

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 13, 1968

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS**TRANSPORTATION STUDY**

Mr. CORCORAN: Details of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study were released by the Premier yesterday. He was reported in the newspaper as having said that the total sum envisaged for all road and highway improvements would exceed \$436,000,000. He continued:

However, it must be remembered that, over the 18 years that this money will be spent, revenue raised under normal means will total more than \$330,000,000. This brings the total amount of extra money to be found down to something like \$104,000,000.

Can the Premier say whether this involves the whole of the Highways Department revenues which, over that period, would normally be spent in the metropolitan area being devoted entirely to the improvements suggested in the plan?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get a report for the Acting Leader, because this matter is of great importance and should not be the subject of off-the-cuff answers on aspects that may be considered when debating the matter later. I remind the Acting Leader that the report is now to be discussed, and I am sure it will be widely discussed in the community.

It will then be up to the Government to decide, I think after six months has elapsed, whether it accepts the total report or any part of it. Because of this, I think the honourable member could again study the report, which would give him many of the answers. In reply to his specific question, I will get a report from the Minister of Transport.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: From the report it seems that a large part of the Hindmarsh municipality will cease to exist when the plan is developed. To me, and to the council, it seems that something must be done about re-drawing the boundaries of Hindmarsh in order to retain this council area, because rate revenue will be reduced to such an extent that the council will not be able to continue. The council has two courses open to it: first, to acquire land from the Woodville or Enfield council areas; or secondly, to amalgamate with the Thebarton council so that both councils, which will lose properties under the plan, will have a reasonable area. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague to investigate the re-drawing of council boundaries so that Hindmarsh may retain its identity?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be pleased to do that.

SWAN REACH TO STOCKWELL MAIN

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made in laying the 32-mile Swan Reach to Stockwell main and on constructing the necessary storage tanks and pumping stations? Can he also say when it is expected that the main will be completed and ready for use?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As the honourable member was good enough to tell me that he required this information, I obtained the following report:

On July 31, 1968, 26 miles of the 32.25 miles of Swan Reach-Stockwell main had been laid. Two 1,000,000-gallon storages, one on Black and White Hill north of Sedan and the other near No. 3 pumping station 19 miles from the Murray River, are nearly complete. Foundation work for two 12,500,000-gallon tanks at the summit storage site is well advanced and a contract has been let for their construction, which is scheduled for completion in May, 1969. Excavation work for the construction of No. 1 pumping station near Swan Reach is 40 per cent complete. All construction work is scheduled for completion in 1970, but the pipeline will be available for use in early 1969, with the installation of temporary pumping plant.

GOVERNMENT LEADERSHIP

Mr. LAWN: I am not sure whether the Premier is aware of this, but during his absence abroad the skids were put under him and it was freely rumoured here that, following this session, the Liberal and Country League intended to change its Leader and make the present honourable Chief Secretary its Leader. At that stage, it seemed that the odds were about five to four on that the Premier would retain his position. However, in view of the vote at the recent L.C.L. conference, when the Premier lost, I understand, by 90 to 60 in favour of the Chief Secretary, can the Premier say whether he is aware that the skids were put under him while he was away and whether he intends to throw in the towel in favour of the Chief Secretary at the end of this session?

The SPEAKER: Order! No odds are allowed in this Chamber.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am extremely pleased to have had the member for Adelaide looking after my interests whilst I was abroad. I commend and thank him for this. It is untrue that I have any intention of retiring voluntarily. I think I shall be asking the people for a mandate for my Government at the expiry of its term of office. If the honourable member desires to enter further into this debate, he can do so by altering his political views sufficiently to enable him to join the Liberal Party. If he cares to do this, he will be free to support a free-enterprise Government and to express his views accordingly at next conference. I thank him for the question.

EAST END MARKET

Mr. GILES: Considerable pressure has been brought to bear on me by two groups of people—one representing greengrocers in the metropolitan and country areas, and the other representing a group of growers marketing produce in the East End Market. With the present situation regarding marketing hours, between 12 midnight and 4 a.m. trucks unload produce at the wholesalers, but they must be out of the market by 4 a.m. From 4 a.m. to 6 a.m. orchardists or growers who market their own produce are allowed to enter the market with greengrocers, who in this period buy fruit they require for the following few days. At 6 a.m. greengrocers are allowed to pick up produce from trucks in the market and take it to their vehicles, and thence to their place of business. It seems to both greengrocers and market gardeners, as they are termed, that the period between 4 a.m. and

6 a.m. is too long because most greengrocers buy or order produce at the previous market and merely confirm orders with the grower-marketer during this two-hour period. Greengrocers consider that this period is too long—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot debate the question; he must ask the question of the Minister.

Mr. GILES: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I will ask the question. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether this two-hour period can be reduced so that greengrocers can begin to pick up produce at 5.30 a.m. instead of 6 a.m.?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Knowing of the honourable member's wide knowledge of the market and of his wide experience of conditions there, I will take this matter up with the Minister of Agriculture. However, if the honourable member has supplementary information in favour of this move I shall be pleased to give that information to my colleague when I ask him for a report.

GAWLER BLOCKS SCHOOL

Mr. CLARK: Recently I asked the Minister of Education a question concerning what I was informed was a language difficulty at the Gawler Blocks Primary School. Has the Minister had time to obtain a report on this matter?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The matter was referred to officers of my department and I am awaiting a report, which I will give to the honourable member at the earliest opportunity.

WILD LIFE RESERVE

Mr. FERGUSON: On January 28, 1966, I asked the Minister of Lands a question about establishing a fauna and flora reserve on southern Yorke Peninsula and, after he had given me details, he said, "However, when the matter is finalized I shall inform the honourable member." As I have not been informed, and as I presume the matter has not been finalized, will the Minister of Lands ascertain when details will be completed and the reserve will be dedicated?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall be pleased to obtain that information but, so that no-one will have the wrong impression, I point out that it was the previous Minister of whom the question was asked. However, I will check the position and inform the honourable member when I have the information.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL FRANCHISE

Mr. HUDSON: I understand from a report in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Liberal and Country League conference rejected a move for a change in L.C.L. policy to provide for adult franchise in the election of the Legislative Council. We are told that this move was supported mainly by the Premier and the Attorney-General.

Mr. Clark: How did this manage to get into the press?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know, but it was written about very kindly, and I was pleased to see that the Premier was referred to by the *Advertiser* rather as a knight in shining armour (and, of course, we all feel about him that way!).

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not allowed to answer a question asked by the member for Gawler. I understand that honourable member's question is addressed to the Premier.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand also that decisions of the L.C.L. conference are not binding on the Government and never have been in the past. My question therefore concerns the possibility that the Government will be introducing a Bill to provide for adult franchise in connection with the Legislative Council and for the use of a common roll for both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. If no decision has been made on this matter, will the Premier see whether he cannot get a majority of his colleagues in Cabinet to favour introducing such a Bill?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Again, I am intrigued, and I am thankful for the honourable member's interest in this matter. I assure him that the L.C.L. Government considers all matters to be current and does not reject one matter merely for the sake of another. We are considering various matters continuously, and the honourable member is assured that this matter is one that we will consider from time to time.

Mr. CLARK: Since the report appeared in the *Advertiser*, I have received many telephone calls from people strongly supporting the attitude taken by the Premier at this conference. I know that this is an unusual occurrence for him, and the Premier will appreciate that he may well have a majority of the people supporting him on this issue. I understand that one of his chief supporters, if not the chief supporter,

was the Attorney-General. So that the people of South Australia, through this House, may receive full information on the matter (and I know they are interested in it), will the Premier make a Ministerial statement enumerating the arguments he used at the conference in support of his stand? Also, will he ask the Attorney-General whether he would be prepared to make a similar statement?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sorry that the detailed information is not available for publication.

Mr. Hudson: It would be if the conference were open to the press.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: However, I am sure the honourable member will become used to the fact that the majority of people are supporting me and this Government.

EYRE PENINSULA ELECTRICITY

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the supply of electricity on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The electricity Trust has purchased land near Pine Corner on the Cleve-Lock road for the purpose of establishing a substation which will be supplied from the 132,000-volt transmission line which runs between Whyalla and Port Lincoln. This substation was planned to be built to coincide with the Poldalock-Kimba water supply scheme. However, as this scheme had been deferred, consideration is now being given to establishing this substation in advance of the water scheme proposal in order to supply electricity to the towns of Cleve, Cowell and Arno Bay, and to the surrounding districts. This would enable the diesel-operated power stations at Cowell and Arno Bay to be closed. The earliest date by which this substation could be established would be 1971.

Electricity supply to Lock and Kimba is dependent upon the Poldalock-Kimba water supply scheme and will be considered in detail when plans for the water supply scheme are more definitely known. The extension of the 66,000-volt transmission system to Wudinna, Streaky Bay and Ceduna is expected to follow at a later stage, but no detailed planning has been done. At the present time it is unlikely to be scheduled until the mid-1970's, and it will then be dependent on an economic examination of the proposals and on the availability of funds to carry out the work.

HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: My question relates to the municipality of Hindmarsh, which I believe to be the oldest metropolitan municipality in the State. Hindmarsh was South Australia's first industrial centre, and many Christian organizations established their first churches in this State in Hindmarsh; the Salvation Army established at Hindmarsh its first corps which, in fact, I believe was the army's first corps in the Commonwealth of Australia. Many of the industries that were established in Hindmarsh by individual families are still in existence; for instance, the wool-scouring company of G. H. Michell and Sons Proprietary Limited is still in its original locality at Hindmarsh, and I believe that company was the first to commence wool scouring in Australia. The Mayor of Hindmarsh has invited me to join him in seeking to form a historical society with a view to collecting certain materials for a museum and writing the history of Hindmarsh. If this society is formed, can we depend on the Government for physical and financial assistance?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I commend the honourable member for asking his question. It is a worthy effort of the Mayor to seek to form an historical society, and I hope it will be formed, because I think it is essential that we in South Australia preserve the history of our origins as a State which today is a part of modern society. People in the future will appreciate the facts concerning the State's origin. At this stage I cannot say that the Government will be able to help such an organization financially, but it will be happy to help physically. I am sure that in the Government's records and in its departments there is material that will be valuable to the society in its work. If the honourable member sees me, I shall be happy to discuss with him and with the Mayor any way the Government might help.

BONDING

Mr. VENNING: Has the Premier an answer to the question I asked on July 30 concerning the bonding of medical students?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Director General of Medical Services reports:

The scheme of granting medical cadetships was commenced in 1966, when assistance was granted to one sixth-year medical student. This student has since completed his studies, served his residency and has been directed to a country area where there is a need for additional medical services. A further cadetship was granted in 1967 and three more in 1968. These four cadets have not yet completed

their studies. It is a little early yet to judge the success or otherwise of the scheme, as only one cadet has as yet completed his course and been allocated to a country area. However, judging by the applications received for the cadetships offered, it would appear that the scheme has been well received and will serve a useful purpose in providing medical practitioner services in country areas where a need for additional doctors exists.

LOAN EXPENDITURE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The sum of \$10,650,000 was provided in the Loan Estimates for school buildings for 1967-68 and the actual payments for school buildings as shown in the 1968-69 Loan Estimates were \$8,679,000—an amount of underspending of \$1,971,000. In a statement dated March 22, 1968, the Under Treasurer advised Cabinet that the probable underspending on school buildings for 1967-68 would be \$300,000. In view of the Under Treasurer's statement how does the Treasurer account for the greatly increased underspending of \$1,671,000 as indicated in the Loan Estimates?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The figures I gave were the actual figures. It is not my department but the Minister of Works Department that spends the money. I know the expenditure fell short of expectations because of slower progress on certain works, the details of which I do not have at hand. The figures I gave were accurate and whatever forecast the Under Treasurer made was no doubt the best forecast that could be made at that point of time. The present Government took no action to slow down expenditure, nor did it have any control over the circumstances involved. The underspending as I gave it was according to the figures. I do not have any further explanation at present to give to the honourable member, and I do not know whether the actual shortfalls in expenditure on the various projects can be ascertained.

Mr. BROOMHILL: The member for Whyalla has drawn attention to the underspending on school buildings during the last financial year, as shown in the Loan Estimates. The Treasurer has said in reply that the Loan Estimates show a fall-off in expenditure of about \$1,750,000, and he has pointed out that some matters, details of which he did not have available, could have created this position. In view of the immense interest in this subject, will the Treasurer provide the House with a report explaining the details which he believes may have been evident?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In a statement dated March 22, 1968, the Under Treasurer informed Cabinet in respect of the 1968-69 Loan programme that special Commonwealth Government grants toward teachers colleges, science blocks and technical colleges were expected to be available to the extent of \$2,600,000 in 1968-69, compared with \$2,300,000 in 1967-68. In explaining the Loan Estimates for 1968-69, the Treasurer said:

Included in the proposed expenditures are technical colleges, science laboratories and teachers college projects, towards which I expect Commonwealth contributions of about \$1,700,000.

How does the Treasurer reconcile his statement of last Thursday with that of the Under Treasurer to which I have referred, and why has the Under Treasurer's estimate been cut by \$900,000?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will check the figures and obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. HUDSON: In the document prepared toward the end of March and referred to earlier this afternoon by the member for Whyalla, it was estimated that probable spending on Government hospital buildings would be \$7,560,000 or \$1,500,000 under the estimate. The level of spending for the year 1967-68 was \$6,823,000, which was an underspending of \$2,237,000. Will the Treasurer obtain a report giving details of the reasons for this underspending and the specific projects on which it occurred?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

MURRAY BRIDGE HOUSING

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question in which I requested details of the probable erection of houses by the Housing Trust at Murray Bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the trust reports that the trust will commence building further houses at Murray Bridge once the subdivision of the land referred to by the honourable member in his recent question is finalized. It is intended to programme initially for 20 rental houses, 10 rental-sale houses, and 10 sale houses.

PORT PIRIE EDUCATION

Mr. McKEE: The leading article in last week's *Recorder* states that the Education Department intends to close the Port Pirie branch of the South Australian Institute of

Technology. I find it hard to believe that the department would do this in view of the nature of the area, with the many types of technical work and the large industrial complexes at Port Pirie. Further, this branch of the institute has been used extensively by employees of the Highways and Local Government and the Engineering and Water Supply Departments at Crystal Brook. Therefore, as the branch has given wonderful service for several years to people living in Port Pirie and its surrounding areas, can the Minister of Education say whether the Government intends to close this branch? If it does, will she seriously consider having that decision reviewed?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a considered reply on this matter for the honourable member.

OUTER HARBOUR

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the work programme for, and the passenger terminal at, Outer Harbour?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The construction of a modern passenger terminal at the Outer Harbour costing \$1,638,800 was approved by the then Government in August, 1964. Since that date work has proceeded slowly on ancillary works such as drainage, power supply, removal of rail tracks and rail track alterations, strengthening of adjoining wharf, sewerage and water reticulation, car parks, fencing, removal of redundant buildings, etc. The architects have now completed all the necessary working drawings for this project and certain of the structural steelwork has been purchased and delivered. Work this financial year allied with the proposal consists of the completion of the adjacent road alterations. The next stage will be the demolition of No. 2 shed and completion of the piled foundations.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 6 concerning an extension of water supply and sewerage to the Modbury area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The expenditure of \$22,340 approved by Cabinet covers the construction of 3,400ft. of water main and 2,870ft. of sewer to serve 88 allotments in an existing subdivision comprising Montrose Road, Shakespeare Way, Carribean Terrace and Barclay Street adjacent to the corner of Milne and Nelson Roads at Para Hills.

CANBERRA TELEVISION SERVICES

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked last week about the dispute between Canberra Television Services Proprietary Limited and three former employees of that company?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Following the honourable member's asking this question last week, I have been informed that the Senior Industrial Inspector has interviewed the three persons who were dismissed, each of whom was a sales representative of the company. He also arranged to interview the Manager of Canberra Television Services Proprietary Limited at the head office of the company, but when the Senior Industrial Inspector arrived to keep the appointment he was introduced to a reporter from the *Advertiser*. On the Crown Solicitor's advice the Senior Industrial Inspector declined to interview the manager of the company in the presence of a newspaper reporter. In the meantime, the three dismissed employees have made application to the President of the Industrial Commission, pursuant to the provisions of section 26 (2) of the Industrial Code, 1967. This section provides that, if a question arises whether the dismissal of an employee was harsh, unjust and unreasonable, the President may (except in certain instances which are not relevant in this case) determine the matter and may, if he thinks fit, direct the employer to re-employ such employee. As such an application has been made to the President of the Industrial Commission, it would be improper for me to comment further at this stage as the matter is now *sub judice*. However, I believe I have given sufficient information to indicate to the honourable member that his plea to me is being examined.

VERMIN PROTECTION

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the vermin-proof fences constructed around forest reserves of the Woods and Forests Department?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have been informed by the Minister of Forests that the Woods and Forests Department is not legally responsible for the erection or maintenance of common boundaries. It has been the practice, however, in almost all cases, for costs to be shared.

BLACK FOREST MAINS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about when work will be commenced on the laying of new water mains in the Black Forest area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The work on replacing water mains in the Black Forest area will commence within the next 10 to 12 weeks.

BALAKLAVA COUNCIL

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Local Government, a reply to my question of July 25 in which I requested that the investigating officer's report on action taken against the Balaklava council be tabled?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I presume that the honourable member wishes me to give him that reply. The Minister of Local Government states that a similar question was asked by the former Minister of Local Government and that he then replied as follows:

On March 1, 1968, an inspecting officer of the Highways Department visited Balaklava and during his inspection he carried out a test check of the time sheets to the Government grants pay sheets. This check indicated that a substantial amount of moneys expended had been incorrectly charged against the Government Grants account. This was reported to the then Minister of Roads and the Auditor-General was also advised. Arrangements were made for an officer of the Auditor-General's Department and the inspector of my department to accompany the officer of the Highways Department to Balaklava for the purpose of making a comprehensive examination of the council records over a number of years. This examination revealed that from early in 1960 until late in 1967 moneys paid by the Highways Department in the form of Government grants had been used on works within the district other than those for which they were originally granted. The total amount over-charged to Government Grants account was:

	\$
Main road grants	63,928
Federal rural areas grants	20,244
Debit order grants	4,488
	\$88,660

Until 1965, the Highways Department did not carry out systematic test checks of local authority time sheets and relied upon certificates of the district clerk, overseer, district engineer and the council auditor. A limited amount of test checking was introduced in 1965, but the department still had to place considerable reliance on the certificates mentioned above. Following this investigation, some changes have been made in the methods of checking of Government Grants account

so that this type of misuse of funds can be more easily ascertained. Following the receipt of the reports of the officers, I wrote a letter to the council requiring the repayment of the moneys which had been used other than for the purposes granted. The council has been requested to repay the money over a long but reasonable period. Since writing the letter I have had a discussion with the Chairman and the present District Clerk and am awaiting a reply from the council giving details of financial arrangements proposed for the reimbursement of the funds to the Highways Department.

My colleague has considered the request that the report of the investigation be tabled. Although it is his desire to keep honourable members fully informed on all matters affecting the State generally, he does not consider there is any need to place this report before members. When a report is tabled, members of the public, as well as honourable members, will have the right to peruse it. Certain matters reported therein have yet to be resolved and it would not be fair for information which could influence or prejudice consideration of anything not yet determined to be made public. However, my colleague has made an offer to the former Minister of Local Government for him to peruse the docket so that he can be fully informed of its contents.

RAILWAY FENCES

Mr. ALLEN: The fences bordering the railway from Clare to Spalding are in a bad state of repair. Whilst the fences on the land-owners' side are being replaced when necessary and are being left in excellent condition, those bordering the road are in a very bad state of repair, so much so that sections are lying on the ground. Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether provision has been made this financial year for the repair of fences bordering the roadside?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not know, but I will find out and let the honourable member have the information.

DUMPING OF ORANGES

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 24 (almost three weeks ago) about the steps the Government is taking on the dumping of oranges?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No.

DENTAL HEALTH

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about school dental services in my district?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: A clinic will be established in the Upper Murray, but the location has not yet been determined.

Mr. CASEY: In asking the Minister of Education a question about dental health on July 23, I asked her to see whether children attending independent schools in some of the isolated areas of the State could be attended to by mobile dental clinics visiting the areas. Unfortunately, the reply I received did not refer to this part of my question. Therefore, will the Minister obtain for me a reply on this aspect?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

SUNDAY CRICKET

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Premier a reply to the question asked last week by the Leader about Sunday cricket on the Norwood Oval?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This contest is obviously a promoted commercial venture of international cricketers, and Government policy is opposed to this type of entertainment on a Sunday. The application was made for Sunday, October 13. I understand the game is being now promoted for Monday, October 14, a public holiday, which should prove satisfactory to both promoters and the public of South Australia.

WARREN MAIN

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 7 about the several-year-old nuisance caused by the hundreds of pipes from the old Warren trunk main, some of which are lying on the side of the road and some on private property?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Whether the reply is satisfactory is another matter, but I have the following report:

The lifting of the pipes of the old Warren trunk main from the Warren reservoir to Paskeville on Yorke Peninsula has been done under a contract let to a certain company in 1961. This was a firm that had done satisfactory work for the department previously, but before any work was commenced on the lifting of the pipes the company was taken over and its subsequent actions have not been satisfactory. However, the department had been paid in full for the pipes in the ground and it had no monetary hold over the contractor. The present position, which has not

changed since the contractor first lifted the pipes from the ground, is that the pipes are the property of the contractor, whose policy appears to be that the pipes are only carted away when he has a buyer for them or when he has an empty truck passing through the district. The leaving of the pipes along the side of roads has caused a good deal of inconvenience to district councils in particular, and the problem has been referred to the Crown Solicitor for advice on several occasions. Acting on this advice the department, on the specific requests of several councils, has shifted certain groups of pipes and rendered accounts for the cost to the contractor. These have not been paid and the first group of accounts was the subject of a court action early in 1967.

It has only been possible for the department to move a limited number of pipes which were preventing councils from carrying out planned roadworks, because of the following difficulties: the pipes are not the property of the department; the extreme difficulty in recovering the costs involved, even by court action; a serious shortage of suitable stacking areas; and great difficulty in carrying out any negotiations with the contractor. In these circumstances, it has not been possible, to date, to make any satisfactory arrangements for the moving of these pipes. However, the department will continue to consider moving pipes in any section of road where a council is unable to do planned road construction and the contractor has refused to move the pipes.

MINISTERIAL LETTERS

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Local Government to my recent question about the undue and unnecessary delay in receiving replies from the Minister? As the member for Port Adelaide asked a similar question, will the Attorney-General give a combined reply to both questions?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: On behalf of my colleague I am pleased to give the reply and to conform to the request to combine replies to both questions in a single reply. I had this reply last Thursday, and so informed, I thought, the honourable member, but there was some delay in his asking for it. The Minister of Roads states that in his administration of the Highways and Local Government Department he endeavours to keep himself up to date on all matters raised by members of Parliament by adopting a policy, where possible, of viewing and signing acknowledgments of their letters. His portfolio has been a very busy one, entailing necessary absences from the office over the last few months so that he personally could gain firsthand knowledge of the many matters

for which he is responsible. This has occasionally caused some delays in the answering of correspondence. He expects that the position will improve in the future.

It is fair to point out that my colleague, since he came into office, has been keeping two separate Ministerial offices going, something he inherited from the outgoing Government because of the grouping of portfolios. He has not seen fit to close one or other of the offices, because he wants to apprise himself fully of the situation before making a decision, and he intends to keep both offices going until he moves into the new building.

Mr. Jennings: Why does it take a week from the time he signs a letter until it is posted?

Mr. Ryan: That is what we are complaining about: the time after he signs it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Only one complaint at a time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I think that all members will acknowledge, as the Leader of the Opposition so generously has acknowledged recently in a speech, that the Minister of Roads has done a tremendous job since he came into office.

Mr. Jennings: I suppose he is responsible for the M.A.T.S. report!

Mr. Hudson: He did it all by himself!

Mr. Ryan: He tried to hush it up.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! I do not think that the Attorney-General can continue, because there is too much interruption.

KULPARA SCHOOL

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent request for a new school and residence at Kulpara?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Education Department is aware of the unsatisfactory condition of the Kulpara school residence and attached classrooms. The present head teacher, when offered promotion to Kulpara in February this year, was informed that a residence would not be available at least for some time, and he accepted the position on that condition. Earlier this year an offer was made to the department of a privately-owned residence at Kulpara, but on inspection this was found to be unsatisfactory. An approach has since been made to the Housing Trust for advice as to whether it holds land at Kulpara on which a new residence could be built, and also concerning the

estimated cost of such a residence. When this information is received, Cabinet approval will be sought for an order to be placed with the trust for a new residence. It is intended to demolish the existing residence and attached classrooms. The school already has one timber classroom, and it is intended to provide another, and other necessary accommodation. The District Inspector has been asked to report on requirements.

PINE TREES

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Forests a reply to my question of July 31 about supplying pine trees to primary producers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: At the direction of a previous Minister of Forests, pine trees were made available free of charge in suitable areas, subject to certain prescribed conditions, and this policy still operates. One of the conditions is, of course, the availability of stocks of trees, and a charge is made for lifting, packing, etc. The Woods and Forests Department experienced difficulty this season in meeting its own requirements, and found it necessary to purchase some trees from an outside source. Obviously, under these conditions, no trees were available from departmental nurseries.

GILES POINT

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the completion of port facilities at Giles Point?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that the present work at Giles Point is up to schedule. It is hoped to complete the jetty and bulk loading plant by August, 1970.

SILVERTON TRAMWAY COMPANY

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 7 concerning compensation to be paid to the Silverton Tramway Company on account of gauge standardization?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member's question was based on his understanding that transport authorities from South Australia, New South Wales, and the Commonwealth would meet representatives of the company in Melbourne early last week. There was no meeting last week of transport authorities from South Australia, New South Wales, the Commonwealth and the company.

TREE PLANTING

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the Highways Department's protecting newly planted trees and its seeking co-operation of landowners in the siting of these trees?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads reports that in order to protect the newly planted trees being established along some of our main highways, it has been necessary to erect fencing. This has restricted the passage of tractors and stock in some places. However, once the trees are well established the fences will be removed and the passage of stock, etc., will not be impeded. The Highways Department consults with adjoining landowners whenever this is readily practicable. The Highways Department is aware of the problem, but finds it impracticable to consult every adjoining landowner, as these are often difficult to contact.

HIGHBURY WATER STORAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 7 regarding the possibility of the Engineering and Water Supply Department's purchasing a property at Highbury East as a possible water storage area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: No approach has yet been made by W. Duhne & Sons Proprietary Limited offering any portion of their property at Highbury East as a possible water storage. However, the department is prepared to investigate the offer made and would be willing to confer with the representatives of the firm. It is intended to proceed with the proposal, and departmental officers will contact representatives of the company in order that the offer can be further considered.

CITRUS

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding the marketing of citrus?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Negotiations between the Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia and Home-grown Fruits Co-operative in the United Kingdom are proceeding, and at present are at a confidential stage between the two parties.

BIOLOGICAL CONTROL

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 31 regarding biological control in South Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have a statement setting out the research being done on biological control in South Australia. It is too long to read in full; briefly, however, it refers to the approach to pest control being applied to the following three major projects concerned with horticultural crops in South Australia: (1) in oranges, principally against red scale; (2) in peaches, principally against oriental fruit moth; and (3) in apples, principally against codlin moth and two-spotted mite. As there is nothing controversial in the statement, I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

BIOLOGICAL CONTROL

Biological control of insect pests is achieved by the manipulation of biological factors to keep the pest insect down below economic levels as distinct from the use of chemicals alone. The current approach to all pest control is better described as "pest management", using a control programme which integrates natural environmental control factors (for example, the decline in the numbers of winter pests as temperatures rise in the summer) and biological control factors (for example, parasites and predators) with chemical control. Such an approach to pest control demands as a preliminary a close study of the population dynamics of all the insects occurring in the crop to be protected (that is, both pests and beneficial insects) so that an integrated programme of pest control is devised for all the pests of that crop. This approach to pest control is being applied to three major projects concerned with horticultural crops in South Australia: (1) in oranges, principally against red scale; (2) in peaches, principally against oriental fruit moth; and (3) in apples, principally against codlin moth and two-spotted mite.

Mr. N. L. Richardson, Research Officer (Entomology) with the South Australian Department of Agriculture at Loxton is personally responsible for the red scale and oriental fruit moth projects, while the apple project is part of a large co-operative investigation by State Agriculture Departments in Tasmania, Victoria, New South Wales, South Australia, Western Australia and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. Mr. Richardson designed the insectary at the Loxton research centre specifically for biological studies with temperature-controlled insect breeding rooms and similar facilities. Two types of biological control are being investigated for red scale: first, the use of parasites and predators, and secondly, the use of the technique of mass-releasing sterile male insects by which the small fertile male population in the field is swamped and normal breeding of the pest is prevented. Concurrently with these studies, Mr. Richardson is carrying out field population studies

of red scale and trials with chemical methods of control, all leading to the development of an integrated biological and chemical control programme involving the minimum use of chemicals.

The work with oriental fruit moth is being assisted by the canning peach industry, which has financed a five-year project involving insect population studies in canning fruit orchards, studies on the dynamics of the oriental fruit moth and trials with the ultra-low volume spraying technique from aircraft. All these are aimed again at an integrated control programme for peach orchards involving a minimum use of pesticides. The apple project is being carried out in South Australia in a block of several acres of apples retained on the Blackwood experimental orchard for this specific purpose. Mr. W. B. Harris, Senior Research Officer (Horticulture) and Mr. H. F. Lower, Project Officer (Entomology) of the Agriculture Department are responsible for this project. Plans are being made at present to carry on this project after the co-operative programme ceases in 1969, by applying the principles established to the deeper hills. A similar study will be initiated at the Lenswood research centre on the section of the property purchased in 1967. The present project on apples is being financed jointly by the apple and pear industry and Commonwealth funds.

TEACHER'S SUSPENSION

Mr. HUDSON: On August 7 the Minister of Education, referring to the suspension of Mrs. McLellan (*Hansard* page 487) said:

A certain recommendation will be made to me on this matter in due course.

I presumed, when I heard this reply, that a decision would then be taken. Can the Minister say today whether a decision has been taken and, if it has, what it is? If a decision has not yet been taken, can the Minister say when it is likely that she will be able to inform me of the decision?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I said last week that, pending a decision, Mrs. McLellan had been suspended. Following this, the Director-General of Education communicated with her and said he would like to interview her: at this minute he is doing so. If a decision is available by the end of Question Time, I shall convey it to the honourable member; if it is not, I shall let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

STUDENT TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Transport a reply to my recent question regarding special concessions for students in uniform travelling at weekends on Municipal Tramways Trust buses?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports:

The Municipal Tramways Trust has a concession travel scheme under which students under 19 years of age may purchase scholar concession tickets to enable them to travel to and from school on recognized school days at rates lower than child cash fares. For students in the over-15 and under-19 years age group, the concession is substantial. The trust is experiencing continued difficulty in keeping the deficit in its finances to manageable proportions because of continual wage and price increases and the continual decline in patronage. Because of this, the trust is not able to grant concessions of this nature from its own resources.

It is pointed out that the wearing of a school uniform is not an acceptable form of recognition for a scholar because a school uniform is difficult to define, as there are schools whose scholars do not wear uniforms, there are scholars whose parents cannot afford uniforms, and uniforms or part-uniforms could be worn by people who have left school.

SEMAPHORE CROSSING

Mr. HURST: Last week I asked the Attorney-General to obtain from the Minister of Transport a report concerning accidents that had occurred on the Semaphore railway line. I understand that last Saturday there was another accident at the corner of Woolnough Road and Semaphore Road, where a car was hit by a railcar. Will the Attorney-General ask that a report on this accident be included with the report on the other accidents, when it is available?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly ask my colleague whether that can be done.

HEART MACHINES

Mr. BROOMHILL: On July 25 I asked the Premier to consider the provision of heart-monitoring machines at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and pointed out that the incidence of heart disease in this State was increasing. I asked the Premier whether he would find out how many such machines were available at the hospital and, if this number was inadequate, whether the Government intended to increase it. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have obtained the following report:

Present facilities: There are seven sets of monitoring equipment at present available for use in this hospital. This number is not considered by the cardiologists to be adequate for the present needs, but action has been taken progressively to increase this number as follows:

Supplementary equipment: As an interim measure until the equipment for the new intensive care areas included in the rebuilding project is available, an additional four monitoring units are at present on order.

Ultimate provision: As the new intensive care areas in the new buildings become available for use, additional monitoring units will become available progressively as shown hereunder:

- (a) Medical intensive care ward (includes coronary care unit): This area will have a total of 17 beds, all of which will be wired to permit plugging in of monitoring equipment as necessary. The exact number of monitoring units that will be provided in this area has not been finally decided, but it is likely to be 14 in the initial stages.
- (b) Cardio-thoracic areas to be established in McEwin building: It is proposed that a total of 12 monitoring units will be available for use in these areas.
- (c) General recovery areas: It is proposed that a total of eight monitoring units will be available in these areas.

When all the new areas are equipped and occupied a minimum of 34 monitoring units will be available, and it is considered that these will be adequate for the requirements at that time.

EGGS

Mr. FREEBAIN: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about egg-grading charges in other States?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports:

The South Australian Egg Board's grading agents deduct 6c a dozen for the handling and grading of eggs. Of this amount 5.821c a dozen is retained by agents to meet handling, grading and administration costs and to provide a margin of profit. The remainder of .179c a dozen is remitted to the board. The charges a dozen for grading and handling in other States are as follows:

Central Queensland	4c
South Queensland	4c
New South Wales	6.3c
Victoria	5c
Western Australia	4.25c
Tasmania	3.7c

The board emphasizes, however, that it is not in possession of information on the services rendered by grading floors in other States; therefore, it is not able to make accurate comparisons. The board is aware of changing conditions within the industry, and at present it is investigating the whole basis of payments to grading agents.

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked recently about progress being made by the Highways and

Local Government and the Engineering and Water Supply Departments on the plan for the metropolitan area drainage scheme?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Local Government reports:

No metropolitan drainage board has been formed during the last three years. A draft Bill was prepared to create such a board by the previous Government but was not proceeded with. A meeting of councils was arranged about two years ago, at the instigation of the then Minister, to discuss drainage. The outcome of this meeting was a defined policy on metropolitan drainage, the main points being as follows:

- (1) drainage is basically the responsibility of local government;
- (2) local government is responsible for the design and preparation of drainage schemes;
- (3) such schemes, if submitted to the Commissioner of Highways, will be checked to ensure integration with the overall plan; and
- (4) subject to the priority of any scheme submitted and the availability of funds, the Government will consider a 50 per cent subsidy of the actual or estimated cost of the scheme, whichever is less.

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: In reply to a question I recently asked of the Minister of Marine about deepening the berths and channel at the Wallaroo harbour, the Minister said, among other things, that other ports which were awaiting urgent works had been allocated a higher priority than had Wallaroo. In last week's issue of the *South Australian Farmer* appeared the following report:

Ship Diverted From Outport: A Norwegian phosphate rock ship has been diverted from Wallaroo to Port Lincoln because she was drawing too much water. Protests have been made to the Marine and Harbors Department by shopkeepers in the area, who claim that considerable business has been lost. Seamen usually make extensive purchases at their first port of call, they said.

They also contended that shipping interests at Wallaroo say the ship could have berthed safely. The Wallaroo Harbourmaster said he was acting on orders. Shipping authorities believe that the minimum depth under the keel of an incoming ship required by the Marine and Harbors Department is unrealistic.

Will the Minister ascertain from the Director of Marine and Harbors whether this ship could have berthed safely in the Wallaroo harbour? Further, as this is not the first case in which a ship has had to be diverted from Wallaroo because of the depth of water, will

the Minister also ascertain whether the minimum depth of water under the keel of a ship, as required by the department, is realistic, and will he re-examine my previous request to have the berths and channel deepened?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Appreciating the member's concern in this matter, and in an effort to help him ascertain these facts, I will certainly call for a report and see whether something can be done in this regard, especially in connection with the depth of water required and the draughts of the types of vessel to which he has referred.

BROKEN HILL ROAD

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question about the Adelaide to Broken Hill Road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I think it will be very acceptable to the honourable member. The Minister of Roads reports that the date for the opening of the Barrier Highway is Thursday, November 7, in the vicinity of Yunta. The guest list is in course of preparation and it is intended to invite the honourable member. An official invitation will be sent to him later.

UNDERGROUND WATER

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about underground water?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: For a number of years the Mines Department has been systematically repairing uncontrolled artesian wells in the Great Artesian Basin, and there is still a substantial rehabilitation programme ahead. In December, 1967, an area of 1,500 square miles was proclaimed under the Underground Waters Preservation Act in the Robe-Kingston-Lucindale area. In this area there is a substantial number of flowing bores, which are currently being assessed for appropriate rehabilitation to prevent wastage.

PORT IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my question of July 25 regarding facilities at fishing ports in the South-East?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The specific details sought by the honourable member are as follows:

Port MacDonnell	Estimated date of start of work
(a) Marking wreck of "Tenterden"	March, 1969
(b) Provision of concrete dinghy ramp . .	mid-December, 1968
(c) New navigation light on jetty	March, 1969
(d) Provision of 200ft. of berthing space on east side of jetty	February, 1969
Beachport	
(a) Decking 105ft. gap between crane platform and widened section of jetty, north side	mid-October, 1968
(b) Fendering south face of crane platform to provide alternative space for unloading fishing boats	February, 1969
(c) Re-fixing displaced dinghy mooring platform from (a) on north side of jetty immediately seaward of slipway	November, 1968
(d) Providing low-level dinghy mooring platform on north side of jetty	March, 1969
(e) Lowering dinghy ramp between bents 28 and 29	late November, 1968
Robe	
(a) Provision of toilets for fishermen	February, 1969
(b) Provision of dinghy mooring area, piled timber walkway and retaining wall, etc.	March, 1969
South End	
(a) Provision of 150ft. of low level dinghy mooring platform on jetty extension (in three separate lengths)	Work in hand
Cape Jaffa	
(a) 500ft. extension of jetty	October, 1968

However, a number of these jobs will have to wait until the winter weather is over as they involve work over the water which would be continually hampered by rough seas if attempted before October. An extra gang will also have to be recruited as the permanent South-East gang is fully occupied on the extensions to the jetties at South End and Cape Jaffa. With regard to the slipway at Port MacDonnell, a suggestion has been made by certain fishermen at that port that if the slipway rails were "humped" so that they were above the level of the beach in the area of high-water mark, seaweed in its travel southwards would pass under the rails rather than accumulate against them. This suggestion is being investigated, but it is very doubtful whether a worthwhile gap below the soffit of the rail beams would be possible, as the level of the rails where they cross the public road and also at the toe of the slipway could not be raised for obvious reasons. Nothing further is being done about achieving a greater depth of water in the approach to the slipway from seaward, as every possibility in this direction has already been fully explored with no result. Before the slipway was built, it was realized by all concerned, including the fishermen, that it would have limitations, but the plea at the time was that it would be better than no slipway at all.

COOBER PEDY POLICE STATION

Mr. EDWARDS: When I visited Coober Pedy recently I was asked when the new police building would be erected. The accommodation for the police officer at that town is extremely limited. I believe that a new police building has been mooted for some time, and also that a promise was given that the appointment of an extra police officer would be considered. I consider that in a town with a population of about 1,500 people, especially with the type of people resident there, it is essential that an extra police officer be appointed as soon as possible. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to consider these requests?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to get a report for the honourable member.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I point out that Coober Pedy is in my district. As I have made representations for some time for the appointment of police officers at Coober Pedy and improvement in their accommodation, will the Premier include me in his answer when he replies to the member for Eyre?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to do that. I must admit that, when the question was asked, it never occurred to me that this matter affected the honourable member's district. I now recollect that Coober Pedy is

in the honourable member's district and I remember visiting this station when I went to Coober Pedy several years ago.

McRITCHIE CRESCENT SCHOOL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the McRitchie Crescent Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As the honourable member will know, it was decided during the last summer, on the recommendation of the Water Conservation Committee, to restrict the grassed areas in schoolgrounds to actual competitive playing fields and some small areas in front of school buildings. The Public Buildings Department was advised of this decision and requested to report on the most effective means of consolidating ungrassed areas to overcome the dust problem. The rubbing of all ungrassed areas was recommended. When the McRitchie Crescent school committee disagreed with this, the Public Buildings Department was again consulted and stated that, contrary to the committee's opinion, rubbing was an effective means of controlling dust. It was stated further that, properly consolidated, it would not constitute any danger to children and that weed growth could be easily controlled.

The matter of the extent of grassed area has been further considered and, in view of the high percentage of migrants at McRitchie Crescent, it has been decided to allow for a soccer pitch in addition to the Australian rules oval. Allowing for a small perimeter, a total area of four acres may now be grassed. Although the cost of water at Whyalla is higher than that anywhere else in the State, the economics of the proposal had no bearing on the decision to restrict the grassed areas. The policy was introduced because of the need to conserve the State's limited water resources both at Whyalla and elsewhere.

COONAWARRA TOURISM

Mr. RODDA: I have received a communication from the people at Coonawarra, who point out that their town is playing an important part not only in the wine industry but also in the tourist industry of this State. They say they have had many visitors at the Coonawarra Estate. In fact, the visitor's book for the period January 2 to June 30 contains the signatures of 744 adults, with yet another 65 in July, making a total of 809. They say that, with prominent notices along the road through

Coonawarra, one cannot miss it when travelling along the Naracoorte to Mount Gambier road, but it is amazing how many visitors say they have difficulty in locating the road to take to get to Coonawarra. Some travel from Adelaide along the Coorong and find that when they reach Robe they have another 60-odd miles to travel across country to get there. All stress the fact that Coonawarra should be shown on the map, and they have asked that something be done about placing it on all future South Australian road maps and seeing that it is suitably sign-posted to assist people travelling through the Millicent area. Can the Minister of Immigration and Tourism comment?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I recognize the growing importance of Coonawarra as a centre of winemaking and tourist interests. The suggestion seems to be cogent, and I will examine it to see whether some arrangements can be made to accede to the honourable member's request. Apart from other things, it will entail working out just who is to carry out the type of reform the honourable member seeks. I will do what I can to see that this is done.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on August 6 concerning the Highbury and Hope Valley sewerage scheme?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Progress on the approved Highbury and Hope Valley sewerage scheme has been slightly delayed by the wet weather experienced in recent months. The scheme, however, is almost complete. The only sewers remaining to be constructed are several short reticulation sewers in and adjacent to Grand Junction Road in the vicinity of the Bremen Hotel. It is now expected that the approved scheme will be completed by about the end of August.

UNSOLD HOUSES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Housing an answer to my recent question concerning unsold Housing Trust houses?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the trust states that, as at August 8, 214 houses built by the trust under its house sales scheme remained unsold. This compares with about 500 at the same time last year.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I am pleased that the Minister is able to report that the trust has shown improved figures at this stage of the

year over the same period last year regarding unsold trust homes. However, I would have expected that the movement into the Elizabeth area during the last four months of Commonwealth Army and Air Force personnel would have had some impact on the numbers of this type of house being sold by the trust. So that members may be provided with a fair comparison, will the Minister ascertain how many homes have been provided in the last four months for Commonwealth Army and Air Force personnel?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be happy to do that. As the honourable member will recall, I simply gave him the figures: I did not comment on them. However, I will now have the matter examined in the way suggested by the honourable member.

SULTANA VINES

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands an answer to my question of August 1 regarding sultana vines?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports:

The press release referred to by the member for Frome concerns nematode-resistant rootstock, as distinct from commercial scion varieties. South Australia, because of its long-standing quarantine protection of the viticultural industries against imported pests and diseases, has never had to use rootstock for the successful culture of grape vines. All of our vines, including sultanas, have in the past been grown simply and cheaply from rooted cuttings without the expense of grafting a scion variety onto a rootstock type. The Chief Horticulturist reports that nematode-resistant vine rootstocks bred in U.S.A. have been introduced into South Australia by the Phylloxera Board under strict quarantine conditions for research purposes. These are the same rootstocks referred to as being "developed" by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. These rootstocks are being tested for suitability to our soils and climate in South Australia. The rootstocks are currently undergoing multiplication for research as to compatibility and performance.

ROAD FINANCE

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, an answer to my question of August 1 concerning councils' contributions for roads?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads reports:

Contributions required from councils for grants made to them from highways funds vary according to benefits to be derived by the State, as opposed to purely local benefits. Local roads, which are arterial as between districts, could be subject to a lower or no

contribution in relation to one that carried purely local traffic. There is a need for the adoption of a uniform policy for the whole State, and some investigations to develop an acceptable system have been made in the past. However, until a complete classification of the existing road system into specific types, that is, national routes, State highways, main roads, district roads and others, has been carried out, a uniform policy cannot be developed.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. ARNOLD: On June 6 last I had the pleasure of being present at probably one of the most interesting and informative meetings I have ever been to: it was at Berri and concerned the Chowilla dam project. The Premier, Sir Thomas Playford and the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) addressed the meeting. As a result of that meeting it was decided to form the Chowilla Promotion Committee. Can the Speaker say what plans the committee has for enlightening the public further at this stage on the benefits to be derived from this vital project?

The SPEAKER: Following the meeting at Berri, which I thought was one of the most magnificent meetings ever held in South Australia for the progress and future development of the State, this House has been unanimous in its decision that this project should go ahead, as honourable members well know. In accordance with the motion carried at Berri, I have written to every South Australian Senator and member of the House of Representatives, most of whom have acknowledged receipt of the letter, which, in accordance with the resolution, was pressing for the Chowilla dam. The position as regards the committee at present is that I have written to several bodies, which have indicated their support and willingness to serve on it. I have not yet received a final answer from one or two bodies which have yet to nominate their representatives on this committee. When that has been done, the committee will be called together as soon as possible and then we shall work out plans for publicity and public relations and the steps the committee intends taking to make this project a reality in the interests of South Australia.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General yet obtained a report from the Minister of Transport about the progress of work on the standardization of gauge on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line and when the work is likely to commence on the Solomontown over-pass

section? If he has not the answer now, after three weeks, will he be kind enough to explain to the House the reason for the unusual delay?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will pursue the matter.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General referred my question about the standard gauge railway line and the over-pass at Port Pirie to the Minister of Transport?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Of course.

COMPREHENSIVE INSURANCE

Mr. RYAN: Some time ago a constituent of mine approached me about comprehensive insurance. I handed the relevant documents to the Leader of the Opposition who, in turn, passed them to the Attorney-General for consideration. A reply was received from the Attorney-General's Office by the Leader of the Opposition, who in turn passed it to me for consideration. Rather than give the name of the constituent and of the insurance company at this stage, I will give merely the file number of the matter—A.G.O.197/68. The particulars of this case are that my constituent went to an insurance broker, who issued a third party insurance certificate for a car to be registered: in fact he issued a cover note on behalf of a certain insurance company. Some time later my constituent, on inquiring, discovered that no insurance policy had been issued by the broker; nor had the premium been forwarded to the insurance company concerned. The Attorney-General's letter to the Leader of the Opposition states, in effect, that the insurance company is considering accepting liability in the event of accidents. The Attorney-General suggested in his letter that my constituent again approach the company and that, if satisfaction was not obtained, the matter could be referred back to him for further inquiry. My questions to the Attorney-General are as follows: (1) If a cover note is issued by a broker in the name of an insurance company, should not the insurance company immediately accept liability, because somebody has issued that cover note in its name? (2) Why should the insured person or the client suffer in matters such as this? (3) Is prosecution of the insurance broker pending, and has his licence been cancelled—because there are several other cases involving the same broker and the same insurance company?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be glad if the honourable member will privately give me all the names and every particular that he can in the matter. He has already given

me some. Matters of this nature are causing me considerable concern. At this moment I will not try to answer the three specific questions asked but point out that whether a company is bound depends on the authority of the agency and whether the company has held out a particular broker as its agent. This can be a complicated legal matter. I shall be only too happy to follow it up if the honourable member has any further information he can give me and, in any case, I will prepare an answer to his questions for him.

PHYLLOXERA BOARD

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to a question I asked on August 1 about meetings of the Phylloxera Board and the publication of the board's report?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The following information has been supplied by the Acting Secretary of the Phylloxera Board:

The membership of the board has not been altered in numbers since the inception of the Act. In 1966, however, the boundaries of some districts were altered to give more representation to the river areas at the expense of other areas which were consolidated. Districts are now:

No. 1—Central—Adelaide Plains and South of Adelaide.

No. 2—Barossa.

No. 3—Waikerie—Lower Murray District.

No. 4—North Murray District—Barmera, Berri, Renmark, etc.

No. 5—South Murray District—Loxton, Moorook, etc.

No. 6—Northern District—Clare, Watervale.

No. 7—South-Eastern District—Coonawarra.

Since the alteration in boundaries the board has met on the following dates: April 21, 1967, July 12, 1967, December 14, 1967, June 7, 1968, July 10, 1968, July 23, 1968. The matter of regular reports by the board is being further investigated.

DISCRIMINATION

Mr. CORCORAN: Last week the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier a question about allegations that the managers of some Adelaide hotels had refused to provide accommodation for coloured people. The Leader asked the Premier to have this matter investigated urgently and to see whether there was any foundation for the allegations. He further asked whether, if the allegations were proved, action would be taken. In the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, I now ask the Premier for a reply to that question.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sorry that this report is not yet available. However, it is on the current list and is being obtained.

AIR POLLUTION

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question on clean air regulations?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Following discussions with management of the various industries concerned, a final draft of regulations for the control of dark smoke has now been prepared and will be considered at the next meeting of the Clean Air Committee, to be held on August 29 this year.

BERRI CHANNEL

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply to my recent question regarding the enclosure of a departmental main channel that surrounds on three sides the Greek Orthodox Church in Berri?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This church was built in 1967 without reference to the Lands Department and before the Minister of Lands had given consent to the transfer of the land on which it is built. There are over 60 miles of open channel in the Berri irrigation area and, whilst endeavours are made to replace open channels with pipe main within township areas as the opportunity arises and as funds are available, it is not intended to extend this policy outside town areas. The persons responsible for building the church were well aware of the proximity of an open channel when they selected the site. I believe that the Greek Orthodox Church community in this instance preferred the site near the open main channel to a township allotment fully serviced and protected. It is considered, therefore, that if any protective measures are now needed to safeguard the interests of children or other members of the congregation, then it is the responsibility of the church authorities. In these circumstances, although I appreciate the sincerity of the inquirers I cannot at present agree to the replacement of the channel by pipes. No objection will be raised if the church arranges for some form of covering over the channel, provided that such covering can be removed when channel cleaning and maintenance is needed. The cover should be transparent, possibly a wire mesh. Better still, the church could provide sufficient protection if the boundaries of the land were adequately fenced.

CUDLEE CREEK SANCTUARY

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question on foxes in sanctuaries?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Forests states that the declaration of forest areas as fauna sanctuaries does not necessarily prohibit the destruction of vermin in them. The department does not intend to vary its policy of taking all reasonable action to control vermin on forest areas. Regarding the area mentioned at Cudlee Creek, I am sure that the department will be willing to co-operate with responsible people who desire to help implement this policy.

AUBURN CROSSING

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question concerns the road-rail crossing about two miles north of Auburn. As I have asked several questions about this crossing in the last few years, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Transport whether there are plans to rebuild it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know the crossing well, and I will certainly ask my colleague about this matter.

PORT OF LONDON

Mr. RYAN: I am not sure whether my question should be addressed to the Minister of Marine or to the Minister of Immigration and Tourism. During the weekend, the member for Semaphore and I attended a function at which the guest was Mr. Webb, who is the Australian representative of the Port of London Authority. One of his express purposes in being in Adelaide was to talk about, and show films of, the Port of London and the development that will take place there. He said that my colleague and I should have been invited to the exhibition of the film at the Tourist Bureau yesterday morning. He was amazed that we, who are vitally concerned with containerization and other harbour problems, had not been invited to see this film. Can the Minister concerned tell me who was invited to see the film? Also, is it not the usual practice to invite the people greatly concerned to attend such functions?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: As Minister of Marine, I will meet Mr. Webb, who is representing the Port of London Authority, in about half an hour. I regret that the usual courtesies were not extended to the honourable members concerned. In fact, I knew of this film only a few days ago, and I regret that I have not had an opportunity to see it. I am not sure who prepared the guest list for this function, but it certainly did not come to me. However, I assure the honourable member that, in the case of any films or information on matters of this type of

which I become aware in the future, I will certainly see that the members concerned are included when invitations are issued. Although I am not sure whether any opportunity exists for this film to be shown again, I will certainly inquire to see whether this can be done so that as many members as possible can be invited to see it. As the film deals with containerization and as I know the particular interest of the member for Port Adelaide in this matter, I personally regret that some oversight in the issue of invitations has occurred: I will see that a similar oversight does not occur in future.

FIREARMS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about silencers for firearms?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The question of legislation dealing with silencers is presently being considered.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about returns received as a result of operations of the Totalizator Agency Board?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have a table which includes the information sought of Government revenues from T.A.B. since its inception. As the table includes many figures, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

T.A.B. REVENUES TO THE GOVERNMENT

	1966-67	1967-68	To 30/6/68
	\$	\$	\$
Commissions paid to Treasury	88,469	642,240	730,709
Commissions in transit	7,896	4,551	12,447
Fractions	20,511	134,337	154,848
Unclaimed dividends (net)	—	38,465	38,465
Margins on Broken Hill investments	—	442	442
	<u>116,876</u>	<u>820,035</u>	<u>936,911</u>
Less reimbursement for 5 months to clubs for loss of winning bets tax	—	66,345	66,345
Net	<u>116,876</u>	<u>753,690</u>	<u>870,566</u>

Reimbursement to the clubs will continue for seven months of 1968-69 and amount to a further \$85,180.

THEVENARD FOOTBALL MATCH

Mr. HURST: During the weekend, I read in the newspaper of a considerable disturbance at a football match at Thevenard, which is in the district represented by the member for Eyre. In view of the interest being displayed in the posting of police officers to various places, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to see whether there are sufficient policemen at Thevenard to control the apparent unruly behaviour of constituents of the member for Eyre? Also, will the Premier suggest to the member for Eyre that he look after his own backyard and not worry about other members' constituencies?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is a commendable amount of fraternization in the House today. I believe this started last week when the member for Frome asked a question about a district other than his own. I see

that this practice has become fashionable; the support being offered by members on both sides of the House is certainly leading to a middle course. I shall be pleased to get a report for the honourable member.

HOUSE FOUNDATIONS

Mrs. BYRNE: I refer to the cracking of houses built by the Housing Trust in the Holden Hill area, which matter has been dealt with in correspondence between the Minister of Housing and myself. A letter of July 25 from the Minister contains this paragraph:

Earlier this year, when the trust considered the possibility of excessive soil movement in new areas of development, particularly in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide, consideration was given to families who had purchased houses from the trust with the assistance of lending authorities as well as those

who purchased houses under the trust's rental-purchase scheme. It was decided at the time that where excessive soil movement had taken place, resulting in fractures of the brickwork, the trust would relieve purchasers of their obligation to purchase a house, buy out the first mortgagee, and permit the purchasers to remain in occupation as a tenant of the trust.

Can the Minister say whether, in the event of some families accepting the trust's offer to re-purchase, thus buying out the first mortgagee, this will exclude those families from qualifying for a future bank loan on a new house from the Savings Bank of South Australia, the State Bank, or any other lending authority?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Each application for a second loan is considered on its merits and those that are, in the opinion of the Treasurer and his advisers, considered justified are granted. I am quite happy to consider any such applications on their merits, but I would not say at this point of time, by way of a blanket answer to the question, that everyone would be permitted to take out a second loan. However, I shall certainly consider applications as favourably as possible.

MILLICENT RAILWAY YARD

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Transport about reconstruction of the Millicent railway yard?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. I am glad the honourable member has asked the question. The Millicent station yard was inspected a few days ago by an officer from the Railways Department, who reported that there were a few pot holes in the roadway which required attention. Instructions have been issued to have the holes filled as quickly as possible.

WHYALLA OCCUPATION CENTRE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the Whyalla Occupation Centre?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: A contract was let for these works to Arthur Hall, Ackson & Co., Port Pirie, on June 25, 1968. Preliminary setting out of the work was commenced on August 1, 1968, and drainage pipes have been positioned. Unfavourable weather conditions have caused a little loss of time, but the contractor has given an undertaking that, subject to favourable weather conditions, the work will be completed by the end of this month.

WINNING BETS TAX

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about the winning bets tax?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall not have time now to give the honourable member all the figures and I ask leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

REVENUE FROM WINNING BETS TAX

1966-67	\$
To March 31, 1967	700,856
April to June, 1967	308,921
Total	1,009,777
1967-68	\$
To March 31, 1968	606,820
April to June, 1968	249,790
Total	856,610

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Totalizator Agency Board operations commenced on March 29, 1967, and the winning bets tax was removed from the stake from February 1, 1968.

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:

Clovercrest Primary School,
Marden High School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of the committee and notified the selection of its representatives.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank honourable members for their courtesy in allowing me to give the second reading explanation without delay. This will give them an opportunity to examine the Bill with this explanation. Its purpose is to resolve a somewhat anomalous situation that has arisen in relation to the sale of carcasses by organizations that buy cattle for slaughter. In the past

these organizations have generally sold these carcasses in a broken-down state and this sale did not attract cattle stamp duty under the Act. However, there is a growing practice of selling whole carcasses to butchers, and as the Act is at present framed this sale of whole carcasses attracts duty. The amendments proposed exempt from duty sales in these circumstances of whole carcasses and in addition relieve the organization from the liability to make returns in relation to these sales but, as a corollary, impose on the organization the onus of demonstrating that in any particular case duty under the Act is not payable.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for compensation for loss arising from measures to eradicate fruit fly. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

I appreciate the strong support I have received from members in allowing me to suspend Standing Orders. This Bill is in similar form to the Acts passed in previous years, its object being to enable the payment of compensation for losses arising from the campaign for eradication of fruit fly. A proclamation relating to the fruit fly outbreak at Port Augusta was made in December last year under the Vine, Fruit and Vegetable Protection Act and, as members know, the practice has been for compensation to be given for losses arising by reason of any act of officers of the Agriculture Department within a proclaimed area.

Clause 2 accordingly provides for such compensation and compensation for loss arising from the prohibition of removal of fruit from land in a proclaimed area. Clause 3 fixes the time limit for lodging claims at August 31. This date, fixed as a closing date for claims last year, proved satisfactory. It is expected that about 200 claims (one commercial) will be made, and the cost of compensation is estimated at about \$3,000.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to confer on the Registrar of Motor Vehicles power to delegate his administrative powers and functions not only to a deputy registrar, as the law at present allows, but also to other officers in accordance with directions given by him. The need for this Bill has arisen out of the Full Court decision in a recent case in which the Crown failed because the delegation of a power by the Registrar in the ordinary course of his administration was held to have no statutory support. The Motor Vehicles Act technically requires the Registrar to perform a number of functions, which he is obliged for administrative reasons, to delegate to certain officers and the main object of this Bill is to give statutory support for such delegations.

Clause 2 (a) amends section 7 (2) of the principal Act by enabling the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to delegate to officers, besides deputy registrars, power to act on his behalf in matters he allots to them. Paragraph (b) validates any past actions done by officers on behalf of the Registrar in pursuance of his directions, and paragraph (c) is a consequential provision that extends the definition of "the Registrar" to include any officer lawfully acting or deemed to have lawfully acted on behalf of the Registrar and any officer who, whether before or after the Bill becomes law, has acted in any matter in pursuance of and in accordance with directions given by the Registrar.

Mr. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank the House for its indulgence in allowing me to suspend Standing Orders to enable me to give the second reading explanation forthwith. The object of this Bill is to simplify the evidentiary provision at present contained in section 13 (c) of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963. That paragraph at present provides that a certificate or document purporting to be issued pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Act or any corresponding previous enactment or pursuant to any corresponding legislation or ordinance of any

State or territory of the Commonwealth that states the load capacity of a motor vehicle or trailer, or the maximum permissible gross weight of a motor vehicle or trailer together with the load that may be carried thereon, or the tare weight of a motor vehicle or trailer shall be *prima facie* evidence of the matters so stated.

Under that provision, therefore, in a prosecution under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act in which a document issued by or on behalf of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is relied on, it would be necessary to establish that the document had been issued pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Act. This requirement should not be necessary, especially as the document might well be issued for the purposes of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act. It is also not always strictly correct to describe the legislation of another State pursuant to which documents referred to in paragraph (c) of the section are issued as "corresponding" legislation, for the reason that, even though legislation having much the same effect has been enacted in other States and Territories of the Commonwealth, it may have variations that may not always "correspond" with the South Australian legislation.

Clause 2 accordingly strikes out paragraph (c) of section 13 of the principal Act and inserts in lieu thereof two new paragraphs (c) and (ca). Paragraph (c) gives evidentiary value to "a document purporting to be signed by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles or by a person acting on his behalf or by a person deemed pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1968, to have acted on his behalf", whereas paragraph (ca) gives the same evidentiary value to "a certificate or document purporting to be issued pursuant to any enactment of a State . . . or of any Territory of the Commonwealth". The amendments proposed by this Bill will not prejudice any defendant but will simplify the procedures relating to prosecutions under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act.

Mr. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1957. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time

Its object is to confer (a) on a Minister of the Crown a general power to delegate his statutory powers and functions to a person under or within his Ministerial control; and (b) on a public servant, a person appointed to a statutory office or a statutory body, a general power, with Ministerial approval, to delegate his or its statutory powers and functions to some other person within the same administrative control. The need for this Bill has arisen out of a Full Court decision in a recent case where the Crown failed because a necessary delegation for administrative reasons of a power or function by the head of a department had no statutory support, and the Government has been advised that, in view of the decision in that case, all delegations made for such or similar purposes should have statutory support.

Clause 2 of the Bill inserts a new section 36a in the principal Act. Subsection (1) of the new section confers the general power of delegation on a Minister of the Crown. Subsection (2) confers the general power of delegation on a public servant, a person appointed to a statutory office or a statutory body. Subsection (3) enables the delegation to be general or limited. Subsection (4) enables the delegation to be revoked or varied by the person who made the delegation.

Subsection (5) provides that a power or function so delegated may be exercised or performed by the delegate: (a) in accordance with the instrument of delegation; and (b) if the exercise or performance of the power or function is dependent on the opinion, belief, discretion or state of mind of the person who made the delegation, in accordance with the opinion, belief, discretion or state of mind of the delegate. Subsection (6) provides that a delegation does not prevent the exercise of the delegated power or function by the person who made the delegation. Subsection (7) provides that the new section applies to: (a) all Acts that come into operation after the Bill becomes law; and (b) any Act that is presently in force to which the section is by proclamation declared to apply. Subsection (8) provides that the new section does not derogate from the operation of any provision of an Act to which that section applies.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

EVIDENCE (AFFIDAVITS) ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Evidence (Affidavits) Act, 1928. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this short Bill is to enable proclaimed bank managers to take affidavits for use in any court in the State. At present the principal Act provides for only justices of the peace to take affidavits. Although the Oaths Act, 1936, enables proclaimed bank managers to take declarations and attest the execution of instruments, it does not enable them to take affidavits for use in the courts. The inability of proclaimed bank managers to take affidavits for use in the courts gives rise to difficulties in country areas where a justice of the peace may not be readily or conveniently available. There seems to be no good reason why proclaimed bank managers should not be authorized to take affidavits, and the Bill provides accordingly.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Aboriginal Affairs Act, 1962-1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, which is in the nature of a Statute law revision Bill, is designed to bring the Aboriginal Affairs Act up to date so that the Act may be reprinted under the Acts Republication Act, 1967. Clause 2 amends section 7 (7) of the principal Act by including therein, in addition to the reference to the repealed Public Service Act, a reference to the Public Service Act, 1967, thus bringing the subsection up to date. Clause 3 amends section 16 (3) of the principal Act so as to apply its provisions to officers who have been appointed and are holding office either under the old Public Service Act or under the Public Service Act, 1967, whichever is for the time being applicable. Clause 4 repeals section 30 of the principal Act, which contains amendments to certain sections of the repealed Licensing Act

that are obsolete anyway. The amendments are of a formal nature and do not alter the policy of the legislation.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGED AND INFIRM PERSONS' PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is in the nature of a Statute law revision Bill designed to enable the principal Act to be reprinted under the Acts Republication Act, 1967, with all amendments incorporated. When the Act was being prepared for reprint it was discovered that certain provisions were obsolete or referred to obsolete enactments. Section 7 (2) contains a reference to the Inebriates Act, 1908-1934, which is now obsolete as that Act has been repealed by the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act, 1961. Clause 2 accordingly strikes out a reference to the repealed Act. Section 30 of the principal Act contains references to the Mental Defectives Act, 1935-1939, the title of which has since been altered to Mental Health Act, 1935-1967. The section also contains references to orders under section 10 of the Inebriates Act. These references are also obsolete, as it was not intended that similar orders were to be provided for under the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act.

Clause 3 (a) accordingly amends section 30 by substituting in subsection (1) a reference to the Mental Health Act in place of the references to the Mental Defectives Act and deleting the reference to an order under section 10 of the Inebriates Act. Clause 3 (b) amends section 30 by substituting in subsection (1) (a) a reference to the Mental Health Act in place of the reference to the Mental Defectives Act. Clause 3 (c) amends that section by striking out subsection (1) (c). This paragraph is also obsolete, as it refers to an order under section 10 of the repealed Inebriates Act. Clause 3 (d) substitutes in subsection (2) (a) of that section a reference to the Mental Health Act in place of the Mental Defectives Act. Clause 3 (e) strikes out subsection (2) (c) of the section, which is also obsolete as it refers to an order under section 10 of the Inebriates Act. Clause 3 (f) strikes out another reference to an obsolete order under section

10 of the Inebriates Act. The amendments are of a purely formal nature and do not alter the policy of the Act in any way.

Mr. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

OATHS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a Statute law revision Bill. The definition of "bank" in the original Act of 1936 refers to the Banking Companies Act, 1935, which was repealed in 1946. The definition is therefore no longer applicable. The Bill defines "bank" as "a bank within the meaning of the Commonwealth Act providing for the carrying on of banking business in Australia, but including the State Bank and the State Savings Bank which, being engaged in State banking, are not subject to Commonwealth legislation".

Mrs. BYRNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 6. Page 484.)

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): It is indeed a pleasure and a delight to be able to say, in association with my colleagues, that I accept in principle the 47-seat plan proposed by the Government. But in case someone thinks that, by saying that, I mean that we accept the whole proposal, I point out that that is not so. However, we believe that in a spirit of compromise it should be possible to reach a reasonable agreement that will enable South Australia once again to take its rightful place in Australia's democracy. Indeed, did not South Australia assume its rightful place in 1894 when women in this State were given the right to vote? Last Tuesday evening I had the pleasure of hearing the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) say that, with this Bill, we had come a long way towards achieving electoral justice in South Australia, but he also said that we had a suspicious mind.

Many members on both sides have said that the electoral system in South Australia is not just. There is no need for me to tell the House what we think of the electoral system that has existed in South Australia for many years. However, as previous speakers

on this side of the House, and as you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have said, let us approach this matter in a spirit of compromise. You, Sir, said that no-one could say that the present system was a good one, and we would agree entirely. After 30 years of electoral boundary manipulation, I think any reasonable man would agree that the Labor Party in this State was justified in suspecting any electoral reform Bill sponsored by the Liberal and Country League. We remember with some horror the L.C.L.'s proposals of 1933, 1936, 1955 and 1963, which sought to perpetuate a system that denied basic justice to a man in his right to elect the Government of his choice and to dismiss that Government if he so desired.

The principle supported by the Labor Party is that, as each citizen is equal in the sight of the law, he should have a vote of equal value to the vote of each other citizen in electing the legislators who make that law. Therefore, in our view State electoral districts should have, as nearly as practicable, an equal number of voters. In order to carry out this policy and preserve to the country districts of South Australia the number of members needed to serve them as members of Parliament, the Labor Party put forward a plan for a 56-member House. Our object was to retain for country areas the same voting strength as they now have. However, the Opposition at that time (the Party now in Government) did not agree to this move. As we did not get, under the present unfair electoral system, the necessary overwhelming vote at the State elections to ensure the passing of a 56-member proposal (although we obtained 53 per cent of the total vote), in an endeavour to get something approaching electoral justice we agreed to compromise and suggested a 48-member House on a ratio of four State seats to every Commonwealth seat in the new Commonwealth redistribution. However, in the light of proposals that have since been made it is clear that the Party on this side has accepted the plan put forward by the Government for a 47-member House, which is very close to the 48-member proposal put forward by the Labor Party with no other object than to get some just electoral set-up in this State.

In fairness to the Government, I will say that it has come a long way towards achieving what my Party considers to be electoral justice. Although we do not agree that having 47 seats is ideal, we accept the proposal in the spirit of compromise adopted by the Government, and we hope that out of this will come

an electoral system that can be an object lesson to other States. I might add that in Committee I propose to move an amendment on one aspect. The system that has operated in this State for many years has been manipulated over the years to serve the interests of one political Party. I agree that it has been operated by an expert. Not only was he an expert in South Australia—I believe the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) agrees with me—but he also went to Queensland a few years ago and set up a good system there. I believe the Liberal Party in Queensland is very happy with the set-up there. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), when speaking on this Bill the other day, said:

I do not think country people's interests are very much different from those of city people. We must work together, because the prosperity of one group depends on that of the other. Consequently, one might ask why we cannot be governed on the one vote one value principle.

I heartily agree with those remarks, because that is the system that the Commonwealth Government has used in drawing up the new Commonwealth electoral boundaries in South Australia. Of course, in a couple of instances the country quotas are greater than the city quotas. I consider that the Commonwealth electoral commission has been very fair as regards Commonwealth electoral boundaries in this State, for it has recognized the principle of one vote one value, which is something that the Labor Party has been advocating for a long time.

Mr. Jennings: It is a fundamental principle.

Mr. BURDON: Yes, one on which all Parliamentary elections should be held. That system operates for Senate elections, and there is no reason why it could not operate in State elections. Although we have agreed that some tolerance should be allowed in fixing quotas, we do not agree that there should be a difference of 100 per cent, which could occur under this Bill.

Mr. Rodda: Those are the extremes, aren't they?

Mr. BURDON: Yes, but just because South Australia has been used to extremes for 30 years is no reason for wanting to see these extremes continue for the next 30 years. We believe that, no matter what people are engaged in or where they live, they are equal in the eyes of the law and should have equal voting rights. All people who break the law are treated the same, and on that basis everyone should have the same opportunity to make the

laws. That is the fundamental principle under which electoral justice should be brought about in this State.

Mr. Casey: The members opposite believe it, too, but they are afraid to say so.

Mr. BURDON: I have my suspicions about members opposite. However, a heartening note was sounded at its conference the other day. The only other comment I wish to make on that point is that the Liberal Party does not allow the doors to be opened to the press, whereas with the Labor Party conferences press and television representatives are admitted and anyone else can attend.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the honourable member should return to the Bill.

Mr. BURDON: If I was straying, Sir, I accept your admonition. However, I believed that what I was saying was relevant to the Bill. I was about to deal with the Legislative Council, and the Bill contains some reference to the Legislative Council.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. BURDON: I heard one member opposite (I do not know who) say that we go to Trades Hall to get our orders, but that is not so. We do not take orders from anybody. At the annual conference delegates from all parts of South Australia make decisions that will be in force for the next 12 months. The Party's policy appears in the rule book, which we are proud for everyone to see. Everyone can see the policy laid down.

Mr. Hudson: The press is admitted in open conference.

Mr. BURDON: Yes, press and television representatives and members of the public are admitted.

Mr. Hughes: We have nothing to hide.

Mr. Hudson: And we don't have press reports written by public relations officers.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Tell me one thing—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order! If the honourable member addressed the Chair he might make a better speech.

Mr. BURDON: I was talking about the possible 100 per cent difference between city and country electorates. We have had extremes before, and we do not want this situation to continue. There appears to be no need for me to say that, except for one South Australian newspaper, every newspaper in Australia has commented on our electoral situation.

Indeed, some have gone so far as to suggest that the Hall Government should not be recognized. I have also been shown a copy of an editorial that appeared in a newspaper published in Christchurch, New Zealand, in which appeared the following:

We believed we were behind Australia politically. However, it would appear that in one Australian State, i.e. South Australia, they have a system we put behind us 20 years ago.

In an editorial headed "The Challenge of Democracy" in the *Northern Review* of July 26, 1968, appeared the following:

One of the greatest challenges facing a democratic people is to achieve democracy. Most South Australians erroneously believe they live under a democratic system, yet under scrutiny the very constitution of its Parliament proves to be undemocratic. One of the many points which came out of a seminar at Jamestown last Sunday is worthy of much closer inspection.

The State's Constitution can be changed only by a constitutional majority in both Houses of Parliament. There is no provision for voters to accept or reject any proposed change. And worse, the machinery is there for any faction which controls both Houses of Parliament to alter the Constitution so that it cannot be removed by the voters.

That is the situation we have had for a long time. The article continues:

This serious situation presents a number of challenges, cutting across Party politics and sectional interests.

The challenge to the Jaycee movement is to take up a basic anomaly which has been revealed by the seminar it conducted—not one of Party politics, but one of human rights. They are in a position to draw the attention of all State politicians to the fact that a change is needed. The challenge to both political parties is to put aside their differences as well as their own interests and to rectify this undemocratic aspect of the Constitution under which they function. Both Parties have indicated they are seeking a just and equitable voting system, but this is an even more basic issue to which they should give priority. The challenge to every member of Parliament is to put the interest of his or her constituents above his own and those of the Party. If necessary surely an amendment can be introduced as a private member's Bill. The challenge to every individual entitled to vote is to bring the anomaly to the attention of his or her local members and bring pressure to bear for action. Any structure is only as substantial as its foundations and no system of government can be regarded as democratic unless it has a democratic constitution.

That is something that we in this State have been preaching for some time. The challenge before this Parliament is to give South Australia an electoral system that will stand not

only scrutiny in the next year or two but also the test of time in years to come. This is something the people of South Australia are waiting for. I shall not deal with the electoral systems operating in other States. Those figures were given in detail by the Leader of the Opposition last Tuesday, so I need not ask to have them incorporated in *Hansard*, as they are already there.

However, I should like to say one or two things about some proposed amendments to be submitted by my Party during Committee, all of which we believe will go far to enabling a series of compromises to be reached in this House on electoral reform. First, I deal with clause 4 of the Bill, which provides that, should any commissioner die or be unable to perform his duties for any period, the Governor may appoint any person to act as a deputy. Such a person would, while acting as a deputy, have the full power of a commissioner or, if deputy to the Chairman, of the Chairman. As the Bill stands, there is no limitation on who may be appointed as a deputy. The Bill should be amended to provide that the replacement for the Chairman should be another judge of the Supreme Court, the replacement for the Surveyor-General should be the Deputy Surveyor-General, and the replacement for the Returning Officer for the State should be the Deputy Returning Officer.

Clause 5 has the provision that effectively gives the Chairman of the commission a veto over any decision of the commission. It is, as it stands, an insult to the Returning Officer for the State and the Surveyor-General because, should the Chairman disagree with the other two, the view of the latter cannot prevail. Clause 5 (1) should be amended to provide that, in the absence of the Chairman, the commissioners present shall appoint one of their number to preside; subclause (2) should be amended to provide that any two commissioners shall constitute a quorum, and subclause (3) should be amended to provide that a decision of the commission is valid if it is concurred in by any two commissioners.

Clause 7 defines the metropolitan area and, as it stands, the definition excludes the area of the corporation of Gawler. Gawler corporation includes virtually only the township of Gawler and does not extend into the surrounding countryside. Gawler township was included in the definition of the metropolitan area brought in by the commission established by the Playford Government in

1962. The terms of reference for that commission were written in such a way that it had to make its own determination. Clearly, if Gawler was part of the metropolitan area on a reasonable interpretation in 1962, the same would hold even more strongly today.

Mr. Rodda: You are going against the M.A.T.S.

Mr. BURDON: We will deal with the M.A.T.S. later; we have dealt with the problems of the extremes. This clause also requires the commission to exclude any land adjacent to the boundary of the metropolitan planning area which at the end of seven years is likely to be substantially or predominantly used for the business of primary production. The legal effect of "substantially or predominantly" is that "substantially" could be taken to mean less than 50 per cent. In other words, if 30 per cent of some land at the end of seven years was likely to be used for primary production, it should be excluded. Obviously, this would permit the exclusion of land from the metropolitan area where substantial residential development had taken place. We are, therefore, advocating the deletion of the words "substantially or" from clause 7 (2).

Clause 8 contains directions to the commission in subclauses (2), (4) and (6), whereby the commission, in making calculations, must disregard any fraction. On the other hand, subclause (3) requires the commission in making a calculation not to disregard any fraction but to calculate the figure to the nearest integral number. For the purpose of consistency of interpretation, we are suggesting amendments to alter "disregarding any fraction" in subclauses (2), (4) and (6) to "calculated to the nearest integral number". The effect of this amendment is of significance in only subclause (4).

The provision in subclause (3) that the metropolitan quota is calculated by adding 15 per cent to the State quota gives rise to the average number of electors in metropolitan seats being about 15,000. This provision, together with the definition of the metropolitan area, will result in the average number of electors in metropolitan seats being some 60 per cent in excess of the average number of electors in country seats. This figure should be compared with the average excess of 30 per cent that applies in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. It is proposed to amend subclause (3) so that the metropolitan quota would be determined by adding 10 per cent to the State quota, which would give an average figure for metropolitan seats of 14,300

and an average figure for country seats of 10,000. The average excess of metropolitan over country seats would thus be reduced to 43 per cent. While this figure would still be in excess of that applying in the Eastern States, it would be in accordance with the present spirit of compromise.

Subclause (7) provides for a tolerance of 10 per cent on either side of the quota for metropolitan seats, and 15 per cent for country seats. There is no substantial reason why the tolerance applying to country electorates should be any different from that applying to metropolitan seats, and we propose to amend Section 7 (b) to alter 15 to 10. Subclause (8) has the provision enabling adjustment to take place to Legislative Council boundaries. As this is a Bill which deals purely with the House of Assembly, no adjustments even of a minor nature should be permitted to the boundaries of Legislative Council districts. There is no doubt that such boundaries need reform but they should be the subject of a separate Bill and not "fiddled" in any way by a provision of this Bill. In other words, all we are asking is that the House of Assembly be dealt with separately from the Legislative Council. I understand that the Government may, in the foreseeable future, move to give full adult franchise to the Legislative Council voters. This is in accordance with our policy and we welcome it.

At present the Constitution Act requires that Legislative Council districts shall consist of whole Assembly districts. When the report comes back from the commission, it will be necessary to remove this provision from the Constitution Act because, if Legislative Council boundaries are to remain unaltered, they will no longer consist purely of whole Assembly districts. In addition, further amendments will be necessary to the Electoral Act to permit a returning officer for a House of Assembly seat to act as an assistant returning officer for more than one Legislative Council district should it be the case that his particular Assembly district straddles a Legislative Council boundary. So long as any new subdivision lies entirely within an existing Assembly district, no real problem will arise. The voters in any particular subdivision will all lie within the same Legislative Council district.

Clause 9 is the clause setting out the matters that must be considered by the commission. It is intended to add to subclause (1) (a) (iv) the words "and the trend of population" so that the commission will have to take into

account likely population growth. Without such a provision, the seats created by the commission close to the boundary of the defined metropolitan area would get out of line with other seats rapidly indeed. As one of the reasons for the great debate on the need for electoral reform has been the extent to which Assembly districts have got out of line with one another, any Bill which hopes to establish a permanent settlement of this question must guard against similar distortions occurring in the future.

Clause 9 (2) would, as it stands, permit the commission to use the full country tolerance in order to include a complete country seat within a particular Assembly district. This subclause also needs amendment, as the need to avoid cutting up a country seat should not be carried to the extent that there is a substantial departure from the country quota. We hope that this Bill will provide a satisfactory electoral system for South Australia in future, and that we will not continue to have a situation in which people are continually grizzling about electoral injustice. I hope that the Bill will continue to be debated in a spirit of compromise and that it will pass this House. Of course, the legislation to be introduced after the electoral commission makes its report will really determine the type of electoral system we are to have in South Australia.

As I said earlier, I do not intend to go over many figures that have already been quoted. However, I wish to point out that, under the Bill, there could be a difference of 100 per cent between the number of people living in a country district and those living in a metropolitan district. If one takes the extremes (and I use the word "extremes" because we have had to put up with extremes for the last 30 years in this State), a country district could have a population of 8,199 and a metropolitan district a population of 16,453. New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland provide for metropolitan seats which have, on the average, only 30 per cent more electors than country seats. Victoria and Queensland both provide for provincial cities with quotas in excess of those for rural seats. In Queensland, provincial cities have more electors, on average, than metropolitan seats.

Victoria allows only a 10 per cent variation from any quota, while New South Wales and Tasmania allow 20 per cent. Queensland and Western Australia have cases where the tolerance appears to be greater than 20 per cent

from the appropriate quota. Tasmania combines one vote one value and proportional representation. The Western Australian system provides for heavy weighting of some country districts. I understand that three seats in the north-west of Western Australia have between 1,800 and 2,700 electors. New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland have systems almost identical to the proposal made by the Labor Party for South Australia in respect to the type of tolerance given to country voters. Our principle is that there should be effective equality and voting power for all the citizens of the State. For adequate representation to be given to country areas, the Assembly would have to have more than 47 members. Of course, that is why we wanted to retain for the country 26 districts, as we provided in our 56-seat proposal. However, that system was decried by the Government. We are prepared to compromise on a 47-member House and to give weighting to country areas to ensure that they receive adequate service. At the same time, we believe there should not be a great departure from the principle of one vote one value.

The average weighting between metropolitan and non-metropolitan seats in the Eastern States is about 30 per cent. However, to provide for a difference of between 60 per cent and 100 per cent is far too great a departure from the basic principles of democracy. We are prepared to support the Bill at the second reading stage, believing this to be a good basis for discussion. Originally we proposed a 56-member House. Later we said that we would compromise. The Opposition suggested a 45-member House and we suggested 48 members; we have now agreed to accept 47 members. If both Parties can reach a compromise on one or two other matters, the State should have an electoral system of which it can be proud and which can serve as an example to other States.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): The member for Mount Gambier was so fulsome in his praise of the Bill that my suspicions were aroused. I must say that I have never been entirely happy about the Bill because it has been introduced as a compromise between Liberal and Country League and Socialist principles: I believe it is a compromise between L.C.L. principles and evil. Listening as carefully as I could to the member for Mount Gambier, I thought he referred three times to a 47-member House. Twice he was enthusiastically in favour of the Bill and said

he intended to support it, but on the third occasion he had his reservations. I am afraid I shall have to wait until tomorrow, when I read the *Hansard* proofs, to give the honourable member's speech the thoughtful study it no doubt deserves. I have maintained that, in this House, no two members indicate the necessity for small rural districts more than do the members for the Districts of Millicent and Mount Gambier. Each district has about 8,000 electors at present, and it is evident that neither member knows the present boundary of his district, because the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle) and I had to find out where these boundaries were during the campaign in Millicent two or three months ago. We have heard much about Birdland in the past few weeks, and perhaps I might amplify, because what happened showed clearly that Labor members are not able to represent their present small country districts. How much less will they be able to represent larger districts if this Bill for a 47-member House is passed? Before the by-election campaign in Millicent, Liberal and Country League representatives in Mount Gambier told us that Birdland, in the District of Millicent, had not been canvassed by the L.C.L. team.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member not to pursue that line of argument. I do not see in the Bill a clause relating to Birdland.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for drawing my attention to that, but the point I was making, with the greatest possible respect to you, was that the two members did not know their present boundaries, although each district comprised only about 8,000 electors.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must return to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I did not hear the ruling you gave, Mr. Speaker, because your remarks were drowned out by interjections from the Socialists opposite. Anyway, thanks to the L.C.L. organization in Mount Gambier, the people of Birdland now know that they are in the District of Millicent, not the District of Mount Gambier. I think we should praise the L.C.L. organization for having shown the two Labor members where the boundaries of their districts are. The enormous size of country districts was brought home to me forcibly before the last election, when I was in the District of Eyre helping Mr. Edwards, then the endorsed L.C.L. candi-

date. We spent a week travelling as quickly as we could from town to town, yet we were able to traverse only half of that district.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the clauses of the Bill. The last election has nothing to do with those clauses.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am trying to amplify the point that country districts now are, if anything, too large to be adequately represented by a member, and I want to stress that the issue at stake is representation of the people. This arithmetical nonsense of one vote one value is unreasonable and cannot apply in real life. We have heard much from members opposite about one vote one value and why the Party that gets 51 per cent, 52 per cent or 53 per cent of the votes should be in power. However, every member knows that Parties are not mentioned in the Electoral Act or the Constitution Act and that a person casts his vote for a candidate. If he follows a card when he is inside the polling booth, that is his own private business entirely. The claim that a Party that obtains the percentage of the votes that I have mentioned has a mandate to be the majority Party in the House of Assembly is sheer nonsense. I will now quote from one of my favourite newspapers, dated June 27, a report describing the electoral win of Mr. Trudeau, in Canada.

Mr. Ryan: Do you still get the *Tribune*?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am pleased to get that interjection because, although I do not take the *Tribune*, I get much interest from reading it from time to time. By keeping myself up to date with the latest Socialist thinking in the *Tribune*, I have been able to keep at least one year ahead of the Labor Party's Grote Street convention. However, I do not want to embark on this aspect, which is so dear to the heart of the member for Port Adelaide. I shall come back to Mr. Trudeau and keep to the speech as I have planned it.

The SPEAKER: As long as you speak to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being advised to speak on the Bill. I was only rebutting some arguments advanced by members opposite, because those arguments have a very real bearing on the Bill. You and I, Mr. Speaker, as representatives of country people, have a real stake in the Bill. The report states:

Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau's Liberal Government swept back to power today with 154 out of the 264 House of Commons seats in Canada's general election.

With my little understanding of arithmetic, I think those figures represent a fairly big majority for Mr. Trudeau in the Canadian House of Commons. The report goes on:

It is the first majority Government elected in Canada for 10 years. Preliminary figures on the nation-wide popular vote showed the Liberals won 46 per cent and the Conservatives 31.

I am quoting the popular press. In reply to and for the edification of members opposite, I point out that Mr. Trudeau's Party gained only 46 per cent of the popular vote, yet he gained 154 of the 264 seats. I cannot but compare Mr. Trudeau with our present Attorney-General (Hon. Robin Millhouse): both are brilliant personalities and brilliant lawyers, and both make a fine contribution in their spheres. I turn now to France and, in referring to the results of the elections held there, I am trying to make out a case to point out to Labor members that all this business of winning a few per cent more than 50 per cent of the popular vote is nonsense. A report in the *Australian* of July 2 states:

In the provisional figures given today for 485 results the Gaullists won 299 seats.

I will repeat those figures so that they may sink in to the minds of members opposite: of 485 seats in the Chamber of Deputies, DeGaulle won 299. The report continues:

With their allies, the Independent Republicans, they control 355 out of the 487 seats.

This is the king-hit for members of the Socialist Party opposite:

Although the voting was slightly less heavy than the 80 per cent turnout for the first round on June 23—

members opposite will know that there is a two-ballot system in France—

the Gaullist vote was nearly 46 per cent, compared with 47 per cent the previous week.

Although DeGaulle had only 46 per cent of the popular vote he now controls 355 out of the 487 seats. This should be sufficient evidence for members opposite to accept the fact of life that merely having a majority of the popular vote in the Lower House does not entitle a Party to claim that it should rule the Treasury benches. We have heard much from the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) about one vote one value and how essential it is to have an electoral system based on that principle. If I had a reasonable command of shorthand I could have taken down his most effusive remarks about this principle but, as I do not have it, I am impelled to turn to the Australian Labor Party's constitution to find how one vote one

value applies to it. That constitution determines the candidates who are endorsed by the Party and, as members opposite would maintain, decides who sits as Labor Parliamentarians. Members opposite would say that those who vote for Labor candidates are voting the Labor ticket. From the constitution we find how the Party endorses its candidates, and it is a most remarkable story: there is no essence of democracy in it.

Mrs. Byrne: Why not stick to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am talking of one vote one value, and I am replying to remarks by the previous speaker and two other Socialists who have claimed that the Labor Party believes in one vote one value, whereas it does not. I now quote clause 26 of the constitution.

Mr. Casey: Is that the latest rule book?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, it is not, because I cannot afford 50c every year and the Secretary of the Labor Party does not have the courtesy to send me the numerous amendments made each year at the convention. Clause 26 provides:

(a) Representation at convention shall . . . be on the following basis: Members of affiliations (including sub-branches) who have paid the prescribed sustentation fee—

I do not know what "sustentation" means.

Mr. Hudson: Look it up in the dictionary.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The clause continues:—shall be entitled to representation on the following basis:

- 25 members and over—one delegate.
- 150 members and over—two delegates.
- 250 members and over—three delegates.
- 350 members and over—four delegates.
- 500 members and over—five delegates.
- 750 members and over—six delegates.

The complete lack of the principle of one vote one value is shown in the contents of this rule book.

Mr. Hudson: If we didn't write that you wouldn't be able to make a speech.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I will come back to the member for Glenelg later if he keeps interjecting. The clause continues:

(d) The State and the Federal Parliamentary Labor Parties shall each be entitled to representation by one delegate.

All these other unions have many representatives at the convention, yet the State and Federal Labor Party are represented at the convention by only one delegate.

Mr. Hudson: Are you going to say something about your convention?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, I will.

Mr. Jennings: Were you on the side of Hall or DeGaris?

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member for Enfield on the side of Standing Orders?

Mr. Jennings: Well, yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed much latitude in this debate. As this is a matter of tremendous public interest in South Australia, it is necessary for a little latitude to be allowed to members. I have allowed the honourable member for Light a fair amount of latitude, but I now ask him to come back to the Bill. I do not think that the Australian Labor Party's constitution has any reference to this Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I very much appreciate what you have said, Mr. Speaker, and I heartily agree with it. Following your valued and proper remarks I say that members opposite have been making a great play about the principle of one vote one value, and I was merely pointing out to them that this principle did not apply in the halls where the A.L.P. policy is made. Members of that Party believe in one vote one value where they think it is to their electoral advantage, but nowhere else. I know that the vote of the member for Glenelg is worth nothing at the A.L.P. convention, because all members opposite are represented by only one vote at the convention, whereas every member of a trade union is entitled to a representative vote. That shows how little the A.L.P. values its Parliamentary members. I stress that the principle of one vote one value does not apply in the A.L.P. As members opposite, and you, too, Sir, have said, there has been much widespread public interest in this Bill, and representations have been made to me and, I think, to you, Sir, and other members, by various Parties putting forward their plans for electoral reform.

Mr. Ryan: The Labor Party never approached you.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am making a speech and I think it would be fair to allow me to contribute to this debate. In referring to a letter written by the leader of the Social Credit League, and published in a newspaper, I bring it to the attention of the House because I believe that, in a democracy, minor Parties and minor interests should be represented. The A.L.P. believes that everything should be subject to it and to its socialistic plans, but it seems to me that the leader of the Social Credit League deserves to have his views expressed in this Chamber. That league has no representative in this House, but its views on electoral reform are not too dissimilar to those expressed by you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Riches: Do you support them?

Mr. Hudson: Will you cross the floor?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: One of my colleagues has pointed out that the Social Credit League supports the A.L.P. This is yet another group that backs the A.L.P. The letter, which criticizes our single-member constituency system, is as follows:

The single electorate system can never truly reflect the voter's wishes, even if all areas had an equal number, and the Social Credit League will continue to press for the adoption of the best system yet devised, proportional representation, for all elections.

I think there is a case to consider for proportional representation in the Upper House, if not in the Lower House. I see, Sir, that I now have the rapt attention of every Socialist member opposite, because proportional representation was A.L.P. policy until a few years ago, when the Trades Hall barons decided to change the policy. Of course, members opposite were not even invited to express their opinions about the change from proportional representation to single-member constituencies. The change was made as a result of the fragmentation of the A.L.P. seven or eight years ago. By having single-member constituencies the Socialist Party thought it would keep splinter groups out. Another letter was published, and I hope every member of this House—

Members interjecting:

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am making this speech, and I will tell members opposite where I stand before I finish it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light was elected a member of this Chamber, and is entitled to the same privileges and rights as is every other member of this House. Interjections are out of order, and there have been far too many of them. Honourable members must respect the right of the honourable member for Light to speak on this Bill. I have allowed a certain amount of latitude in regard to this Bill. When the honourable member refers to single-member constituencies he is within the scope of the Bill. I do ask honourable members to allow the honourable member for Light to make his speech in his own way.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I was interrupted I said that I would make it clear where I stood on electoral reform before I had finished. I think there is a case for proportional representation; it ensures that these minority groups are represented in this Parliament. I am

sympathetic to the amendment that has been foreshadowed by the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott). A few days ago a letter was published in the popular press from Miss Edith Casely, Secretary of the League of Women Voters of South Australia, who also represents a minority group. The letter, which made out a case for proportional representation, is as follows:

This system calls for large electorates returning, say, five or seven members instead of only one. For example, nine electorates might return five members each. The electorate returning only one person is incapable of ensuring representation of all citizens. Any change in boundaries, or simply more members of Parliament, is not reform but a patching of an ineffective system. The suggestions made by the two Parties appear to the public to be designed for their benefit rather than for the good of the State. This would be amusing if it were not so serious for democracy.

Although I have reservations about proportional representation for a House that has the Treasury benches, I believe there is a strong case for proportional representation in the Upper House in order that minority Parties (and I am thinking of the Democratic Labor Party and the Communist Party) can be represented in the Legislature in some way. One or two members opposite are trying to ridicule the whole idea because they do not want to be worried about minorities. Provided they have an absolute majority somewhere, that is all they care. I think I have dealt carefully with the A.L.P.'s internal election system. The Communist Party is the only Party we have not yet considered very much this afternoon—and it is a responsible Party that is entitled to be heard in this place. The fact that it does not return a member to this House does not indicate that it is an inconsiderable force in South Australia.

I took the trouble last Tuesday to go to the Communist Party's office-cum-bookshop and obtain a copy of its constitution. I thought it was only fair that, if the A.L.P.'s constitution was ventilated *ad nauseam* and if the L.C.L.'s constitution was to be quoted, we should in all democratic fairness consider that of the Communist Party too. The only point I could not find in its constitution was how it endorsed its Parliamentary candidates. I bought a copy of the Party's constitution for 10c, and I immediately noticed a remarkable similarity between it and the A.L.P. constitution. The Communist Party's constitution states:

The Communist Party of Australia is a voluntary union of people who actively support the objective of the Party, Socialism.

This is on all fours with A.L.P. policy. The constitution continues:

The party is based mainly on the working class, which is the most decisive class in the movement for Socialist change.

Members on this side of the House believe they are workers, too. The constitution states that the Communist Party works for:

expanded democracy and the creation of all the conditions necessary for the full physical, moral and cultural development of the individual.

Members opposite are strangely quiet, so I can only assume that they are listening intently. The constitution continues:

It will co-operate with other organizations and persons for the realization of these goals. Of course, although the Party is small and does not have a chance of returning a member to this place, it makes its contribution at election time by giving its preferences to the A.L.P. Just before the last election the Communist Party made its stand clear, when it again published in the popular press a voting guide for its supporters, which reads:

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.

I remind members opposite that this was supplied by the Communist Party, which is ramming for members opposite, and it is members opposite who would deny that Party and any other minority Party representation in this Parliament. The article 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.

This was said in the popular press by Mr. Moss, the Secretary of the Communist Party, just before the March election. The article 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.

At this point I think I shall leave the subject of the Communist Party in connection with the Bill now before the House.

Mrs. Byrne: Were the Communist Party's preferences allocated?

Mr FREEBAIRN: I do not believe the preferences of any of those Communist Party candidates were allocated in favour of any Labor Party candidate, but this has happened in South Australia, and I believe it happened

to a member who later became a Minister in the last Labor Government. He got into the House of Assembly on the preferences.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Mr. Shard did.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, he came into the House of Assembly on the preferences of a Communist candidate. Let no member opposite say that the voice of the Communist Party is not loud in the halls of the Australian Labor Party. No member opposite can say that his Party believes in one vote one value, because it does not. Every member on this side of the House wins his pre-selection on the basis of a one vote one value popular ballot of members of the L.C.L. in his own district, and perhaps the less we say about how members opposite are endorsed by their Party, the better it will be. I was greatly amused to hear the member for Barossa say something about Labor candidates being endorsed only because they had given years and years of good and faithful service to their Party. My friend the member for Frome was a member of the L.C.L. when he was endorsed by the Labor Party! The member for Glenelg had only just landed in Glenelg when he was endorsed, and the member for Port Pirie had only just landed in Port Pirie when he was endorsed.

Mrs. Byrne: Don't you think they had done something somewhere else?

The SPEAKER: Order! I should be pleased if the honourable member would tell me the clause in the Bill relating to the member for Frome and the member for Port Pirie.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I was speaking rather generally. The electoral systems applying in other States have some bearing on this Bill, and I do not think anyone can say that we must disregard the way in which those systems work. I think the member for Glenelg, when he was speaking, went in some detail into the electoral loadings obtaining in other States. Perhaps I should refresh the memories of members opposite concerning how the Liberal and Country Parties have been elected in other States under the various electoral systems. The member for Mount Gambier tried to prod me a little by referring to the gerrymander which he alleged the Liberal and Country Party Government had forced on the people of Queensland. However, it occurs to me that the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party is elected to Parliament basically on a one vote one value system. Although the commissioners may apply a 20 per cent tolerance, Commonwealth L.C.P. members are elected on a one vote one value

system, and they have been in office in Canberra for most of my adult life. I was only a schoolboy when the Socialist Party was swept out of office in Canberra, and I have really known only a Liberal and Country Party Administration in the Commonwealth sphere.

Mr. Casey: You don't act as an adult now.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister of Works prompts me to the effect that the L.C.P. has been in power in Canberra now for 19 years, but I believe it has been in power for 20 years. The Liberal and Country League coalition has been in power in Victoria for nearly 12 years, and its majority is bigger now than it has ever been. The Liberal and Country Party is solidly in power in Western Australia, and it increased its majority in New South Wales at the last election. In South Australia, for most of the last 68 years, the right-wing Parties have been in power. Although there was a long dismal period of Socialist Administration in Queensland, that Administration was so right-wing that eventually it hived off from the Australian Labor Party and called itself the Queensland Labor Party. Indeed, I carefully noted that the member for Glenelg referred to the Queensland Labor Party and not to the Queensland Branch of the Australian Labor Party.

We find in Tasmania that the Labor Party in power is so right-wing that it is virtually indistinguishable from a Liberal and Country League Administration. Everyone knows that the system of proportional representation obtaining in Tasmania (and I hope that is not the system that you, Mr. Speaker, envisage for South Australia)—I believe it is the Hare-Clark system, or a variation of that system—is such that the Liberal and Country Party Opposition has to obtain almost a 10 per cent majority over and above Socialist votes in order to gain power. I appeal to the Labor Party to try to resolve some of the differences and breaches existing within its organization, because I believe that true democracy will be achieved only if the A.L.P. can present a good and solid Opposition. In some States, the Labor Party is so weak as almost to be a non-Opposition. When I was planning my speech for Tuesday last—

Mr. Clark: Surely this is not a prepared speech!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Members opposite are just being rude.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It's rubbish, that's all.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If members opposite listen quietly, I shall complete my speech sooner. It is only because of their interjections and interruptions that I cannot complete it. I am trying to give members opposite some good advice in order to make the democratic system in South Australia work better than they will let it work now. I noticed in the *Australian* when I arrived in Adelaide from the country last Tuesday that Mr. Whitlam had been rather roughly treated by his Commonwealth organization.

Mr. McKee: Is there anything in the Bill about Mr. Whitlam?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am trying to tie up my remarks, and if the honourable member does not interrupt so rudely I shall do so. Members opposite, who are Socialists, do not believe in free speech. We have seen that this afternoon. The article in the *Australian* states:

The Labor Party yesterday bound its 69 Federal M.P.'s—

and I ask the House to note that it states "bound" those members—

including its Leader, Mr. Whitlam, to support the proposed electoral redistribution in all States.

The article refers, of course, to the Commonwealth redistribution, and continues:

The Federal Secretary (Mr. Wyndham)—I think he used to call himself "Mr. Isaacs"; he changed his name, because he thought "Wyndham" would be more advantageous politically.

Mr. Clark: Would you say that outside the House?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I read about it in that Labor-orientated paper, the *Bulletin*. The article continues:

The decision is binding on all members of the Labor Party.

It means Mr. Whitlam must now abandon his announced intention to urge Labor M.P.'s to oppose the proposed new boundaries for New South Wales. For him to pursue such a course after yesterday's decision would irrevocably lead to his dismissal as Leader.

In other words, if he does not do what his Party hierarchy tells him to do, he will get the axe. On the same day I read that the Parliamentary Labor Party in South Australia had met to discuss the Bill. I saw this in the popular press, the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, August 6, an article in which states:

The attitude of the Opposition to the Government's proposals for electoral reform will be announced today—

This is the joke, Sir—

Labor parliamentarians have been studying the proposals since they were introduced by the Premier (Mr. Hall) in the Assembly on Thursday. They will meet again this morning.

In other words, members opposite went through a show of trying to make the public believe that they were coming to some decision on the 47-member House. Everyone knows that the Trades Hall has spoken loudly and firmly and that the Labor Party will support the 47-member House proposal.

Mr. Clark: Don't be too confident about that.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: They might make a show, but there is no doubt in my mind that when members opposite get their orders they take those orders or they get the axe. On the last major breakaway they had in South Australia, we found after the following election that two or three Labor Parties were represented in the House of Assembly, and members opposite know that they will not risk another split of that magnitude because it took the Labor Party 27 years to recover.

Mrs. Byrne: You axe your members in pre-selections.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I expected that members opposite would make some reference to the United States Supreme Court ruling that State Legislatures in the U.S.A. had to be redistributed on the one vote one value principle. To give some background to this, I refer to an article in the *Time* magazine of May, 1967, which I commend to members opposite.

Mr. Clark: Another pro-Labor paper!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is pro-Democratic in American terms, or pro-Socialist in terms that we would understand here. This article is well worth listening to, because it will give members opposite something to think about tomorrow when they have a chance to study the pulls with care. It states:

To listen to Everett Dirksen—

The minority leader in the United States Senate—

1984 is just around the corner. "If the effects of this decision are not remedied," declaimed the Senate minority leader last week, the result may be "a centralized all-powerful, leviathan Federal Government, clothed with power to convert citizens into subjects, and gradually shear away the freedoms they once knew."

From the doomsday tone of Dirksen's Senate speech, it was not easy to deduce that he was talking about reapportionment. For the fact is that since 1962, when the Supreme Court issued the first of a series of "one-man, one-vote" rulings designed to redraw state legislatures and congressional districts, the effects have been surprisingly salutary. Of the 99

legislative branches in the 50 states (Nebraska has the only unicameral legislature), 93 have been reapportioned since 1962. Oregon voluntarily reapportioned both houses, but in 1961.

Dirksen is determined to enact a constitutional amendment that would over-rule at least part of the one-man, one-vote doctrine by permitting the states to select one house of their legislatures on a basis other than population. Twice, his efforts to push such amendments through the Senate were defeated by seven votes. Now the Illinois senator is off on a different tack.

I am reading this to give members opposite the latest information on the one vote one value theory as it applies in the United States. Indeed, I am surprised that more has not been made of this ruling by the United States Supreme Court to illustrate the one vote one value principle as it could apply in South Australia. The article continues:

A total of 32 state legislatures have approved petitions urging Congress to call the first state-summoned constitutional convention in U.S. history to modify the reapportionment rulings. Only two more endorsements are needed to raise the total to two-thirds of the states, and Dirksen claims: "We've got six states, possibly seven, where the opportunity is good." Ohio is one of them; Iowa, whose lower house has already approved the petition, is another. Even should Dirksen line up the required 34 states, however, there is no certainty that a convention would ever meet. Some critics note that the petitions are invalid because they are not identical. Others point out that some of the legislatures that approved them have since been reapportioned, and that the petitions may thus be worthless.

Politically, Dirksen's distaste for the reapportionment ruling is puzzling, since it has helped Republicans more than it has hurt them. Initially, political scientists thought that the state legislatures would see a swift, drastic transfer of power from rural areas to the predominantly Democratic inner cities. Power has indeed flowed away from rural representatives—but to suburbia, where political loyalties are still in flux and Republicans are more often elected than Democrats.

"The suburbs and, in the long run, only the suburbs, will gain in the upheaval resulting from reapportionment," said William J. D. Boyd of the National Municipal League two years ago, and he has been proved right. In state elections last year, Republicans gained 45 new seats in reapportioned legislatures v. 25 for the Democrats. In Pennsylvania, ultra-conservative upstate Republicans were replaced—but by other Republicans, from the suburbs of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. In Illinois, Chicago and several downstate counties lost six seats apiece in the legislature, while Chicago's suburbs and exurbs picked up all twelve and filled them largely with Republicans. Throughout the South, the Grand Old Party has gained strength in state legislatures. Tennessee now has 41 Republican legislators—the most in this century; in North Carolina,

their number has grown from 15 to 33; in Kentucky, from 22 to 36. On the national level, G.O.P. candidates won only 40 per cent of the seats in the House of Representatives during the 1962 mid-term election, even though they collected 48 per cent of the votes.

I leave the quote there to again point out to members opposite that the Republicans gained 40 per cent of the seats in the House of Representatives in 1962, even though they received 48 per cent of the votes. I emphasize that to again make it quite clear to members opposite that this business of winning a certain percentage of votes cannot be translated to a certain number of seats in the Legislative Chamber. It continues:

Last year, after nearly two-thirds of the states had redrawn their congressional districts to make them more nearly equal in population, Republicans increased their share of House seats to 43 per cent while increasing their share of the vote only to 48.3 per cent.

There is another example of how Party voting cannot be translated to actual seats in a Legislative Chamber, and they cannot be translated to seats in the Legislative Chamber with the single member constituency system; it is only under a system of proportional representation that that can be done.

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

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Before the adjournment, I was quoting from an article in *Time* which illustrates some of the problems caused by the one vote one value ruling in the United States. The article continues:

In the state legislatures, most rural representatives feared that reapportionment would mean an influx of city slickers who would, as one Illinois representative put it, "run roughshod over downstate wishes."

Political Greenhorns. Reapportionment, clearly, is not going to prove a quick and easy solution to the myriad ills currently plaguing the American states. For one thing, rural representatives still control most committee chairmanships by virtue of seniority. For another, many of the reapportionment legislators—though generally better educated than the men they replaced—are political greenhorns. No less than 40 per cent of Arkansas' state representatives are first-termers; in Utah, 56 of the 97 house and senate members are freshmen; 25 of Nevada's 60 lawmakers are sitting in the legislature for the first time. "It may be two or three legislatures from now before the new crop of lawmakers gain the experience necessary to make the system work," says a political veteran in Tennessee.

Even when the lawmakers do acquire the necessary savvy, reapportionment alone cannot be expected to solve the problems of the nation's cities and states. Any marked improvement in the quality of government can only

reflect the quality of the men and women who are sent to the state capitals from the newly created legislative districts. In that sense, reapportionment is not so much an end as a beginning.

In a later issue of *Time* (April 12, 1968), I was able to find a further comment on this one vote one value system in which attention was drawn to the fact that the Supreme Court judgment had a much wider sphere of interest than, doubtless, their Honours thought at the time they brought it down. This article is headed "The Supreme Court. One Man, One Vote, Locally", and states:

State legislatures got the one-man, one-vote reapportionment treatment from the Supreme Court four years ago. Last week the court used the equal-protection clause of the 14th Amendment to extend one-man, one-vote to city, town and country legislatures as well. Looking askance at the voting districts of Midland County, Texas, Justice Byron White spoke for a 5-to-3 majority. "The equal-protection clause" he said, "reaches the exercise of state power however manifested, whether exercised directly or through municipal subdivisions of the state. If voters residing in oversize districts are denied their constitutional right to participate in the election of state legislators, precisely the same kind of deprivation occurs when the members of a city council, school board, or county governing board are elected from districts of substantially unequal population."

In the case of Midland, a member of the commissioners court was elected from each of four districts but the one who represented almost all of the city of Midland had many times as many constituents as the three rural representatives put together. As a Midland resident, Mayor Hank Avery objected, and filed suit. Since the commissioners were regarded as the general ruling body of the county by the Supreme Court majority, it had no hesitation in halting the rural over-representation. It did note, however, that a different conclusion might be reached in the case of "a special-purpose unit of government assigned the performance of functions affecting definable groups of constituents more than other constituents." If, for instance, the commissioners in Midland had been concerned only with rural roadbuilding, apportionment "in ways which give greater influence to the citizens most affected" might be permissible. The court also recalled two of its decisions last term:—

and the cross reference here was "*Time*, June 2", but when I checked that issue I found that this particular article had not been printed in the Australian edition and obviously appeared only in the American edition—

one, citing the "basically appointive" nature of a county board of education, approved its selection by delegates elected from districts of unequal population, the other upheld a plan that gave each of seven unequal districts a resident city councilman but required that they

be elected by a citywide ballot. Such limitations could significantly cut down the number of legislative bodies affected by the court's new decision, but government experts estimated that 20,000 local units would still be involved. Some had already adjusted districting after the state-legislature decision, but many have not. The aftermath of *Avery v. Midland County* will probably be as dramatic—and chaotic—as was the aftermath of the initial one-man, one-vote decision, particularly since the court again chose not to specify how close to the equal-population ideal a districting plan must come to be acceptable.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Didn't they decide that redistricting should take place as far as practicable?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is rather difficult to get much worthwhile reference in this country to the result of the American Supreme Court's decision. However, in reply to the interjection, I believe that the Court did declare that redistricting should take place with, as near as practicable, equal districts. However, judging from the references in *Time*, it would seem that "as near as practicable" is so wide that one can drive a horse and cart straight through it. I hope that, when members get their copies of *Hansard*, they will pay a little attention to those references from *Time* magazine.

Mr. Hudson: A highly academic source.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not know about that, but it is the only source of American political information readily available to me. I believe there are other excellent American political commentaries but that our library does not take them. If the honourable member cares to write to the Library Committee suggesting that the Parliamentary Library take further American political literature, I shall be pleased indeed to support his representations.

Moving away from the American scene, I wish again to go back to the idea of one vote one value, in which our friends opposite pretend to believe so fervently but as yet do not seem to carry out in their own backyards. In the Parliamentary Library, I found *The British General Election of 1966* by Butler and King. At the end of the book in the appendices the authors quote the result of the peculiar English system of having single men constituencies and using a single cross vote. Great Britain does not enjoy our most excellent system of preferential voting. If the vote cast for the candidate of one's choice does not elect that candidate on the first count, one does not have a second, third or subsequent preference, so one's vote is completely wasted.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: And it is voluntary voting.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes; that is one thing about the English system that impresses me much, and I consider that the electoral system in South Australia and in the Commonwealth of Australia would be greatly improved by its introduction.

Mr. Hudson: What is your Party's policy on voluntary voting?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Voluntary voting appeals to members of the L.C.L., because they do not believe in compulsion. However, that system does not appeal to members opposite, because they believe in compulsion: they believe that if you cannot attract voters to the polls you have to compel them to vote.

Mr. Broomhill: Is it your Party's policy?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My Party does not normally make Party decisions of this kind.

Mr. Clark: It did over the weekend, didn't it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: They are not Party decisions: they are general recommendations. My Party places members of Parliament at the top level in the Party structure, whereas Labor Party members of Parliament are merely dummies, put there to carry out trade union edicts. On my side of politics, members of the L.C.L. look up to their members of Parliament and take leadership from them.

Mr. Hudson: I heard you telling the electors of Port MacDonnell that you were free to cross the floor of the House.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I told the electors that the member for Glenelg was a dangerous Socialist, and they shuddered.

Mr. Clark: You'd make anyone shudder!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I happened to mention to them that the member for Glenelg had been exported from New South Wales to make his contribution to the South Australian political scene, and that I thought that, if he had been a good member of the Party, the Parliamentary Party in New South Wales would have seen that his talents were put to use in that State. However, I do not want to get on to that matter.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member had better not; he has had too much latitude already.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your observation, which I appreciate. You were quite right, of course. When I was interrupted by members opposite, I was about to give them the benefit of some information on the English electoral system.

I mentioned that that was a system of single-member districts, each elector having only one vote, that being recorded by a cross. I believe that this is the policy the A.L.P. has adopted since the Democratic Labor Party has come on the political scene. I am citing this book for the benefit of members opposite, none of whom is so old that he cannot learn a little about what goes on outside the Trades Hall in Grote Street. Butler and King comment on the British electoral system at page 291. If members opposite are going to keep on interjecting, I will pad this a little by reminding them that my colleague, the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles), has said that the English have a good system, under which some districts receive much heavier electoral representation than do districts comprising electors who live in other areas. Members opposite are not taking the trouble to try to correct that, because they know it is true. The only way in which the English can keep the Scots within the United Kingdom is by giving them a very substantial electoral loading. If members opposite look at the numbers of voters in Scottish constituencies, they will see that the numbers are much fewer than those for English constituencies. At page 291 of this excellent book, *The British General Election of 1966*, the authors state:

Under the British electoral system, argument about vote-splitting is inevitable. There is bound to be constant speculation about what would have happened in a straight fight or, more hypothetically, what would have happened under the alternative vote system. In either case the assumptions involved are similar and mainly revolve around Liberal candidates who take third place. The evidence of the effect of Liberal intervention and withdrawal in marginal seats (see p. 274) suggests that, on average, Liberal withdrawal was worth a swing of 0.5 per cent to Conservative: equivalent to 55:45 split of Liberal votes in such seats in favour of the Conservatives. However, it is clear that the ratio of such a split would vary regionally: in a Southern English rural seat Labour would probably still have been the net loser. A further complication peculiar to the 1966 general election is that, whereas there were seven seats won by Labour which even a 60:40 split of the Liberal vote would have given to the Conservatives, there were no less than 22 where a similar split of a Liberal vote in favour of Labour would have enabled Labour candidates to win Conservative seats. It is doubtful whether the Conservatives would, on balance, have gained from Liberal withdrawal for although the Liberal vote would probably have split more often in their favour, there were nearly four times as many seats where Labour could have benefited from a locally favourable split. If in every seat

the Liberal vote had split uniformly 55.45 in favour of the Conservatives the Conservatives would have retained four seats gained by Labour (Bedford, Croydon South, Harrow East, and Rushcliffe). But in four Southern English rural, or partly rural, seats (Lewestoft, Maldon, South Norfolk, and Peterborough) Labour would have won on a split of 55.45 or less. In the circumstances, perhaps the most sensible assumption is that neither Party would have benefited significantly from the withdrawal of all Liberal candidates in marginal seats, or from the transfer of their votes. There is less room for arguments about other cases where M.P.s were elected on minority votes.

I hope members opposite will take notice of this:

Communist candidates cost Labour Hornsey, and possibly Mitcham.

You can see that, because there is no simple preferential voting system in the United Kingdom, the strength of the Communist vote (which is quite considerable in parts of England) is lost to the Socialist Party.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable member to address the Speaker, not members of the Opposition.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I did see my friend the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), making some sign to draw your attention to my omission, and I apologize. At page 293—and I hope that the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) is listening to this—

Mr. Clark: I am doing my best not to, but I can't help hearing some of it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am reading this so that members opposite may educate themselves.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have previously asked the honourable member to come back to the Bill and not to address members of the Opposition. He would get on much better if he ignored interjections from the Opposition and addressed the Chair.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The book goes on:

The electoral system actually in use continued to work with fairly predictable regularity. On a uniform two-party swing of 3.5 per cent Labour should have won 52 seats which had elected a Conservative in 1964; in fact Labour took 47 such seats. Only two Conservative seats fell to a swing of more than 4.5 per cent (Cardiff North and Conway), but six vulnerable to a swing of 2.5 per cent were saved—Ayr, South Dorset (where following their 1962 by-election gain, the 1964 result had overstated Labour's strength), Eastleigh, Hendon North, Maldon, and the perennially perverse South-west Norfolk. On the 1959-66 comparison, the regularity is more striking: if the 7.0 per cent swing had been completely

uniform Labour would have gained 100 seats from the Conservatives; in fact the net Labour gain from Conservative was 103.

I hope that some of the members of this House who advocate a non-preferential type of voting, with a simple cross vote, will heed that extract from that excellent book by Butler and King, and that they will realize that the road upon which they have directed themselves is stony. All they have to do is to come to an arrangement with the other Parties that are on the left of the political spectrum to join forces, and they will swing the polls throughout Australia, but the nature of members is such that they do not seem to be able to get together very well. I was challenged to give my views on proportional representation, and I believe that a good case could be made out for it for one Chamber. I hope members opposite are listening, because this may not appear in their Party's Platform, but if they are as influential in their political organization as they say they are perhaps it could be introduced. I believe that there is a strong case for proportional representation in one Chamber, particularly in an Upper House, so that minority groups would have some measure, at least, of representation in the Legislature.

I have covered many topics. I spoke about Communists although, unfortunately, some members opposite were absent when I quoted the Communist Party's constitution. I was agreeably surprised at the people who worked in the People's Bookshop. I did not know what to expect, but I found that they were quiet and mild-mannered and obviously intelligent and well educated. To a casual observer one would have thought they were Liberals and not Socialists. They were a peace-loving people. I know that Communists have conferences on peace, and that may be a good thing.

We as members of Parliament are here because we represent people, and people can only be represented in a practical sense. The size of the electoral district that returns a member must have a bearing on the quality of the representation he can give here. The members for Glenelg, West Torrens, Hindmarsh, and Port Pirie, with electoral districts not much bigger in area than a pocket handkerchief, can service many more electors than can a member representing a large country area. The District of Eyre covers almost half of South Australia; the District of Light extends from the Murray River to the Adelaide Plains; and the District of Frome covers an enormous part of the State. The principle of representation is extremely important, and a simple arithmetical arrangement whereby equal

numbers of voters are allocated for the purpose of House of Assembly single Districts is not satisfactory.

Mr. Lawn: Does the honourable member service them here?

Mr. FREEBAIN: I believe that I service them far better than the member for Adelaide services his electors, because I am an active L.C.L. member, not a tired Socialist. The members for Millicent and Mount Gambier did not know the boundaries of their electoral districts, and that fact indicates their attitude.

To bring Opposition members back into line I quote the famous words of Edmund Burke, who represented Bristol and who, in 1774 gave his electors some good advice (and it is still good advice) when he said:

Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate against other agents and advocates but parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole; where, not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member indeed; but when you have chosen him, he is not member of Bristol, but he is a member of Parliament.

I wish that, when members are elected to this House, they would remember that they are representing not a tiny pocket handkerchief of people but all the people of South Australia. If they remembered this, the principle of one vote one value nonsense they speak about would disappear into the limbo of the lost. I have one last word of warning to members opposite. Most of them, especially those who have spoken, have indicated that they would support a 47-member House. I give members opposite some good straight advice, that is, not to fiddle about with the Bill in Committee. Knowing that the Trades Hall has told Labor members to vote for the Bill, I warn them that, if they attempt to interfere too much with the Bill in Committee, I will vote against it on the third reading. In so doing I will cause their bluff to be called as they will have to divide, show their true colours, and show that the Trades Hall barons have instructed them how to vote. I support the second reading.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I intend to speak to the Bill and, after hearing the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, I believe that will be a pleasant change. I was surprised to find that the honourable member could speak for as long as he did without referring to the Bill, but what disturbed me, in view of the important nature

of the Bill, was that he did not (as has been the case, unfortunately, with all Government members) attempt to answer the many Opposition criticisms of the Bill.

Mr. Clark: He read nearly 43 books.

Mr. BROOMHILL: True, but if he had answered some of the real criticisms made by the Opposition he would have served a much more useful purpose. I support the second reading, but with many reservations. I believe that the Bill provides an opportunity to discuss this important matter and that, especially in view of what has been said publicly in the last week or two by the Premier, it is proper for members on this side to make completely clear where we stand on this proposal. The Leader and other Opposition speakers have properly congratulated the Government on withdrawing from the firm and tight stand it had adopted in recent months on electoral reform. We remember the attitude the Liberal Party had adopted before the March election, and we also remember the attitude it adopted before the Millicent by-election when the Premier made it clear that he was inviting people in the District of Millicent to elect a Liberal member to this Chamber in order to provide the present Government with 20 members.

Mr. Hurst: That would have been the kiss of death for democracy in South Australia.

Mr. BROOMHILL: That is so. The Premier said that by providing the L.C.L. Government with 20 members it could implement its electoral plan without a compromise and without considering the Opposition's point of view. Opposition members have properly congratulated the Government on withdrawing from the stand it adopted then and on introducing this proposal which, although we consider it far from satisfactory, at least provides a basis for the consideration of electoral reform proposals. However, I was disturbed because after the Bill had been introduced a report in the *Advertiser*, under the heading "Mr. Hall sees no need for election", stated:

Mr. Hall said he sensed a general acceptance of the Government's reform proposal to divide the State into 47 Assembly seats. He gathered that the A.L.P. was impressed by the Bill providing for an electoral commission which he introduced in the Assembly on Thursday. Although this was not to say there would not be some serious criticism of it from the Opposition, he did not expect much trouble in getting it through Parliament.

When I read this article I believed that it was fair comment for the Premier to make: he recognized that the Labor Party would be raising criticisms and, when he commented

that he did not expect much trouble in getting the Bill through Parliament, I assumed that he was undertaking to look closely at the Opposition's criticisms. However, under the heading "A.L.P. 'Happy on Seats'" in the *News*, we read:

The Premier, Mr. Hall, said today he believed the A.L.P. was "happy enough" with the Government's 47-seat electoral plan. "I don't think they have raised any real objections to the Bill they can sustain," Mr. Hall said.

I point out that it is wrong for the Premier to think that the Opposition is happy enough with this proposal: we are most unhappy with it in its present form. The arguments raised and the criticisms made by members on this side can sustain the need for the amendments we have foreshadowed, and the Government would do well to reconsider its attitude if it thinks the Opposition is happy about this proposal. Without these amendments, this Bill is most unsatisfactory.

Mr. Rodda: Do you support all the amendments?

Mr. BROOMHILL: I am certainly suggesting that the Government should consider the Opposition's amendments, which can be sustained, contrary to what the Premier would have the people of this State believe. The general public, too, readily recognizes that our amendments can well be sustained. If the Government adopts the attitude that the Opposition is happy with the Bill as it stands and, therefore, the Government does not properly consider our objections, all I can say is that the amendment that you, Mr. Speaker, have foreshadowed would provide a fairer electoral system than that provided in the Bill as it stands.

Part II, dealing with the electoral commission, needs close consideration. I very much regret that not even one Government member has yet tried to answer the Opposition's criticisms about the provisions in this Part.

Mr. Clark: You realize why?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes, and this is the disturbing thing about it. The Premier, as spokesman for the Government, has tried to tell the community that the A.L.P. is satisfied with this Bill. Clause 4 (3) provides:

(3) Of the three persons to be appointed as commissioners—

- (a) one, who must be a judge, shall be the chairman;
- (b) one must be the Surveyor-General; and
- (c) one must be the Returning Officer for the State.

I agree with this, in principle. However, in clause 4 (4), clause 4 (5), and particularly in clause 5 (3), we find some of the most unusual provisions that have ever been included in legislation to establish an electoral commission either in this State or in any other State. I have looked closely at the proposals put forward in past years both by the Labor Party and by the Liberal and Country League and on no occasion was a provision similar to this put forward. Normally, the provisions are in a standard form, and the fact that this form has been departed from on this occasion makes it obvious that the departure is deliberate. When one considers the effects of these clauses, it is surprising that most of the present Government members were prepared to support such a set of conditions that appears in the Bill now before the House. My estimation of many Government members has fallen as a result of their action. Clause 4 (4) provides:

(4) Where a commissioner dies or is unable to perform his duties as such for any period, the Governor, as occasion requires, may appoint a commissioner in place of the commissioner who has died or may appoint a deputy to act for the commissioner during that period or any part thereof.

This is one of the subclauses that is completely new to this type of legislation. If any of the three commissioners dies or is unable to perform his duties, the Government may appoint any person to replace him.

Mr. Lawn: He could even be Sir Thomas Playford.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes. Indeed, the person appointed can be any member of the community: he might hold the same views as does Sir Thomas Playford. This is a most unfortunate set of circumstances. It is clear that the Government is aiming at including a person of this sort on the commission. What makes it worse is that in clause 5 (3) we find another deliberately worded new provision, which states:

(3) If a decision of the commission is concurred in by the chairman and at least one other commissioner, it shall be a valid and effectual decision of the commission for the purposes of this Act, and not otherwise.

The provision in its present form is incorrect. The Chairman (and we are providing that a judge shall be the Chairman) is given the power of veto. The fact that he must agree with at least one other of the commissioners before a decision can be valid is a serious insult both to members of this Parliament and

to the other two commissioners, who are highly respected and important members of the Public Service.

Mr. Lawn: They must be fairly sure of the judge they plan to appoint.

Mr. Jennings: It will be another gerrymander.

Mr. BROOMHILL: That is a good word. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) complained about this provision. It is most unfortunate that, when we are considering a Bill to improve our electoral system, we should create a position where one man can outvote the other two commissioners. In connection with clause 4 (4), the situation could occur where the Chairman might be unable to carry on his duties as a commissioner. We would then find that this strange person who could be appointed by the Government would hold the position of Chairman and would then have the power to reject any proposals agreed to by the other two commissioners. I believe that if the Surveyor-General and the Returning Officer for the State form the majority on the commission, both deciding that a particular course should be adopted, that decision should be taken. Amendments will therefore be moved by the Opposition to provide that a decision made by any two of the commissioners shall prevail.

Clause 5 provides that the Chairman and one other commissioner shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. I believe that the ideal provision would be for all three commissioners to be present before any business was dealt with, but I would accept that, in the absence of one of the commissioners, certain minor matters could be considered by those on the commission who were present. I believe therefore that the provision stipulating that there shall be no quorum unless the Chairman is present ought to be amended to provide that any two of the commissioners being present may constitute a quorum. Dealing with the provision relating to the metropolitan area under Part III, the Opposition has already indicated that it intends to move an amendment to include Gawler within this area. It seems to me wrong that Gawler should be excluded from the metropolitan area when, in fact, it is recognized by most members of the public as being within this area.

Mr. Hudson: The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study recognizes it as being part of the metropolitan area, too.

Mr. Broomhill: True. When we consider the development of areas close as Elizabeth and Smithfield and how close Gawler is to

those areas, we must realize that the people of Gawler have a community of interest with those living in the areas to which I have referred. Bearing in mind the provision in the Bill for the commission to consider community of interest, I think a strong argument exists to include Gawler in the metropolitan area, and I certainly hope that the Government reconsiders the present provision. Under Part IV, the State is to be divided into the proposed electoral districts, and provision is made for the number of seats, their situation, and quotas. The first provision, relating to 47 House of Assembly seats, meets with my approval, but there are sound reasons—

Mr. Rodda: You would prefer 56?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes, but I believe the Opposition has acted properly in attempting, in response to public demand, to improve the present electoral position in this State. As I have said, no doubt the Government has also recognized the feeling of the people in this State by introducing the Bill. I hope this is not the last step the Government intends to take on the matter. Certain public statements made by the Premier and the type of remark made by a certain other member of the Government, who made threats indicating that the Government would accept either this Bill or nothing at all, are most unreasonable. I think the attitude of the member for Light is probably an unusual one, even for a Government member.

Mr. McAnaney: You want Gawler in the city, yet you had it in the country in the 56-member proposal.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I suggest that the honourable member should not isolate one matter that was previously involved in our overall policy. The member for Stirling spoke for a considerable time on this issue without once referring to the objections raised to the measure by the Leader and subsequent speakers on this side. Although the member for Angas attempted to justify the Bill, I regret that members of the Government generally have not seen fit to refer to some of our criticisms. The member for Angas made what I believe was a genuine attempt to justify the weighting established by this Bill in favour of the country voter as against the metropolitan voter. Although we recognize that there must be some weighting in favour of the country voter, we object to the extent that it is applied under the Bill. The member for Angas, in trying to justify the Bill's provisions, made the same mistake as that made by other Government speakers, particularly the member for

Stirling. I suggest that Government members watch this closely in the future: they have taken notice of statements made and figures given by the Premier, and I suggest that that is a most chancy exercise for any person to take. The member for Angas said:

The Bill provides for 47 districts and, according to the Premier's second reading explanation and calculations, it appears that there will be 29 metropolitan seats with an average of 14,600 electors and 18 country seats with an average of 9,700 electors. If that is so, 66.5 country votes would equal 100 metropolitan votes.

Mr. Hudson: But it isn't so, of course.

Mr. BROOMHILL: No, although I believe the honourable member made an honest mistake. As he pointed out, he was willing to accept what had been said by the Premier. The Premier said he estimated that under the plan the new metropolitan area would have between 430,000 and 440,000 voters and the country, between 170,000 and 180,000 voters. As a result of this, an article appeared in the *Advertiser* under the heading, "What the New Bill Would Do" and, repeating what the Premier had said, it stated:

The Premier (Mr. Hall) yesterday estimated the number of electors in the metropolitan area as defined in his new Bill as between 430,000 and 440,000 and the number in the country area at between 170,000 and 180,000. The reporter then went on to provide an exercise, making the same mistake as did the member for Angas, and he stated:

Assuming the numbers to be 435,000 (metropolitan) and 175,000 (country), the commission, under the terms of the Bill, would calculate seats and quotas as follows— An interesting point among the figures quoted is that the number of metropolitan seats (435,000) divided by 14,950 would come to 29. However, the actual figure provided by the Electoral Office for persons on the roll as at July 31 was 611,289. Only 428,000 of those voters would be within the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hudson: At the most.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes.

Mr. McAnaney: You can't be dogmatic about that.

Mr. BROOMHILL: We can be dogmatic about this, and I suggest that members opposite would be incorrect in trying to justify the figure supplied by the Premier.

Mr. Rodda: You will be pleasantly surprised.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Of course, my objection to this is that the figures provided by the Government members in support of the weight-

ing of the country against the city have shown that there will be 29 metropolitan seats. If members of the Government think I am incorrect, I would be satisfied if they were to include a provision that there shall be 29 metropolitan seats. If they are as confident as they make out they are, they will not object to that. However, the member for Victoria, for one, assures me that this is the position. Obviously, he thoroughly agrees with it because he supported the remarks made by speakers opposite in attempting to point out that there will be 29 metropolitan seats. I suggest, however, that they have been mistaken by the figures quoted by the Premier. Either that is the case or they are deliberately trying to mislead the people of this State. I hope I am wrong in that assumption and that they have actually made an error.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: How did you arrive at the lower figure you just quoted?

Mr. BROOMHILL: I suggest that this could be obtained from the Returning Officer. The Leader of the Opposition, and particularly the member for Glenelg, took much time to point out where this figure came from, and this was not denied. The Premier admitted, by way of interjection when the Leader of the Opposition drew this to his attention, that he was wrong. He quickly withdrew and said that he did not say there would be 29 metropolitan members. Indeed, he said there would be 28 or 29. This was because he knew his figures could not be sustained. However, the member for Angas, once establishing these figures, went on to say that, because there would be 29 metropolitan seats, this proportion would work out provided that 65 country voters equalled 100 city voters. That shows a country weighting that is far too severe. Nevertheless, as I have already pointed out, it would be impossible for the metropolitan voters to be of sufficient numbers to have 29 seats, and this weighting in favour of the country would be too severe.

I point out to the member for Angas that, by dividing by 47 the 611,289 voters in this State at July 31 (and this exercise has been done before) one gets an answer of 13,006 electors. The 15 per cent tolerance provides us with a city quota of 14,957, the supposed average. That figure, with the 10 per cent tolerance allowed to the commission, gives us 16,453 voters at the top for a metropolitan seat, or 13,461 at the bottom. However, with 428,000 people within the metropolitan area it would mean there would be only 28 metropolitan seats, and the remaining voters in

excess of the number justifying 28 seats would provide us with an average of 15,268 voters for each seat.

As there are 183,289 country electors and 19 country seats, the average will be 9,646. With the tolerance allowed, the figure would be 11,093 at the top point, and 8,199 at the lowest point. Therefore, the average number of metropolitan voters for each Assembly district would be 15,268, whereas the country figure would be 9,646. This would mean that the value of the metropolitan voter would be reduced, and would also mean that 62 country votes would, on average, be equal to 100 metropolitan votes. Of course, when one works out the average voting strength excess in metropolitan seats over and above that in country seats, the figure is 58.5 per cent. Government members should recognize that Opposition members feel this is not good enough. The Government should consider seriously the amendments that will be moved by Opposition members, and I would indeed be disappointed if the attitude of the member for Light was adopted by other members of the Government. Paragraphs (a) and (b) of clause 8 (1) provide for adjustments to be made to the Legislative Council districts. I am a little surprised that this provision appears at all because, during his second reading explanation, the Premier made the position in relation to the provisions of this Bill quite clear, when he said:

The Bill is, therefore, concerned with the constitution of the House of Assembly, the election of whose members decides the type of Government that will govern South Australia.

I disagree in general terms with his argument because it has been clearly established during the three years of Labor Government that this is not the case. When the Legislative Council is able to defeat the legislation of the popularly elected Government in the House of Assembly, it is not true to say that "this Bill is concerned with the constitution of the House of Assembly, the election of whose members decides the type of Government that will govern South Australia". I believe that whilst this would be desirable, unfortunately we still have the problem of the Legislative Council.

I think the Premier was trying to make the point that he believed this Bill should be designed only to affect House of Assembly districts in this State, and with that point I certainly agree. It is quite wrong for this House at this time to include a provision in the Bill affecting the Legislative Council. The

attitude of the Opposition was properly expressed by the member for Glenelg when he said we should let sleeping dogs lie. This certainly fits the position on this occasion. It is not necessary to interfere with the boundaries of Legislative Council districts under this proposal. It has been pointed out that the Opposition will suggest that these provisions be removed from the Bill. A simple exercise can be undertaken to correct the position that may occur when Assembly boundaries are altered: it would be simple to redefine the Council districts as they are now. I suggest that we should do as little as possible at this time to interfere with the activities of the Legislative Council. However, I agree with other speakers on this side who have suggested that this Parliament should soon have the opportunity to provide for some alteration to the existing disposition of the Legislative Council.

Clause 9 provides for the various tests that the commission must apply in determining the various Assembly districts. I agree with most of them. I agree that the commission should have regard to community of interests within the proposed Assembly districts generally and to the economic, social and other interests of the people within the districts. However, one omission disturbs me and other Opposition members. Clause 9 (1) (a) (iv) refers to "the population of the proposed Assembly district and of various parts thereof" as being one of the subjects to which the commission shall have regard. I believe the proposal outlined by the Leader has much merit and I can see no reason why his suggestion in this respect, as well as the other amendments put forward, should not be accepted. We suggest that the commission should have regard to population trends as well as to the present population of a proposed district. It is logical that the commission should do this because we have already allowed it, in metropolitan seats in particular, a tolerance up and down from the average. The population of some districts in the metropolitan area is growing rapidly whereas in other districts, which are well developed, little room exists for further growth. For instance, the number of people on the roll of the West Torrens District is increasing by 1,000 a year, which has been the case for at least the last 10 years. I believe the same position applies in the districts of Enfield and Glenelg, and in other districts represented by members on this side.

Mr. Hudson: Also Alexandra.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes, there would be others. The point I make is that many areas in the metropolitan area, in particular, are growing rapidly. Therefore, we should tell the commissioners clearly that they should have regard to population trends. In this way they would be able to provide a higher quota in completely established areas and make allowances, by providing lower quotas, in areas likely to develop over the years. If we do not instruct the commissioners to take this course, I believe they will recognize that we have omitted to give such an instruction and, within a short time, the number of electors in some metropolitan districts will be completely out of proportion to the number in other metropolitan seats. This is one of the pitfalls we should try to avoid.

Mr. McAnaney: That is like the 10 per cent margin allowed now.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes, but in the Bill the commission is not directed to consider population trends in applying a quota. It will not take notice of population trends unless we tell it to do so. Unless we provide a more specific instruction, the commission may use the tolerance only when it can easily define a district by using a river, main road and so on as a boundary. I point out to the member for Stirling that we should direct the commission to consider population trends so that it will apply the tolerance particularly in the instances that we regard as important. Therefore, it is no good merely saying that we have given the commission an opportunity to provide a tolerance. It is our responsibility to inform the commission that, in specific cases, it ought to consider the trend of population and apply tolerances in such cases.

I am particularly interested in one area. The West Lakes scheme adjoins my district and, if it is proceeded with, many people will move into that area, which is presently surrounded by some built-up districts. This is an instance where the commission should take into account the development likely to occur. This also applies in connection with Christies Beach. I support the second reading and look forward with interest, but not with much confidence, to the Committee stage of the Bill. I hope that, between now and the time when the Committee stage is reached, somebody will speak to the member for Light and to any other member like him—

Mr. Clark: There is no other member like him.

Mr. BROOMHILL: That may be true but, if there are any other members like him on the other side of the House, they should recognize that the Bill has some weaknesses. For instance, the establishment of the commission is unusual and completely improper. I believe some members opposite will recognize that our complaints in this direction and other complaints we have made are justified.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): I do not wish to give silent support to the second reading. The provisions of the Bill depart considerably from what has been put to the House previously by either Party on this most important subject. My Party has gone a long way towards the viewpoint expressed by the Opposition of one vote one value. In representing the far-flung district of Eyre (the largest district in this State), I travel up to 50,000 miles a year to give people in the district the representation to which they are entitled. From the shores of Spencer Gulf to the Western Australian border is up to 500 miles, and it requires extra mileage to give people of this vast district even a small proportion of representation. In view of what I have said, I can agree with the sentiments expressed by the member for Glenelg that more assistance should be afforded to members of Parliament to enable them to discharge their duties. I want to state again that I am here to put the viewpoint of country people. However, in doing so, I do not lose sight of the fact that city dwellers have a right, and form an important part of society.

Mr. Lawn: Who wrote your speech for you?

Mr. EDWARDS: If members opposite will remain silent for a few moments, I can get on with the business of the day. I believe that the isolation and privations experienced by country people tend to be overlooked when legislators consider such matters as electoral reform. It seems to me that when honourable members have been addressing themselves to the Bill, our remote areas and sparse population have got very scant consideration. The Bill goes further than I would like in this regard and, Mr. Speaker, again I am not unmindful of the situation in which the Parliament finds itself in the current situation in Australia. There has had to be some compromise. In March our policy was 25 city and 20 country seats. We have definitely made a genuine attempt to reach some form of compromise. We have gone even further in our latest proposals. A compromise of 27 city and 20 country seats is a mighty improvement on the present 13 city and 26 country seats, which

we realize, was out of proportion. We have come well over half way in our proposal for 27 city and only 20 country seats. We are giving the city over 100 per cent more representation, with six fewer country seats. I consider that we have come a long way indeed.

Mr. Speaker, under our Bill we have not any more gerrymander in our policy than members opposite have in theirs; in fact, we have not as much. They are really pulling the Bill to pieces, but it is a better Bill than the one they were going to introduce. I will not go into a lot of figures, as other members have done that, and it would be mere repetition for me to do so. Nobody can say how many seats we shall have in either the city or the country until the boundaries are drawn up by the commission appointed to do that.

The Bill which the Premier has introduced favours the city even more, with what looks like 28 city seats, with a possible 29, according to boundaries, and with only 19 or 18 country seats. I repeat that we are definitely attempting to reach a compromise. If it goes to 29 city seats, that will be an increase of 120 per cent or more, and I consider this a wholehearted compromise. I cannot agree with the stated views of the Leader of the Opposition and honourable members opposite that there must be further adjustments to quotas and tolerances in the country areas. Eyre Peninsula produces almost 50 per cent of the wheat and barley grown in South Australia. Development is proceeding at such a rate that this figure will soon be greatly increased. I make this strong plea for the country elector: he must have adequate and just representation in this Parliament. As I have said before in this House, I urge all honourable members to remember that the city depends on the country, and the country depends on the city. Neither can get along without the other. Let us all be united in this great effort towards electoral reform. I support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I wish to express my profound gratitude to the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards). He has solved for me a problem which I thought was insoluble, namely, how the former member for Eyre (Mr. George Baron Bockelberg) could have represented that district for 12 years. Now the scales have been taken off my eyes. I realize now that the reason is that the present member for Eyre was the only alternative.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you think he could have travelled 50,000 miles in his district?

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, not in the first three months of the year, anyway.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair.

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was about to do that. However, I want the indulgence of the House to some extent, because I did not have an opportunity to speak on the Address in Reply debate.

Mr. McAnaney: Why not?

Mr. JENNINGS: Because I am a democrat and I agreed to abide by a democratic decision of my Party to enable this Bill to be brought on first, so that we would have this important matter decided before we went through all the interminable nonsense that we had from members opposite in the Address in Reply debate.

Mr. Clark: Perhaps they did that out of a sense of loyalty.

Mr. JENNINGS: That is precisely what I am going to do. I promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, her heirs and successors, and make known to Her Majesty all treasons and traitorous conspiracies and attempts against her person, Crown and dignity, also to His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh, to all members of the Royal Family, and certainly to the Archbishop of Canterbury and all those people to whom we should on occasions such as this pay proper homage.

Mr. Clark: God save the Queen!

Mr. JENNINGS: I shall endeavour to sing that on prorogation night. I support the Bill, with some reservation; indeed, with much more reservation than my friend the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon), who said he was delighted to support it. I certainly support the second reading, because if we do not support it we shall not have an opportunity to consider the amendments on members' files, including the amendment from the honourable Speaker himself, for whom you are deputizing so efficiently, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I believe this Bill is a compromise.

Mr. Broomhill: A first step.

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, if it is a first step, it is some sort of compromise. This is despite the fact that the honourable Premier said just before the Millicent by-election, when he expected to win it, that there would not be any compromise at all; that if the Liberal and Country League won Millicent the L.C.L. electoral policy would be introduced (and I

do not have to remind you that that was completely different L.C.L. policy from that which was introduced in the House recently) but that, if the A.L.P. won Millicent, he would consider it an endorsement of the A.L.P. policy. He has shown that, on this issue, he was not a man of his word. Since then he has learned, and he has been acting rather differently. Perhaps he has found, belatedly, after returning from overseas and bringing back a Dutch doll as the only evidence of the benefits of his trip, that some of his colleagues were trying to sabotage him while he was away. I think he has now realized that while he was away certain members of the Cabinet tried to use the long knives on him in his absence. They would have been long enough to reach him anywhere, so, consequently, he has adopted a completely different attitude, particularly at the L.C.L. conference. It is significant that, although in the past the secrecy of L.C.L. conferences was well controlled, on this occasion there must have been a leak, because of the things that have come out since. We heard things from the inaudible rabble-rouser from Light, this Eddy Ward in reverse, this man who mouths all sorts of nasty things about us on this side, and who would make us shake in our shoes if we could only hear what he was saying.

Mr. McAnaney: Speak up, we can't hear you.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am not particularly concerned about the member for Stirling, because he could not understand anyway, no matter who was speaking: that would have nothing to do with it. I shall speak up if the honourable member is patient, but even that would not enable him to understand. I will have to put my speech into simple words, although I do not think four-letter words are allowed in this place. Perhaps I would have to put it not in kindergarten language but in Braille in order that the honourable member could understand it. I think there is a chance that he has been well enervated for a long time, and there is not much chance of that condition increasing, because there is nowhere to increase. It is like the Cabinet: it is the best that the Premier could possibly select, but it is also the worst. After all, they are like the new members of this House to whom we have listened making their maiden speeches. We all congratulated them, and we realized that they are in the fortunate position that they have plenty of room to improve, because there is nowhere else to go.

The present compromise, although it is a compromise, is still violently unfair, but I am prepared to support the second reading. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) could have spoken longer, except that he was getting apprehensive about the speech that might follow him and was wondering whether he would be assailed by this new, vigorous, young member for Eyre. However, although he may have curtailed his speech he showed clearly that if we did not support the second reading we could not debate the amendments, which he enumerated. He did an excellent job, and I shall add nothing in that respect. I said that the new proposal could still be, and indeed must be, violently unfair. Numbers of electors could still be between 9,000 and 16,500.

Mr. McAnaney: That is better than a 56-member House. Why change your view?

Mr. JENNINGS: This proposal is immensely better than what exists at present, where one electoral district has 45,000 electors and another has just over 5,000. In this situation one vote is worth nine times the value of a vote somewhere else. Surely, no-one, not even the Codlin moth man (the member for Gumeracha, Mr. Giles) would accept this, although in his Address in Reply speech he said that it was sound and democratic for country members to have much smaller numbers of electors to represent than did city members because the country people earned all the money for the State. He could not sell the apples that he sells without first having used a plough made in the metropolitan area to dig the ground.

Mr. McAnaney: You are about 20 years behind the times: they do not cultivate apple trees now.

Mr. JENNINGS: Perhaps I am. At least I am three or four weeks behind, because I completely forget what was said in the Address in Reply debate by the mover.

Mr. Arnold: It is in *Hansard*.

Mr. JENNINGS: I cannot quote from that now. The member for Chaffey spoke about decentralization, but the one example that he gave was David Shearer Limited at Mannum, a company that was established in 1877. As mover of the Address in Reply, the honourable member had to move into the district of the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle), who seconded the motion, to give an example. We still do not know to what extent that interfered with the sermon of the member for Murray. I do not think there is any need whatsoever for any kind of zoning in electoral affairs. There

is no system of zoning in connection with Commonwealth electorates; the recent report of the Commonwealth electoral commission did not zone as between country area and metropolitan area.

Mr. Ryan: Liberals said it was fair.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is interesting to note that several predominantly rural districts in South Australia now have a greater number of electors than do metropolitan districts, and this applies generally throughout Australia. The member for Port Adelaide interjected that the L.C.L. has not objected to the Commonwealth electoral commission's report. I point out that the Country Party, also, has not objected to it.

Mr. Clark: I thought the Country Party objected to everything.

Mr. JENNINGS: Generally speaking, it does, but on this occasion it did not do so.

Mr. Clark: Has Andrew Jones objected?

Mr. JENNINGS: I wish to refer now to the member for the Commonwealth electoral district of Adelaide (Mr. Andrew Jones). I should not like to confuse the member for the State electoral district of Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) with Mr. Andrew Jones, because Mr. Lawn might have me up for defamation of character. The Hon. Andrew T. Jones has not appealed against the decision, because he believes he is a man of destiny and that he will win anyway. I can say that, after the new boundaries have been finally determined, the Commonwealth member for Adelaide will have as much chance of holding his seat as an old man with one arm and one eye has of putting a pound of red-hot butter in a wild cat's ear with a needle.

There is something about the new Commonwealth electoral districts that is certainly relevant. Because the Districts of Eyre and Wakefield take in most of the North, the Mid-North and the North-West, a very large proportion of the State is now represented in the Commonwealth Parliament by two members. The Commonwealth electoral commission thus recognizes that members of Parliament represent people, not square miles or posts or cows or sheep.

Mr. McAnaney: Country members have to serve these people.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think I learned my lesson fairly well in Millicent. I think the people of Millicent learned, too, and we cannot go beyond the decision they made. I did

not see my honourable friend from Gumeracha down there, although I did see, unwillingly, some other Liberal members giving us invaluable help. However, be that as it may—

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member had better get back to the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS: I intended to get straight back to the Bill, Sir. I think I have been assiduous in considering the Bill. One thing that has been referred to in this debate (and I am now linking this up with the Bill, Sir) is the effect that comments in the press overseas and in other States have had on the credibility of South Australia.

Mr. Clark: Are you going to quote from *Time*, too?

Mr. JENNINGS: No. I did not know, of course, from which *Time* the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) was quoting, and I do not think he knew either. I will quote now from a paper that has some currency in South Australia. So that it would remain anonymous, I accidentally took off the front of it, but it is not the *Tribune*; it is the *Catholic Worker*. Dealing with the elections in South Australia, it states:

Once again we have been reminded of basic South Australian mathematics: three urban votes equal one rural vote plus two cows—coming perhaps from Stirling—

The assumptions underlying South Australia's electoral distribution—a legacy bequeathed by "Uncle Tom" Playford—are quite explicit: there is no place for "one vote one value" and that sort of Chartist nonsense. Yet, last century, South Australians used to pride themselves on their pioneering contributions to Australian democracy. Since 1885 Great Britain has managed to preserve fairly uniform electorates—

This does not agree with some of the things that have been said in this debate. The article continues:

In this century the Australian States (Queensland excepted) and the Commonwealth have given more than lip service to the principle; but on this matter South Australia has returned to something like 18th century English values. Before the A.L.P. took office in 1965 we had become accustomed to the L.C.L. winning elections with the support of less than half the electorate. In 1962 the A.L.P. obtained 53 per cent of the votes and stayed in Opposition; the L.C.L. remained the Government, enjoying the confidence of 40 per cent of the electorate (L.C.L. 19, A.L.P. 19, Independent (?) 1). In 1965 the A.L.P. managed to achieve the almost impossible feat of gaining a Parliamentary majority—but only by increasing its percentage to 55 while the L.C.L. slumped to 35 (L.C.L. 17, A.L.P. 21, Independent (?) 1). After 33 years of non-Labor Governments, the Adelaide *Advertiser*

and the South Australian "establishment" have tolerated the premierships of Frank Walsh and, latterly, of Don Dunstan. But with good reason the stout anti-Labor forces have smiled through their tears at the prospect of a return to normal in 1968, partly because the Labor Government has been unable to persuade the hostile Legislative Council to consent to "one vote, one value" for Assembly elections (adult suffrage does not operate in Council elections, hence 16 L.C.L. versus 4 A.L.P. members). And now it seems that the respectable classes will not be disappointed. Last month the Government suffered from a slight swing to the Opposition, and was able to muster only 53 per cent (as in 1962) of the total vote against the L.C.L.'s 43. Party strengths are identical to those of 1962; and it seems that the political outcome will be the same as that of 1962: another term of office for the L.C.L.

We know that it has turned out in exactly that way. We have been told time and time again over the years that the L.C.L. does not retain office with a minority vote, but who do we have admitting this now: none other than the Premier when, on August 9, he told the L.C.L. conference that, when the Government's electoral proposals went through, the L.C.L. would never be quite the same again. Well, any difference must be an improvement. The press statement read:

Making his first speech to the biggest meeting of L.C.L. delegates ever, the Premier appealed to the league to take up the challenge.

Mr. Hudson: Which public relations officer wrote that do you think?

Mr. JENNINGS: It does not matter particularly. At least the Premier has not denied it. I do not doubt for one moment that he said it, for this was not one of the L.C.L.'s business sessions where reporters are not allowed in: it was one of its sessions where its Leaders are enabled to make speeches in front of the television cameras and press reporters. I do not doubt for a moment that what the Premier is reported as having said is correct and that we have, for the first time in a very long time, an admission from a Leader of the L.C.L. that the Labor Party in this State has suffered for years under a tremendous electoral disadvantage.

Mr. Clark: It would be the first admission ever.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but perhaps sometimes these things have to come. I disagree with one of the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan), as I think he gave undue emphasis to the work of members of Parliament as agents for their constituents. I know that this is an important part of their job. I believe it must be accepted

that the duties of a member are, first, to make the laws of the land and, in this respect, if everybody in the land is to have an equal say in the formulation of that law, every person must have an equal say in the election of his member of Parliament. I concede this and go further, agreeing with the Leader—

Mr. McAnaney: It is just as well you said that.

Mr. JENNINGS: This would not be the first time I have disagreed with the Leader publicly or in any other way. I have the guts to do it, and that is more than the member for Stirling has in respect to his Leader.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JENNINGS: In enabling a member to inform himself of how he should vote on Bills before the House, it is helpful if he is in touch regularly with the people he represents, for he can then discern their feelings and take what he thinks is the appropriate course to represent them adequately.

During the debate we have heard the member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) refer to the situation in Western Australia and the member for Angus (Hon. B. H. Teusner) talk about Queensland. We have heard other members speak about what happens in other States. However, I do not believe that any one of the things we have heard has been particularly relevant. Most of what was said (except what the member for Angus said about Queensland) merely shows that Liberals are the same wherever they are. Therefore, we do not endorse what was said has been done in Western Australia by Liberals any more than we endorse what has been done in South Australia over the years by the Liberal and Country League. I will certainly concede that part of what the member for Angus said about Queensland was correct. However, the members of the Liberal and Country Parties in Queensland can be proud on one thing: despite the fact that the Upper House in that State was abolished many years ago, successive conservative Governments have not even attempted to restore it.

I know that many members opposite are extremely worried about this Bill. They know that some who have been here for only a few months will have to fight preselection ballots against their colleagues. I think one of the reasons why my friend the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) has been so voluble this evening is that he is worried about his position.

Mr. Broomhill: How will he get on, do you think?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think it would be a shocking reflection on the voters in a preselection ballot if he won, unless we looked at those who were likely to oppose him, and on that basis I think they have little choice. After all, one cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, so they will not have much choice. I have heard that the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans), after being here for only a brief period, is likely to seek endorsement for a vacancy in the Upper House. If that is true and the honourable member is successful in such an election, I can only say that that will tremendously increase the standard in both Houses.

Mrs. Byrne: Is he old enough?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the member for Barossa has the position wrongly. The physical age of 30, not the mental age, decides whether one is entitled to be elected to the Upper House. I thought that our friend the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), as he spoke for so long about nothing, would have been original in most of what he said. However, he went on late this afternoon about the last Canadian election. Now, although I cannot reflect on honourable members of another House or on the other House itself, I should mention that only recently a lady member of that House finished her Address in Reply speech by saying (and these are almost exactly the words used today by the member for Light):

The *Advertiser* reported, under Ottawa date-line June 26, that Mr. Trudeau's Liberal Government had obtained 154 seats out of 264, or 58.5 per cent of the seats in the House, in a nation-wide popular poll of 46 per cent. There has been no suggestion in the press that Canada is upset or that it intends to fool around with electoral redistribution.

Earlier the honourable lady had said that she thought nothing at all in the South Australian electoral laws needed amendment. In effect, she said that the electoral laws in this State were as good as they could possibly be, because they always gave the right result. Apparently, something went wrong in 1965 but, apart from that, for the last 32 years or so they have always given the right result, which means that these laws are justified, are legitimate, and are thoroughly democratic. The member for Light could not even be original, so I thought it might be beneficial if I obtained the Statutes of Canada which the member for Light has

probably never bothered to read. The electoral boundaries provisions are contained in a long Bill which I shall not read.

Mr. Edwards: We want to go home tonight.

Mr. JENNINGS: As far as I am concerned the honourable member can go home now. Section 13 of the Act, which is based on the North America Act, provides:

In preparing its report each commission for a province shall be governed by the following rules:

- (a) the division of the province into electoral districts and the description of the boundaries thereof shall proceed on the basis that the population of each electoral district in the province as a result thereof shall correspond as nearly as may be to the electoral quota for the province, that is to say, the quotient obtained by dividing the population of the province as ascertained by the census by the number of members of the House of Commons to be assigned to the province as calculated by the Representation Commissioner under section 12;

That quotation gives a fair indication that the Canadian electoral system is bound to the principle of one vote one value, but the Act goes further when it states:

- (c) the commission may depart from the strict application of rules (a) and (b) in any case where

- (i) special geographic considerations, including in particular the sparsity, density or relative rate of growth of population of various regions of the province, the accessibility of such regions or the size or shape thereof, appear to the commission to render such a departure necessary or desirable.

Surely, this shows that our own Commonwealth commissioners have acted on instructions similar to that, and that neither the Hon. Mrs. Cooper nor the member for Light knew anything at all about this, otherwise they would not have referred to it, first in the case of Mrs. Cooper in the Address in Reply debate, and secondly, in the case of the member for Light in this debate.

I have much more to say, but I will restrain myself because there will be an opportunity in Committee to debate many issues (the Opposition's amendments, for example). Much has been said in this debate about the disadvantages of country members *vis-a-vis* metropolitan members. I am not a country member, so I can speak from only one viewpoint and even members of my own Party may disagree with me. One thing, however,

is certain: if country members suffer a great disadvantage in representing their districts, they may find Parliament only too glad to provide facilities that will help remove that disadvantage.

Mr. Clark: Some members would need much assistance.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but others represent their districts fairly well, and at long range, too. It is significant that some Liberal Party members who are always crying out about the disabilities of country members and who represent vast electoral districts live in Toorak or somewhere like that. This is fairly hard for some of us to understand. As an example, I quote from a country newspaper with which is incorporated *The Murrayville Pioneer and Lameroo Recorder*. The article, accompanied by a photograph of a very distinguished looking gentleman, states:

Mr. W. F. (Bill) Nankivell took advantage of a break in his busy city programme to visit Pinnaroo line towns last Friday. Mr. Nankivell moved from Geranium six months ago, and has his home property at Keith, but finds his duties on Parliamentary committees necessitates his being in Adelaide most of the week. He has been appointed to the Public Works Standing Committee, which meets on Tuesdays and Thursdays. In this connection he is very interested in the proper reticulation of water resources.

The member for Albert should be interested in many other things dealt with by the Public Works Committee. The article continues:

These resources are not being intelligently used, he said, and it was important that the underground resources be investigated fully and immediately, as the availability of water will ultimately determine the acreage which can be developed permanently under intense forms of agriculture.

So, he has come to Adelaide to serve on all these committees. I do not disagree even in the remotest sense that the member for Albert

should serve on these committees: indeed, he is an adornment to some of them.

The SPEAKER: I do not see anything in the Bill regarding that adornment. Perhaps we had better get back to the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS: I will, Sir. I intend to finish in two or three minutes, anyway. If the member for Albert is, as he and his colleagues so frequently claim, incapable of representing his vast district with its sparse population, why does he not give proper representation to his electors by getting off these committees? He does not have to be on them.

This Bill is one which we support on the second reading. We hope that the amendments foreshadowed by the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of our Party will receive proper consideration and will become a part of the Bill before its contents are considered by the commissioners. However, whilst we may agree at this stage, and whilst perhaps we have not the numbers to prevent the Bill's passage, let us say here and now that the spirit of compromise which has been emanating recently, but of which I personally have not seen much evidence, anyway, will change if the commission brings back a report that is not suitable to every section of this House, because then we shall be considering a constitutional measure in this House, and we have, as you know, Sir, the power and the numbers to prevent its passage, if necessary. So far, I support the Bill.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 14, at 2 p.m.