

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 8, 1968.

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

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery His Excellency Mr. Gojko Sekulovski, Ambassador for Yugoslavia in Australia. I know that it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that His Excellency be accommodated with a seat on the floor of the House, and I invite the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to introduce our distinguished visitor.

His Excellency Mr. Sekulovski was escorted by the Hon. R. S. Hall and the Hon. D. A. Dunstan to a seat on the floor of the House.

QUESTIONS

BOMB INCIDENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been in another State over the weekend but I read there with abhorrence of the incident involving the member for Burra (Mr. Allen), and I take this first opportunity to offer the sympathy of members on this side to the honourable member and particularly to his wife for the suffering and worry inflicted on them. This incident intrudes into political life something that we in this State have been singularly free from, although most of us have had our share of abusive letters and telephone calls. I assure the Premier that, if an investigation can in any way be helped by any member on this side, that help will be forthcoming unreservedly.

The SPEAKER: This unfortunate incident has extremely shocked every member of this House and the South Australian public generally. I intend to consider further tightening up procedures relating to the delivery of mail. After I have made decisions and the messengers who handle the mail have been given instructions to carry them out, I will ask for the co-operation of all members, in their own interests, to see that the new procedures are carried out.

Mr. McANANEY: I am sure that all honourable members sympathize with Mr. Allen as a result of the unfortunate incident last weekend. Will the Premier say what action has been taken to investigate this incident?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Police Force is carrying out a further intensive investigation into the origin and source of the bomb that was sent to Mr. Allen. On Sunday, when I first learned of this appalling action, I immediately asked the Government Whip to contact all members of our Party and members of the Opposition to ensure that every member was aware of the threat that had been made to Mr. Allen and of any other types of threat. From the handwriting on the parcel sent to Mr. Allen, I am sure that the sender is a person who has previously written anonymous letters. I am almost certain that this individual has written anonymous letters to me, as I believe I recognize the handwriting. The Government has decided to offer a \$2,000 reward for information leading to the prosecution of the criminal responsible for this act. I appreciate very much the gesture of the Leader of the Opposition in offering the full co-operation of his members in any investigation that may be needed to apprehend this person. I ask all members (especially the Party leaders) to study the handwriting on the parcel, because all members receive anonymous letters. Members should cast their minds back to any previous occasion, as perhaps even some small detail may assist the Police Force in its investigation. The immediate action taken today is the decision to offer a substantial reward for information leading to the criminal's apprehension.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members on this side of the House appreciate the warning they received from the Government, concerning the incident involving the member for Burra, and the way in which the Premier has handled this matter. However, I wish to direct a question to you, Mr. Speaker, because members on this side have had a number of queries and protests concerning a passage which appeared in the *News*, which was attributed to you, Sir, and which states:

Apparently, some people have the depraved idea that democracy means everybody must vote for the political Party which they support. These people seem to think the member of Parliament has no right to vote or speak otherwise, and if he does they believe he should be given a bomb or his life should be threatened until he complies with their unbalanced view.

The implications of that statement are obvious: that whoever perpetrated this ghastly incident was a supporter of a political Party opposed to the views of the member for Burra. I do not know what basis there was for a statement of

that kind, but I ask you whether you were accurately reported and, if you were, what was the basis for the remark.

The SPEAKER: I do not know whether or not the Leader is aware that immediately following the elections (and even as recently as last Wednesday evening) I myself received threatening telephone calls. Some of those calls have been answered, and the conversation that has followed with the person on the other end of the line formed the basis of the statement appearing in the *News*. The statement is correctly reported and, as I have said, it was based on the threatening telephone calls I have received. These calls seem to indicate that one is not allowed to have any political view different from the view of the person making the call. For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, I point out that my statement was not a reflection on him or on any other member of his political Party. I remind the Leader that there are several other political Parties in South Australia, and that mine was a general statement in that regard.

Mr. ALLEN: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. ALLEN: I should like to take this opportunity to thank Government and Opposition members for their messages of goodwill and concern in relation to the recent bomb attack made on me which, as it ultimately turned out, was an attack on both my wife and me. Fortunately the bomb did not explode. It is encouraging to know that I have the support and co-operation of all members of the House at this time. I have stated publicly that, in my opinion, the attack was not directed against me personally but against the Parliament as a whole. If, however, the attack was made on me personally, then I will continue to carry out my duties as I have carried them out in the past. I have been elected to Parliament and it is my intention to carry on just the same, regardless of any threat.

Mr. HURST: Will the Premier ascertain whether it would be practicable, without deterring a scientific examination by the police, to supply members with a photostat copy of the label and handwriting on the parcel received by the member for Burra, so that the handwriting may be examined?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased the honourable member has asked this question, because he has jogged my memory: yesterday

morning I personally examined the label on the parcel, and the Deputy Commissioner provided me with a photograph of the label later in the morning. We then agreed that he would supply me with further copies, which I would distribute to members of the House (there would be copies sufficient not for every member but for both sides generally). I must admit that I have been neglectful, for I have forgotten to ask for those copies. However, I will bring them down tomorrow. The honourable member's suggestion is a good one, for I should like members to study carefully the writing that was on the parcel, and to ascertain whether any anonymous letters, or other letters generally, they have previously received have borne similar handwriting.

Mr. ALLEN: Having had discussions over the last few days with officers of the Police Department, I have learned that, apart from using a bomb, many other ways exist by which a person can inflict harm on members of Parliament, for instance, by interfering with members' cars, etc. I was amazed when I heard of the many devices that might be used. Will the Premier ascertain whether a police officer might explain to members the use of these devices?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: One of the problems in dealing publicly with the point raised by the honourable member is, of course, that the police do not wish to broadcast the ways in which harm may be inflicted on people, and they take a sensible precaution in this regard. However, officers of the force have already expressed their willingness to explain this matter to members, and I am sure that those officers would welcome any inquiries members might wish to make. I am sure, too, that if members care to present themselves at the Police building and see the officers concerned they would be shown what to look for in any material they received, say, through the post. The police offer their full co-operation in this regard. Although I do not believe the situation warrants an organized visit, I think members can decide what inquiries, if any, they should make of the Police Department.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Because of the bountiful rain we have enjoyed over this weekend, can the Minister of Works say what is the present position of reservoir holdings, whether he expects all reservoirs to be filled, and what effect their being full may have on pumping next year?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: True, the rains received during the weekend and since have been bountiful. The only two reservoirs not full are South Para and Myponga. On the basis of the present overflow from the Warren reservoir into the South Para reservoir, it is confidently expected that the latter reservoir should be full during the coming weekend. I understand that this reservoir has overflowed only once in the 10 years since it was built. I also expect a similar position to apply to the Myponga reservoir, so all reservoirs should be full by about next weekend. I understand that it will not be necessary now for the State to commence pumping on the Mannum-Adelaide main to supply the Adelaide metropolitan area until some time in January (the latter part of January, I hope). Although pumping will have to continue for the remainder of the financial year, it is hoped that it will be confined to offpeak pumping hours.

SCHOOLGROUNDS

Mr. HUDSON: It has come to my knowledge that there may be in process a decision by the Government to restrict the number of acres that can be planted with grass or watered at any school. As it has been suggested that the restriction will limit the number of acres at any school to three, can the Minister of Education say whether a decision has been made to do this? If no decision has been made, will the Minister, in making a decision, consider fully that in almost every suburb of Adelaide, and in country areas, school ovals provide a recreation area not only for the students but also for the entire community, as many outside bodies use schoolgrounds at weekends and, if these facilities are not available, there would be serious disadvantages for the community and for schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This is news to me: certainly nothing has been brought to my notice until today. However, in view of what the honourable member has said, I will inquire and obtain a report as soon as possible.

ROAD PASSENGER SERVICES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Attorney-General received a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question of September 17 concerning the proposed road passenger service to and from the Barossa Valley?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Transport Control Board has not stipulated the frequency of services which should be provided for a licensed road passenger service between Truro, Angaston and Adelaide. Applicants have, however, been informed that the time tables submitted, fares (including concessions for pensioners and students), and the standard of coaches to be used will be taken into account by the board. No provision is made for railway employees to be carried at concession fares on any licensed road passenger service, but concessions will be available by rail from Gawler onwards. Employees could travel on rail freight services to Gawler and thence by passenger train. Admittedly, this would not be convenient. Councils in the area will be contacted by the board before a decision is made on the services to be provided.

Mr. VENNING: At present, a road passenger service operating from Whyalla to Adelaide is taking patronage from the railways, and I heard at the weekend a widespread rumour that the Railways Department could lose its parcel traffic to road transport. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether there is any truth in this rumour and, if there is, why this should be so?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask my colleague about it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week, when replying to a question I asked concerning applications now being received for licences for a road service from Robertstown to Adelaide, the Attorney-General said:

... intending applicants for a licensed road passenger service between Robertstown, Eudunda, Kapunda, Freeling and Adelaide have been informed that the Transport Control Board, when considering the applications lodged, will take into account fares to be charged (including concessions offered pensioners and students), vehicles to be used and services to be provided.

Some weeks ago a senior officer of the Railways Department, when addressing public meetings at Eudunda and Kapunda, indicated that existing concession fares for students, pensioners, and weekly ticket holders at present allowed on the passenger train service would be continued on the road service. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to make it mandatory for licensees to provide these concessions in accordance with promises already made?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Although I cannot give any undertaking, I will certainly discuss the matter with Mr. Hill.

ELECTORAL ROLL

Mr. VIRGO: On July 25 I asked the Attorney-General whether the combined computer-produced roll would continue to be produced by this Government. I now draw his attention to a report in Friday's *Advertiser* in which the following remarks are attributed to the Commonwealth Minister for the Interior (Mr. Nixon):

Australia's first computer-processed electoral roll, for the Northern Territory, has been produced by the Commonwealth Electoral Office.

It is reported that the Minister has also approved the production of the joint Commonwealth-State roll for South Australia by this method, and the article continues:

It was estimated that computer-processed rolls should save about 25 per cent of the costs by present printing methods.

As a result of these statements, will the Attorney-General acknowledge publicly that the first computer rolls of a joint nature, that is, combined Legislative Council and House of Assembly rolls, were produced by the State Labor Government under the guidance of and as a direct result of a direction given by the former Attorney-General, now Leader of the Opposition? Will he also retract his severe criticism of the former Attorney-General's action in producing these rolls, now that the Commonwealth Government has acknowledged their value?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think we have some loaded questions from the member for Edwardstown. I will certainly acknowledge the fact that the first rolls produced by this process were produced during the time of the Labor Government, when the present Leader of the Opposition was the Minister responsible for electoral matters. When this matter was canvassed the other night in the Budget debate, I said that my one complaint with the honourable Leader was that he went ahead with this process without consulting the Commonwealth, and that that consultation was desirable and, indeed, necessary under the arrangement for the printing of the rolls.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan. It was not done without consultation at all.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Let me put it another way, to be impeccably accurate: the Leader went ahead without agree-

ment with the Commonwealth concerning the variation in the arrangement which is necessary as a result of the use of this process. This landed us in some financial difficulty with the Commonwealth, because of our obligations under the arrangement to pay our share for the production of joint rolls. It also meant that we were saddled with the responsibility of bearing the whole of the cost of producing the computer roll. However, I am glad to say (and I need not cover the same ground again; I think I made this clear in Committee last week) that since this Government came into office we have been able to come to an agreement with the Commonwealth whereby the Commonwealth is paying us a development fee for the work done in South Australia in producing a roll by computer process.

Mr. Virgo: Cashing in on Labor.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well, we have been able to correct a mistake, or an omission, of the Labor Government (put it that way, again, to be impeccably accurate). The Commonwealth approached us some time ago and asked whether we could help it with its investigations in this matter, and in South Australia we produced the roll for the subdivision of Arnhem, I think (I believe that is the subdivision in the Northern Territory), and this was in the nature of a trial. While I have not heard directly from Mr. Nixon (I do not know whether the Premier has had a letter from him, or from the Prime Minister, on this matter), I was pleased to hear of the report in the paper last Friday that the Commonwealth was acknowledging the work which was done here and which (again, to be entirely accurate and fair) was started in the time of the Labor Government.

UNIVERSITY ENTRANCE

Mr. ALLEN: In the *Advertiser* of October 4, under the heading, "University Entry Procedure", appears the following report:

Application forms for admission to the University of Adelaide and Flinders University in 1969 are now available from either university. The completed forms must be lodged with the Universities Admission Office, Box 498D, G.P.O., Adelaide, 5001, not later than November 30. This was announced jointly yesterday by the Acting Academic Registrar of the University of Adelaide (Mr. T. J. Somerville) and the Registrar of Flinders University (Mr. H. J. Buchan).

They said quotas would be applied to every first degree and undergraduate diploma course next year. For each university, selection

would be based as far as practicable on academic merit within the student's preference of university and course. Students taking the matriculation examination this year would be required to return to the U.A.O. a confirmation slip, to confirm their application for admission, as soon as the results of the examination were known. Selection would be made later in January after the confirmation slips had been returned. Selected students who wanted to go back to school for a post-matriculation year, or take a year's absence from full-time study, would be able to apply to have their university entry deferred until 1970. If it was granted, the student would have a place in the course concerned reserved for him in 1970, and his place in the quota for 1969 would be offered to the candidate next on the list in order of merit.

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the honourable member condense his statement and ask his question?

Mr. ALLEN: I am finishing it now, Sir. The report continues:

Every selected student would be sent an offer of admission, which must be returned to the U.A.O. within five days. If not so returned it would lapse and the place would be offered to another applicant.

Can the Minister of Education say whether the term of five days for returning applications can be extended to, say, eight days so that country people will have more time to return their forms?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will ask representatives of the universities whether they can supply me with information that will enable me to answer the honourable member's question.

RURAL ADVANCES

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Treasurer a reply to my question of Thursday last about loans made under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have ascertained for the honourable member that, since the Rural Advances Guarantee Act was proclaimed on December 19, 1963, the following guarantees aggregating \$2,739,990 have been given: State Bank of South Australia, \$1,677,250; Savings Bank of South Australia, \$1,028,660; and private banks (3 loans only), \$34,080. The number of guarantees given in successive years has been: 1963-64, nine; 1964-65, 50; 1965-66, 23; 1966-67, 17; 1967-68, 10; and 1968-69 (to date), 2; total 111. Five others are approved and documents have yet to be formally executed. About 60 per cent of applications have been approved. I under-

stand that both the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank have, as a matter of policy during the last few years so as to help as many deserving rural applicants as possible, restricted the amount of individual loans in ordinary circumstances to \$30,000. This applies to rural loans generally and not only to those seeking Government guarantees under this Act. In special circumstances either bank is prepared to approve a higher figure strictly on the merits of the case, but for quite obvious reasons the banks would not be prepared to approve a higher sum for a guaranteed loan than they were generally providing to those of their own customers who could give adequate security without a guarantee. Both banks report that they have observed no serious hardship arising from their present policy to limit rural loans generally to \$30,000, though a number of applicants have had to resort to supplementary finance from vendors or elsewhere, and some to adopt rather less ambitious proposals. I am, however, asking them to consider a higher limit for the future, particularly if the availability of loanable funds should improve with a prospective favourable harvest. To make it clear (although I think the honourable member understands the position), may I add that the \$30,000 limit is not a limit imposed under the terms of the Act nor is it as a result of any action taken by me as Treasurer. This was a matter for the lending institutions and therefore, as I have said, I shall be happy to ask them whether they are prepared to increase the limit in the circumstances to which I have referred.

SCHOOLTEACHERS

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of October 3 whether the services of any unclassified teachers have been terminated by the department since the present Government came into office?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: In answering the question, I have assumed that the honourable member wishes to know whether any unclassified teachers have been regarded as having their "services completed" to make way for trained exit students from the teachers colleges. During the term that the present Government has been in office, no unclassified teacher, whether primary or secondary (general or art or craft), has had employment terminated on these grounds. However, some unclassified art/craft teachers have been appointed recently on the clear understanding

that their employment will be of limited tenure until the end of the year, pending the appointment of exit students from teachers college.

MURRAY BRIDGE CLUB

Mr. WARDLE: There is an effective senior citizens' club at Murray Bridge, but it has always been faced with the problem of securing a permanent home. Although several halls have been let during the year, the position regarding hall letting and the equipment required by these elderly citizens to run their club properly is extremely unsatisfactory. Can the Treasurer say whether State Government assistance is available to elderly citizens' clubs to build premises?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Past Governments and the present Government have agreed to support the establishment of elderly citizens' clubs, many clubs having been so assisted. I think the maximum amount of subsidy available to a club is about \$6,000.

Mr. Clark: I think you have the figure in the Budget.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I may have, but I cannot recall the exact figure. However, a substantial maximum has been fixed for any one club, although recently one or two clubs have requested that the amount of subsidy available be increased. An important matter for consideration is whether it is a good plan to grant additional subsidies to existing clubs, or whether it may be better to encourage the establishment of more clubs, particularly as, perhaps, they could be located with some geographical advantage to the people they are designed to serve. However, I will not canvass that matter at present. In reply to the question, a subsidy is available to approved elderly citizens' clubs, and I will find out the limit of subsidy available and the terms on which it is approved so that the honourable member may make further representations regarding the Murray Bridge proposal.

MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. RYAN: In the absence of the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens), I interviewed yesterday one of that honourable member's constituents from Bowden, in connection with a complaint that he had. On May 27, 1966, the person concerned was advised, as the respondent in an action, by assessment of maintenance pending suit in the Supreme Court that he was required to pay to his wife, the petitioner, \$16 a week maintenance and \$1 a week for payment of arrears

of maintenance. These payments were made regularly until October 22, 1966. On November 11, 1966, a few days later, the case was before the Supreme Court and was dismissed. This man was told that no further maintenance payments were required. On April 26, 1968, he received from his solicitor the following letter:

We wish to advise that we have obtained an order of the Supreme Court discharging the arrears for maintenance. This means that no further maintenance is payable and we will obtain a dismissal of the complaint from the Summary Court.

On September 5, 1968, the Social Welfare Department advised the person concerned by letter that he was responsible for the payment of maintenance at the rate of \$16 a week, plus \$1 a week arrears. Because of the letter he had received in April from his solicitor, he ignored that letter from the department. On October 2, 1968, only a few days later, he received the following letter from the Social Welfare Department:

The department notes that you have made no payments under the Supreme Court order made against you on August 14, 1968, and the arrears as at September 30, 1968, amount to \$153. Unless these arrears are reduced immediately and payments made in the terms of the order made, court action will be taken against you.

On October 4, two days after the date of that letter, this man saw his solicitor, who said he could do nothing for him. Therefore, yesterday (October 7) the man went to the Social Welfare Department and was told that a Supreme Court order had been made on August 14, 1968, requiring him to pay \$16 a week maintenance as from July 29, and that the arrears were to be reduced at the rate of \$1 a week. The man knew nothing of any case pending in the Supreme Court: he was not told that the case would be heard and was not given any information that the court had made a certain determination. However, when he was at the Social Welfare Department (which is administered by the Attorney-General) yesterday, he was told that the department had a copy of the order but that it was not available to him: the department could not disclose other than the terms of payment provided in it. However, the department told him that he should see a solicitor or a member of Parliament to have this matter aired before he made any payments. Because of what seems to be some peculiarity about this case, will the Minister of Social Welfare obtain a report so that I

can advise the person concerned, having regard to the advice given to him by the department yesterday?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I cannot quite follow some features in the account that the honourable member has given of the matter but, if he gives me any papers or at least details of the names and addresses of the parties, I shall have the matter investigated.

PREMIERS' MEETING

Mr. GILES: Can the Premier say what progress was made at the Premiers' meeting last Friday in Sydney regarding getting extra finance for the States, and can he also say whether the Commonwealth has considered reimbursing the States the cost of the recent total wage increase of \$1.35 a week?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The conference held in Sydney last Friday was the beginning of what I consider will prove to be an effective campaign by the States to have rationalized Commonwealth-State financial relationships as we now know them. I think the honourable member and the public generally would appreciate that this was not simply a gathering of Premiers for the purpose of having another bash at the Commonwealth. The meeting was held in a responsible atmosphere to begin a search for a solution to a problem that has bedevilled Commonwealth-State financial relationships for some time. I am pleased to say that a press statement indicated that further meetings of State Premiers would be held to consider suggestions made by the Under Treasurers and their officers at a meeting to be held soon. The next meeting of the Premiers will be held in Adelaide. I am pleased that the Premiers welcomed the idea of coming to this fair city, showing the regard in which South Australia is held. It was announced in the joint statement, which was agreed to unanimously by the six Premiers or their representative (the Premier of Queensland having been unable to attend), that the three aspects to be considered by officers of the States and subsequently by the State Premiers were the heavy interest burden on State debts, the cost of social services to State Budgets, and the revenue fields that could be made available to the States. The honourable member will realize this covers a wide field of operations between the States and the Commonwealth. He can be assured that this conference was convened and will continue to be convened at the highest level. The agreement reached by the six

Premiers, as well as the intention of each Premier and of the Governments concerned to follow this matter through, augurs well for a common approach to the Commonwealth that has not been seen in this form for many years. The matter of the Commonwealth's consideration of the implication of the \$1.35 rise in the total wage is something that is met, in part, by the automatic adjustment in the Commonwealth payments to the States, but the full implications will be discussed with the Commonwealth at a meeting which the Premiers are seeking with the Commonwealth early next year. I like to think that the Commonwealth will accede to the States' request for this meeting.

TRAIN ACCIDENTS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General received a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question of August 27 concerning a rail accident near Roseworthy?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Roseworthy crossing on the Main North Road has been reviewed by the interdepartmental committee on railway crossing protection. The existing traffic conditions are such that this crossing would justify the installation of flashing lights during next financial year. This is, of course, subject to the availability of Highways Department funds to finance the work and to the availability of railways manpower physically to perform it. From a Highways Department viewpoint this portion of the Main North Road is part of a national route and carries relatively high traffic volumes (1,200 vehicles a day) at relatively high speed. These vehicles are required to cross the railway line on down grade approaches where they could encounter trains operating at relatively high speed. In these circumstances the committee is prepared to give this crossing high priority for installation of flashing lights, when preparing the programme for the 1969-70 financial year.

THEBARTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LAWN: Has the Minister of Education further information about the building of the new Thebarton Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Although Thebarton Primary School has been included on a list of schools that it is considered should be replaced, no provision has been made for the project on the current Loan works building programme, and all available funds for 1968-69 have been allocated. Thebarton's needs will be kept in mind when new lists are

being prepared. In the meantime, the Public Buildings Department will proceed with preliminary sketches as part of the initial planning.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the control of the flow of water in Eckert Creek?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Eckert Creek broadens out into a wide lagoon from which Mr. Migga irrigates. Additional pipes placed in the bankettes on the upstream end of Eckert Creek would not materially increase the flow down the creek at times of river flow large enough for releases to be effected from the basin. It was proposed some years ago to divert the discharge from the basin away from Eckert Creek. However, this proposal will be re-examined after more detailed field data has been obtained.

ROYAL PARK SEWERAGE

Mr. HURST: In Royal Park, about 192 houses are located in the area comprising Dover Street, Royal Terrace, Alexander Street, James Street, Lorne Street, Cooke Crescent, Durham Terrace, Yorke Terrace, Marion Terrace, George Street, McKenzie Avenue, and Frederick Road. For some time people living in these houses have been anxious to have sewers connected to their houses. I understand that for some years frequent outbreaks of dysentery have been prevalent in this area, and that the people believe that the lack of proper sewer facilities has had an adverse effect on their health. Can the Minister of Works say whether Cabinet has considered installing sewers in this area and, if it has, what the present position is?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will obtain a report as promptly as possible.

CEDUNA ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the supply of electricity to Ceduna?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The Electricity Trust will provide technical assistance to those independent electricity undertakings intending to erect single wire earth return extensions. Several such extensions have been constructed by independent electricity undertakings, and it has been the Government's practice to subsidize electricity sales in these extensions under the Electricity (Country Areas) Subsidy Act, 1962-1965. The subsidy has been

reviewed each year and, in consequence, the undertaking has been assured of sufficient income to cover the cost of the extension.

FOOTBALL DESCRIPTION

Mr. RICHES: Last Thursday, when I asked the Premier to take up with the appropriate authority the question of broadcasting the interstate football match, I said that residents of Melbourne could listen to a kick-for-kick broadcast but that country people in South Australia were denied this privilege. Although the Premier was apparently unsuccessful, can he now say whether, in the course of his representation, any reasons were given for what seems to me to be an extraordinary decision?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

PETERBOROUGH RAMPS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked some time ago about providing hand-rails on the newly-constructed ramps at Peterborough?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member asked this question on September 25, and the answer, which has been supplied to me by the Minister, is as follows:

It is presumed that the honourable member refers to the Standards Association of Australia (draft Australian standard code of recommended practice for building design requirements for the disabled). This code provides under section 3 (2) that when the gradient of a path exceeds one in 20 it is considered to be a ramp, the recommended specification for which under section 4 (5) provides for a gradient not exceeding one in 12, with hand-rails on both sides. It is pointed out that this specification provides *inter alia* for the following disabilities:

Impairment of ability to walk which may confine individuals to wheelchairs, or which may necessitate the use of walking aids and which may make it difficult or impossible to use stairs or steps.

The subway access at Peterborough is being provided primarily for the use of passengers and other ambulant persons requiring to do business with the Railways Department. As previously stated, should the local authority or some other instrumentality wish to provide hand-rails, no objections will be raised, provided they are not at departmental expense; this has been done elsewhere.

Mr. CASEY: I thank the Attorney-General for his speedy reply to my second question about these ramps. However, the last paragraph is not quite accurate. It states:

The subway access at Peterborough is being provided primarily for the use of passengers and other ambulant persons requiring to do business with the Railways Department.

I should like the Attorney-General to tell his colleague that Peterborough is divided in half by the railway line, and that people living on the south side of the line have to cross it either by ramp, by over-pass, or by some other means, in order to reach the shopping centre of the town, which is on the northern side of the railway line. The ramps do not cater, to any great extent, for railway passengers or for people doing business with the Railways Department. In fairness to the people of Peterborough, particularly those living on the south side of the line (and more than half of the town's population is situated here) who have to shop in the main street and would use the ramps extensively, I believe that a ramp, over-pass, or some other facility should be provided by the Railways Department, and, in these circumstances, I believe that hand-rails should be provided. Will the Attorney-General again refer my question to the Minister of Roads and Transport so that he can consider this additional information?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am not certain from the honourable member's explanatory statement what the question is, but I shall bring his comments to the notice of my colleague.

DRUG ADDICTS BOARD

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I wish to ask a question on behalf of the Hon. C. D. Hutchens, who is away ill at present. Has the Premier a reply to the question asked by my colleague about the costs in connection with the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Of the \$30,300 provided on the line "Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board—Maintenance", \$19,300 is for the normal administration expenses of the board, and includes salaries of board members, medical officer, social workers and typist. This provision is \$3,191 less than the actual expenditure for 1967-68. An additional \$11,000 has been provided as operating costs for the hospital and treatment centre now being acquired.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about the disposal of railway houses?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads and Transport, who is acknowledged as being somewhat expert in

these matters, informs me that it is not material whether real property is sold by tender or public auction. In either case the relevant point is that there are buyers available, each prepared to offer a maximum price on which he has already decided. The winner is the one with the highest price under either of these methods. If sales by public auction were conducted, this work would probably be given to land agents, and the Minister has some doubts whether members opposite would approve of this practice. The procedures now followed are in accordance with a Cabinet approval.

DERAILMENTS

Mr. HUDSON: I point out to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, that many people in South Australia, including members of this House, are disturbed by the number of derailments that have occurred within South Australia on the Adelaide-Melbourne railway line. It has come to my attention that, because of the damage that takes place on the South Australian section of the line, some firms are no longer sending certain classes of their goods by rail to Adelaide. Apparently this damage is caused by the state of the track, by the movement of the goods in the freight trucks and, in the case of certain classes of product, by what is called galling. I understand certain attempts have been made by the Railways Department to remedy this and that some freight trains will now travel at a much lower speed to see whether this produces a better result. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to have made an extensive investigation so that detailed recommendations can be produced for the necessary renovations or repairs to this line to give it the requisite standard of safety for the cartage of freight and to eliminate the possibility of extensive damage that apparently now exists?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall certainly be happy to do that. Of course, the honourable member will be aware of the anxiety of the Minister (which I think he has expressed publicly) on this matter and of the intense interest he has taken in it from the day he came to office. I am sure it would be a great help to him in his investigation (and it would be a help to the Railways Department) if the honourable member would be prepared to give the Minister the names of those companies which he said no longer consigned their goods by rail—

Mr. Hudson: I referred to the consignment of certain types of goods.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —in the hope that we can meet their objection. We certainly do not want to lose freight if we can avoid doing so. I should be happy if the honourable member could help in that way.

JUVENILE CRIME

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: For some years past the magistrate of the Adelaide Juvenile Court has referred in the annual report to the steep increase in juvenile crime. I understand that in Queensland a juvenile aid bureau has operated for some time past and is functioning successfully in the interests of juveniles who are in difficulties. Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government is contemplating setting up in this State a juvenile aid bureau, which could help to arrest the upward trend of juvenile offences here?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the honourable member will be aware, Cabinet (and I think the whole community) was most perturbed by the remarks of the present Juvenile Court magistrate in the report that was made public some weeks ago. The Chief Secretary, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Roads and Transport and I have discussed various points, which particularly concern the departments under our control, with a view to examining the suggestions made by the magistrate in the hope that, by acting as he has suggested, if it should turn out to be practicable, something can be done to reduce the incidence of juvenile crime in this State. One aspect of that crime which has received much publicity has been stealing by juveniles from shops. A few weeks ago, the President and Secretary of the Retail Traders Association of South Australia Incorporated called on the Chief Secretary and me, discussing with us the scheme which, as the honourable member has said, has been operating in Queensland for some time. We are, frankly, quite attracted to it, but we doubt whether it is altogether wise that this should be operated within the Police Department. It is rather more properly (I feel personally and I think the Chief Secretary agrees with this) a social welfare function that could better be undertaken outside the Police Force although in close co-operation with it. At present, we are considering the suggestions made by the Retail Traders Association on this matter to see whether it is practicable to introduce some such scheme in South Aus-

tralia. However, as the honourable member will have gathered, this is not the only matter that we are at present considering with regard to juvenile crime, although it is certainly an important aspect of it.

KESWICK SIDING

Mr. VIRGO: For many years a railway siding led from the side of the Keswick railway bridge into the Army premises and Chrysler Australia Limited's works at which loading of Army materials and products of Chrysler Australia Limited took place. Although this line was removed some time ago, I am now informed that it has been replaced in order to provide a loading bay for pipes for the natural gas pipeline. I am also informed that a contract has been let to a road carrying firm (Brambles Transport, I understand) to carry by road all pipes associated with the pipeline. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether my information is correct and, if it is, on what authority the railway line was built to provide a service under a contract that did not exist? Also, can he find out what is the difference in price between carting these pipes by road and by rail?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will inquire.

COOMANDOOK SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the building of a new residence for the headmaster of the Coomandook school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Housing Trust has informed me that a contract has been let for a new headmaster's residence at Coomandook and work has commenced. It is expected that the residence will be ready for occupation by the end of April, 1969.

WORLD BANK

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about trade representation in Indonesia and about a loan of the World Bank to developing nations?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Director of Industrial Promotion has reported that he has nothing to add to the remarks I made in answer to the honourable member's question. The South Australian Government has found that the Commonwealth Trade Commissioners in any area are keen to assist with any matters entrusted to their care. When travelling abroad last year, the Director found personal

evidence of this and he found that any attempt to have duplicated services would tend to lead to confusion.

INSTITUTION FOR THE BLIND

Mr. RICHES: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked in the debate on the Estimates regarding the provisions for the South Australian Institute for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb and the Royal Institution for the Blind?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Grants to institutions are generally based on the recommendation of the Auditor-General. This recommendation is made following an investigation of the financial position of the institution. The amount (not a fixed sum) is usually the sum required to bridge the gap between the estimated receipts and estimated payments.

FOOT-ROT

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works, on behalf of the Minister of Lands, a reply to my question of September 26 regarding foot-rot?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Chief Inspector of Stock reports that there were no properties under quarantine for foot-rot for a period of approximately four months between March and July this year. Since then, the disease has been diagnosed on two properties in the Lower South-East. In both cases there had been dealing in sheep, and it has not been possible to trace the source of the outbreaks. The present season is extremely favourable for the development and spread of foot-rot, and its appearance in only two flocks is most encouraging. If the present position continues to the end of November, South Australia can consider that it has successfully eradicated foot-rot, although a threat will exist, because of the danger from the possible reintroduction of the disease from another State, until control action is taken similar to that instituted in this State in 1956.

TRANSPORT SERVICES

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 18 regarding transport permits in the north-east of the State?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: At the request of the member for Frome, the previous Minister of Transport arranged for the issue of two travel authorizations to each of the four station managers specifically requested by the member. Arrangements were made by the Transport Control Board for replacement authorizations to be forwarded to the station managers con-

cerned, on receipt of the duplicates of authorities issued. The board has not received any complaints from station managers concerning the renewal of travel permits but it will, on request from the station managers concerned, issue up to four authorizations in lieu of the present maximum of two. The board is still responsible for the two functions of country road passenger service licensing and investigation into the closing of railway lines. For these reasons there are no present proposals to abolish the board.

ARTIFICIAL LIMBS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked about artificial limbs in the debate on the Budget?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Two children were provided with the service during the financial year 1967-68. The individual costs were \$1,269 and \$1,943, and the total cost of \$3,212 was shared equally by State and Commonwealth Governments.

STRATHMONT HOSPITAL

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Works replies to the two questions I asked on October 1 about the letting of tenders for the building of the first stage of the Strathmont hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Cabinet has now approved of the acceptance of the tender of B.C.M. Constructions, an amalgamation of three Adelaide building companies, for the construction of 17 villas at the Strathmont Training Centre at a cost of almost \$3,000,000. The tender accepted was the lowest tender.

DRIVERS' LICENCES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of October 1 regarding the practicability of three-yearly drivers' licences?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads and Transport advises that drivers' licences are now available in New South Wales for a period of three years. The motorist has the option of obtaining an annual or a three-yearly licence. In the past it has been considered that it would cause additional administrative problems and expense to introduce a system whereby a three-yearly licence could be obtained on an optional basis. This would create the position of running two systems of drivers' licence

machinery—one for an annual licence and one for a three-yearly licence. The position is, however, being further investigated at the present time.

HANSARD DISTRIBUTION

Mr. VIRGO: On August 8, I asked you, Mr. Speaker, whether public schools were entitled in their own right to obtain free copies of *Hansard*. You were going to look into this matter and inform me. Have you a reply?

The SPEAKER: I took up this matter with the Chief Secretary, who is the Minister responsible for giving approval to the honourable member's suggestion, and I understand he is looking into the matter. As I have not received a reply from him, I will take up the matter with him again.

WATER LICENCES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of October 1 regarding water licences at Meningie?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Prior to October, 1967, the Control of Waters Act, 1919-1925, was applicable only to that portion of the River Murray between Mannum and the South Australian border. On October 19, 1967, the Act was extended by proclamation to cover the full length of the river in South Australia, including Lakes Alexandrina and Albert. At this time Dehy Fodders (Australia) Proprietary Limited had 1,080 acres already planted, but in their application for a licence to divert water dated November 15, 1967, they applied for 2,400 acres. The inter-departmental committee in its second report on irrigation diversions from the Murray River made certain recommendations. This report is still being considered by the Government. Pending its decision a current licence for diversion has not as yet been issued to the company.

ELECTRICITY POLE

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 26 regarding the position of an electricity pole at Booborowie?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The pole was placed in its present position by agreement with the person to whom the power is supplied, in order to avoid cutting trees. Now that the trees have been removed the Electricity Trust does not consider that it has any obligation to bear the cost of changing the pole position. A

minimum quotation has been given to do the work, on the basis that it would be arranged when a gang was in the town for other purposes.

HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question concerning the reasons for the reduction in the rental-purchase housing programme as a percentage of the total housing programme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member has referred to a drastic curtailment of the rental-purchase programme and to a possible change in policy by the trust. I wish to make quite clear, first, that there has been no change in policy and, secondly, that to compare the 1968-69 proposals with the original proposals for 1967-68, rather than with the actual experience of 1967-68, is misleading. It is also misleading to refer only to the rental-purchase programme in isolation rather than to the combined programme for relatively low-cost housing, including both rental and rental-purchase. The appropriate figures to take to give a worthwhile comparison are those I quoted on September 18, that is to say, the actual expenditure on rental and rental-purchase housing in 1967-68, totalling about \$12,000,000, and for 1968-69 the somewhat higher programme of \$12,610,000 proposed in the Loan Estimates. As to changes in the proportions of rental and rental-purchase houses, I should point out that at the beginning of a year the estimates put before Parliament are based on the experience and trends apparent at that time and that during a year there may be changes in the requirement not only for types of house but even more in the requirement for types of finance. The term rental-purchase refers to a method of finance rather than to a specific type of house, and it may happen that single-unit houses suitable for the rental-purchase scheme are eventually rented. Two recent examples of this change in the method of finance were: (1) Smithfield Plains, where single-unit houses of the type frequently sold under the rental-purchase scheme, and originally designated as such, were rented to meet a particular demand from Royal Australian Air Force personnel; and (2) Christie Downs, where a similar situation applies for employees of Chrysler Australia Limited.

Also, in general terms it may be said that the low economic tempo in South Australia last year meant less cash in the hands of the prospective house purchaser, a lowered ability to

provide deposits on a house, and a tendency to seek rental rather than rental-purchase or sale houses of the trust. Moreover, people became, in the circumstances, perhaps a little reluctant to undertake long-term commitments. As a result, the proportion of new housing allotted to rental last year was greater than had been expected earlier and the proportion to rental-purchase was less. The Government intends that the trust carry out in 1968-69 a low-cost housing programme greater than that achieved in 1967-68. Every encouragement will continue to be given to people to provide the small deposit required to finance houses under the rental-purchase scheme and every effort made to provide suitable housing for those people who decide to use the scheme. But, of course, if either special requirements for rental housing or a lack of demand for rental-purchase housing should require, the trust may again divert houses originally programmed as rental-purchase to be simply rental. Equally, if the demand should tend the other way, some houses programmed as rental will be available for rental-purchase.

FREIGHT CHARGE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about livestock freight charges?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The South Australian Railways' proportion of the livestock rate between the Adelaide abattoirs and Melbourne has not been increased since 1966. Recently the Railways Department introduced a 25 per cent rebate for the carriage of sheep and lambs in consignments of two vans or more when consigned to certain stations in South Australia from any South Australian railway station, from any listed country market or off-shear sale to any station intrastate or interstate, or when forwarded to any listed country market or off-shear sale from any South Australian station. It is intended to continue the rebate, and Cabinet is satisfied that the new rates are economic. The 25 per cent rebate, which applies only to sheep and lambs in consignments of two vans or more, does not apply to livestock rates between the Adelaide abattoirs and Melbourne.

BEACHPORT WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Works will recall that recently he gave a progress report on exploratory drilling at Beachport for a satisfactory water supply. The District Council of Beachport recently suggested to me

that work should be done to try to locate a satisfactory supply outside the township area. Evidently, the council is concerned because the exploratory drilling in the town has not been successful, but I am not certain about that. However, I was told that an oil company, while drilling within, by direct line, two miles of the town found a satisfactory supply of water. Will the Minister obtain from the appropriate department (I think the Mines Department) a report on whether consideration has been given to looking farther afield than the township area for a satisfactory supply, and will he also get an up-to-date report on exploratory drilling on the present town site?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will certainly do that.

PIPE BANDS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked of the Treasurer during the Estimates debate about the payment of appearance money to pipe bands?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Adelaide Highland Games are an addition to Adelaide's calendar of tourist attractions, and the original submission for Government assistance in 1961 was backed by the Director, Tourist Bureau. In 1964 and 1966, the games were held as part of the Adelaide Festival of Arts programme, and the grant was increased to enable the Australian Pipe Band Championships to be held in Adelaide. The 1969 games will be held in March and it is expected that 30 pipe bands from all over Australia will take part. The organizers suggest that 30 bands and followers would provide an additional 2,000 tourists for the period, apart from the interest created locally.

CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS

Mr. EDWARDS: Because sometimes it is difficult to know whether people collecting in the country for different charities have been authorized, can the Treasurer say how people are to know whether collectors are genuine? Further, can the Treasurer say whether moneys paid to South Australian institutions for the blind, deaf and dumb attract subsidy?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will get this information for the honourable member.

RAILWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question regarding improvements to the Adelaide railway station announced by the Minister of Roads and Transport?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states that he has received a report regarding the matters mentioned by the honourable member and is at present considering it.

SHEEP INSPECTION

Mr. ALLEN: In the absence of the Minister of Lands, has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about sheep inspection?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Director of Agriculture reports that the movement of sheep from Western Australia does not constitute a weed hazard to South Australia and there would be no justification for establishing an inspection service. On the other hand, the measures still being taken to inspect sheep entering the State from New South Wales are warranted, in view of the danger of the introduction of noogoora burr.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked during the debate on the Loan Estimates about the cost of converting the Adelaide-Terowie railway line from 5ft. 3in. to 4ft. 8½in. gauge?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No detailed estimate has been prepared for the provision of a standard gauge railway between Adelaide and Peterborough via Terowie. However, a preliminary estimate for the Adelaide-Peterborough proposal is about \$19,000,000. This figure comprehends the provision of an independent line between Adelaide and Hamley Bridge and the conversion of the existing railway between Hamley Bridge and Peterborough. It should be pointed out that the provision of this line, instead of one between Adelaide and Port Pirie direct, would increase the mileage to Perth and to Alice Springs by about 90 miles.

EGGS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works, who is temporarily representing the Minister of Lands, ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the South Australian Egg Board intends to introduce a new standard of grading classification and what the standard will be? Also, as I understand it is to be a much higher grading what effect will this have on the grading of eggs from small producers?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will refer this question to the Minister of Agriculture for report.

OAKLANDS CROSSING

Mr. HUDSON: To the north and south and within a few yards of the Oaklands railway crossing, about 10 roads converge. The crossing has always been a dangerous traffic hazard but, with the opening of the new shopping centre at Marion, the volume of traffic using the crossing has increased and the problems at the crossing are now more serious than they have been in the past. I understand that the Railways and Highways Departments have a co-ordinating committee which considers the problem of re-organizing railway crossings, and that the Oaklands crossing has been studied for some years and is continuing to be studied by this committee. Will the Attorney-General consult the Minister of Roads and Transport about the urgent need for a plan to re-organize the crossing and limit traffic flows in certain directions, and to implement immediately any plan that is determined?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

SIGNALLING DEVICES

Mr. ARNOLD: Although the regulation concerning flashing signalling devices to indicate turning or diverging was to operate from July 1, the date of operation was postponed by Cabinet, and a further regulation operated from October 1. I believe that the previous regulation was postponed so that its effects on tractors and tractor-driven trailers could be considered, and I was informed in a letter from the Minister of Agriculture that tractors and tractor-driven trailers would be exempt from the new regulation. However, considerable confusion has arisen in the Upper Murray district amongst police officers and growers as a result of clause (c) of the regulation, which provides:

Tractors and farm implements used solely for primary production purposes shall be exempt from the requirements of paragraph (a) of this subregulation when they are being driven in accordance with the provisions of section 12 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1967, but not otherwise.

Section 12 of the Motor Vehicles Act refers to tractors which are unregistered being driven on the road. Police officers in the Upper Murray area consider that the present regulation indicates that tractors which are registered must be fitted with flashing indicator lights. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider this problem, because considerable confusion is being caused in the Upper Murray area amongst police

officers, growers are not sure of the position, and it is extremely expensive to fit flashing indicators if they are not required?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will see whether the matter can be cleared up.

CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

Mr. RICHES: I remind the Attorney-General that on August 31, 1966, he was of the opinion that the Government should introduce a Bill to provide for the payment of compensation to victims of crimes of violence and that it should be done that session. Can the Attorney-General say whether he is still of that opinion and, if he is, whether such a Bill will be introduced this session?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am still of the same opinion but, unfortunately, in spite of my efforts I could not persuade my predecessor to introduce such a Bill, and my introducing it as a member of the Opposition would have been useless. The honourable member, who was then Speaker, will remember that I tried diligently during the three sessions spent in Opposition to persuade the previous Labor Governments to take action in this matter. I remind the honourable member that contained in the policy speech of the Liberal and Country League, delivered by the Premier prior to the last election, was an undertaking to investigate this matter ourselves. I am happy to tell him that the matter is being actively considered at present. I was looking at the docket over the weekend and I hope to be able to make recommendations to Cabinet in the next few weeks. However, this is a matter of finance, and whether or not we will be able to take any action this session or next session does not rest only with me but must, of course, be a Cabinet decision.

MONEY BOXES

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about wombat money boxes?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Recently when the Bank of Adelaide Savings Bank was seeking a change from money boxes in the form of a pig, a campaign to preserve wombats was being promoted. It was therefore considered appropriate to issue wombat money boxes. A spokesman for the bank has said the wombats have been successful.

KAPUNDA DRAINAGE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I received letters yesterday that are intended to be sent on to the Minister of Local Government, protesting at the action of the District Council of Kapunda in proceeding with the installation of effluent drainage at Kapunda without first holding a poll of ratepayers in the area concerned. The many signatories to the letters claim that they have twice presented demands to council and have had them rejected as improper. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government to investigate the situation?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I know something of this matter, because when I was on duty at the Liberal and Country League caravan at the Royal Show the matter was discussed at some length with me by a resident of the town. I shall be happy to take up the honourable member's request with the Minister of Local Government.

TRADING STAMP ACT

Mr. NANKIVELL: Does the Attorney-General consider that there is any justification for continuing the Trading Stamp Act and, if he does not, is he considering the repeal of this Act?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have been considering this matter, too, in the last few months, but I have not come to any firm conclusions on it or made any recommendations to Cabinet.

BULLS

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. How many bulls have been sold annually under the bull subsidy scheme of the Dairy Cattle Improvement Act, in each of the past five years?
2. What has been the average sale price a bull?
3. What has been the average contribution a head from the Dairy Cattle Fund in each of those instances?
4. How many farmers have bought more than one bull under this scheme during this period?
5. How many of the herds of these farmers are under herd test?
6. Has there been any apparent herd improvement over this period as a consequence of using subsidy bulls?

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe, for the Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 1963-64, 98; 1964-65, 96; 1965-66, 111; 1966-67, 116; and 1967-68, 98.

2. 1963-64, \$260.67; 1964-65, \$279.14; 1965-66, \$297.60; 1966-67, \$311.60; and 1967-68, \$320.30.

3. 1963-64, \$74.57; 1964-65, \$73.09; 1965-66, \$78.53; 1966-67, \$78; and 1967-68, \$79.66.

4. 47.

5. (a) Of the 47 dairymen who have purchased more than one bull, 45 have submitted their herds for test during the past five years.

(b) During the past five years, 327 herds that have been tested have introduced subsidy bulls.

6. No recent survey information is available. However, a survey conducted over a 15-year period from 1942-1957 showed a superiority of a little over 1 lb. of butterfat a cow a year for those herds in which subsidy bulls had been used.

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Trustee Act, 1936-1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For some time now the permanent building societies in South Australia have been making representations to the Government for deposits made with them to be accorded trustee status, thus enabling the societies to gain access to funds that are not presently available to them for house mortgage lending. The Government is anxious to assist in any reasonable measure that will promote the application of additional funds for home financing and, in fact, gave an undertaking at the time of the election that it would proceed to formulate legislation to give trustee status to deposits made with certain permanent building societies, subject to acceptance by those societies of conditions which would give adequate protection to the trustee and at the same time place the building societies in proper relationship with other authorized trustee investments. This short Bill gives effect to that electoral undertaking.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal and clause 2 provides a definition of "deposit" which excludes certain share subscriptions that otherwise could be included in such a definition.

Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act and provides for the declaration by proclamation of certain permanent building societies with which deposits may be made by trustees. In addition, the Governor has been given specific power to amend, vary or revoke all proclamations made for the purposes of section 5 of the principal Act.

It will be noted that trustee status will be given only to such building societies as are declared by proclamation by the Governor, and in giving consideration to an application from a society to be so declared the Government will in the first instance have regard to the society's financial strength to ensure that deposits made will have the safety and security required of a trustee investment.

In the second place, the Government will require societies to give reasonable undertakings regarding their lending procedures. In particular, the societies will be required to undertake that their lending on house mortgages will be subject to the similar restriction to that which would apply if they themselves were trustees: that is, that they may not lend more than an agreed proportion of the reasonable value of a property unless the repayment of the loan is insured with the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. Finally, the approved societies will be required to seek the approval of the Treasurer for the rate of interest they propose to offer on deposits from time to time. In giving approval regard will be had to the rates of interest being offered by other persons and bodies listed in section 5 of the Trustee Act, and regard will be had to other matters bearing upon their reasonableness.

Mr. HUDSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the State Bank Act, 1925-1958. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal purpose is to give effect to the decision of the Government, as announced in the Budget proposals, to require the State Bank of South Australia to make a contribution to the revenue of the State out of its annual profits. The amount of this contribution will be generally in line with the amount it would pay in Commonwealth income tax if it were not exempt through being an authority of the State. The opportunity is being taken also to bring up to date certain other sections of the

Act mainly by making necessary conversions to decimal currency, and by repealing certain provisions that have ceased to be useful or effective and most of which are now obsolete.

The functions of the State Bank, as most members will know, may be broadly classified in three categories. First, it operates a general banking business covering the whole normal field of trading bank activities and, though it is traditionally more orientated toward rural finance, it nevertheless conducts a wide range of industrial and commercial as well as personal accounts. Secondly, it operates an extensive business in long-term housing loans, lending as principal a large volume of funds made available out of the Home Builders Account constituted under the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement.

Thirdly, it carries on, as agent for the State, a variety of lending functions under the Loans to Producers Act, the Advances to Settlers Act, the Loans for Fencing and Water Piping Act, the Advances for Homes Act, the Student Hostels (Advances) Act, etc. For this last group the funds are provided by the Crown, all income belongs to the Crown, and all expenses are met by the Crown. Accordingly, the Crown receives all profits from those activities and bears all losses, but, fortunately, all of these activities operate on a fully self-supporting basis with small profits. The first two activities of the bank, namely, the general banking and the long-term housing loans, are conducted by the bank as principal and accordingly any profits are retained by it for its own purposes, and they must also cover the bank's own losses. Fortunately, the bank has for many years been able to operate profitably to the mutual benefit of its customers, the State generally, and the bank itself. The bank's profits last year were \$822,380.

Of course, all private banks with which the State Bank is in active competition pay Commonwealth income tax, which is currently at the rate of 45 per cent. It is the practice in many States and other countries to require trading concerns owned by the Crown to contribute to public funds in much the same proportion as a private concern would be required. The Commonwealth Government requires the Reserve Bank of Australia and the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, which includes both trading and savings banks, to make large contributions out of their profits to Consolidated Revenue. A number of other States that have Government Insurance Offices require those offices to contribute, out of their

profits, amounts in lieu of taxation. The previous Government had proposed, in a Bill providing for the setting up of a Government Insurance Office, a comparable requirement.

It has appeared to the Government that it is reasonable and proper to seek to make this provision, and that an appropriate proportion to be diverted to revenue is 45 per cent, which is the current rate of income tax upon companies generally. This will not be a severe imposition upon the bank for it will be payable only if there are profits, and 55 per cent of its profits will remain with the bank for further expansion of its business.

I will now deal with the various clauses in the Bill. Clauses 2 (a), 3, 6 and 7 merely effect conversions of sums of money from sterling into decimal currency. Clause 2 (b) makes a drafting correction which had been overlooked in 1958. Clause 4 repeals the existing section 34 dealing with the disposal of the bank's profits and replaces it with a new section which requires the bank to make the requisite contribution to Consolidated Revenue and provides, in a more simplified manner than at present, for the holding and use of existing reserves and the balance of future profits after the contribution to Consolidated Revenue has been made. The manner by which the bank's profits will be determined will require the approval of the Auditor-General.

Instead of continuing the existing disposition of the retained surpluses of the bank in the two separate funds known as the Bank Reserve Fund and the Redemption Fund, the new section, on the recommendation of the bank board, has been drafted with the object of consolidating these two funds in the Bank Reserve Fund. This has been recommended mainly because the Redemption Fund was originally designed to repay debentures raised by the bank from the public, and the bank has not found it necessary or practicable to secure its capital in this way.

Clause 5 repeals section 37a of the principal Act. This section was enacted in 1941 to deal with certain losses that had been incurred in connection with certain transactions entered into in the past in accordance with Government policy. This section has served its purpose and is no longer required. Clause 8 repeals Part VIA of the principal Act which was enacted in 1935 and originally designed to make loans to primary producers out of funds specially provided by the

Treasurer for the purpose. Since the enactment of this Part the bank has greatly expanded its activities and now provides for this type of business out of its normal funds in the course of its ordinary business. No advances have been secured from the Treasurer for these purposes for many years and most of the earlier advances have been repaid. At June 30 last, the outstanding amount was only \$12,084 and the bank held reserves on account of this particular business to an amount equivalent to \$118,396.

On the recommendation of the bank, Part VIA is accordingly repealed and by clause 9 provision is also made for the bank to repay the Treasurer the outstanding amount and to treat any subsisting advances to primary producers made under the Part to be repealed as if they were advances made by the bank in the ordinary course of its business. Provision has also been made by clause 9 for the reserves remaining after repayment in full of the outstanding advances made under Part VIA to form part of the Bank Reserve Fund.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 719.)

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): It is now seven weeks since the Government saw fit to list this Bill, which the Labor Party considers a matter of both great importance and extreme urgency. When I last spoke on the matter, I dealt with many aspects associated with the overall question of electoral reform and its need in South Australia. I was rather concerned by an article (and I direct the attention of Government members to it) that appeared in the *Advertiser* of September 28 in the "Political Commentary" column. I am not aware who, within the Liberal and Country League, is responsible for providing this material. I understand that the Attorney-General was previously responsible for it, but I imagine the weight of his office has necessitated his having to unload it on to some less competent member, because it is obvious from the statements made in the article of September 28 that the person who writes it either does not know what he is talking about or is telling deliberate untruths. I will read the article and members can judge for themselves whether what I have said is true.

Mr. Clark: There has been a marked improvement in the column since March.

Mr. VIRGO: I am pleased to hear that, but I wish that whoever writes it would start telling the truth.

Mr. Clark: It wasn't good before March.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know whether it is better now than it was before March, but it is certainly not good now. The article states:

They say politicians make strange bedfellows.

I am not sure what point is made there: I leave members to put their own construction on it.

Mr. Lawn: Wouldn't you agree that the member for Light would make a strange bedfellow?

Mr. VIRGO: I would not care to be a bedfellow of the member for Light or of any other member opposite. The article continues:

You will remember all the fuss and bother Mr. Dunstan made over the need for electoral reform during and after the State election in March last. He said "electoral redistribution in South Australia is a matter of prime urgency and importance." The L.C.P. introduced, in the first week of August, a Bill designed to allow 47 seats in the House of Assembly—29 seats in the city and 18 in the country.

On August 6 Mr. Dunstan indicated in Parliament when talking to this Bill that in principle his party would accept the ideas suggested by the Premier (Mr. Hall) and, subject to some amendments, would agree to it. It was assumed that the Labor Party would be anxious to have this electoral reform debated as quickly as possible so that the necessary alterations could be made and you, the people, could decide which party should govern the State. It is nearly the end of September. What has happened to the need for "urgency and importance" that was the cry four months ago.

In relation to this article the first thing one should ask is, "Which Party is responsible for the placing of matters on the Notice Paper of this House?" The Opposition cannot decide that this Bill should be the first to be discussed. The Government said it wanted to introduce the Budget and have it debated and finalized. Opposition members did not quarrel with this, realizing the necessity for that course to be taken. Therefore, why should the L.C.L. flagrantly misuse the truth and say that the reason the Bill has not been debated is that the Labor Party has not pushed it? The Labor Party has not been given an opportunity to debate the matter. I sought leave to continue my remarks on this matter seven weeks ago, and today is the first opportunity I have had to do so.

Mr. Corcoran: This is consistent with the type of trash they dished out to the people before March 2.

Mr. VIRGO: Exactly, and unfortunately it is the type of trash that so influenced a small section of the community in small pockets that the L.C.L. was able to gain as many members of Parliament as the Labor Party gained and, with the assistance of the Independent member for Ridley, to form a Government. As soon as the necessary alterations are made, the people will be able to decide which Government they want. I hope the Government has decided that it will go to the people immediately this matter is resolved, because it has no authority to be sitting where it is today. It is there under false pretences and because of a rotten electoral system.

Mr. Corcoran: It is a minority Government, and members opposite know it.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: We are a majority Government.

Mr. VIRGO: The Government today has the support of only 43 per cent of the people, and it has no right to introduce legislation or to occupy the Treasury benches. I hope that it will expedite this Bill now that it has moved it to the top of the Notice Paper, and that it will have the commission appointed to enable an election to be held forthwith.

Mr. Venning: You are going to accept the Bill, are you?

Mr. VIRGO: So long as the Government is prepared to delete some of the obnoxious clauses that it has added to the Bill, I have every reason to believe that members of the Opposition will accept it. However, it certainly needs cleaning up in a few quarters. I now refer briefly to the compilation of rolls, a matter that I raised in Question Time. Full regard must be given not only to the former Attorney-General (now the Leader of the Opposition) for his efforts in producing a computer roll (which has led Australia; the other States as well as the Commonwealth Government are thinking of doing the same) but also to a man who did a tremendous amount of work in this regard and who is indeed a most responsible person so far as this Parliament is concerned. I refer, of course, to the Returning Officer for the State, who did such a tremendous job in compiling this computer roll under the leadership and direction of the former Attorney-General. I thought the present Attorney-General would have leapt to his defence when this statement, taking

away the kudos from South Australia, the former Attorney-General and the Returning Officer for the State, appeared in the press. This shows a lack of appreciation of the ability of one of South Australia's finest public servants.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I certainly appreciate his ability and helpfulness.

Mr. VIRGO: I wish the Attorney-General had jumped into the press and corrected that statement, instead of just giving it by way of interjection when he is prompted.

Mr. Corcoran: He is not honourable.

Mr. VIRGO: The Standing Orders provide that the Attorney-General is to be called, "the honourable the Attorney-General", and far be it from me to quarrel with the Standing Orders that prevail in this Parliament. By interjection, the member for Rocky River (Mr. Venning) asked me whether I was going to support the Bill and I said that provided some of the obnoxious clauses were rectified I could see no reason why we should not support it. The honourable member and other members on his side should consider some of the clauses that we regard as obnoxious. In clauses 4 and 5 there are rather strange, to say the least, situations created. Clause 3 constitutes quite a normal sort of commission, quite in line with what previously operated in this State and quite in line with what one would expect to operate not only in this State but in other States and in the Commonwealth sphere. With the exception of one person, the composition of the proposed electoral commission is identical with that of the Commonwealth commission that has just completed its job. The Returning Officer for the State and the Surveyor-General were both members of the Commonwealth redistribution commission, and they are to be members of the State commission.

In clause 4, subclauses (4) and (5) leave much to be desired. I do not know what the Government is attempting to arrive at with these provisions but it seems a cumbersome way to try to get around the position of replacing someone unable to carry out his duties because of death or for some other reason. The position could be rectified fairly simply, and as this matter has been pointed out to the Government I hope it will see the folly of the wording it has used. Clause 5 (2) of the Bill concerns me most. It provides:

The chairman and one other commissioner shall constitute a quorum of the commission for the transaction of business.

That means that until the chairman agrees no decision can be valid. If that is the case, why should we have the other two members? This will, in effect, be a one-man commission. I do not know why the Government has departed from its previous practice, but if it had gone back and looked at the 1962 Electoral Distribution Bill, introduced by an L.C.L. Government at that time, it would have seen that section 4(2) provided:

Two commissioners shall constitute a quorum of the commission for the transaction of business,

and that section 4(3) provided:

A decision of the commission shall be valid if it is concurred in by at least two commissioners, but not otherwise.

Surely, this is a normal function. What superior position is the chairman supposed to hold that he has to agree, otherwise the decision is not valid? This is indeed a grave departure from accepted democratic principles where majorities rule, and it is one that must be rectified for this Bill to function. It is pointless to appoint three commissioners if we are to give the full power to the chairman. We might just as well leave the other two out.

Mr. Broomhill: Not one Government speaker has attempted to defend that clause.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not think any speaker could defend it, because it is quite indefensible. I refer now to the definition of "metropolitan area" contained in clause 7. In this respect, we have an extremely unpalatable position. Again, Government members would be well advised to refer back to their 1962 Electoral Redistribution Bill because on this occasion (some six years after their 1962 Bill was introduced) they are trying to turn the area covered by the Corporation of Gawler into a rural area, when six years ago it was a city area. All this is brought about by approaching the subject in a different way, and this clearly shows the inexpediency of attempting to define the metropolitan area in the way it is done in clause 7. No sound case can be made out to make the town of Gawler a part of the rural or country section, as is envisaged under the definition in clause 7.

The other point that gives me a great deal of concern is this: the redistribution commission's function is, as near as possible, to come up with a democratic redistribution, whereas clause 7 states that it must determine the areas that are likely seven years after the commencement of the Act to be substantially or

predominantly used for the business of primary production, and this suggests to me that we will not see another redistribution for seven years. If that is the case, electoral districts will probably be as far out of balance at that point of time as they are now, unless the redistribution is done thoroughly and properly, and it cannot be done thoroughly and properly unless we as a Parliament give the commission the proper terms of reference. These are points that should and must be given the greatest consideration.

I turn now to the method by which the Bill defines the various quotas for the metropolitan and country seats. This, I think, is one of the strangest ways I have ever seen a commission instructed to go about a redistribution. The tolerance allowed where, having arrived at a State quota, 15 per cent is added because metropolitan people are not liked as much as are the country people is, to say the least, rather strange. The Government should consider the public's views. I refer the Government to the Gallup poll published in the *Advertiser* on October 3. The poll showed that the public was in favour of all votes having equal value. It was conducted on a Commonwealth electorate basis, as all polls are because they are Commonwealth polls. If the results of the poll apply on a Commonwealth basis, they must equally apply on a State basis because both Parliaments govern the people. Members of Parliament here are supposed to represent their electors the same as Commonwealth members of Parliament are supposed to represent their electors.

The poll results showed that 45 people out of each 100 interviewed said that the votes of country and city people should be the same. Only 35 out of each 100 interviewed said there should be fewer electors in country electoral districts. This means that 35-45 is the ratio, the remaining 20 being taken up with people who had no opinion. This is conclusive proof that the proposal to add 15 per cent to the State quota to arrive at a metropolitan quota is an act of a Government that is completely out of touch with the attitude of the people. When these figures are applied, with the 15 per cent loading and the maximum tolerance in metropolitan-country electors of 10 per cent and 15 per cent respectively added, an electoral district in the metropolitan area could comprise over 16,000, whereas an electoral district in the country could comprise only 8,000. In other words,

we will be back where we were in 1938: two-to-one.

Mr. McAnaney: Your 1965 Bill allowed two-to-one at the extreme.

Mr. VIRGO: We are now discussing the 1968 Bill. If the honourable member wanted to support our 1965 Bill, the time he should have done it was when it was before Parliament. Now we are in the situation of looking at a Bill that approaches redistribution in a strange and totally different way altogether.

Mr. McAnaney: You advocated in March a two-to-one ratio.

Mr. VIRGO: There was no advocacy in March by the Labor Party for a two-to-one vote. In fact, it was the Liberal and Country League that destroyed the country representation when it opposed the Labor Party's proposals for a 56-member House. The member for Stirling knows that that is the only way we can retain the same degree of country representation, otherwise there must be a reduction. There must be 56 members if we are to accept the principle of one vote one value, and the member for Stirling knows that as well as I do.

Mr. McAnaney: How many country seats did your 1965 Bill give?

Mr. VIRGO: I think the member for Stirling would do far better if he concentrated on the Bill at present before the House. There is no hope of getting the 1965 Bill carried, but there is hope of getting this Bill carried if the Government uses some common sense and tolerance. I remind the member for Stirling of his own words, because the point I am making is that the very moment this tolerance is applied we start discriminating. When he spoke on the Bill, he said:

I do not think country people's interests are very much different from those of city people. We must work together, because the prosperity of one group depends on that of the other.

I remind the member for Stirling of his words and suggest that if the prosperity of one group is dependent on that of the other, and if we must work together, let us be equal together and not try to give people, because they happen to live at Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek or Bull Creek, a greater say in the law making of this State.

Mr. Lawn: Are you sure the member for Stirling made that statement?

Mr. VIRGO: I am certain he did, because I have the extract from *Hansard*. He has, by interjection, acknowledged that he made it.

I hope he was speaking from the bottom of his heart and that he firmly believes what he said.

Mr. McAnaney: It would be better if you repeated the whole thing.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not think honourable members should be made to suffer so, as I do not think they have done anything to deserve such an injustice as having that inflicted on them. I come now to another point to which the member for Stirling should also give some careful consideration. I refer to clause 8 of the Bill which, unfortunately, fiddles around with the Legislative Council boundaries. When we first looked at this Bill, we were happy that the Legislative Council was not involved. We thought that that omission would perhaps enhance the prospects of the Bill's passing through another place and that, consequent on its being accepted, the Government would (and, if it did not, I think the Opposition would) introduce a Bill to reform the Legislative Council—and heaven knows it needs it!

Unfortunately, the Bill neither leaves the Legislative Council alone nor introduces reform there. I think the simplest way to approach the Bill is to ensure that the Legislative Council is untouched as a result of any redistribution that may take place in the Lower House. Particularly in view of the statement made in this debate by the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), we ought to have a clear appreciation of the attitudes of the Parties towards the Legislative Council. The Party that I have the honour to represent has a clear and unequivocal policy on electoral reform, to which I am happy to subscribe. It states:

The ultimate aim of a Labor Government should be an electoral system which, to the greatest extent possible, recognizes (a) that, as each citizen should be equal in the sight of the law, so each citizen should have a vote of equal value to the vote of each other citizen in electing the legislators who make that law; and (b) that a second Parliamentary Chamber in South Australia is unnecessary and wasteful of public funds.

Mr. McAnaney: Surely you would not agree with that?

Mr. VIRGO: If the honourable member will contain himself for a while, I think I shall convince even him.

Mr. McAnaney: Not on that one.

Mr. VIRGO: The platform continues:

The immediate aim should be: The Legislative Council should be abolished after a favourable vote of citizens at an election at which abolition is an issue. Meanwhile, the Council should be reformed by (a)—

Mr. McAnaney: What about having a referendum on it first and then making a decision?

Mr. VIRGO: If the honourable member will listen to me for a few minutes, I will tell him what our policy is. It will appear in *Hansard*, and he can read it at his leisure.

Mr. Lawn: But he cannot read.

Mr. VIRGO: I am sure other members of his Party would be prepared to read it to him. The platform states:

Meanwhile, the Council should be reformed by (a) altering its powers to conform with those of the United Kingdom's House of Lords; (b) providing adult franchise in the voting for this House; and (c) boundaries for the Legislative Council allocated on the basis of one vote one value.

That is a policy to which the member for Stirling should be proud to subscribe.

Mr. Lawn: He supports the House of Lords.

Mr. VIRGO: I have just stated the policy of the Australian Labor Party. Now let us compare it with the Liberal Party's policy.

Mr. Clark: Where did you find it?

Mr. VIRGO: We were able to obtain a copy of its policy from the Liberal and Country League office, as long as it did not realize that we were connected with the A.L.P. I have a friend who is not known there; he went and got it. The hypocrisy of the Liberal Party's policy is clearly demonstrated in the wording of the first of its objectives:

An Australian nation dedicated to political liberty and the freedom and dignity of man.

Political liberty! We have been the prisoners of an electoral gerrymander that the Liberal Party introduced over 30 years ago; yet that Party has the temerity to state in its policy that it is "dedicated to political liberty"!

Mr. Burdon: Shame!

Mr. VIRGO: How hypocritical can one get! A little further on it gets worse. We read:

An Australian nation in which an intelligent, free and liberal Australian democracy shall be maintained by (a) Parliament controlling the Executive and the law controlling all; (b) independence of the Judiciary; (c) freedom of speech, religion and association.

How hypocritical can one get!

Mr. Clark: They mean a "Liberal democracy", do they not?

Mr. VIRGO: They spell "liberal" in that part of their policy with a small "l". I do not know what it has to do with a "liberal democracy". Some people say it is "ell" all the time in the Liberal Party, but I do not know. Let me continue and see whether the member for Stirling can still hold up his head.

Under the Liberal and Country League's "Objects" we see:

(c) To advocate sound, progressive, and humanitarian legislation, and to unite into one movement all electors who believe in a fair deal for every section of the community.

Mr. McAnaney: The honourable member cannot argue with that one.

Mr. VIRGO: Where is "a fair deal for every section of the community" under the rotten electoral system that the Liberal Party introduced 30 years ago and has perpetuated ever since?

Mr. Broomhill: And it is now trying to continue it.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes; it is trying to continue it. I should like to make one further reference to the Liberal Party's policy.

Mr. Edwards: You wouldn't understand it, anyway.

Mr. VIRGO: I am pleased to hear the member for Eyre make that interjection. I agree with him completely—I cannot understand it, because it is so hypocritical. If the honourable member can understand it, then all he is doing is proving just what a hypocrite he is. My final reference to the Liberal Party's policy is in the statement of principles on the back cover—"the Legislative Council and the principles of its franchise". Obviously, every member opposite is dedicated to subscribing to an electoral system that denies the people the right of electing the Government they want and rejecting the Government they do not want.

Mr. McAnaney: The honourable member is not correct there. We are not the Labor Party.

Mr. VIRGO: For that remark, thank the Lord and pass the ammunition! We know that the members of the Liberal Party go around the countryside singing their own praises and saying that they did not have to sign a pledge. They say that they are not bound like the members of the A.L.P. are; that they can follow the wishes of the electors. We all know that the minute the Premier says "Jump!" every one of them jumps—and it is no good you, Mr. Acting Speaker, shaking your head, because you know that neither you nor any other member of the Government Party is prepared to cross the floor. You will jump when the Premier tells you to jump.

I do not know whether the member for Stirling agrees, but the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) said that, if the Government accepted any amendments promoted by the

Leader of the Opposition, he would vote against them. They are brave words and I am waiting to see whether a Government member has the guts to cross the floor and defeat the Government.

Mr. McAnaney: We wouldn't be expelled if we did, but you would.

Mr. VIRGO: The member for Stirling need not worry about our being expelled. He would be expelled by not getting pre-selection for the next election, and that is a much more vicious way of doing it. I am waiting to see one of these brave members of the Liberal Party on the Government benches go to the electors in defiance of the Party that has put him there. The member for Stirling knows as well as I that, but for the fact that the L.C.L. was gracious enough and perhaps foolish enough to put the L.C.L. label around his neck, he would not be sitting here today. If he wants to challenge that, I invite him to stand as an Independent at the next election.

Mr. Broomhill: He may have to.

Mr. VIRGO: He may not get a seat for the next election, but I hope he does: he is a genial chap to have around the place.

Mr. McAnaney: I nearly made it as an Independent once, you know.

Mr. VIRGO: Nearly making it is not enough. One is not on the payroll if one nearly makes it.

Mr. Langley: That's as good as 43 against 53!

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, we nearly made the Government this year, but that was not enough. I now refer to the pamphlet authorized by Mr. R. Y. Wilson and distributed before the last State election, entitled *Why South Australia needs the Legislative Council*. I have not found why in the pamphlet: I think the reason is hidden. However, Government members ought to consider these words in the pamphlet:

It is L.C.L. policy to maintain the Legislative Council, because all legislation passed by the Assembly is reviewed by the Legislative Council, and so better laws result.

Better laws result, in whose opinion? Certainly not in our opinion. I ask members opposite, if the Legislative Council is, as the pamphlet suggests, a House of Review, what are the powers of the Legislative Council about reviewing legislation that that Chamber initiates. The House of Assembly is not, and never has claimed to be, a House of Review, so who reviews the legislation that the Legislative Council introduces, or does that legislation not

need review? Do members of the Legislative Council review the legislation before they introduce it? Are they so perfect? Is this what the Government is saying?

Mr. McAnaney: That legislation is reviewed here, and we have a conference if there is disagreement. You're only new here and you haven't caught up with the procedure.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Nankivell): Order! The member for Edwardstown.

Mr. VIRGO: I think the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) gave the best answer when he said that members of the Legislative Council have contact with the Supreme Being above. That can be the only valid reason for their legislation not being reviewed. They have the Divine right! As was suggested on one occasion, they have been anointed, not appointed.

Mr. Edwards: That's only your opinion.

Mr. VIRGO: I am sorry if I am disturbing the member for Eyre, who is reading the newspaper. I apologize to him and to you, Mr. Acting Speaker, and I hope that the honourable member will be able to continue his reading, as he finds that more interesting than he finds the business of this House. This statement in the pamphlet also merits comment:

The Legislative Council is retained because it stands against class legislation.

The Legislative Council is the one House that introduces class legislation! Not only does it stand for such measures, but the members are elected by class representation.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VIRGO: As the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) says, members of the Legislative Council consider that only the wealthy ought to vote at Legislative Council elections, and they say that those members in the Upper House are there to represent only the wealthy.

Mr. Edwards: Don't you vote at Legislative Council elections?

Mr. VIRGO: That interjection is timely. Of course I do, but the honourable member's Party has ensured that the votes of people like me are nullified.

Mr. Edwards: Bunkum!

Mr. VIRGO: I suggest that the honourable member examine the last election result and the number of people in the various Legislative Council districts and then say whether anything I have said is bunkum. He knows, or ought to know, that the Legislative Council Districts

of Central No. 1 and Central No. 2 are grossly loaded with electors, as compared with the Districts of Southern, Midland and Northern.

Mr. Hudson: He thinks that the people who don't get a vote aren't really people and don't count.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! This is not a conversation. The member for Edwards-town.

Mr. VIRGO: I shall make another brief reference to this pamphlet and then leave it, because it is upsetting members opposite, who hate to have this brought home to them.

Mr. Clark: Does it say anything about the permanent will of the people?

Mr. VIRGO: No, it misses that, but it states that the Legislative Council is retained because it stands in the way (it sure does that) of any Government's pursuing policies greatly exceeding election promises. I want to find out from members opposite whether this Legislative Council, dominated by 16 L.C.L. members, will consider that statement and oppose every Government action that exceeds election promises.

Mr. Lawn: See what they do about fluoridation!

Mr. VIRGO: I want to see what they do about the Budget, which greatly exceeds the Government's election promises. They have not said a word yet. If the Legislative Council is dinkum, it will throw out the Budget and thus throw out the Government.

Mr. McAnaney: For what logical reason?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know about logical, but I know that the pamphlet is illogical. Mr. R. Y. Wilson, the boss of members opposite, has authorized that pamphlet and Government members have to bow to his dictates in the same way as they bow to the dictates of Mr. R. S. Hall.

Mr. Edwards: Where do you get your information?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not waste my time and only read newspapers; I get around and get information, which I give *gratis* to the honourable member in the hope that he may gain something from it. Members opposite support the Legislative Council. I wonder how many of them have considered what its members do.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to keep his remarks to the Bill. I have looked at clause 8 and cannot see anything in it that he is talking about.

Mr. VIRGO: Clause 8 provides that the commission shall adjust and redefine the areas

of the existing Council districts, and deals with the electoral districts. I am making the point about the function of the Council and saying that the boundaries should not be altered, and I remind members opposite that they are bound by their Party's policy, which subscribes to the retention of that undemocratic House. How many Government members know that since Parliament resumed on June 25, about 15 weeks ago, the Legislative Council has sat for a total of 37 hours 58 minutes, an average of 2 hours 32 minutes a week.

Mr. Broomhill: Shame!

Mr. VIRGO: I understand that the Council did not improve its average today, because it sat for 1 hour 20 minutes to do a day's work. This is the House that members opposite are attempting to defend.

Mr. McAnaney: The Government hasn't got any Bills there yet, but that is not the Government's fault.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know about that, but if it does not have any work to do let us get rid of it.

Mr. Lawn: Throw them out.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VIRGO: I turn now to clause 9, which is an important part of this Bill, because it is an instruction to the commission on how it shall determine the new districts under the redistribution.

Mr. Edwards: Let's hope you make a better job of it than you did on the others.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know what the honourable member is complaining about, but I suggest to him and to all Government members that they should consider uniformity of purpose. In another debate on a Bill before the House, introduced by the Leader of the Opposition and providing for a reduction in the age of majority, we have heard many Government members saying that, although they agree with the principle of the Bill, there must be uniformity. We find the same sin perpetrated in this Bill.

Mr. Edwards: Are you speaking for yourself?

Mr. VIRGO: The main omission in this clause dealing with matters that the commission should consider is the trend of population changes within the State. It has been suggested earlier that we are not going to see a further redistribution, if the present Government remains in office (which is doubtful), for at least seven years.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: That is not right.

Mr. VIRGO: If the Minister of Works reads clause 7 he will find the provision that there will not be a further redistribution for seven years. In that case, we have to ensure that, whatever instructions are given to the commission, they are sound and will produce a redistribution that is as close as possible to one vote one value. For this reason we must, at least, have as a prerequisite that the commissioners shall consider the trend of population changes within the State. This is an important aspect, because the population is rapidly changing: numbers in some districts are diminishing whereas other districts are rapidly expanding and, for this reason, we have to be cognizant, and so must the commission, of these facts. I said earlier that I am happy enough to support the second reading in the hope that we shall be able to get some degree of democracy by amendments in Committee. I hope that in South Australia, and in Australia, we shall not see the press of this country writing about South Australia as a hill-billy State, merely because we suffer from an electoral system which is unjust and which savours of a system that would operate in a dictatorship rather than in a free democratic country.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): First, it is disappointing to me that country representation is to be reduced to such an extent if this Bill is passed. Basically, the Bill was introduced after several attempts had been made to bring about some type of reform in the electoral position in this State. At the election on March 2 the Australian Labor Party plan of a 56-member House was not accepted by the people of South Australia as, in fact, the Leader of the A.L.P. said in this House earlier in this debate. The Labor Party was forced to accept a smaller number of members because of the reactions of the people of South Australia at the election on March 2, and not because of any action of that Party. The Liberal and Country League gained support at that election with its proposal for a 45-member House.

Mr. McKee: What about Millicent?

Mr. EVANS: It has been said that at Millicent my Party probably lost some of this support. I should like to quote a comment by the *News* political reporter at that time. I believe the Opposition accepts the *News* as a fair newspaper which makes fair comment, and will accept what the political reporter said as being fair. If it does not accept it, it has no reason to grizzle. They will never be satisfied.

Members opposite growl at one newspaper or the other but accept none. Jeff Turner, the *News* political reporter, reporting at the Millicent by-election stated:

Electoral reform is not the burning issue so far in the A.L.P.-L.C.L. fight for the seat of Millicent—at least not to the voters. Among many people I spoke with in the town of Millicent only some were at all sure how both parties intend increasing the size of the House of Assembly and redrawing electoral boundaries. For them the contest boils down to a simple choice on June 22 between sons of two of the best-known families in the district, Labor's Des Corcoran, and the Liberal and Country League's Martin Cameron.

Mr. Burdon: What about reading what your Premier had to say about how he regarded this by-election as a barometer.

Mr. EVANS: The weather has changed lately and I do not wish to talk about the barometer. At the by-election at Millicent we saw a personal victory for the ex-member for Millicent. I congratulate him on his victory, but the Millicent by-election was fought on personalities and personalities alone. At this by-election the L.C.L. submitted to the people the same plan for a 45-member House, knowing that at the election on March 2 the people of South Australia preferred this to the A.L.P. plan for a 56-member House. The A.L.P. plan for a 56-member House would have increased representation of the metropolitan area, as defined by the Town Planner in the latest report, by at least 21 seats to 34 seats and decreased the number of country seats by four to 22.

Mr. Casey: You know that's not true.

Mr. EVANS: I am sure it is true, because it is what the A.L.P. Bill suggested in 1965. That Bill sought to define the country area as being "any area outside the area comprised in electoral districts for the House of Assembly of Adelaide, Torrens, Prospect, Thebarton, Hindmarsh, Semaphore, Port Adelaide, Norwood, Burnside, Unley, Mitcham, Goodwood, and Glenelg, as such electoral districts were defined at the time of the passing of the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act, 1954," those districts having been originally defined in 1936. If members opposite accepted that as constituting the metropolitan area, why do they now argue that we are trying to have Gawler included as part of the country area? The A.L.P. Bill to implement a 56-seat plan would have decreased country membership by at least four seats to 22 seats. The L.C.L. proposal to establish 45 seats would have given the metropolitan area an increased

voting power of 80 per cent and would have given the country areas a decreased voting power of 20 per cent.

Mr. Casey: You didn't tell the people of Millicent what your 45-seat plan was. You had no idea.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: This Bill will provide for at least 29 metropolitan seats and only 18 country seats, thereby giving about 60 per cent of the voting power to metropolitan districts, and that is practically identical to the amount of voting power sought to be given by the A.L.P. in its 56-seat plan, except that under this Bill the man in the street is not paying for as many politicians (I do not think many of them are statesmen, so we shall call them politicians). Had the A.L.P. plan for 56 seats been implemented, we would have had more politicians for whom the man on the street would have had to pay.

Mr. Casey: I think he's more concerned about the Budget.

Mr. EVANS: If we had had 56 members, the Budget would have had to provide for further increased taxation. I agree with the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), who said that the principle of this Bill was close to that of one vote one value, and I agree also with the Opposition speakers who have said that there must be a weighting for those districts outside the metropolitan area. Is it therefore not logical to assume that this Bill must represent a fair compromise and that it is giving the Opposition something for which it has been asking? We are offering the same percentage of seats in the metropolitan area as was offered by the A.L.P. in its 1965 proposal. This Bill gives the currently-defined metropolitan area an increase of at least 115 per cent in voting power, and it decreases the country voting power by 27 per cent, bearing in mind the number of metropolitan and country districts as defined in 1955.

The Leader of the Opposition said that his Party governed from 1965 to 1968 with 21 members, even though his Party was electorally entitled to more members, but he knows that that is not correct, for the Opposition was entitled only to those of its candidates who had won the majority of votes in their particular districts. Even with equal numbers in electoral districts, it would not necessarily follow that the Party winning the most votes throughout the State would win the majority of districts.

Nothing in the Constitution refers at all to Parties. The rotten part of the South Australian political situation is that Parties have developed. If we were Independents we would not be concerned with who won 53 per cent, or 43 per cent: we would be concerned only with who won districts and with who represented those districts, and the group with the majority would form the Government, whether that group consisted of four Parties, 10 Parties, or only one Party.

Mr. Casey: Then why are you a member of a Party?

Mr. EVANS: Because the political situation in South Australia has reached that stage. If a man has ambitions to be a politician and to represent the people in his area, there is no alternative for him but to join a Party. Even if he is an Independent, he must join a Party in order to receive an opportunity to express his views, without being bound by a Party controlled by Trades Hall, such as the one we have opposite.

Mr. Ryan: Or the club on North Terrace.

Mr. EVANS: The Leader said that this was a matter of urgency: why was it not a matter of urgency in 1965? It has been said that we took over 100 days to introduce the Bill, but there was a mix-up at the commencement of the Parliamentary session as a result of a by-election being held. Although no mix-up occurred in 1965, the A.L.P. took longer to introduce its Bill than we have taken.

Mr. Clark: It took you 30 years to introduce it.

Mr. EVANS: As I am 38, I had no say in what went on previously. We now have a reliable L.C.L. Government, elected by the people of the State to put South Australia back on the road to economic stability, and we are entitled to the three years of this present term of office to prove our effectiveness. We must remember that, had there been 25 more Labor supporters in the District of Murray on March 2, a Socialist Bill for a 56-seat plan would have been before the House.

Mr. Casey: That was not our policy, and you know it.

Mr. EVANS: We would have had a 56-seat plan. The Leader of the Opposition said he was afraid that under the Bill there would be only 28 metropolitan seats.

Mr. Broomhill: Are you denying that?

Mr. EVANS: I am wondering what the Leader is afraid of. I am not denying anything.

Mr. Casey: You said earlier that you agreed with one vote one value.

Mr. EVANS: I believe in that principle. However, why is the Leader afraid that there will be only 28 metropolitan seats?

Mr. Broomhill: What did he say exactly?

Mr. EVANS: He said he was afraid that under the Bill there would be only 28 metropolitan seats.

Mr. Corcoran: When did he say that?

Mr. EVANS: I will come back to that. The proportion of voting power of districts represented in this House would be exactly the same under this Bill as it would have been under the 1965 A.L.P. proposal.

Mr. Broomhill: What do you mean?

Mr. EVANS: Under the A.L.P. proposal, there would have been 22 country seats and 34 city seats, or about 60 per cent city representation compared with about 40 per cent country representation.

Mr. Corcoran: What do you call a true country seat?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: Although I disagree with the Leader's figures as representing the likely quotas, I will use them for the sake of a little harmony. I refer to the Leader's statement to the effect that the lowest country quota possible under this Bill would be 8,199 and the maximum metropolitan quota 16,453. In other words, there would be a difference of 100 per cent. I realize his figures are roughly correct in this respect. The Bill introduced in 1965 by the Labor Government provided for the same difference of 100 per cent between the quotas. Therefore, why do members opposite complain now, when we have similar terms of reference which will bring about the same result?

The difference between the largest country quota of 11,093 and the smallest metropolitan quota of 13,452 is only 16 per cent. The terms of reference are already giving too much representation to the metropolitan area, which will be over-represented. A member representing 8,199 people on the far West Coast could not give the same representation to his electors as could a member representing 16,453 people in a closely populated area. This Bill will affect electoral districts in every part of the State, and I agree with the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran), who, by way of interjection, said that the State of Victoria should

give up a small portion of its area to help us keep the three South-East electoral districts intact. It is only right that the honourable member should advocate this. We know that he has no other occupation to fall back on, and it would be shocking to see such a capable man without an occupation.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Where did he say that?

Mr. EVANS: I shall find it. I know that all Opposition members would help us in this approach because, when they were in Government, they gave Victoria the part of the continental shelf where there are large deposits of minerals, oil and gas.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you suggest we acted improperly there?

Mr. EVANS: Why not continue the off-shore boundary in a straight line overland to the New South Wales border, so that our worry about the employment of the member for Millicent would be solved? Perhaps we should send the Leader of the Opposition, who we are told is a great advocate, to argue that Victoria should give up a small portion of its area to this State, so that we can save the member for Millicent at the next State election. Members opposite can find on page 650 of *Hansard* the portion of the debate where the member for Millicent made the interjection to which I have referred. During the speech of the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) interjected: Particularly in Millicent.

The member for Victoria replied:

The member for Unley can make his own speech in his own time and in his own way. I live near the Victorian border and frequently visit areas immediately adjacent to my district.

The member for Millicent interjected:

Don't you think you ought to extend the border?

I agree with him on this, and I believe he and the Leader of the Opposition should advocate this point. I should like to go further in comparing the areas a member has to represent under the terms of this Bill with the areas a member of Parliament in another State represents. The total area of this State is 380,070 square miles, of which only 711 square miles is in the new Adelaide metropolitan area. This means that 99.8 per cent of South Australia is to be represented by only 18 members.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you represent only square miles?

Mr. EVANS: I represent the area as well as the people. If there are 1,000 miles of road in my electoral district, it is my duty to ensure that that road is kept in good order for the people in the area.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: But you don't represent area.

Mr. EVANS: In my opinion I do. One country member represents 21,075 square miles, whilst in the metropolitan area 29 members will represent less than 0.2 per cent of the State's area. In other words, one metropolitan member will represent 24 square miles. Can a country member, representing people scattered over 21,075 square miles, represent his electors as effectively as can a metropolitan member? It is not humanly possible to do so. Every member of this House agrees that we are entitled to something near similar representation, but we are not even offering anything near it. The Leader of the Opposition has said that one of the main functions of a member of Parliament is to act as an agent for the people he represents, but how can a Parliamentarian act as an effective agent if he has to represent 8,000 people scattered over 21,075 square miles, compared with a metropolitan member who represents 16,000 people concentrated in only 24 square miles? I would much prefer to represent 16,000 people concentrated in 24 square miles than to represent half as many people scattered over 21,075 square miles.

I believe that members of Parliament in this State are just as capable as those in other States. If members look at quotas for metropolitan and country electoral districts in other States, they will realize how foolish we are in overburdening the people of this State with too many Parliamentarians. This is what will happen if this Bill is passed, and it will happen to an even greater extent if its provisions are weighted any further towards metropolitan electoral districts. The members for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), Gawler (Mr. Clark), and Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) have agreed that country areas have suffered under their present representation.

Mr. Corcoran: Who said that?

The SPEAKER: The member for Millicent is out of order. There is too much conversation.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) said that we are delaying the debate and that we should be rushing this

Bill through the House as fast as possible so that we can see whether the Legislative Council passes it.

Mr. Clark: Where did he say that?

Mr. EVANS: If I looked up every comment in *Hansard* and replied to it we would be here for a long time. I will show the statement to the honourable member later. If he keeps quiet now, I shall be able to continue. What will happen if we further drastically reduce the country quota? The aim should be to have enough members to represent the people of this State effectively, so that every person has an effective and readily available agent. This is the main function of a Parliamentarian.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It is not.

Mr. EVANS: It is: We have heard the word "gerrymander" so often that most people now realize that it is not a second-grade orange but the juggling of electoral boundaries. We have heard the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) admit that both Parties, in his opinion, would juggle boundaries to suit themselves if they had the opportunity to do so. We can infer from his admission the reason for the proposal for a 56-seat House: it was to save heads from rolling in country electoral districts represented by Labor Party members. The only reason was to ensure that the city-based Trades Hall-controlled Australian Labor Party would govern this State for the next 20 or 30 years. The member for Enfield said that, if the Bill were passed and the area I represent eliminated, I would seek election to another place. I believe I should explain this. The matter arose as a result of a discussion between the honourable member and me during which I thought I would test his ideas on the subject. I said to him that, after 15 years of being a member of this place (and I say this with all due respect to you, Mr. Speaker, and point out that this was not my view, but that I put it forward to test the honourable member), a person should retire and let someone else have the opportunity to represent the people of that area. The honourable member asked me what he could do and I said I would apprentice him as a garbage collector or he could have a shot for the Upper House, as I would. At the same time, the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) asked me whether I was old enough to stand for that House. In the circumstances, I do not think I should answer that question. However, if the honourable member asks me outside, possibly I can give her an answer then. If the Bill is passed and the voting trends stay as they are,

in fairness I must say that this would automatically mean that this Government would be removed from power at the next State election. Therefore, no-one can say that the Bill provides for a gerrymander. If the Bill is passed, we will be out on our ears at the next election.

Mr. Clark: That is what the people want.

Mr. EVANS: If that is true and we are defeated at the next election, I am sure we would accept our defeat more gracefully than members opposite accepted their defeat. All of us who are honest will agree that at an election every voter is a potential supporter of any candidate. I disagree with members in this place who refer to areas as Liberal or Labor. People in an area may vote for one Party at one election but, if the right legislation and the right type of candidate are offered by the other Party, the people will change their representative. The proof of this was in the Millicent District where the sitting member was nearly defeated (in fact, enough votes were cast to defeat him) at the last election. However, at the by-election he regained support. This was a case where, at the election before last, the sitting member gained a large majority but, at the following election, he was nearly defeated.

I stress how important it is that we all realize that we represent all the people in our district; if we say we support only a Party we are wrong. We are elected by the people of the district and we should represent everybody in that district. Many times it has been said that Party politics are the main concern. Perhaps that is the impression people get, but according to the Act that is not the case. We come into this place as individuals and we should vote according to the wishes of the people in our districts. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) gave figures in relation to Victoria, where there are 44 metropolitan seats with an average of 25,000 electors. Does the fact that a Victorian member represents 25,000 people whereas, under the Bill, a member here will represent only 16,000 or less mean that Victorian members are superior to South Australian members, or does it mean that we are bludging? Do we need to have as many Parliamentarians as is proposed? Victoria has eight provincial seats with an average of 22,000 electors and 21 country seats with an average of 18,000 electors. I suppose that the type of thought that comes immediately to the minds of Opposition members is, "Why should there be 18,000 voters in Victorian

country seats and only 8,000 in ours?" However, I point out that this State is much more sparsely populated than is Victoria. In Victoria the metropolitan area covers 792 square miles and is represented by 44 members whose districts take up an average of 18 square miles, compared with the average of 24 square miles and 16,000 electors represented in this State.

Mr. Broomhill: What do these figures about Victoria prove? Are we really interested in Victoria?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Frome spent 15 or 20 minutes on these figures and, when he had finished reading them, he told us to forget about Victoria and to concentrate on this State. Perhaps, after I have used the figures, I will say the same thing.

Mr. Broomhill: What are you trying to prove?

Mr. EVANS: I am trying to prove that in Victoria Parliamentarians represent more people than do Parliamentarians here. I do not honestly believe that the number of members in this House should be increased to such an extent. I believe that an increase in the number to 45 would be fair enough, that 47 is a little over the fence (but I will most probably have to accept it), and that 56 is too many altogether.

Mr. Riches: Why will you have to accept it?

Mr. EVANS: After hearing a comment made earlier by the member for Edwardstown, I am sure the Labor Party members have been instructed on the matter by their Party and that they will not speak or act individually but will have to act collectively. In Victoria, outside the metropolitan area there are 29 members who represent a total area of 87,000 square miles, the average being 3,000 square miles. In South Australia, the average country area represented by a member is 21,000 square miles. Therefore, the difference in the area represented is vast. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it is the ability of Parliamentarians to act as agents that counts, and it is much more difficult to act as an agent in an area of 21,000 square miles than it is in an area of 3,000 square miles. I will not quote figures for New South Wales, because I understand they give practically the same picture as the Victorian figures. In spite of that, the member for Frome quoted these figures. I believe that an evenly balanced House is essential, as a weak Opposition tends to lead to weak Government and a strong Opposition to strong Government. I should like to see an opportunity left for any particular

section of the community which felt it was being unjustly treated to be able to affect the result of an election by voting against the Government of the day, be it L.C.L., A.L.P. or Communist.

I am not over-enthusiastic about my Party's altering its proposal from a 45-member House to a 47-member House but, as the Opposition asked for a compromise, a 47-member House was recommended. However, that is as far as I am likely to go. I am practically a metropolitan member, because most of the people in my district are concerned with the metropolitan area. While dealing with this point, I should like to take to task the member for Edwardstown, who accused the Government of having mainly city members in Cabinet. Most members of Cabinet have lived in the country or had interests there most of their lives. I believe it is a most evenly balanced Cabinet (which the Opposition would see if it looked at it in its true light) with representation being equally divided between city and country members.

Only twice since I have been here has a member strongly advocated voluntary voting as the most democratic form of voting. As the Opposition states it is so fond of democracy, I am disappointed that no Opposition member has advocated that voluntary voting should be included in the Bill; nor has any member opposite indicated he will move an amendment to bring about voluntary voting or said that it should be the subject of a future Bill.

Mr. Clark: You might introduce that as an amendment.

Mr. EVANS: In speaking to the Bill I have mentioned some dissatisfaction with the number of members of Parliament it provides. I believe the people of Australia voted against increasing the number of Parliamentarians in the Commonwealth sphere, and I believe the people of South Australia would do the same if this question was put to a vote. The variation between 29 members for the metropolitan area and 18 for the country districts is too great. I support the second reading, in order to see what eventuates in Committee.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I was amazed to hear what the member for Onkaparinga has just said. He is certainly not like his predecessor, whom I met in the Parliamentary refreshment room just after a new Parliament had been formed. There were present at morning tea one or two new members, one of whom was very vocal, and the former mem-

ber for Onkaparinga said the trouble was that some of these men were here for only five minutes before trying to set the world on fire. That statement reminds me of the speech made by the member for Onkaparinga this afternoon. He said that he disagreed with the Bill and that we should not have 45 members, but later he said we should have 47 members. He also said that the Opposition had been forced into this situation by the people of the State. Recently, he mentioned a rather rare bird. This afternoon, however, the actions of the member for Onkaparinga reminded me of a very common bird—the cock sparrow. He also referred to the 1965 Bill on electoral redistribution. Later in my speech I, too, will refer to the 1965 Bill and I hope that what I say will be of an educational nature to the member for Onkaparinga, because he seemed to be right off the beam in his knowledge of the Bill.

In view of the Party strength in the House and the percentage of electors the Opposition represents, the Premier was left with no alternative but to compromise with the Opposition. Despite what the Premier said during the Millicent by-election campaign that, if the Liberal and Country League candidate was successful on June 22, he would take this as a vote of confidence and introduce amending legislation to provide for a 45-member House and that, if the Labor Party candidate was successful, he would introduce legislation to provide for a 48-member House, as outlined by the Leader of the Opposition, after the election had been won for Labor he still persisted with the idea of presenting a Bill to provide for a 45-member House, and would have done so but for the persistent efforts of the Opposition to introduce a Bill for a 48-member House.

This is borne out by members of the Australian Country Party in South Australia. An article headed "Boundaries a 'Panic' Bill" states:

The Australian Country Party (S.A.) State Secretary, Mr. A. G. Matheson, speaking of the proposed electoral reform Bill, said it appeared that the Labor Party had forced the Hall Government to panic and bring down a similar Bill for reform, were it really reform, as that sponsored by Labor. The Parties were equal—they had both changed their policies twice since March 2. "Surely it is time the Liberal Party removed the word country from its name in view of the sellout of country representation in favour of urban representation in the proposed legislation," Mr. Matheson said.

The Country Party maintained that electoral reform should be above Party politics and that the only fair way was to appoint a Royal Commission to consider all aspects. He thought it remarkable that this was the first positive legislation sponsored by the new Government since taking office. Electors could have looked forward to other more urgent legislation being enacted to bring about an increase in industry and commerce in the State. The Government had, of course, announced fluoridation, something that wasn't even mentioned in the policy speech of March. "But in a changing world, we must expect quick changes of policy," Mr. Matheson added.

That is what the Secretary of the Australian Country Party in South Australia said: we must get used to a quick change of policy. I assure honourable members that there was a quick change of policy and attitude on the part of the present Government because of the pressure brought to bear on it by the Opposition.

The Premier could see that public opinion was mounting against him rapidly, so much so that he found it necessary to get up in the House and make a personal explanation in an endeavour to ease the concern of the public of South Australia. At last he had become aware that people in the country, as well as those in the metropolitan area, were becoming uneasy over the delay in having legislation introduced to provide for a redistribution of electoral districts. The Premier could see that public opinion was heavily weighted against him, particularly as the Australian Labor Party had been prepared to compromise on a 48-member House instead of a 56-member House. He realized the implications of the situation in which the Government could find itself, so he and his Party did a very sensible thing in so far as the people of this State were concerned, even though it was done under Opposition pressure.

It has been contended by country members opposite that the division of the State as suggested gives the urban community increased representation at the expense of the rural community, but that is not so. If the urban vote exceeds the rural vote, then it is only logical to assume that the greater number of people should be entitled to a more even measure of representation. Any reason why a country voter's vote should be given more value than that of an urban voter is difficult to comprehend and certainly ridiculous in application when democratic principles are admitted. The people who contribute toward democracy know something about the rights for which

they are subscribing. Do members opposite who have spoken against the principle of one vote one value think that we must retain a constitution that was framed many years ago? If we adopted that policy and did not alter any of our legislation, where would we be?

The first House of Assembly in South Australia was formed with 36 members in 1857, and by 1890 there were 54 members. With the introduction of federation, the members were reduced to 42. After the Northern Territory was transferred to the Commonwealth in 1911, the number was reduced to 40. In 1915 the number of members was increased to 46, and it remained at this figure until 1938, when the present unjust system was originated by Act of Parliament providing for 39 members. As everyone knows, the unjust reason for the reduction at this time was the political motive of foisting on to the people of South Australia a gerrymander that enabled the Liberal and Country League to remain in office until 1965.

In 1965 the Labor Party received a mandate from the people of South Australia to proceed with constitutional and electoral reform to ensure equitable electoral boundaries with one roll for all Parliamentary elections and the retention of compulsory enrolment and voting. A Bill was introduced specifically stating that the Lower House redistribution would provide for 26 of the 56 seats to be in the present country area. I want the House to note that because this has been denied by honourable members opposite; but it is true that, when the provision was made, the Premier of the day said:

This Bill will provide that 26 of the 56 seats must be in the present country areas.

Before proceeding let us look at the proposals put forward by the L.C.L. Government in 1964, because several months before the 1965 election the L.C.L. members went to a lot of trouble to place before the electors in country districts through the press their ideas on electoral reform. They endeavoured to convey to readers how good the L.C.L. proposals would be for the country areas and how totally unacceptable the proposals of the Labor Party were to the country.

I will quote from the second reading speech of the then L.C.L. Premier to enable members to know how innocuous the proposals were, how the great champions of democracy were prepared to pull the wool over the eyes of the

electors in this State. As reported in *Hansard* of February 20, 1964, at page 2045, the Premier said:

The basis of the redistribution of the State into Assembly districts as recommended by the commission is, in fact, the abolition of the notion of the metropolitan area as it has existed over the years and substitution of provision for the election of 20 members from primary-producing districts, 20 from non-primary-producing districts adjacent to the capital city, and two additional members from non-primary-producing districts representing industrial areas away from the capital city.

Two years before this the L.C.L. executive in South Australia had brought redistribution to the notice of the then Premier, Sir Thomas Playford. However, it took two years of pressure to alter the views of Sir Thomas. The younger members of the L.C.L. Party could see that, unless the Premier changed his views on electoral reform, the L.C.L. would lose Government. However, he left his run too late and was not prepared to listen, much to the disgust of the L.C.L. executive.

It was said this afternoon by the member for Onkaparinga that the *News* was fair. I think it is. It was fair when it published this editorial about the position then:

The L.C.L. executive's proposal to revise the Party's insistence on the existing country-city seat ratio in the State's electoral set-up introduces a new concept. Up to now the Party, and particularly Sir Thomas Playford, has been adamant that there should be no change. The last commission on State electoral boundaries was specifically instructed to preserve the two-to-one ratio, which provides 26 country and only 13 city seats in the 39-seat assembly. The new approach is refreshing, and should lead to a spirited debate at the annual Party meeting early next month.

However, the Premier's attitude on this question is all-important. It is not mandatory on him to carry out resolutions of the Party conference. If Sir Thomas Playford does not accept the proposal, then it will die no matter how Party delegates vote. And there has been no sign in his recent statements and attitudes to suggest he is prepared to change his view. At the same time, it seems that the L.C.L. executive is not prepared to go all the way in electoral reform. Along with its Assembly ratio proposal it reaffirms support for the Legislative Council "and the principles of its franchise." This will ensure that the L.C.L. always has a majority in the Council—a big consideration whether the L.C.L. is in office or in opposition. The executive's proposal on the seat ratio—and at present it is no more than a proposal—shows an awareness of public feeling. A very large proportion of the public believes that a new deal is overdue. Public interest in next month's Party meeting will be high. It will be higher still in watching for signs which way Sir Thomas Playford will jump.

That report showed conclusively that the executive of the L.C.L. was becoming extremely concerned, because of the attitude of the Premier and, more particularly, that of the people of South Australia. The Premier was not prepared to accept the views of his own Party. What happened? In 1965 he lost the Government. The same position applies today. The members of the present Government well knew that, unless they compromised along the lines of the representations that previously had been made in this House by the present Leader of the Opposition, they, too, would lose the Government, and that was the reason for the quick change of heart by the present Premier and the members of his Government.

Reverting to the quotation I made regarding what happened in 1964, the great champions of country areas were going to reduce the country vote! The Government did not tell the people that it was not only reducing country representation as it then stood but that it also would bring country districts closer to the city. This is when the words "rural areas" began being used in this House. I again quote from the second reading explanation of the Premier, as reported in 1964 *Hansard* at page 2046.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link his remarks to the Bill. I have been fairly lenient so far.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am linking them with the effect that this Bill is having on the people of South Australia today and the attitude previously taken by the people to the measure I have mentioned. At that time, Sir Thomas Playford said:

This follows from the fact that, whereas the metropolitan area as now defined has a representation for the House of Assembly of 13 members, under the wider definition that includes rural areas adjacent to the capital city the number of members will be increased to 20.

The representation of the country was to be less and a greater area was to be brought under country representation. The people in the country were not told this. They were not told that the redistribution Bill would bring country representation within about 10 miles of the General Post Office. In fact, the Government tried to have country people believe to the contrary, as I will prove to the House soon. In addition, the then Premier, in an effort to further the gerrymander in this State, wanted to combine the electors of Whyalla,

Port Augusta and Port Pirie and reduce the representation of these cities from three members to two, all out of the goodness of his heart, to enable acres to be represented in Parliament and not people, as the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) has said this afternoon. Sir Thomas did not say that these three districts were Labor districts and that by reducing the representation he was not only getting rid of the Labor district that comprised Port Augusta but was reducing the value of the vote of people in that area—people who contributed much toward rural production. In 1953 the then Premier said:

Generally speaking the country is underprivileged. I believe the present electoral set up has been of great benefit to them—

meaning country people—

it would be a bad thing for the State if the representation were reduced.

In the following year he said:

Let me make it quite clear that I do not budge an inch from my belief that the present metropolitan representation is adequate as compared with the representation for country areas.

Again, in 1954 he said:

If we are going to represent the State and provide for decentralization, that is no warrant for taking away representation by country members.

In 1958, when speaking on proposals to give additional representation to the metropolitan area, he said:

I believe it would have a bad effect on the community and not improve the State's development. It would increase the centralization which every member desires to avoid.

What a complete about-turn the Premier had after the 1962 elections! That was similar to the about-turn by this Government under pressure from the Opposition. No longer was it a bad thing for the State to reduce country representation. In fact, it was intended to eliminate the District of Stuart. Every avenue was used by the previous L.C.L. Government members to make it look as though the Government was being most charitable to the members of the Opposition by offering them a redistribution of electoral boundaries. They used the public platform and the press to tell the people that the Labor Party had voted out the basis of one vote one value. Their ammunition was well prepared in an endeavour to convey to the people that a genuine attempt had been made to give realistic representation to the metropolitan area and at the same time to give equal representation to country areas

to enable the advancement of South Australia to continue in its splendid fashion under the Playford Administration.

The emphasis at that time was placed on equal representation of the country as compared with the metropolitan area, but they did not draw the attention of country people to the fact that, under the L.C.L. one vote one value scheme, country representation would be reduced. Sir Thomas Playford said:

In the Bill there is no assurance that reasonable representation for rural districts will be given. Rural districts are important not only to rural districts but to the whole economy of the State. The policy of the people opposite is anti-rural.

Sir Thomas, when in Opposition, charged the Labor Government with that, but I am at a loss to understand how he could justify such a statement. When he was Premier he wanted to reduce country representation: not one member can deny that. However, when a realistic and democratic approach had been made by the Labor Government to pass legislation to provide for a redistribution of electoral boundaries on the basis of one vote one value, without taking away any of the present representation of country areas, what happened? Sir Thomas Playford said that the policy of the people opposite was anti-rural. That is what the Government was charged with then, and that is what the Opposition is being charged with today—that we are anti-rural. That statement was a complete distortion of the truth. The Bill introduced by the Labor Government set out to protect the present representation of country areas, but it went one step further and provided for future representation in the event of decentralization of people in country areas.

Did the Bill introduced by the former L.C.L. Government provide for such country representation? Of course it did not: the first thing it set out to do was reduce country representation. Earlier, I said that, prior to the 1965 elections, L.C.L. members went to much trouble in the press to convey to readers how good the L.C.L. proposals would be to country areas and how totally unacceptable the proposals of the Labor Party were to the country. I have never been sure whether the writer, whose article I will refer to and who is a member of another place, was being used up or whether he had become afraid that the Council might be abolished and was endeavouring to build up the prestige of that Chamber to enable him to remain a member of the best club in Australia. I should like to

quote from one of his articles, which was reported in the *S.A. Farmer*, of July 16, 1964, but, in view of your earlier remarks that I had to keep as near to the Bill as possible, Mr. Speaker, I will not quote it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has been a quarter of an hour away from the Bill. Would he please get back to it?

Mr. HUGHES: I will refrain from quoting that portion of it. The writer said that the last redistribution based on the present ratio was supported by all Opposition, as well as Government, members. In fact, the Opposition opposed the Bill to appoint the commission on redistribution and its terms of reference at every stage, because the proposal constituted extension of the electoral system; it was merely a reshuffle of boundaries to meet population shifts, whilst still retaining the ratio. There was a second article at that time, but the writer strayed away from redistribution altogether, and linked his remarks with the formation of the Electricity Trust.

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

Mr. HUGHES: I assure the Premier that I will support the second reading but that, in Committee, amendments will be moved which I trust the Government will be prepared to accept. Clause 4 provides:

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

As the Bill stands, the Governor may appoint any person as a deputy, but the Bill should be amended to provide that, if and when necessary, the replacement for the the Chairman should be another judge of the Supreme Court; the replacement for the Surveyor-General should be the Deputy Surveyor-General; and the replacement for the Returning Officer for the State, in my opinion, should be the Deputy Returning Officer. The Government should have no quarrel with this suggested amendment, because all three replacements to whom I have referred would have the background and knowledge possessed by their colleagues or superiors to enable the commission to proceed without interruption. Clause 5 (3) provides:

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

This is most unfair to the Surveyor-General and to the Returning Officer for the State, for if the Chairman disagrees with either of those officers, any decision arrived at cannot prevail. Clause 5 (1), (2) and (3) should be amended to provide that in the absence of the Chairman the commissioners present should be allowed to appoint one of their number to preside; the provision should also be amended so that any two commissioners shall constitute a quorum and so that a decision of the commissioner is valid if it is concurred in by any two commissioners. Turning to other functions of the commission, I point out that there are directions to the commission in clause 8 (2), (3), (4) and (6) whereby the commission, in making calculations, must disregard any fraction, yet subclause (3) requires the commission, in making a calculation, not to disregard any fraction but to calculate the figure to the nearest integral number.

I think the suggestion to amend subclauses (2), (3), (4) and (6) to substitute "calculated to the nearest integral number" in lieu of "disregarding any fraction" is a good one, for it would enable consistency of interpretation when arriving at a quota concerning both the country and the metropolitan areas. In clause 8 (3) the commissioners are, in effect, being asked to determine the metropolitan quota by adding 15 per cent to the State quota, but I believe that that is too heavy a weighting in favour of country districts. On inquiring, I was informed that electors enrolled at July 31 last totalled 611,289 which total, divided by 47, results in 13,006 electors in each district. With a 10 per cent tolerance applying to the metropolitan area and a 15 per cent tolerance concerning country districts, the commission would be allowed to give certain country districts a 60 per cent loading over some metropolitan districts.

Mr. Virgo: It could even be 100 per cent.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Although I am prepared to support a certain loading in favour of country districts, 60 per cent in favour of any country district is out of all proportion. This would make metropolitan districts 17.5 per cent above and country districts 25.8 per cent on average below the State quota or a 58.5 per cent difference of metropolitan electors over country electors. The Bill in its present form provides for 28 metropolitan districts and 19 country districts. Taking into account the proposed 15 per cent tolerance in favour of country districts, we could have districts in the country with a quota as low as

8,199 and districts in the metropolitan area with a quota of 16,453, double that of certain country districts. I admit I have quoted the extremes, but it can happen with this Bill as it now stands.

With 428,000 electors in the metropolitan area, an average metropolitan district could have 15,286. With 183,289 electors in the country, an average country district could have 9,646, but the actual quota for the metropolitan area would be 14,957. However, I believe that the metropolitan quota should be determined by adding 10 per cent to the State quota and not 15 per cent. On average, this would give 14,300 for metropolitan seats and 10,000 for country seats. If this were adopted, it would reduce the 58.5 per cent difference of metropolitan electors over country electors to 43 per cent. Clause 8 (7) provides for a tolerance of 10 per cent on either side of the quota for metropolitan seats and 15 per cent for country seats. If we are to accept this Bill in a spirit of compromise, why the tolerance which applies for country districts should be different from that applying to metropolitan districts I am at a loss to understand.

Mr. Virgo: There is no justification at all.

Mr. HUGHES: True. This subclause should be amended and at the appropriate time measures will be taken to alter 15 per cent to 10 per cent. Certain definitions of the metropolitan area have been given, but the definition in clause 7, in fact, leaves the commission little discretion in the determination of the metropolitan area. Particularly is this so when discretion 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 exceptions, subdivision of a residential type has not occurred outside the defined area, nor is it likely to occur. Furthermore, the submissions of the Planning and Development Department to the M.A.T.S. Authority 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.

The requirement of clause 7 for the exclusion of all areas adjacent to the boundary which, after seven years, are likely to be used predominantly for the purposes of primary production means that the following areas will almost certainly be excluded: all the Willunga electoral subdivision, except possibly the coastal strip containing Aldinga and Sellick Beach; all the Morphett Vale electoral subdivision south of the Onkaparinga River, except for Port Noarlunga, Moana and Seaford, and that part of the Noarlunga residential area lying south of the Onkaparinga River; all of the Clarendon electoral subdivision, except Happy Valley, O'Halloran Hill, Coromandel Valley and their immediate environs; 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.

Mr. Edwards: Are you the Royal Commission?

Mr. HUGHES: No, but, unlike the member for Eyre, I have had a very good look at the Bill. I hope the member for Eyre will have a good look at the Bill and will be able to make a worthwhile contribution to the debate.

Mr. Virgo: Obviously, from his interjection, he has not looked at the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: True, otherwise he would not have made such a foolish interjection. The areas to be excluded would also contain all the Highbury electoral subdivision not included in the Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully council areas, and that part of the Two Wells electoral subdivision lying inside the metropolitan planning area. The exclusion of the areas I have mentioned would give a metropolitan electoral enrolment of 427,000, or 428,000 at the outside. If the Corporation of Gawler were included, the metropolitan electoral enrolment would be about 431,500, or 432,500 at the outside. At July 31, 1968, 433,750 electors would have been required to get 29 metropolitan seats. So the Bill clearly cannot give rise to more than 28 metropolitan seats, even if Gawler is included, despite what certain honourable members opposite have said. If the figures are analysed in the way I have given them it will mean that there will be 28 metropolitan seats, even if Gawler is included. I know that some Government members are anxious to say that we want to bring in 29, if not 30.

Mr. Rodda: It will not be much good to you or me, whether it is 28 or 29.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not concerned about the member for Victoria or myself, otherwise I would not be talking tonight in the way I have been talking, because I want to see electoral justice for the people of South Australia, even if it affects me adversely.

Mr. Rodda: You are going to the stake like a hero.

Mr. HUGHES: I am glad to know that the member for Victoria realizes I am honest about this and not talking with my tongue in my cheek, as a certain member was this afternoon. The honourable member can say what he likes but I will challenge him to get up and convince me that there will be any more than 28 seats in the metropolitan area, even if Gawler is included.

Mr. Rodda: You are anticipating what the commission will do.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not anticipating at all. I have studied the Bill closely. I have gone to much trouble to work out the figures. Apparently, the honourable member has not been listening; otherwise, he would not have made that interjection. I hope that he, too, works them out so that he will be able to analyse this legislation, as we expect the commissioners to report later. I could be proved wrong by the commission (I do not anticipate at all what it will do) but I think the figures I have taken the trouble to procure and give to the House will prove conclusively, when the report is made, that I am right and the member for Victoria is wrong.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I support this Bill. I have felt for some time that a Bill of this nature is due, if not overdue. I can understand why some people in this State feel they are not being given their full rights as electors. Many electorates comprise between 30,000 and 40,000 people, while several electorates have only about 5,000. No wonder some people have objected to the imbalance in our electoral distribution. This is one of the most important Bills to be brought before this House for many years. It affects many people. It is particularly important and interesting to the new members of this House, not many of whom, I suspect, were completely conversant with the details of electoral reform before they came to this place. That is why the debate on this Bill is both interesting and informative.

Many basic principles put forward by various speakers have been challenging. Honourable members have ventured to give this House their opinions on how the State should be divided by the commissioners when this Bill becomes law. I do not intend to go into the details of how they will divide the State, for many members, including the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) and the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), are much more expert than I on this. They have submitted their findings to this House and I have no doubt that, to some degree, they are correct. I have no doubt, on the other hand, that some of their estimations will not coincide with the findings of the commissioners.

I consider loadings for country areas to be important. Since the Bill was introduced, I have taken every opportunity to discuss the matter with metropolitan people, who are not pleased about an electoral situation that gives an eight-to-one ratio in some cases, and the pleasing aspect of the Bill is that it reduces this ratio and makes more equitable the whole electoral system. I have found that metropolitan people are sympathetic to having a loading for country areas. From a sheer physical point of view, it would be impossible for a member to service a country district that comprised the same number of electors as a city district. One could not represent one's district fully on that basis. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) spoke of the necessity to provide greater clerical assistance for country members and, whilst we appreciate the tremendous assistance already given to members, I consider that all members would be assisted more if this help were provided in members' own offices.

Mr. Corcoran: What do you have in mind?

Mr. WARDLE: Much time is taken up in taking material to a typing pool. None of us denies the efficiency of the staff and their courtesy to all members, but a much more efficient method would be to provide clerical assistance in members' rooms, where we have our telephones and where people call on us. Nevertheless, I want it clearly understood that I greatly appreciate the assistance being given to members at present. I note the attitude of tolerance displayed by many members opposite in regard to this Bill. The Leader of the Opposition spoke of due consideration being given to the compromise that must take place in the debate, and said on August 6 (as reported at page 455 of *Hansard*):

However, the Premier, when he introduced this measure, introduced something different.

As the Government appears to have been moved, to some extent, to compromise on this issue, I can say that the Opposition is prepared to accept a proposal for a 47-member House and that we are prepared to vote for the second reading of this Bill with the aim of improving it in Committee so that it will more nearly accord with our principles than it does at the moment.

I consider that that shows an attitude of compromise and tolerance. I read with interest in *Hansard* of February 1, 1966, the comments of the member for Frome, who said:

In fact, I supported that principle in this House when we debated the Electoral Bill presented by the previous Government. On that occasion I said that while I agreed with the principle of one vote one value I did not think it was humanly possible to incorporate it in an electoral system in a State such as ours. I went on to say that we have vast, sparsely populated areas and that it was not humanly possible to have an equal number of voters in each district throughout the State. I made that clear when I spoke on that Electoral Bill in this House several years ago, and I make it clear again now.

All the various factors have to be considered, and they have been considered in this Bill. I heard the honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) say that under this Bill his district would be increased by about 10,000 square miles. If that area were added to his district at present it would still not be half as big as mine is at present, yet under the earlier legislation the previous Government wanted to increase my district by about 5,000 square miles. That would have killed not only me but any member who came after me.

I believe this indicates that all members realize it is physically impossible for country members to serve areas containing much greater distances than the areas those members are serving at present. I refer to what the member for Edwardstown said, because I consider that his attitude was not nearly as co-operative as the Leader's and did not show the same spirit of compromise. I believe it did not show entirely the attitude of as many people in the metropolitan area as the honourable member would convey. He said:

The plain fact is that in its present form the Bill is completely unacceptable. It is a dictatorship and a continuation of the gerrymander that we now have. It certainly does not introduce electoral reform, as the previous speaker suggested when he said that both Parties had attempted to introduce electoral reform over the years. I strongly refute the claim that the L.C.L. has tried to introduce electoral reform proposals.

Mr. Virgo: That is completely correct.

Mr. WARDLE: I disagree with the honourable member.

Mr. Virgo: You call it electoral reform: it is a continuation of the gerrymander.

Mr. WARDLE: I call it electoral reform: it is a vast reform of the existing situation.

Mr. Virgo: You are admitting that we have a gerrymander now.

Mr. WARDLE: I quote again what the member for Edwardstown said, as follows:

Members opposite should not run away with the idea that this is electoral reform, because it is no more electoral reform than we had from the Playford Government in 1962, and it will not give effect to the express wishes of the people, who demanded that we have democracy and one vote one value in the South Australian Parliamentary system.

Mr. Virgo: You are dead right in that view.

Mr. WARDLE: I disagree entirely with the honourable member. I believe that, to a degree, the honourable member has subjected this House to an extremely leftist militant badgering—

Mr. Virgo: Oh! Cut it out. Leftist!

Mr. WARDLE:—in his speech on electoral reform.

Mr. Virgo: What are you—an extreme right-wing fascist?

Mr. WARDLE: I believe that the honourable member is not as closely in touch with as many people as his remarks on electoral reform would indicate.

Mr. Virgo: More closely in touch than you are.

Mr. WARDLE: I repeat that, from my discussions with people in the metropolitan area, I believe that no-one is averse to giving country areas some sort of loading, because of the sheer impossibility of being able to serve a country district otherwise. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) said the Bill was completely out of touch with the wishes of the people, but I suggest that much of what he said was completely out of touch with the view of the people. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), using figures to substantiate his argument, said that in extreme circumstances there could be a two-to-one loading in favour of country districts. However, from the inquiries I have made of people in the metropolitan area, I find that they are not averse to this situation.

Much has been said about clause 4 (3) regarding the appointment of deputies for commissioners, but I have no doubt that the position will be considered in the Committee stage of the Bill and that provision will be made for the commissioners to be represented by their

deputies. I am sure, too, that the position regarding the Chairman's power of veto over the commissioners (clause 5 (3)) will be considered at the appropriate time. We have grown accustomed to having the metropolitan area defined by the State Planning Office.

Mr. Hudson: What about the M.A.T.S. Report?

Mr. WARDLE: I do not think there are any objections to this definition. I do not intend to deal with the clause relating to the percentage loading for country and metropolitan seats, because I believe this has been adequately covered by the would-be experts, and it would be foolish of me to prolong the debate by repeating the relevant figures.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): Although I support the second reading, I do so reluctantly, because of the terms of the Bill. I sincerely hope that in Committee members will consider the principles contained in the Bill and at least attempt to put South Australia in a more favourable democratic position. One of the basic principles of democratic Government relates to dividing the State into districts. If one analyses the situation in South Australia, one can seriously question whether it has improved since 1851, when the right was given to people to elect to the Upper House 16 members, and there were eight nominees. Over a century has elapsed and yet 16 elected representatives in another place can veto every measure introduced in this House. Surely after such a time we, as the responsible representatives of the people, should pay due regard to the wishes of the people. Everyone should recognize the fundamental principle that Parliament represents people; therefore, districts should be divided as equally as possible to enable all votes to have equal value and each person to have the same representation in this place, irrespective of whence he comes. That is a reasonable principle that should be observed.

To some extent it is a coincidence that this is Human Rights Year, which is recognized throughout the world. We should have regard to the basic principles that should be followed by all citizens as set down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The member for Murray referred to the views of the member for Edwardstown as being leftish. I thought the member for Murray was one who regarded citizens as human beings. It might be advisable to remind him and other honourable members of the Universal Declaration of

Human Rights (after all, this declaration was approved by representatives of people and these are the fundamental principles set down to guide all of us) approved by resolution 217A of the General Assembly on December 10, 1948, when the following preamble to the Articles approved was set out:

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human right should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge.

Now, therefore,

The General Assembly

Proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

Article 1. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international

status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

If members opposite take cognizance of the preamble, if they have any conscience, and if they believe in the rights of citizens and human beings, we would not have heard the type of debate they contributed.

We have been for over a century and are still under the control of 16 persons in another place. This is not good for society. Until we have boundaries under which, as far as practicable, every person's vote is equal and the majority of the people have the right to elect the Parliament of their choice, we will not have electoral justice. Over the years we have tolerated a situation that makes us feel ashamed, particularly when we go to oversea countries where principles of justice are determined. Then we get our own political situation thrown in our faces. It is most embarrassing and undignified and tends to discredit the State when we, as responsible representatives, should be doing all in our power to promote the utmost confidence and dignity for the benefit, betterment and development of the State so that the vast majority of its people can benefit from the fruits of their labour and enjoy a reasonable standard of living.

Much has been said about country representation. It is officially on record and was referred to in the Liberal Party's propaganda. I know that we have amended our platform—and why? Because it is physically not possible under our Parliamentary system in South Australia, where we have another place with equal authority and power to that of the democratically elected representatives in this Chamber, to bring about a truly democratic situation and give the people the rights they want. I was surprised to hear—

Mr. Jennings: You were astonished, not surprised.

Mr. HURST: I was astonished to hear country members frankly admitting their inferiority to city members.

Mr. Virgo: But they represent rabbits and sheep.

Mr. HURST: It is a relationship that they themselves have come to believe. I was born and bred in the country. I have never conceded that I am inferior to anyone living in the metropolitan area. I am pleased to say that, as a result of my enunciating those principles, the people in the metropolitan area, even prior to my entering this Chamber under a

democratic system of voting, held me in high esteem and elected me in the face of opposition from people living in the metropolitan area.

There is too much of this talk. Country representatives are continually writing themselves down. They talk about the number of electors they represent. I have travelled South Australia and Australia as much as any other member of this Chamber has and have been fortunate enough to travel in other countries, where I have studied and analysed their electoral systems. I find that, by and large, people do not differ: it is their state of mind that varies, through this continual preaching about the inferiority of the country representatives and pleading for additional representation. In the cities, we encounter more problems as we represent more people. True, the country electoral district may occupy a larger area of land. The number of miles of roadway in certain country electoral districts has been mentioned, but have honourable members ever stopped to realize just how many miles of streets, footpaths and roads there are in the district I represent? The people that I represent encounter many problems, including those associated with the foreshore and shipping, yet I represent those people quite well. The limited field of matters with which country members have to deal cannot be compared with the problems in the metropolitan area. Many country representatives regard their Parliamentary work as being a part-time job.

Mr. Edwards: You speak for yourself on that.

Mr. HURST: I know as much about the country as the honourable member knows. It was as a result of my interest that the Giles Point silo was built, and I also interested myself in the work of the Phylloxera Board and the Citrus Organization Committee.

The SPEAKER: Order! Citrus is not dealt with in this Bill.

Mr. HURST: I am speaking about country representation. Despite the many inquiries that I get from constituents, I find time to interest myself in country districts and their problems. I, and every other member on this side, will take up any injustice affecting country areas. The sooner the member for Onkaparinga and all other Government members realize that they represent people, the sooner we will progress.

Mr. Edwards: What do you think we represent?

Mr. HURST: Well, although I have travelled the world, I find it difficult to say

what the honourable member represents. At the last election for the House of Assembly, about 575,000 electors (or 94.48 per cent of the total enrolment) voted, whilst in the election for the Legislative Council only 262,328 electors (95.15 per cent of the total enrolment) voted. Any measure introduced in this House by the elected representatives of the people can be vetoed by representatives of the privileged 42.42 per cent of the population voting for the Upper House. Further, the Legislative Council has a restricted franchise. To be eligible to vote for that Chamber one has to be an inhabitant occupier or a property owner, but these restrictions do not apply to this House. Despite all these restrictions and years of hand picking of individuals entitled to elect the veto Council, the percentage of informal votes in the Upper House is double that of the House of Assembly. We have been told that everyone does not have the same intelligence.

Mr. Rodda: You have not been told that at all.

Mr. HURST: If it has not been told to us it has been spelled out in electoral legislation. It is applied in practice, so that metropolitan people are not given the same rights as are given to country people. Qualifications to vote for the Legislative Council means that those who are eligible to vote are hand picked. Voting for another place is not compulsory, and each person who casts a vote for Council members purposely votes to return a particular Party, because the structure is loaded in favour of that Party. The large number of informal votes at council elections should be seriously considered by members opposite in relation to the voting rights of individuals.

Undoubtedly, this Bill would eliminate, to a degree, country representatives in this House. We on this side considered this fact when we introduced the proposition for a 56-member House, but we knew full well that, no matter what we did, we had no chance to implement that policy, because of the veto in another place. We attempted to take into account country representation, but because of opposition to the measure in another place different policies were announced by the different Parties. That is when the L.C.L., whether it likes it or not, deprived country people of representation in this House. If this Bill is passed in another place some alterations will be made: we want to see alterations so that people can elect or reject a Government, but this Bill

will not enable that to be done, and that is one reason why we oppose many of its provisions. I sincerely hope that the Government will consider the suggestions made by members on this side. Government members ought to consider the statements made when they were in Opposition and compare some of their speeches with those made by their predecessors regarding these matters. Under clause 5, which contains the provision for a commission to be established, one man may have charge of the whole situation, and that is entirely wrong. I hope that Government members will acknowledge the points we have made when they are again made in Committee and that they will be big enough to vote for the particular amendments that will be moved.

We will support the Bill for a 47-member House. The quotas are to be determined mathematically, and they have been skilfully worked out, particularly regarding metropolitan members. The public pressure on the Government was such that it was forced to recognize the wish of the people, and it has done so, but only to a degree, for this Bill is merely an attempt to fob the public off and restore what status the Government may have had in the eyes of the people. I am particularly concerned about clause 7, which relates to the definition of the metropolitan area and which includes Gawler as a country district. Gawler, in my opinion, has a much greater affinity with the metropolitan area, and this affinity will continue to grow in future. However, under the Bill it will be impossible to include Gawler in the metropolitan area. I am also concerned about the lack of provision for certain areas.

This Bill will not result in electoral justice for South Australia, and I believe that within the next few years metropolitan members may be representing two to three times the number of electors represented in other parts of the State. The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) at present represents over 40,000 electors, and that is too much to expect of one person. Concerning the instructions given to the commission, I have in mind the District of Semaphore, which I represent, and in which there is scope for much development. Although much was said of this development on the hustings, we have heard little since. However, areas of land in my district are waiting to be developed, and I believe that within, say, seven years the number of electors living in a small area will be far greater than the number living in perhaps much larger areas. However, inadequate provision is made in

the Bill concerning this situation. The Bill will not rectify the present unbalanced representation. If the Bill is carried in its present form, in time we shall find that the numbers of electors in districts will again become disproportionate.

I support the second reading with some reluctance, and I do so only because I realize that something must be done about our electoral system. The present boundaries are intolerable and must be changed. However, the Bill does not embody the rights and principles in which I believe. Only the lack of a democratic parliamentary system in South Australia leads me to support the Bill, and I do that reluctantly. Its provisions will result in some slight improvement, provided the Government will accept sensible amendments at the Committee stage.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I support the second reading, not because the Bill appeals to me or because I believe it will effect electoral justice or because I think it is in any way what the people of the State need and desire, but merely because I believe members must either accept electoral distribution as we know it today or vote for this Bill. I say at the outset that the vote I cast at the second reading stage does not mean that I approve of the Bill as a whole, but merely that I believe it will provide for a situation considerably better than the rotten situation presently operating in South Australia. I make that explanation because I was placed in a similar position in earlier days. In this debate members opposite have gone to great lengths to try to tell the people that, because we voted for a certain measure some years ago, we favoured the provisions in it. At one stage I cast a vote in favour of the Bill which provided for the present electoral districts, but at no stage did I support the present system.

The situation was that the Government had set up a commission to inquire into the redistribution of seats and to bring about a better balance in the numbers of people in the districts, but it had still instructed the commission to retain the system under which 13 seats were to be located in the metropolitan area, and 26 in the country. I spoke and voted against that system but, in spite of the opposition to the Bill and the constructive appeals and suggestions offered from members on this side of the House, the commission was appointed and instructed to draw up the present boundaries. When the Bill providing for

the present distribution was brought in, we were faced with the choice of maintaining the position then obtaining or accepting an improvement, and that is similar to the situation in which we are placed today. Now, we have to be content to carry on with the present system or to accept the Bill. Because I believe the Bill is an improvement on what obtains today, I intend to support the second reading.

I am disappointed that the Government or Parliament as a whole has not seen fit to carry into effect the policy which I thought was a reasonable one for South Australia and which the Labor Party advocated, namely, that where there had been an increase in population there should be an increase in the numbers of members of Parliament and that the country districts as they exist today should be undisturbed. It is reasonable that areas where there has been a growth of population, such as Elizabeth, Modbury and Port Stanvac, should have representation on the same basis as we expect representation from country electorates but, in order to do that and say to the country districts, "You must reduce your number of members by eight", is not in the best interests of the country and I believe that those who advocate and vote for that are not serving the people as they should.

I hold strongly that country representation should not be lessened. To the extent that the Bill lessens the service to the country people by eliminating at least eight seats (it also lessens the service to the country people by increasing the size of every country electorate) it will not make for better representation but for worse representation. That is one of the features of the Bill I do not like. I cannot understand how country members can reject the submission that all present country seats should be retained. In order to bring about a balance, because no-one can be satisfied with the state of imbalance in representation that is taking place, surely it is logical to argue that there should be additional representatives in areas where the population has grown. But no: we find some members who follow the dictates of people who make policy in Government circles, because although they speak in terms in which I am speaking and although they speak of the difficulties a country member has in adequately representing his area over vast distances, and even compared to the difficulties of representation in the city, they are nevertheless prepared to acquiesce in the elimination of eight seats and in an increase in the number of metropolitan seats

by about 15. Then they go to the country and say they are serving the interests of country people.

Mr. Corcoran: They have never given adequate facilities to country members, either.

Mr. RICHES: No. Country members have never had the facilities I think they are entitled to. I should like to see every country member have an office in his electorate where people could contact him in their own electorate in a central place, instead of a member having to do this work by sending members of his family out of the front room so that interviews can take place in his home. When I came into Parliament 46 members represented just over 500,000 people. The 1966 census showed that that population had more than doubled, but we have only 39 members now. It is not unreasonable to suggest that, because of the alteration in what is expected of a member of Parliament through changing circumstances and conditions over the years, that number should be increased to 56.

I want to make two points quite clear, because it may sound as though I am pitting country against city—and that is not so. I have noticed that country members perforce have to live in the city and when they join the Cabinet they are, to all intents and purposes, city dwellers. As long as I have been in Parliament I have never known an issue in which city has been pitted against country. I have observed that, where there is an issue for the good of the country, we get just as strong support from the city members as from the country members. As a matter of fact, sometimes the city members have a wider vision. I do not like to admit that, but it is the truth.

Mr. Rodda: Not in all cases.

Mr. RICHES: I did not say "in all cases". Of course, there are some cases where a country member has a wider vision—but I exclude the member for Victoria from this. I did not intend to exclude him but he has just belied that statement by his interjection. Too much has been said on this subject in the past, because some people have been able to make political capital out of persuading country people that their interests are not being considered by everybody living in the city and that somehow or other their interests are different from those of people living in the city of Adelaide.

I was born and brought up in the country; I lived there under difficult conditions, but I never found such a conflict of interests there,

and I do not believe it exists. There should not be a reduction in the number of members representing country electoral districts because of the work involved. I know that the nature of the work of a member of Parliament has changed. We are living closer together in spite of distance. We see each other more frequently now than hitherto. We have improved means of communication. When I first entered Parliament it took me 13 hours to get from my home to Adelaide, and 13 hours to get home; now I can do the journey in 1½ hours. As against that, members have to pay more attention to individual problems, which tend to become more complex and more widely spread. In those days, we had no problems of migration or assimilation. Development did not take place so rapidly as it does today. We did have the Thousand Homes Scheme at Colonel Light Gardens, which was unprecedented in those days, something quite out of the ordinary; but now we have many housing problems to contend with from day to day and, of necessity, a member of Parliament who tries to represent 40,000 people even in a small area must have more calls and demands on his time than ever before, and must be prepared to make himself available to the public and give more attention to them than a member with only 8,000 electors.

Even so, those 8,000 electors may be spread over a vast area. So I believe that conditions have so changed that some of these problems that formerly were peculiar to a metropolitan electoral district are now problems confronting members representing country districts. No longer are they concerned solely with the weather and the price of wheat, wool and beef. I consider it wrong and not in the best interests of this State that the number of country members should be reduced. The reason why the 56-seat policy has not been adopted and why country districts are not to be retained as they are now is that it was considered that when this proposition was put to the people at the last election the people did not accept it. I do not agree with that, because whenever I have put the matter to people in conversation I have not had one person say that he agreed that the present country-metropolitan ratio should be retained. The people agree that there should be adequate country representation and they also agree that, where population has increased, it is only fair that those areas should have adequate representation. No-one has advocated to me that having 40,000 electors in one district and 8,000 or fewer in an adjoining district can be

justified. That is the feeling of the people, as I have been able to discover it, and they are extremely incensed at the situation that has been allowed to develop for 30 years.

The record of the Liberal Party in electoral reform is not a happy one. The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) has said that every Australian mainland State has a Liberal Government, but I remind him that all those Governments were elected after a Liberal Government had altered the electoral boundaries. Labor in South Australia has never altered an electoral boundary. When I became a member, there were 46 members in the House. A Bill was introduced to ensure that never again would there be a Labor Government. A move was made to increase the life of Parliament from three years to five years and a commission was set up to divide the State into electoral districts. That is when the matter of the city *versus* the country commenced, when 60 per cent of the people elected 13 members and 40 per cent elected 26 members. That is when the inequality was first introduced, and it became the law of the land.

Mr. Corcoran: And it wasn't accidental.

Mr. RICHES: No, nothing was hidden. No-one did anything that he did not freely admit he was doing. Then, as the population increased, it was obvious that places such as Whyalla had to have a representative, and so the boundaries had to be redrawn, but the 13 districts in the main centre of population and the 26 districts in the outer areas were retained. That position has continued until today. The position was such that one of our Adelaide newspapers contained this leading article:

The outcome of the State election has made one point patently clear. South Australia has to accept the basic democratic principle of equality of votes. What we do know for certain is that the Labor Party won 54 per cent of the total votes to the Liberal Party's 44 per cent. In harsh, measurable statistics, this is inequality at its worst. Understandably it has brought nation-wide derision of South Australia as the "hill-billy State" of Australia.

That article concerns a people whose record in this field was second to none, whose record was such that we could hold our heads high and say that in democratic reform we led the rest of Australia. We were first with the vote for women.

Mr. Hudson: First in the world.

Mr. RICHES: That is interesting. Two years ago I attended a function conducted by the Polish group, or one of the New Aus-

tralian groups, who invited me to their ball and told me it was to celebrate the 700th anniversary of giving women the vote in their part of the world. When I travelled overseas in 1963, wherever I went I was told that that place was the centre and the beginning of democracy. I noted with much interest that many people put a great price on democracy. In Greece I stood in the Parthenon and looked down on the area below. I was told that here democracy was born: here Socrates drank the cup of hemlock. At Venice we were taken into the Doge's Palace and told that the Venetians were more democratic than the English, because Doges were elected, and amongst them was a woman. I began to wonder whether the history that had been taught to me was correct, after all. I believe that people who have to obey the law, people whom we want to have a respect for the law, should have an equal voice in determining the law and of electing those who are charged with the responsibility of making the law. That seems to me to be reasonable and something like the ideal we all seek to achieve. Because I believe that this Bill goes a little further than the situation that obtains today I will vote for the second reading but, in doing so, I make it abundantly clear that the Bill does not go far enough, that I think we are doing a disservice to the country areas of the State by reducing their representation by eight members, and by enlarging the already large electoral districts we are making the work of country members more difficult than it has ever been. I reserve further remarks on the details of the Bill until we are in Committee.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I, too, support the second reading, but with some apprehension. Many times the Labor Party has moved for electoral reform and has been the pioneer in this field, but each time recently our efforts have been defeated in another place. This time we find that people in all walks of life have at last realized that our method of electing members of Parliament has much merit in it. The election held last March was the first election in which all districts were contested, and that clearly shows that the position obtaining for some time has been unsatisfactory. I cannot understand why some people do not agree that everyone in the State is equal, for I have never noticed a difference in any walk of life, and I am sure the average person notices no difference between people living in the city and those living in the country. Government members apparently

consider that such a difference exists, but they must not forget that we are all South Australians. Seldom is a Party receiving most votes at an election not elected to Government.

Mr. McKee: Members opposite believe they're the governing class.

Mr. LANGLEY: That is probably correct. The L.C.L. during its previous long term in power, seldom gained the most votes. That is significant, and I am waiting for a Government member to tell me where I am wrong. However, I believe that in most cases the L.C.L. has been on the wrong side of the ledger concerning the number of votes gained at an election. Why should a Government not be elected on a one vote one value franchise, allowing the people to decide for themselves whether or not a particular Party is good enough? If the electors are dissatisfied with the Government, they will vote against it, and we must be bound by the way in which the electors vote.

The disparity in votes at a recent New South Wales election was similar to the position in South Australia, but the difference in that case was that one Party won by about 10 seats. In Western Australia the contest was closer; one Party won by between one and three seats. The people of South Australia were shocked to learn of the things that had been going on for a number of years, and they were particularly anxious to know why the Party they had elected to become the Government (it received 10 per cent more votes than did the present Government) finished up in Opposition. The Opposition has always been willing to improve the situation, and I only hope that we will have the co-operation of Government members regarding this Bill, particularly concerning the provision that allows the commission to be a one-man show. People in this State do not want to have a one-man show, and we wish to ensure that they receive electoral justice. The member for Stuart said that, because of its electoral system, South Australia had lost kudos. It is remarkable that many newspapers in other States (and possibly people in different parts of the world) have joined in the protest against the voting conditions in this State.

Mr. McKee: The gerrymander is known throughout the world.

Mr. LANGLEY: Perhaps. I do not think it started in South Australia (although it did not take South Australia long to cotton on to it); I think it started in the United States of

America. However, since it started in this State there has not been much trouble for a Party to retain Government while receiving less than a majority of the votes. Be that as it may, we must look to the future and ensure that the people receive justice at the ballot box. Although I have nothing personal against the staff of the *Advertiser*, when comparing its articles with those in newspapers in other States, it is obvious to me that its policy is far behind the times. Over the years, newspapers in this State have not taken too much notice of public interest. On matters such as the Totalizator Agency Board and the lotteries they backed the wrong horse. In this case they have been loath to tell the people the real facts about electoral distribution in this State. I like to notice what is the opinion of people in various sections of the community, and in this connection I wish to quote the following article by Don Whittington in the *Australasian Manufacturer* of March 16, 1968:

South Australia's general election has provided another example of the scandalous gerrymandering that the Australian public is apparently still prepared to tolerate. It seems incredible that in a so-called enlightened age a party that polls 53 per cent of the total vote at an election can lose, or nearly lose, to one that polled only 43 per cent. This sort of thing happens to a lesser extent in Queensland. After legislation that may be passed in the Federal House this year, it could happen in the Federal sphere, too. We deplore the Russian system where candidates can represent only one party, but the day could be coming here where only one party will ever have a chance of winning.

I have often heard members opposite refer to the *Tribune*: according to this article, the system in this State is close to the Russian system of electing candidates.

Mr. Lawn: They do it rather more subtly, though.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. I do not think the people in this State will ever allow things to be as bad as they were before. I have listened to what members opposite have said but none of them has been able to say why 43 per cent of the votes should beat 53 per cent. This can happen only as a result of the subtle movements that have taken place over the years. As the member for Adelaide said, this has been done by gerrymander. The Government moved the boundaries around to suit itself.

Mr. Nankivell: It's not the number of runs but the number of games that counts.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, but although in the last election we had an equal number of candidates, one team scored more than the other.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: That's how Mr. Shard got into the Assembly. He had Communist preferences.

Mr. LANGLEY: That is news to me. Country members think they are different from city members. This afternoon, the member for Edwardstown mentioned the Liberal Party platform. The one thing I did not see in the book was that if one member from the country represents 36,000 people and another represents 6,000 people, one gets six votes to each vote the other gets. I do not think that a delegate from Stansbury should get more votes than one from Burnside.

Members opposite have said that country members are hard hit and hurt by living in the country. Some city members represent about 40,000 voters and some about 20,000 voters. I would not mind representing Gumeracha or Onkaparinga, but I do not think I would be happy to represent Frome or Eyre, which cover far greater areas. With today's opportunities members have to move around in their districts. If they cannot see their constituents once in three years I do not think they are doing their job properly. If a member represents 20,000 or 30,000 people, he should be able to see his constituents once in three years, although a member representing 40,000 people might find this difficult.

Mr. Clark: What about 35,000?

Mr. LANGLEY: That is too many, too. I think there should be one vote one value, wherever the voters may live.

Mr. Jennings: They are equal under the law.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, and they are all South Australians. I hope that during the Committee stage the Government will appreciate that the Opposition has something to offer to improve the Bill. We do not mind the Government's introducing a Bill (that is its right, and it is proper so to do) but the Committee stage is the time when members should give and take, to a certain extent. I recall that the former Premier was only too willing to have a better Bill and to listen to what was considered an improvement to any Bill. During the Committee stage of this Bill the Opposition will move certain amendments which, I am sure, will improve the Bill. I hope that justice will be done for the people of South Australia by this legislation, that we shall see a far better distribution of seats than obtains now, and that the people will be able to elect

the Government they want. Until these last few years, they were not at all times able to do that.

During the Millicent by-election much was said about what the Government and the Premier would do. It appears that members opposite have changed their ideas somewhat and the Government has not honoured its promises.

Mr. Clark: The result of the Millicent by-election made a difference.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am sure it did. If the present member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) had been defeated, the electoral measure submitted to Parliament would have been vastly different from this one and the Labor Party would have been kept out of office for many years to come. However, I hope there will be give and take in the Committee stage of this Bill. When it is finally assented to, we should go to the polls immediately to give the people a chance to decide who should govern. Nobody was really satisfied with the result of the last election. There was some conjecture about which Party should form the Government. If there is a fresh election under new boundaries, we on this side shall be only too willing to abide by the will of the people.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I will support the second reading of this Bill but I will strenuously oppose some of its clauses. At this stage I wish to reply to some remarks made by members opposite today. I agree with the member for Unley that, had it not been for the result of the Millicent by-election, the Bill now before us would have been entirely different, even worse than the present Bill. The Premier said during the Millicent by-election that he would accept a win for his candidate as an endorsement by the people of South Australia of his electoral policy, which was largely in accordance with the Playford Government's Bill of 1964. However, he went further and said that he would accept a win by the present member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) as an endorsement of the A.L.P. policy. He has not kept that promise: this Bill is not an endorsement of our policy. I was interested in the speech made by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) this afternoon. I have not heard many of the honourable member's speeches, but I should not think he would be interesting on many occasions.

Mr. Clark: And you don't care if you don't hear much of him, do you?

Mr. LAWN: No. Although the honourable member does not realize it (and I must get this in before he gets the *Hansard* galley, because he may try to make an alteration) he said:

If this Bill is given effect to, this Government will be out of office after the next election.

Mr. Corcoran: He did say that.

Mr. LAWN: Not more than 10 seconds after that he said:

Given the right Party, given the right candidate, and given the right policy, that Party can win any election.

Mr. Corcoran: Yes, he said that.

Mr. LAWN: By saying that he was saying that by this Bill members opposite were giving away government to the opposite Party. What did he mean?

Mr. Corcoran: That on all counts they were out.

Mr. Jennings: He meant that they had not the right Party, candidate or policy.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Millicent and the member for Enfield have agreed that the member for Onkaparinga meant that on all counts the Government would be out of office after the next election.

Mr. Virgo: It should be out of office now.

Mr. LAWN: I agree, but the member for Onkaparinga has put the seal on the result of the next election by saying that this Government will be out of office then.

Mr. Rodda: You hope it will be.

Mr. LAWN: I am certain it will. While the Speaker is having some "shut eye" I am prepared to offer some odds to the honourable member.

Mr. Jennings: I thought you would speak about the gerrymander.

Mr. LAWN: There is more coming. I consider that the people should have what they want, and 52.8 per cent of the people made clear earlier this year what they wanted. The Party opposite polled about 42.8 per cent of the vote, yet, because of the gerrymander they occupy the Treasury Benches, and then only because they have the casting vote of the Speaker.

Mr. Ryan: That makes them a minority Government.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The member for "Wombat", or for Eyre (Mr. Edwards), interjected this afternoon while the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) was speaking. As all honourable members would remember, the member for Edwardstown was criticizing the present gerrymandered electoral set-up in South Australia, and the member for Eyre mumbled, as a wombat does. He was looking at the form of the beauty queens at the function last night. The honourable member interjected and said, "The present system was all right in 1965." Although this may be his first session he should know that in 1965 we considered that it was not all right: we have never said that it was all right. In 1965 we tried to alter the system, but the honourable member's colleagues in the Legislative Council said that it was all right and left it as it was. To win Government in 1965, under the present gerrymander, the Labor Party had to poll 56 per cent of the votes, not 53 per cent as we did this year. Can the member for Eyre, or any member, say that for one Party to become the Government it should poll 56 per cent or better of the votes? Is that democracy?

Mr. Virgo: Government members claim that it is.

Mr. LAWN: Of course, but I say definitely that it is not. When the member for Unley was comparing our system with that existing in Russia, I said that our system was more subtle. In that country, to make sure people vote correctly a big commissar sits alongside the ballot box. If the Russian system were adopted here, the electors would have a choice of red, white, or yellow coloured paper. If that system were adopted here and the elector wished to vote for the Communist Party he would select a piece of red paper and put it in the ballot box: if he wished to vote for a Labor Party candidate he would select a piece of white paper (white for purity); and he would select a piece of yellow paper if he wished to vote for the Liberal Party. Our system is not much different from the Russian system, but it is more subtle. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 9, at 2 p.m.