far this afternoon and this evening—

Mr. Hudson: There hasn't been a debate, because it's been impossible to get Government members on to their feet.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I hope that, now that I have an opportunity to speak, the member for Glenelg will do me the courtesy of listening to what I have to say.

Mr. Hudson: I'll interject on you just as much as you've interjected on me.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is a matter between the honourable member and the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will be out of order if he does that.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to deal with any interjections that are allowed, but permit me to get something out of my mouth before they start. I intend to say, and shall try to say again, that the debate so far has been marked by a degree of bitterness that I hope will not be typical of all speeches which we have from the Opposition during this session of Parliament and, indeed, during the whole life of the Parliament. I may say that the speech that we have just heard from the member for Whyalla was the bitterest of all the speeches we have had today, and we have had a dozen I think, at least. We know that this bitterness springs from the frustration of the members of the Australian Labor Party because they did not win the last general election in this State.

Mr. Corcoran: They did win it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: They have shown, and their Leader has shown since March 2, a frenzy of frustration that is unparalleled even for him. True, the Labor Party won the by-election last Saturday for the seat of Millicent, and I personally congratulate Mr. Corcoran on that win. It was a personal victory of some magnitude: it was achieved in spite of his Leader and in spite of the policies of his Party, a Party to which, he said this afternoon (and I accept his statement), he is proud to belong. However, although the honourable member won on Saturday he has a long way to go, I remind him, before he gets back to the position of popularity he enjoyed in 1965 when his Party won the general election by a convincing majority. Perhaps the honourable member would not mind if I were to remind other members of the situation. I have a table showing the percentage votes at the three elections in Millicent: in 1965, in March 1968, and in June 1968. Unfortunately, this table shows only the percentage gained by the L.C.L. candidate but it does not take too much arithmetical exercise, at which the member for Glenelg is so expert, to work out the percentage vote for the honourable member for that district.

Mr. Langley: What about 1962?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Please let me give the figures. I shall give not the box figures but the figures for the two subdivisions.

Mr. Hudson: Did you work out these figures?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, but if the honourable member cares to check them

I shall be happy for him to do so and, if they are wrong, I shall be the first to admit it.

Mr. Hurst: Did you check them before you made the statement?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, because I am going to make the statement now. In the Millicent subdivision in 1965 the L.C.L. candidate polled 35 per cent of the votes.

Mr. Corcoran: What about 1962?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have not got those figures.

Mr. Corcoran: Get them; it will be an interesting exercise.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In 1965 the L.C.L. candidate received 35 per cent of the votes.

Mr. Hudson: Who was he? Was he a good one?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In March of this year he got 45.9 per cent, an increase of 10.9 per cent of the vote in the subdivision. On Saturday that had dropped by 2.9 per cent to 43 per cent, but it is still a full 8 per cent above the figure achieved by the L.C.L. in 1965. In the Robe subdivision, in 1965 the L.C.L. candidate got 48.5 per cent of the vote. This increased by the remarkable percentage of over 13 per cent, I think, to 61.8 per cent in March this year, and dropped last Saturday to 59.4 per cent. But it is still, on my calculations, 10.9 per cent above the figure the honourable member achieved in 1965. The reason why I mention these figures is this: the result in March of the Millicent by-election showed an enormous swing against the then Government, and the result last Saturday, after an intense campaign waged by the honourable member himself, by his Leader and, I think, by every member of his Party—

Mr. Broomhill: And your Party and your Leader!

Mr. Langley: And your candidate!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —showed that only 3 per cent of the gain which we made in March was made good by the A.L.P.; so I congratulate the member for Millicent on his win, which I regard as a personal triumph for him, although he still is a long way behind the position in which he was in 1965.

May I now make one or two replies to some of the points made by the member for Whyalla. I had not intended to make these comments, but I shall now. The first concerns the late Frank Walsh. The honourable member sneered in his speech because this

Government appointed the late honourable member to the Forestry Board, and said we expected him to live on \$500 a year.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I didn't suggest that at all.

Mr. Nankivell: They were your exact words.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is what the honourable member said. We were happy to make that appointment of the late gentleman to the Forestry Board; it was one we made with the greatest of pleasure, because we believed that he deserved to be able to continue to serve this State as he had served it for so many years. Two days after the sudden and tragic death of Mr. Walsh, I saw a letter of appreciation which the honourable gentleman wrote on the day of his death to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, and there was certainly in that letter, Mr. Speaker, no suggestion that we were throwing a bone to a dog. It was a letter of genuine appreciation of the fact that this Government, made up of his political adversaries but personal friends, had appointed him to that post, and I personally grieved very greatly at his passing.

The other matter that I desire to raise is one which I raise at the request of the Premier, who has spoken. The honourable member, when he spoke a few moments ago saw fit to recount what happened at a meeting in Millicent last Thursday. He recounted, at second hand as I understood him, an answer given by the Premier to a question asked at this meeting regarding the benefit that hospitals in this State gained from the State lottery. I understood from him that the Premier gave an explanation at the meeting that was given by me, and no doubt by other members on this side, during the general election campaign to this effect: that in fact the hospitals of this State gained little, if any, benefit at all from the Hospitals Fund, because all the moneys which they obtained from that fund were merely sufficient to serve as the annual increment or addition to the hospitals vote. In other words, if there had been no Hospitals Fund at all, the sum available to hospitals would have been exactly the same as, in fact, it was, because it would have had to be made up out of revenue, and this was the point I made during the Budget debate. Therefore, in fact, the Hospitals Fund was used by the previous Government merely in aid of the general revenue of the State.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is sheer nonsense.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is not nonsense. I said it myself during the Budget debate, and the then Treasurer of the State did not answer me.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes, I did.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The figures speak for themselves. That was the point the Premier made at the Millicent meeting last Thursday. I should now like to say something about a few of the points made by other members: first, in relation to the maiden speech of the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo); then in relation to the speech of the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran); and, finally, in reply to some of the points made by my friend the Leader of the Opposition in opening the debate this afternoon.

I congratulate the member for Edwardstown on his speech. As it was a maiden speech, we could not under any circumstances interject. It was delivered with a degree of confidence that shows that the honourable member will be a formidable debater in this Chamber. However, he made a couple of points that I believe need some answer because they were points in which he attempted to reflect, as I understood him, upon my administration of the Electoral Department, which is the responsibility of the Attorney-General. He referred, first, to the panic (I suppose we could call it) that occurred in the Millicent and Mount Gambier Districts last Friday over the area known as Birdland. He took me to task, as the Minister responsible for electoral matters, for the mix-up which had occurred and which had apparently been occurring without the knowledge of anyone for many years. Through me, presumably he took to task Mr. Norman Douglass (Returning Officer for the State).

Mr. Hudson: He deliberately avoided that.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: There can be no other conclusion at all drawn from his remarks but that he was blaming me for the way the Act had been administered and, through me, the Returning Officer for the State. I will say straight out that the Leader, as my predecessor, would not for one moment quarrel with me when I say that the Electoral Act needs urgent review, which it will get. I am sorry indeed that the previous Government did not get around to doing it. It said it had this in mind but that there was just not time to do it. All of us, and the people of the State, would have been spared much upset and concern had it been done, but it was not. However, it will be done by this Government; I can give that assurance. It is ironical that the member for Edwardstown

should take me to task for what happened last Friday in Birdland, when I have been responsible for the department for, I think, nine weeks or so. May I remind the honourable member and all honourable members of the comments read out this morning by the Clerk of this House regarding the administration of the Electoral Department? This is what His Honour, who was one of my colleagues and a colleague of the Leader of the Opposition on the Court of Disputed Returns, said:

An unfortunate result has been brought about by official errors that have clearly affected the outcome of the election, and the parties to the petition have been put to substantial expense through no fault of their own. Under whose administration did those official errors occur? They took place under the administration of my predecessor, the member for Norwood, the former Attorney-General, the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Edwardstown did not see fit to mention that.

Mr. Hudson: When did you first hear about it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: He mentioned only the question of Birdland.

Mr. Hudson: But when did you first hear about it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: He will be an effective debater in this House if he is fair in the points he makes. I first heard about Birdland on the Friday evening when I returned from the Attorneys-General Conference, some few hours after it was known by those on the spot. The other point that I take up with the member for Edwardstown is this: he reproved me (and through me, presumably, the Returning Officer for the State) for allowing the issue of postal votes when the application did not show clearly the grounds on which such a vote was sought. We all know the position, the form of the application: it has five grounds on it. He mentioned one—pregnancy of the applicant. The applicant is supposed to cross out the grounds which do not apply so that there is only one ground left, which shows clearly the ground on which the application is made. He then had the gall to imply that I had allowed postal votes to be issued because Mr. and Mrs. Cameron, the parents of the L.C.L. candidate, were absent in Hong Kong and if I did not allow their applications to stand they would not have time to make another one and get a vote. This is the clear implication of what the honourable member said this afternoon, and he suggested that I myself had given a very strange

interpretation of the law. It is true that the Attorney-General is the chief law officer of the Crown and that ultimately I have the responsibility for these things while I hold that office. However, I differ from my predecessor—

Mr. Hudson: Thank goodness!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I say "Amen" to that. I differ from him in that I think I am a little more cautious than he is and I do not propose to give and have not yet given opinions myself without seeking advice from the Crown Solicitor, who is the professional assistant and adviser to the Attorney-General. I should like the member for Edwardstown and all honourable members in this House to know that, when the ruling was given that postal applications should be allowed even though they did not show which of the grounds was relied upon, I gave that ruling upon the advice of the Crown Solicitor after receiving an opinion from him.

Mr. Hudson: Do you know that other votes were involved?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I do, and I hope the honourable member for Glenelg will at least pay me the compliment of not thinking that this in some way twisted my judgment or that of the Crown Solicitor. This was done not by me of my personal volition but on the advice of my professional officers.

Let me now come to Mr. Corcoran, the member for Millicent, the member seated today. The honourable member said, and other members have said, something about the sittings of this House. He has said we have done nothing to expedite them or that we have stopped the House from sitting, but what are the facts of this matter? This Government took office not early in March, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but in the middle of April, six weeks or more after the election. Immediately after this Government took office the Court of Disputed Returns was set up and it sat physically in this Chamber for five weeks. I suppose we could have sat somewhere else to allow this Chamber to be used for its normal purpose, but we sat here. There were four members of this House (two Ministers, the Leader of the Opposition and an ex-Minister) engaged in the court, and had the House sat during that time those members would not have been here, and there would have been no member for Millicent, either. Does any member really suggest that Parliament could have or should have sat during that period before the judgment was given by the Court of Disputed Returns?

Mr. Hudson: There would have been a member for Millicent!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, a member whose election was being challenged and whose election was in fact successfully challenged. But if the honourable member for Glenelg persists in saying we should have sat during that period, he is even more unreasonable than I thought he was. What happened after the court gave its decision that there should be a fresh election in Millicent? We held the by-election, which was fixed by the Speaker of this House on the first possible occasion, the first Saturday he could by law have it.

Mr. Hudson: Nobody is denying that.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, nobody is denying it, but it has been suggested that we have kept the House from sitting. The honourable member for Millicent was reported as saying this in a newspaper during his by-election campaign. I do not know which honourable members thought this House should have sat during the by-election campaign. If honourable members had been asked individually, I should say there would not have been one who would have wanted to sit during that time. Where are we now? The by-election took place only last Saturday, and today is Tuesday, the first normal sitting day of the House since then.

Mr. Hudson: And we will adjourn tomorrow.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, we will adjourn tomorrow, but for very good reasons. I remind you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that only yesterday not one of us knew what the policy of the Opposition was to be on pairs. We did not know whether pairs would be granted to Ministers on Ministerial business.

Mr. Hudson: Oh, you can't get away with that. Rubbish!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg can say "rubbish", but how did we know if the position in the previous Parliament was to obtain in this one? The Opposition certainly did not make this clear. The first time we heard there were to be any pairs for sickness was when the Leader of the Opposition spoke this afternoon. That is the position. How could we, in any case, whether or not it was desirable that the House should sit without the two senior Ministers here, plan to sit when we did not know what the policy of the Opposition would be on this matter? Anyway, let us leave this aside and look to see when Parliament started last year.

The 1967 session of Parliament was opened on June 20, five days earlier, by the calendar, than this session has been opened. Despite the fact that the then Government had been in office for two years and was firmly in the saddle, and that the previous session of Parliament had ended in March, it was June 20 before the new session opened. I grant you (and I am sure members opposite will be quick to take me up on this) that when we did sit we sat right through. We propose a break of three-and-a-half to four weeks at the most, at a time when the Premier will be overseas on State business. Surely this is not unreasonable. No-one knows for how long Parliament will sit. This is, of course, a matter for the Premier and for the whole Cabinet, but I should think that without doubt this House will sit for as long as it is necessary to transact the business put before it.

Mr. Broomhill: As brief as you can make it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member for West Torrens can sneer. I do not believe that what he says is true but, if it were, no-one could blame us. What have we heard from the Opposition? We have heard that it intends to take the first opportunity to defeat this Government on the floor of the House. This is hardly an encouragement to sittings of the House. Let us be realistic. The member for Whyalla is a realist, as he told us a few minutes ago, so let us be realistic about this matter, too.

I shall turn now to three matters mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition in opening this debate. The first is the question of the Labor Party's petition, to which much attention was given in the early stages of this debate by members of the Opposition. They wandered a long way from this topic during some of the intervening speeches, but this was the reason given by the Leader of the Opposition for the debate. The first point he made was that the Government was ignoring the petition presented by him on the second day of the first session of this Parliament and that we did not intend to take any notice of the petition on electoral reform.

Mr. Hudson: You are ignoring it now.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Government has had very little chance to do anything else. Parliament has not really had an opportunity yet to get down to these matters. What are we supposed to do? Are we supposed to come out in the press and give every detail of every piece of legislation that we propose to introduce? We believe that the

floor of this House is the place where these matters should be thrashed out. That is one of the functions of Parliament.

Mr. Hudson: Will we be able to obtain a copy of your Bill from the Government Printer?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg will see that Bill in due course. I think I have been accused by every member of the Opposition who has spoken. Expressions such as "spied on", "stolen", or "found out by stealth" have been used, and I shall deal with that in a moment. Let me say something about petitions in this House. Immediately after the election the Labor Party spent the whole of its energies over a period of several weeks in collecting signatures for the petition. This was made public and it was quite obvious that everything was being done to get signatures for a petition; I believe that 70,000 signatures were obtained for it. How many of these were genuine I do not know. I can, however, tell the honourable member that at least one person who attended the Light Square rally signed the name "Alfred Deakin". No doubt many other people did the same sort of thing.

Mr. Langley: He was a dishonest person.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: He may have been a dishonest person, but I am simply raising the query regarding how many other dishonest people there were. Let me remind honourable members that it is not really a very difficult job to get signatures. I am not defending this man for what he did; I am merely stating a fact. He told me that he had signed the name Alfred Deakin, or it may have been Edmund Barton.

Mr. Hudson: It certainly wasn't Robin Millhouse, anyway.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I give an unqualified assurance that I did not sign my name, although someone else may have signed it.

Mr. Hudson: I don't think anyone else would do that.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is not a very difficult matter to get signatures on a petition.

Mr. Broomhill: Have you tried to get signatures supporting your proposal?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for West Torrens suggests we try to get some supporting our proposal. A petition was circulated and that petition contained 6,842 signatures, not one-tenth of the number on the Australian Labor Party petition. However, let me read an extract

from a letter that was sent to me with the petition, which I forwarded respectfully to His Excellency the Governor, to whom it was addressed. This is part of the letter that accompanied that petition: I need not read it all, but the honourable member is welcome to see the whole letter if he wants to see it. The letter is dated April 15, and these are a few paragraphs:

No doubt there will be a tendency to compare the number of signatures obtained with those on the petition obtained by the Labor Party. For this reason we feel it important to give some details of the origin of the petition.

The petition was drafted and presented in an effort to bring to the notice of His Excellency that there were many people throughout South Australia who held the belief that there was no moral or legal justification for another election. The authors and organizers of the petition consist of two married couples, both with two young children.

Mr. Jennings: Were they married to each other?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think it is a funny matter and I ask the honourable member to keep his facetiousness to himself for a minute. The letter continues:

Only one family has a motor vehicle, neither has a typewriter (those used being borrowed), and both families are dependent for income on the salary of the husband. No special time off from work was taken by either husband, lunch hours and weekends being the only time available.

To support the complete independence of the petition, we the organizers, are prepared, if necessary to make a sworn statement, that we are not and never have been members of any political Party, that the petition was prepared both in wording and form on our own initiative and that no political party or organization or member of Parliament, influenced our decision to prepare and organize the petition.

The petition has received support from acknowledged L.C.L., D.L.P., and even A.L.P. voters. We emphasize that to our knowledge all persons signing the petition were electors and that no signature was obtained under duress or because persons felt obliged to sign.

Now, two young couples with young families were able to obtain, in a lesser period of time than the Labor Party took, well over 6,000 signatures to their petition. It was an extremely good job, when we consider two young couples, without political affiliations, pitted against the whole organization of the A.L.P. in this State, and well organized, I have no doubt, by the member for Edwardstown. The fact that they had only 6,000 signatures, while the A.L.P. had 70,000, is indeed of some significance.

Mr. Broomhill: It makes one wonder whether it could possibly be true.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the member for West Torrens doubts me, I shall be happy to introduce him to both couples. They live in my district.

Mr. Clark: You accidentally stumbled over them!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am glad the honourable member has made that interjection. I did not know any of them before this. I ask the honourable member and everybody else to accept my assurance that this is so. I had never met them or spoken to them. To be perfectly fair, I think I had seen both husbands on the train on which I travel every day. I knew them by sight but I had not spoken to them and did not know their names. I hope members will accept my unqualified assurance on that. The A.L.P. has been going in for mass demonstration, extra-Parliamentary demonstrations, and its petition was a manifestation of this. We had another in Light Square a few weeks ago, and we had a further manifestation of it tonight on the steps of Parliament House. I said this morning, and the Leader of the Opposition heard me, that there is nothing, so far as I am aware, unlawful about this, but I say deliberately that this sort of thing is highly undesirable, and if members opposite and the Party to which they belong intend to continue with these tactics they may find that they cannot dismount from the tiger.

I need hardly remind honourable members that there was a slight manifestation of this about four hours ago in the gallery. I have a document which may be taken as a joke but which I think has very dangerous implications, and I ask honourable members opposite, before they continue with these tactics, to think of what they are doing. This is a document headed *Action*, printed and published by the Students for Democratic Action, Volume 1, No. 2, distributed to the University of Adelaide. The bulk of it is an attack on an old friend and colleague of the Leader and mine, Mr. Jeff Scott, but when we come to the second page we see the heading "S.D.A. in Brief", and there are six items under that heading. The second item states:

Next week Mr. Don Dunstan will be the guest of S.D.A.'s weekly forum. He will be speaking on "Electoral Justice"—Barr Smith lawn, Thursday at 1.05.

Well, there is nothing wrong with this: a very good thing indeed for the honourable member to go to the university and get some of those things off his chest that have been so firmly fixed there. But what I take exception to and what I believe is incipiently very dangerous—

it may have been put here as a joke but I do not take it as such—is the statement underneath, which reads as follows:

Join the Students for Democratic Action Become a—

- (1) Neo-Fascist, or
- (2) a Communist dupe.

Mob violence can be fun . . . just fill in the form below and leave it at the S.R.C. Office.

That is an irresponsible thing to put in a pamphlet. People may laugh; I let them do so if they want to, but that sort of thing, in view of what is happening overseas and what could happen here, is, I believe, highly undesirable. I hope that the leader will not lend his personal prestige to these matters in the future. Now, Sir, may I say something about the Bill and my obtaining of it. I have been rebuked by every member who has spoken about this. The member for Wallaroo dealt with the railways at some length, and then every member—

Mr. Clark: Which Bill is this?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is the Bill which was prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman.

Mr. Broomhill: How did you get it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will tell the honourable member in a moment, although I know that he knows. It is dated April 10, 1968. The Leader read out the correspondence between us on this matter, and perhaps I could simply invite attention to one phrase in his letter to me of April 16. The letter states:

As far as I am concerned—
that is, he personally—

the matter is in the same position as material provided by the Parliamentary Draftsman to your Party when in Opposition.

He put in the qualification (and it was a wise qualification to put in his letter) "As far as I am concerned . . .". I wrote in the margin of this letter (and I put it there some time ago) the words "I do not agree"; because what are the facts of this matter? They are that this was a Bill which, on the face of it, was prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman for the last Government. It was contained in a Government docket (a Premier's Department docket), and the Leader had (and I use the word advisedly) the impudence to send back the empty docket cover to me with the contents gone. It was not prepared for the Labor Party, as such: it was prepared for the last Government and, as such, it was Government property.

Mr. Hudson: Rubbish!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the Leader cared to take it away with him (I understand Lord Palmerston always took docketts away when he went out of office), I know of no ethical bar to my getting a copy from the Government Printer, as I did. On the first day on which I came into office the Parliamentary Draftsman (Dr. Wynes) waited on me with a list of 30 or 40 Bills which he said had been prepared for the last Government, and he invited me to ask my colleagues which of those Bills we desired should be introduced during this session of Parliament.

Mr. Hudson: Was a Constitution Act Amendment Bill one of those on the list?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, it was not, because that had disappeared at that stage.

Mr. Hudson: That indicates that Dr. Wynes regarded it as having a special status.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, he did not. The Bill was not available, and we did not have a copy of it. The Leader had taken it with him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member opposite suggest that we should not have looked at those 30 or 40 Bills for which instructions had been given by the previous Government?

Mr. Hudson: This was on a different level.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It was not; it was exactly the same. All those Bills, I venture to say, are contained in departmental docketts, and they were all prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman in just the same way as this Bill was prepared. Is the honourable member saying that we should have said, "Oh, no, Dr. Wynes, it would be unethical for us to look at any of the matters which were under consideration by the previous Government"? The thing is all too silly, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If one looks at the remarks the Leader of the Opposition made this afternoon, in the light of what I have just said, one will see that they are utterly absurd. When one Government goes out and another comes in, the incoming Government is heir to all that the outgoing Government leaves behind. Further, this Bill was publicly discussed by the Premier of South Australia during the Millicent by-election campaign (parts of it he had with him, for I gave him the copy of the Bill).

Mr. Hudson: I hope he didn't misread it, too.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It was discussed and made public well before the Leader and I took part in the *Encounter* debate on television. I produced a copy of that Bill on television.

Mr. Hudson: Then you misquoted it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Will the honourable member let me make this point: the Leader and I discussed the Bill at some length on television. When the segment of the programme in which we took part had finished, he and I exchanged a few pleasantries, and he then left. Neither on television nor afterwards did he reproach me for having used the Bill. It was five days afterwards before he saw fit publicly to rebuke me for making available to people the contents of the Bill. Why, if it were such a wrong action on my part, did he not reproach me there and then, either on the screen or afterwards?

Mr. Hudson: He did.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: He said nothing whatever about it. When he did publicly criticize me last Thursday in the *Advertiser* (the newspaper in which he says he can never get any publicity), he made a curious statement. Having said that I should not have made this available, he said that, in any case, it was all public, that the basis of his Party's scheme had been discussed, and that there was nothing new about it. Now, what does he want to do? First he says nothing in reproach to me for five days, when he could have said it to my face. He then reproaches me in the newspaper and says that, in any case, there was nothing in it that was not public before. He hoped that, by reproaching me last Thursday, he would help Mr. Corcoran in the by-election last Saturday and deflect public scrutiny from the contents of the Bill.

The last point I wish to make is in regard to the scheme in this Bill and the so-called compromise about which we have heard so much from the honourable gentleman and his colleagues since March 2. What facts are now given to us in this matter? In the policy speech of the Labor Party, the honourable gentleman said that the Party, if returned to office, would reintroduce the Bill, which failed to pass in 1965, for a 56-member House of Assembly, to alter the provisions for the resolution of deadlocks between the Houses, and to alter the franchise of the Legislative Council. That is what he said in his policy speech—nothing else. We were to have that Bill, if members opposite got back, and nothing else. Of course, that was the only Bill on

electoral redistribution which the Labor Party had brought in during its term of office. Members opposite said nothing at all about the matter during the last two sessions of the Parliament. They say the reason for this was that they knew any Bill would be blocked in the Legislative Council. I believe that at least much of the reason for this was that they believed that the present electoral system in South Australia, under which Frank Walsh had won handsomely in 1965—

Mr. Hudson: With 56 per cent of the vote.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —was favouring them and that they would win again under it at the election in March, 1968. They believed that the seat of my colleague, the Minister of Lands, would fall to them because of Housing Trust development in his district.

Mr. Langley: And what a fright he got.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Not nearly as big a fright as the Labor Party got, and not as big a surprise as it got when it found that it did not win the election under those boundaries. Mr. Frank Walsh, in 1965, had a majority of members in this House supporting him—21 out of 39. The present Labor leader succeeded him on June 1, 1967. He could not equal the achievement of his predecessor and the Labor Party lost two seats in the House of Assembly. However, I believe members opposite were content to go to the people at the election because they believed that they would win again under those boundaries. That is the only reason why they did not attempt again to introduce electoral reform and why they said not one word about compromise on electoral matters until about two of three weeks after the election. It was not until they had a post-mortem and decided that one of the reasons for their defeat in the election was that the people disliked a wholesale increase in the number of members of the House of Assembly to 56 (something they could have worked out, one would have thought, following the referendum failure last year) that we heard anything about a compromise. What did we hear on this point? In June, 1967, the annual conference of the Labor Party gave the Leader (the then Premier of the State) authority to compromise on electoral matters. If he wanted to compromise why did he say nothing about it for eight or nine months? Why is there nothing printed in the Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party to show any authority at all for a compromise?

Mr. Virgo: Read the conference report.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If this platform is not to be followed, if it is to be varied by some document which has not been printed in the report, how much reliance can we place on this document? Under "Constitutional and Electoral" we find that clause 1 deals with the abolition of the Legislative Council and its interim reform. Clause 2 deals with the establishment of an independent Electoral Boundaries Commission to provide for a House of Assembly of 56 members representing single electorates elected with a simple majority by the cross system of voting. They are going to throw out preferential voting; this is the policy of the Party, although they say nothing about that.

Mr. Clark: What is the date of that?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: June, 1967.

There being a commotion in the Strangers' Gallery:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Persons in the Strangers' Gallery must observe silence. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am sorry, I have not made myself clear. I am discussing the position taken by the Labor Party in June, 1967. The publication provides:

(b) Electorates to be divided to provide for approximately equal voting strength on the principle of one vote one value, subject to a margin of 15 per cent over or under the average.

Then there is a rider, which has now been completely abandoned; it is as follows:

In the remote areas of the State a wider margin to be allowed in order to provide effective representation where communications are extremely difficult and the area is sparsely settled.

That could well have been written in, I suggest, by members of the L.C.L., but it has gone now from their scheme. There is nothing in this at all to suggest any authority for compromise, and the Party opposite made no attempt to compromise. In fact, it concealed any authority it may have had to compromise until after the election. It may call it a compromise but in fact there is no compromise at all, because a 48-member Bill comes within the limit of 15 per cent above or below the average which is set out in the book. Let this be understood: the principle upon which this much vaunted and now rather tatty Bill is based is of having 48 members with a quota determined by dividing by 48 the electors in the State but for country

electorates defined in the terms of the Bill there is a quota 10 to 15 per cent below the original quota.

Mr. Hudson: That is not what you said originally.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is what I am saying now: it is 10 to 15 per cent below the original quota and for metropolitan electorates it is up to 15 per cent above the quota, but nothing below it.

Mr. Hudson: There is a further provision there.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Have I got it substantially right?

Mr. Hudson: Yes.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is within the tolerance set out in this document of 15 per cent either way, and the country electorates are to be between 10 per cent and 15 per cent below and the city ones are to be between 10 per cent and 15 per cent above. So, there is no real compromise in this document, but it was brought out with a great beating of drums by the then Premier, the present Leader of the Opposition, as a compromise to meet us. However, the curious fact is that we never saw the contents of that Bill and never knew the precise principles upon which it was drawn until (and apparently this is where my crime comes in, in the eyes of the A.L.P.) I gave it to the Premier, he made it public, and I asked the Leader of the Opposition about it on television.

Mr. Ryan: Why had not you done it before?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If they had genuinely wanted a compromise and all they said on March 2 on this question of electoral redistribution had been sincere, they would have come to us immediately they had the authority after the June conference in 1967. The electoral boundaries then were the same as they are now; they were no different and no better than now, except for the vital point that the Party had lost an election on them since. There can be no doubt, and there is no doubt in my mind, that the loss of the election which members opposite thought they would win and which the Leader thought he would win (as his predecessor had been able to win three years earlier), but which they lost, is the only reason (certainly the substantial reason) why we have heard about compromise since. As the Premier has said tonight, there will be ample opportunity to discuss our Bill, for

members to move amendments to it, and for there to be a frank and full discussion in this House.

Mr. Clark: This year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It was the fourth paragraph in His Excellency's Speech today.

Mr. Clark: For years I have seen paragraphs in His Excellency's Speech that never get dealt with at all. We want your assurance.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: You can have my assurance, as you have had the assurance of the Premier tonight, that this is a matter which we regard as of very great importance and of urgency. But, of course, it cannot come in until we have disposed of the Address-in-Reply debate: Standing Orders do not allow that, and members opposite know that as well as I do.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: You can suspend them.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have made it clear that, in my view at any rate, all that we have heard from the Opposition in its frenzy of frustration and bitter disappointment because of March 2 is a sham.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): It is now 11.43 p.m., and it appears to be the time when we will soon have to draw stumps. We have had only two Government members batting, and they stayed at the crease for a long time without scoring anything. It is, therefore, my intention to retire after a short period, as I will not say much. I hope the member for Mitcham does not think I make a habit of following him in debate, although I enjoy doing it. However, that was not the case tonight. I always enjoy listening to the member for Mitcham or, should I say, the Attorney-General. However, in common with many people in South Australia, I am having difficulty getting used to his being the Attorney-General as, I am sure, he is. I am sure this is an office he never expected to get. I believe from conversations I have had with people all over the State that the same feeling exists throughout the State in regard not only to the appointment of the Attorney-General but also to the appointment of other Ministers as well.

I think the honourable member for Enfield years ago referred to a particular Ministerial appointment and said it was the most peculiar appointment since the Emperor Caligula appointed his horse as consul, and so far as I can gather this opinion is held by many people in South Australia regarding one or two of the Ministerial appointments that have

been made as a gesture of gratitude by the present Premier. I do not want to say much about the remarks of the Attorney-General; he is always worth listening to because he is so amusing. He is such an odd mixture of innocence and ability rolled into one, as was exhibited tonight. He is so naive and, of course, in company with some of his colleagues, so right! Let me mention one or two things that he said.

He started off by chiding some of our members and, in particular, the honourable member for Whyalla, for bitterness in the debate. He attributed this to frustration because we did not win the last election. He forgot to mention that in the eyes of certain people in South Australia we did win the election. Most of us follow Australian rules and watch it. Under Australian Rules, if a team wins by four or five goals it wins the match, but under our existing rules here, if we win by four or five goals, as we did, we do not get the decision: we lose the match and we do not get the points.

The Attorney-General then went on in a very breezy manner to congratulate the member for Millicent, Mr. Corcoran, on his great win. He forgot to mention why Mr. Corcoran won, but the House can take it from me (I was there, although unfortunately for a very short time) that the reason why Des Corcoran won in Millicent was that the by-election was conducted democratically. There was no way anyone could get round it. There were two candidates and a bit, and the man who got the most votes won. As everybody expected, that man was Des Corcoran, and I congratulate him publicly.

After so kindly congratulating the member for Millicent, the Attorney-General went on to denigrate his victory as hard as he possibly could; this is how it appeared to me, although the Attorney-General had, a few minutes before, been speaking about bitterness on this side of the House. Surely if a political Party in this country has a right to be bitter, it is the Labor Party in this State. I am not saying we are bitter, but we have reason for being bitter. The Attorney-General accused us of being annoyed out of frustration, and he then proceeded to show us that he was particularly annoyed and frustrated because we had won in Millicent. I will say this for him: he and his Party had the good sense to keep him out of the campaign. There were two gentlemen who I thought would have been actively campaigning in the Millicent by-election but who were not there—the Attorney-General and the

Chief Secretary. Both, for reasons best known to their Party and themselves, were studiously kept out of the area, and I believe they did a very wise thing in so doing.

The Attorney-General then went on, in spite of his remarks about nastiness and frustration, to repeat a particularly pernicious untruth that had been spread by himself, as he admitted, and by other members of his Party regarding the funds from the State Lotteries Commission going to hospitals. I say that this allegation is completely untrue, and the Attorney-General knows it is untrue; so do his colleagues. We then heard a few innuendoes about a particularly good speech made earlier today by the member for Edwardstown.

The Attorney-General did admit one thing: he told us that the sittings of the House were a matter for the Premier, and I am quite certain that this is so. We shall find, if the Premier continues in the way he has commenced, that everything will be a matter for the Premier. This, of course, is in accordance with the tradition of the L.C.L. as we have known it in this Chamber for many years.

I do not think I should waste the time of the House in speaking further about the Attorney-General. There is, however, just one more thing that I should mention before I leave this subject. He chided us for not coming along in 1967 and saying to the present Government (then the Opposition), "Please, we want to compromise on electoral reform." What reason did we have at that stage to compromise on electoral reform? We had been elected as the Government in 1965 and were naturally elated about it, because we had thoroughly beaten the pernicious L.C.L. gerrymander that we had been trying to beat for years. We were in a position to put through Parliament what we thought was necessary and, in fact, what the people of South Australia had overwhelmingly endorsed in respect of electoral reform. Indeed, by this time that would have been law and the last election would have been held under it if we had not had a second Chamber in this State. Everyone knows this, and that is all there is to be said about it.

This is what my late friend Mr. Mick O'Halloran called a grizzle session. I shall not grizzle much, although I grieve about many things, and I think more and more people in South Australia are grieving about them. Before long, the number grieving will increase further. Before I do my grizzle, I should like to say two things that I may have dealt with earlier. Today two things pleased me. One was the speech

made by our new member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo), who showed us plainly his ability, and I think even the Attorney-General reluctantly admitted that.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I wasn't reluctant.

Mr. CLARK: Well, he said it without being reluctant and out of the kindness of his heart, with obvious admiration for the efforts of a new member, and I thank him for it. I congratulate my friend, Des Corcoran, on his coming back to the seat that belongs to him and on his continuing to represent the district that he and his father have represented so well for a long time. Many people down there say, "This is Corcoran country," and it is. However, this does not mean that Des is building it up for one of his sons later: obviously these things must be earned.

In recent weeks I was in the happy position, with my colleagues on the Public Works Committee, of being able to visit Victoria, New South Wales and Canberra for three or four days. Unfortunately, that kept me away from the by-election campaign for some time. Before I got to Millicent I was investigating a Government project that the committee had been charged with examining. I had the opportunity to talk to many members of Parliament in those three places, and I was interested in doing this. All honourable members have read press reports about the general feeling of disgust in other States about the electoral system in South Australia, and I wanted to look at this at first hand. Therefore, if members of Parliament from both sides of politics that I met in those places did not raise the subject themselves (and they normally did, because of the interest in this matter), I broached the subject. I have come to the conclusion, which was gained, peculiarly enough, not only from the Labor side but also from members of the Liberal and Country Party—the conservative party—(call it what you will) that there is complete disagreement among almost all people in the other States who are interested in politics with the ideas of the Stott-Hall Government regarding electoral reform.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about their own systems?

Mr. CLARK: I did not know enough about their systems to challenge the members on them, but it is interesting that members in the other States have gone to enough trouble to find out more about our system than I knew about their systems, and it is obvious that, when the general opinion in those States is that some

electoral reform must be carried out in South Australia, somebody is on the right track, and I believe that the Party of which I have the honour to be a member is on the right track.

Mr. Casey: I understand that some Party is extremely concerned in Queensland at present.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that an extremely conservative Party in Queensland is now pressing for one vote one value. I think many of my colleagues in this Chamber will remember that a former Premier had never heard of it in his life.

Mr. Broomhill: I think the Prime Minister supports that principle.

Mr. CLARK: Why has there in the last few months been such a resurgence of the feeling that there is a need for electoral reform? The Attorney-General would say that we whipped this up, and I make no apology for the fact that we have done some of that, because it is our duty to do so. The main reason for the resurgence is that my colleague the member for Adelaide has, over the years, (as we all have done) raised this matter of the gerrymander. In so many cases we have been a voice crying in the wilderness because people did not seem to be interested, but in the last State election the two major Parties opposed each other in every electoral district, and that was the first time we could give figures gained by each Party and compare them, without the member for Mitcham and others trying to prove to us how wrong we were in our figures because we did not allow for certain things.

For the first time the figures were obvious to everyone, and this caused dissatisfaction in the minds of many people and a feeling that there was something wrong with the electoral system. I believe the Premier increased this feeling, that there was something rotten in the State of Denmark, when he made what was virtually a threat regarding the by-election at Millicent. I believe this feeling was engendered in the District of Millicent and throughout South Australia and, according to newspapers, beyond our borders. A Melbourne columnist, who I admit is fairly ignorant, reported last week that at the moment there were more politicians in the District of Millicent than there were sheep. That is a gross libel regarding the number of sheep in the district, but it shows that we were correct in saying that the eyes of Australia were on Millicent. I believe the victory of Mr. Corcoran showed that an election held under a completely democratic vote really meant

something, and a big percentage of South Australians rejoiced that the majority of citizens of Millicent chose Mr. Corcoran.

I am sure that many members, particularly on this side, would like to say something about the type of propaganda used in the general election, because much of it was rotten. One of the most deplorable aspects (and I saw this again at Millicent recently) is the carefully fostered anti-Dunstan propaganda that has been put out. It does not matter how gross the libel or how nasty the statement; the type of propaganda has been deliberately fostered in every district in which I have had the pleasure to work.

Mr. Lawn: They are jealous because they have not got Don Dunstan.

Mr. CLARK: True, it is caused by jealousy but, unfortunately, in districts where the former Premier, because of his multifarious duties as Premier, did not have the opportunity to visit as much as he would like, some people who had not seen him were deluded by this propaganda. It is insidious, particularly so coming from a Party that accused us in the recent by-election at Millicent of setting up a personality cult. They do this in reverse towards the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lawn: He spent some time down there.

[Midnight.]

Mr. CLARK: He did. Apart from the combination of ability and value of the member for Millicent, I point out that, with the ability and value of the Leader of the Opposition, the more trips the Leader makes to the district the greater the majority will be. This poisonous propaganda appeared in all sorts of ways. It started in here when the Attorney-General, as a private member, started asking questions and suggesting that I was not seen much in Elizabeth, and the Liberal Party included this sort of propaganda in its leaflets. It did not worry me much, because everyone knew it was not true. Another thing included in the leaflet was a statement to the effect that my opponent, if elected, would represent all sections of the community. This got under my skin for a minute until I realized it was silly because, of course, every member worth his salt represents all sections of the community.

The thing that really tickled me most (and the member for Millicent will be interested in this) was the suggestion that I had communistic leanings. When I was preparing to enter Parliament in 1952 this story was fairly widespread, and I was interested in ascer-

taining the facts (although not the name of the individual concerned). About eight or nine years previously, when I was studying political science at the university (as might be expected I gained a credit in the subject!), I had to write an essay on the difference between Socialism and Communism. I was persuaded some years afterwards to read this essay to a discussion group in Gawler (not a political discussion group at all) and so, on the strength of an essay I had had to write as a project for a university degree unit, I was branded as having communistic tendencies. I suppose this suggestion, having apparently drifted on from 1952, has merely bobbed up again in 1968. I am afraid I do not know much about Communism; quite frankly, I have never been able to see much difference between Communism and the present so-called Liberalism, for they are both extremes of different things. What impressed me was that the Attorney-General had tried to tell me I was neglectful in serving Elizabeth, although I received a five-to-two vote in Elizabeth, which was probably the best result in my district. Concerning the suggestion that people did not know me, it might be of significance that in the area in which my opponent lived and had his business I received a three-to-one vote.

Mr. Jennings: It might be that they knew him.

Mr. CLARK: Perhaps it is just as well if one is not too well known.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Perhaps they liked your opponent but not his politics.

Mr. CLARK: I think my opponent is a highly estimable gentleman. Indeed, he is a friend of mine, and people apparently object not to him but to the colour of his politics (and I naturally agree with them). In going through the election results today, I was interested to see that the number of electors in my district is just about the same as the total number of electors in the Districts of Burra, Light, Rocky River, Yorke Peninsula, Angas, and Gumeracha. I am not claiming to be any paragon or the best member in the House but, after all, the fact that six members represent the same number as that which I represent seems to indicate a slight need in South Australia for electoral reform! I was interested in, and most sympathetic with, the remarks made by the member for Stuart. I have been in Parliament since 1952, the honourable member having been here, I think, for more than twice that period.

Mr. Riches: 35 years!

Mr. CLARK: Yes, and I was impressed with his remarks today. I have heard him speak about this before, and I have deplored it myself in this place: that is, the idea of separating the country from the city. I have always firmly believed (and I still believe) that we are all South Australians: we have a community of interest and we are all members of the same State. If we go to an interstate football match we like to see the South Australian team win, although it seldom does. For the life of me, I cannot see why these artificial boundaries should exist between the country and the city. However, we must remember that they are artificial boundaries, which have been fostered over the years by the Party that has been in Government for most of that period. It is indeed wrong to perpetuate such things in our electoral system. Whatever we do we must bring the city and country closer together. I believe you, Sir, as a country member, would share those sentiments, too.

I shall not go into detail on some matters that grieve us all. I shall not talk about Chowilla dam, which has been fully canvassed by members more able than I to deal with it. I wish to quote again the statement made by the Premier (and I think it is something that he wishes he had never opened his mouth about) before the Millicent by-election as reported in the *News* of May 29, as follows:

If we win Millicent, I will consider it an endorsement of our plan. If we lose Millicent, I shall consider it an endorsement of the A.L.P. plan.

Mr. Lawn: Do you believe his statement?

Mr. CLARK: I cannot believe it now, but I suppose some people believed it before. The report continues:

Of course, we will then have to compromise to achieve electoral reform.

I believe this statement has done the Premier and his Party great harm. Today the Premier made the best speech I have ever heard him make, yet it was a deplorable effort. He referred particularly (and this was in one of his wilder flights of fantasy) to the fact that members on this side had brought the South Australian Parliament into contempt. As I have said, I have recently been to two other States and to the Commonwealth Parliament, and I can assure honourable members, including the Premier (if he needs assurance), that the general opinion in other States (as it is in the Millicent District) is that it is not the Opposition that has brought the South Australian Parliament into contempt.

Mr. Broomhill: The Millicent result confirmed that this is so.

Mr. CLARK: People with any knowledge at all have only to look at the record of the L.C.L. in South Australia on electoral reform to see (and I put it bluntly) that it stinks. As it always has done, it is hard to convince people now that that odourous smell has departed from it. I do not think it has—nor do others. Over the years we have been used to ruthless but strong leadership of the L.C.L.

Mr. Ryan: It has taken a distinct turn.

Mr. CLARK: I agree. I have nothing against the Premier at all: he is a likeable chap. However, frankly I think the present leadership of the L.C.L. is at the lowest ebb it has been for years. Having the principles I have, I should be delighted with this, but I am not. I grieve every day, because this must do South Australia harm. I think perhaps the easiest and truest way to put it is that if we had lost Millicent (and we did not, fortunately) the Premier would have held the State of South Australia in the hollow of his head, or hand, whichever you like, but now he does not.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The member for Gawler was clearly batting on a sticky wicket.

Mr. Ryan: The bowling was not too good.

Mr. McANANEY: He had difficulty in getting his ideas across. It is now after midnight. There has been mud-slinging about the way we fought an allegedly dirty campaign in Millicent. Members opposite are saying they are white angels for what they did down there, but their performance tonight gives the lie to it straightout in that they have abused us up hill and down dale on what we did last week. We must get down to the more important things that the Opposition always seems to consider of minor importance. The Leader of the Opposition says that electoral reform is the main thing confronting South Australia at the moment, whereas I say that the development of South Australia is the most important thing at the moment. We were chided tonight by the Leader of the Opposition who said that we had not yet honoured our promise to get South Australia going. Let us go back to when the present Opposition took office three years ago when we had a booming economy in South Australia, when our population was increasing at the second fastest, and at most times the fastest, rate in Australia. This carried on for nine months before it began to slow down

under a Labor Government, when it started to introduce its policy of higher taxation, sapping the confidence in this State so that in January our unemployment figures were rising. We had people coming into the work force looking for jobs and not being able to find them. It took nine months for a gradual slowing down to occur in that high rate of business activity in South Australia, yet now the Opposition says we must get South Australia going in a matter of 10 weeks.

What did we take over from? The fact is that our young people wanted jobs in January, and many of them could not get jobs. What was the state of the Loan Fund in South Australia? The sum of \$9,500,000, which should have been spent on development work and creating employment, was not spent. Why not? Was it because of the slowing down of the administration and the Ministers slackening in their jobs, or did the Premier want to appear on television and be able to say, "The trust funds are intact" because he had some millions of dollars and he could say, two days before the last election, "My trust funds are intact"? That was when the young people were unemployed in South Australia because this money was not being spent on development; yet the Leader of the Opposition says that electoral reform is the most important thing. The most important thing is that our population growth rate has slowed down to become the second lowest in Australia. The only State with a growth rate worse than ours is Tasmania, which always has had difficulty in maintaining its population. We must reverse this trend of people leaving this State because the building trade has run down during the three years. Here we are in May with 223 more private houses built during this period. Naturally, the economy will take some getting going.

Members opposite say that our Premier should not go overseas to make the 15 or 20 contacts necessary to attract business here, but that is the only way to do it. We must get things going again, we must attract investment here and increase our growth rate, which will in turn get our building trade going again. This is something that must be tackled in this way.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Who said the Premier shouldn't go overseas?

Mr. McANANEY: You are saying that we should meet during his absence.

Mr. Langley: That's not the Premier.

Mr. McANANEY: If the honourable member can read the newspapers, he will see that the Treasurer is also going to Canberra within the next two days. This pairs business is quite new. The main thing is to get development going again in South Australia. I turn now to electoral reform. Contradictory remarks have been made in this House in this regard. It was claimed by the Leader of the Opposition that there would be a 25 per cent margin on the plan he intended to introduce. I interjected and said that I did not think he was right in saying that, and I have since seen how he worked out the figure. Under his scheme, if there were a 10 to 15 per cent margin below the quota in country seats, there would be an average margin of 12½ per cent. As there are twice as many people in the Opposition's so-called "city" area, to balance it up there must be 6½ per cent above the quota or, by my reckoning, a 19 per cent margin. The only way to get a 25 per cent margin is to take the country quota and say the city quota is 25 per cent above that.

The Leader of the Opposition has publicly announced that he will introduce a Bill providing for 48 seats, and that the Commonwealth seats will be divided into four State seats, but the Bill that has been discussed here tonight is not in line with that Bill, which provides for a margin of 20 per cent below and above. Working on the Leader of the Opposition's assumptions, a 20 per cent margin below a quota of 10,000 would be 8,000, and 20 per cent above would be 12,000, or a difference of 50 per cent between the two. Yet the two Bills the Leader of the Opposition has stated publicly he will introduce are entirely different from what he stated elsewhere. He must make up his mind what he is advocating, or what scheme the A.L.P. platform will allow him to introduce.

When members opposite introduced their 56-seat proposal it was not discussed with us beforehand because they knew at that stage it was in the A.L.P. platform and they could not in any circumstances discuss that Bill before it was introduced here. However, members opposite need to be more consistent in these matters. We have spoken much about democracy, and it would not worry me if we returned to one vote one value to win an election, compared with what we are bringing in. Members opposite will, if they look up the definition of "democracy", see that it means "Government by the people". To take it further, the meaning of "people" is "communities"—not "individuals". That is

what we want in South Australia: a Bill that will give the country people an opportunity to have some swinging seats in the country so that, if they are dissatisfied with the Government of the day, they may reject it. I do not think it matters whether it be a Liberal or a Labor vote: there must be Government by the people representing all interests. However, if we take the Bill that members opposite wish to introduce, there will be 15 or 16 seats in the country.

Mr. Hudson: That's not right.

Mr. McANANEY: It depends how you define "country". Our definition of the country means that there would be 170,000 electors, whereas the definition of the A.L.P. would result in 186,000 country electors. I do not know what boundaries have been used by the Opposition in drafting its legislation.

With the Labor Party's quota, on present voting trends, if there are 15 country seats, there will be 12 sure Liberal seats, and it will take a mighty swing for the Labor Party to win those seats. The Labor Party will have three seats, one in the South-East and two at Whyalla, which will be certain Labor seats; whether there are 15, 16 or 17 seats, there will be no swinging seats in the country. Under our plan, with 20 country seats outside the Town Planner's metropolitan area—

Mr. Hudson: How far east does the metropolitan area go?

Mr. McANANEY: Wait and be patient. The member for Glenelg never likes people to interject when he is speaking. If I interject he calls me names. If he could only get away from that academic background and from the chip on his shoulder he would not be a bad sort of chap. Regarding our proposed scheme for 20 country seats, this is what we stated publicly to be the town planning conception of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hudson: What is that metropolitan area?

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member should get hold of the town planning volume; there are three maps at the back. If he unfolds them—

Mr. Hudson: How far east does it go?

Mr. McANANEY: Surely, with the member's academic education, he can read a map: where the line goes east of Stirling, that is where it is. I am not going to do the honourable member's homework for him. Under our scheme I think there will be four sure Labor seats and there will probably be 13 sure Liberal seats. There will be three swinging seats in

which the country people can indicate their desire for a Liberal or a Labor Government. The member for Glenelg has said we will allot one seat to a big area around Whyalla but I point out that, if we put many people in one seat, the smaller the country quota becomes for the other seats, and they become swinging seats to a greater extent. If the Labor Party's suggestion were adopted there would be more swinging seats, which would not necessarily be to our advantage; but surely it would be a good thing to have some swinging seats. The member for Glenelg said that his Party could not win any country seats, and I can believe him after what the Labor Party did during the last three years. If the Labor Party had not followed the policies it did follow over the last three years it would not be out of office now. The Party imposed taxes, such as land tax, and introduced measures that the other place refused to pass.

Mr. Hudson: How much of the tax is paid from within the square mile of the city of Adelaide?

Mr. McANANEY: Surely a man who has been to the university would know that if the Government imposes a tax on the square mile of the city of Adelaide such a tax is passed on in the form of rising costs. The city business people do not make any less profit: the extra tax goes on to the cost of things, and ultimately it must be borne by the country people. The member for Glenelg may lack practical experience, but I assure him that this does happen. It is obvious to anyone who has had any experience in business what goes on in the community. Under the Labor Party's scheme the election would be virtually decided on an arc around the south and west of the Torrens. The Liberal Party would have to win 68.5 per cent of the seats in that area under the scheme the Labor Party wants to introduce. On the other hand, I have calculated that we will have to win 13 of the 19 seats, or about 68 per cent.

On the figures for the House of Representatives election 18 months ago, we would have gained 100 per cent of those seats and on the basis of the last Senate election we would have won more than 13 seats, 68 per cent of them. On our proposal, in these areas certain seats are doubtful, so perhaps we will have to win eight seats (53 per cent) or nine seats (63 per cent). In order to win 53 per cent, we will have to win Unley and Glenelg and, even if the swing is large enough for us to win those seats, a not much greater swing is needed to win a much larger area in Adelaide.

Whether the basis be one vote one value or our proposal, the swing needed to change the Government will not vary much either way, but the country people, with a few swinging seats, will be left to indicate whether they support the Government, and in this area the L.C.L. will have to win a number of seats in order to govern. I consider that our system is very fair because it allows for community of interest and a chance for the people to express their view at an election. Even on a one vote one value basis, we have to win 70 per cent in that area, and that involves a small swing. Under our proposal we have to win 53 per cent to govern, under the Labor Party proposal we have to win 68 per cent to govern, and under the one vote one value system we have to win 71 per cent, so a swing of 1 per cent or 2 per cent will decide which Party governs, and I do not consider that unfair. It is not much harder to win on the basis of one vote one value than on any other basis.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed that the A.L.P. had won an election by the biggest majority obtained in Australia in the last 10 years, but I do not accept that. I understand that the Western Australian Government won by a bigger percentage about three years ago, and the figure for the most recent House of Representatives election was also larger. A two-to-one country loading does not necessarily favour the Liberal Party, because in Western Australia it is a loading of eight to one in four seats and two to one in the rest, and it will be remembered that the Western Australian Government was nearly defeated and that it was reported in the newspaper that the Government "might win by one". I think the Government had a majority of five finally, but the margin was narrow. The figures for that election were as follows:

	Percentage of Votes
Party	
Liberal	43.1
Labor	45.8
Country	4.6
D.L.P.	3.1
Democratic6
Communist5
Independent	2.2

Members opposite say that D.L.P. voters are Liberals, so we will claim those votes. We will give the Labor Party the Communist vote of .5 per cent, because those voters support the Labor Party. Members opposite say that we are allied to the D.L.P. because that Party supports us, so on the same argument members opposite must be allied to the Communists.

I do not think they are, but I am using the same argument. There was a 2.2 per cent Independent vote, which we will split evenly. Yet the Government barely scraped in, with this two-to-one loading. In the last election with the D.L.P. preferences we would have had a surplus in the southern Adelaide area, but we finished with three out of the eight seats, and I have not heard the Leader of the Opposition complain.

Mr. Hudson: Your vote is heavily concentrated in Burnside and Mitcham.

Mr. McANANEY: With one vote one value that loading can be obtained in a particular area, and one Party could govern with a minority.

Mr. Hudson: The Labor vote throughout the metropolitan area in the northern suburbs is concentrated far more heavily, and there is a greater wastage of the Labor vote in the suburbs of Adelaide.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stirling is making the speech.

Mr. McANANEY: The Opposition has also criticized progress of the Chowilla project. The present Leader of the Opposition gave away Chowilla provided we could get something else, but now he chides us for what has been done. Also, Opposition members claimed during the Millicent by-election that we could govern with only 40 per cent of the votes. That is incorrect. Three years ago we obtained over 46 per cent of the votes, and after the distribution of preferences we would have had 47 per cent. If the Labor Party had not antagonized country people by increasing their taxation we would have had to win both Unley and Glenelg, and that would have required a 3 per cent swing to enable us to govern. By its actions the Labor Party offended this section of the community, and it is now trying to take away from country people their right to say who should govern in South Australia. The claim about the 40 per cent of votes is mere propaganda, and even the member for Glenelg would know that it is a deliberate falsehood.

Mr. Hudson: I don't know that.

Mr. McANANEY: Many Opposition members have spoken for a long time but there is little to rebut, except for a remark by the member for Wallaroo. Some time ago I jokingly said that I had not been in my area for two years, and tonight he reminded me of that. Before the Labor Government came into office I had an area easy to represent as it had almost everything it required. However, in the last three years under a Labor Administration my work has increased, and I have to

work seven days a week to satisfy the complaints from people in my district. I hope that we will not have a repetition of tonight's debate, because if this is the type of debate to be used by Labor Party members they must have a poor case. The member for Glenelg in his first speech in this House criticized members of the Liberal Party, but I hope the new member for Edwardstown will learn that he can have a difference of opinion with Government members without getting down into the gutter. We will maintain the dignity of this Parliament by sticking to facts and not speaking of personalities, and I hope the member for Edwardstown will remember that.

We have a most difficult situation today with young people leaving school and seeking employment. It has been said that the member for Millicent is a humanitarian, but are not we all? I am just as much a humanitarian as he, and I have probably undertaken more unpaid public work than he has. Let us get together and thrash out the merits of a case rather than deal with personalities.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I am grateful for the opportunity that has been provided for us to air some grievances that were put forward initially on behalf of Opposition members by the Leader of the Opposition. After listening to the attempt of the member who has just resumed his seat to reply to some of the criticisms we have made, it is no wonder that members on this side of the House have grievances to air, if the line of thought being applied throughout the Government is similar to that which has been expressed by the member for Stirling.

It is somewhat surprising that we have been given this opportunity today to make certain criticisms, because the Premier has admitted that we would not be sitting today had it not been for the fact that urgent financial matters must be dealt with by this Parliament. I think that supports the criticisms advanced that members on this side of the House have had little opportunity to raise matters of great concern to this State. The Leader of the Opposition dealt with four main headings, which have not been properly answered by the few speakers on the other side of the House who have elected to take part in this debate. Having heard much about electoral reform, I do not intend to deal with this subject in great detail but, at the same time, the Premier, in his earlier reply to criticisms that have been made, has pointed out that once again he is prepared to make all sorts of changes in his attitude; and if we look at the various changes

that he has adopted since the commencement of this year (in particular, prior to the March elections and prior to the Millicent by-election), we find that he has had more changes of opinion in this short space of time than the Attorney-General normally has in a year.

If we look at the major conflicting statements that have been made by the Premier in recent months, we find also that the first important one followed the announcement by the Leader of the Opposition that members on this side of the House were prepared to examine the proposal that had been put forward by a Commonwealth Liberal member in relation to the 48-seat plan. I think that everyone in this State recognizes that the system of four seats for each of the 12 Commonwealth divisions would receive little criticism from any member of the South Australian community. I have never found any person, whether living in the country or the city, criticizing the boundaries that are applied on a Commonwealth level. No-one suggests they are weighted in favour of the city or the country, and I believe that the proposal that has been advanced by the Leader of the Opposition in this regard meets with the overwhelming support of the South Australian community.

However, following the speech made by the Leader, other members have referred to the statements of the Premier in which he made it clear that he was pleased that this change had taken place. The Premier said that he was always prepared to listen to the other side and that he was quite happy to discuss any matters of compromise on this subject. However, a change took place after the announcement by the Court of Disputed Returns concerning the Millicent by-election, and on this occasion the Premier announced that he would be taking the by-election in Millicent as a test of what should apply regarding electoral reform in this State. It is astounding to find that he has now retreated from this position once again. It makes one wonder whether the Premier believes that, by making all of these conflicting public statements, he is doing his Party any real service. Obviously, he must be aware that people are reading what he has to say, because people are interested in this subject. It is apparent to me that he is putting himself in a position where he is losing more favour with the public on every occasion he opens his mouth on this subject.

Some members on this side have suggested that the Premier is making these conflicting

statements simply because he does not know any better. However, I refer honourable members to an article that appeared in the *News* earlier this month to the effect that the Premier at that time had been taking swims at 6 a.m. for about two weeks. I do not know whether he has continued this practice, but he made it clear to the person interviewing him on that occasion that his policy in that respect was to trot up and down the beach and, as he expressed it, to kid himself to go into the water by repeating over and over again, "It is not cold; it is not cold." I suggest he has applied this form of self-hypnosis to all his political thinking, particularly in relation to electoral reform.

Mr. Clark: Do you think we could possibly use it on him?

Mr. BROOMHILL: I believe he has managed to impart some of this technique to some of his colleagues. I imagine the Premier trots up and down the beach and, in addition to kidding himself that the water is not cold, kids himself that the people of South Australia do not take any notice of the many conflicting statements he makes in relation to electoral reform. I suggest to the Premier that it is no good his attempting to fool the people of this State. At this time he is not able to fool even the members of his own Party, for the West Torrens Young Liberals only recently attempted to alter the electoral situation applying to the Legislative Council. Although this move was defeated (and undoubtedly much pressure was brought to bear on the Young Liberal Convention not to adopt this practice), I refer to the press report as follows:

Several speakers attacked the L.C.L.'s policy of restricted franchise and called for a more "democratic" system and more "liberalism". The delegate from Blackwood said he believed the Party's poor showing in the Millicent by-election was a reflection of the attitude it had adopted. "The majority of people are tired of conservatism—they look for democracy," he said. "We have failed to keep up with modern thinking."

This was not a comment made at a Labor Party meeting: it was made at a Liberal Party meeting. I believe this is something that members opposite should bear in mind. It is no good their trying to press their point of view simply in order to hold office because, although they may kid themselves that by retaining a small percentage of the vote in this State they can cling to office, what will happen is that they will drive more and more of their supporters away from their line of thinking.

Mr. Clark: Do you know what happened to the fellow who expressed that opinion?

Mr. BROOMHILL: I have a fair idea. I point out that many Liberal voters in my district criticize the L.C.L.'s electoral policy. It was pointed out to me (and it is interesting to look at this exercise) that, although I enjoyed the pleasure of a comfortable majority in my district in the March election, my Liberal opponent succeeded in obtaining 14,800 votes. Although he polled this number, nevertheless he was defeated. It was drawn to my attention by members of the Liberal Party in my electoral district that the 14,800 Liberal voters in the area of West Torrens had failed to gain any representation in this House. Nevertheless, when we consider the fact that the Liberal electors in the districts of Rocky River, Eyre, Chaffey and Burra totalled a lower vote than that recorded by my defeated opponent (they may be considered more important, but the Liberal voters in my electoral district could not see the logic of this), I suggest to members opposite that they should take into account the fact that they will not continue to cling to office with a minority vote. If this minority vote recedes much further, they will have absolutely no support. The Premier tried to fool this House by suggesting, by some figures he quoted, that the proposal he was putting forward compared favourably with the position in other States. I do not know whom he thinks he will fool on this issue, but I will quote from comments in a last week's *News* by Dr. Blewett, Senior Lecturer in Politics at the Adelaide University, who said:

In South Australia for every 100 voters represented by a Labor M.P. today 54 voters are represented by an L.C.L. M.P. He said, "By comparing the present S.A. electoral system with that of other Australian States and other Anglo-Saxon countries, the degree of maldistribution of electorates in S.A. is seen to be greater than anywhere else."

I think that this view of a person who is not a member of this House, who is in a position to study closely the proposal put forward by the L.C.L. and the proposal now put forward by the Opposition, and the view of many other people who have spoken on this throughout Australia will carry more weight with the public than a flat announcement by the Premier that in his view his scheme is satisfactory.

I noticed an interesting thing about the Millicent by-election while I was down there. I had the pleasure of seeing the L.C.L. candidate during a television advertisement period, and he was able somehow or other to show by means of a map where the Labor Party's

proposal would remove Millicent as a State seat. Perhaps he did not do this with any degree of accuracy or confidence, but nevertheless he made the claim that this would happen. Of course, I believe he knew that this was quite incorrect. What amused everybody watching this television advertisement was that the candidate then went on to show what would happen under the L.C.L. proposal. The comments he made whilst showing the map and the boundaries that would apply in Millicent under their proposal were made all the more amusing by the fact that he pointed out what would be the seat of Millicent under the L.C.L. proposal after an independent commission had drawn up the boundaries.

Mr. Freebairn: He said "probably"; be fair.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I am being as fair as I can.

Mr. Hudson: Mr. Cameron was not fair.

Mr. BROOMHILL: At the time I was watching this particular programme in the comfort of a hotel. I was in there only because a cheerful wood fire was burning. When Mr. Cameron made this announcement on television, he drew laughter from everybody watching the programme, so perhaps I was not misled about what I certainly thought Mr. Cameron had said. While the Premier continues to deny that he placed the onus upon the electors of Millicent to establish what was to be the situation regarding electoral reform in this State, and despite what he may be saying now, everyone is well aware that this was the issue that was canvassed at every political meeting I visited during the time I was in the Millicent area. It seems to me that the Premier will not win many friends if he continues to deny that the situation in Millicent was the one that he claimed would decide the future of electoral reform in this State.

The other matter the Leader of the Opposition has already thoroughly dealt with is the claim by the new Premier, made before the last State election, that by returning an L.C.L. Government the electors would get South Australia moving. However, he did not say whether it would be backwards or forwards: one can only assume what he intended.

Mr. Hurst: But it has turned out to be backwards, hasn't it?

Mr. BROOMHILL: It certainly has not gone forward. He also said that an L.C.L. Government would instil confidence into the economy, which would mean that South Australia would develop rapidly. The only remark he could make when asked whether South Australia had gone backwards since the L.C.L.

Government had been in office was that some industries were coming to, or enlarging in, South Australia. He went to some pains in this, because I believe he knew we could check on the position. He said they would all be small industries that would not employ many people, but he failed to point out that the number of people dismissed from employment because of factory close-downs since his Government assumed office would exceed that figure. Having examined the facts of employment, one can see that the L.C.L. Government has not got South Australia moving; nor has it instilled confidence into the people of this State. The Premier failed to reply to the criticism made by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the important aspect of building work in this State. I refer to an article headed "Housing work reduced", which appeared in the *Advertiser* of June 6. It states:

A drop in house commencements and completions in South Australia is reported in building figures issued last night by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. The figures show that in the quarter to March last, 1,655 houses were started—eight fewer than in the December 1967 quarter and 36 fewer than in the March, 1967 quarter. There were 1,531 houses completed during the three months ended last March—642 fewer than in the previous quarter and 410 fewer than in the same quarter of 1967.

The total of 2,056 dwellings (houses and flats combined) started was 58 more than in the preceding quarter and 84 more than in the March, 1967 quarter. There were 11,768 people recorded as employed in building jobs at March 29, 1968. This was 435 fewer than on December 13, 1967, and 664 fewer than on March 31, 1967.

On June 19 another article, headed "South Australian Housing Decline Continues", appeared as follows:

A continuation into this year of the decline of house approvals for construction in South Australia for 1966 and 1967 is reported in the current edition of the national journal of the Housing Industry Association. The prolonged recession in dwelling construction in South Australia may have reached its limit, but there is little expectation of any marked upsurge, the journal says.

Although the Premier made a half-hearted attempt to explain the failure of his Government to make a marked improvement in the overall situation in this State, there has been no immediate sign of confidence resulting from the L.C.L. promises made before the election. I think, however, he could have taken the opportunity to tell the House what he intended to do to correct the decline in house building that has become more evident since his Government took over the reins of office.

I also wish to refer to the attack that has been made on the privileges of members of this House. The Attorney-General had been provided with correspondence from the Leader of the Opposition regarding the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, which had been prepared earlier this year. Despite the fact that the Leader of the Opposition had suggested that this should not be made available to him, the Attorney-General, as he pointed out, simply wrote in the margin of the correspondence that he disagreed, and he went ahead and obtained from the Government Printer a copy of something that the Leader regarded as confidential. I have not been in this House for very long, but I know that all members jealously guard their rights and privileges, and I hope that we receive a better explanation than that provided by the Attorney-General when he simply said that he disagreed with the view of the Leader of the Opposition on this matter.

It would not have been so bad, as has been said earlier, if, having obtained the Bill, the Attorney-General had properly used it during the television programme *Encounter*. I watched the programme, and I sympathized with the Attorney-General because of the drubbing he took at the hands of the Leader of the Opposition on all matters raised. Since they were dealing with the question of electoral reform, the Leader of the Opposition naturally had the better case, but some members have been unkind to the Attorney-General and have suggested that he deliberately misread or misquoted what was in the Bill. I do not agree that this is so, because I believe that a lawyer who holds the position of the leading law authority in this State would not deliberately make a fool of himself on television by showing that he was unable to read a straightforward Bill, which, I believe, even the member for Stirling would be able to understand. I believe he did not deliberately misquote it, despite the fact that, where he did misquote the Bill, it was certainly designed to help his argument.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think he is a fool?

Mr. BROOMHILL: No. I believe he was very wise when he said today that he was not prepared to give any decisions in his capacity as Attorney-General; he said that he referred such matters to the Crown Law Office. If he had done this with the Leader's Bill, we would not be in the position we are in today, when we find it necessary to criticize him for misquoting a Bill improperly obtained.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think he needs assistance?

Mr. BROOMHILL: He admitted this, and I agree that it is becoming more apparent as we observe the activities of the Attorney-General.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): We have heard many angry words in this debate today. Since it is close to 1 a.m. I shall not delay the House for more than five or 10 minutes. I wish to answer some of the outrageous charges that have been made during the course of the debate. I welcome back to the Parliament my old friend, Mr. Corcoran. I welcome him back on a personal basis; we are all his friends personally, and I know we are all very pleased to see him back with us again. The member for Whyalla was sufficiently charitable to say that the two candidates who represented the major Parties in the Millicent by-election were both regarded very highly as individuals. I found, throughout the two or three weeks that I canvassed in Millicent, that Mr. Cameron and Mr. Corcoran had hardly an enemy in the whole district. It is evident that Mr. Corcoran was re-elected on the basis of his popularity and he comes back to the Parliament despite the enormous hurdles of the Australian Labor Party—Trades Hall machine and, I am sorry to say, the doubtful assistance he got from the Communist Party.

Mr. Broomhill: What was that? What do you mean?

Mr. Clark: What did you say?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I will come back to that, because several speakers today have made rather wild remarks about the Communist Party and I regret that on one or two occasions my name was linked with the Communists. I understood the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) to say that some of the new L.C.L. members in this House were not very experienced in politics and did not have much background experience. While the honourable member was speaking, it occurred to me that he had forgotten that the democratic principles that obtained on the L.C.L. side of politics ensured that the process of the machinery for election meant that the members had to face members of the L.C.L. in their own districts in order to gain endorsement.

Their endorsement depended on the vote of the members of their own Party in the respective districts. I think that every member on this side gained his political grounding by fighting the preselection that resulted in his coming to this Parliament. I thought it might be worth while to remind the

House about how the A.L.P. endorses its candidates. This is on page 27 of this excellent 50c booklet entitled *Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party* and it is as follows:

Applications for endorsement of candidates for Parliamentary selection shall, where practicable, be invited by the State Executive prior to the Annual Convention in the year immediately preceding any State or Federal election unless otherwise recommended by the State Executive and approved by the State Council.

On the next page appears the following:

The State Executive shall inquire into the membership *bona fides* and suitability of all applicants for endorsement . . .

We see how easy it is for an A.L.P. candidate to be endorsed and to come to the Parliament by election in some cases. Perhaps I might refer to Birdland. It is amazing that members such as the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) and the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) could have held their seats for three, five or six years and yet not have known precisely the boundaries of their districts.

Mr. Clark: No-one else did, either.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The members should have known the boundaries of their districts. I knew that the boundary of the Millicent district ran into the township of Mount Gambier only because members of the L.C.L. in Mount Gambier told me so and said, "Whatever you do, don't forget to canvass Birdland." When I got to Birdland, I found that the people were enrolled not for Millicent but for Mount Gambier. Labor members of Parliament, or any member worth his salt, ought to know where the electoral boundaries are and ought to ensure that voters claiming to be in a constituency do live there.

Mr. Loveday: They told you only the day before the election, did they?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On the last day before the election I was asked to canvass in Birdland, as my own Party machine believed that these people were enrolled for the district of Millicent. However, there is no excuse that the member for Mount Gambier, whose district is no greater in size than a square mile, should not know his district boundaries. I was amused in the early evening of Friday, when I happened to be canvassing next door to Mr. Burdon, to hear him say to a householder in Birdland, "You know me, I am Allan Burdon, your local member, but I have just found out that I am not your local member after all." Although he had been a

member for five years, this was an admission that he did not know where his electoral boundaries ran.

Mr. Clark: How could he know? Did anyone else know?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I know where mine runs and I am sure that every member on this side knows precisely where his boundaries are.

Mr. Clark: Wouldn't you take it for granted that if people voted in your district they belonged in your district?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, because I know where my boundaries are.

Mr. Broomhill: Would you say that your boundaries were not as odd as those at Millicent?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not think they are odd. The boundaries were drawn to encompass a rural district. Section 18 in the hundred of Blanche is clearly in the district of Millicent and both the member for Millicent and the member for Mount Gambier should have known this.

Mr. Clark: But no-one else did.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If the sitting members do not know their boundaries—!

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: When did you canvass the district?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I canvassed the area on Friday evening.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Mr. Cameron was there at midday on Friday.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If that is so, it is unknown to me. I have been accused unjustly that when canvassing in the District of Millicent I said that Mr. Corcoran was a Communist or a Communist sympathizer. That is untrue, and I categorically deny that I have associated the name of Mr. Corcoran with Communism. What I did say frequently was that the Communist Party was officially supporting the Labor Party in the Millicent by-election. For the interest of members, especially members opposite, I quote what appeared in the popular press of March 1, 1968. This reference is authorized by J. Moss, 180 Hindley Street, Adelaide, who writes as follows:

The constructive record of the Labor Government is a sound reason why it should continue to enjoy the confidence of the people at the election tomorrow.

Of course, Mr. Moss is referring to the March general election. He continues:

It stands out when compared with that of the L.C.L. which had more than 30 years in office yet allowed the conditions of the people to slip behind those in other States.

In Adelaide and Port Adelaide we urge support for the Communist candidates, Elliott Johnston and Peter Symon. Their election would strengthen the Labor Government.

I repeat: "Their election would strengthen the Labor Government." Mr. Moss continues:

A vote for the Communist candidates is a vote for this policy. If second preferences are allocated to the A.L.P. these become as good as primary votes if the Communists are not elected.

Now, we come to the Australian Broadcasting Commission news service of May 29, 1968; in part of that service the following was stated:

The Secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. Moss, said this morning that his Party would not contest the by-election but would do everything possible to ensure an A.L.P. win.

If that is not an indication that the Communist Party supported the Labor candidate at the Millicent by-election, I do not know what it is. I never associated the name of Mr. Corcoran with the Communist Party or used it in any other way at all—

Mr. Clark: What's the difference?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: —because I try never to mention the opponent's name when I am canvassing. I always refer to him as the Labor candidate. That is the rebuttal to some of the more unfortunate remarks that have been made by members opposite during this debate, and it indicates the sort of matter that I shall, if necessary, develop during the Address in Reply debate later this year.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I join with my Leader, the Deputy Leader, and members on this side of the House in the remarks that have already been made by them. I, too, am disturbed that the House is to be adjourned tomorrow until July 23. We all know that the last Parliament ended on November 3 last year, that the State elections were held on March 2 and that then, because the electoral position needed to be clarified, our Party called the House together on April 16, on which occasion, of course, our Government was defeated on the floor of the House. When the Hall Government took office on April 17, Parliament sat for one hour 34 minutes, and the length of time in which to raise important matters (except for today) has therefore been almost negligible. I point out that had it not been for our Party we still would not be sitting at this late hour. The Government no doubt would have adjourned the House by about 5 p.m. today. We really have not had any opportunity until now to raise matters concerning our constituents. I wish to raise many matters important to electors in my district,

although some members may think that these matters are not important. Apart from that, of course, many matters of State need to be raised, as has been emphasized by the member for Whyalla.

The Attorney-General said last session our Government commenced sitting in June, although he admitted that the Parliament rose in the previous session in March, so that, of course, we did not sit in the interim for about three months. I have not checked his statement, but I assume that what he said is accurate. However, I point out that, except for the brief sitting that took place on April 17, we have been out of session since November 3 last and that, therefore, many matters which we could and should have raised in Parliament have been neglected. During the time that our Party was in Government the House of Assembly sat for 212 days (including, of course, many night sessions) and the Legislative Council sat for 187 days, including a few night sessions. This is to be compared with 137 days of sitting for the House of Assembly, and 113 days for the Legislative Council, in the three years prior to 1965. It seems to me that the Government apparently intends to return to the pattern established by its predecessors in office. Of course, this will mean that it will not sit much at all. The reasons for this policy could be varied. Perhaps the Government is returning to the lethargic way of previous L.C.L. Governments or perhaps it does not wish to be questioned by the Opposition or for there to be much debate on matters that could come before this Chamber. The Attorney-General said that the Government could be defeated on the floor of the Chamber. I suppose that possibility exists, although we had not thought of that; perhaps that is the reason why the Government does not want to sit very much.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Do you think that the Government does not wish to sit very much?

Mrs. BYRNE: I am coming to that. Of course, the Premier will be away overseas for about four weeks on what I agree is important business for the State. It was suggested that the Address in Reply debate could take place in his absence, but he said that he wished to be present to hear that debate. However, I doubt that he will sit in this place and hear every member on both sides of the Chamber speak in the debate.

Mr. Jennings: Is he frightened that the Attorney-General might sabotage his position while he is away?

Mrs. BYRNE: The Leader of the Opposition said that pairs would be granted to Ministers engaged in affairs of State. Therefore, obviously the Premier and his Deputy would have pairs granted and Parliament could continue in session during their absence. Obviously the shorter the session the less time Opposition members will have on Wednesday afternoons for private members' business. Perhaps this is another reason why the Government does not wish to have long sittings.

The matter of electoral reform has been raised in this debate by almost all speakers. Naturally it is one of the main reasons why the Opposition wants Parliament to continue to sit as soon as possible. I have already pointed out that, when the Labor Party assumed office in 1965, Parliament met and continued to meet, but that is not the case now. One matter that most members have omitted to mention regarding the electoral situation is the vote received by the Labor Party at the recent State election. The final votes for the respective Parties were: A.L.P., 292,442; L.C.L., 246,553; Democratic Labor Party, 9,223; Social Credit League, 4,792; and Australian Communist Party (and perhaps the member for Light might note this), 1,606. If the A.L.P. had received the second preferences of the Communist Party, that certainly would not have made much difference to the result. The Independents received 5,781 votes and the Country Party 2,251. This meant that the total formal votes for all candidates numbered 562,648, and the informal votes numbered 13,256. The total vote, including informals, was 575,904 out of a total of 609,626 people on the electoral roll for the lower House. These figures show that the total A.L.P. vote exceeded the total L.C.L. vote by 45,889, but, of course, we are sitting on the Opposition benches. It also exceeded the combined totals of the L.C.L. and all other Parties by 22,236 and exceeded those combined totals plus the informals by 8,980. Therefore, of course, when it became known that the A.L.P. in spite of this record vote was to sit on the Opposition benches, it was not surprising that a disquiet existed in this State. Also this matter received much publicity, not only in this State but also in other States. Most people realize that the Liberal Party, although the Government of the day constitutionally, morally has no right to govern.

Mr. Casey: But it does not realize that.

Mrs. BYRNE: I am afraid that is the case. However, all this really goes back to 1856 when in the Lower House a two-to-one ratio

was fixed in favour of the country compared with the metropolitan area, and this has never been altered. That is the proportion enshrined in the Act of 1856—a two-to-one ratio in favour of the country. It is interesting to note that there was a reason in 1856 for the country having twice as many seats as the metropolitan area, because at that time the population in the country was twice as large as that in the metropolitan area, so there should have been twice as many seats in the country.

In 1856, on a State basis, there were 107,886 persons and there were 36,524 in the metropolitan area. However, it is interesting to note that this changed in 1918, this being the first year in which the population of the metropolitan area exceeded that of the country. Statistics show that there were then 457,552 people in this State, of whom 229,776 were in the metropolitan area, so at that time, if we had had any electoral justice, the numbers of members of Parliament should have been even or moving in that direction. However, as I have stated, this has continued to the present day; in 1965 there were 1,064,629 people in this State, of whom 618,100 were in the metropolitan area. That means that 58.06 per cent of our population was then in the metropolitan area. Of course, under our present electoral system, despite the complete change in population in favour of the metropolitan area, we still have twice as many country members as we have city members.

At the recent State election, as in previous elections, the Leader of the Opposition placed before the electors the Labor Party's electoral policy of a 56-member House. The Attorney-General said he could not understand why our Party had not at that stage altered its policy because the Commonwealth electoral referendum had failed. I point out that his Party supported that referendum. He said also that we introduced a Bill for electoral reform only in the first session of the last Parliament. However, we did that because it was obvious that no good purpose would be served by putting it before the House a second or third time, as it would have been defeated as it was on the first occasion. He also said we introduced only one Bill because we thought we would win the election, in which case we would not have to make any compromise. However, I point out to him that even our 1967 conference carried a resolution which, of course, he read to the House. It would

not be much use if we had tried to compromise with the then Opposition, since our Leader has now tried to compromise with the Premier. He will not compromise now, so I cannot see why he would have compromised then.

At the recent State election the then Opposition (now the Government) put forward its 45-seat proposal. Although the member for Stirling went to great lengths to explain it to us, I am afraid I cannot understand how he arrived at the figures he quoted and, therefore, I cannot comment on them. All members know that since the State election on March 2 a protest march to Light Square was held on March 17, and there about 10,000 people attended a public meeting. The Attorney-General said he knew someone at that meeting who had signed one of the petitions later presented to Parliament. However, that would not be so, because those petitions were not at the Light Square meeting. Something was distributed on that occasion, but it was not the protest petition presented to Parliament. Indeed, it was not even printed then.

Also, several demonstrations have been held by university students on the steps of Parliament House. At times the students have been joined by other citizens and, of course, tonight another protest meeting or demonstration was held on the steps of this House. It was estimated that 2,000 people attended. The Attorney-General said he thought that these tactics were highly undesirable. I point out to him, however, that, if he does not want a repetition of these tactics, the solution is in his hands and in the hands of the members on his side of the House. All that is required to stop such demonstrations is electoral justice in this State.

I think it was the Premier who implied that the Leader of the Opposition was stirring up trouble by addressing meetings and demonstrations of this kind. I point out to him, however, that he had equal opportunity to address the gathering this evening, because he was challenged to do so, but of course he did not appear. He could have addressed the gathering if he had desired, because it finished at 7.20 p.m. Of course, it can be claimed that he did not know anything about it, because he was not present, but I know that some members on his side were present and they could easily have gone and told him.

Much has been said about our compromise for a 48-seat House of Assembly. This plan

was announced on March 28; in the *News* of that date the following report appears:

"The plans the Premier has talked of today bring the parties much closer in their viewpoint," the Opposition Leader, Mr. Hall, said today. He was commenting on the 48-seat House of Assembly compromise plan outlined by the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, today. Mr. Hall said he was extremely pleased with the announcement of the new plan. It was an excellent sign that the A.L.P. was ready to compromise on electoral reform.

We all know what developments have occurred since this statement, and the only thing I can suggest is that Mr. Hall has forgotten what he said then: he has now changed his mind. I now turn to the petition containing 74,916 signatures which was presented to this House on April 17 and which asked for electoral redistribution and for a new election to be held after new boundaries had been decided. The Attorney-General told the House that another petition, which he denied was a Liberal Party petition, was signed by 6,486 persons. He said that these people did not believe another election should be held. He did not say, however, that these people did not believe in electoral reform, so I infer they did so believe. The only thing they did not believe in was that an election should be held at that stage. He also drew a comparison and said that the organizers of this petition obtained more signatures in the time they worked, but he was very vague regarding the time these people took to do the work. He said that they worked during the week and were able to get signatures for the petition only at the weekend. However, he could not prove his case. Although I have not gone around on behalf of our Party with a petition, I know the amount of time that is involved and I say that it would have been impossible for these people to do the work without help.

The member for Light spoke of the Milliment by-election. At this by-election the L.C.L. submitted electoral reform as the main issue and, as our Party won the seat, we can assume that the people endorsed our proposal for a 48-seat House and that they wanted electoral reform. I do not know the relevance of the statement by the member for Light that it was surprising that our candidate won because he had to carry the heavy burden of the way he was endorsed.

The honourable member also said that it was easy to get endorsement in our Party. When the member for Millicent was first endorsed, he had to contest a pre-selection ballot against six other candidates. He was

required to address a Party convention and had to eulogize himself. There is nothing harder than establishing one's supremacy over opponents and, unless one can prove that one has done a lot of work for the Party, one has no hope of gaining endorsement. I do not think there is any difference in the Liberal Party or that it is any easier to get endorsement in our Party than in the L.C.L.

The member for Light also mentioned the unfortunate incident of canvassers walking around Birdland on the Friday evening before the by-election and said that he was surprised that the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) did not know the boundaries of the Mount Gambier District. I do not know why any criticism was levelled at the member for Mount Gambier. After all, our Party received advice from the Electoral Department at Millicent at 5.15 p.m. on the Friday before the by-election that a mistake had been made in the past by enrolling these people wrongly. How can anyone deduce from that that the member for Mount Gambier did not know the boundaries of his district?

The Attorney-General said that ample opportunity would be given for discussion of the electoral Bill, but I remind the Attorney-General that that is why I am on my feet now and why other members have spoken this afternoon and this evening, because we wanted the House called together to discuss this Bill and other important matters.

Mr. McAnaney: Is this more important than development?

Mrs. BYRNE: I do not know what development has to do with it at this stage. The Premier spoke of industries coming to this State and of getting South Australia moving again. I wonder whether we will have a repetition of what the previous L.C.L. Government did when it was in office. I can remember that for many years when one opened the daily newspaper one could read a report of the Premier making a statement under the heading "New Industry Coming", or "New Industry Next Year", or "New Industry Next Month". Finally, one would see a photograph of a Minister or even of the then Premier laying a foundation stone, and probably 12 months later there would be a photograph of someone opening a factory, followed in another six months by figures about production.

This created in people's minds the impression that there were more industries coming to this State than there were, in fact. Is the same position to continue under the present

Government? Apparently, this sort of thing is what the Premier describes as getting South Australia moving again.

I suggest to the Premier that when he is in the United Kingdom he visit South Australia House and Australia House. I know that Australia House is controlled by the Commonwealth Government, but there are many English migrants in my district and in the Premier's district. No doubt he has received, as I have, claims, charges or comments from migrants that they have been misinformed in the United Kingdom about various matters relating to South Australia, for example, employment opportunities. They were assured that they would obtain employment, but when they arrived in Australia they found that they could not follow their usual occupation. On the evening before last I received a telephone call from a woman who told me that she had been assured when interviewed in the United Kingdom that she would receive employment as a social worker in South Australia, but now she finds that her qualifications are not recognized by the authorities.

I have also received complaints about difficulties of children and adults in having their educational qualifications recognized, and in some cases they consider that the assessment given is not equal to their British equivalents. These matters should be considered by the Premier whilst he is in the United Kingdom. I hope that he will do this, because there is nothing worse for people than to arrive in South Australia and find that they cannot obtain employment. I have known some people to buy a house dearer than one they should have bought (usually involving a second mortgage), and because they may have been allegedly told that wages in Australia will be higher, when in fact that is not so, they find that before long with their house payments and payments for furniture and a motor vehicle (both often on hire-purchase), they are in difficulties. In fact, some people have lost their life savings. It is no wonder that these people can become disgruntled and may wish to return to the United Kingdom. If this matter were examined more thoroughly in the United Kingdom, I believe that many of the problems that arise might be solved.

Turning now to the Local Government Act Revision Committee which, so far, has not been referred to, I was dismayed to read in the *Advertiser* of June 18 the following statement:

That is why there is such concern at the recent announcement by Mr. K. H. Gifford,

Q.C., that the new L.C.L. Government had put the Local Government Act Revision Committee into "cold storage". The Minister of Local Government (Mr. Hill) has expressed doubts whether the complete rewriting of the Act is necessary, and said he hoped to arrive at a decision on the committee's future within the next fortnight.

On June 21 a report appeared in the *Advertiser* to the effect that "the Minister of Local Government described reports that the work of the committee had been put on 'ice' as wild and exaggerated". This report also quoted the Premier as saying that "the work of the Local Government Act Revision Committee had been suspended while Cabinet decided whether its investigations should be geared to immediate needs or the rewriting of the whole concept of local government". It was also stated that the report of the committee would be produced by March, 1969. Although it has been denied that this committee was put "on ice", as stated in the press, I recently attended the First Session of the Local Government Women's Conference (on June 8), at which one of the officers present announced that it was doubtful whether one of the principal speakers, who was a member of the committee, would speak, because the committee at that time had been suspended. However, I understand that the person concerned later spoke at that conference. Nevertheless, I was dismayed when I read about a suspension of the committee, because I believe that a new Local Government Act in this State is long overdue.

No doubt, all of us, as members of Parliament, receive complaints occasionally regarding local government matters, and I think many of these complaints could be eliminated if we had an up-to-date Local Government Act. I am therefore pleased to see that, although we have not been told as much in the House (I certainly hope that what I have read is correct), the report of the committee is to be produced by March, 1969, and I hope that this report will be fully implemented.

In conclusion, I agree with members on this side that many matters should be debated in Parliament, particularly electoral reform, and that Parliament should continue in session in order to debate such matters.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): As the hour is getting rather late, I shall confine my remarks to my principal grievance which, in common with those of other members on this side, has to do with the need for electoral reform in this State. The whole Government is a mockery and a joke: it is also an insult to the people of the State. As the member for Edwardstown

(Mr. Virgo) said at the declaration of the poll in his district, the people of South Australia are prisoners of an electoral gerrymander. This was proved by the demonstration that took place outside this Chamber last evening. Unfortunately, the Speaker is not here, but I wish to say that his appointment as Speaker of this House is also a joke. By continually casting his vote in favour of the Government he has made final decisions in this House. That is contrary to the practice of democratic government.

Mr. Lawn: It is contrary to Parliamentary practice.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. Erskine May's *The Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*, under the heading "Principle on Which Speaker gives Casting Vote", states:

If the numbers in a division are equal, the Speaker, who otherwise does not vote, must give the casting vote. In the performance of this duty, he is at liberty to vote like any other member, according to his conscience, without assigning a reason; but, in order to avoid the least imputation upon his impartiality, it is usual for him, when practicable, to vote in such a manner as not to make the decision of the House final, and to explain his reasons.

In 1962, the Speaker was asked publicly how he would use his vote and he said that he would never use his casting vote to overthrow a Government or to turn a Government out. He was asked the same question in 1968 when he said, with a smirk on his face, that a lot of water had run under the bridge since 1962. I will repeat what I have said, and I hope the Speaker reads it. I have respect for the Chair and for you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but not for the gentleman whose appointment was proposed by the Government. We intended to elect you, Sir, as Speaker of the House.

Mr. Ryan: It would have been a wise choice.

Mr. McKEE: I believe it would have been. However, unfortunately you, Sir, were not the choice of your Party, which decided to elect a puppet Speaker who would dance to the tune and direction of the Hall-Stott coalition.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Putting it the other way round, we could dance to his tune.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think that he will get a knighthood out of it?

Mr. McKEE: It is doubtful; it depends. When he removed people from the gallery of this House, one person was heard to mention that he could be bought for a bag of chaff.

Mr. Ryan: You cannot get much lower than that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McKEE: I am only repeating what was said in this House by a member of the public. It was said, and I think every member of this House heard the remark. However, no matter how the Government tries to hoodwink or pretend to the people that it has a mandate to govern—

Mr. Hudson: The only mandate it has is to resign.

Mr. McKEE: Recently, Sir Thomas Playford was interviewed by a television station on the verandah of his home and he was asked by the interviewer, "Sir Thomas, would you say there is a gerrymander or an establishment in this State?" "Well," he replied, "It took them a long time to wake up to it," and he laughed with contempt for the people of this State.

Mr. McAnaney: But look what he has done for them.

Mr. McKEE: He had the audacity to select the present Premier to carry on these undemocratic actions.

Mr. Lawn: He is his protégé.

Mr. McKEE: As for the Upper House, which has been mentioned tonight, we talk about the gerrymander in this State being the laughing stock of the rest of Australia, but members should hear what the rest of Australia has to say about our Upper House! Under the present system of voting for the Upper House today, if the L.C.L. contested the four A.L.P. seats (I cannot remember the L.C.L. ever doing that) it would win those seats and there would be 20 L.C.L. members sitting in the Legislative Council. At the recent State election the people voted overwhelmingly for the return of the Dunstan Government. As was pointed out by the Leader this afternoon, the vast majority of people throughout the State were so annoyed after the election that they went to great lengths to present to this House a petition with several thousand signatures on it. Many of those people came from my own electoral district so I owe them an obligation to stand up here and speak on their behalf and protest against this most vicious situation. No matter where one goes, the people in the street are saying, "How can the L.C.L. Government continue in office?" The people want to know how their principles allow them to go against the will of the people.

Mr. Ryan: Who said they have any principles?

Mr. McKEE: That is what people are asking. There must be an ounce of principle among some members opposite. They should

say, "We cannot do this; we cannot force ourselves on the people, if the people do not want us."

Mr. Lawn: They have got the Legislative Council to help them.

Mr. McKEE: That is another issue. The people do not take any notice of the Legislative Council: not recently anyhow.

Mr. Hurst: They don't know it exists.

Mr. Casey: The Attorney-General once favoured one vote one value. He said that on many occasions in this Chamber.

Mr. McKEE: He has been known to make several statements. He makes various statements at different times and does not worry about them later.

Mr. Lawn: He also said his dog Susie had more brains than he had.

Mr. McKEE: This situation has existed for far too long in this State. For well over 30 years the people of this State have been prisoners of an electoral gerrymander. As the member for Edwardstown said, "They have been subjected to a dictatorship not equalled anywhere else in the English-speaking world."

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: How do you explain what the Hon. Frank Walsh did in 1965?

Mr. McKEE: I could go back to Sir Richard Butler, when he first got on to this gerrymander situation, and when Sir Thomas Playford got on to it in 1938. Sir Richard said to Mr. Playford (as he then was), "Well, Tom, you have no worries for about 20 years. I have these boundaries well organized and you will be able to sit back for 20 or 25 years."

Mr. Ryan: He never said a truer word.

Mr. McKEE: That is right. In 1954 Sir Thomas could see that he was losing favour. As long as he had a constitutional majority, what did he do? The Attorney-General can laugh: he knows what Sir Thomas Playford did.

Mr. Freebairn: The Labor Party supported that Bill.

Mr. Ryan: Go back to sleep.

Mr. McKEE: I will come back to the honourable member for Light in a moment. In 1954 the State had a further gerrymander, and again in late 1962 another. I have here an interstate newspaper article referring to South Australia. It contains a nice picture of Sir Thomas Playford, and it refers to South Australia as a hillbilly State. It says:

What does Mr. Renshaw have in common with Mr. Steele Hall, the Liberal-Country Leader in South Australia? The answer: both of them polled 43 per cent of the votes in their respective State elections.

It then goes on to say that, while Mr. Renshaw was soundly beaten on February 24, Mr. Hall came very close to winning on March 2. Mr. Hall was able eventually to form a Government. The L.C.L. in South Australia has been "elected" to the Treasury benches. What is wrong with the electoral boundaries? Obviously, something is very wrong.

Mr. Ryan: Something is very wrong with the Government.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, I would agree with that. The article goes on to say:

The scale of this injustice is worth examining. Of the votes counted so far, the A.L.P. has polled 267,577 and the L.C.L. 218,890. Because the electoral boundaries are weighted in favour of country districts, where the population is smaller and the electorates more numerous, Labor piles up big majorities uselessly in city seats. According to a D.L.P. analysis, 70 per cent of South Australians are represented by 13 politicians; and 26 politicians represent the remaining 30 per cent. For any party to win 54 per cent of the votes in an Australian election and still not be sure of a parliamentary majority is a disgrace to our democracy.

I notice that the Attorney-General agrees with that, because he has nodded. Perhaps I should conclude my remarks at this point.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I shall nod again if you like.

Mr. McKEE: At this stage I should like to refer briefly to the Millicent by-election. I spent some time down there, of course, and I am very proud about the result because I made some contribution to our victory there. I should like to mention the tactics of some Government members during the campaign. I was having lunch at the hotel one day when two Government members sat opposite me at the table. I had had a little information passed on to me before I went in to lunch, so I thought I ought to warn them. I had been speaking to Des Corcoran prior to going to lunch, and he had been informed of certain matters mentioned by the two members.

One of the two members frequently refers to all of us as Communists; anyone who belongs to the Labor Party or supports the Labor Party is called a Communist by this member. I do not need to refer to him. I want, however, to warn his little mate, a garbage collector who comes from the hills area, that he ought to be very careful about taking advice from the honourable member for Light. If he continues to accept advice from the member for Light, the only future left for him will be back on the garbage heap. Fancy picking a man like Des Corcoran, who has been decorated for

fighting Communists. What has this little man done to fight Communists? Both of the Government members I am referring to are young enough to be sent to Vietnam now; they should go over there with Andrew Jones. I do not know why the member for Light has not gone there. If I was as concerned about Communism as he is I should be over in Vietnam now. I am disappointed that he is hiding behind 20-year old boys, because a man like him would make a really good jungle fighter.

This will give an idea of the hide of the member for Light. He goes down to Millicent where there have been three or four generations of Corcoran and he tries to tell the people there that Des Corcoran is a Communist sympathizer. No wonder the Labor Party won the Millicent by-election. I think I have got the point home to the member for Light. He would be wise to drop that Communist caper, for it could land him in a lot of trouble.

Mr. Hudson: At Port MacDonnell on Saturday the member for Light—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Port Pirie!

Mr. McKEE: I was going to finish dealing with the situation that developed with the member for Light in the Millicent by-election campaign. It has been mentioned that his friend, the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans), was in his company. I hope that the member for Onkaparinga, if he is present, has got the message. He is reasonably intelligent and will wake up that the advice that he has been getting from the member for Light will not do him any good.

Finally, I, like other members, am concerned about the future sittings of this House, because many problems confront my district and there are projects which the Labor Government intended to carry on. The provision of the new children's ward at the Port Pirie Hospital is extremely important. I have spoken to the Minister about that and also about other matters, such as the oil tanker berth. He has replied to me but has not indicated the Government's intentions. He would know that the wharf in Port Pirie was finished recently. I give credit in relation to that project, which was started by the L.C.L. Government and finished by our Government.

The Housing Trust is going on with work at Port Pirie but houses are needed for about 350 additional employees of Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited who are

being engaged consequent upon the development taking place. We need a continuity of labour for people employed on the waterfront and on the construction of the wharf. I understand that some employees have been transferred to Giles Point, but it is convenient to transfer only single men. Many men live at Port Pirie permanently and, as the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) has said, married men who leave to work elsewhere have to keep two houses. This is not satisfactory, and I ask the Minister to consider arranging for the commencement of the oil tanker berth. There are many other matters that I should like to place before the Government.

Mr. Lawn: What about Government regulations? If they don't allow us to sit, your committee will not be able to make any recommendations for disallowance, will it?

Mr. McKEE: I have noticed in the newspaper that certain recommendations have been made at Executive level. There has been an increase of 100 per cent in parking meter fees, and I think that that matter should have been discussed here.

Mr. Hudson: That is a tax on country people. The farmer pays that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. McKEE: We have heard much about farmers this evening, and I think that the matter of farmers fighting city dwellers has been well hammered. I think the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) will agree that a man who builds a tractor, a truck or a plough for a farmer is just as important as the farmer. People in the city who buy the farmer's produce are equally as important as the farmer. In fact, they are all people and they should all be treated equally. In the Port Pirie Hospital sick children have been placed in corridors and in wards with adults. The Labor Government had intended to commence additions to this hospital during this coming financial year, and I hope I will receive good news from the Government that this project will be continued in order to relieve the serious situation at the hospital.

Improvements to the oil tanker berth are important. We read frequently in the newspapers of disasters associated with the discharging of oils and fuels. Fortunately, this has not happened here, although there may have been minor accidents in Newcastle and on the eastern seaboard. If such an accident occurred at Port Pirie there would be a major disaster. The high school, with about 800 children, and the centre of the city are situated

close to the tanker berth. When the House resumes I hope that the Minister will give me some guarantee that these important works will have been considered.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I would be remiss in my duty and, indeed, failing my many constituents if I did not protest about the delay in electoral reform in this State. By "electoral reform" I do not mean the electoral gerrymandering that we have witnessed in this State for the last 34 years. Once South Australia led the way in many reforms, because we were a progressive State and I believe that this was the first State to extend votes to women. This happened in 1894.

Mr. Hudson: It was the first place in the world to do that.

Mr. HURST: Since then, however, we have been going backwards. It is only since the last general election and during the regime of the Walsh and Dunstan Governments that people have realized the need for electoral reform. At no stage have we had a press that would publicize any semblance of democracy. Indeed, newspapers will go to any length to try to avoid publishing any material that could enlighten the electors of this State about the dreadful system under which we have operated. The *Advertiser* is the only newspaper in Australia that failed to comment on the result of the elections this year, and that is not to its credit. However, even the most conservative newspapers in the other States saw fit to condemn the system under which the present Hall Government is ruling South Australia. It is not democracy. Although I am proud to be a South Australian, I am not proud to be governed by a Government that has been elected under a system such as the one existing in this State. It is one of the worst systems in the British Commonwealth; indeed, I believe it is worse than what must exist in some of the countries that are under a dictatorship. We must ensure that this State has a system of elections that will give the majority of people the right to elect the Government they desire.

Mr. Lawn: And to change it if they desire!

Mr. HURST: Yes, whether it be a Liberal or Labor Government. We must stand foursquare behind these principles, and honourable members on this side of the House have advocated that line for many years. True, some people have referred to proportional representation, although I do not intend to deal with that subject in detail this evening. It is a subject on which one could speak at length,

However, I will at least say that I have reservations about such a system. I believe that the system advanced by our Leader to the people of South Australia deserves the support of any fair-minded person in this House. Let us look at the basis of his proposal: there is a Commonwealth Liberal Government, and the basis for the proposals is to divide—

Mr. Ryan: It's a coalition.

Mr. HURST: I think a form of coalition exists even in South Australia, because I sincerely believe that some gentlemen opposite could not agree with the actions of their present Leader who, I believe, has been a complete failure. He is only young but, with the greatest respect, I do not believe he will be in his present position for long. Our Leader has proposed a system for an independent tribunal to examine boundaries and to allocate four State seats for every Commonwealth district, broadly on the same principle as that applying to the Commonwealth situation.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: There is no mention in the Bill of any Commonwealth distribution.

Mr. HURST: I shall deal with the Attorney-General in a few minutes. He thrives on publicity, and I recall that when he was a vigorous Young Liberal he was trying to obtain kudos and received great prominence when he submitted a motion to the Liberal Party convention on the principle of one vote one value. What happened? I believe the then member for Torrens (now a Supreme Court Judge) was chosen to deal with him at that conference. The Attorney-General was talked out of his proposal and, as a sop to him, in order that the Liberal Party could remain in office, and so that the honourable gentleman would not create any grave discontent among the young people, the Attorney-General was selected as the member for Mitcham, which district he has represented ever since.

Mr. Lawn: Do you reckon they got rid of a nuisance?

Mr. HURST: Yes. What has happened to his principles now? He was so ambitious to get a portfolio that he was prepared to accept that position, knowing full well that his Party received 10 per cent less votes than our Party received. Sometimes I wonder what goes on in the Party opposite, and I should like to look at its rule book. Frequently we hear our rules quoted in this place. I understand the Liberal Party has changed the cover of its rule book: I believe it consists of a cover on the front and another on the back, and that it is blank in between. Members

opposite make up rules to suit themselves and to suit each occasion as it arises. I do not know when a Bill on this matter will be introduced in this House, although His Excellency specifically referred to the fact that electoral reform was an urgent need in South Australia. This week we will sit for two days and then adjourn so that the Premier can attend the Premiers' Conference and the meeting of the Loan Council. However, his attendance in Canberra should not prevent the business of the House from proceeding. The Opposition has made its position clear: provided Ministers are genuinely involved in Government business for the benefit of South Australia, pairs will be granted. I see no reason why we should not proceed to deal with the legitimate business of the State. Because of the gerrymandered electoral system operating in South Australia, we have been deprived of a voice in this place, practically since Parliament adjourned last year for the election. Only by virtue of the gerrymander have we not been able to express our views. Also, all the other complications have flowed from this system of electoral boundaries which has been perpetuated by members opposite.

It has been said that while we were in Government nothing was done about electoral reform. Certainly we were in Government in this Chamber, but what happened in another place? When members opposite campaigned in the recent by-election they were not honest enough to tell people that the Bill we introduced on electoral reform did not get past the second reading stage in the Upper House. It was rejected by the Upper House and, therefore, all this trash that has been circulated through television, radio and the press, in an attempt to blame the Labor Party for not trying to do something about the situation, is just not true. The people of South Australia have overwhelmingly endorsed our policy. Indeed, I believe the Leader has compromised too much on this issue, because our policy for 56 seats in this House was overwhelmingly endorsed by the people. Twice we were prevented by the Upper House from giving effect to this policy; now we are obstructed by the gerrymander which has prevented us from occupying the Treasury benches and from being able to have the necessary numbers to pass our Bill without obstruction.

Mr. Ryan: We want to govern in our own right.

Mr. HURST: Yes.

Mr. Ryan: We would not be tied to an Independent.

Mr. HURST: We will not sacrifice our principles.

Mr. Rodda: Tell us about the fan mail you received at Millicent.

Mr. HURST: The honourable member had some amendments to the Industrial Code. I suggest that the member for Victoria devote his time to seeing that justice is extended under the Industrial Code. In my district 5,000 signatures were put on the form within three days petitioning this House for electoral reform, and I know quite well that my constituents want justice—and not only the people who voted for me, because there are supporters of the L.C.L. in my district who say plainly that they are disgusted with the present system of electoral boundaries in South Australia.

This should be a warning to members opposite. They have recently experienced defeat in the by-election at Millicent, and make no mistake about it: the question of boundaries was publicly discussed by our Leader and the member for Millicent at every public meeting that I attended. When I was door-knocking the farmers and the men on the land, I found they were alive to this issue and many of them expressed disgust to me that people could be elected to this House on the preferences of minority groups. That is how the Government, even disregarding the gerrymander, got into office: it was the preferences of minority groups which were responsible for certain people winning their seats.

This issue is not thought of only by people in the metropolitan area. People in country areas oppose this principle, and the position was highlighted by the fact that the D.L.P. entered the field in the Millicent by-election. However, it was clearly demonstrated by the results of that election that there was no demand by the people of Millicent for a D.L.P. candidate. Where did he come from?

Mr. Ryan: We know where the finance came from.

Mr. HURST: The D.L.P. announced, following the last election, that it did not have a cent to contest any seat. Later, in a television interview when a member of that Party was questioned about where it got its money from, he stated that a bank overdraft had been obtained. Members opposite are bright enough to know that people cannot obtain a bank overdraft without some backing. Where did the backing come from?

Mr. Burdon: From the L.C.L.

Mr. HURST: I do not think it was from the Party as such. They did the canvassing in

the Millicent District in an underhanded manner, and I believe it was the supporters of the L.C.L. who made contributions to the D.L.P. to ensure that they entered the contest in Millicent. It is a tribute to the electors that they cast an intelligent vote. I was amused to hear the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), quoting from a newspaper cutting, say that the Communist Party was suggesting and advocating the support of the member for Millicent, Des Corcoran. Why the member for Light had to stoop to that level of canvassing is beyond me.

Mr. Ryan: He admitted it afterwards.

Mr. HURST: Yes; apparently he seemed proud of it. Did the member for Light tell the electors in Millicent that the Party to which he belonged was responsible in the Commonwealth arena for having one of its members (Mr. Killen, the member for Moreton) elected to the Commonwealth Parliament on Communist Party preferences? However, that could not be said of the Labor Party. The Attorney-General can look down his nose and frown, but he cannot point to one instance where the Labor Party has relied on Communist Party preferences to gain a seat, but that is what the Liberal Party has done. It will receive preferences from anyone, provided that it can get the seat: principles do not count.

I was amused at the Premier's attempts to explain his electoral reform proposals. His statements were confusing and, while I do not profess to be an authority on all these matters, I would require much greater detail than he gave to ascertain even where there is any principle whatsoever in the measures he has put forward.

We have heard much about the progress of South Australia and how the L.C.L. will get the State moving, but the whole time that Party has been in Government has been spent trying to work a method whereby it can continue to gerrymander the districts in South Australia to enable it to govern on a minority rule for another 30 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HURST: The honourable member for Stirling will not put me off by interjecting. If he got among the people whom he purports to represent, and kept his ear to the ground, he would be speaking along the same lines as I am, because they are the people who want justice done. The Leader of the honourable member's Party made the number of seats for

the House of Assembly the issue in the Millicent by-election. However, his Leader has repeatedly contradicted himself and, it seems, does not know where to go. I said once that I admired the reporters of the *Advertiser*, because any reporter who can build up a man in the press to the extent that the *Advertiser* builds up the Premier is a super reporter.

Mr. Ryan: They haven't got much to work with, have they?

Mr. HURST: However, I am afraid their foresight is about the same as that of the Premier; they will be shockingly disappointed, because he will not be able to make the grade. They will have to chew some words they used in trying to build him up. This House has to adjourn to enable the Premier to go overseas to try to attract new industries to South Australia. I have no objection to the Leader of the Party going overseas; indeed, I think that overseas trips for members are exceptionally good for this Parliament and the State, and I believe there should be more of them. But who is fooling whom? How many industries will the Premier attract to this State? When our Party was in Government it appointed a Director of Industrial Development, a person with prestige who knew industry.

With great respect to the Premier I point out that, in view of the backwardness of this State in respect of electoral boundaries, the impression industrialists will get of South Australia is that it is so backward, so far behind in respect of electoral reform, that labour in the State would be unsuitable to face up to the technological progress the industrialists have made. Consequently, I believe the Premier's mission will curb development rather than promote it.

If the Premier were going on a trip to see the world and learn, I would support the trip. We have heard about the trip to New York of the member for Stirling and of the unusual incidents he experienced in many places. We have heard about his picking up with a Communist girl in New York, and he told us (and it is reported in *Hansard*) that he was in the hotel talking to her at 4 a.m. The member for Stirling should accompany the Premier, because any man who can find a Communist girl in a city the size of New York on his first visit is a superman. I think they may possibly find two Communist girls in London; their personalities are such that they would attract even this type if such girls were there. The member for Stirling should be taken by the Premier as an adviser.

Mr. McAnaney: He can do it on his own; he does not need an adviser.

Mr. Rodda: Tell us about the fan mail you got at Millicent.

Mr. HURST: Time will not permit. I wish now to mention a matter I heard during the Millicent by-election campaign. I was utterly surprised that members of the Liberal Party should express disrespect for Sir Thomas Playford. I realize we are in the Hall go-ahead regime. I thought, however, that the remarks of members of the Liberal Party were most unworthy. Whilst I differed politically from Sir Thomas Playford, I remember that time and time again these people eulogized the progress, development and planning that he encouraged in the State. Yet, in the by-election campaign, they completely discounted his work.

I believe that, if members went to the electors tomorrow, the Liberal Party would find itself in Opposition because its stocks have slumped to such an extent through its members making foolish contradictory statements, through their indecision and through their inability to give the leadership that this State requires for development. In the short time since the general election the people of South Australia have awakened to the situation. During the general election campaign much publicity was given to ways in which the Party opposite will get things moving, and in my district an ambitious candidate stood for election, as was his right. He advertised in the newspaper about how he was going to get the Upper Port Reach scheme on the move. However, after the advertisement had been appearing for a couple of weeks, his Leader said he wanted to examine the situation carefully, and we have not heard much about that scheme since.

Indeed, from the remarks made by the candidate at that time, I thought that the present Government would already be reclaiming land and getting on with the job. However, it is apparent that, once candidates get L.C.L. endorsement, they will say anything to get a vote. Doubtless the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) will deal with containerization at Port Adelaide. Plans were in hand to make Port Adelaide a feeder port for container cargo, but we have now read the Minister's announcement.

Mr. Ryan: No protest.

Mr. HURST: There has been no protest. I have always considered Port Adelaide an ideal port for a main terminal, and the Government should have been investigating this.

However, it is not to be even a feeder terminal. I express my disgust at the lack of positive action by this Government. The Districts of Semaphore and Port Adelaide are two of the main districts in South Australia. They are the hub of the State and are most competently represented. What would happen to the man on the land if it was not for the fertilizer produced in these districts? They contribute much to primary production in this State. Every basic industry in South Australia is located in the Port Adelaide and Semaphore Districts, the gateway to South Australia.

I am concerned also about the lack of action in the cleaning of school windows. When will the Government start cleaning the windows? There has been a change of Government, but what has the new Government done about this work? I have driven past the schools in the morning but have not noticed than any windows have been cleaned. The Government ought to clean the windows and keep faith with the people of South Australia.

I have noticed that some painting has been done at the Adelaide railway station, but when the Labor Party was in office we heard many questions from the then Opposition members, who are now in Cabinet and who could influence their colleagues, about tidying the station. When I look through my office window I become demoralized and no doubt my outlook in life will be affected if something is not urgently done to make the station more attractive. The Prime Minister of Australia came to Adelaide to speak in the Town Hall in support of the Hall Government. The Premier has said that it would be easier for him to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government, but what has happened? From a grant of \$50,000,000 for beef roads, South Australia received a paltry \$1,000,000.

Mr. Casey: We got that.

Mr. HURST: This is the preferential treatment that the Premier's colleague in the Commonwealth Parliament has given! This is not good enough. When the Premier returns from the Loan Council meeting we expect to hear of better treatment for this State. When we were in office members opposite said all we had to do was sit pat, but the Premier, instead of sitting pat, is to trot off to London to try to see what can be done there. To expedite the business of the House I shall say nothing more.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): After listening to the member for Semaphore I am convinced that we should start shedding tears,

because it seems that many matters concerning the State should be discussed by this Parliament. I assure members that I, too, have several problems concerning my district, but before dealing with them I inform the member for Light that I shall say something about his activities in the recent Millicent by-election. I, too, shall have something to say about the electoral system operating in this State. When listening to the member for Stirling I was intrigued by his mathematical methods to try to convince members in relation to the 50 per cent tolerance he said was required for electoral adjustment in South Australia. It was rather interesting that the 20 per cent in relation to 10,000 happened to be 2,000, whichever way one calculated it, and I am unable to see how he arrived at the 50 per cent. But that is the way in which his mind works and, indeed, the way in which his Party operates.

The South Australian Constitution was originally set up in 1857 to operate on the principle of one vote one value, but in about 1876 the Legislative Council of this State seized the opportunity to discontinue that principle, and to the present day it has ensured that the principle has not operated. To date, this State has never been governed by a Labor Government because, although the Labor Party has been in office in this Chamber on several occasions, for the last 100 years a hostile Upper House, which is elected on a restricted franchise, has existed.

It was interesting to read recently that a move had been made by the Young Liberals for democracy in this State, but they were overwhelmingly defeated. They evidently got the message, as did the Attorney-General a few years ago. Although I was not in the Chamber all the time when the member for Light spoke to this debate, I was not surprised at the attitude he adopted during the course of the election campaign. I was elected to this Chamber in December, 1962, and, as Parliament did not meet next until June 22, 1963, it was over six months before I was sworn in as a member. Indeed, it seems that the present Government's attitude will be for Parliament to meet as little as possible.

Concerning the area that was canvassed by both Parties last Friday evening, I can only say that it is a disgrace that not one vote of the people in question was counted. This was brought about by the activities of a member of the Liberal Party. This situation was known back in 1963,

when Sir Thomas Playford introduced his Bill for electoral reform in this State. However, as the people living in this area had enrolled in the Mount Gambier District and had not, in filling out their forms, claimed to be enrolled in the Millicent District, the State Returning Officer allowed the situation to remain as it was at the time or until such time as the boundaries had been altered.

Mr. Lawn: Supposing some of the electors of Adelaide had been enrolled for the Burnside District. Do you think the Crown Solicitor's Department would accept it?

Mr. BURDON: I do not think so. I cannot see why the Crown Solicitor's Department would make such a ruling, which resulted in these people being canvassed and having to vote in the Millicent election on Saturday. They have a community interest in Mount Gambier, as do many people living outside the Mount Gambier District. However, the people concerned live less than a mile and a half from the centre of Mount Gambier, yet the Electoral Department advised political Parties on Friday afternoon that those people should vote in the Millicent by-election. I believe that those responsible for this owe an apology to these people, as they were subjected to canvassing unnecessarily. After all, not one of their votes was counted.

Mr. Rodda: You are not being fair to the Returning Officer.

Mr. Lawn: Don't interject when you are not in your proper place.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Nankivell): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. LAWN: On a point of order. I understood you, Sir, to speak to me about interjecting. I draw your attention now to the fact that a member opposite is interjecting although not sitting in his proper place, whereas I understood you to speak to me for interjecting when I was interjecting from my proper place. Will you make a similar remark to the honourable member opposite?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: My attention has been drawn to the fact that a member who is not sitting in his place is interjecting. I call the honourable member to order. It is out of order for an honourable member to interject when not in his proper place in this Chamber.

Mr. BURDON: I wish to refer to the sittings of this Parliament. As I said earlier, I believe it is the duty of the South Australian Parliament to meet, as there are urgent matters to be discussed. Members wish to raise urgent

matters affecting their districts. As the matter of electoral reform has formed the basis of the debate that has ensued for the last 13 hours, and as it will occupy much time in the future, I believe it is the duty of this Parliament to sit whenever possible. During the three years of the Labor Government, tactics were adopted by the Opposition that kept the House in session while needless debates took place. We wish to discuss electoral reform, believing that the matter must be disposed of at the earliest possible moment in the interests of the people of South Australia. I regret that the Premier has seen fit to refuse to discuss the matter with the Leader of the Opposition and that he refuses to compromise, because on May 29 he said:

If we win Millicent I will consider it an endorsement of our plan. If we lose Millicent I shall consider it an endorsement of the A.L.P. plan, and we shall have to compromise on the machinery for electoral reform.

In view of that statement and the result of the by-election at Millicent, I believe the Premier would have got a fair amount of support from the people of South Australia if he had been prepared to compromise on electoral reform. We have had arguments about electoral reform going back over the last 30 to 40 years. In 1933 it was gerrymandered by Sir Richard Butler and it was further gerrymandered by Sir Thomas Playford in 1938. In 1955 it was further gerrymandered but in 1962-63, when the L.C.L. could see that time was running out for it, it did not have a constitutional majority, which is the situation today: neither Party has it.

Let us dispose of this problem of electoral reform by getting it off the books as soon as possible. The only way to do this is for both Parties to sit down and arrive at a compromise that will be in the interests of South Australia, because once we get rid of this problem by the mutual agreement of both Parties we can get on with governing the State. After all, we are charged as members of Parliament with getting on with the governing of the State and with the legislation necessary for its progress. The whole State would derive great benefit from that.

I take this opportunity of raising certain matters affecting my district. I shall be brief but I want to draw the Government's attention to several matters affecting the electors of Mount Gambier, the first of which is the provision of public buildings. Four days before I was elected as the member for Mount Gambier, in 1962, the former Attorney-General in the Playford Government

announced that the Government would build new public buildings in Mount Gambier. The conditions under which public servants are working in Mount Gambier are a disgrace. The previous Government prepared plans for new public buildings in Mount Gambier and I appeal to the present Government to get on with the job of seeing that these new plans and specifications are taken advantage of and that these buildings are provided at the earliest possible moment. Also, when these buildings are provided in Mount Gambier, the former Premier indicated to me that the previous Government would proceed with the establishment of an office for the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. I draw the Government's attention, too, to a pilot scheme announced by the Premier at an election meeting in Mount Gambier, saying that the Director-General of Public Health in South Australia, following a Cabinet decision that a pilot scheme would be initiated in the country, had agreed to Mount Gambier being the first country centre for the provision of spectacles for pensioners.

Previous speakers have referred to hospital funds. During the recent Millicent by-election campaign certain L.C.L. members created the impression that funds derived from the lotteries were not being given to charitable institutions in this State. However, it has been published (and I have been told by a Liberal canvasser) that the Lotteries Commission has paid into the Hospitals Fund about \$3,000,000. Some canvassers said that all the money from the lotteries had gone into general revenue and not one cent into the Hospital Fund.

The Government expects this House to rise at 4 p.m. today to enable both the Premier and Treasurer to go to Canberra to take part in the Loan Council discussions that are so vital to South Australia. The Opposition has made it clear to those two members that they will be granted pairs. After the Loan Council meeting the Premier will proceed on an overseas trip. Members on this side hope he will bring back to this State some new industrial activity whether it be of a small or large nature. The previous Labor Governments, under the late Frank Walsh and the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, set up an industrial division within the Premier's Department, and it was well known several months ago that nearly all these contacts had been arranged by the previous Government. Further, had the Hon. D. A. Dunstan still been Premier he would already have been overseas and returned by now. The Labor Government

can take a full measure of credit for the Premier's proposed trip to make what contacts he can.

Mr. Lawn: But will he do any good?

Mr. BURDON: I have reservations about that. However, I would not like to say anything that would jeopardize the interests of South Australia. We want to do something to assist South Australia. We have seen the Liberal Government in office for only three or four months and already three or four industries have closed down. I heard the Premier say something about industries in the District of Mount Gambier. I am proud and pleased to know that one of the industries there, Panelboard, is expanding its activities, but this was known many months ago: it was known by the previous Premier. These things do not happen overnight: they have been happening for a considerable time, but every effort is made by the present Premier to claim all the credit for activities taking place in this State.

According to the member for Stirling, it would appear that the Labor Government of 1965 to 1968 was primarily responsible for the drought which occurred in Queensland and New South Wales and which caused a dramatic downturn in business activities in 1966. The Labor Government was blamed because there was little rain in Queensland and New South Wales, but if the member for Stirling was honest with himself and with the Parliament and people of South Australia he would tell them that South Australia has to sell 85 per cent of its products in the Eastern States. During this drought people did not have the money to buy farm machinery, motor cars, refrigerators, washing machines and other electrical goods. Eighty-five per cent of our products have to be sold in the Eastern States. If the member for Stirling believes that this is incorrect, let him get up and deny it.

Following the drought in New South Wales and Queensland, in 1967 South Australia passed through the most severe drought it had experienced in 100 years. If the droughts over the last three years were not harmful to the South Australian economy, I do not know what would be harmful. Yet members of the Liberal Party had the gall to say to the people of South Australia that the downturn was brought about by the Labor Government. They did not tell the people about the calamities of nature that brought these things about. I, like every other person in South Australia, was delighted to see and hear rain falling in the

late autumn and early winter in South Australia; possibly never before in the history of this State have we seen such a wonderful opening to the season. The farming community of this State will derive every benefit from it, because in most areas farmers have had a tough time for the last two years. This, in itself, will lift the South Australian economy, but the Labor Government was blamed because it did not rain. Undoubtedly the Liberal Government will claim the credit for the rain this year.

This is the situation in South Australia and any Government member who is honest with himself will admit it to the people. I hope that later today we will have the opportunity to ask questions about matters affecting our districts, because this will be our only opportunity to do so for three or four weeks. I also hope that, on the conclusion of this debate, the Government will decide to discuss electoral reform, which is the real problem affecting the State at present. A satisfactory compromise on electoral reform will benefit South Australia for, probably, the next 25 or 30 years and I hope that both sides will be able to achieve this reform.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the statements made by my colleagues on electoral reform, which has become a lively topic since the people found out at the last State election what has been going on in the State for years. This is the first time that the people have really been able to gauge the relative strengths of the Parties, and it has been shown that the Labor Government has been able to obtain an overall majority of the votes. I think every member agrees that we must bow to the will of the majority. However, the present Government is not doing that and, in consequence, the people are up in arms.

Although the Government says that we did not do anything about the position, we did act but our proposal was rejected by the Upper House. The present position would have been worse if Sir Thomas Playford had not known that we would be strong enough to win a general election. The Australian Labor Party has been able to gradually increase its membership in the House and I do not think that the L.C.L. Government can pull the wool over the eyes of the people any longer. The people know that a change is needed.

I sincerely hope that members will show their willingness to ensure that the people receive the electoral justice to which they are entitled. I am sure that any member who

went to a meeting attended by 100 people would agree that, if 53 people voted for a motion and 43 voted against the motion, the motion was properly carried. There, the majority would rule, but this has not happened in South Australia for many years, and the people will protest loudly if something is not done. I do not know of any Party in any State of Australia that has received 53 per cent of the votes but has not governed. The member for Stirling referred to Western Australia. There was a disparity of 3 per cent in the voting in a close fight but in South Australia with a disparity of 10 per cent the Party receiving the majority of votes did not win the Government. The people of the State need to be told that something in accordance with their wishes will be done. The population of this State has increased and the number of electors in different areas has also increased. In the inner metropolitan area of Adelaide the number of electors may have decreased, but the number in the outer suburban areas has increased. Few members representing the outer metropolitan area districts would not have 20,000 or more electors, and this is too large a number for one member to represent.

Mr. Jennings: I have 45,000.

Mr. LANGLEY: Certain discrepancies in country districts could be overcome in the future. As he said, the member for Enfield has 45,000 electors in his district; West Torrens has 39,000; Glenelg and Burnside have 37,000; Edwardstown 34,000, and Mitcham 27,000. In the outer suburban areas most of the electors need help of some kind, whereas the electors in the inner suburban areas have lived there for many years.

Mr. McAnaney: Who is advocating that these numbers be retained?

Mr. LANGLEY: Your Party has done nothing and has not moved with the times, although it has had the opportunity to change the system. We tried to do it but the Upper House rejected our legislation and would not compromise in any way. The District of Gawler is supposed to have 7,000 electors with a 10 per cent tolerance, but it contains 35,000 electors and no attempt has been made by the Liberal Government in 16 years to change that situation. To look after 35,000 electors the member would have to be a superman.

Mr. McAnaney: You should get up to date.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am trying to bring the honourable member up to date as much as possible. He works out figures to suit himself and, to be frank, I cannot understand him.

Mr. Ryan: It is not your fault.

Mr. LANGLEY: I will speak about matters about which I know, but I cannot understand what the member for Stirling talks about. I challenge the figures he gave concerning the percentage in New South Wales where 53 per cent of the votes were won by the Liberal Party while the Labor Party secured 43 per cent. However, it is the opposite in this State. In Western Australia the disparity was only 2 or 3 per cent in a close fight, and that is reasonable. No-one wants to be perfect, but a disparity of 10 per cent is out of character with the democratic wishes of the people of this State. I think we have reached the stage where people generally want an opportunity to receive proper representation in this House. Although I may be a little biased, I consider that everyone in South Australia is equal; we need people in the country as well as people in the city and, although certain factors must always be considered, we must not overdo these considerations.

The situation has now been exposed and people who may not have thought that Sir Thomas Playford would be a party to what has occurred in the past now know differently. It is probably only by a stroke of good fortune that certain developments have occurred; if Sir Thomas had had his way we might have been in Opposition for many years. Although I admire Sir Thomas for the courage he displayed in this regard, I think the situation is now quite different. The Attorney-General, whose district is next to mine, recently wrote an article in the local press to the effect that he was quite happy when I was elected (although he won easily in his district, it was not so easy for me). He apparently intends to look after me in this House. However, I assure him I need no looking after.

Further, I challenge one of the statements the honourable member made during the course of the election campaign: can he name any occasion on which the Democratic Labor Party has given preferences to the Australian Labor Party? I can recall no such occasion, yet the Attorney-General said in the Millicent by-election campaign that his Party was fighting two Labor Parties. I do not know how some of the candidates are obtained, but they always seem to be at the top of the list and their preferences always go to the Liberal Party. That is their entitlement, but surely the Attorney-General knows that the D.L.P. does not in any way help us in an election. In fact, that Party was instrumental in bringing about our defeat in the Murray District. Good

luck to the candidate who won, but no-one can escape the fact that he was helped by D.L.P. preferences. Never has the D.L.P. been on our side, and I assure the Attorney-General that he is right off the beam when he says that we are helped by that Party.

Many old houses in my district have become vacant through the death of their elderly occupants, but it is nevertheless difficult for people wishing to purchase these houses to obtain the necessary finance. As has already been said today, purchasing a house is perhaps the biggest outlay that most people make in a lifetime, and they must be helped in this regard as much as possible. I have received several complaints concerning people who sell these houses and who sign up prospective purchasers for a short-term loan, promising them that they will receive a bank loan or perhaps other finance within 12 months. I consider that this type of practice should be immediately stopped: assurances concerning the obtaining of finance are usually only verbal, and the people in question later swear that they have given no such assurances. These purchasers are left in a terrible plight: they are paying off the money borrowed and are never paying anything off the principal. Finally, at the end of 12 months, when they think something will be done for them, nothing is forthcoming. I bring this matter to the Government's attention and ask it to ensure that people are covered in respect to this type of salesmanship, because I am sure it is reasonably prevalent in relation to old houses in the inner suburban areas. As other members have said, I hope that during the course of this session we will have ample time to air our grievances. I hope that we will not have simply the Executive Government, and that members will have an opportunity to raise matters affecting their districts and to be heard in this place.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): As probably the last speaker in this debate, it will be difficult not to repeat what has already been said, especially when the subject dealt with has been mainly electoral reform. However, any repetition is repetition about what people in this State want. It is not the politicians who want electoral reform: it is the electors of the State. They have repeated over and over again (not only since March 2, but for the last two or three years) that there should be electoral reform in South Australia. I was really amazed at some of the statements made in this debate that electoral

reform was not important because for three weeks, during which I assisted in the Millicent by-election campaign, this was all we heard about not only from Labor Party members assisting the member for Millicent but also from members of the Government side. They told the people of Millicent that electoral reform was the most important issue that had to be decided on June 22. However, now that the by-election is over and the people of Millicent have returned the same member, some members opposite have the audacity to say that the matter is no longer important. Members on this side have been accused of changing their attitude on electoral reform. I wish to refer to one of the first speeches I heard as a member of this Chamber. In August, 1959, in the first year the Premier and I were in this place, Mr. O'Halloran (Leader of the Opposition at that time) moved:

That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be appointed—

- (a) to recommend to the House new boundaries for electoral districts for the House of Assembly to give substantial effect to the principle of one vote one value; and
- (b) to report on the advisability of increasing the number of members of the House of Assembly.

We have been told that over the years our policy has changed. We may have changed in regard to the number of members we consider necessary to represent adequately the people of South Australia in this Parliament, but we have never shifted from the principle of one vote one value.

Mr. Lawn: Sir Thomas Playford said he did not know what it meant.

Mr. RYAN: True. In regard to any shifting policy, let us examine what some members of the present Government said at that time. Unfortunately for some members, they do not realize that what they say is printed in *Hansard* and is available at all times for any person to peruse.

Mr. Lawn: The Treasurer learned that this afternoon.

Mr. RYAN: Absolutely, and much to his sorrow, too. The member for Gouger (the present Premier) said on September 23, 1959, during his first year in this Parliament when speaking in opposition to a measure for electoral reform:

If this measure were passed our voting system would be weighted in favour of the cities.

Then Mr. Dunstan interjected:

It would not be weighted at all.

The member for Gouger continued:

Mixed up with this motion is the suggestion, I think put forward by the member for Adelaide, for a larger Parliament, which means larger costs. I believe this motion is put forward to benefit politicians rather than the people of South Australia, and I urge the House to reject the motion and to think more of the people and less of the politicians.

The present Premier has made a complete somersault, because the Bill, about which we do not know much, proposes an increase in this Parliament of no less than six members, from 39 to 45, and that is probably the broad principle of the Government's intentions as far as I know them. It is contained now in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, but in 1959 it was considered not necessary to increase the Parliament because the cost was too great and "we should think more of the people and less of the politicians". Let us look at the present Labor proposal. Where did it originate? Is it fair and just? If it is fair for the Commonwealth, it should be fair for the State of South Australia. There have been many statements that what the Leader of the Opposition said was not true. I turn now to the Commonwealth *Hansard* for the House of Representatives, one of the members of which was a member of the most exclusive club anywhere in the world prior to joining the House of Representatives. This is what the Commonwealth member for Angas (Mr. Giles) said on March 20, 1968:

There has been a heavy population growth in and around Adelaide and when South Australia has twelve Federal seats it may be appropriate to divide those twelve Federal seats into quarters to provide for forty-eight State seats. This would be slightly more than the forty-five seats suggested by—and I am getting muddled as to what position he actually holds at present—

he is no more muddled than we are—

Mr. Steele Hall, and considerably fewer than the fifty-six seats suggested by Mr. Dunstan. There was an interjection by the Commonwealth member for Hindmarsh:

Would the Liberal and Country League support that suggestion?

The member for Angas went on to say:

But if the Parties got together in a friendly fashion nobody would be more pleased than I or the people of South Australia. It would seem to me that to divide twelve Federal seats into quarters for the State Parliament would be an economic and beneficial way of overcoming the present situation without too much political haggling. . . . The division into electorates is a matter for the Distribution Commissioners. I would leave it to more competent people than the honourable member for Hindmarsh or myself to decide Federal boundaries.

This is an amazing thing: because the Labor Opposition introduced this measure it is, therefore, unjust, unwarranted and unnecessary. However, it is necessary; it is just; it is suitable for the Commonwealth Parliament; and it is further amplified and put forward by Liberal members selected on the same basis of preselection as the State L.C.L. members. As one of our members said, there is no such thing, and I agree with that.

However those members are selected, the Commonwealth member for Angas is under the same system of rules as are the State L.C.L. members, so apparently the members of the L.C.L. in South Australia speak in a different voice and in a different tone from their counterparts who represent South Australia in the Commonwealth Parliament. We heard much about one vote one value being not warranted and about how it was an unfair and unjust system that should not be implemented in this State. Once again, it is amazing what people can say and forget to suit their own convenience. In January, 1966, the Attorney-General, the member for Mitcham (who would have been in Opposition at that time) said:

Section 24 of the Commonwealth Constitution provides that this principle (one vote one value) should be used in the election of members of the House of Representatives and it has been used since the first Commonwealth Parliament was elected.

There were then several interjections, and the Hon. Mr. Millhouse continued:

In my view, that does not detract from the principle which has been in the Commonwealth Constitution since it was drawn up and which I consider is the only principle—

this is really amazing—
on which a popular House of Parliament can be elected.

The member for Mitcham said this in January, 1966, when he was referring to one vote one value. He said he supported the principle of one vote one value, and he continued:

It is absolutely correct and unavoidable in a State like South Australia because of the sparseness and spread of our population as well as a number of other factors and it is essential that there should be some departure from the principle of one vote one value. It appeared that the Australian Labor Party, until it got into office, supported the principle of one vote one value without any qualification.

The member for Mitcham said that, yet last night we heard him say that this was not a principle that should be applied in South Australia. It is quite obvious that L.C.L. members can say one thing in Opposition

but give a different interpretation of their policy when they get into Government.

I have been a member since 1959, and since the time Mr. O'Halloran moved the motion I have quoted we have never departed from the principle of one vote one value. What do other States think about South Australia and the hillbilly system operating here? The members of the L.C.L. are hillbillies: there is no doubt about that. Much has been said about the biased reports of the *Advertiser*. No-one by any stretch of imagination could say that the *Advertiser* was linked with or a supporter of the A.L.P. What do the colleagues of the *Adelaide Advertiser* say in other States? The *Brisbane Courier Mail* would be a real Labor newspaper! The *Sydney Morning Herald* is another colleague paper of the *Adelaide Advertiser*. The *Melbourne Age* referred to the hillbilly system that operates in this State; it said:

Parliamentary democracy, or what is left of it, in South Australia is again in wrong keeping.

The *Melbourne Age* also said:

Mr. Hall has promised electoral reform, but there can be no confidence that he will voluntarily arrange anything approaching justice for the mass of South Australian electors.

I suppose members opposite will say that these papers support the Labor Party's policy! The *Melbourne Herald* said:

South Australia is not the only State with gerrymandered electorates, but it is the one where the loading of votes has produced an absurdity which even the favoured minority party cannot defend.

Once again, I do not have to tell members or the public of South Australia whose policy these newspapers support. The *Sydney Morning Herald* said:

Mr. Dunstan behaved with notable dignity in the way he stepped down. It is possible that he behaved with some shrewdness as well. No doubt there were some indignant spirits in his party who would have liked him to go down fighting, to threaten to hold on, and publicly denounce the injustice of his party's defeat. He must have been tempted to do so.

On the other hand, it is likely that he saw no advantage for his party in a fresh election on the old boundaries. He would have put the public to the expense and inconvenience of another poll, and might have come out of it worse than before. He has everything to gain—including public sympathy—by waiting for a redistribution. But how long will he have to wait?

The *Sydney Sun* (another real true-blue Labor paper!) said:

The Liberal-Country Party's succession to power in South Australia is a political absurdity

and an abuse of our electoral system. This is a situation which cannot be tolerated.

Mr. Hall, the new Premier, must ensure that in future South Australian elections the party backed by the people governs the State. I gave these quotations to members of this House because there was not one mention in the *Adelaide Advertiser* of what was being said in the Tory press of the Eastern States. The *Adelaide Advertiser* was so biased that it did not have the decency to tell the people of South Australia what the press was saying about this State. At least the *News* gave the South Australian public the press details of what the other States were saying. The *Sydney Morning Herald* at a later stage referred to South Australia as the hill-billy State of politics. I am not quoting from a newspaper supported and financed by the Australian Labor Party: I am quoting from the Tory press. Yet even these people are disgusted at what is going on and what has gone on over the years. We saw the cheek and audacity of some members who said that this was not an important matter; my views on politics must differ greatly from those of such members on the Government side, because if people must live under the laws of the State at least they should have the right to determine the type of Government they want and to determine who should make the laws on their behalf. As I have said, we have been accused of being contradictory in our policy and outlook. Old nodding Charlie is back again. It is amazing. I wish he had been here when I referred to what he said in 1966 about there being only one principle, namely, one vote one value.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Don't go right through that again.

Mr. RYAN: I do not want to go through it again and I do not want to embarrass the Minister. During the Millicent campaign, in the debate between the present member for Millicent and the Liberal candidate, the latter said that the policy of no compromise resulting from the Millicent by-election was one for which he took responsibility. This statement was made on television by Martin Cameron, the L.C.L. candidate. He said, "I take the responsibility for no compromise on electoral reform resulting from the election next Saturday in Millicent; if the Premier was even thinking of a compromise he would have to get another Liberal candidate, because I would not be part and parcel of that Party if it determined that there should be any compromise."

So, he took the credit that we have heard about. The Premier said that it was his deter-

mination that there would be no compromise. It is apparent that even the Premier is taking orders from people who are not members of his own political Party. Much has been said about Mr. Hall's statements. During the history of politics, Governments are usually given the names of the people in charge of the particular Government of the day. At present, the Commonwealth Government is referred to as the Gorton-McEwen Government. In South Australia the Government is referred to as the Stott-Hall Government, and it is a poor state of affairs when a major political Party has to seek advice on its policy and on what it is going to do from somebody not attached to that political Party.

We on this side would never accept those circumstances. We govern in our own right or not at all. It is easy for people to make statements and to try to get publicity (and cheap publicity, at times) when they know that they cannot give effect to their statements. On page 4 of last evening's *News* there was a big heading, "Stott's 'No'", followed by this statement:

The man with the balance of power in the House of Assembly does not favor either the L.C.L. or Labor plan for electoral reform.

The newspaper admits that the person concerned holds the balance of power. With all due respect, the report goes on with this rather amazing statement:

Taking the last State election figures on a 45-seat basis, with 25 central or metropolitan seats and 20 country seats, and converting it to proportional representation, the result would have been 24 A.L.P. seats and 21 L.C.L. seats.

It is amazing that one individual can keep a Government in power on a minority vote and on minority representation, and that is what we have in this State today. That is one of the reasons for the real hostility of the electors of this State at present. They do not want to be governed by one man and they do not want their laws to be determined by a man who is not attached to any political Party. However, that principle is operating in this State today. The sooner people have the opportunity for true representation the better it will be for this State.

Much has been said about the policy of the L.C.L. to get South Australia going. One word has been omitted: they mean to get South Australia going backwards, because the latest actual figures of people receiving unemployment benefits rose slightly irrespective of a boom in the motor car industry. This is an amazing statement in view of reports in the *Advertiser*. One headed "Government

plans to boost housing legislation programme" was on the same page as the following report:

Canberra sees need to check boom: record car sales and near-record house-building figures have the Commonwealth Government worried that inflationary conditions may develop. As a check the Premiers attending the Loan Council meeting in Canberra on Thursday are likely to be told that public spending must be held down.

The Commonwealth Government is about to clamp down, but the State Government will try to boost the economy! How contradictory can one get? Undoubtedly, the Commonwealth will clamp down on one industry which the State cannot afford to have retarded—the motor car building industry. The Labor Government has known only too well the effects of Commonwealth Government intervention over the years in the industrial affairs of this State, because when the motor car industry is interfered with in any way this State is the first to suffer and usually the last to recover. We now read that, irrespective of the State Government's plans as outlined by the Lieutenant-Governor yesterday, the Commonwealth Government intends to curb activities in this State. Let us hope that at least those in Government will have the courage to face up to the Commonwealth Government and tell it that South Australia cannot afford any curbing that may be inflicted on it.

One major activity in my district, which is the outlet and inlet of the prosperity of South Australia, is the shipping industry. In the *Advertiser* of Thursday, May 2, 1968, under the heading "Cut in Ship Freight Service Opposed" appeared the following report:

The South Australian Government is seeking to have reconsidered a move by a South American shipping line to exclude South Australia from its ports of call. The Premier (Mr. Hall) said yesterday that he had written to the Prime Minister (Mr. Gorton) seeking urgent reconsideration of the problem which would arise as a result of the move. The shipping line, known as K line, had announced that Port Adelaide would be excluded from its Australian schedule because it could not continue the service under existing conditions.

The K line was introduced about four years ago with an agreement to load cargoes from Eastern States ports and South Australia. It was assisted by a Commonwealth Government subsidy but had recently announced that it could not continue this service unless the Commonwealth subsidy was increased. It had also announced that it would omit B class ports of call from its Mediterranean service.

Mr. Hall said both of these services played an important role in South Australia's development of its export programme. South Australian exporters had actively promoted sales to South American markets following an Aus-

tralian trade mission there and results had appeared highly promising.

Elimination of Port Adelaide from the K line schedule would mean that the work done in the past was of no avail. South Australian exporters would have difficulty in maintaining contracts and virtual promises for continued service to the area. The omission of Mediterranean B class ports would hit a sound export business which was being developed, particularly to the Libyan ports of Benghazi and Tripoli.

His letter to Mr. Gorton followed an approach by the President of the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce (Mr. K. D. Williams). Shipping services to serve developing export markets were vital to South Australia's industrial future, he said.

The Stott-Hall Government made direct representation to the Commonwealth Government because of a shipping line that was being cancelled. Although I am always in favour of direct services, I believe this would have meant, even though the service was discontinued, that a service from Australia out of Adelaide would still have been available to exporters. It would have meant transhipping in either Sydney or Melbourne, but at least the service would still have been available to the exporters of this State. What did we hear from the L.C.L. when it was in Opposition? Its members said that, if they were in Government, they would get a fair deal because they would have direct representation with a Commonwealth Liberal Government and would receive the treatment that existed between one State Liberal Government and the Commonwealth Liberal Government! However, we find that on the first occasion this is put to the test no co-operation exists at all between the Commonwealth Liberal Government and the present State Government. Further, in the *News* of June 25 last the following report appears under the big headline "Container Ship Link with Melbourne lost":

The Marine Minister, Mr. Coumbe, today announced cancellation of Associated Steamship Co. Ltd.'s plans to link Adelaide with Melbourne and overseas markets by container shipping. However, Mr. Coumbe said the trade would not be lost to South Australia, as the sea link had been abandoned in favour of the South Australian Railways container cargo service. Mr. Coumbe said the Associated Steamship decision would in no way affect the building of a "roll-on-roll-off" trailer and container ship terminal at No. 3 Dock, Port Adelaide, for the Australian National Line. He said he expected the agreement on this project to be finalized within a month.

There was not one voice of protest from any member on the Government side against the cancellation of this important sea link

concerning containerization between Adelaide and the rest of the world! The Minister said it was not of much importance: there was no loss to South Australia, because we had the rail link; but it is apparent to me that the present Minister is not conversant with the agreement that existed or with the arrangements that were made after long, hard negotiations.

Mr. Broomhill: He should have made himself familiar, though.

Mr. RYAN: Why do they worry about these matters if they are not interested? Long negotiations took place, during which all those vitally interested in this important matter made certain submissions. The overseas shipping companies agreed that, whilst Adelaide would not be a terminal port for containerization, it would be a linking feeder port with the terminal ports they would determine, and the freight charge from overseas ports to Adelaide would be a flat rate, irrespective of the transshipping in either Melbourne or Sydney by a feeder service into Adelaide. However, from inquiries I have already made, I have ascertained that the freight rate under the new system, by the cancellation of the Associated Steamships container link with the terminal ports (because that organization is a subsidiary of Overseas Containers Limited which will operate the container services in and out of Australia) will be determined from the overseas port to port of delivery, which will be either Sydney or Melbourne. The increased cost of transporting goods from shipping ports at Sydney, Melbourne or Fremantle to Adelaide by rail will be borne by either the importer in regard to imports or the exporter in regard to exports.

Mr. Broomhill: Is this what the Minister says does not matter?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, apparently it is not important: not one protest has been made by Government members. Yet, regarding the other matter to which I referred (that the K Line was cutting out Port Adelaide as a port of call and there was no increase in either import or export rates because it was a flat rate from Adelaide for transshipping on the K Line) was a protest made? The Prime Minister was approached but he turned a deaf ear to the Liberal Government of South Australia. However, where it is of utmost importance and is a matter of controlling either exports or imports by additional charges, not one voice of protest has been raised by Government members. How

inconsistent can they be? The present Minister of Marine went to great lengths, when he was an Opposition member, to criticize the Labor Government, saying it had not made strenuous moves for Adelaide to be a terminal port. Because Adelaide is only a feeder port, he blamed the Government of the day for its attitude.

Mr. Broomhill: He is strangely silent now.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I can't get a word in, anyway.

Mr. RYAN: The Minister would be ashamed to say anything. I had many discussions about containerization not only with people in Adelaide and throughout Australia but also with people in other shipping ports around the world, and the information I received from these people was that, although Adelaide was not to be a terminal port, it would be a feeder port but that there would not be a different rate regarding delivery either for imports or exports. At least I received that information from those people. However, now that the subsidiary (Associated Steamships Proprietary Limited) has cancelled its operation at Port Adelaide the cost will be greater.

The State has been put to great expense over the years in making available to Associated Steamships Pty. Ltd. facilities and amenities for its full use of No. 5 berth, Port Adelaide, for its containerized shipments. The moneys were spent as a result of the information and advice of that company which was that, although it would use the berth until the implementation of containerization from or to overseas countries, it was to be fully used by the company when containerization became the method of shipping. However, what do we find? We are now left with a white elephant, because the State now has an agreement with the Australian National Line to provide other berths when the A.N.L. decides to enter the containerized operation in shipping.

It is expected that the Select Committee's report will contain a recommendation that A.N.L. shall enter the overseas trade, for which it was created many years ago. We are committed. We spent much money on No. 5 berth, Port Adelaide, bringing it up to date to meet the requirements of the company and for the sole use of that company. Now the company does not want it and we are committed to build another for A.N.L. If any matter should be raised as a matter of urgency,

with protests on all grounds possible, it should be the cancellation of this shipping line, which, as I have said, will create additional cost to South Australia.

Once again I want to refer to the Minister of Works, because he used to take a great interest in the activities of the industries and the industrial world of South Australia. In his speech on the Address in Reply in July, 1966, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) when referring to the development of industries in South Australia said:

No mention is made of the difficulties being experienced by many industries or of any steps being taken to assist them over a difficult period. The closing down of Diecasters at Elizabeth was conveniently overlooked.

Tonight, we heard probably one of the worst efforts ever by a Premier. Naturally, we expect that when the Premier of the State speaks we shall hear something outstanding and of value to the people of South Australia. I think my colleagues on this side will agree that we heard tonight one of the feeblest and poorest efforts that we have ever heard from a Premier since I have been a member of this House. There was no meat or anything of importance in what he said.

He is going to announce in the next few weeks a couple of little industries but he has forewarned the people of South Australia that they will employ only a few people. What does the Premier say about his policy of "getting South Australia going"? What does he say about the closing down of Rosella Foods? There is not much comment. What did he say about the closing down of Davies Coop? There was very little comment on that, either. What did he say about the closing down of Beckers? When we were the Government and one particular industry closed down, we were crucified by the then Opposition because of our inactivity in allowing an industry to close down. Three industries in South Australia have closed down in the last three weeks, yet there is practically no comment about it. The Government members have said (it may have been an excuse) that the inactivity or lack of activity of these companies is something they never had time to rectify or discuss with the companies, but in this morning's *Advertiser* (it is not often that we first read the *Advertiser* in the House, although we were forced to do so when we were in Government because of the heavy legislative programme), after the "get going"

policy of the Liberal Party, there is an article which reads as follows:

But the Elizabeth Vale plant of Electric Control and Engineering Ltd., which depends largely on the automotive industry for its orders notified 11 fitters they would be stood down next week because of a lack of work.

This is the "get going" policy that we heard so much about. In Millicent the important thing stressed was electoral reform; under the "get going" policy of this Government, the industrial capacity of South Australia was not an issue in Millicent. After the Government has been in office and has had sufficient time to settle down and consider what is happening to the industries in South Australia, it follows up, after Rosella Foods, Davies Coop and Beckers have closed down, with today, Wednesday, June 26, another industry shutting down because there is no work for it. This is the confidence that industry was going to have in the Government as a result of a Liberal Government coming to power: it could whisper in the ears of a Liberal Commonwealth Government. Apparently the whispering is so inaudible that the Commonwealth Government cannot hear it! If this is to be the pattern of the L.C.L. Administration, however long it may last as a Government, I can foresee a period of difficulty. I do not want to be a defeatist and I do not want to adopt the attitude of crying down the State adopted by Liberal members when in Opposition. We have heard the call "Get South Australia moving" but the confidence that South Australian industry was to have in the Government will be misplaced and it looks as though the position can be rectified by only one Party: the Australian Labor Party. However, we have to do it on the basis, first, of electoral reform. It is hard not to repeat what has previously been said but let us repeat it until we get what we are after: electoral reform in South Australia.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I place before the House for consideration Supplementary Estimates totalling \$764,489. Before dealing with them in detail, however, I believe it would be useful for me to give members a brief summary of the present state of Revenue Account and the probable results for 1967-68.

REVENUE BUDGET, 1967-68

The Revenue Budget presented to the House on August 31, 1967, anticipated a deficit of \$3,967,000 for this financial year. As the Revenue Account was carrying a cumulative

deficit of about \$5,500,000 at June 30, 1967, the prospects were for a cumulative deficit of about \$9,500,000 at June 30, 1968. There have been a number of variations from the original Estimates for individual items of receipts and payments, but overall the picture remains much as it appeared to be in August last—that is, for a deficit currently of about \$4,000,000.

Receipts:

Receipts in total are likely to be a little below estimate. Because of the increased severity of the drought and its effect on rural production, railways receipts from the carriage of grains and from the transport of merchandise for the farming community have been adversely affected, and now seem likely to be about \$1,800,000 less than the original forecast. Harbours receipts are also feeling the same effects and are expected to fall short of estimate.

These two shortfalls will be largely offset by a special Commonwealth grant. The Commonwealth, recognizing that the drought in southern and eastern Australia has had severe effects on State Revenue Budgets, has made available a special grant of \$14,000,000 as general revenue assistance for New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and South Australia. Based on its proportionate share of the tax reimbursement grants, South Australia is receiving about \$1,700,000 from the special grant.

The other major variations in receipts are for the Hospitals Department. After a very rapid early growth, the public's support of the State lottery declined to a lower level, and as a result the receipts of the Hospitals Fund will be about \$600,000 less than earlier expected. This has a corresponding effect on the contribution to Revenue Account towards meeting the higher running costs of Government hospitals. Receipts from patients' fees, recoups from the Commonwealth, and other hospitals receipts also appear likely to fall short of estimate. On the other hand, receipts from succession duties are running at a level which indicates a final return some \$600,000 above estimate. Stamp duties and the recoveries of the law courts are also running ahead of the estimate.

Payments:

For payments, the present indication is that, as with receipts, the total will be a little below the original forecast. The major saving is in the running expenses of the Railways Department arising from the reduced carriage of

freight; but, whereas receipts have been reduced by some \$1,800,000, running expenses have been saved only to the extent of some \$500,000, so that the adverse effect of the season on the undertaking is a net \$1,300,000 or thereabouts.

It appears that the payments of the Education, Public Buildings, and Social Welfare Departments will also be a little below the Estimates. On the other hand payments for the Hospitals, Engineering and Water Supply and Agriculture Departments will be above the Estimates. Provisions for these three departments are included in the Supplementary Estimates and I will give some details in a moment.

Summary 1967-68:

Summing up the present situation then, it appears that, after taking account of all individual variations in receipts and payments, the 1967-68 Revenue deficit will be about \$4,000,000, or fairly close to the original estimate. I should add that in a Budget of nearly \$280,000,000 (that is, receipts and payments each averaging more than \$1,000,000 a working day) small variations in timing at the end of a year, even over a few days, could affect the final result by several hundred thousand dollars.

APPROPRIATION REQUIREMENTS

The necessity for Supplementary Estimates, despite the fact that payments in total are expected to fall below estimate, arises from the fact that the Appropriation Act appropriates funds separately for individual departments, and unused appropriation for one department is not transferable to support excess payments by a second department. Within a department savings on a line (say, office expenses) are normally available to support excess payments for another properly approved purpose (say, purchase of office equipment) without the necessity for additional appropriation, but this availability does not extend to excesses for a department as a whole, or to new purposes—that is to say, new lines not specified in the Estimates of Expenditure. Where an excess above a department's total appropriation is incurred, or a payment has to be made for a new purpose, it is necessary for the Government to rely on other sources of appropriation authority.

Appropriation Act—Special section:

One of these sources is the section in the main Appropriation Act which gives additional appropriation to meet increased costs owing to awards of wage-fixing bodies and to meet any

unexpected upward movement in costs of pumping water through the two major mains. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover the costs of a number of relatively small variations in salary and wage awards and a small increase above estimate in the cost of pumping through the Mannum-Adelaide main. As members are aware, the original Estimates took account of the poor season in prospect and included a very large appropriation for pumping.

Governor's Appropriation Fund:

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund, which in terms of the Public Finance Act may cover the expenditure of up to \$1,200,000 in addition to that otherwise authorized. Of the \$1,200,000, up to \$400,000 is available, if required, for new purposes; that is, for purposes not previously authorized either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. The appropriation in the fund is being used to cover a number of excesses above departmental provisions and the costs of a number of new purposes, but it is not sufficient to provide for all the expected claims for additional appropriation.

Supplementary Estimates:

Therefore, the Government has decided to put before you Supplementary Estimates to cover the excess expenditures of three of the larger departments and to relieve the fund accordingly. At the same time, the opportunity is taken to include several appropriations for new purposes to relieve that restricted portion of the fund. The provisions included in the Supplementary Estimates may be summed up as follows:

Those to cover departmental excesses and designed to relieve the fund generally:

Hospitals Department	280,000
Engineering and Water Supply Department	300,000
Agriculture Department	60,000
	<hr/>
	640,000

Those to cover special purposes not previously authorized and designed to relieve that limited portion of the fund (\$400,000) available for such purposes:

	\$
Bonus payment to members of the Police Force	32,700
Advertising for water-saving campaign	25,000
Repairs to river bank at Renmark wharf area	6,789
Control of water salinity in Murray River	60,000
	<hr/>
	124,489

DETAILS OF APPROPRIATIONS

The details of the appropriations given in the order in which they appear in the Estimates are as follows:

Police Department:

It has been the practice for some years for Cabinet to consider a recommendation that an additional payment equivalent to two days' pay be made to members of the Police Force in appreciation of their excellent service, particularly during holiday periods, and, on being satisfied, to approve the recommendation. As the payment is subject to Cabinet's scrutiny and special approval each year, it is somewhat different from the normal salaries and wages that are paid as a right. It has been decided that the payment of \$32,700 is not specifically covered by the normal salaries and wages vote appropriated by Parliament and should be appropriated as a special purpose.

Hospitals Department:

Apart from the cost of awards covered otherwise, it is expected that the final costs of maintaining and developing the department's essential services will be about \$280,000 in excess of the original provision, and the Supplementary Estimates provide accordingly. The additional costs are widely spread throughout the department, with the heaviest impact being for the Royal Adelaide and the Queen Elizabeth Hospitals.

Engineering and Water Supply Department:

The additional costs of pumping water and of award variations are being covered by other means as I have described, but it is still necessary to provide in these Estimates for \$300,000 of excess expenditures for operation and maintenance. The department has been involved in heavier than normal costs in the redevelopment, maintenance and operation of bores, in special maintenance to repair all burst mains at immediate notice, and in chlorination of water. An amount of \$25,000 is to cover the costs of advertising to impress on the public the necessity to save water.

Minister of Works—Miscellaneous:

An amount of \$6,789 is required for a Government contribution towards the cost of repairing the wharf at Renmark following damage caused by a fall in the river level. Because of an increase in the salinity of the Murray River, approval was given to investigate the problem and to weir off some of the backwaters and \$60,000 is provided to cover costs this year.

Agriculture Department:

The sum of \$60,000 is required to meet the costs arising out of an outbreak of Mediterranean fruit fly at Port Augusta in December, 1967. Eradication measures undertaken between December and April involved \$35,000 in wages and \$25,000 in spray materials, travelling expenses, etc. The total additional provision for the purposes I have explained is \$764,489.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the first line of the Supplementary Estimates.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the adoption of the Supplementary Estimates. The amounts shown are straightforward and could hardly be opposed, as we agreed to every one of them when we were in office. The payments to members of the Police Force were agreed to at the end of last year, and additional moneys would obviously be required for salaries and wages in the Hospitals Department and in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The cost of advertising the water-saving campaign was authorized by our Government when in office, and this campaign was extremely successful despite the things said about it at the time and the suggestion that we were gambling with the State's water supply. It succeeded excellently, and we were able to go through the summer with this small payment, which is much less than we would have had to pay an army of inspectors to enforce restrictions that would have been less palatable to the general public.

The \$100,000 for the extra cost in the Adelaide water district was agreed to by us. Repairs to the river bank at the Renmark wharf area were obviously necessary, and the control of salinity in the Murray River was a programme undertaken by us in view of the grave salinity problem that arose. The money paid for fruit fly control was obviously a necessity because of the outbreak in Port Augusta. Therefore, there is nothing in the Estimates to which members, least of all ourselves, could take exception.

It has been stated in the House during the present sitting and at other times that the lotteries revenue has been used, in effect, to recoup general revenue and has not resulted in additional payments to hospitals in South Australia, but any study of hospital expenses in South Australia must show that statement to be incorrect because, in fact, during the the first two years of Labor Government the sum by which expenditure in the

Hospitals Department increased was much more than the normal increment in any year under the previous Government. The increase in health and hospitals expenditure was an increase in two years of nearly 55 per cent a head of population. Consequently, it could not be expected that that increase each year, which was not the normal annual increment to the Hospitals Department but a greatly increased expenditure to catch up on the back lag in hospital and health expenditure that had occurred, would continue. To take the increment in the previous two years and say that this was the normal increment for every year hereafter would be an absurd proposition and completely unjustified. When the lottery was introduced, the Labor Government said that it would maintain the existing level of expenditure on health and hospitals, which was a record level of expenditure far above the sum spent by the previous Government, and in the Estimates last year the extra sums to be paid from the Hospitals Fund, into which moneys were paid from the resources of the Totalizator Agency Board and from lotteries, were assigned separately from the moneys from revenue. That was clearly explained to members at the time, and it is incorrect to say that general revenue has, in fact, been recouped from the Hospitals Fund. The Hospitals Fund is an extra and should continue to be treated as such, and I would expect that in the Estimates to be introduced later this year the course followed last year of showing the sums paid from the Hospitals Fund separately would be continued.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): First, I refer to the statement made by the Treasurer that the payments by certain departments, such as Public Buildings, Education, and Social Welfare, would be below estimate. It has come to my attention that some positions in departments in the Public Service have, as a result of a Cabinet decision, not been filled, and that it is not intended to fill them at present. For example, in the Social Welfare Department, in the brief period I was Minister, two vacancies existed for maintenance officers, and the work of the department was being seriously hampered by the delay, even in that time, in appointing these maintenance officers. I should appreciate it if the Minister concerned, or the Treasurer, could indicate the general policy being adopted by this Government in relation to filling already established positions throughout the Public Service. Has any attempt been made to achieve what seems to me may well be false economies by issuing

instructions that these positions be not filled, at least for the present? In the case I mentioned, relating to the Social Welfare Department, not filling these positions simply means that the service provided to members of the public (in this case, to very needy members of the public) falls considerably below standard.

Secondly, I refer to the statement that the deficit for the current year is likely to be of the order anticipated (about \$4,000,000), leaving a cumulative deficit to the end of June, 1968, of about \$9,500,000. This is to be contrasted with the surplus of Loan expenditures referred to in His Excellency's Speech. How can the Treasurer, in view of these circumstances, give any assurance that no further transfers will be made from Revenue Account to Loan Account? In view of the statements which he made in the press, and in view of the previous statements made by the Premier during the election campaigns criticizing the previous Government for relieving Revenue Account of certain capital items, how can the Treasurer hope to give an assurance that transfers which previously took place to Loan Account from Revenue Account will be brought back on to revenue? If he cannot give such assurances, is he prepared to retract the criticisms that he and the Premier made, in my view unjustly, of the previous Government?

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I refer to the concluding paragraph of the Treasurer's statement about the additional sum required in connection with the expense involved in eradicating fruit fly at Port Augusta. I notice that \$60,000 is asked for. It seems that \$25,000 of that sum represents the cost of spraying materials and travelling expenses, etc., in connection with eradicating fruit fly, but no reference whatever is made to any payment for compensation.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: There is another Bill on that.

Mr. RICHES: I want to know why another Bill is necessary, and I have raised this matter here previously. It seems wrong to me that people who suffer loss when their fruit is taken away should have to wait 12 months and sometimes longer for compensation merely because of the necessity to pass a special Act every time an outbreak of fruit fly occurs. I was under the impression that this was remedied last year when Parliament passed legislation enabling the Government to make payments in cases of flood, fire, or damage by pestilence.

I thought the scope of that Bill was wide enough to authorize payments for compensation in the case of a fruit fly outbreak.

As I still believe that, I should like that point examined, for I think it is grossly unfair that people should have to wait for these long periods before a compensation payment is made. These remarks should not be taken in any way as a criticism of the department's action in engaging in this fruit fly eradication, which appears to have been successful in containing the outbreak in a limited area much more effectively than has been the case in relation to any previous outbreak. Nevertheless, many householders suffer losses which they should not have to bear for such long periods. Will the Minister concerned see whether compensation cannot be paid at an early date and whether the legislation passed last year should not cover an outbreak of fruit fly? I believe that that was the intention when the Bill was passed by Parliament.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his courtesy in the handling of this matter. Although I do not want to open up a debate, I wish to reply briefly to the comment made by the member for Glenelg, although I doubt whether it really comes within the scope of this discussion. My criticism of the previous Government's policy in transferring substantial items from Revenue to Loan Account over a period still stands, but the position in which I am placed at the moment is that, because of the extent of those transfers, I am unable to forecast that I can get out of this position immediately.

Mr. Hudson: Will you make any further transfers?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Not unless I am forced to do so by circumstances.

Mr. Hudson: If you are forced to make transfers, will you withdraw your previous criticisms as being unjust?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, because I did not put the State in this position and am therefore not in exactly the same position as was my predecessor.

Mr. Hudson: What services would you cut?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In any case, that is not a matter to be discussed now: we can discuss this fully when the Loan Estimates come before this Chamber. Suffice to say at this stage that it is essential that the Treasury have cash in it. I appreciate that this was the position my predecessor was in

but, as I did not put the State in that position, I am not answerable for that situation. Undoubtedly I shall be forced to maintain some part of the policy in order to maintain the liquidity in the Treasury. However, the Government hopes to break away from this situation as soon as possible.

As regards fruit fly, I shall be happy to have my colleague the Minister of Agriculture or the Attorney-General look into the possibility of using last year's legislation to meet the circumstances outlined, but it has been the practice always in the past (and the honourable member objects to that; he says so) that claims for compensation are made as soon as they can be reasonably made. In past years we have had some difficulty in getting people to make their claims. Whether the claims are unnecessarily cumbersome or involved I do not intend to discuss, but we shall look at the matters raised to see whether that Act can cope with the situation.

First line (Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, Police Department, \$32,700)—passed.
Hospitals Department, \$280,000—passed.

MINISTER OF WORKS

Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$325,000—passed.

Miscellaneous, \$66,789.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to the item "Murray River—control of water salinity, \$60,000". We were told by the Treasurer that this sum was required to investigate the problem and to weir off some of the backwaters. Serious questions arise from this and, although they do not require an immediate answer, I should appreciate a detailed report later. What have these investigations shown? How far has the work progressed on the weiring off of some of the backwaters? Has the possibility of obtaining Commonwealth assistance, such as has been given to Victoria, to undertake large-scale research into salinity problems in this area been investigated? If it has not been investigated, will it be investigated so that we can get Commonwealth assistance to help control this problem? This will obviously be a long-range problem for us. The Commonwealth now seems to recognize, with the provision of \$3,600,000 for the State of Victoria for two salinity control projects, that this is now an urgent matter. We should be able to get such assistance, too. If active investigation into this matter is carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, it may well provide significant Commonwealth assistance that would be of great value in years to come. Some of our salinity problems

in South Australia will not be subject to control, particularly the problems at Waikerie, but other parts that are subject to control will become even more urgent.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Works): I shall be happy to get the information for the honourable member as promptly as possible.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF FORESTS

Agriculture Department, \$60,000—passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Supplementary Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for \$764,489 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. G. G. Pearson, and read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is based upon the Supplementary Estimates which have been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further \$764,489 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum and sets out the amount to be provided under each department or activity. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made.

Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds or bank overdraft if the moneys received from the Commonwealth Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1967. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. Except for the amount of appropriation sought, and the period covered, this Bill is the same in all respects as the supplementary Appropriation Bills passed by the House in recent years. I commend the Bill for consideration of members.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1969.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I do not wish to detain the House for very long, but I do want to say some things about matters spoken of in the House earlier. The Premier said very feelingly that there should not be any talks between the Opposition and the Government on the subject of electoral reform. I do not know why in the world there should not be talks about this, since there are talks about other things from time to time. It has always seemed to me, from experience, that if one had to work out in detail some kind of agreement it was more easily done by a small group of people working informally than by a large group of people subject to the formal rules of debate. Certainly, that has been the experience in this House time and time again. However, I point out to him that, if he wants to get an electoral proposal through this House, it will be necessary to have talks with the Opposition, because there will be no other way of passing the measure.

Let me make this clear to him: the Opposition is in a position to prevent from passing this House something that it is not in agreement with, but that protection that it has for the people of this State is a limited one. It is limited to our being able to prevent the passage of the Bill through this House at the second and third readings. Now, we are not prepared to pass a Bill at the third reading after there has been an agreement in Committee unless we are in a position to have a clear and unequivocal undertaking that the Bill will not be amended by the Government majority in the Upper House and that the amendments will not then be sent back to this House to overrule the objections we have had to any original Bill through the amendments being carried by a simple majority of this House.

If the Premier thinks that that device can be used to thwart the Opposition's objections to any of his proposals, I can assure him that he is wrong. Therefore, to pass a measure of compromise through this House it will be necessary to have talks. We are prepared to have them, because we want to get an effective amendment of the electoral system in South Australia, but I can assure the Premier that, in any measure to come before this House, the protections that we have for the people by our numbers in this House will be maintained.

Regarding the Attorney-General's statements, we were treated again to an impassioned address on our failure to compromise on previous occasions. I do not know where this failure to compromise was. We were offered no compromise.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you take him seriously?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He seems to think that the public might take him seriously, so I intend to deal, at any rate, with the matters that he has put forward in this House. True, the Labor Party gave us the right to compromise on the Bill that we put before the House, and this was published. The Attorney-General rushed into print saying that I had put forward a specific matter of compromise; he said that it was a mere sham and that we did not have any power to do it. He does not know the Labor Party's rules as well as we do. I was able to put forward a compromise, and we are all still members of the Labor Party: we have not been expelled.

We have always been ready to discuss any reasonable compromise put forward by the Liberal Party in South Australia, but none was put forward. When we introduced our measure, no compromise was offered to us by members opposite or by the Legislative Council. We had nothing from the Opposition that indicated in any way that the Opposition was prepared to meet us at all on the existing electoral situation. The only thing we had ever known from them was a proposition to have representation in this House not of people but of interests, a situation that members opposite know would have made the electoral position in South Australia very much worse than it now is. Nothing else has been offered to us.

How can the Attorney-General say that we failed to compromise? It is the Liberal Party that failed to offer any compromise. We had before the House a proposition that the Liberal Party failed to discuss in any way other than with outright opposition. I refer to another statement by the Attorney-General. When we

left office, there was in course of preparation a number of non-contentious matters, a list of Bills which almost entirely involved administrative changes and which were not matters of policy of any kind. Naturally enough, I consented to these being left in the hands of the Parliamentary Draftsman for discussion with my successor. The Bill is in the same category as a measure ready for introduction to this House, as none of these other matters were, and obviously the matter was confidential to the member concerned. The Attorney-General was well aware of the difference and of my objection to his attempting to obtain information about it, because I wrote to him, and I have read the letter to the House. How can he say his action was not a gross breach of the privilege of a member of this House in obtaining, quite wrongly and quite contrary to the whole traditions of this House, material from the Government Printer concerning a matter that had been prepared for me for introduction? There is no analogy between the two matters and the Attorney-General knows this perfectly well. Of course, I did not leave that matter in the hands of the Parliamentary Draftsman. The other matters were mostly not matters of contention in policy and therefore could properly be discussed with my successor as a matter of routine administration.

The Premier said some strange things about the Chowilla dam. He said that the motion put before this House last year had originally included the word "alternatives" (the final motion agreed unanimously by this House did not), and that somehow or other we had communicated to the River Murray Commission some change in attitude concerning the pre-eminent right of this State to Chowilla. I do not know how it was supposed to have been communicated to the commission. The resolution unanimously passed by this House was achieved after debate, but it was an agreed and a unanimous resolution and there was no question that the Labor Government communicated anything else either to the Governments of other States or to the commission. There was no departure from the position that this Government had maintained, that we had a pre-eminent right to the Chowilla dam. To say that what we had done was the same as what the Premier has now done is sheer nonsense.

The Premier is trying to head off criticism about his withdrawal of the instructions we had issued to our Commissioner to create a dispute, the one protection we had. The

Premier is trying to head off criticism by making an ill founded reply. His excuse for his action is that he has used this device to maintain Chowilla alive, but all I can say is that he has maintained it in an extremely comatose condition, because while it has not been completely dismissed by the commission it is clear now that he has sold the position that had previously been maintained and that our position in any future dispute is hopelessly weakened. His recent junketing to other States has not brought any comfort whatever that he would get the political support for the future building of Chowilla that he claimed he would get by this device. He has not. His reply on this subject is one that I am sure will not impress anyone but himself.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): Our beards grow long in the service of the State, and I do not intend to re-awaken a large debate on the issues raised again by the Leader of the Opposition. He knows of the operations of the River Murray Commission, and that it started its studies of alternatives in 1967, when he or his representative was attending the commission. It is on record. However, I am quite sure that these factors will come out in later debates on other issues before the House.

Regarding electoral reform, let me assure the Leader that there are no tricks in our scheme or in our intention to get the measure through this House if possible. I assure the House that there are no tricks in our mind. Unless legislation passes freely through this House, in the present circumstances we have no intention of passing it elsewhere, bringing it back and by some legal trickery getting it through this House. We will have nothing to do with debating this issue outside. I do not know whether the Leader is in control of the mob or whether the mob is in control of him, although it looked last evening as though it was in control of him as he waded to the gallery trying to quieten it. With the ebb and flow as he deals with his supporters, I hope he can control it and that it does not eventually control him. We maintain our position: the Bill will be debated here.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): Although I got certain grievances off my chest in a previous debate, the reply given by the Premier later and just now has brought them back on to my chest rather solidly. To recapitulate in relation to the Chowilla dam (and I wish the Premier would get this particular point clear), I point out that, at the time of the debate last year

and the decision of the River Murray Commission to further investigate the matter, the particular problem that gave the other States a real argument against Chowilla was the problem of salinity at Mildura and the need therefore to maintain a minimum flow at Mildura in a dry year. This meant that the other States did not receive the benefit that they expected to receive from Chowilla. This matter was fully explained by the then Premier in his report to the House in relation to the problems that had arisen over Chowilla, and if the present Premier would care to read pages 1271-4 of last year's *Hansard* he would find a complete statement on this matter by the present Leader of the Opposition.

This meant further investigation. The charge that we sold Chowilla away is one of those great thumping untruths which the Premier is fond of letting loose when he finds himself in difficulty in debate. The final resolution agreed on was moved by my colleague the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill), and that was after considerable debate had occurred which involved working out a form of words acceptable to everyone. It did not alter the conditions before the River Murray Commission at all. Until such time as salinity investigations on the Murray River above Mildura were undertaken and could demonstrate quite clearly that salinity at Mildura could be controlled, it was not possible for this State to argue, either in public or at the River Murray Commission, that New South Wales and Victoria would receive the benefits they expected to receive from building the Chowilla dam. This was the one serious argument that New South Wales and Victoria could at that time bring up against Chowilla, apart from the question of cost. A point was made about the size of the Blowering dam having been increased, but this was a bit of fluff on the top. The one serious matter was the question of salinity, and it was clear that that matter had to be investigated. It has already been partially investigated, and the reports received suggest quite strongly that salinity can be controlled in such a way as to give the full benefits to New South Wales and Victoria. It was at this stage that we needed to insist, in the words of the resolution unanimously carried by the Parliament last year, as moved by the member for West Torrens, as follows:

The State of South Australia has a fundamental and legal right to the construction of the Chowilla dam without further delay, and that assurances must be given by the Governments, the parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement, that pending construction of the

dam South Australia will be supplied in dry years with the volume of flow of water which the dam was designed to ensure.

That was the resolution asserting our fundamental and legal rights to Chowilla dam at that time, and we all agreed on it. It is that legal right that has been repudiated by the other States, and now this State, under the instructions of the present Premier, has voted similarly.

Finally, in relation to statements made on electoral reform, the Premier assured us that he would not play any tricks. The credibility of the Premier is at stake. We are simply not satisfied at this stage with assurances, because he has gone back on his word.

Mr. Casey: Could he control the Upper House?

Mr. HUDSON: That is a good question. However, quite apart from that, we have the question of his own record of how statements at one time, particularly before an election, turn out to be different from what he says after an election. We already know what he said before the State election on March 2, particularly in relation to such matters as the Chowilla dam, but the more glaring example is the one that has occurred so recently, on May 29, when he said that if the electors of Millicent returned the L.C.L. candidate he would take it as endorsement of the L.C.L. plan; and that if the electors of Millicent returned the A.L.P. candidate he would take it as an endorsement of the A.L.P. plan for electoral reform and therefore a compromise would be necessary. Now he has gone back on that statement. He has said he will introduce his own Bill, and that is the end of the matter: he will not have any form of discussion or talks. He needs to assure us that his word is good and that if the other place decides to muck around with the Bill and introduce certain amendments no tricks will be played. Until the Premier delivers on the statement he made prior to the Millicent by-election, agrees that we made our point and says that he will stand by that statement, how can we accept assurances? I suggest that we simply cannot.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer) moved:

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1969, a sum of \$40,000,000 be granted: provided that no payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the

rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ending June 30, 1968, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service or by any regulation or by any award, order or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried.

Resolution adopted by the House. Bill founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. G. G. Pearson, and read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the appropriation of \$40,000,000 so that the Public Service of the State may be carried on in the early part of next financial year. As members know, the annual Appropriation Bill does not normally receive assent until the latter part of October and, as the financial year begins on July 1, some special provision for appropriation is required to cover the first four months of the new year. That special provision takes the form of Supply Bills, normally two such Bills each year. Without this Bill now before the House there would be no Parliamentary authority available for normal revenue expenditure from July 1, 1968. The appropriation proposed in the first Supply Bill is normally designed to cover requirements throughout July and August and may be required for the early part of September. For the past five years the amount of the first Supply Bill has remained unchanged at \$36,000,000. With the continual growth of the total Revenue Budget and correspondingly of the requirement in the early part of the year it is desirable that the amount now be increased to \$40,000,000. It will be necessary for a second Supply Bill to be submitted to the House in the latter part of August or early in September to provide for requirements while the Estimates and the main Appropriation Bill are being considered.

A short Bill for \$40,000,000 without any details of the purposes for which it is available does not mean that the Government or individual departments have a free hand to spend, as they are strictly limited by the provisions of clause 3. In the early months of 1968-69, until the new Appropriation Bill becomes law, the Government must use the amounts made available by Supply Bills within the limits of the individual lines set out in the original Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates approved by Parliament for 1967-68.

In accordance with normal procedures members will have a full opportunity to debate the detailed 1968-69 expenditure proposals when the Budget is presented. In recent years the Budget has been introduced just prior to Parliament's adjourning for the week of the Royal Show, and I propose to follow that practice this year. I commend the Bill to members.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill.

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

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that, in compliance with the summons from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which I obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. RICHES: Can the Premier say whether members will have an opportunity to ask questions later in the day? If there will be no such opportunity, I should like to ask a question now.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have spoken to the Leader of the Opposition in the last few minutes.

Mr. Hudson: A secret discussion!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes; the Leader of the Opposition will be happy if we have one set of questions today. We are happy to come back at 2 p.m. as scheduled. The Treasurer and I would like to get away at 4.15 p.m. at the latest. Consequently, if we can go through the rest of the matters on the Notice Paper without a Question Time, the Bills already passed here can be transmitted to the Legislative Council.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Christies Beach Technical High School,
Whyalla (Bevan Crescent) Primary and
Infants School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, the Hon. Robin Millhouse, and Messrs. Arnold, Lawn, and Riches.

Library: The Speaker, and Messrs. Clark, Evans, and Venning.

Printing: Mrs. Byrne, and Messrs. Edwards, Ferguson, Giles, and Langley.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) moved:

That a committee consisting of Messrs. Arnold, Freebairn, McAnaney, Wardle and the mover be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Lieutenant-

Governor in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, and to report on Wednesday, June 26.

Motion carried.

DEPUTY LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to inform the House that the member for Millicent (Mr. J. D. Corcoran) has been re-elected Deputy Leader of the Opposition, with effect from Saturday, June 22, 1968.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.46 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 26, at 2 p.m.