

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 15, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

DISCRIMINATION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Last week I asked the Premier a question about allegations that had been made in newspapers, both here and in other States, concerning an alleged breach of the South Australian Prohibition of Discrimination Act. In my absence the Deputy Leader of the Opposition earlier this week asked the Premier questions about it, but at that time the Premier had not a reply. I point out to him that the continuing absence of a reply in this matter would mean that hotels generally in South Australia might well be unjustly considered to have done something illegal. On the other hand, if something has happened that is a breach of the Prohibition of Discrimination Act, then in justice not only to those hotels but also to the people of South Australia, action should be taken promptly to show that that sort of thing does not have the approval of the people of the State. Therefore, has the Premier a reply? Can he tell the House what the position is and whether action is to be taken?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have an interim reply which states that investigations were more protracted than had been anticipated. The Attorney-General has handed me something that is not typed, but I prefer to study something typed before I reply.

JUVENILE OFFENCES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on July 31 about suggestions made by the magistrate in the Adelaide Juvenile Court in his annual report dated October 25, 1967, in connection with the measures that should be taken for combating juvenile delinquency?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The reply is fairly long but I think it is important, in view of the seriousness of the question asked. The suggestion in the annual report of the Juvenile Court dated October 25, 1967, that "Morality and Citizenship" should be taught as a separate subject in all schools, appears to emphasize the acquisition of a special body of knowledge. However, it is becoming increasingly recognized in education that if

the value of a school subject is to transfer to other real life situations, the abilities, skills, and practice in making judgments must rank as of equal importance with the acquisition of knowledge. Moreover, the teacher must deliberately set out to achieve as much transfer of this real knowledge as possible to the real life situation by providing as many circumstances as possible, resembling those of the latter situation.

In matters of the kind referred to by the honourable member, the most effective work done by schools must always be the traditional inculcation of accepted standards of behaviour that students acquire in the discipline and practical day-to-day life of a school, particularly in the human give and take between teacher and pupils, and between pupils themselves, both in the classroom and in the school extra-curricular activities conducted in clubs and on the sports field. However, much of what is recommended in the subject "Morality and Citizenship" is contained in the study of Government, some of which has always been taught in primary schools and which for the past two years has been taught in greater depth to all first year high school students for about 35 lessons.

This work was made the subject of 16 special telecasts by the Australian Broadcasting Commission to reinforce the lessons. This work is carried still further in the social studies course of the high schools alternative course, which includes a section on "Law and Order", to enable the students to examine in detail the functions of the Police Force and the law courts in South Australia. Still further emphasis is given to such work in a new social studies syllabus studied in a number of high schools this year in which the core of the study is community relationships, starting with the narrower circle of the family and expanding to the broader and more complex unities of the city, State and nation.

True morality and citizenship (that is, a proper respect for other people and a recognition of the necessity for integrity in social relationships) is certainly presented in high schools in a realistic and vigorous manner, which enhances its chances of carrying over in adult life. This topic is similarly dealt with in technical high and area schools. In my opinion, and in the opinion of the Director-General of Education, this is a better approach to teaching these matters.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. BURDON: In view of the apparent co-operation existing between one country and one metropolitan member in this House (I refer to questions asked by the members for Semaphore and Eyre about maintaining law and order on the West Coast), each representing districts that are far apart, and as, to a large extent, the districts depend on one another in that satisfactory farming requirements of farmers in the District of Eyre depend on fertilizers produced in Semaphore, can you, Mr. Speaker, say whether you intended, when you drafted your amendments to the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill (requiring the commission to investigate the proportional representation system) to encourage greater togetherness between country and metropolitan members in order that some country members might obtain a much wider knowledge of democratic principles with the ultimate object of providing electoral redistribution on the basis of one vote one value?

The SPEAKER: I have been a member since 1933 and, to my knowledge, there has been no discrimination in respect of any member asking a question about another member's district. This seems to be the aspect that prompted the honourable member's question. The object of my foreshadowed amendment to the Bill now before the House is a matter for debate in Committee. The honourable member does not seem to understand the purpose of proportional representation. It means multiple-member and not single-member districts, and therefore the principle of the one vote for the candidate of the people's choice, and the value thereof, is achieved, provided that the districts are amalgamated to give multi-member representation. I, as Speaker of this House, welcome the co-operation of members in looking after one another's interests, whether they be city members or country members, because in the long run it is always good for the community of South Australia.

GAS PRICE

Mr. EDWARDS: My question, which is addressed to the Minister of Works, concerns the supply of 100 lb. gas cylinders in my district. Can he say whether each Government department negotiates separately with the South Australian Gas Company to arrive at a price for gas supplied to Government employees for domestic use? If this is the case, could this matter be investigated?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will take the matter up with the Supply and Tender Board and the South Australian Gas Company and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

DENTAL HEALTH

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the extension of dental treatment to pensioners in country areas?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Not yet.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my recent question on rail standardization?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Transport reports that the Commonwealth Government has not as yet made a decision with regard to the construction of a standard gauge line between Adelaide and Port Pirie, together with associated works in and immediately north of Adelaide and on the Peterborough Division. He did, however, have useful discussions on this matter with the Minister for Shipping and Transport on Monday, August 12, 1968. The project is important to South Australia and strong representations are continually being made to the Commonwealth Government.

EDUCATION INQUIRY

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Can the Minister of Education indicate the terms of reference for the investigation into education which we have been told is about to take place?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Although I cannot give the honourable member the terms of reference at present, as they are still being worked on, an announcement will be made in due course.

INDUSTRIES

Mr. GILES: Did the Premier, in his recent overseas tour, contact any petro-chemical companies with a view to their establishing here when the gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide is completed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I did not contact a petro-chemical works as such, although I have (as have the officers of the Industrial Development Branch) considered certain factors inherent in the advantages that will accrue to South Australia when gas is piped to the metropolitan area. The Government is, therefore, examining all such matters. However, I did not include this aspect in my overseas tour.

PRIME MINISTER

Mr. VIRGO: My attention has been directed to a document currently being circulated among members and supporters of the Liberal Party, condemning the Prime Minister and urging his replacement. Typical of the statements made in this document, I think, is what appears on page 2, as follows:

We are not going to set out a long list of Mr. Gorton's shortcomings. They are better known to members of the Executive and the Parliamentary Party than to us . . . One thing disturbs the Cabinet most . . . It is Mr. Gorton's off-the-cuff way of speaking, without careful reflection. This rashness has already landed the Party in difficulty after difficulty. Nothing could be more damaging. He has to take back his words far too often. He fails to consult his colleagues before making statements on matters that concern them closely.

In view of this widespread opinion, which I understand is being voiced by the people who have financially backed the Liberal Party for many years, does the Premier consider that the statement Mr. Gorton made in Adelaide prior to the South Australian election (that South Australia would be treated much more fairly financially if it had a Liberal Government) is typical of these off-the-cuff statements that later have to be retracted? Further, in view of the extreme likelihood of Mr. Gorton's being deposed as Prime Minister, will the Premier consider making an early approach to Mr. Fairhall, who apparently is the heir apparent, with a view to stating a case for financial aid?

The SPEAKER: Does the Premier desire to reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes. It seems to me that the honourable member is allying himself with a pressure group, the name of which we apparently are not told. If the honourable member cares to ally himself with such a group, that is his business. The answer to his questions is "No".

STURT HIGHWAY

Mr. ARNOLD: Although my question does not specifically concern my district, it concerns many people in this State. Between Truro and Blanchetown, the Sturt Highway traverses what is known as Accommodation Hill, and the grade at this point is such that the speed of heavily laden vehicles is reduced to between 10 and 15 miles an hour. The stretch of road concerned is of considerable length. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads to consider having this section of the Sturt Highway made a three-lane thoroughfare?

The SPEAKER: Order! Before the Attorney-General replies, I refer to the question asked by the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) about honourable members' asking questions relating to districts of other members. I think I should have added at the time that, although there is no restraint on a member's asking a question concerning another member's district, it has more or less been an unwritten law in all the years that I have been in Parliament that members should not ask questions concerning other members' districts. However, the question asked by the member for Chaffey relates to Accommodation Hill, over which many of his constituents must travel to reach their district, and that applies also to my constituents in the District of Ridley.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to take up the matter with the Minister of Roads.

MOONTA RAIL SERVICE

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Transport a reply to my question about the rail service between Moonta and Adelaide?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Transport reports that the retention of one passenger rail service operating between Moonta and Adelaide would result in only a marginal saving to the Railways Department and that, accordingly, if the request were agreed to, the aim in improving railway finances would be defeated.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Mr. NANKIVELL: During the Address in Reply debate I referred to the type of school being constructed in South Australia and suggested that schools were possibly too elaborate. I understand that a British consultant has been approached to come to South Australia and advise on the standard and type of building that we should consider constructing to meet our needs. Can the Minister of Works say when he expects the consultant to arrive and what his terms of reference will be?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Minister of Education and I have considered this matter. Following the recent visit to the United Kingdom of the Director-General of Education (Mr. Walker) to report on improved teaching methods, arrangements were made for a representative of an English consulting firm that specializes in the latest types of educational building to come to this State to confer with officers of the Public Buildings Department and the Education Department.

Mr. Clark: Will you introduce him to the Public Works Committee, too?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I shall be pleased to do so. The purpose of obtaining the consultant's services is to obtain for students and teaching staffs the very best and most economical type of accommodation available which is in line with the latest overseas trends. The representative will be in this State for some time and will work in close co-operation with officers of both these departments. I will see whether I can arrange for him to interview the Chairman of the Public Works Committee. Later, an officer of the Public Buildings Department will go to the United Kingdom and other countries to see at first hand improvements made in educational buildings. I do not have with me the actual date that the honourable member has requested, but I will obtain the information as soon as possible.

BERRI HOSPITAL

Mr. HUDSON: I noted the questions asked this afternoon by the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) and the member for Chaffey (Mr. Arnold) and your comments, Mr. Speaker, on those questions. I realize that you, Mr. Speaker, are not able to raise the question I have in mind, and I have waited for some time for a Government member to do so. I refer to the provision in last year's Loan Estimates of \$60,000 to commence the construction of a laboratory building at the Berri Hospital to provide pathological services for the Murray River area. I note that in this year's Loan Estimates there is no provision under this heading. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary how far this project has progressed, whether it has been completed or, if it has had to be postponed, the reasons for this postponement?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain this information for the honourable member.

GAWLER BLOCKS SCHOOL

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding the language difficulty at the Gawler Blocks Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The head teacher of the Gawler Blocks Primary School discussed the difficulties encountered in dealing with the large percentage of migrant children at his school with the district inspector recently. The inspector made several suggestions about methods of individualizing work so that children would be able to work at their own level.

There are 117 children on the roll and four teachers, which provides a pupil-teacher ratio below that in most primary schools. However, the numbers are highest in the lower grades, where most difficulty is encountered with children who have spoken little or no English before coming to school. The honourable member's suggestion that the school might take in from the teachers college a teacher who can speak Italian as well as English has been considered. However, it can be stated that the task of absorbing and educating migrant children with little or no English has been carried out for many years, and experience has shown that they learn to speak and write English more quickly when this is the sole means of instruction. Similarly, they profit more from mixing with English-speaking children than from being placed in a special class. It is considered that little is to be gained from appointing a teacher who can speak Italian, and sufficient teachers who are sufficiently fluent are not available. Many measures have been adopted with a view to improving the education of migrant children. A survey of these children and the difficulties experienced in primary schools is being made. It is intended to hold at an early date a conference of headmasters of schools where the problem is acute.

TEACHER TRAINING

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked during the Address in Reply debate about the training of teachers?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: A generally accepted measure of whether numbers of teachers in a State educational system are adequate is the pupil-teacher ratio. The conference of Directors-General of Australian States has recommended in recent years that strong efforts should be made to bring the pupil-teacher ratio in secondary schools to 16. The 1968 figure of 18.9 for South Australia is therefore higher than we wish. To make a significant reduction in pupil-teacher ratio would require a substantial increase in teacher recruitment. At present the pool or source of supply, namely, graduates, near graduates and others who have had tertiary education, is fully taxed in meeting State-wide needs in the professions and industry on a wide front. Investigation has shown that with our vigorous and well prepared recruiting methods we get our fair share of recruits from the common pool. The only satisfactory solution in the long run will be to do our best to increase retention in secondary schools to fifth-year level and so increase the common

pool. It is not our experience that teachers with brilliant academic records in our employ are insufficiently trained as teachers. By the end of four years of training all teachers college students, irrespective of academic prowess, would have completed a similar length of time in practice teaching. The only difference would be that the brilliant student would do more of his teaching practice in his fourth year after completion of his degree. He would then be more mature and, in effect, would probably benefit more from his teaching practice.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to my recent question about the usual day on which the Social Welfare Department posts out relief cheques?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. When the honourable member originally asked the question, I said that I thought they were posted out towards the end of the week. This is done on Thursdays. To complete the answer, I will read out the following report:

Relief cheques are posted out each day from Monday to Friday as applications are determined. Most applicants are paid in cash at the department's head office. Cheques for maintenance payments are posted out each Thursday to be in the hands of recipients by the weekend.

ST. AGNES SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 7 about finding an appropriate site for the St. Agnes school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Land Board valuation of the two alternative sites for a new primary school has been received, but a final decision on which site is to be sought has not yet been made. I shall be pleased to advise the honourable member as soon as possible after the decision has been made.

Mrs. BYRNE: A letter dated July 29 from the Director of Administration and Finance of the Education Department to Angove's Proprietary Limited states:

The alternative site has been investigated from all angles, but it has been found that the most suitable area for the purpose required is on the corner of Smart and Dillon Roads in part section 833, hundred of Yatala. Cabinet approval has now been given to this department's taking the appropriate steps to negotiate the purchase of this site, and in the circumstances, it would be greatly appreciated if you would advise me, at your earliest convenience, what price your company would require for

the unencumbered fee simple of the site of about 10½ acres. It is regretted that the land required forms part of your vineyards. I shall be grateful if you will accept my thanks for your forbearance.

The Minister will realize that that letter is in direct contrast to the reply she has just given. In the light of the contents of this letter, and as Angove's still desires to avert this acquisition, will the Minister comment on the situation?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Since the letter was written and received by Angove's, several factors have been introduced that have led officers of the department to further consider the proposition and, for this reason, the answer was as I gave the honourable member. The whole matter is being held in abeyance for the time being.

NORTHERN ROADS

Mr. CASEY: My question relates to the newly constructed bitumen road between Quorn and Gordon and the extensions of the bitumen through to Hawker and the Wilpena Pound. The deterioration of this road is causing concern to people living in the area. The barytes plant at Quorn derives its supply from the mine situated between Hawker and Blinman and, until recently, most of the ore was transported from Hawker to Quorn on rail by the Commonwealth Railways, which ran one train a week. Due to the increased demand for barytes in offshore oil drilling, contracts have been called and let for motor vehicles to cart the ore from the mine to Quorn. Some of these trucks carry loads in excess of 30 tons. It will be a problem for the future as to whether the bitumen roads that are being constructed in that area will be able to withstand these enormous loads. As the railways have been and are still carting this ore, but as a tremendous amount is being carried by road, I should be pleased if the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, would ask his colleague to inquire into this matter to see whether something cannot be done to prevent these heavy vehicles from using the bitumen road in that area, especially as a railway line already exists there? I am sure that if we can keep this heavy traffic off these roads they will last much longer. This problem will also arise in connection with the road between Port Augusta and Whyalla, which was mentioned in the House earlier this week.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot debate the question.

Mr. CASEY: It was only a diversion. I should be pleased if the Attorney-General would obtain from his colleague a report on

the possibility of having this ore transported by rail from Hawker to Quorn, rather than by road as at present.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I take it that the honourable member has asked me to take up this matter with the Minister. If that is so, I shall be happy to do it.

DAWS ROAD HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 23 concerning the Daws Road High School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Immediately after the purchase of the land for the Daws Road High School, the Corporation of the City of Mitcham was asked whether it had any objection to the closing of parts of roads as shown on old Lands Titles Office plans within the site's boundaries. Appropriate action was taken, but, following objection from some adjoining owners that their access to Goodwood Road was curtailed, the road closing order was adjourned by the council pending negotiations with the objectors. Following representations from the late member for Edwardstown (Hon. Frank Walsh), the practicability of providing a pedestrian right of way along the eastern and southern boundaries to the school property was investigated. My predecessor agreed to the provision of the right of way, subject to the Public Buildings Department report that the proposal was practicable. Although the investigations showed that the residents concerned suffered only minor inconvenience, the proposed right of way was reported to be practicable. However, without realizing that the previous Minister had approved of the project under these conditions, a departmental officer decided, as he was in normal circumstances competent to do, that because of the minor inconvenience to residents the access pathway should not be constructed. This occurred before I took office and the matter has never previously been submitted to me. However, in view of the circumstances, I have now approved of a departmental recommendation that the access pathway be constructed, at an estimated cost of \$525.

WOMBATS

Mr. EDWARDS: Recently I received from a grazier in the Nundroo area a letter regarding the wombat and the dog fence. This problem is very serious at the moment, as the wombats are in plague numbers. They are digging holes under the dog fence and in some cases the holes are large enough for the wild dogs to come underneath the fence.

This is very serious. However, the land-owners are not permitted to fill in these holes, because, according to the officials of the Fauna and Flora Conservation Board, the owners may kill a wombat in the process of filling in the burrow. Not only do wombats dig holes underneath the fence: they simply blunder into the fence and make big holes through which the wild dogs can walk without any trouble whatsoever. At the time this letter was being written to me, there were two wild dogs on the inside of the fence. If honourable members know anything about wild dogs, they will know how serious this problem can become, especially if a pair of wild dogs are involved and they cannot be caught and they start breeding on the inside of the fence, which could easily happen.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to read the letter in full, but if he gave the context I think he would be in order. It is not in order to read letters in full.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have been given to understand that a wild dog on Colona Station is killing sheep and causing alarm at the present time. It seems that the wild dogs are greater in number this year than they have been for a long time, and that there are more wombats also than there have been for years. I was wondering whether it would be possible to give one or two of these landholders, or somebody else, a permit to shoot some of the excess wombat population and chill the meat in a freezer for pet food, instead of wasting all that amount of good meat from a wombat's body. If not, could these landholders have permission to fill in the burrows at least up to half a mile inside the fence, and one mile on the outside, to prevent damage being done to the fence and to prevent dogs from getting inside?

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member had better summarize his question now.

Mr. EDWARDS: Sir, if we cannot have some relaxation from flora and fauna protection, perhaps the members of the great Australian Labor Party opposite will agree to my recruiting the wombats for other purposes.

Mr. Hughes: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must now ask his question.

Mr. EDWARDS: Can the Minister of Lands say whether we are allowed to have some form of control over the wombats in the far west vermin board area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This question involves me considerably because the Dog Fence Board, which comes under my jurisdiction, has its responsibilities; also, I represent here the Minister of Agriculture, who is in charge of fauna conservation legislation. One small point that may have escaped the honourable member's notice is that the Fauna and Flora Board is not involved in this matter, it being a body that deals with land on Kangaroo Island only, but obviously this matter involves the rights of the fauna conservation authorities. The honourable member has raised a serious point, which should be investigated urgently. I will do that.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Further to an answer I received yesterday from the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, which would seem to be a little astray, concerning Greenhill Road parking, will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether a grader can be used to level unused roadway until the main highway is commenced?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am surprised to hear the opinion expressed that one of the answers from my colleague the Minister of Roads could possibly lead the honourable member astray. However, I shall be happy to discuss the matter again with my colleague to make certain that neither he nor I am off the track.

WATER LICENCES

Mr. McANANEY: Some months ago the Lower Murray and Lake Alexandrina area was brought under the control of the Waters Act. Since then, investigations have been made by the department concerning growers' acreages under irrigation. I understand that some are extending their plantings and others are not because they do not quite know what the licensing system will be. What stage has the Government reached in determining this matter?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: This is being currently considered by the Minister of Lands and myself, who are jointly concerned with this whole matter. I shall be able to advise the honourable member shortly of the outcome of those discussions.

LOAN EXPENDITURE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Treasurer an answer to questions asked about the Loan Estimates by myself and the member for Glenelg?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have the information that the honourable members sought in regard to some underspending in the Loan Estimates programme, which resulted in a considerably higher surplus at the end of June than was anticipated. Each honourable member referred to a statement tendered to the previous Government by the Under Treasurer in March of this year, and the information he has given me will, I think, cover the matters raised by each member. Questions have been asked about variations in figures in the Public Buildings Department portion of the Loan Estimates, in particular the underspending on hospital buildings and school buildings in 1967-68 and the extent of special Commonwealth grants to be available in 1968-69 towards school buildings. The estimate of probable expenditures in 1967-68 put before the previous Cabinet in March, 1968, was based on the information available to the Treasury and the Public Buildings Department at the time. There were indications then that a number of contractors were spending less than had been earlier expected but general information from contractors was that they expected to make up much of the lag in progress. In fact over the last four months of the year they not only failed to make up the leeway but fell further behind. The wetter autumn may have been a factor in this. Also, the Public Buildings Department experienced a number of delays in letting contracts over the latter half of the year. These delays were due to technical reasons involving lengthy consideration of tenders and were certainly not due to any conscious slowing down. The Royal Adelaide Hospital project was the largest single project involved. At this project there was an unforeseen delay in the letting of the tender for the new wing for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

The Public Buildings Department, with the concurrence of the Government, did not make a deliberate effort to expedite the actual disbursement of funds by June 30, 1968, but planned sensibly to have contracts let and proceed as practicable, having the assurance that any funds required early in 1968-69 rather than in 1967-68 would be re-voted. I would add that early in April the Under Treasurer, in reporting on finances to the end of March to the then Treasurer (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) said:

On Loan Account, payments during March, 1968, were \$8,036,000, showing a significant increase upon the rate of expenditure during previous months. The aggregate Loan expenditure for the nine months to March 31, 1968,

was \$51,897,000. There is accumulating evidence of lag in payments by the Public Buildings Department, mainly arising from a lag in claims by the major contractor for Royal Adelaide Hospital. In part, this may be due to delay in presentation of accounts by the contractor but the indications are that the full year's payments will be below estimate. Although individual departmental estimates suggest that overall eventual Loan payments will not be greatly below the original Budget, I believe they are optimistic and that there will be under-expenditure during 1967-68, at least to the extent of the \$3,750,000 suggested in my recent report for Cabinet, and probably rather more.

As to the variation in Commonwealth grants expected to be available in 1968-69, the estimate made in March (that is, \$2,600,000 for science laboratories, technical training and teachers colleges) included \$1,250,000 for teachers colleges. The latter included an early preliminary estimate of \$1,100,000 for the Salisbury Teachers College. A review of planning early in July showed that a more realistic figure of expenditure on approved teachers college projects in 1968-69 would be \$600,000, including \$500,000 for Salisbury. This is the major factor in the variation. There is also a small decrease following review of the amounts likely to be available this year towards science laboratories and technical training. I would emphasize that over the period of the appropriate Commonwealth legislation there will be no loss of Commonwealth grants. In particular, for the Salisbury Teachers College, the Public Buildings Department is making every effort to maintain the occupation date as the beginning of 1970. I regret that I do not have copies of this reply as it came to me only late this morning, but I will let *Hansard* have the full text, so that it will then be available in correct form for the honourable members concerned.

Mr. HUDSON: In last year's Loan Estimates the sum of \$5,915,000 was provided for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and the separate amount of \$400,000 was provided for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. This was for a new wing, which was estimated to cost about \$2,500,000. However, there seems to have been a change in the way these items have been set out in the Loan Estimates for this year, because the supplementary document states that a grant of \$6,200,000 is provided for the Royal Adelaide Hospital rebuilding scheme, including the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. Will the Treasurer therefore find out for me the amount spent during the last financial year

for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, and how much of the \$6,200,000 allocation for this year is reserved for the new wing for the institute?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

STOCK THEFTS

Mr. RODDA: I understand the Minister of Lands has further information in regard to a question I asked on August 7 about stock thefts.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member some time ago asked about a report dealing with stock thefts in the South-East, to the effect that during the drought large numbers of sheep and cattle were being driven along the roads in that area. He asked whether the provisions of the Act could be tightened up. I have been furnished with a report from the Chief Secretary, incorporating a report from the Police Department, which states:

Since the Travelling Stock Waybills Act was repealed on December 9, 1965, there has been no actual control of the movement of stock in South Australia. However, the stock movement report was introduced and a copy of all reports of the movement of stock coming under police notice is filed at this office. There are ample powers in the Road Traffic Act and the Brands Act to police the stock movement reports. All instances of stock entering South Australia from interstate without health certificates that come under my notice as the result of the stock movement reports are reported to the Agriculture Department. There are ample powers in sections 14 and 15 of the Impounding Act for the control of stock invading property owned by other people. This also includes stock straying or wandering on a road adjacent to the enclosed land of another, or feeding off enclosed land, notwithstanding that the stock are lawfully depastured on the road. I do not see the necessity of tightening up the relevant Act. Owners or occupiers of land concerned with encroaching stock may impound them either on their own land and claim sustenance fees or place them in the nearest pound. Should the landowner not wish to take this action he should report the matter forthwith to the local council authorities.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the date on which it was decided to transfer from Revenue Account to Loan Account the financing of the \$100,000 grant to the Renmark Irrigation Trust for 1967-68?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The decision was first taken on April 8, 1968, and that decision having been taken it was carried forward into the accounts again this year.

GOOLWA BARRAGE

Mr. McANANEY: Every year there is some controversy about whether the barrages at Goolwa are closed quickly enough to maintain the level of the lakes and river at pool level. As the storages in the Upper Murray catchment area are fairly low this year, can the Minister of Works assure me that, as the time of closing approaches, as few logs as possible will be kept out of the barrages so that they can be closed quickly when the flow in the river nearly ceases?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The position last year, of course, was rather the reverse. I will get the information for the honourable member.

FROGMORE ROAD BRIDGE

Mr. BROOMHILL: The bridge across the Torrens River at Frogmore Road, Kidman Park, is a cattle bridge that can take only one car at a time, thus creating dangerous situations for drivers. In addition, as Kidman Park is rapidly developing, Frogmore Road is becoming a major route for people travelling between Grange Road and Henley Beach Road. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads to urgently consider constructing a new bridge on this site?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask the Minister about it.

ULEY-WANILLA BASIN

Mr. EDWARDS: Because of the importance of the Uley-Wanilla Basin as a source of water for districts represented by the Treasurer and me, can the Minister of Works say what is the condition of the basin and whether any survey is being made at present?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Recent rains have resulted in the Tod River reservoir itself overflowing, causing the Uley-Wanilla Basin to overflow for the first time in, I believe, 10 or 12 years. Advantage has been taken of this phenomenon, and an aerial photographic survey has been made for recording purposes and also to assist in further research into the work to be undertaken.

ANZAC HIGHWAY

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General received a reply from the Minister of Roads to a question I asked some time ago about the Anzac Highway?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think I had a reply yesterday: I gave one to the member for West Torrens who had asked a question, the import of which had a direct

bearing on the one asked by the honourable member. Unfortunately, I do not have anything in the bag today for the honourable member.

RAIL SERVICE

Mr. McANANEY: As I understand that the Minister of Transport has recommended the closure of the railway line between Mount Barker Junction and Victor Harbour, will the Attorney-General ask his colleague when the report from the Transport Control Board about this closure will be available?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask about that.

GLENELG SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Some weeks ago the contract for building a new two-storey building at the Glenelg Primary School was let. From my observations of what is going on at the school, it seems that the contractor, for one reason or another that I do not know about, has been slow in commencing work. This raises the question whether this work will be completed for the beginning of the new school year in 1969. I shall be pleased if the Minister will take up this matter with the Public Buildings Department to ascertain why the delays (if any) have occurred, and also whether the people concerned with this school can be assured that the new building will be ready for occupation by the beginning of the 1969 school year.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Last Sunday afternoon I spent some time looking at a number of projects, one of which was the school to which the honourable member refers. I had expected work to be further advanced than it was. I will ascertain what progress is being made, especially in view of the hoped for completion date, and I will advise the honourable member accordingly as soon as I can.

OUTER HARBOUR

Mr. HURST: Will the Minister of Works ascertain for me the amount of road work, fencing and other work performed on the construction of ancillary office accommodation at Outer Harbour during the financial year ended June 30, 1968?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes.

WHYALLA RAILWAY

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Premier a reply to my question concerning the suggested railway between Port Augusta and Whyalla?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I wrote to the Prime Minister this month, stressing the need to construct a new standard gauge railway between Port Augusta and Whyalla. In this letter I also drew attention to the fact that the future development of Whyalla is at present being studied by the State Planning Authority in conjunction with the Highways Department and other Government departments. I pointed out that it is important to ensure the future orderly development of this city and that a proposal to provide a standard gauge rail connection to Whyalla will require close co-ordination between the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner and these authorities.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding a conference of teachers of Aboriginal children?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am informed that an invitation to nominate teachers to attend the conference on training of teachers of Aboriginal children was sent to the Director of Welfare, Northern Territory, through the Director of Northern Territory Schools. As a result, a request was received to keep a place for a teacher from the Welfare Department, Northern Territory.

WOOMERA ROAD

Mr. RICHES: My question relates to the Woomera Road, and in particular I refer to the reply the Attorney-General gave last week concerning that road. I had drawn attention to the desirability of permanently upgrading the road between Port Augusta and Woomera, a request that has the strong support of local government bodies and representative organizations in both Port Augusta and Woomera. In his reply the Minister said:

No construction work on the Port Augusta to Woomera road is planned for the current financial year. Maintenance on the present alignment is continuing. Commonwealth assistance was requested during the latter part of 1967, but up to the present no reply has been received.

The only maintenance work that can be carried out on that road is occasional grading after vehicles have been bogged. This request to the Commonwealth Government has been made repeatedly over the years. Since attention is now being paid to the Stuart Highway right through from Port Augusta to Alice Springs (as the Minister stated in reply to another question yesterday), and as other announcements regarding roadworks have been made,

will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads whether the Commonwealth Government has yet replied to the representations that have been made and, if it has not, will he ask that further representations be made, as it is now nearly 12 months since the last case was presented?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

MURRAY BRIDGE WEIGHBRIDGE

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, ascertain for how many hours the weighbridge at Murray Bridge (which, I believe, is staffed from Adelaide) is staffed each year, and the cost of staffing it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ascertain that information for the honourable member.

PORT AUGUSTA ROAD

Mr. RICHES: Last week the Premier promised the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) that he would obtain a report on the possibility of building the Port Augusta to Whyalla railway, and at the same time he promised me he would call for a report on the condition of the bitumen road, particularly between the El Alamein Army camp and Port Augusta, and the Yorke Crossing road, which will be used by hauliers when bringing steel from Whyalla to Port Augusta. I also asked whether he would obtain a reply regarding whether that steel would go over the Port Augusta bridge, and, if so, what the tonnages would be. Has he a reply on this matter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sorry that I do not have a reply. However, I assure the honourable member that it is on the current list and is being obtained.

SEAVIEW DOWNS SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Shortly before the previous Government went out of office, a new Samcon school was approved for the Seaview Downs area, and provision for that school has been made in this year's Loan Estimates. I understood at the time that it was hoped to have the school completed by the end of this year so that it would be ready for occupation at the beginning of the 1969 school year. Can the Minister of Works therefore inform me whether any contract has been let in relation to this school and, if it has, what the progress of work is so far? If no contract has been let, when can we expect work on this school to commence?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: As I cannot recall whether a contract has been let, I will certainly find out for the honourable member and expedite the matter if necessary.

UPPER HERMITAGE WATER SUPPLY

Mrs. BYRNE: Certain houses situated at Range Road North, Upper Hermitage, which forms part of the scenic route, are connected to the Engineering and Water Supply Department's main from its present terminal at the Upper Hermitage tennis courts, involving a distance of about half a mile. A constituent has asked me to inquire whether the department has any immediate plans to connect these houses to its main, thus obviating the necessity for the people concerned to provide their own pipes. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on this matter?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I shall be happy to do that.

PORT AUGUSTA GAOL

Mr. RICHES: Representations concerning the Port Augusta Gaol having been made to the Government over several years, the matter was eventually referred to the Public Works Committee, which about three years ago reported that reconstruction was urgent. With the growth of the population, including moving population, in the northern areas, overcrowding occurs, and I know that considerable difficulty is experienced by officers of the gaol in providing adequate accommodation, including beds. The proposed reconstruction of the Adelaide Gaol and improvements to other gaols seem to have come into the picture after promises had been made concerning the Port Augusta Gaol, which is in a poor state of repair. Will the Minister of Works have the present situation investigated and obtain a report on what the Government intends to do in the immediate future?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I appreciate the honourable member's concern about this real problem at the Port Augusta Gaol, which I have visited, albeit on a purely temporary basis. Recently I have discussed at some length with the Chief Secretary the whole question of gaols and the future programme in this regard. The maintenance of existing gaols, including the Port Augusta Gaol, was also discussed. However, I will ascertain from the Chief Secretary the latest information and I will obtain from the Public Buildings Department, which I administer, its future plans concerning this gaol. I will inform the honourable member of the outcome as soon as I can.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Education will be aware that the previous Government introduced arrangements whereby new schools were to receive a grant of \$1,000 for starting a secondary school library, \$800 for starting a primary school library and, I think, \$100 for starting a one-teacher school library. Will the Minister bring down a report on whether the proposed assistance from the Commonwealth Government concerning libraries will in any way interfere with these arrangements? Further, will she indicate in what way this money is to be spent (particularly, of course, regarding departmental schools) and whether the Commonwealth has laid down any conditions regarding this expenditure?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Naturally, I was delighted when I read of the Commonwealth Government's decision to help State education authorities in this field by making grants for library purposes. At this stage, I know little more about the matter than the honourable member knows, having only read about it in the paper and having seen reports of the allocations to be made. However, as soon as I have the relevant information, I shall be happy to tell the House how these grants will be applied and in what proportion.

CROSS ROAD JUNCTION

Mr. VIRGO: A letter of complaint has been forwarded to me about the redesigning of the junction of Wattle Terrace and Cross Road. In reconstructing what is quite a dangerous area, the Highways Department has unfortunately deprived the people who own attractive properties in the area of access into and out of Wattle Terrace. The department has virtually closed the exit from this street at Cross Road, presumably for the sole purpose of facilitating the flow of traffic into and out of Morphettville racecourse. As I believe the situation of the residents concerned is of greater importance than that of patrons of the racecourse, will the Attorney-General take up the matter with the Minister of Roads with a view to restoring to these people what I believe is their right to have access to their houses, without their being required to go around four streets to reach Cross Road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask the Minister about the matter.

GAS

Mr. HUDSON: Certain details were given in the Loan Estimates in relation to the financing provisions for the building of the

gas pipeline from the Gidgealpa-Moomba area to Adelaide. We were informed that \$1,000,000 was provided from State Loan funds last financial year for this purpose and that a further allocation of \$1,000,000 was to be made this financial year. The following rather cryptic statement also appears in the explanation:

The remaining \$5,000,000 is to be provided by advances from the normal State Loan programme and from borrowings arranged as part of the normal semi-government programme.

Can the Treasurer indicate whether the borrowing of this \$5,000,000 that comes from State Loan funds will be of a permanent nature or whether it will be repaid to the Loan Fund as it is gradually replaced by semi-government borrowing, so that in a few years' time all of the \$5,000,000 will form part of the semi-government programme and none will come from the State Loan programme? Is it intended, for example, that part of the \$5,000,000 will be permanently borrowed from the State Loan Fund and that the balance will be from the semi-government programme, or will the semi-government part be gradually increased so that the money borrowed from the State Loan programme will be repaid over a fairly short period?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Because I am unsure whether I completely understand the honourable member's question, I will confer with him privately to ensure that we are not at cross purposes. Some of the money advanced by the State Treasury is advanced on a very short-term basis. I think I referred to this aspect when explaining the Loan Estimates. I shall endeavour to obtain information about the general programme.

Mr. HUDSON: An article in today's *News* reports that a 10 per cent interest in the South Australian oil and gas fields at Gidgealpa and Moomba has been sold by Delhi Australian Petroleum Limited to an Australian company, Vam Limited, of Melbourne. The article states:

The Australian company is to spend about \$6,550,000 to help Delhi meet its commitments in developing the natural gas fields in the north of the State.

I always thought that Delhi-Santos could well have difficulty in financing all of its necessary expenditure to process natural gas at Gidgealpa and Moomba prior to the gas entering the pipeline. Consequently, it is no real surprise to me that it has found it necessary to raise finance in this way. However, this raises a question concerning the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority Act. I

think I am correct in saying that, under this Act, Delhi-Santos is entitled to two representatives on the authority. If an interest in the South Australian oil and gas fields is sold in this way, the continuance of this representation as it stands at present must be called into question. Can the Treasurer say whether the Government approved this sale of a 10 per cent interest in the South Australian oil and gas fields and whether it has considered amending the Act to provide, perhaps, for changing the authority's composition should any further sale of Delhi-Santos interests take place?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think the first part of the honourable member's question does not come within my purview and should be directed to the Minister of Mines.

Mr. HUDSON: The report states that the Minister of Mines must approve.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member was not kind enough to inform me of that, and I have not seen the press report. Representation on the authority is a matter for the company concerned. I will check the provisions of the Act, which the honourable member himself was not quite sure about, to see what is provided if the company sells off its interests and thereby stands to lose its representation on the authority. I do not think for one moment that it would lose its representation, certainly not until it had disposed of all its interests. This is a matter of interpretation of the Act, and I will consider it. I do not think any farming out or selling of any portion of its holdings in this venture would preclude it from holding its representation on the pipeline authority. I will consider the matter, because it is of some importance.

Mr. HUDSON: The original plan provided for an 18in. pipeline, and queries were raised concerning whether this size was adequate. I think an 18in. line was originally recommended by the Bechtel Pacific Corporation Limited after a series of computer runs relating the existing reserves to the expected demand for natural gas over a period of years. Obviously, the appropriate size of the line would be affected if there was a change in the available reserves or in the estimates of demand. I, for one, was pleased to see that the size of the pipeline was to be increased to 22in. The total cost of the project is now estimated in the Loan Estimates to be \$40,000,000. Can the Treasurer tell me or ascertain the effect on the total cost of the project of the increase in diameter of the pipeline from 18in. to 22in.?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: From memory, the original estimated cost of the pipeline was \$35,000,000.

Mr. Hudson: From memory, I think it was \$38,000,000.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As some inevitable increase in the cost has taken place as a result of the larger diameter of the pipeline, I will find out exactly what that increase amounts to, if that is ascertainable. The present estimated cost of the pipeline is the result of a tender being called for both supply and construction. However, as far as I know, we did not have a tender for the construction of the smaller diameter pipeline. Therefore, I do not think it will be possible to obtain a precise comparison because, on the one hand, we have only an estimate and, on the other hand, we have an actual tender. I agree that the fact that we have now let a tender for a larger diameter pipeline, as a result of the greater availability of gas at the source, is a reason for all of us to be gratified.

NORTHERN RAILWAY

Mr. RICHES: Last week the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), in asking a question about the North-South railway (*Hansard*, page 490), said:

A constituent of mine with extensive commercial interests in the Northern Territory is finding it most difficult to get his goods into the Northern Territory because of the lack of suitable roads and also because of breakages to his goods when they are transported on the Commonwealth Railways.

As the Commonwealth Railways is jealous of its reputation for careful handling of goods and of its record in transportation services generally, will the member for Stirling supply me with particulars of the complaint so that it can be investigated or, alternatively, will he himself place these particulars before the Commonwealth Railways so that the complaint can be investigated and answered?

Mr. McANANEY: I will obtain details of the complaint from my constituent and see the honourable member later so that he can have those details. My constituent said he was reimbursed by the Commonwealth Railways for the breakages but the inconvenience was greater than that which should be expected.

HEART MACHINES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Early this week the Premier was good enough to reply to a question I had asked previously about the number of heart monitoring machines available at the

Royal Adelaide Hospital. I was pleased to note that it was planned to increase the number of such machines. The Premier pointed out that seven machines were being used at present and that four more were on order for future use. I understand, however, that these four machines have been on order for some time. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether the supply of these machines can be hastened, because I understand they are urgently needed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will make the necessary inquiries for the honourable member.

LIBRARIES

Mr. RICHES: Many public libraries in South Australia appear to be embarrassed because of the difficulty of obtaining an adequate supply of books to meet the demands of people using the libraries. In some places rather caustic comments have been made about the paucity of supplies. Can the Minister of Education say whether any steps will be taken to increase the supply of books to public libraries (particularly country public libraries) during this financial year?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HUDSON: Of great concern to those members who have had anything to do with the Social Welfare Department in recent years has been the standard of accommodation for officers of the department. The current accommodation gives rise to overcrowded and noisy conditions and, during the summer, unpleasant conditions as a result of over-heating. Early in April this year, a conference took place between the former Minister of Works, the Director and the Chief Architect of the Public Buildings Department, and me regarding future planning for the relocation of the department, as a result of which the whole question whether long-term planning should be based on a continued occupancy of the Rundle Street site was raised. At the time, I was concerned to see that, if the department was to continue to be located on the Rundle Street site (even for three to five years), some money was spent to improve the overall standard of office accommodation, particularly by cutting down the noise, by improving the conditions obtaining in hot weather, and by eliminating the worst of the overcrowding. Can the Minister of Social Welfare give a report to me of any decisions that have been taken in this matter?

If he has no report available, will he examine the matter and give me details of what is intended?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think this is the first question I have had from my predecessor, the former Minister of Social Welfare. As I have been wondering when he would show an interest in his old department, I therefore welcome the question, although I suspect it was asked merely to try to keep Question Time going until 4 o'clock, as is his usual practice. The answers to his questions are "No" and "Yes".

HOME HELP

Mr. RICHES: The Minister of Social Welfare will recall that last year, I think, he drew the attention of the House to the lack of personnel available to carry out adequately the demands on the home help service. He also made a plea for a reduction in costs so that the service could be given to families in need. Can he bring down a report on the situation as he finds it today? Also, can he indicate what steps have been taken, first, to recruit additional staff and, secondly, to meet those cases of need where payment for the service is a major consideration?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member will not be surprised to know that this was one of the first matters I took up with the Director of Social Welfare when I became Minister. The matter is still being examined.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 14. Page 652.)

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): As there seems to be some confusion among members regarding the definition of the metropolitan area, I ask leave to display in the Chamber a map showing the metropolitan planning area so that arguments relating to clause 7 can be better understood by honourable members.

Leave granted.

Mr. McKEE: When the House adjourned last evening I was about to refer to the Premier's compromise, which has been referred to frequently by members opposite in this debate. The *Advertiser* has also made great play of this compromise, but I believe it could well be one of those red cherries (or Gumeracha cherries), to which the member for

Victoria (Mr. Rodda) referred, being used to hoodwink the electors of the State into believing that, if the Bill is passed, they will be living under a democratic system of Government. However, even if the Bill is passed, I do not believe that position will obtain. When one examines the terms of the compromise clearly, one can see that a publicity smoke screen has been set up to draw the attention of the public away from the situation existing in relation to the Legislative Council. I suppose the Council could be described as one of the most undemocratic Houses of Parliament in the world. I believe the situation with regard to the Legislative Council—

Mr. Freebairn: You mean the other place.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. I consider that the other place presents a real challenge to the Government to put the interests of the people above its own and those of its Party. I know that the member for Stirling will agree with this (at least he should), because I understand he is an honoured and valued member of a certain organization whose sole purpose is to protect the liberties of the people. I think he may have hinted that he was trying to get out of the organization, because he said it was a difficult body from which to resign, a member needing about a 60 per cent vote to do so.

Mr. Clark: It sounds like the set-up here.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, it is a gerrymander in reverse. As the member for Stirling is a prominent member of this organization, if he is genuine in his desire to carry out its constitution with respect to the liberties of the people he should exert as much pressure as he can on his colleagues and Cabinet to introduce some measures that would alter the situation in the Legislative Council. In other words, he should bring pressure on his colleagues and Cabinet to introduce adult suffrage and a common roll for the Council.

Mr. Freebairn: Do you think the Civil Liberties Council believes in one vote one value?

Mr. McKEE: It could well do. If the member for Stirling does not bring pressure on the Government to do something about the Legislative Council, I do not think he should have any worry about resigning from the organization; in fact, I recommend that the organization expel him immediately—

Mr. McAnaney: We do not exert pressure.

Mr. McKEE: —if he does not carry out the rules of the organization of which he claims to be a member. After 30 years

at least we have achieved some sort of break-through in this House, but had it not been for the tireless efforts of our Leader and the strong public opinion that has been one of the major factors that has forced the Government to introduce this Bill, we would be debating a Bill not for a 47-seat House of Assembly but for a 45-seat House of Assembly.

Mr. Lawn: That and the Millicent by-election.

Mr. McKEE: Had the Labor Party not won the Millicent by-election, I do not think we would be considering electoral reform at all. I know that the mention of Millicent is a sore point with the Premier. He does not need reminding that while in Millicent he pointed the political bone at himself and his Party. During the by-election he stood up gallantly and told the people that if he won the seat he would introduce a Bill for a 45-seat House of Assembly.

Mr. Lawn: Didn't he say he would take a win in that by-election as a mandate for a further gerrymander?

Mr. McKEE: Yes. The people of Millicent let him know that they would not be pushed around by an arrogant dictatorship. They were determined that they would not be dictated to by someone who intended to take away their right to change the Government if they decided to do so.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you agree with the whopper the Leader told down there?

Mr. Clark: Who said it was a whopper?

Mr. McAnaney: It was a deliberate lie.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members can hold their conversations later.

Mr. McAnaney: Did you do your homework?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling can do his homework later.

Mr. McKEE: The people of Millicent will go down in history as those responsible for introducing at least a form of democracy into this House of Assembly, because their attitude at the recent by-election forced the Government to change its mind from a 45-seat proposal to a 47-seat proposal. The electors of Millicent will be remembered as the people who took the first real action against the gerrymander that has existed in the State for over 30 years. I congratulate them on the stand they took in the cause of democracy by forcing the Government to change its mind and, for the first time, to consider the people instead of its own interests. After the Bill is passed, I hope the Government will consider going to the people as soon as possible.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I am pleased to take part in this debate and to follow my old acquaintance, the member for Port Pirie, but I disagree with much of what he has had to say. I, as the representative of the important Riverland District of Chaffey, approached this Bill as would a country member. I am well aware that, because of the compromise contained in the measure, country representation in this House will be reduced. However, taking a broad view of the electoral situation in this State, I consider that there is a necessity for both Parties to make concessions, as has been done.

Because the Opposition intimated at the commencement of the debate that it would support the second reading of the Bill, there is no point in my repeating things that have been said many times by members opposite. Nevertheless, the Opposition's approach to this measure has underlined not so much that justice is being done but that amendments are designed to assure that there will be 29 districts in the metropolitan area. The spirit of my Party's compromise has been to leave the fixing of the boundaries to the commission. That task is clearly defined in clause 7, and we will accept the commission's decision, whether the representation be 29 to 18 or 28 to 19. If we dictated what the commission was to do, there would be little point in appointing a commission. The Opposition has said that the tolerances allowable by the Bill are too great, but justice cannot be achieved for the people if we tie the hands of the commission.

The Australian Labor Party professes that equality lies in one vote one value. However, there is a lot more to equality than that. There must be equality of representation in Parliament, but this does not necessarily mean that each member must represent the same number of constituents. The people must have equality in other aspects of life, such as facilities, purchasing power and the many other matters that one vote one value does not cover. Country people are at a distinct disadvantage because of their isolation, and the farther they are from the metropolitan area the greater this problem becomes.

Mr. Casey: You don't really believe that, do you?

Mr. ARNOLD: If the honourable member considers the matter, he will realize that the farther one is from the metropolitan area the more one has to pay for petrol, food, or any other item. This state of affairs operates on

a sliding scale, becoming worse the farther a constituent is from the metropolitan area. This is not equality, and these matters should be taken into consideration if the people are to have true equality and democracy.

Mr. Riches: I don't think that's in the Bill.

Mr. ARNOLD: We are talking about equality for the people, and we shall achieve equality and justice if the commission is given a free hand, having regard to the tolerances provided for in the Bill. When the present Leader of the Opposition was Premier, he made the mistake of playing to the majority of the people in the metropolitan area and disregarding the country people, and the reaction of the country people was evident at the March election.

Mr. Jennings: It wasn't very obvious in the Millicent by-election, was it?

Mr. ARNOLD: The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) received considerably fewer votes at the Millicent by-election than he had received previously. The problems of the remoteness of country people and the lack of ready accessibility to their members were borne out before the March election, because although the city candidates had many more constituents to visit, they were able to visit them in about half the time taken by country candidates to canvass their constituents. Yesterday the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) ably told us of this problem, when he pointed out—

Mr. Jennings: His best defence is to keep away from them.

Mr. ARNOLD: The member for Eyre pointed out the problems that country people faced, because of scanty representation.

Mr. Jennings: They prefer—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Enfield must not interject. He has made a speech.

Mr. Jennings: I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It was a slip of the tongue.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has no right of reply.

Mr. ARNOLD: When the member for Enfield was speaking, he commented on the boredom that he suffered when new members were making speeches. However, that does not compare with the boredom that I had to suffer during his speech on this Bill. He was neither constructive nor informative and added nought to this debate. I have never considered that one section of the community is more

important than another. Country people depend on the city for markets for their produce and the people in the city depend on those in the country for the disposal of secondary production. If this Parliament approved a system something like one vote one value, we would be taking the attitude that one section of the community was more important than the other. The emphasis would be on the metropolitan area. The flexibility in this Bill is designed to give the commissioners the opportunity of weighing up all the problems and, if their decisions are acceptable, according to the provisions of the Bill, we shall be able to achieve justice for the people of this State.

Mr. Freebairn: Did you mention why your district rejected Socialism at the last election?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not reply to that. Socialism is not mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. ARNOLD: Earlier in this debate the member for Angas made an excellent quotation from the Rt. Hon. John McEwen which I think is well worth repeating for the benefit of the Opposition. It is:

We do not want a Parliament which is organized for country people; we do not want a Parliament which is organized in such a way that country people may be forgotten; we want a Parliament which is so organized as to pay regard to all considerations that are critical for the wellbeing of this country. In other words, we want good government for all the people from a properly balanced Parliament.

We cannot get a properly balanced Government in a State like South Australia with one vote one value, but we shall get it if the commission is given the necessary flexibility and the opportunity for initiative to do justice to all the people in the State. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support the second reading of this Bill. Many features of it are not acceptable to me personally and most members from this side of the House have expressed themselves admirably along these lines. Members opposite, strangely enough, have not concerned themselves much with the Bill itself. That is a pity, because it results from the animosity shown by the people to an electoral system that has operated in South Australia for far too many years. In the past we have put forward several plans to incorporate what the Labor Party believes in—the principle of one vote one value. I have expressed my view in this House on other

occasions that, while this is desirable, it is not always practicable to implement in South Australia—or in other States, for that matter. Nevertheless, the whole idea of drawing up a Bill of this nature is that this should be the prime factor governing the electoral system of any State or country. Members opposite have strayed from this important concept of one vote one value.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They did it deliberately to keep in power.

Mr. CASEY: That is so, because in the case of an electoral distribution when a Government puts forward a measure of this nature, it knows full well before it is introduced into the House what its implications will be; so let us not kid ourselves otherwise. This measure caused great concern and disharmony within the Liberal Party.

Mr. Clark: And still does.

Mr. CASEY: And possibly still does, because over the years we have seen 26 country members representing a very small number of people in this State. Some of those members, including some newly-elected members, will lose their seats under this Bill, which will give them food for thought. That, possibly, accounts for the friction within the L.C.L. but, if members opposite are genuine in their approach to this matter, in seeing that the people of South Australia are given an opportunity to be properly represented in this Parliament, they must bury their differences and realize that they must act in the best interests of their constituents and of the State as a whole.

The first part of the Bill deals with the electoral commission. As pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, it has certain undesirable meanings, which we appreciate as we go through the Bill. This has all been covered by members on this side of the House and I agree with what has been said: the Chairman should not have the power of veto. That is completely and utterly wrong. It has never been done before in any electoral Bill before this House and I do not think it has ever been done in an electoral Bill in any other part of the British Commonwealth. Why this power was included I do not know. Perhaps it was for the reason that we on this side would move an amendment and the Government would agree to it, and then it could say, "We have compromised on this one; therefore, we shall not compromise on something else." The tactics usually employed in a case like this are that, if one side can yield on a

couple of small items, it can then say, "At least, we have compromised. How much further do you want us to go?" In a case like this members opposite should realize that the Chairman's right of veto is absolutely wrong; it should never have been included in the Bill in the first place.

Mr. Edwards: You are saying that he does not know his job.

Mr. CASEY: Only a person of the calibre of the member for Eyre would think of a stupid suggestion like that; I shall come to the member for Eyre shortly and point out a few things that he said that he should not have said during his speech. There is no doubt, as the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) interjected, that his speech was written by somebody else and the honourable member just read it, but whoever advised him advised him incorrectly.

I come now to the provision for deputies being appointed for the Chairman and the commissioners in case of illness, etc. Those people should be the deputies of those particular gentlemen in their normal occupations, not merely people to deputize for them. There are the Surveyor-General and the State Returning Officer, either of whom would fill the bill admirably as Chairman if the Chairman of the commission was indisposed and, if they were indisposed, their deputies, and not other people should deputize for them: they should be there to take their place. The definition of metropolitan area is interesting. In the last Bill introduced by a former L.C.L. Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, the city of Gawler was included but, for some reason, Gawler has been excluded from the metropolitan area in this Bill, which provides:

The metropolitan area shall consist of the Metropolitan Planning Area as defined in the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967.

However, the terms of reference of the Town Planning Committee were restricted when it defined the metropolitan area in such a way that Gawler could not be included. In every other document presented to this House concerning the metropolitan area Gawler has always been included. The stage has been reached where, if the L.C.L. is such a reform Party, it should accept Gawler as part of the metropolitan area.

Mr. McAnaney: We take notice of experts.

Mr. CASEY: I know the member for Stirling lives in the southern area of the State, but we who live in the northern areas and

travel regularly on the Main North Road to Gawler realize that Gawler is, and has been for years, part of the metropolitan area.

Mr. McAnaney: Are you a better expert than members of the Town Planning Committee?

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member was not present when I said that the terms of reference of that committee were restricted so that it could not consider including Gawler in the metropolitan area. The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study is the latest report on the future development of the metropolitan area and, although I do not know where the Government will obtain the money to implement it, that report includes Gawler as part of the metropolitan area. If Gawler is excluded from the metropolitan area an injustice will be done to the people of Gawler and the State, and the Government will not be facing facts.

Mr. Jennings: They had to go back to 1962 to get a report to exclude it.

Mr. CASEY: Of course. There must be a reason for the Government's adopting this attitude. I think it wanted to restrict the number of people in the metropolitan area so that there would not be too many seats there. When the commission is set up and considers the actual electors on the roll there could be a difference of one seat, because only by bringing the fractions to the nearest whole number (but these are to be disregarded under the Bill's provisions) would there be 29 seats in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Clark: I think this is doubtful.

Mr. CASEY: I am sure that the Government drew up the Bill specifically in that regard. The Government cannot ignore, and should not ignore, that the people of Gawler are hostile because they have been excluded: they accept the fact that they are part of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Freebairn: They want to be attached to the District of Light and be represented by me.

Mr. CASEY: Heaven forbid that they should have that forced on them. It is interesting to note the suggested division of the State by the proposed electoral boundaries. Apparently, the Government already knows, to a large extent, where the seats are to be allocated, even before the commission draws up the boundaries. It can only guess at the divisions in the metropolitan area, but certain country areas are simple to define.

Mr. Jennings: Last night the member for Victoria seemed to know the answers.

Mr. CASEY: True: by his speech he indicated that he already knew the divisions of the State and where they would be, and it seems that his Party has already drawn them up roughly and has a good indication of what will happen. The number of electors in the State is 611,289, which when divided by 47 gives a State quota of 13,006. By simple arithmetic—

Mr. Virgo: Perhaps it is skulduggery!

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member can call it that if he likes. Obviously, when dealing with this aspect one can resort to skulduggery. Under the Commonwealth distribution of boundaries the commissioners were told that they were to have one tolerance of 20 per cent, and most States do the same. However, when considering the provision of tolerance it is possible to manipulate things.

Mr. McAnaney: The commissioners could?

Mr. CASEY: No, those who drew up this Bill and introduced it did—the Government. For the benefit of the member for Stirling the definition of metropolitan area in clause 7 leaves the commissioners with little scope for discretion when dividing the metropolitan area, particularly when it is judged in terms of the numbers of electors involved. The "living" and "country living" areas set out in the Town Planning Committee's report of 1962 set the limits of any subdivision of land for building allotments which is likely to occur for the next seven years, apart from subdivisions in what are clearly defined as "country townships", such as Willunga, McLaren Vale and McLaren Flat. Since 1962, apart from minor exception, subdivision of a residential type has not occurred outside the defined area, nor is it likely to occur. Furthermore, the submissions of the State Planning Authority to the M.A.T.S. committee, giving population forecasts for a whole series of data collection units throughout the metropolitan planning area, together with Gawler, confirm the fact that no significant residential development is expected outside the defined "living" and "country living" areas.

Regarding the requirement under clause 7 for the exclusion of all areas adjacent to the boundary which, after seven years, are likely to be used predominantly for primary production, the following areas will almost certainly be excluded: (1) all Willunga electoral subdivisions except possibly the coastal strip containing Aldinga and Sellick Beach; (2) all Morphett Vale electoral subdivision south of the Onkaparinga River, except for

Port Noarlunga, Moana and Seaford, and that part of Noarlunga's residential area lying south of the Onkaparinga River; (3) all Clarendon electoral subdivision except Happy Valley, O'Halloran Hill and Coromandel Valley and their immediate environs; (4) all Mount Barker and Norton Summit electoral subdivisions, except the residential development extending along both sides of the Mount Barker Road between Mount Lofty and Bridgewater; (5) all Highbury electoral subdivisions not included in the Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully council areas; and (6) that part of the Two Wells electoral subdivision lying inside the metropolitan planning area.

The exclusion of those areas would give a metropolitan electoral enrolment of 427,000 (428,000 at the outside). If Gawler were included, the metropolitan electoral enrolment would be about 431,500 (432,500 at the outside). As at July 31, 1968, 433,750 electors would have been required in order to have 29 metropolitan seats under this Bill (and, therefore, under the terms of reference). The Bill therefore clearly cannot give rise to more than 28 metropolitan seats, even if Gawler is included in the metropolitan area. Although the M.A.T.S. report includes Gawler in the metropolitan area, the Government does not want Gawler included, apparently because such inclusion does not appear in the Town Planning Committee's 1962 report. However, I sincerely hope that the Government will see fit to include Gawler in the metropolitan area. As I have said, any Government can, by using the word "tolerance" when introducing a measure for electoral reform, fix the seats according to its requirements.

We have a rather unusual situation in this Bill in that the metropolitan quota is obtained (after the metropolitan area and the State quota itself have been defined), and 15 per cent is added to the metropolitan quota, bringing it up to 14,957. The Bill then goes a step further and provides for a tolerance of 10 per cent either way. Why go to the trouble of all this mathematical manipulation in trying to determine how many people will be in the metropolitan area and how many will be elsewhere? I think this is a completely stupid provision. It does not exist in other States except perhaps where there are three types of electoral district.

Mr. McAnaney: It exists in Tasmania.

Mr. CASEY: We can disregard Tasmania because that State has proportional representation, anyway. The New South Wales Lower House has 94 members, and its Upper House

is elected differently from the way in which our Upper House is elected. The New South Wales Upper House is elected by both Houses and not by the electors. That is a rather archaic practice but, of course, members of the New South Wales Upper House receive only a small salary, whereas members of our Upper House receive the same salary and benefits as we receive. Concerning the New South Wales Lower House which, as I have said, has 94 members, the Act provides for 48 seats in the Sydney metropolitan area which, incidentally, is not defined to cover all the newer suburbs: and 46 seats are provided for the rest of the State. This, of course, was the system operating under the new Liberal Government in New South Wales headed by Mr. Askin.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That legislation was passed years ago.

Mr. CASEY: I did not say the Askin Government altered it. In New South Wales the electoral commission is a permanent body and must redraw electoral boundaries every five years, unless directed by the Government to do so earlier. Quotas are established for metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, and the commission must work within a 20 per cent tolerance. A redistribution took place prior to the election on February 24, 1963. The Askin Government amended the Electoral Act to provide for the re-introduction of postal voting and at the time of the 1968 elections there were 48 metropolitan seats, comprising 1,365,471 electors, and 46 non-metropolitan seats comprising 1,001,383 electors. The average for the metropolitan electoral districts was 28,447, as against 21,769 for the non-metropolitan area, so the tolerance was 20 per cent. The metropolitan seats varied between 24,387 and 32,532, and the non-metropolitan seats varied between 18,306 and 25,453. It is interesting that, when we compare the lowest number in the non-metropolitan area with the highest number in the metropolitan area, we do not find a huge increase like that provided in this Bill, for the average in New South Wales is only 30.7 per cent, whereas under this Bill it is 53 per cent.

Mr. Venning: What about Western Australia?

Mr. CASEY: The member for Rocky River is my very good friend and I like to correct him when I can. I am available at all times to help him: he can rest assured on that. I believe in helping not only the people in my own district, who are northerners, but

any northerner; indeed, I believe in helping people in the metropolitan area, too. I just like helping people. I point out to the member for Rocky River that the area of Western Australia is about one-third of the whole of Australia.

Mr. Venning: South Australia is more like Western Australia than it is like New South Wales.

Mr. CASEY: How can it be, when Western Australia's area is one-third of the whole of Australia? The Victorian electoral redistribution Act, which was passed in 1965, provides for 44 Melbourne seats averaging 25,000 electors, eight provincial city seats averaging 22,250 electors, and 21 country seats averaging 18,200 electors.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must be allowed to make his speech without so many interjections.

Mr. CASEY: The Victorian Act provides that the commission must keep within 10 per cent of the average. I hope the member for Rocky River is listening. The Victorian commission drew boundaries that resulted in an average of 25,011 electors in the 44 metropolitan seats, 22,163 electors in the eight provincial city seats, and 18,096 electors in the 21 country seats (at September, 1965). At the time of the distribution the metropolitan seats varied between 23,469 and 25,817 electors, the provincial city seats varied between 21,501 and 22,953 electors, and the country seats varied between 17,431 and 18,901 electors. The average excess of electors in metropolitan seats over those in country seats was 38.2 per cent, whilst the excess of electors in metropolitan seats over those in country seats and provincial city seats combined was only 30.1 per cent. This was a fairly small amount of tolerance between one section of the community and another, and I think this is very wise.

Mr. McAnaney: In the 1965 Bill your area was to have half as many electors as there were to be in city electoral districts, and you voted for that Bill. Why change now?

Mr. CASEY: If the member for Stirling wants to bring up dead wood I am quite happy to discuss the 1965 Bill, but I would prefer to deal with the Bill now before the House. The member for Stirling lives in the past; he should come up to date and consider the present Bill. Turning to the quotas that will apply under this Bill, I point out that in

addition to the 15 per cent that I spoke about earlier there is another tolerance of 10 per cent. This means that the maximum number of electors in a metropolitan seat will be 16,452 and the lowest will be 13,462. This, of course, determines the number of metropolitan seats, so there will be 28 such seats, even if Gawler is included in the metropolitan area. Nineteen seats will be left over, and these will be country seats, with a total number of electors, under this Bill, of 183,289.

Mr. Rodda: You are assuming figures that the commissioners will have to work out.

Mr. CASEY: I have described how it works out under the Bill. The member for Victoria has probably worked it out himself; if he has not done so I would be surprised, because as Government Whip he occupies a very important position and should be well up on these things. When we divide 183,289 by 19 we arrive at the country quota of 9,646, and here we have another mathematical problem. Here again we can have a tolerance in either direction, and this time, for some reason or another, the Government has thrown in the figure of 15 per cent. It was 10 per cent in respect of the metropolitan area. We then see that a country seat may contain a maximum of 11,092 and a minimum of 8,200 electors. Why is a 15 per cent tolerance provided in respect of the country quota? There are a few cities outside the metropolitan area, one of which, Whyalla, is growing very quickly. Other northern cities are Port Augusta and Port Pirie, and we have the city of Mount Gambier in the south. The idea is to avoid splitting up these city areas wherever possible, although some overflow must inevitably take place in Whyalla. The member for Chaffey (Mr. Arnold) said that country people must be considered because they have to pay more for food, petrol and clothing, and I agree with what he said. However, can he tell me what is the difference between the case of people living in Whyalla and the case of those living at, say, Cowell? Are those people not subject to the same conditions? Of course they are.

Mr. Giles: Have they got a doctor at Cowell?

Mr. CASEY: That is beside the point.

Mr. Arnold: You are trying to limit the commission's initiative.

Mr. CASEY: I am not. I have no ulterior motive at all: I am merely trying to find out why the country tolerance is 15 per cent. I

believe the tolerance is designed to enable large towns outside the metropolitan area to be incorporated in the new districts. The member for Chaffey tried to answer the question I put to him but he stumbled, because it is unavoidable that, wherever people live in the country, they face the same conditions. I defy any member to say otherwise. I have lived in the country all my life and I know this to be true. I hope I will not offend the member for Eyre, but I represent an area in which he would get lost.

Mr. Edwards: Don't you believe it!

Mr. CASEY: I suggest that the honourable member refresh his memory by looking at the map of electoral districts displayed in the Chamber. He should open his eyes and see exactly what is the size of Eyre compared with certain other districts in the State, such as Whyalla and Frome. Under the Bill, the minimum quota for a country district will be 8,200 people, and the maximum quota for a metropolitan seat, 16,452.

Mr. Ryan: A difference of 100 per cent.

Mr. Venning: It is a lot less than the difference in Western Australia and Queensland.

Mr. CASEY: But how does it compare with New South Wales and Victoria? We can argue around the mulberry bush on this point, but where will it get us? For the purposes of the discussion this afternoon, let us disregard the position in other States and look at the position in South Australia. Does the honourable member honestly believe that people in the country should have twice the say of people in the metropolitan area?

Mr. Venning: In extreme cases, yes.

Mr. CASEY: Well, that could mean anything. I believe there should be a tolerance in respect of country districts, but not to the extent allowed in the Bill.

Mr. Venning: Then why do you say there should be a tolerance?

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: He does not believe in one vote one value.

Mr. CASEY: I know the member for Angas is a genuine person and that he will acknowledge that I have said often in this Chamber that, although I favour the principle of one vote one value, I realize it is not practicable to implement it, because it is almost impossible to do so. In no State can we expect to have the same number of people in country seats as there are in city seats: that is not practicable. However, I do not agree that the difference should be as great as

is provided in the Bill. If the tolerance provided to country seats were less, I would go along with it; if it were about 30 per cent, it would be all right, but 53 per cent is too high.

I have examined the position in some of the northern seats. In looking at the situation, I tried to put myself in the position of Government members, who were responsible for drafting the Bill, and I tried to see what ulterior motives they had and how they would manipulate boundaries in order to hold seats. Any Government wants to hang on to power. The Liberal and Country League proved that for 30 years, during which it tried to hang on by all means possible. To make an analysis, one must go to an extremity of the State to make a start. I have taken for this purpose the District of Flinders, which can extend only one way.

Mr. Ryan: Out to sea.

Mr. CASEY: If it goes out to sea it is sunk. With all due respect to the Treasurer, we naturally expect that the new district will include a part of the present District of Eyre. I suppose the electors of Eyre who are affected will be pleased that they will then come in the Flinders District. The present enrolment for Flinders is 7,786. Under the quota in the Bill, plus the tolerance, the minimum number of electors in a country seat will be 8,200, so therefore, for the purpose of my analysis, some electors must be transferred from Eyre to Flinders. To make up the difference, 414 people could be transferred from Eyre to Flinders so that the Flinders District could meet the requirements. As this seat will probably be represented by the L.C.L., we have to assume that the quota will be as low as possible.

In the case of the Eyre District (which loses 414 people to Flinders under my analysis), I have endeavoured to find out in what way it can be built up. I suggest that it will incorporate part of the District of Whyalla, because that is the only district from which it can draw. Whyalla already has too many voters for the country quota and naturally, because it is a Labor seat, we have to go to the top rung and take as many voters as we possibly can from that district to build up the District of Eyre! This can be done by incorporating portion of the subdivision of Whyalla (which I understand is Iron Baron) and possibly part of the subdivision of Tarcoola, but naturally this would be determined by the

commission and it is difficult to say specifically how many electors would be taken out of that area. However, I assume that not many would be taken, because not many people live out on that far-flung route to Western Australia. By keeping the quota for Whyalla as near as possible to 11,092 (Whyalla at present has a complement of 11,585) and removing portion of what is in the subdivision of Whyalla and tacking that on to the District of Eyre, the latter district would be built up (with portion of the subdivision of Tarcoola added as well) to about 8,300.

The SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member is in order in pursuing this argument, anticipating the decision of the commission.

Mr. CASEY: I am not anticipating, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Well, I listened to the honourable member a short time ago and he was on the borderline. I do not think he should say that the commission may have any ulterior motive. That would be strictly out of order.

Mr. CASEY: That is so, Mr. Speaker, and I will ensure that I do not so transgress. The District of Stuart (of which Port Augusta is the centre) at present comes right down to Port Pirie and takes in a portion of Solomontown. I do not know how anyone could be so ridiculous as to bring a district from another part of the State into the District of Port Pirie. As they are both Labor seats at present, they will have to be built up as much as possible once again. Therefore, we will tack on to Stuart the remainder of Whyalla that Eyre does not want and give the subdivision of Port Germein, which is now in Stuart, to Port Pirie. We then find that Stuart has not enough voters, so we take the top half of Frome. Honourable members must realize that all that I have said could happen. I consider it the sort of thing that will take place under this Bill. As I examine the measure, I find that, in the case of Labor-held seats, the maximum tolerance is adhered to as far as possible and that, in the case of Liberal-held seats, we try to reduce the tolerance to as little as possible.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Who said so?

Mr. CASEY: Nobody said so, but I think that is how it will work.

Mr. Giles: You are assuming that the commissioners are biased.

Mr. CASEY: No. The commissioners have not yet been appointed: the Bill has not been passed. I am discussing the terms of reference, as set out in the measure.

Mr. Ryan: You have the right to criticize that.

Mr. CASEY: Of course I have. That is why I am speaking.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You are putting a false interpretation on it.

Mr. CASEY: I am not. I think the Minister of Works would grant me the privilege to speak on the Bill. Clause 8 will give rise to many problems, and I know that members opposite are not too pleased about the terms of reference. It is only natural that the Government is attempting, by all possible means at its disposal, to retain as many country seats as possible, because Government members know that the majority of their voters live in certain country areas, and the Government must hold on to those areas as tightly as possible. This is unfortunate, because it has brought about a tactical display by one Party against the other, trying to hold on to many seats, and the people as a whole are completely forgotten.

Mr. Evans: You admit that you are doing that?

Mr. CASEY: We did not introduce this measure. We are concerned with the people as a whole, but the Government is not. It is obvious that the Government is trying to at least indicate that it thinks some people should have more say in this matter than others should have. It is as simple as that, in my opinion, so I hope that Government members will examine the Bill closely to ascertain whether the overall section of the South Australian community is being considered. It is fairly difficult to try to substantiate a claim that a person who lives in a city such as Port Pirie, Port Augusta or Whyalla should not have the same equality of representation in this Parliament as has some other person.

Mr. Clark: Remember the country industrial scheme?

Mr. CASEY: Yes, that was shocking. It was proposed by the former Liberal Premier (Sir Thomas Playford). Some honourable members will recall the scheme, and I suggest that new members examine it and see what Sir Thomas Playford intended to do.

Mr. Jennings: That was a bit of skulduggery that didn't come off.

Mr. CASEY: It was absolutely shocking. A document I have here will perhaps give members opposite some idea of what the

country people are thinking about electoral reform. I have no hesitation in saying that the present Government was pressured into introducing this Bill.

Mr. Rodda: By whom?

Mr. CASEY: By the people of South Australia, and no-one else. The member for Victoria knows full well that the system under which he was elected to this House is crook; he will admit this. He does not deny it; otherwise, he would not be voting for this measure. I refer the member for Rocky River to the position at Jamestown, as he may be representing the people of Jamestown at some time, if he is lucky enough. Jaycee held a seminar at Jamestown a short time ago. The Jaycee movement not only there but throughout the State was concerned about the undemocratic system operating in South Australia under the Playford regime.

Mr. Allen: Were you at the seminar?

Mr. CASEY: I do not think that has anything to do with it.

Mr. Allen: I was.

Mr. CASEY: I am pleased to hear that the honourable member was there. The following is a press report of the seminar:

The group, asked to define "democracy", was not satisfied with the glib "government of the people by the people for the people"—I agree with that: it is a little glib—

but considered that it should also ensure freedom of the individual without infringing on the freedom of others. It also considered a basic requirement that the people of a democracy should retain the right to change its Government should the majority so desire, and it was observed that there was a basic anomaly in South Australia's Constitution because it could only be changed by a constitutional majority in both Houses of Parliament. That is quite true. The report continues:

In the wrong hands this could enable a Government which controlled both Houses to alter the Constitution so that it could not be removed.

That is exactly what Sir Thomas Playford set out to do, and that is why he remained in office for over 30 years.

Mr. Ryan: He thought he would never be defeated.

Mr. CASEY: True.

Mr. Riches: It was not the Playford Government; it was the Butler Government.

Mr. CASEY: It was the Butler Government but Playford improved upon it. The editorial of the *Northern Review* states:

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.

This was the opinion of the people in the North, not only in the area in which this meeting was held. I am pleased that the member for Burra attended.

Mr. Allen: Did Jaycee say that or was it the editor?

Mr. CASEY: The last portion was an editorial, but what I quoted previously was stated at the meeting: basically, they are the same thing.

Mr. Ryan: Would he be a member of the Labor Party?

Mr. CASEY: No. These were the things that forced the Government to introduce this legislation. Before the Millicent by-election the Premier said that if he won that by-election he would accept it as a mandate from the people of South Australia to introduce a Bill, but that Bill would have been much different from this measure.

Mr. Ryan: He did a complete somersault.

Mr. CASEY: Of course. He also backed down again, because he said that if Labor won he would accept the victory as a mandate for the Labor proposal.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think the Premier would know: is he capable of knowing?

Mr. CASEY: He was put on the chopping block.

Mr. Ryan: Is that why the skids are under him now?

Mr. CASEY: Of course. I hope that the member for Burra, who was present at the seminar, told the people that the Parliament of this State has two Houses.

Mr. Allen: I think you will find that that statement came from one discussion group, not from the whole meeting.

Mr. Jennings: It was a valuable discussion group.

Mr. CASEY: Perhaps the member for Burra could elaborate.

The SPEAKER: Order! He would be out of order if he did.

Mr. CASEY: Perhaps I should explain to the member for Burra, who is a new member, that there are two Houses of Parliament—a Lower House of which he is a member and an Upper House, known as the Legislative Council. Basically, in order that legislation

should become law it has to be passed by both Houses. The member for Burra should realize that these people are saying that they should be able to change a Government by a majority decision. How can this be done with the present set-up of the Legislative Council? It cannot be done. The member for Port Pirie suggested that if the L.C.L. decided to present a candidate for Central No. 1 District, which it has not done for 40 years, it would win the seat. This opinion was expressed to me by a member of the Upper House. What an extraordinary state of affairs it would be if the Upper House was controlled wholly by one political Party! It would be a mockery of the Government and the Parliament of this State!

Mr. Jennings: It is now, but it would then become obvious.

Mr. CASEY: Of course. It would be obvious how stupid and silly is the manner in which the Upper House is elected. If members opposite are genuinely interested in the welfare of the people of this State, it is time they realized that, although each member is elected to represent a particular district, his duty does not start or end there. Members represent not only electors in their own districts but electors throughout the whole State. Legislation introduced in this Chamber, by and large, affects everyone in South Australia, although some affects only a section. I was pleased to note that the Attorney-General was so forthright in arguing this point at the latest L.C.L. conference.

Mr. Ferguson: How do you know he did?

Mr. CASEY: He told me. I wonder whether the member for Yorke Peninsula supported that argument.

Mr. Ferguson: Never!

Mr. CASEY: I believe the Premier, too, supported it. I think it is high time that members opposite took stock of the position. They apparently desire to be permanently in full control of the Upper House so that, even though the majority of the people elect the Lower House, they can still crack the whip (as evidenced over the last three years) and throw out legislation introduced for the benefit of the majority of South Australians. Some members of the Upper House amuse me by the statements they make, and I shall quote a statement made prior to the 1968 election that affected me personally. I noticed in the local paper, which was published two days before the election, a letter from the Hon. G. J.

Gillfillan, M.L.C. (Northern), under the heading, "Let's Keep the Legislative Council". I could not answer that letter in time, because it was published only two days before the election, but I answered it later. In making his plea to keep the Legislative Council, Mr. Gillfillan said:

There has been a lot of comment from the (previous) Premier about the need to reform the Legislative Council—

Mr. Clark: And now from the present Premier, too!

Mr. CASEY: Yes.

Mr. McAnaney: This isn't in the Bill.

Mr. CASEY: The Bill refers to the Legislative Council. The honourable member apparently does not like my criticizing the Council.

Mr. McAnaney: I am a great supporter of it.

Mr. CASEY: Perhaps he would learn more if he heard the other side of the story. The letter continues:

Most of this publicity has not mentioned that the real reason for these moves is to weaken the Legislative Council in anticipation of its abolition. There should be no mistake in thinking that this is just one Party's policy against another's. It goes deeper than that. There is a very real danger—

and this is a gem—

that the rights and freedoms of South Australians will be lost completely if this plan to weaken and destroy the Legislature is successful.

Mr. Ferguson: Don't be so dramatic.

Mr. CASEY: Well, this is stupid. The letter continues:

If it is successful, then the system of having two Houses of Parliament will be replaced by a risky system of Government. It would be a system with which we have had no experience, which other countries have rejected as undesirable, and which will undoubtedly make it quite an easy matter for a political dictatorship to take over control of our whole way of life.

How silly! It continues:

And this is precisely what the present Government has as its objective. They plan, by removing the restraining influence of the Legislative Council, to gain absolute power.

I say that the absolute power of the Parliament of this State is vested in the Upper House, and members opposite know it. Strange to say, early this session I had talks with Government members of the Upper House and the conversation turned to the new Government. I said, "Your Party is back in Government, so I suppose you will be telling it what to do very shortly." They said, "We are doing

that already." It is such a fiasco, and members opposite know it: they got the axe at the L.C.L. conference the other day. The Attorney-General at least believes in one vote one value, and I give him credit for that. The letter continues:

With my colleagues in the Legislative Council, I am convinced that this must not happen. We have no doubt that the voters outside of Adelaide, who have not always been treated fairly by the Government, will also reject any attack on the existence of the Legislative Council. At the next election, when we vote for the people who will be the Government for the next three years, we should keep in mind the following points:

These are beauties:

The present Government isn't interested in reforming Parliament—it wants to control it. Almost every Parliament throughout the world has two Houses of Parliament, including South Australia. Most countries that have abolished their second chamber, as our Government wants to do, have quickly restored it again.

This simply is not true: it is absolutely ridiculous. It did not happen in New Zealand or Queensland. The letter continues:

Many new nations which are establishing Parliaments for the first time are creating two Houses of Parliament, and are using a system similar to that in South Australia.

We have a system of our own, a shocking and disgraceful system. There should be the same electoral roll for both Houses of Parliament. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Hudson: The only reason why many members opposite are here is that there has been a gerrymander. If there was a decent system they would not be here now.

Mr. CASEY: That is so. In my published reply to the letter of the Hon. G. J. Gilfillan I said:

I wish to point out to readers that the move made by the Premier was for an adult franchise for both Houses of Parliament:—

which he did make—

surely this move would give every citizen in this State the right to vote for the candidate and party he or she wished. Every citizen in Australia has the right and freedom to elect a Federal Parliament in Canberra. Why the restriction for the Parliament of South Australia?

How on earth can Mr. Gilfillan be genuine and talk about the rights and freedom of the people when he will not allow them to vote!

Mr. Hudson: Some members opposite do not agree with the Attorney-General and the Premier.

Mr. CASEY: No. Regarding the claim that some countries have abolished the Upper House and then restored it as quickly as possible, I point out that Queensland abolished its Upper House 40 years ago and has never made any effort to restore it. Contrary to what Sir Thomas Playford was reported to have said, Queensland has not suffered ever since. Canada has 10 provincial Parliaments similar to ours, the Canadian system of Government also being based on Westminster. Only one of those provinces has an Upper House. This means that what the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan said is absolutely untrue. I have met people from the newly-emerging States in Africa and have been told that those States are not adopting a bicameral system of Parliament. I believe members opposite have learned something this afternoon because they have listened attentively indeed to what I have said. I was intrigued by the leading article in the *Advertiser* of August 7 (it seemed to have a couple of bob each way, but a little on the Liberals as well), which states:

Mr. Dunstan seems to expect this tolerance—and the reference was to Mr. Dunstan's remarks about the difference between the maximum quota for a metropolitan district and the minimum quota for a country district (I have already said that I think that the difference is too great)—
to be exercised to an unfair degree. But is there any ground for such a belief?

Members opposite have told me that, although the tolerance is provided for in the Bill, they do not think it will be applied. If that is the case, why is provision made for it? I believe this is the crux of the problem. Honourable members opposite say that we are silly to look at the extremes that can result from exercising the tolerance. However, we must do this because the Bill allows for a maximum and a minimum—they are the terms of reference. If members opposite sincerely do not believe the extremes will apply, then they should agree with what we suggest.

Mr. Rodda: You are miles ahead of us. If you have a car that will do a big speed you don't have to drive at that speed.

Mr. CASEY: I am surprised at that statement by the member for Victoria implying that, although one may have a car that will travel at 120 miles an hour, one does not necessarily drive at that speed. What is important is that, if the owner gives the car to somebody else, the other person can drive

it at 120 miles an hour. The commission, not the member for Victoria, will draw up the boundaries, and this power is being given to the commission. I ask honourable members opposite to examine their consciences. They consider that tolerance at both extremes will not be adhered to. That has been claimed by the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) and the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney).

Mr. McAnaney: No. When was that said?

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member was agreeing with the member for Victoria, who said that, although one's motor car will travel at 120 miles an hour, one does not necessarily drive at that speed.

Mr. McAnaney: I have never mentioned motor cars.

Mr. CASEY: I take it that the member for Stirling disagrees with the member for Victoria now.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will be in disagreement with the Chair, if he does not address the Chair.

Mr. CASEY: Very well, Mr. Speaker. If honourable members opposite consider that this tolerance between the extremes is not likely to be adhered to, the provision should be removed. Let us compromise, and improve the Bill.

Mr. McAnaney: That provision would be better than the present position in South Australia.

Mr. CASEY: The member for Stirling is reminiscing again. He dreams about the good old days. I sincerely hope that something of great benefit to the people will result from the passing of this Bill. I support the second reading.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): This Bill is one of the most important measures ever introduced into this Parliament. I am a country representative and I realize the sterling work of former members for Rocky River. I acknowledge the attitude of the primary producers and the support that they have given me. Because of this, I do not intend to cast a silent vote on the Bill.

The legislation drastically reduces country representatives in Parliament. It is not necessary for me to tell the House of the value to this State of the primary producers and their subordinates, because I am sure that the former member for Rocky River (Mr. Jim Heaslip) has done that in no uncertain way.

Mr. Ryan: All the time he was here he never mentioned it!

Mr. VENNING: For some time we have heard much about the supposed gerrymander in this State and of the need for some reform. May I remind members opposite that, although we were supposed to have a gerrymander in this State, we have had three different Governments in the last three years. The people in 1965 thought perhaps a change from Sir Thomas Playford and his Party would be a good thing, but remaining in office for 27 years was not a bad effort anyway. However, it was not long before the people realized what the alternative to Sir Thomas Playford's Government and leadership was really like and they were soon planning for the day when they would rectify the "blue" they had so innocently made. They did not know what the alternative was like, and I can understand why, because Sir Thomas Playford had done an excellent job for the State for many years. Anyway, people discovered their mistake and planned immediately for a road back.

Last evening the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) was reminiscing about the Chowilla dam. He was incensed when he was reminded by members on this side of the House that, had Sir Thomas Playford and his Party been given the opportunity for another term of office, the Chowilla dam would have been half built today.

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VENNING: This is not necessarily my opinion. I attended a monster meeting in Berri a few weeks ago (I refer to the meeting organized by the United Farmers and Graziers Association) and the thinking of many people attending that meeting was that what I had said would have been the case.

Mr. Ryan: What has this got to do with the Bill?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. VENNING: I shall endeavour to do so. Most people agree that the time has come for some electoral reform in this State.

Mr. Ryan: You said it was not necessary.

Mr. VENNING: The Leader of the Opposition has been particularly vocal on this matter, especially since about 10 p.m. on the day of the March election. It was obvious that the Leader of the Opposition, although he had a plan for a 56-seat House, thought he could win on the old boundaries, and that at about 9.30 p.m. on the day of the election it would appear

that he thought he had retained Government and, as far as he was concerned, it would only be a formality to count the rest of the votes. But, alas, by 10 p.m., and according to the television programme I was watching that evening—

Mr. Ryan: What about Mr. Heaslip?

Mr. VENNING: He did a remarkable job for the District of Rocky River and the State: he put stability into the wheat industry and that automatically put stability into secondary industries. When I was watching television at about 10 p.m. on the day of the election the celebrations being televised turned into bewilderment and the drowning of sorrows. From that time the Leader of the Opposition has been screaming his head off about the need to have electoral reform in this State. He was not content to hang his head in shame and quietly work out where he had miscalculated the will of the people, but he blasted abroad his self-assessment of the reasons for his defeat, and in doing so he dragged this State from its high position of prominence. It will take many years of good Government to restore this State to its former grandeur.

I listened to Opposition speeches with some interest and heard members say something about their plan for a 56-member House and how this plan would have been superior to the present proposal. I well remember my predecessor, Mr. Heaslip, speaking to the Rocky River district committee some time ago about this plan and he said that under the Labor plan there would be no more than 10 rural seats. The Government has introduced a Bill for a 47-member House of Assembly and I know that this move seems to have surprised Labor members. Perhaps they were not really surprised or perhaps the secret service they seem to have feeding them information of my Party's activities may have blown the gaff. By the pleasant atmosphere with which Opposition members are debating this Bill, it seems (as the member for Light said last night) that his Socialist friends opposite have received their instructions. It is a shame that Labor members do not have the same freedom to exercise their opinions as L.C.L. members have, and as we do. Yesterday, the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) conscientiously put his case in support of country people regarding the increased charges to be made for consuming excess water.

Mr. Freebairn: He stuck his neck out a bit.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, he gave himself away. He vigorously supported country people and enumerated the difficulties and problems confronting them because of their situation and isolation. Certain Opposition members representing country districts, if given a free hand, would have been looking for a better deal, under this Bill, for country representation. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when speaking to the Bill, invited the member for Stirling to say whether, as a result of the imbalance that existed in the past, the metropolitan area had suffered. The metropolitan area has not suffered, but that is because of the efforts of a man who was the best "Labor" Premier this State has ever known: who, as the Leader of the previous L.C.L. Government, provided houses, employment and a standard of living that will be difficult to maintain in this "new look" era.

I do not intend to go into great detail on the various aspects of the Bill, as many excellent speeches have been made by members on this side of the House, carefully explaining the various provisions. The member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) made a "copy-book" speech on the details of the Bill and compared the size of proposed electoral districts with those in other States. The member for Light also expressed a dedicated country representative's view of the Bill, warning his Socialist friends that should they "play around" with the Bill in Committee he would take the necessary action.

Mr. Broomhill: What does "Socialism" mean?

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not in the Bill.

Mr. VENNING: Some of the alterations suggested by the Leader of the Opposition may be reasonable: I refer to the amendments relating to the appointment of the commission, the appointment of a deputy to act for a commissioner who may be indisposed, and the power of veto given the Chairman. However, I am not prepared to support any further amendments to the Bill unless, of course, they relate to a better loading for country seats. I believe the member for Stuart would support me in this respect, and I should also be looking for some support from the member for Whyalla.

Mr. Freebairn: What about the member for Frome?

Mr. VENNING: No, he has already indicated his attitude. I have much respect for the member for Whyalla, who was previously

President of one of the greatest organizations in this State, namely the South Australian Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association.

Mr. Casey: I think he helped to form that association.

Mr. VENNING: He may have; his photograph hangs in the premises of that organization on South Terrace. I hoped that he would be given an opportunity as an individual to show his hand concerning this Bill, so that he could support what I am saying. The member for Frome explained in great detail the electoral systems in Victoria and New South Wales. It was significant that he did not go on to deal with the systems in Western Australia and Queensland.

All members realize that Victoria and New South Wales are fairly closely settled but South Australia, although not entirely like Western Australia, is more like it than it is like the two eastern States. It would have been fairer for the member for Frome to deal with electoral systems throughout Australia than only with those in Victoria and New South Wales. However, I have much respect for the honourable member: he is going to help the Rocky River District. I hope that, when this Bill has been passed and the commission has made its report, he will get a very safe metropolitan seat as a reward for his labours, a seat where he will not have to traverse great distances to attend to his constituents' needs. He well realizes what this Bill means for country representation and just how difficult it will be for country members to represent their constituents, particularly in certain areas. Because the member for Frome omitted to mention Western Australia and Queensland, I shall do so. Queensland, as members opposite know, also has three categories of representation, and it is most significant that the largest metropolitan electoral district has 18,000 electors, whilst the smallest country electoral district has 7,000 electors, a tolerance of 150 per cent in favour of the country.

Mr. Hudson: Those figures were taken out 10 years after the redistribution took place.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to restrain themselves.

Mr. VENNING: The figures prove the point I wish to make. The member for Frome should not pick out only those figures that suit his own argument. Western Australia has three categories of representation: (1) metropolitan; (2) agricultural, mining and pastoral; and (3) the north-west. There is in reality a difference of 100 per cent when we compare the first category with the second category. The third category is 500 to 600 per cent below the first category. I want to give the true picture, so that members opposite can work it out for themselves and realize that our intentions are reasonable: we want country people to have a fair go.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I have shown a great deal of tolerance during this debate. The honourable member for Rocky River has been elected a member of this Chamber, and he is entitled to all the privileges of every other honourable member. Therefore, he is entitled to make a speech in his own way without interruption.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In this House recently I have heard the Leader of the Opposition plead that he might be able to get together with my Party to work out some electoral reform for South Australia. I believe this Bill more than meets his requirements. During the Committee stage we will be able to judge just how genuine he has been in his plea for electoral reform. I support the second reading.

Mr. CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 20, at 2 p.m.