

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 15, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Roads and Transport is reported as having announced that a joint committee of Government and industry representatives is being formed to consider matters mostly connected with commercial road vehicles. The matters which, according to the report, are to be considered affect the working of people in the industry but, apparently, it is not intended that the Transport Workers Union, which covers all workers in this industry, should be represented on the committee. As this seems to be a departure from policy, in view of the fact that previously committees that have affected industries have normally had workers' representatives on them, will the Premier take up with the Minister of Roads and Transport the desirability of having representatives of the Transport Workers Union on this committee?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will confer with my colleague, examining with him the precedents raised by the Leader and the question of how deeply this committee will inquire into matters affecting those employed in the industry.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry comment on this morning's newspaper report that employment figures at the end of September were the best since September, 1965?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: There has been a very substantial improvement in the employment situation in South Australia according to the review of the employment situation as at the end of September, 1968, which was issued yesterday by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service. During the month of September there was a reduction of 900 persons registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service. There was a reduction of 911 persons during the previous month. The number of persons registered for employment (6,207) is the lowest number recorded at the end of September since 1965. The number of adult males registered for employment declined

by 548 during the month, while 40 fewer junior males were registered, and there was a reduction of 171 adult females and 141 junior females. Notwithstanding the substantial decrease in the number of persons registered for employment, 246 more vacancies were available than were available a month earlier. This increase during the month of September follows an increase of 129 vacancies available during the month of August. There was once again a substantial decrease in the number of persons receiving unemployment benefit, there being a reduction of 419 for the month, following a reduction of 360 in August and 275 in July. The number of recipients of unemployment benefit as at the end of September was 2,427, and this was the lowest at the end of September for three years. Although the number of persons registered for employment in South Australia expressed as a percentage of the estimated work force (1.3 per cent) is still higher than the percentage for Australia as a whole (1.0 per cent), the September figures indicated a further substantial improvement following significant improvements in July and August. The number of persons registered for employment in South Australia as at the end of September for the last three years, and the percentage of the estimated work force, are as follows:

	Number	Percentage
September 1966	7,078	1.6
September 1967	6,949	1.5
September 1968	6,207	1.3

WHYALLA LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government whether the committee appointed to deal with the matter of full local government in Whyalla has met and, if it has, what progress has been made?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Is that the committee whose appointment I announced on behalf of the Minister some time ago?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Yes.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will find out what progress is being made in the matter.

REMARK RESERVOIR

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the name of the Remark reservoir?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Remark reservoir, prior to the construction of an outlet channel to the river, was a natural backwater. As such, salt accumulation occurred at normal river flows and the backwater was

flushed at periods of high river. The name Salt Creek developed locally, and the two titles are synonymous to local residents. All old maps show the backwater as the Renmark reservoir. It is agreed, however, that it would be appropriate for both names to be displayed on the signs placed at the extremities of the project on the Sturt Highway, and arrangements are being made to have such a sign manufactured and erected at the site, bearing the names Renmark Reservoir—Salt Creek.

CONTESTS OF SKILL

Mr. CLARK: This morning I received a letter, together with a copy of a letter that had been sent to the Attorney-General by the Rev. N. C. Kempson, priest in charge of the Anglican Mission District of Elizabeth, which includes five churches. Father Kempson is extremely concerned, and so am I, about so-called contests of skill, and in his letter he states:

The tactics usually consist of informing a contestant that a minor prize has been won, and that the prize consists of a certain amount off the retail price of a major appliance. Usually the prize is no more than a simple discount for an inflated retail price. The excitement of winning a "prize" is often enough to sway the customer into a very unwise purchase.

Father Kempson is not only priest in charge of this area but also a prominent counsellor of the Elizabeth Counselling Centre, and I share his disquiet on these matters, as, no doubt, do other honourable members. When the Attorney-General has prepared a reply to Father Kempson's letter will he let me have a copy and also his opinion of such contests?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have not seen the letter from Father Kempson yet, but I expect it will be waiting at my office, probably tomorrow. This has become a well-known sales gimmick (and that is all it is) in recent years. I agree with much of what has been said by the honourable member, and I shall be happy to let him have a copy of my reply to Father Kempson. No doubt this will satisfy him.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Mr. GILES: I understand that a committee is inquiring into agricultural education but, as I am not sure whether this is correct, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether such a committee exists and, if it does, what are the names of its members?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Such a committee exists and I know the names of some of its members, but I will obtain a full report for the honourable member.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: I have been approached by a constituent who about five years ago purchased a block of land at Pasadena and, on release of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, inquired of the local council and was told that the M.A.T.S. Report would not affect his block. Subsequently, he drew up plans and obtained prices, but has now been told by the council that he will not be permitted to build, because the Hills Expressway will cut through the middle of his property. He was informed to contact the Highways Department and did so but, contrary to assurances given by the Premier on numerous occasions, the department told him that it would not buy the block until the M.A.T.S. plan was adopted by Parliament, and then, if the block was not required for 15 years or so, it would not buy it at all. First, is the Premier aware that this information is being given by the Highways Department to members of the public who inquire and, secondly, will he take steps to ensure that the assurances he has given this House that, where people are so affected, the Highways Department will buy the property, will be honoured? Also, will he issue, or have the Minister of Roads and Transport issue, an instruction to the Highways Department to negotiate with the person concerned?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member will give me the details, I shall take up the matter personally with the Minister and see what I can do about it for his constituent.

THREE-CORNER JACK

Mr. EDWARDS: At Warrachie siding on Eyre Peninsula there is a considerable area of three-corner jack. As most farmers in the area do not have this noxious weed growing on their property (and, indeed, they do not want it), when they leave the siding after perhaps picking up a load of superphosphate or produce they must check all the tyres of their vehicles and remove the three-corner jack, so that it will not be transferred to their properties. As three-corner jack is a noxious weed which is harmful to farming country, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to have this problem examined?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

AMERICAN PROJECTS DIVISION

Mr. BROOMHILL: I have noticed a newspaper report indicating that the American Projects Division at the Weapons Research Establishment, Salisbury, is to move its headquarters to Canberra early next year. Can the Premier say whether this means a substantial change in the work force involved in this project at Salisbury?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I am not aware at the moment of any implications of this change, I will look into the matter for the honourable member. In other fields the number of American personnel in South Australia is still increasing, especially in relation to activities in Alice Springs, and I understand that a further increase in the numbers of United States citizens coming to South Australia is expected. Whether or not the position to which the honourable member has referred means a reduction of American activity in this State, I am not aware.

MAIN ROAD No. 30

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the recent question I asked about Main Road No. 30 in my district?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Funds have now been approved for work to proceed on the construction of traffic islands at the junction of Main Road No. 30 and Main Road No. 387 with Main Road No. 23 at Port Pirie. Council will be officially notified that work will recommence soon.

TEXTBOOKS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Multiple copies of textbooks are to be provided in each of the teachers colleges for the use of students. I believe that all the colleges have large student enrolments covering a wide range of courses of study. Can the Minister of Education say what student-textbook ratio she plans to maintain in relation to the multiple collections for each course of study; what provision she is making for additional staff to administer the multiple collections; and where the multiple collections will be housed? As I realize that the Minister may not have this information at her fingertips, will she be good enough to obtain it for me tomorrow?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As I certainly do not have that information here, I will try to obtain it for the honourable member as early as possible.

ENFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked during the debate on the Loan Estimates regarding modifications to the Enfield Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As I promised the honourable member when he raised this matter during the discussion on the Estimates on October 2, I called for a report concerning progress on the modifications to the Enfield Primary School to provide a general purpose room, improved library accommodation, staff room, sick bay, office for the Deputy Headmaster and store room. I am advised that drawings and specifications for the electrical work and services associated with the project have now been prepared and that the Public Buildings Department is ready to proceed. The work is expected to commence about the middle of November.

CHANDLER HILL ROAD

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of October 3 about signs on Chandler Hill Road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The existing signs will be supplemented with advisory speed signs indicating the safe speed with which the sharp turn can be negotiated under normal driving conditions. In addition, other hazard-marking signs and direction signs will be erected in the immediate vicinity in order to make the hazard apparent to the motoring public.

WARRADALE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: I have been approached by the Warradale Primary School Committee regarding its plans for the levelling and reticulation of the north-west corner of the schoolgrounds. This work was delayed last year because of the water shortage. A bore that was sunk last summer is now used to water the school oval and will provide water for the new grassed area. I understand that departmental approval has been obtained for this project. Some time ago the school committee obtained additional quotes for this work, but it is waiting on the approval of the Public Buildings Department before it proceeds and there has been some delay. Will the Minister of Works see whether final approval for this project can be given as early as possible?

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

FOOTBALL DESCRIPTION

Mr. RICHES: Has the Premier a reply to my question of October 3 about the broadcast description of a recent interstate football match on the Adelaide Oval?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Unfortunately, it was on a Thursday that the honourable member asked his question, and the communication to my secretary did not reach him before I went to another State on the following day. I had an important conference after the House rose on the Thursday evening and had to hurry for the plane. I apologize to the honourable member for not getting that communication to my staff in time for it to be effective. However, it would not have altered the situation. Prior to the commencement of the 1968 football season the radio stations which engaged in football descriptions negotiated an agreement with the South Australian National Football League to broadcast descriptions of matches throughout the season up to and including the grand final match. Appropriate fees were paid by the stations to the league. Arrangements for the match between the South Australian premiership side and the Victorian premiership side were not completed until comparatively late in the football season. Of necessity, broadcasting stations had arranged programme commitments following the completion of the normal football season. In these circumstances, the three commercial stations were not prepared to vary those arrangements and pay an additional fee to broadcast a description of the match between the two premiership sides. The Australian Broadcasting Commission did pay a fee and broadcast a description of the match, interspersed with racing descriptions.

ROAD TAX

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General replies from the Minister of Roads and Transport to questions on road tax that I asked in the Budget debate?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Collections since the introduction of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963, on July 1, 1964, amounted to \$7,723,823. Annual collections were as follows: 1964-65, \$1,426,200; 1965-66, \$1,903,177; 1966-67, \$2,070,118; 1967-68, \$2,324,328. The State has not made an approach to the Commonwealth Government on road tax.

WEST BEACH SCHOOL

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last week I read a press report stating that several new schools (including the West Beach Primary School,

in which I have a particular interest) would open soon. I point out that, during the term of the Labor Government, the then Minister of Education said the school committee would receive assistance to establish an oval at the West Beach school. Can the Minister of Education say what provision the department intends to apply to help new schools establish ovals?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain a report on this matter for the honourable member.

STREAKY BAY SCHOOL

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about fencing and paving projects at the Streaky Bay Area School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Tenders for this work are included in a combined project for similar works at Ceduna Area School and Haslam Primary School. Tenders for this group contract have closed, and a tender is expected to be submitted for acceptance soon.

HOLDEN HILL HOUSES

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Housing will be aware that the Housing Trust has constructed 63 brick-veneer houses in an area at Holden Hill bordered by Southern Terrace, Lyons Road and Valiant Road. On August 8, I asked whether suitable footings had been incorporated in the construction of the houses and, on August 20, received a reply to the effect that the trust had endeavoured to provide suitable footings. During this weekend, on inspecting some of the houses I found some evidence of cracking. As the Minister will also be aware of the arrangements made between the trust and occupants of houses in an adjoining subdivision at Holden Hill, can he say whether a similar offer can be made to occupants of the 63 houses to which I have referred?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will examine the matter and the honourable member's request. In accordance with an offer I made to a deputation introduced to me last week by the honourable member and the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), I will inspect some houses in the Holden Hill area next Monday afternoon, when I can perhaps be shown some of the houses that are the subject of the question raised by the member for Barossa. After a long and most amicable discussion with the deputation, I decided that the best thing I could do was to look at the houses myself, and this offer was accepted by,

the deputation. Therefore, after I have made the inspection I hope, perhaps, to be better able to discuss with the Housing Trust and with the honourable member matters relating to this problem.

MISSING PARCELS

Mr. ARNOLD: On August 2 of this year, a constituent of mine was notified by the Berri stationmaster that a parcel my constituent had ordered to be railed from Adelaide was missing. Although this happened about 10 weeks ago, still no information is available as to the whereabouts of this parcel. Again, on October 11 the stationmaster informed my constituent that a further two parcels were missing (one had been missing since September 30 and the other since October 3). Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to find out what has happened to these parcels and to say how many parcels, etc., have disappeared while in transit on trains and how many have been recovered this year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As this situation certainly sounds unsatisfactory, I will ask my colleague whether he will try to track down the parcels and provide the information requested.

PORT BROUGHTON ROAD

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the Port Broughton road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: After expenditure of the financial allocations (as supplied in reply to the honourable member's question on September 26), the following lengths of the Port Broughton-Port Pirie road will remain to be sealed: District Council of Port Broughton—one mile of the Port Broughton to Merriton Main Road No. 436, and three miles of the Clement Gap-Port Pirie district road; District Council of Pirie—12 miles of the Clement Gap-Port Pirie district road between Cocky Crossing and Clement Gap. It is expected that funds will be available during future years to permit the completion of sealing of the road in the District Council of Port Broughton area during 1969-70, and in the District Council of Pirie area by 1971-72.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about reservoir storages in the upper reaches of the Murray River?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Hume reservoir, on October 14, held 2,210,000 acre feet and was rising at the rate of about 20,000 acre feet a day. Lake Victoria is full, at 551,700 acre feet, and Menindee Lakes held 786,000 acre feet on October 9, 1968. There is a small freshet downstream of Yarrowonga which should give a flow of about 10,000 cusecs for a short period in South Australia in the middle of November, 1968.

LONDON-SYDNEY RALLY

Mr. CASEY: On October 1, I asked the Premier to examine the problem arising in connection with a motor car rally that was to take place between London and Sydney. I was extremely concerned because the route was through parts of my district in which residents made many complaints to me. However, I point out to the Premier that he need not now ascertain the exact route, because details are set out specifically on page 14 of this morning's *Advertiser*. Nevertheless, I am now concerned about the action of reconnaissance vehicles in going through this area without first contacting the station people, and I have received more adverse reports about that during the weekend and again this morning. The report in the *Advertiser* states:

Station owners are co-operating by leaving gates open while the cars pass through.

I do not know what the Premier thinks about that, but I assure him that, to my knowledge, there has been absolutely no co-operation from the people who have approached me. I do not think station people would leave their many gates open so that cars could go through, particularly when the paddocks contain stock. Will the Premier take up with those conducting the rally the matter of changing the route between Wertaloon station and the New South Wales border so that the cars will go from Wertaloon to Yunta, joining the main Adelaide to Broken Hill road there and thus inconveniencing station owners to a lesser extent than would be the case if the route intended at present were used?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have referred this matter to the Deputy Police Commissioner, in the absence overseas of the Commissioner, and a report is pending. Although I am pleased to note the honourable member's question asked today, I think we should await the Deputy Commissioner's report, which I hope to have available this week and which should clarify the attitude of local people about the rally—and about the honourable member's concern (a concern which I

share) about station roads or tracks serving this area having to be repaired after the rally at the expense of those who constructed them originally for their own use. When I receive the report, I will reply to the honourable member.

HOSPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. RODDA: Compulsory contributions by councils throughout the State to hospitals within the council areas have been increased, the Naracoorte council's contribution having been increased from \$8,500 to \$9,500 and the Lucindale council's contribution having been similarly increased in respect of the four hospitals in that council's area. Because councils prepared their budgets and fixed their rates before they knew what the increases were, a difficulty arises: for example, the Naracoorte council is alarmed to find that it has to contribute an extra \$1,000 for which it has not budgeted. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether councils can be notified of such increases as these before they prepare their revenue budgets for the year?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague.

ABORIGINAL WELFARE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Today's *Advertiser* reports a speech by the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr. Wentworth) when giving the first annual Latham Memorial Lecture, entitled *The Australian Aborigine*, at the University of Sydney. Part of the report states:

With the co-operation of the States, it was the Federal Government's intention to ensure that, from the beginning of the next academic year, every Aboriginal child who qualified would have the opportunity of advancing his education from primary to university level.

I do not understand what is intended, nor do I know whether the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs understands the statement of the Commonwealth Minister. However, will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs get a copy of Mr. Wentworth's speech, if that is possible, so that we can examine in detail what the Commonwealth Minister said and what is intended?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I saw the report in this morning's paper, and it occurred to me that it would be as well to ask the Minister what he had in mind. I intend to do that.

EGGS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In today's popular press, part of a letter from a poultry farmer at Rockleigh states:

... the antagonism of poultry producers against the intrusion of Egg Board officers compulsorily inspecting flocks since the introduction of the bird levy plan in South Australia. This policing could well be a contributing factor in the prevalence of the infectious laryngotracheitis (I.L.T.) at present causing concern.

That the incidence of I.L.T. is increasing rapidly is well known by poultry farmers in South Australia. While the use of preventive vaccine is not generally permitted in South Australia the disease is extending. Because of this, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture what action is being taken to ensure that officers who inspect poultry flocks under the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia levy-collection plan are not spreading this disease around South Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Minister of Agriculture.

FESTIVAL HALL

Mr. VIRGO: Twice I have asked the Premier questions about the intended re-routing of the underground railway suggested in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report in order to accommodate the new site for the festival hall announced by the Premier. I am pleased to read in the report tabled by the Premier that the committee considered this problem, the words used being as follows: "The committee believes that the subway could be satisfactorily routed along the approximate line shown." I looked at the "approximate line shown" to try to find out the radius of the curvature but, unfortunately, this drawing is one of the few I have seen that has no scale marked on it. Consequently, it is impossible to know whether it is drawn to scale or, if it is, what the scale is. Will the Premier ascertain what the radius of curvature of the proposed line is and at what speed a train would be able to travel over the proposed curve?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get the necessary information if it is available.

MENINGIE SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: A month or two ago, when the Minister of Education was visiting my district, she visited the Meningie Area School. Will she ascertain why the paving work and other improvements that were then discussed have not been carried out, and will she find out when the work will be done?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

SEALS

Mr. EDWARDS: During my recent trip to the far west coast of Eyre Peninsula I was told that last year some of the shark and cray fishermen were reported to have been shooting seals at Seal Bay to use as shark and crayfish bait. It was also reported that these fishermen were using porpoises as bait. Shooting seals is a cowardly act. The colony at Seal Bay is the only one on the mainland and the number of seals is definitely decreasing. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture, who is in charge of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department, to consider this matter, because the seal colony is an added tourist attraction in this area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will speak to my colleague, and I am sure he will take the matter further.

FURNER ROAD

Mr. RODDA: During the weekend some irate landholders told me that Main Road 298, between Furner and the Lucindale road, was in a shocking condition. They doubted whether anyone in authority had recently inspected it, and they were disappointed at the reply of the Minister of Roads and Transport to a recent petition. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether officers of the Highways Department will inspect the road in its present condition, because the winter traffic count of the lesser number of vehicles carried on this road would not reflect the true need for repairs to it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I greatly regret the inconvenience and upset caused to the honourable member's constituents, and I will certainly take the matter up again as he requests.

ELECTRICAL REPAIRS

Mr. LANGLEY: I have received several complaints from people in the District of Unley concerning the minimum call fee of \$5 charged by an electrical appliance firm, which fee includes only labour and not the cost of parts. Also, the jobs are usually completed within an hour. At an average of six calls a day the service would return \$150 a week for one man, although his weekly wage would be only about \$56. As this fee is much higher than the controlled charge for electrical work, will the Premier find out why there should be this difference between the cost of home appliance repairs and that of household electrical repairs?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to refer this question to the Treasurer, who is

in charge of the Prices Department, and he or I will furnish a reply.

LAMEROO SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: For several years I have corresponded with the Minister of Education and her predecessor about a new school at Lameroo. At the beginning of the year certain major renovation works which were to be carried out at the school were deferred because it was expected that something might be done about building a new school. Subsequently, a revision was made of the schedule of repair and maintenance works to be carried out, and I believe tenders were either called or were expected to be called, but up to the present nothing has been done to carry out the renovations necessary at the school. Also, there is a carry-over contract for drainage work from last year which, I understand, lapsed because of the default of the contractor. Will the Minister obtain a report on these matters so that I can inform the people concerned?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member, and I hope that I shall be able to visit the honourable member's district soon and inspect this school.

ROBERTSTOWN BUS SERVICE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about concessions to pensioners on the new bus service between Robertstown and Adelaide?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No power exists under the provisions of the Road and Railway Transport Act to make it mandatory for pensioner concessions to be granted by country bus operators. However, applicants for licences between Robertstown and Adelaide have been asked to stipulate concession fares proposed for pensioners.

HIGHWAYS EXPENDITURE

Mr. HUDSON: During the Budget debate I asked the Attorney-General to find out from the Minister of Roads and Transport why \$5,000 provided last year under the Highways expenditure as a contribution to the Planning and Development Fund for interest and sundries was not spent. As the Attorney-General promised to find out, has he obtained this information?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I always keep my promises, and the report states that two debentures were negotiated on July 25, 1967, for an amount of \$250,000, with interest at the rate of \$5.875 per cent payable

on January 12 and July 12 in every year. Since the balances in the Planning and Development Fund form part of the general trust balances which the Treasury are able to invest from time to time, interest is allowed on end-of-month balances in the account at the current three months' bank fixed deposit rate. The provision from revenue is to cover the difference between interest payable and interest received. In the financial year 1967-68, since the debentures were taken up after July 12, there was only one interest payment, that is, on January 12, 1968, of \$7,343.75. Interest credited was \$9,587.00, hence there was not a requirement to use moneys from revenue. In the current financial year the interest payable will be twice that of the previous year.

SCHOOLTEACHERS

Mr. CASEY (on notice):

1. How many teachers resigned from the Education Department in each of the years from 1963 to 1967 inclusive, and also to September 30, 1968?

2. How many teachers were employed by the department, and how many resigned to marry in each of these years?

3. What other reasons were given for resigning during the periods mentioned?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The replies are as follows:

- 1. 1963, 760.
- 1964, 791.
- 1965, 902.
- 1966, 957.
- 1967, 961.
- 1968 to September 30, 1968, 528.

2.		Teachers employed	Resigned to marry
	1963	7,548	255
	1964	8,309	441
	1965	8,740	382
	1966	9,224	214
	1967	9,703	110
	1968 to August 2,		
	1968 (latest figures available)	10,345	39
			(to September 30, 1968)

No teacher can be required to give a reason for resignation. The figures relating to teachers resigning to marry, therefore, show those who have, in fact, offered a reason. From December, 1965, married women could continue teaching without break of service.

3. Home duties; pregnancy; travel; transfer of husband; to teach in a private school; to teach in other States or overseas; to take up full-time study; to take up other employment; unsuited to teaching; health; and personal.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1840.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Although the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) claims that the co-operative societies would not be able to handle any increased money made available to them, I was glad to read today that the Manager of the South Australian Co-operative Building Society had said that his organization did not expect to receive such a large sum from this source but that sufficient resources were definitely available to handle any increased building and administrative work required. I do not expect a bank to lend money unless it actually has sufficient deposits. A bank waits until the deposits actually exist, and any increased money that is available as a result of, say, a good harvest this year will go into the general banking system, with the result that more money will be available for housing from the various lending institutions. Most trust estates are handled by the Public Trustee and are not connected with the Savings Bank, and the big trustee companies would not have funds invested in the Savings Bank, bearing in mind the existing rate of interest on large deposits. Only in the case of smaller trust estates would money be in the Savings Bank. If sums are transferred from the Savings Bank to the co-operative societies, more houses will be built.

Co-operative societies in other States are taking over the financing of private building activities. A lag in this regard exists possibly only in South Australia. The banking system is not the only avenue for financing the building of houses. The co-operative building societies encourage their subscribers by paying bonuses, etc., and lend money at 5½ per cent. As I said on Thursday, despite the building boom being experienced in New South Wales, some building societies in that State are advertising the fact that they have money to lend to people wishing to build houses. I think it would be a good thing if South Australia developed its co-operative societies to the extent that the Housing Trust was able to finance more house building for the poorer people and to provide rental houses for those who require such accommodation. More Loan funds would then be available to be spent on developmental works for the benefit of South Australia.

The building industry in this State has been in the doldrums for the last two or three years, and if we are to get it going again we must first get industry going by spending more money on development work and by attracting more migrants. In 1964 South Australia's percentage migrant intake was 14.86 per cent; in 1965, 15.14 per cent; in 1966, 14.97 per cent; and in 1967, 10.61 per cent. Migrants left this State when they were not able to secure work, and this put our building industry in the doldrums. In 1964 the number of houses built in South Australia was 11.45 per cent of the Commonwealth total, and this figure was well above the population percentage, but in 1967 it dropped to 8.32 per cent. The trend in employment figures has indicated over the last two or three months that more migrants will be attracted to South Australia. We shall be able to retain those already here, and this will have the snowballing effect of increasing employment in this State similarly to the way it has been increased previously. The building industry will again become active and, if the building societies can encourage savings among young people who will contribute more capital to build their own houses, it will be much better than having to rely to such a great extent on the Housing Trust. In other States money has been attracted from the private sector to finance building programmes, which are progressing at a record rate at the moment.

I support the Bill and commend the Government for making more funds available from its own resources to the co-operative building societies and for making it possible for the societies to expand by securing more money from private investors. It does not matter what state the building industry is in, as long as the money is going into it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short titles."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In subclause (1) after "1968" to add "and shall come into operation on a day (not earlier than the first day of March, 1969) to be fixed by proclamation".

The amendment is the result of the points raised in the second reading debate. My particular concern is that as a result of the Bill there may be some switching of deposits from the Savings Bank to building societies which, at the present time, could cause the bank some difficulty with its current rate of approvals of loans. The Treasurer has said that a few months ago the bank reduced its rate of approvals of new mortgage loans but that over the last few days the rate was

increased on the expectation that there would be an increase in the bank's deposits as a result of the good season. The purpose of the amendment is to delay the operation of the Bill until the Treasurer is satisfied that the bank's rate of mortgage lending will not be adversely affected by any possible switching of deposits from the bank to the building societies.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I do not object to the amendment. In actual operation, the public and the building societies will be aware that the Bill will probably operate on the date that has been suggested and will, no doubt, plan accordingly. However, as the societies have to some extent increased their scope and scale of operations in recent years, even though they have not been accorded trustee status, I have no doubt that the delay of several months will not inconvenience them seriously, particularly as this year the Government has allocated a larger proportion of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement moneys to the societies than previously.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Authorized investments."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In new paragraph (f1) after "and is" to insert ", in accordance with subsection (6) of this section,".

This amendment is the first of two amendments that place in the Bill the conditions which the Treasurer, when explaining the Bill, said he would require of the building societies before making the proclamation according trustee status to deposits with building societies. These conditions are set out in the second amendment, which will follow the first amendment, if it is accepted, and which provides that the Governor shall not make a proclamation referred to in paragraph (f1) of subsection (1) of this section unless he is satisfied that the society is in a sound financial condition; the society will not offer a rate of interest on deposits made with it in excess of the rate of interest for the time being approved by the Treasurer by notice in writing for the purposes of this section; and where the society lends an amount of money, on the security of real property, in excess of an amount equal to 75 per cent of the valuation of that property, that society will insure, with an insurer approved by the Treasurer, against the default of the borrower in relation to that loan.

This would ensure that, first, the Governor of the day must be satisfied of the society's sound financial condition before a proclamation is made. Secondly, it would give the Treasurer control over the interest rates charged on deposits by the societies. This is an important control for the Treasurer to have. Under the Bill as it stands, the Treasurer has this control over interest rates only inferentially. If he asked the societies not to raise interest rates and they refused to co-operate, the Treasurer could recommend the revocation of the proclamation registering the deposits with the building society as trustee investments, but in order to get his way the Treasurer would have to revoke the proclamation. This would be the only formal act the Treasurer could undertake to get the societies to comply with his wishes in this matter. The interest rates on deposits offered by building societies is a matter of concern to any Government because of the important assets which are alternative sources of deposit to trustees. One of the alternatives is deposits with the Savings Bank of South Australia. Clearly the Treasurer would not want the rate of interest offered on deposits with the building societies to get significantly out of line with the rate of interest on deposits with the Savings Bank of South Australia, and I believe that was made clear in the Treasurer's second reading explanation. The amendment makes it absolutely clear that the Treasurer has this particular control over interest rates and that the building society concerned must get its maximum interest rate approved by the Treasurer by notice in writing. This means that the Treasurer no longer has to revoke the proclamation in order to ensure that he gets his way in relation to interest rates charged by building societies.

Finally, as the amendment relates to the requirements of insurance, it merely spells out what the Treasurer would normally want the building societies to do; therefore, it is a worthwhile amendment. The more we can have loans insured so that, should the borrower default for any reason, the full value of the loan is provided, the better it will be for the overall community. This is an extremely valuable provision to have, for example, in any loan a borrower enters into, particularly where the person concerned is married and has a wife and family to support. The value of the loan is insured and, if the borrower dies (which is the most likely case in which trouble can arise), the full value of the loan is immediately provided and that person's widow and family are properly provided for. I know many people, for example, who have borrowed from

an organization such as the South Australian Superannuation Fund and who have, at the same time, taken out an insurance policy, which is offered, in order to provide a guarantee for the loan for their wife and family should death occur. The development of the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation means that the ability to insure the value of the loan can be extended much more widely than was previously the case. Under the old arrangements, a person could have his loan insured only if he was under the age of 36. Of course, the establishment of the corporation means that any loan can be insured provided other conditions are met, and this is of considerable assistance to borrowers. I imagine that what would happen in relation to most loans taken out through building societies would be that the building society would charge the borrower with the premium involved in the particular insurance. This would not be an additional charge on the building society, the premium involved being automatically passed on to the person undertaking the borrowing. The premium would be small and would certainly be a worthwhile payment.

Mr. McAnaney: What would the premium be?

Mr. HUDSON: That varies with the size of the loan. In the case I have before me, the premium for insurance represents one-twenty-eighth of the three-monthly payment, so on a weekly repayment of \$10 a complete coverage to the borrower against any default on the loan would increase that payment by only 30c.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In my second reading explanation, I said that the Treasurer would endeavour to ensure that the institutions concerned would exercise certain restraint in respect to their lending and the conditions of their lending. I also said that he would satisfy himself as to the *bona fides*, financial standing and so on of the financial institutions. Although I do not criticize the honourable member⁹ for this, I point out that I saw the amendments for the first time only a few moments ago and I have not had much opportunity to consider them. One problem that could arise is that banks, for example, are proclaimed as trustee investment institutions. We do not spell out requirements in respect to banks and other trustee investment institutions in precise terms as is proposed in the amendment. I do not say that I will oppose the amendment but, as I should like to make one or two inquiries about it, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

Mr. HUDSON: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment for the purpose of moving another.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In new paragraph (f1) after "and is" to insert "subject to subsection (6) of this section".

The amendment I moved earlier was part of a series of amendments designed to write into the Bill specific conditions to be fulfilled before the Governor could make the proclamation referred to in new paragraph (f1) of section 5 (1) of the principal Act, which is amended by this Bill. The Treasurer raised certain difficulties with me about these amendments and, as a result of the discussions that took place, I am now moving an amendment that requires only that the Auditor-General should make a report on the financial condition of any building society before the Governor can make a proclamation declaring the deposits held with that society to be trustee investments. This amendment replaces the proposal which was previously put forward by the Opposition and which was that the Governor could make a proclamation only if he was satisfied that the society was in a sound financial condition, that the society would agree to the control of interest rates, and that certain provisions with respect to insurance with the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation would be fulfilled. I think the Treasurer pointed out, quite correctly, that certain difficulties would arise in connection with the laying down of specific conditions, in that some building societies could fulfil all of the stipulated conditions but, because of some other reason that had not been specified in the legislation, could not be granted trustee status, and the Treasurer could be put in an invidious position in refusing trustee status to a particular building society.

The Opposition has accepted this point of view and is prepared to accept the Treasurer's assurances that he will require to approve interest rates offered by building societies with respect to deposits, that he will also require a building society to insure with the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation against the default of any borrower, and that, therefore, we need not write those conditions specifically into the legislation. In view of that, it is sufficient to provide that, before any proclamation is issued under this amending Bill making deposits with a building society trustee investments, a report as to the financial condition of any particular building society shall be obtained

from the Auditor-General. This amendment is designed as the first of a series of amendments with that in mind.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In paragraph (e) after "following" to strike out "subsection" and insert "subsections".

This is consequential on the previous amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

After paragraph (e) to insert the following subsection:

(6) The Governor shall not make a proclamation referred to in paragraph (f1) of subsection (1) of this section unless he has received a report from the Auditor-General as to the financial condition of the society.

I have already explained the purpose of the amendment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This is the operative section of the amendment. As the member for Glenelg stated earlier, it comes about as a result of discussions I had with him earlier today. I think the Committee agrees that it is adequate in the protection it affords. After all, the main requirement of a trustee investment is that its financial structure and condition should be beyond question. Therefore, the amendment has merit, in that it requires that the Treasurer does not act alone and without advice in his advice to the Governor proclaiming certain institutions to be trustee investments. I think the honourable member will agree that I suggested that the Auditor-General, as an independent authority, would be the proper person to make such a report to the Treasurer. I have no objection to the amendment, and I thank the member for Glenelg and the Opposition for their co-operation in this proposal.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 8. Page 1732.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I have just received a letter that may be helpful to me in this debate.

Mr. Rodda: It's not about dancing, is it?

Mr. LAWN: I have received much correspondence since referring to the Premier's dancing ability, and I will deal with that matter

later. Clause 4 (3) sets out who shall comprise the commission, and I do not object to its constitution. However, I take strong exception to the provision in clause 5 (3). I have never seen it in any other State or Commonwealth redistribution legislation. Recently the Commonwealth Senate disallowed a Commonwealth redistribution in Queensland recommended by two of the three commissioners. Although the two commissioners out-voted the chairman, the latter's report was also submitted to the Government, it not being vetoed by any Act. However, 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.

By this clause the Government is tying up the matter so that if it gets the judge it wants (the judge it thinks will be its way), the decision arrived at will be the one favourable to the Government.

Mr. McKee: It's a one-man commission.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, provided that the Government gets the judge that it hopes to get.

Mr. McKee: Who do you think it will be?

Mr. LAWN: I could name one or two judges, but I do not intend to, because I do not know whether they are being consulted. It seems that the Government has included this provision solely because it wants its nominee to be chairman of the commission. I also take strong exception to clause 8 (3), which loads the State quota by 15 per cent. I have no objection to the division of the number of Assembly electors by 47, but then the metropolitan districts are to be loaded by 15 per cent. I have no objection to the provision in sub-clause (7) of an allowance of 15 per cent under for country districts and 10 per cent over for metropolitan districts, but I object to the loading of the metropolitan quota in the first instance. In the Committee stage I will vote against some of those provisions. The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) is reported at page 583 of *Hansard* as follows:

The member for Mount Gambier was so fulsome in his praise of the Bill that my suspicions were aroused. I must say that I have never been entirely happy about the Bill because it has been introduced as a compromise between Liberal and Country League and Socialist principles: I believe it is a compromise between L.C.L. principles and evil.

The honourable member has made clear that he is not pleased with the Bill and, regarding his reference to a compromise, I say that the people want a compromise regarding the differences between the Australian Labor Party and

Liberal and Country League policies as stated at election time.

Mr. Clark: They want a compromise better than this.

Mr. LAWN: I agree, and I will deal with that. The people are demanding a compromise. The Australian Labor Party policy last March was for 56 districts in the House of Assembly, and that of the L.C.L. was for 45 districts. The A.L.P. has come down from 56 to 48, but the L.C.L. has moved only from 45 to 47. The A.L.P. has said that it accepts 47, so the only compromise has been by the A.L.P. The A.L.P. would have a State quota but it would not then put a loading on the metropolitan area. The evil to which I think the member for Light has referred lies in those parts of the Bill to which we on this side take exception. We take strong exceptions to some parts of the Bill, although we agree about the number of members to comprise the commission. As reported at page 594 of *Hansard*, the member for Light said:

Knowing that the Trades Hall has told Labor members to vote for the Bill, I warn them that, if they attempt to interfere too much with the Bill in Committee, I will vote against it on the third reading.

Mr. McKee: They're brave words.

Mr. LAWN: We will call his bluff. That honourable member went on to say:

In so doing I will cause their bluff to be called as they will have to divide, show their true colours, and show that the Trades Hall barons have instructed them how to vote.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. LAWN: What a stupid statement!

Mr. Broomhill: A member opposite is agreeing with what the member for Light said.

Mr. LAWN: He is probably equally stupid. We have not been told to do anything that is not in our policy regarding the House of Assembly, and our policy at the time of the election was for a House of 56 members. One Opposition member, perhaps the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) or the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon), said that we adopted a policy of 56 members in the House of Assembly in order to retain 26 country members. I know that that is correct, because I was a member of the committee that made such a recommendation to our convention many years ago.

Mr. Venning: How many rural districts would there have been in those 26 districts?

Mr. LAWN: I will not waste time trying to distinguish between rural districts and country industrial districts. During the years

I was a member before the 56-member House became our policy the then Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, who did the talking for the Liberal Party, said in debates that we were trying to deprive country people of representation. I remind the member for Rocky River that it was Sir Thomas Playford who said that. We introduced the 56-member policy deliberately in order to maintain the 26 existing country districts. The Australian Labor Party electoral policy is as follows:

2. The establishment of an Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission to provide for:

(a) A House of Assembly of 48 members representing single electorates based on a ratio of four (4) State electorates for each of the 12 Federal divisions, elected with a simple majority by the cross system of voting;

These are further additions to our compromise. We suggested four House of Assembly districts to one Commonwealth House of Representatives district and, as this is not mentioned in the Bill, we have been willing to compromise on it. Our policy continues:

(b) Electorates to be divided to provide for approximately equal voting strength on the principal of one vote one value, subject to a margin of 15 per cent over or under the average. In the remote areas of the State a wider margin to be allowed in order to provide effective representation where communications are extremely difficult and the area is sparsely settled;

This is another instance where Sir Thomas Playford said that we could not have one vote one value in certain parts of the country. The South Australian Commonwealth districts are getting close to this policy. In the last Commonwealth election each Commonwealth district had 42,000 to 44,000 electors, including the District of Grey, and no-one could say that Grey was not a sparsely populated district.

Mr. McKee: The Prime Minister apparently did not find the political atmosphere in South Australia very good on his weekend visit.

Mr. LAWN: No, and he is also being bluffed to some extent by the Democratic Labor Party.

Mr. Clark: His visit to South Australia was the final blow.

Mr. LAWN: I think that when he came here at the weekend, he found that the Australian Labor Party would improve on its 1966 election effort. Our policy continues:

(c) Periodical redistribution of electorates to provide for movement of population.

I am sure that what I have said answers the argument of the member for Light, who said

that we have been told, directed, or instructed to support the present Bill. If we had been so instructed it would have been a compliment to the present Government to know that those at the Trades Hall thought that the Bill was what they wanted. However, I have given the lie to the statements of the member for Light.

The honourable member said that he would call our bluff and vote against the third reading if the Bill were amended in Committee. What did he mean? The House now has 19 members on each side and the Government relies and gets every casting vote of the Speaker on second and third readings. Whilst you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, occupy the position of Chairman of Committees, the Speaker will always vote with the Government and will do so in Committee on this issue. The voting will therefore be 19 all, so how does the honourable member think there will be alterations in Committee? He is not suggesting that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would cast your vote, as Chairman of Committees, other than in favour of the Government. I would blame you if you did, but he is not suggesting that. Then what does he mean by saying, "if the Bill were amended in Committee"? Does he mean that our case is so good that we will talk him or his colleagues into crossing the floor to vote with us? The member for Light threatened to vote against the third reading. It would not matter if he did that, if in Committee we had reached a good compromise with which both Parties were happy. He could vote how he wanted to vote and there would be no division, because he would be the only member calling for a division. I quote what the Premier said when explaining the Bill.

Mr. Jennings: He didn't say much.

Mr. LAWN: No. What was said by the member for Light is reported on about 15 pages of *Hansard*, but he did not say much either. The Premier's remarks were reported in a couple of pages of *Hansard*, but he only explained the clauses.

Mr. Rodda: How many pages did the member for Wallaroo take?

Mr. LAWN: Some controversy has occurred lately (and I understand that the Speaker is involved in it) about the length of time for which members have spoken. For the last two minutes I have had little opportunity to say a word, because private conversations between members and interjections have wasted the time of the House. With all respect to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not drawing your—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am pleased that the honourable member has ignored the interruptions.

Mr. LAWN: I did, other than to draw your attention to the fact that they existed. I have never seen a more undisciplined House or heard more interjections than I have during this Parliament. I think that if the Speaker controlled the House better there would be less waste of time than there is when a member speaks, because members do not always address the House. Let me have another go. The Premier said:

Despite the differences that have existed between the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal and Country League on this matter, there are, I think, several points on which we agree. One of them is the need for such reform.

This is not a reform Bill, and I do not know where the Premier got that idea. It is an Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill: it alters the present boundaries and increases the number of districts from 39 to 47. The Premier continued:

The urgency for it has grown as the years have passed.

So help me! It has taken the Premier a long time to find out the need for this reform, this redivision. I do not know how long the Premier has been here, but in every Parliament since he has been a member there has been a Bill for electoral reform.

Mr. Virgo: This is not electoral reform: it is a continuation of the gerrymander.

Mr. LAWN: That is so. It is a redivision Bill, whereas there is a need for electoral reform.

Mr. Rodda: Are you in favour of the Bill?

Mr. LAWN: The Premier said that the urgency for it had grown, but although we were in opposition before 1965 we introduced Bills and moved motions to obtain electoral justice, and the then Premier said he did not know what the word "fair" meant. He quoted the *Oxford Dictionary* definition and said it could mean "blond". We then moved that the Government set up a Royal Commission to settle the differences between the Parties on electoral reform. The Liberal Party voted against that, and in 1965 we introduced our own Bill to give effect to what the Premier, in fact, said in his explanation but, if members opposite look at *Hansard*, they will see that the Premier voted against that Bill. It is only the result of the last election that has forced him to realize the need for something to be done and, if it had not been for the people of Millicent, we would not have had a Bill such as this one.

Mr. Burdon: There would have been a dictatorship.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The Bill introduced by Sir Thomas Playford in 1964 would have been nothing compared with the Bill introduced by the Premier if his Party had won the Millicent by-election. I think that the lengthy speeches being made are making the Speaker sick, for he cannot listen too long.

Mr. McAnaney: Your Bill would have set up the best gerrymander.

Mr. LAWN: I can understand the Speaker being sick if he listened to the member for Stirling, who has been set up as the financial genius of this House, and to the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), who is becoming the rabbit behind the Premier, and who can only talk about what happened back in about 1949. The member for Light has set out to be the adviser of new members, such as the member for Eyre. I can understand someone, but certainly not the member for Light, advising the member for Eyre. When I first saw the member for Eyre, I said, "Hello, we have a peanut here", and after having heard his speeches—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member had better come back to the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: —I think it is a peanut without a kernel. The Premier said:

During the passage of these years the L.C.L. has emphasized the need for special consideration of country areas.

Our policy specifically sought to maintain the existing number of country districts, but this Government has said it does not want 26 country districts and that it would eliminate them. There is a big difference between this Bill and the one introduced by Sir Thomas Playford. The Premier continued:

The A.L.P. has not in the past agreed with this attitude. Both Parties approached the last State election with policies for electoral reform which were, I think it is fair to say, major planks in their election platforms. The A.L.P. recommended a 56-member House of Assembly, with some possible weighting for country areas. The L.C.L. recommended a 45-seat House, with 25 members for the city and 20 for the country.

Who is taking away country representation? It was not the A.L.P.'s desire to do so.

Mr. McAnaney: How many country members did you have under your Bill—20 or 21?

Mr. LAWN: If the honourable member cannot understand, I am afraid I cannot waste any more time in explaining it further. Since my question of last week about the dancing capabilities of the Premier, I have received much mail, and—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. LAWN: What I am saying has nothing to do with dancing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member was referring to that just now.

Mr. LAWN: I said "since my question". Even before that, much had been said to me about what this Government and the Premier had not done. I have received correspondence from a number of people in South Australia telling me that they consider the Premier's outstanding achievement relates to his dancing qualities, but that does not speak much for his political achievements.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I told the honourable member just now he was out of order. The honourable member will be seated. I ask him to obey the Chair and relate his remarks to the Bill and not to the matters to which he referred just now.

Mr. LAWN: I am relating my remarks to the Bill and to the ability of people occupying the front bench. I am referring to the promises made before the election which they have not carried out and to their lack of ability to carry them out. In fact, since you have drawn my attention to the fact, I believe the Premier has not the ability to take a portfolio. I cannot remember an occasion when the Premier has not been—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: I am in order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will listen to the Chair. The Chair is here to give the orders in the matters being debated.

Mr. LAWN: I am telling you I am in order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will obey the Chair.

Mr. LAWN: I am obeying the Chair. I am in order in speaking of the ability of Ministers in connection with an electoral boundaries Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member is in order when he speaks about electoral boundaries.

Mr. LAWN: I do not know what else I have been saying all afternoon, if the Deputy Speaker cannot understand it. I have referred to a 56-seat House. Does that not imply boundaries? I have referred to a 48-seat House, and that implies electoral boundaries. I have also referred to a 47-seat House and a 45-seat House. Of course I am speaking about boundaries and about the members coming into the House on the strength of those

boundaries and as a result of the electoral gerrymander that has given us a 19-all House! I have, I think, also said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that members opposite have given us a "knuckle-head". They have given us one of the seven dwarfs.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member should confine his remarks to the Bill and not to individual members.

Mr. LAWN: The Premier said he believed in an uneven number. As against our 48-member House, he preferred an uneven number or an odd number—and we even have an odd member, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Ryan: Several of them.

Mr. LAWN: There are several odd characters opposite, and there is an odd member in the Chair—not you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but Mr. Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: You can keep saying "Order", Mr. Deputy Speaker. I now come to the odd member, elected under the present boundaries as the odd member, the Independent member.

Mr. Ryan: Who said he is Independent?

Mr. LAWN: As you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and all other members know, when the Speaker was asked for a casting vote in his capacity as Speaker of the House in the years 1962 to 1965, every casting vote of that odd Independent member went to the Liberal and Country League, with one exception in 1964. I will indicate to members what this odd member should do when in the Chair. If we had a 48-member House, after the appointment of the Speaker there would be an odd number in the House. This means that it would not call for the casting vote of Mr. Speaker so often. But this is the way the Premier wants it: he wants the odd member, and if we had an occasion similar to the one we have today the odd member would be placed in the Chair. Regarding the casting vote of Mr. Speaker, *Erskine May* states:

If the numbers in the division are equal, the Speaker, who otherwise does not vote, must give the casting vote. In the performance of this duty, he is at liberty to vote like any other member, according to his conscience, without assigning a reason; but, in order to avoid the least imputation upon his impartiality, it is usual for him, when practicable, to vote in such a manner as not to make the decision of the House final, and to explain his reasons, which are entered on the Journal.

This indicates that all second reading decisions by casting vote should be in favour of the Bill not so as to make the matter final but in order to enable further discussion to take

place. Every electoral Bill introduced in the period 1962-65 by the Labor Opposition was defeated on the second reading by the casting vote of Mr. Speaker, whereas the second reading of the electoral Bill and every other Bill introduced by the Government in that period was carried. Last week, the House considered a State Bank Act Amendment Bill, which provides for a completely new law, because until it is proclaimed the whole of the profits of the State Bank will be retained by the bank. The Speaker gave his casting vote in favour of the Bill on the second reading, and would no doubt have done so on the third reading. *Erskine May* states:

The numbers being equal on the third reading of the Church Rates Abolition Bill, 19th June, 1961, Mr. Speaker Denison gave his casting vote against the Bill, stating that it appeared to him that a prevailing opinion existed in favour of a settlement of the question, different, in some degree, from that contained in the Bill; and that he thought he should best discharge his duty by leaving to the future judgment of the House to decide what change in the law should be made, rather than to take the responsibility of the change on his single vote.

The procedure in this House should be the same as the procedure in the House of Commons. I know in the time that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, occupied the Chair you more than once referred to the procedure in the House of Commons. In the years 1965 to 1968 the member for Stuart occupied the Chair and I was Chairman of Committees. On the one or two occasions he and I had to give a casting vote we observed the same principles. Last week, the member for Stuart spoke to his motion regarding excess water rates and the voting on the motion was equal. I have already referred to what a Speaker should do when the voting is equal: like any other member he "is at liberty" to vote according to his conscience, without assigning a reason, but so as not to make a final decision. Last week, before giving his casting vote on the motion of the member for Stuart, the Speaker of the House—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in this debate in speaking about the duties of the Speaker. We are dealing with a Bill before the House, and the honourable member should confine his remarks to that Bill. The honourable member's remarks about the Speaker in this debate are out of order. I have exercised considerable latitude in respect of the honourable member and, as Deputy Speaker, I think he should realize—

Mr. LAWN: I am replying to the Premier's decision to legislate for 47 members and not 48 members. The reason for advocating 45 members was to have an uneven or odd number of members in the House. If there is an even number of members, say 56 or 48, the House has to appoint one member to the Chair, leaving an uneven number of members. I have said what the Premier's advocacy has achieved: an odd number of members and an odd member.

Mr. Ryan: Very odd.

Mr. LAWN: The odd member himself says he is an Independent member. He has been elected to the Chair to give impartial decisions.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What the Chair is complaining of now are the reflections on the Speaker of the House. I ask the honourable member to refrain from reflecting on the Speaker.

Mr. LAWN: I am pleased to know that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, agree with me. As I said earlier, during the years that you occupied the Chair you gave your decisions in accordance with the practices and procedures of the House of Commons.

Mr. Clark: And satisfied us all.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, I now argue that perpetuation of the present odd numbers in the House will not give effect to the high standard of Speakership the House has had in the past.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: I am reflecting not on the Speaker but on his actions in casting his vote. I cannot help the decisions he makes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to be seated. I refer the honourable member to Standing Orders Nos. 146 and 147. Standing Order No. 146 states:

No member shall allude to any debate of the same session, upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by the indulgence of the House for personal explanations.

The honourable member has been referring to another debate that was held recently in this Chamber. I am sure that he knows that to do so is out of order. Standing Order No. 147 states:

No member shall reflect upon any vote of the House; except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

I believe the honourable member, in referring to the Speaker's giving a casting vote, was reflecting on a vote of the House.

Mr. LAWN: Knowing what I intended to say, I had hoped that the Speaker would be

in the Chair when I spoke this afternoon. However, I still intend to say it, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: I did not want to have this argument with you, Sir. I had hoped to have it with his eminence the Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: With all due respect to you, Sir, I must persist and say what I have to say, because it relates to the position brought about by having an odd number of members in this House. The House is entitled to have impartial decisions made by the Speaker, in accordance with the procedure laid down in the House of Commons. If we do not get these decisions, I have the right to speak up on behalf of the people I represent in this House and to expose the Speaker's partial decisions.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! What I am saying is that the honourable member cannot do that in this debate.

Mr. LAWN: Very well. Last week the Speaker gave a casting vote on a motion moved by the member for Stuart. The Speaker said, "I have consulted my constituents and they have told me I can give a casting vote against this motion. However, if the Government had proposed an increase in rebate water rates that would have been a different matter." How is that an impartial decision of the Speaker's?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: In exercising his casting vote, the Speaker said, "I have consulted my constituents and, as the increase applies to the excess water rate, they do not mind; but, if it was an increase in the rebate charge, it would be a different matter." That attitude is not in line with the Speaker's duties. In view of the argument we are having, Sir, I have not time to give the exact reference, but May states that, when a member becomes Speaker, he loses his right to make independent decisions and must make completely impartial decisions.

In 1963, we had the same Speaker as we have now (the thirty-ninth member of the House), and that was the only occasion on which he gave his casting vote (which in that case he gave on the second reading of a Bill) in favour of something introduced by my Party, which was then in Opposition. I will tell you why he did that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In 1963, acting as the member for Ridley, the Speaker was pressing the Playford Government to introduce a Bill to provide for a Totalizator Agency Board. All members will recall that. Speaking to me—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will not allow the honourable member to pursue his line of argument.

Mr. LAWN: All right, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will have to name me because I intend to make this statement. I am sorry, but I just have to make it, and you can name me, which will give me the opportunity, under Standing Order No. 170, to make an explanation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. I ask him to consider what he has said and not to make any further reflections on a member of the House or on the Speaker.

Mr. LAWN: You say they are reflections, Sir, but they are facts. I am only telling members what they know and, if I have to be named, I will have to be named. I am not telling lies: I am speaking the truth. This is the fourth session in which the member for Ridley has been Speaker and only once in this time has he given his casting vote in favour of a measure introduced by my Party. However, according to May, the Speaker should always declare carried the second reading of a Bill when there is an equality of votes. In 1963, my Party did not intend to introduce a Bill relating to workmen's compensation. However, the member for Ridley approached me, asking for my support (along with that of some of my colleagues) for a Bill to provide for a Totalizator Agency Board. I said, "No workmen's compensation, Tommy, no T.A.B." He said, "What?" I said, "If we cannot have workmen's compensation provided to cover employees as they travel to and from work, similar to the provisions that apply in other States and to Commonwealth employees in this State, as far as I am concerned there will be no T.A.B." As a result of that conversation, I was able to get my Party to introduce a Bill for one thing only: to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act so that employees would be covered as they travelled to and from their place of employment.

Before the second reading of that Bill was put to the House, I went to my colleagues and said, "I'll bet you two bob that we get his casting vote in favour of the second reading." Incidentally, this was the second session in which he had been the Speaker. I had a few bets and I think my colleagues would have liked me to be betting £100 instead of 2s. As a result of his casting vote, I was able to collect my bets. In less than 20 minutes the third reading of the Bill was to be put to the House, so I went around again to give my colleagues an opportunity to get

their money back. They said, "It is less than 20 minutes since he gave his casting vote for us; he will surely have to give it to us again", but he did not and I went around and collected again.

That is the only time, while he has been Speaker, that the member for Ridley has given his casting vote in favour of my Party, but we are entitled to have an impartial Speaker. A member of the Liberal and Country League, Sir Robert Nicholls (his portrait faces us) was another Speaker, and during the six years that I was a member and he was Speaker (until his retirement) I could not fault him. He gave me, as a new member of this place, as good a go as any Cabinet member who had been in this place for 30 years.

Mr. Clark: And guidance, too.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. When members got off the track, he would say, "If the honourable member says so and so, he will be in order, but he should not proceed along the line he is following." He was helpful to all members, whether Labor, L.C.L. or Independent.

Mr. Clark: And he had their respect.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, so much so that it was the Frank Walsh Government that arranged for the portrait now hanging in this Chamber. The present Speaker (and I challenge any member opposite to deny this) will never have his portrait hanging in this Chamber because neither the L.C.L. nor the Labor Party will arrange for it. The member for Ridley has been prepared to sell himself for the honour and prestige of being able to be called "Mr. Speaker" in the House of Assembly, and for an expected knighthood. Members opposite are not denying what I am saying: they fully agree with it. We all know what happened this year following the Speaker's appointment.

Mr. Rodda: You're playing it very rough.

Mr. Ryan: We are playing it fair dinkum.

Mr. LAWN: I always play it rough, but fairly and truthfully. I say things to a person's face, not behind his back. I had hoped the Speaker would be in the Chamber when I made this speech, and there is no reason why he is not here this afternoon. Last Thursday no-one wanted me to rise to speak and, as the Speaker was absent, I preferred to wait until today. Let me remind the Government Whip of what has happened. Since I have been a member, the Speaker has hitherto always been Chairman of the Joint House Committee, but what happened this year? The present Speaker was defeated in this case, and is not Chairman of the Joint

House Committee. His appointment could not have been stopped by the votes of my Party, as we do not have the numbers. Therefore, he was defeated by members of the Party opposite. I have been told by L.C.L. members that they do not like him any more than we do.

Mr. Venning: You are talking a lot of rubbish.

Mr. LAWN: People from the honourable member's district have told me that they do not like him any more than we do. They say they do not want him, but are forced to use him. If he thinks he will get a knighthood as a result of his service to the Liberal Party, he has another think coming. We could call him a drop, which is a drip with a swollen head. I have concluded my remarks, and I am grateful to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I would have insisted that I be named rather than forgo my opportunity. However, I would have preferred to make those remarks in the presence of Mr. Speaker. I support the second reading but I will try strenuously to amend the Bill in Committee and to call the bluff of the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn).

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! In referring to the remarks of the member for Adelaide, I point out that the Chair, in its earlier comments, did not mean to indicate that any honourable member could be denied the right to criticize a Speaker or to reflect on a Speaker. However, if he does so, he must do it by way of a substantive motion. I refer the member for Adelaide and other honourable members to this statement by Erskine May at page 396 of the 17th edition of *Parliamentary Practice*:

Matters to be dealt with by a substantive motion: Certain matters cannot be debated, save upon a substantive motion which admits of a distinct vote of the House. Among these may be mentioned the conduct of the Sovereign, the heir to the Throne, the Governors-General of the Dominions, the Lord Chancellor, the Speaker, the Chairman of Ways and Means, members of either House of Parliament and judges of the superior courts of the United Kingdom, including persons holding the position of a judge, such as a judge in a court of bankruptcy and of a county court, or a recorder.

Order! The honourable member for Barossa.

Mr. LAWN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had not completed my remarks, and I have the right to conclude them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member had finished making his remarks.

Mr. LAWN: No, I had not.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: The Speaker cannot be compared with members of the Royal family.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Barossa.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I, like other members, have examined the Bill and my first comment is that the title, Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill, shows that this is not a reform measure but just an extension of the present gerrymander. We on this side realize that, electorally, there is no democracy in South Australia and that the passing of this Bill will merely lessen the severity of the present position. During the debate reference has been made to the increase in the number of the members of the House of Assembly from 39 to 47, and I wish to compare this with the number of members in the Parliaments of other States.

At present the New South Wales Lower House comprises 94 districts, that in Victoria 73, in Queensland 78, in Western Australia 50 and in Tasmania, with proportional representation, 35, or four fewer than the present 39 districts in South Australia even though our population is four times that of Tasmania. Therefore, I see nothing wrong with increasing the number of districts by eight.

Mr. Jennings: We have one fewer district than we had 30 years ago.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, although our population is increasing daily. There is certainly a great need for redistribution in this State, because of the disproportionate numbers of electors in the districts. The following table compares the numbers of electors enrolled in each district in 1956, when the last redistribution took place, with the number enrolled on March 2 last, when the last election was held:

House of Assembly District	Enrolment	
	1968	1956
Adelaide	15,061	22,482
Albert	8,154	6,633
Alexandra	13,870	6,711
Angas	6,794	6,418
Barossa	17,975	6,562
Burnside	37,430	23,021
Burra	5,777	6,266
Chaffey	7,880	7,122
Edwardstown	34,121	23,012
Enfield	45,510	22,728
Eyre	7,655	6,809
Flinders	7,717	6,313
Frome	4,988	6,156
Gawler	35,122	8,307
Glennelg	37,442	23,362
Gouger	12,523	6,671
Gumeracha	7,745	6,762
Hindmarsh	22,521	22,809
Light	5,941	6,601
Millicent	7,649	6,468

House of Assembly District	Enrolment	
	1968	1956
Mitcham	27,057	21,001
Mount Gambier	10,142	7,271
Murray	8,727	7,263
Norwood	19,262	22,974
Onkaparinga	7,857	6,638
Port Adelaide	22,565	23,366
Port Pirie	6,665	6,951
Ridley	7,368	6,467
Rocky River	5,548	6,368
Semaphore	24,306	21,059
Stirling	7,514	7,003
Stuart	8,848	6,534
Torrens	19,488	22,440
Unley	19,163	22,140
Victoria	7,382	6,711
Walleroo	5,834	6,601
West Torrens	39,364	22,921
Whyalla	14,125	6,845
Yorke Peninsula	6,556	6,537

Although I do not wish to compare these figures with those of the Legislative Council, I shall quote the Council figures as a matter of interest. In 1956 the number of electors enrolled for Central District No. 1 was 53,155, whereas the total in 1968 was 79,899. For Central District No. 2 the figure increased from 54,954 in 1956 to 84,220 in 1968. For the Southern District, the figure was 23,125 in 1956 but 35,347 in 1968. In 1956 there were 20,044 electors for the Midland District compared with 44,550 in 1968. For the Northern District, 22,963 electors were enrolled in 1956 compared with 31,685 in 1968.

I will now analyse some of these figures. They show some decreases in country districts compared with large increases in some metropolitan districts, although the numbers of electors in some metropolitan districts have decreased. In 1956 there were 21,001, or the smallest number, on an electoral roll for one metropolitan seat. I should not have to speak about metropolitan or country seats, but this is the situation in which I am forced to make comparisons.

Mr. Virgo: The Bill is designed to retain the difference between country and city, and that is wrong.

Mrs. BYRNE: Of course it is. In 1956 there were 21,001 electors enrolled for the District of Mitcham compared with 23,366 for the District of Port Adelaide. In Frome there were 6,156 electors compared with 8,307 in Gawler. There was a large difference between the numbers of electors on the metropolitan rolls compared with those on country rolls, a difference in ratio of nearly four to one. The largest city seat was Port Adelaide with 23,366 electors, compared with Frome with 6,156, a difference of nearly four to one. That was the electoral situation in 1956 when the present

distribution was drawn up. In 1968, the number of electors on the roll for the District of Adelaide in the metropolitan area was 15,061, compared with 45,510 for the District of Enfield, a difference of three to one between metropolitan districts.

Frome now has 4,988 electors, the number decreasing because of the population shift, compared with 35,122 in Gawler, so in that case there is a difference between country districts of seven to one. The difference between metropolitan and country districts in 1968 is a ratio of nine to one, with the District of Enfield having 45,510 electors compared with 4,988 in Frome. The ratio of nine to one between these electorates is a disgrace and seems to indicate different responsibilities, whereas all members of Parliament have equal responsibility whether they represent a country or a metropolitan district. It is undesirable that this situation should continue. The results of the last State election focussed attention on the electoral situation in this State. It was not the first time this had occurred, because the Liberal and Country League—

Mr. McKee: The eyes of the world are on us.

Mrs. BYRNE: True. Past L.C.L. Governments had their last majority in 1944, when the L.C.L. recorded 113,536 votes against 104,658 for the Australian Labor Party in a total vote of 255,883.

Mr. Jennings: That is the only time since single electorates.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. The same situation is still being tolerated in 1968.

Mr. Virgo: The L.C.L. is still thinking in the 1800's.

Mr. McAnaney: There have been many uncontested seats in the past.

Mrs. BYRNE: Because of the honourable member's interest I will quote the figures for each year since then. In 1947, the L.C.L. recorded 111,216 votes compared with 133,959 for the A.L.P., out of a total of 285,765.

Mr. McAnaney: How many seats were contested?

Mrs. BYRNE: I do not know but the honourable member can refute these figures if he thinks they are not accurate. In 1950, the L.C.L. recorded 113,673 votes against 134,952 recorded by the A.L.P. in a total of 290,306 votes. In 1953, the L.C.L. recorded 119,106 votes compared with 166,517 votes for the A.L.P., out of a total of 336,592. In 1956, out of 280,811 votes cast, 100,569 were for the L.C.L. and 129,853 were for the A.L.P. In 1959, out of 400,531 votes cast, 143,710

were for the L.C.L. and 191,933 were for the A.L.P., which was still going ahead. In 1962, out of 417,462 votes cast, 140,507 were for the L.C.L. and 219,780 were for the A.L.P. Even if there were three or four uncontested seats, they would not make much difference. In 1965, when the A.L.P. members were elected to the Government benches, of the 513,064 votes cast, 179,183 were for the L.C.L. and 274,432 were for the A.L.P.

Mr. Jennings: There were no uncontested seats that time.

Mrs. BYRNE: Nor were there any uncontested seats at the 1968 election, when out of 575,904 votes cast, 246,553 were for the L.C.L. and 292,442 were for the A.L.P. I should like to analyse the votes cast in 1968. Of the final votes cast, the A.L.P. gained 292,442; the L.C.L. 246,553; the Democratic Labor Party, 9,223; the Social Credit League, 4,792; the Communist Party, 1,606; Independent candidates, 5,781; and the Country Party, 2,251. The total formal vote for all candidates was 562,648, and there were 13,256 informal votes. The total vote, including informal votes, was 575,904, out of a total of 609,626 people on the electoral rolls for the House of Assembly. These figures show that the total A.L.P. vote exceeded the total L.C.L. vote by 45,889.

Mr. Virgo: Yet the L.C.L. is in Government.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. The total A.L.P. vote exceeded the combined totals of the L.C.L. and all other Parties by 22,236, and it exceeded these combined totals plus the informal votes by 8,980, yet A.L.P. members have to put up with being on the Opposition benches while the minority Party sits on the Government benches. The above figures show that the A.L.P. gained 51.98 per cent and the L.C.L. gained 43.82 per cent of the total formal vote. These results show that A.L.P. members were returned in 19 electoral districts (mostly urban districts), which have 390,643 electors, whereas L.C.L. members were returned in 19 electoral districts (mostly rural districts), which have 211,615 electors. In other words, 211,615 people are represented by 19 L.C.L. members and 390,643 people are represented by 19 A.L.P. members.

I said earlier that this Bill certainly does not come up to my ideals and it certainly does not provide for one vote one value, the principle for which my Party stands. I am always amazed when I hear arguments that the principle of one vote one value should

not be applied on a State basis, yet there is no argument against it on a Commonwealth basis. There has recently been a redistribution in the Commonwealth sphere, and I should like to quote the figures for each Commonwealth electoral district.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Didn't your Commonwealth Leader have something to say about the Commonwealth redistribution?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Barossa.

Mrs. BYRNE: I do not know to what Leader the Attorney-General is referring, but in any case it has nothing to do with what I am saying. Under the Commonwealth redistribution there will be in the Adelaide electoral district 55,580 electors; Angas, 47,657; Barker, 49,103; Bonython, 48,360; Boothby, 54,622; Grey, 45,373; Hindmarsh, 54,343; Hawker, 53,549; Kingston, 50,199; Port Adelaide, 54,576; Sturt, 49,225; and Wakefield, 46,234. The total number of electors is 608,821. Since it is considered all right for Commonwealth electorates to be divided in this way, I cannot see why it cannot be done on a State basis. The Commonwealth electoral districts cover a much larger area and have much larger numbers. This is particularly significant when we consider the number of electors in some of the smaller electoral districts for the House of Assembly.

Unlike members of the State Parliament, members of the Commonwealth Parliament have secretaries to help them with their work. In the State Parliament only Ministers and other members with special responsibilities have personal secretaries; all other members have to share the services of four secretaries. Such a provision is completely inadequate, and it will certainly have to be increased if the number of members of Parliament is increased. However, this unsatisfactory position cannot be dealt with at this time. It has been suggested that country members would be at a disadvantage if there were about the same number of electors in each electoral district.

Mr. Jennings: Why doesn't that apply in the Commonwealth sphere?

Mrs. BYRNE: Quite: it does not apply on a Commonwealth basis, although in many instances Commonwealth Parliamentarians have 10 times as many electors to look after, even under the new redistribution. At present, in some cases they would have up to 20 times as many electors to look after. Nevertheless, they can manage and, of course, some

country members are not disadvantaged in any way. Also, country people are more mobile nowadays. There is nothing to stop members from telephoning electors, if they so desire, or electors from telephoning or writing to members who represent the sparsely populated districts. I have found in the Barossa District, where I have what one might term a country section and a metropolitan section, that 95 per cent of the work comes from the metropolitan section. Not many people in the other section contact me.

Mr. Freebairn: That's because they contact me.

Mrs. BYRNE: I do not know whether people in my district contact the member for Light, but I suppose we could all say that at times people from other members' districts contact us. The electoral system should not be a means of offsetting any disadvantages experienced by country dwellers but, of course, this Bill perpetuates such a system, to which the Labor Party and I personally are opposed. Under the Bill, there could be a difference, in extremes, of 100 per cent, that is, with perhaps 16,453 in the largest city district as against 8,199 in the smallest country district. That difference is far too great.

Mr. Virgo: It is the old two to one ratio again.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, it certainly is. I am glad the member for Light has come into the House, because I wish to comment on something he said when speaking in this debate. On August 13 last, at page 587 of *Hansard*, he said:

I do not believe the preferences of any of those Communist Party candidates were allocated in favour of any Labor Party candidate, but this has happened in South Australia, and I believe it happened to a member who later became a Minister in the last Labor Government. He got into the House of Assembly on the preferences.

Of course, this was a vague insinuation, for no name, year, or other figures were given to back up the statement.

Mr. Freebairn: You know who it was, surely.

Mrs. BYRNE: No-one else has backed up this statement or been able to produce anything to show that it is correct.

Mr. Virgo: He got mixed up with Killen in Moreton.

Mrs. BYRNE: I was coming to that. A Commonwealth Liberal Party member was elected to the House of Representatives on Communist preferences.

Mr. Virgo: And kept the Menzies Government in power!

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, it was a crucial election at which the A.L.P. won 60 seats and the Liberal and Country Party coalition won 62. Of course, had the A.L.P. won the seat in question, it would have been 61-all. Although there are 124 seats, two of these were not included at the time because they did not have the sufficient quota on the Commonwealth roll. I refer to the seats of Australian Capital Territory and Northern Territory, both of which were represented at that time by A.L.P. members.

Mr. Virgo: They were non-voting members.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. The Liberal and Country Party retained office in Canberra in 1961 with Communist preferences.

Mr. Jennings: But this member to whom you are referring was not a Liberal; he was an arch-Tory.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. So no-one can say that I have not substantiated my remarks, I now intend to quote the figures concerning the House of Representatives election on December 9, 1961, namely, the detailed return for the District of Moreton (Queensland) as follows: the Queensland Labor Party candidate recorded 3,882 first preference votes; the Communist candidate, 676; the Liberal candidate (Mr. Killen), 22,667; and the A.L.P. candidate, 25,123, making a total of 54,269 including informals. The preferences of the Communist candidate were allocated in the way of 93 to the Liberal candidate, as against 390 to the A.L.P. and 193 to the Q.L.P. candidate. As the Liberal candidate could not have won the seat by 130 without the 93 Communist preferences, it could not be said that this was not a crucial election or that the Government was not in the balance and did not depend on any Communist preferences.

Finally, as I trust that the Bill will be improved in the Committee stage, I support the second reading.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): Much has been said about this Bill, and when we analyse the reason for its introduction now we see that politics have been played (and played extremely low) in respect of the measure. The Leader of the Opposition wished to introduce a Bill on July 24, 1968 (only a few weeks ago), but that Bill was voted out in what was probably record time for any electoral reform Bill to be voted out.

Mr. Clark: It was a good Bill, too.

Mr. RYAN: As a matter of fact, it was never explained, because, owing to the present set-up in South Australia, the Leader could not obtain the permission of the House to suspend Standing Orders and to introduce a Bill to set up a commission to bring down electoral reform.

Mr. Clark: We were prevented from explaining it.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. At present, as a result of the electoral system, South Australia practically has a dictatorship, which has been created by the electoral boundaries and the system applying in this State in which the power of determining who shall govern is vested in the hands of one person. That person is not tied to a political Party.

Mr. Clark: Not much!

Mr. RYAN: Not directly, or at least so we are told; he is not tied to any direct affiliation to or membership of a Party, so we have a dictatorship in this State.

Mr. McKee: What is your interpretation of a dictator?

Mr. RYAN: It is one who "suppresses or succeeds a democratically elected Government", That is the dictionary interpretation. What do we have in South Australia? We have one person who suppresses or succeeds a democratically elected Government.

Mr. Clark: Is a Parliament necessary, in the present circumstances?

Mr. RYAN: No; a Parliament is not necessary under the present set-up and will not be necessary until there is an alteration in our present electoral boundaries.

Mr. Lawn: In other words, it is just a mockery.

Mr. RYAN: It is a mockery of democracy. There is no doubt about that because, when the Leader of the Opposition tried on July 24 this year to get a suspension of Standing Orders in order to introduce a Bill to set up a commission, he was suppressed from doing so. Under the present set-up the Government (whether we refer to the Liberal and Country League or to the so-called Independent from Ridley, who is the dictator of South Australia) has succeeded a democratically elected Government. This is why South Australia is referred to as the "hill-billy State of politics". The newspapers that have referred to us in that way do not represent the Labor Party, nor do they contribute to the Labor Party: they contribute to the L.C.L.

Mr. Clark: And even they were disgusted.

Mr. RYAN: Of course they were. We have seen politics sink to the lowest depth of a bottomless pit in this State.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the development of this State?

Mr. RYAN: The development of this State has not come about because of the minority L.C.L. Government. We can refer to it as the Hall-Stott Government, although I prefer to call it the Stott-Hall Government, because the first named is more important to the Government.

Mr. McAnaney: The employment figures are rising.

Mr. RYAN: It cannot be a good Government because it should not be a Government at all, but unfortunately it is. The L.C.L. Government is kept in power by the vote and the direction of one person, and that one person was elected by a small minority of the electors of this State. The Government is kept in office by the casting vote of the Independent member of this House.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McAnaney: You had two members beaten at the election.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Lawn: This is where the House is wasting time, more so this session than ever before.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYAN: I hope I am not accused of wasting the time of this House. We have always prided ourselves here that we have freedom of speech and expression, but the expression of policy was terminated on April 16 of this year when one member, elected by a small minority (a handful of votes), determined who should be the Government and what policy should be in operation in this State. That is not democracy. We have often been told that in politics we must accept the umpire's decision.

Mr. Rodda: And you are not doing that.

Mr. Lawn: There are rules for umpires and for players.

Mr. RYAN: There are rules for umpires and for Independent members of Parliament. We were told before April 16 that if a certain member was elected to Parliament he would not use his position to unseat the Government. That member obviously has no principles whatsoever.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. Under the Standing Orders he must not reflect on any other member of the House, and I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. RYAN: I am referring to the set-up of the electoral boundaries in this State, which allows the creation of the House that we have now. The present Bill is one that we hope—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is in order in referring to the Bill and to the electoral boundaries but he is not in order in reflecting on another member of the House. While he continues to refer to the electoral boundaries he is quite in order, but he cannot reflect on any other member.

Mr. RYAN: The electoral boundaries that we have seen in this State for many years have accounted for the set-up that existed from 1962 to 1965, and again in 1968. That is the system under which the electoral boundaries were created—not by the Opposition but by this Government. The Government knew full well that the set-up of the electoral boundaries in South Australia would allow for that position, and that is what has happened today—a House of 39 members, 19 on each side and one person determining the policy of South Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: He was properly elected.

Mr. RYAN: Under a proper electoral system, should one person be the Government of the State and be able to determine, by his vote, what that policy should be?

Mr. McAnaney: It is the policy on which we were elected.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Port Adelaide.

Mr. RYAN: It has been said here by members of the Government Party that they were elected to become the Government. That is the most ridiculous statement that any member could make.

Mr. Lawn: They were elected by 43 per cent of the electorate.

Mr. RYAN: Members opposite were never elected by the people and, except for one occasion, since 1938 the L.C.L. Government was never elected democratically. As for the "democratically elected L.C.L. Government", the Governor himself asked the Labor Government to continue in office. What was the final result? It was not the L.C.L. that defeated the Labor Government: it was the present set-up of the electoral boundaries that defeated us. The present Government realized that the Millicent by-election was of the utmost importance to it, but the Labor Party won that by-election. Now, we have an L.C.L. minority Government refusing the Labor Opposition the right to suspend Standing Orders in order to introduce a Bill on electoral reform.

As far as I know, this is the first time in this House that one person has been able to suppress a majority in favour of a minority.

Mr. Lawn: In the old days Independent members were always given the right to introduce a Bill.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, they were always given the right to suspend Standing Orders to introduce a Bill. Since I have been in Parliament the procedure has been to give any member the right to introduce and give the second reading of a Bill, whether his Party was the minority or majority Party. That long-standing practice has been taken away from the Opposition: no longer is it being given the right to suspend Standing Orders to introduce something the Government does not want. Is this a democratic Parliament or is it a dictatorship?

Mr. McAnaney: When your Party was in Government your Minister of Agriculture refused me the right to move an amendment.

Mr. RYAN: The member for Stirling will never learn.

Mr. McAnaney: What's the difference?

Mr. RYAN: When the Labor Government was in office after having been democratically elected by the majority of the State's voters it always allowed the Opposition to move a second reading. It is in Committee that an amendment can be moved.

Mr. McAnaney: I was not allowed to move the amendment.

Mr. RYAN: The Opposition never got to the Committee stage on an electoral reform Bill.

Mr. McAnaney: I was talking about general principles.

Mr. RYAN: There are no principles as far as the Liberal and Country League and those supporting it are concerned: they disregard the wishes of the majority. The only thing the L.C.L. wants is power, irrespective of the wishes of the majority. This is the only reason, and it has been proved. This Government has been elected by 43 per cent of the State's voters. If that is not hillbilly politics, I do not know what is. I would never want to be a member of the hillbilly Government.

Mr. McAnaney: You were a member of the hillbilly Administration.

Mr. RYAN: When my Party was in Government we were proud of what we did, and so were the people. We decided what we thought was correct. During the Labor Government's regime it never happened that some people voted no confidence in a Minister in charge of a department with which they were directly concerned. We never reached

that stage, but we carried on in a democratic way—not as this Government is doing at present.

Mr. McAnaney: What about my amendment?

Mr. RYAN: I heard someone sitting near me mention that the member for Stirling dreamt his amendment. Some of the statements emanating from the Government benches show how ridiculous they are and how ridiculous the Government is. It must be a ridiculous Government. The newspapers in other States have referred to it in this way on many occasions.

Mr. Lawn: Some Cabinet members from another place do not speak to their colleagues in this Chamber.

Mr. RYAN: True. This is borne out by the planning of two functions for the same day. This shows the co-operation between Ministers! This is an amazing Bill. The Opposition considers it imperative to introduce a Bill for electoral reform, but what do we see? Almost every Government member spoke in opposition to the Bill and opposed its principle.

Mr. Broomhill: They have not given any reasons.

Mr. RYAN: The only reason they have given is that the Bill provides too many seats. This makes a mockery of democracy. If members oppose the Bill they are hypocritical of democracy.

Mr. McAnaney: I can't understand that.

Mr. RYAN: Many of the things the Government does are not understood by the public of South Australia. The sooner the people are given the right to elect the Party of their wishes, the better it will be for the State. The amazing thing about the Bill is that every member of the Government who has spoken has said that the Labor Party's principle of one vote one value cannot be implemented, but I repeat what the member for Barossa said this afternoon and what other honourable members have said: in the Commonwealth there is a one vote one value principle, and the L.C.L. has eight members and the Labor Party three. This is on a one vote one value basis, and the commissioners adopted this principle for South Australia. There can be a slight movement up or down for every Commonwealth seat, but the basic principle in a Commonwealth redistribution is one vote one value. In the Commonwealth Parliament at present this State has eight L.C.L. members and three A.L.P. members.

Mr. Corcoran: It's a coalition.

Mr. RYAN: Yes. The South Australian Parliament has the second lowest number of members of any State in the Commonwealth, irrespective of size or the number of electors. No State Parliament on the mainland has fewer members than South Australia has. Over the years we have had progressively fewer members. Now the Government is saying that the numbers provided by this Bill should not be so, and every Government member has stipulated this. The only time South Australia had fewer members of Parliament than at present was between 1856 and 1875, when there were 36 members. The highest number the State had was in 1890, when it had 54 members which is 15 more than we have at present. The number of electors then was 324,721, whereas in 1938 the number was 592,000. This Bill increases the number of members, but it does not increase the representation to what it was in the last century. This is what the Government members call modern progress in the State's Parliament. New South Wales, with a population of over 4,000,000, has 94 members, and Tasmania, with a population of about 380,000, has 35 members. Tasmania has fewer than one-third of the population that South Australia has, but it has only four fewer members of Parliament. Victoria has a population of over 3,000,000 and a Lower House of 73 members. Queensland, which is not a backward State, has no Upper House and its Lower House has 78 members, the population of the State being 1,700,000. Western Australia which has a population of 893,000 is held to be comparable with South Australia in many respects, and it has a Lower House of 51 members. South Australia, with a population of 1,118,000, has a Lower House of 39 members, the smallest Lower House of any State on the mainland. Over many years it has been said that electoral reform was urgent in this State. The Labor Government attempted to alter the electoral system. Amazingly enough, this had not been done before, even by previous Labor Governments.

Of course, the present Bill has been initiated by the L.C.L. Although I oppose the setting up of the commission as set out in the Bill, I will not adopt the attitude of some people that it should not be allowed to pass the second reading. It has always been said that if a Bill is not allowed to pass the second reading stage then the privilege of members to introduce legislation is suppressed. Although I oppose parts of the Bill, I will adopt the principle that has been adopted in this Parliament and in Parliaments in democratic countries all over

the world of allowing the Bill to pass the second reading stage. I will then seek to have the Bill amended in Committee. For the benefit of the member for Stirling, this course was followed when he attempted to amend a Bill introduced by the Labor Government during its term of office between 1965 and 1968. That Bill passed the second reading; however, as the amendment submitted was not acceptable to the Government, it defeated it. If democratic principles are to apply, the Bill should be allowed to pass the second reading and amendments should be moved in Committee. With all due respect to you, Mr. Speaker, I point out that if democracy is to prevail amendments moved in Committee should be considered on their merits and in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the electors of this State. If that course is followed I have no doubt about what will happen to the Bill.

The Premier made great play about the urgency of the Bill. He has said that the L.C.L. Government introduced this Bill more quickly after taking office than the Labor Government introduced its Bill after taking office in 1965. However, the circumstances in 1965 were far different from those applying this year, because in 1965 a Labor Government had been elected for the first time in 32 years. Therefore, we are being told that, after 32 years in the wilderness of politics, we should have introduced a Bill in less time than the 107 days taken by the L.C.L. Government this year.

Mr. Virgo: The L.C.L. was subjected to much pressure outside.

Mr. RYAN: It was. We have seen some strange things happen in this Parliament since April 14 when this minority Government, whose policy is determined by a person who is not a member of the L.C.L., took office. Much can be said about Independents and the part one Independent is playing in keeping the present Government in office. However, one of the most ridiculous statements that has emanated from any member during this debate was that made by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) who said:

Nothing in the Constitution refers at all to Parties. The rotten part of the South Australian political situation is that Parties have developed.

They have developed because of the attitude of L.C.L. Governments over the years: the Labor Party has not had an opportunity to alter the rotten political situation that has operated in this State over many years. The honourable member continued:

If we were Independents—

God help us if we ever got to that stage, because we can see what Independents do to the political situation.

Mr. Corcoran: If we had 38 Independents, what policy would there be?

Mr. RYAN: It would be marvellous! The member for Onkaparinga said:

If we were Independents we would not be concerned with who won 53 per cent, or 43 per cent—

apparently the L.C.L. is greatly concerned about the discrepancy in the percentages—we would be concerned only with who won districts and with who represented those districts, and the group with the majority—they would all be Independent!—

would form the Government, whether that group consisted of four Parties, 10 Parties, or only one Party.

How can there be groups if all members are Independents? He continued:

We now have a reliable L.C.L. Government, elected by the people of the State—

If this matter was not so serious it would be laughable. However, electoral reform is important, because the people of South Australia want it. They do not want to be classified in the same category as the Government, which has been called a hillbilly Government. The ordinary, decent voter resents the fact that it is said that he votes in a hillbilly election in this State to elect a hillbilly Government, and the attitude of the average person is of the utmost importance.

Mr. Virgo: You should put that galley proof from which you are quoting in the garbage.

Mr. RYAN: That is where it really belongs—where the garbage man can throw it out. The member for Onkaparinga continued:

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 the present term of office to prove our effectiveness.

No-one knows better than you, Mr. Speaker, how long the life of the present Government will be. This will be determined by one member of the Parliament who says he is not affiliated to any political Party. Unless it has some tie-up with the member concerned, the L.C.L. will not have any say in how long it will govern—only one member can decide that. The member for Onkaparinga said that the L.C.L. was entitled to three years in office to prove its ability. I will not go on to deal with what the honourable member said about this.

Mr. Jennings: He worked day and night for three years to get preselection for his own Party.

Mr. RYAN: He said that he was determined to get into politics "irrespective", and he did. I appeal to not only the honourable member but to all members opposite to treat electoral reform on the basis of its value to the people. Almost every honourable member has said that he does not support the Bill in its entirety. That is because the L.C.L. has reduced country representation in South Australia. We at least allowed the *status quo* to continue regarding country representation. I repeat that I believe in the democratic principles of Parliament and I consider that a Bill, no matter how little merit it may have, should at least be given a second reading. I support the second reading but, if the Bill ultimately does not meet the requirements of democracy and the demands of the majority of the people of this State, I will voice my opposition to it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): We are approaching the end of another debate on electoral matters and those of us who have been here for some years have taken part in many such debates. However, this occasion is somewhat different, because the Bill provides for a change that has been forced upon the members of the Liberal and Country League by circumstance, not a change made by any desire to introduce a provision for anything resembling real democracy in South Australia. For 30 years we have had on our backs an electoral system which has denied democratic representation and which has become a political joke throughout Australia. The force of circumstances and of public opinion has at least brought forth a Bill which, although a long way from satisfactory, is certainly an improvement on what we have had put before us previously by members of the L.C.L.

Over the years I have often listened to members of the present Government Party speaking at public meetings or to students in our schools, extolling the virtues of democracy in this country and saying how our Parliamentary Government was modelled on the British system. However, when one looks back, one sees that through all those years there has been a determined and successful attempt by successive Liberal Governments to ensure that nothing approaching real democracy was ever adopted in this State. Nevertheless, the force of circumstance has now caused some radical alteration to be made. Even then, many members opposite tell us that this Bill goes too far. They are not satisfied

with the terms of reference proposed to be given to the commission. They think they are too liberal and that the country districts will not have sufficient advantage over metropolitan districts. The reasons advanced to try to justify the great difference in enrolments that they would have between country districts and metropolitan districts are interesting.

Before I deal with some of the arguments of Government members, I want to express my feelings on the Bill, and I do that in a few short sentences. The terms of reference allow for a situation in which the smallest country district could comprise 8,199 electors and the largest metropolitan district 16,453 electors, or a situation providing for a 100 per cent difference. Nobody can really justify this sort of difference, regardless of the argument submitted in relation to the needs of country members or their constituents. Clause 9, dealing with matters for consideration by the commission, gives no specific instruction to the commission to consider the probable movement of population. An amendment to this clause has been forecast, and that amendment is of great importance in fixing the boundaries.

When one considers the movement of population in the different districts, one finds that some districts have been static for a long time, that in a few the population is increasing rapidly and that in others the population is decreasing. Obviously, unless the Bill provides that the commission must consider probable movements of population, the boundaries and enrolments will become very much out of line soon. My colleagues have dealt with specific clauses and these clauses will be dealt with soon in the Committee stage, so I shall not refer to those matters. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) went out of his way to put up a very misleading argument by using statistics in a way that completely misrepresents the position regarding country districts. He has told us that the total area of this State is 380,070 square miles, of which only 711 square miles is in the new Adelaide metropolitan area, and he has said that this means that 99.8 per cent of South Australia is to be represented by only 18 members, in terms of the Bill. Well, we maintain that there will be 19 country members, but I leave that point aside for the moment.

Let us consider how the honourable member has dealt with these figures. True, the area of the State is 380,070 square miles, but the honourable member did not say that, if the area comprising the three largest districts is subtracted from that total, only 46,000 of the

380,070 square miles is left. This is the sort of argument he has advanced in telling us that in South Australia the average country district is 21,000 square miles and, using that as a basis, trying to convince us that country members are disadvantaged in regard to giving proper service to constituents. The fact is that the District of Whyalla comprises more than 161,000 square miles, whilst Frome has more than 141,000 square miles, and Eyre more than 30,000 square miles, a total of of about 333,000 square miles. The rest is divided amongst the other country districts, and working on the basis of the honourable member's argument of 18 members (which is incorrect under this Bill) it gives an average of about 3,000 square miles instead of 21,000 square miles. The honourable member uses those statistics to try to convince us that country members are at a disadvantage in representing their constituents. It was amusing to listen to the member for Stirling dealing with the question of country electors. Frequently, he tells us that he does his homework, but I found, when considering his speech, that he first referred to the Whyalla District as being a closely settled area (page 461 of *Hansard*), and at page 463 he said that the honourable member for Whyalla would be able to ride a bicycle around his district before breakfast—around 161,000 square miles! I can only say that the honourable member must regard me as superman.

Mr. Corcoran: He is considered the financial genius of the Party.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: He should be doing his homework much better than that.

Mr. Lawn: Was this the peanut that said that?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No, it was the financial wizard of Stirling, the mathematical genius.

Mr. Lawn: I thought it was the peanut, but it must have been knucklehead.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The member for Eyre said that he had travelled up to 50,000 miles a year to give people in his district the representation to which they were entitled and that he represented the largest district in this State. His district covers 30,000 square miles: Frome covers 140,000 and mine 161,000 square miles. Obviously, this is another case where arithmetic is a weak subject of the honourable member. He has been in this House only for a few months, but he said that he travelled up to 50,000 miles a year to give people proper representation.

His constituents do not expect him to travel 50,000 miles a year. All of them are within one day of him by letter; why should they expect him to go around year after year travelling 50,000 miles and shaking hands with them? Is that an important part of a member's duty? These arguments are utterly ridiculous. It is a pity that Government members do not analyse these statements and ask themselves, "What are the duties of a country member?" I can speak from experience, because I represent the largest district in this State. The figures of my majority do not represent any lack of faith or support by electors in my district. What is a country member supposed to do? What is his most important job, which is the same as that of any other member? As a member he has to represent the majority views of his electors when dealing with legislation. This is the most important duty of all members, because what he does in respect of that legislation affects his electors most.

My colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, said it was important that the member should act as an agent for his constituents, but that it is a secondary consideration. Furthermore, if we are honest (and it is time that we were honest on this subject) we shall admit that, in the main, constituents come to a member for help after they have tried other services. Most of them are within one day's delivery of a letter. We deal with their problems to the best of our ability, but that is not the major duty of a member of Parliament. Whilst it is good for a member to be able to see as many of his constituents as possible, the idea that he has to go around all the time shaking hands with everyone is sheer nonsense, and not the duty of a member of Parliament. It is his duty to make as much contact as possible with his constituents but not to go to such extremes that his other work suffers.

When I first became a member of this House, I realized that if I travelled over some thousands of square miles of my district continuously I would need a four-wheel drive vehicle and I would not have time to do anything else. If I followed the principle of meeting all the people all the time I would not be able to carry out my duty as a member of this House. It is poppycock to say that this is the main duty of a member. I circled people in the remote areas of my district and told them that it would be impossible for me to visit them frequently, but that they could write to me and I would give them service. That is what they have

done when it was required; they have not complained, and they have received the service. I know well the district of the member for Eyre, and I know that there are remote areas in it, but I am sure he does not have to travel any more than I have to. I go to the centres of population in my district, for instance, Andamooka, Coober Pedy and Woomera, when I can, but I would go more often if facilities were better.

The question of area and distance is not the overriding consideration in representation by a member. Work in the district depends on several factors, and there is far more work for a member in an area that is rapidly expanding and with migrants coming in than in the mainly static country districts where hardly anything new happens from one year's end to another, and Government members know that. In places in South Australia considerable activity occurs where there is expansion and where migrants come in, and all those factors place on a member a greater load of work than does the question of square miles, acreages, or anything similar. Government members know this, too. All the arguments for this assertion that country districts should have fewer constituents are based on acreages, areas, distances and so on, but they are not valid. They only have a small validity and I will show how the problem can be met, something which has never been attempted by Liberal Governments in the past.

We should aim to get as close as possible to the one vote one value system, which is the basis of democracy. This principle works in the Commonwealth sphere: no-one wants to revert to a different system there. Matters dealt with in the Commonwealth sphere are just as important to individual people as are matters dealt with in this House. Questions of defence and income tax are very important.

Mr. Jennings: And social services.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. The arguments advanced by members opposite about the need for fewer constituents in country electoral districts are almost completely hollow, and I say this as the member for the largest electoral district in South Australia.

Mr. McAnaney: You haven't many country electors in the Whyalla District.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Whyalla. The honourable member for Stirling is out of order.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have 3,000 country people in my electoral district outside of the city of Whyalla and this number is more than half the total number

of electors in the Frome District, so I suppose it is a considerable number. I find that these country electors are reasonably satisfied with the service I have given. The member for Stirling said, "I do not think country people's interests are very much different from those of city people." I would say "Hear, hear" to that. At last the truth has hit the honourable member. That being so, and since I think I have proved that the most important duty of a member of Parliament is to deal with legislation as it affects the interests of his electors, surely this question of acres, area and travelling is minor compared with what the honourable member has agreed is the main point. The interests are not very different: they are all interwoven.

Of course, this idea of separation of interests has been deliberately fostered over the years. In introducing his electoral reform proposals in 1963 or 1964, Sir Thomas Playford tried to do away with a Labor seat in the northern country towns. He wanted to cut Port Augusta in half and put half of it in the Whyalla District, which already had the largest area of all the electoral districts in the State. The people of Whyalla were not to be treated as country people at all.

Mr. Hudson: Because they voted Labor.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Exactly. Sir Thomas Playford did not take into consideration quarrying, fishing, forestry and mining, all of which are primary industries, purely to establish the idea of an industrial country town.

Mr. Clark: This, of course, was a new idea dictated by circumstances.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. The L.C.L. has always been dictated to by circumstances, merely to keep power in its own hands. There was never any question of trying to achieve a democratic arrangement: that was the last thing to be sought. The L.C.L. has held to the pernicious doctrine that country people should have special privileges because their interests are opposed to those of the rest of the people in the State. It is time this doctrine was knocked on the head.

Mr. Jennings: What good has it done the country people?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No good. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) pointed out that during the regime of the Playford Government the education system in the country was deplorable, because it never received the treatment that it deserved. Country people had to wait for the Labor Government to come to office in 1965.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The honourable member for Whyalla.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It took the Labor Government to look at primary schools on Eyre Peninsula that needed a secondary "top" because the children who needed to attend secondary classes were too distant from ordinary secondary schools. It took the Labor Government to introduce equal pay for equal work for women teachers. It took the Labor Government to abolish the system whereby women teachers had to resign when they married. The Minister of Education today gave figures that showed there were fewer resignations caused by marriage during the last two years of the Labor Government's term of office. It took the Labor Government to introduce the free book scheme. It took the Labor Government to make it possible for libraries in new secondary schools to receive \$1,000 and for libraries in new primary schools to receive \$800. It took the Labor Government to make special provision for ovals when a school was first started. Before the Labor Government came to office parents had to raise money to obtain these facilities. If the member for Stirling likes to consult officers of the Education Department—

Mr. McAnaney: You didn't increase Education allocations.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stirling is out of order.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Those officers will tell the honourable member that more progress was made in agriculture courses in the Labor Government's three years of office than in the previous decade, and we can prove it. If the member for Stirling will cease interjecting so that other members can hear me, I will tell him of an example in my own electoral district.

Mr. Lawn: He does not want *Hansard* to hear, so that all your speech will not be reported.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: When I took office as Minister of Education I took steps to see that the Tarcoola school received a water supply and a cooling system. After I became a member of this House I tried for years to obtain these facilities from the Playford Government. If ever there was a remote, arid area, it is Tarcoola. The Liberal Government said it could not be done, but I tried time and time again to get it done. However, as a result of the steps I took when I was Minister of Education, the job has now been started. Of course, I come from an industrial

area: I am alleged not to have any good thoughts or cares for country people.

Mr. McAnaney: Who said that?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Why have members opposite fostered for so long the idea that metropolitan members do not understand the needs of country people? I have listened to enough speeches from members opposite to know that they deliberately fostered this idea in the minds of country people over the years. We used to hear from Sir Thomas Playford about city slickers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. I must say that I think the honourable member for Whyalla is one of the members of the House who interject least of all, and I think he is entitled to be heard without interruption. The honourable member for Whyalla.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have heard time and time again this propaganda about metropolitan members being unable to understand anything about country affairs and country interests. This propaganda has been deliberately propagated for years. One only has to read the country newspapers to see the effects it has had. Indeed, one only has to read the *West Coast Sentinel* to see the reactionary views that have been cultivated in that area over a long time. The recent references in that paper to the Leader of the Opposition are disgraceful. Those views have been cultivated by the speeches made on this subject. We used to hear from the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford about "city slickers", who would all have their offices within a few minutes' walking distance of the town hall clock and who would not know a thing about what went on in the country. This sort of attitude is still being cultivated.

What sympathy during the depression years did the wealthy Liberals in this State have for the poor farmers in the Mallee areas? The older members in this House who have some recollection of those years know what sympathy they had and how much they cared for the country people—not a scrap! I said earlier that, if members opposite were so anxious to give good service to their constituents in country districts and had a look at the real issues involved, they would be able to serve their constituents better. I refer particularly to the need for better facilities for country members and I will show that the Liberal Government, despite its pandering to this particular doctrine to which I have referred, has been particularly mean in supplying these facilities. If it had

really cared about the interests of country people, it would have supplied its country members at some stage during the 30 years it was previously in Government with better facilities to do the job instead of harping about the need for fewer constituents in country districts that does not enable one to do a better job at all.

Adelaide Airways had a service to Eyre Peninsula a year or two before Guinea Airways, which came into being in 1939, but Australian National Airways planes landed at Ceduna on the way to Perth prior to 1952. Guinea Airways took over in 1952, and Airlines of South Australia took over in January, 1960. In the 1940's a member could get his boat fare paid to Eyre Peninsula but if he went by air he had to pay the difference. Air fares were first allowed in about 1956. When I came into this House only four trips were allowed in between sessions. I held out to get more, and we obtained six in between sessions. For many years, every firm, when sending a commercial traveller, or a tradesman for that matter, from the city to Whyalla sent him by air, but the member of Parliament was never able to go as frequently as that. He was restricted; he was not such an important person in the community in the eyes of the Liberal Government of the day as was the commercial traveller or the tradesman going to do a job in Whyalla or on Eyre Peninsula. What a farce this writing down of the job of the member of Parliament has been over the years! The member for Frome received two air trips a year to Oodnadatta after trying for three years to get them.

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

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Under the Labor Government, South-Eastern members were enabled to use air services to that area for the first time. So, in every one of the remote South Australian areas the Liberal Government was most disinclined to help its members use modern transport even though nowadays most business concerns send their officers, commercial travellers, experts and tradesmen by air whenever they travel long distances on business. I consider that the Leader of the Opposition should have free travel to any part of the State to carry out his duties, and I believe this is the position in some of the other States. In this age, surely we should be making use of modern transport, particularly because of the increased work members are expected to do and the increased population and because, for many

years, the membership of Parliament has remained static.

Regarding the use of telephones, members are not allowed to reverse the charges for telephone calls made to Parliament House and, as far as I know, this has always been the case. The telephone is a valuable adjunct to the country member, and I am certain that many country members make far less use of the telephone for trunk calls than they would do if they had better telephone facilities. Here again, we see this parsimonious attitude. If this attitude had been reversed, country members would have been provided with better facilities. Only recently, under the Labor Government members secured payment of the rental of their private telephones and it has also been made possible by the Labor Government for members to reverse the charges for telephone calls made to Ministers' Secretaries in order to obtain quick communication with Government departments.

Why have not members been treated as responsible people in the past if their position is as has been represented by country members in this debate? If their position has been as they have tried to represent it, why have their Governments not made these facilities available over the years? When I became a member of this House I found it was essential to have an office, but I had to provide it myself: I had to build it on to my own house.

Mr. McKee: We all had to.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That is the position unless a member is prepared to take people into his kitchen or sitting room, which is often most inconvenient and does away with the privacy of a member's own home. However, no provision is made for a country member in this connection. A metropolitan member can mostly use Parliament House as his office, but no facility is available for a country member in this regard. Why has this matter not been attended to by the L.C.L., which says it is so concerned about providing service to constituents in big districts? The country member has no secretarial assistance in his home town for when he is in Adelaide on Parliamentary duties. As a rule, his wife becomes his unpaid secretary while he is away.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That does not apply only to country members.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No, but there is a difference. The Attorney-General must realize that the metropolitan member is at least within a short distance of his home, whereas the country member is in Adelaide on a number of days during Parliamentary

sittings and his wife must deal with everything on the spot. As I said earlier, she does not even have the facility of free telephone calls to her husband in Adelaide: she must pay for these calls if she wishes to make them and conduct the business. These are all matters which, in the aggregate, would mean a tremendous amount to country members and which, over the years, would have enabled them to overcome these disabilities about which they have been speaking, and they are the real disabilities. The disability of distance and so on can be overcome relatively easily. No solid reason has been given why these facilities cannot be provided. If they were provided, little problem would confront country members regarding distance and area.

The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) spoke about members representing areas. Of course, that is fallacious because we represent people, not areas. If areas did not have people, there would be no point in representing them at all. The people are the very means and cause of a member's being in this place: he is not here to represent areas or acres. As I pointed out earlier, the district I represent is the largest in the State, its area being 161,000 square miles. When the House is sitting I am able to have paid air fares to Whyalla without any restriction. I can have six trips in between sittings of the House. However, if I wish to go to Andamooka, Coober Pedy or Woomera, I must pay my own air fare. I have found that when I drive my car the depreciation and damage is such that it is just as cheap (and much less fatiguing) to travel by air. If I wish to go to Woomera, I have to pay my air fare from Adelaide. This is the type of real disability from which a country member suffers. Distances are nothing if a member can travel by air. This should be the way to look at the problem of disability of country members about which we hear so much.

I now wish to deal with the matter raised by the member for Onkaparinga when he said that in South Australia the average country area represented is 21,000 square miles. I showed earlier that, when the three largest districts of Whyalla, Frome and Eyre are eliminated, the average is only 3,000 square miles. When one looks at the list of other country districts, sees what the areas are and takes out a few more of the larger ones, one sees that the result is very different indeed from the picture painted by the member for Onkaparinga. For example, the fourth largest district is Albert, comprising more than 9,000 square miles.

Two other districts each comprise more than 4,000 square miles and nine others more than 2,000 square miles. Of course, the remainder are relatively small. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) admitted that his district was partly metropolitan. However, the area is only 205 square miles.

Many other country districts are relatively small, served by excellent bitumen roads, not far from the city, and are little different from metropolitan districts in terms of time and effort involved in travelling around them. It is not true that the inner country districts have disadvantages compared with the large districts on the perimeter of the State. The large districts are the ones that present difficulties by way of rough roads, the need to pay air fares, and so on. The member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) has told us that he travels 50,000 miles a year. However, as he has not yet been a member for a year he must have estimated that figure. If he travels that distance, he will need two cars a year because of the state of the roads in his district. How will he buy those cars from his district allowance? The member for Frome has found that his allowance is insufficient to pay for the damage to his cars caused by bad roads and long distances. A country member can meet these problems only if he has the right allowance and facilities.

I hope that in future we will not hear so much about the peculiar disabilities caused by area, acreage, and so on, of country districts. These disabilities have been greatly exaggerated over the years, purely to maintain an undemocratic electoral system. Much has been said about the present number of members in this House being sufficient or nearly sufficient, and about 47 members being far too many. It is a great pity that some Government members did not refer to what the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) had said. I thought he gave the House most interesting information, as a result of doing his homework, about the numbers of members we have had over the years. He quite rightly concluded that the time was ripe for making a considerable addition.

He told us that in 1857 the House comprised 36 members, the population at that time being estimated at 90,000, and he told us of the fluctuations through the years, the number having increased from 36 to 46, then to 52, and further to 54 in 1884, when the population was not much more than 300,000. The honourable member told us that the number decreased to 42, then to 40, and that in 1913, when we had 430,000 people, it increased

to 46. In 1936 the number decreased to 39, and that number has remained since then even though the population of the State is now more than 1,000,000. In those circumstances, for the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) to say that it is wrong for the House to comprise 47 members is nonsense. Surely, members opposite who have continually raised this country district issue should be happy to support our provision for 56 members, retaining 26 members in country seats. This should have been the logical outcome of their thoughts in this direction, but some of them said that 47 would be too many members. An important aspect about the number of members of this House has not been canvassed.

In the Parliamentary Library some years ago I read a keen analysis in a book dealing with Parliamentary Government that showed that one mistake people made when considering the number of members of a Parliament was that they never considered that, when there were sufficient members, there was a much better choice for members of committees. Virtually, everyone here is on some sort of committee and, obviously, with more members there would be a better choice of members with specialist knowledge who could be nominated as members of these committees. To the best of my knowledge I have not heard this aspect canvassed, but it is important to this House and to the Government.

Mr. Clark: There could be better Ministers, too.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Definitely: there would be a much wider choice of personnel, and this is a desirable condition. The outcome of this Bill will be determined to a large extent in Committee. We have already given notice of several amendments in respect of those parts that we think deserve to be improved, and it is to be hoped that the opportunity will be taken by Government members to ensure that the Bill provides something that is as near as possible consistent with good democratic principles. Unless this is done we shall have the same problems arising in the future as we have had in the past, perhaps not to the same degree. It is time we made a point of setting up good democratic principles instead of retaining the outworn ideas that have pervaded this State for many years, during which period we have preached to others the virtues and values of a democratic Parliamentary system. It is time we had faith in the people of this State to elect Parliamentary representatives who would treat both country

and city properly and fairly. If that faith were applied properly this would be done.

The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) said that in his experience in Parliament he had always found members considered fairly and squarely the question relating to metropolitan area and country, irrespective of the district they represented. If we adopt that attitude and provide a system that is obviously sound in its democratic principles, all members will respond to it. If proper facilities were provided for country members most of the disabilities about which they complain when speaking of the need for fewer electors on their rolls would vanish. Given modern facilities they could deal with their districts adequately, and there would be no real excuse for having this tremendous disparity between the number of electors in a country district and those in a metropolitan district. We are dealing with people, not acres, not square miles, and without people there is nothing at all. There is no life without the people. We represent the people, and therefore this should be a crucial point in every consideration of electoral arrangements.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1838.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the Bill for reasons that must be obvious to the Treasurer and other members of the Government. I consider that this is a wrong method of raising money in this State, that it is regressive taxation, and that it goes much further in imposing stamp duties than was ever suggested by my Government when it was in office. The Bill will have a dampening effect on the State's business: it will impose additional costs on business and, what is more, it will hit every household budget in the State. No-one will be missed by this tax.

I appreciate that the Premier has said he is trying to spread taxes as widely as possible, but what is happening is that he is taxing the

poor people exactly as much as he is taxing the wealthy. What is happening here is that we are getting flat rate taxes written in in South Australia in a way that I think is quite undesirable. The strange thing is that this runs completely counter to what was said by present Government members when in Opposition. May I remind members opposite that, in 1965, the Labor Government introduced a Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill which widened stamp duty on receipts in South Australia by making receipts compulsory and by widening the area in which receipts were to be given. In addition, it imposed additional stamp duty on cheques. That measure was fought bitterly in this House, and members opposite had much to say about it. The Minister of Works (he was then the member for Torrens) said:

This procedure—

that is, of requiring compulsory receipts not nearly as widely as is required under this Bill—will cause no end of extra work and confusion to the public. It is quite impossible to assess how much this provision will cost the business community, let alone the public generally. I have heard estimates of several hundreds of thousands of pounds a year in relation to the business community as a whole. Some business houses undertake many cash transactions and business dealings, and this will be a heavy impost on them, which will tend to lower their efficiency, whereas others may get off more lightly. I am sure that many will wonder whether ways and means exist of avoiding the implications of the Bill. Additional cost will be involved not only in duty stamps and postage but in the extra time taken by clerks in the offices concerned.

Although I suggested later in the proceedings that one way of obviating the difficulty about the administration of additional receipts was to have a measure similar to that which had been introduced in Victoria (that is, a return on the bulk of transactions by business houses as an option, as compared with the fixation of stamp duty by adhesive stamps to receipts), that at the time was pooh-poohed as a mere milk and water thing, something that would not really work or get around all the difficulties we were imposing on the business community by demanding additional receipts to be given. Actually, we wrote that provision in on my suggestion at that time that there be this option but members opposite still objected to the amount of receipt duty that we were seeking and members of their Party in another place reduced the area in which the compulsory receipts were to obtain, with the net result that we had a reduction in stamp duty revenue in South Australia, something which we had to cure a little later. Members opposite.

certainly were not prepared for the Government to act responsibly to raise revenue as against the necessary expansion in expenditure which they have now so publicly supported at the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council. They said at that time that this was a gross impost on the business community. The Treasurer had much to say about it, as follows:

The effect of the taxation aspects of the Bill will hit commerce and industry and every household budget with a double-barrelled gun. Not only will a person be obliged to pay 5c or 6c for the privilege of writing a cheque, but the effect of these proposals will be far greater in the final analysis than people realize, because businesses pass on their administrative and commercial costs to the buyers of the goods. The stamp duty increases progressively with the amount for which the receipt is given and the proposals are bad because they set back the clock of progress in the commercial world.

He said that about a very mild proposal in relation to receipt duty, a proposal to impose far less than had been imposed by the Liberal Government in Western Australia. This goes much further. It is a far heavier impost, it involves far more administrative activity and far more machinery cost to business, and it involves activity to every person in the community, yet the Treasurer now proposes something that is completely contrary to what he said in this House, as a member of the Opposition.

How much more can it be said that this form of taxation will hit the business community. The disastrous thing is that this is being imposed at this stage of proceedings, because the Treasurer knows well that, by spending money on State services and writing this kind of taxation into our revenue structure, he commits subsequent Governments to a continuation of this kind of taxation, because it will be extremely difficult for any subsequent Government to undo what has already been done in revenue raising. To undo what has been done would mean immediately finding additional substitute areas of taxation, or cutting services.

This has happened in numbers of instances of the imposition of State taxation of a regressive nature. At present, many people in New South Wales would love to get rid of poker machines but they cannot do it. No side of politics can do it because \$20,000,000 revenue from poker machines is committed and, when we commit a State to future expenditure, we commit subsequent Governments almost invariably to maintaining at least the existing means of raising revenue within the State. At this

stage, having regard to the need for business recovery in the State, I cannot conceive that a proposal of this kind can assist business or employment in the State, because all of the matters involved in this Budget, except the gift duty tax, hit household budgets so directly that those budgets will have a lessened purchasing power, and that lessened purchasing power is compounded by the fact that price control is not being maintained in South Australia. The general effect of this will be a lessened economic demand for our goods in South Australia, because people with a controlled and limited income cannot afford to purchase our products. Whilst it is true that the majority of our goods are exported to other States, 10 per cent to 15 per cent of the market is within the State, and that is essential to the continuance of business health in South Australia.

As I have said, this tax hits everybody. The Treasurer has said that the private person who does not carry on a trade, business or profession is exempt from the payment of duty on any receipt for an amount not exceeding \$10. However, thereafter he is compelled to give a receipt, although that principal was opposed strenuously by members of the Opposition when we were in office. He must give a stamped receipt if the amount received exceeds \$10 and, in such a case, stamp duty of 1c for each \$10 or part thereof must be paid. Then, a person who carries on a trade, business or profession has no exemption in respect of any part of a transaction. That is, regardless of how much the transaction is for, he will pay 1c on \$10 or part thereof in stamp duty, so that the smallest transactions will attract a total duty of more than 1c in each \$10.

Mr. Broomhill: How much is the duty on \$10.1?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is 2c. If the person is in business and the amount is \$2, he will still pay 1c.

Mr. Langley: Even if he buys some groceries.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is right, so all the small transactions attract a much larger proportion by the payment of 1c in every \$10 or part thereof, and that duty must be paid on every business transaction conducted in the State. The Treasurer had made it clear that, unless specifically exempted, duty must be paid on all amounts at the rate of 1c for \$10 or part of each amount received.

True, under the provision that was previously made for the payment of duty in bulk, corporations or persons may elect to pay the duty on the basis of a periodical bulk return, in which case the duty is calculated at a rate of 1c for \$10 of the total amount received for the period covered by the return and the duty so calculated is payable to the Commissioner of Stamps by cheque or cash at the time the return is lodged. For a small business that did not lodge a bulk return, all the little transactions would have more duty paid on them. Where payment is made on a total turnover it will not be as much.

Mr. Langley: From 10 trips to the grocer you pay 10c even if the cost of the articles is \$3?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, because on each transaction you pay 1c on every part of \$10. It amazes me that the Treasurer can so blandly introduce something that runs completely counter to everything Government members said when we merely wanted a compulsory receipt duty on the larger transactions, exempting entirely the little transactions from stamp duty. Not only were they not prepared to allow that but they used their numbers to heighten the base level of compulsory receipts, so that we had a drop in stamp duty revenue at a time when we needed to expand expenditure, and they then said to the public that we were being financially irresponsible. At this stage we should be raising taxation by progressive means, because there are means of filling the gap by doing so, and I have outlined them previously. I do not believe that the present kind of taxation should be imposed.

I know that there is pressure from Canberra on the States to try to get South Australia to put a flat sales tax right across the board. Also, there is a suggestion that we should, in all States, be doing what the United States of America is doing, that is, raising a 4 per cent sales tax on all items. No State has yet fallen for that one, but we are continually being pushed in that direction, and this impost seems to be a beginning. The Treasurer forecast in his Budget speech that, if more money was not coming from the Commonwealth this year, stamp duty would apply not only to the things it does now but would be extended to a tax on wages and salaries by means of supplementary financial proposals. We have heard nothing so far of any promises from the Commonwealth. The Premier has been to a meeting of State Premiers, and I thoroughly agree with his going. At present, every State Premier has every reason to be curious about

the way the Commonwealth is treating the States. We have every reason to demand a better deal from the Commonwealth, and the people of this State also have the right to know from the Treasurer whether he intends to carry out his threat.

Can we expect further taxation this year in consequence, since we have had no promises from the Commonwealth and no sign of any additional money; in fact, quite the reverse? It has made it clear that it does not intend to give additional money to the States, because it seems to think that we do not need it. It continues to finance its defence expenditure at the expense of our services. In these circumstances, the Treasurer ought to tell businesses in South Australia, working men, salary earners and wage earners what they have a right to know—whether they can truly expect that their wages and salaries are going to be taxed during this financial year with an impost of stamp duty payable out of their wage packets directly into the Treasury, in addition to the impost now proposed. If that is so, then the outlook is very grim for the ordinary wage earner, salary earner and small business man. He is entitled to know what is ahead of him. I do not believe that this is a sensible or a correct measure at this stage in this State. I fear the results to the State, and I fear what will face a subsequent Government as a result of writing this into the Act at this stage. In these circumstances, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I am surprised that no Government member has risen to support this Bill. I suppose too many of them have said too much—

Mr. Virgo: They have been told not to talk.

Mr. HUDSON: I think too many Government members, when in Opposition, said too many things in relation to taxation measures, and consequently they cannot now get up on a matter such as this and support the Treasurer. The Leader of the Opposition has already given some examples of statements made by the Treasurer, when he was in Opposition, about a previous stamp duties proposal, which was mild compared with the present proposal. The examples quoted by the Leader clearly demonstrated that what the Treasurer said in Opposition had no relation at all to what he intended to do when in Government. The same could be said of the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), who in the same debate in 1965 waxed very eloquent about what the proposals at that time would have

done to the problems of business. The same applies to the present Minister of Works. In Committee, all of them were members who voted for amendments to the legislation and ultimately voted against it, yet we find that they are now supporting a taxation proposal which, if the one proposed by the Labor Government was in any respects harsh, can be described only as vicious, and vicious in the extreme.

As a result, the ordinary member of Parliament, who is not used to the practised ways of politicians such as the member for Stirling and the Treasurer, becomes a little puzzled, and he wonders what credit can be given to any statement that those members make in this House in the future. What possible standing have they left? What creditability can they have with the community as a whole, when they not only bitterly criticized the comparatively mild proposal of the previous Government but also refused during the election campaign to say anything about taxation, although they knew that if, through the crooked electoral system, they were lucky enough to fluke Government they would have to raise more revenue? Each one of them knows today that the position in which State Governments find themselves has resulted largely from the Commonwealth Government's attitude to Commonwealth-State financial relations.

It is a consequence of the fact that while the Commonwealth income tax reimbursement grants to the States have risen at a rate of, say, 7 per cent to 8 per cent a year over the last dozen years or so, the revenue needs of this State have risen by about 11 per cent to 12 per cent a year. Consequently, the gap between our needs and what has been made available to us from the Commonwealth has had to be made up through State taxation. Over the last dozen years State taxation has risen as a percentage of the Commonwealth income tax reimbursement grant to such an extent that it would not surprise me to find that at the end of this current Government's term (if it is sufficiently lucky to last it out) the ratio of State taxation to the Commonwealth income tax reimbursement grant will have risen to about 50 per cent. We are all aware that this Government has suddenly become conscious of the problem of Commonwealth-State financial relations.

The Premier recently attended a conference of State Premiers called by Mr. Askin, the Premier of New South Wales, and no doubt, together in conference with Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte, he waxed eloquent about the

terrible things Mr. Gorton and Mr. McMahon were doing to South Australia. We did not hear any of this while the current Government was in Opposition. We did not hear any constructive criticism of a financial measure while the previous Government was in power. We heard only the most blatant attempts by members opposite to attack anything proposed in the way of a revenue measure, the most blatant attempts at politicking that have been seen in this Parliament for some considerable time. It was an exercise in dishonesty of the worst sort, and that exercise in dishonesty, carried out by members opposite whilst in Opposition, now puts them in the position of having to sit and keep quiet, because there is nothing they can say to justify the actions of the current Government when those actions are compared with the words used by members of the current Government when in Opposition and during the election campaign.

Mr. Burdon: What do you think has happened to the member for Stirling now?

Mr. HUDSON: I think he would like to get up before this House and make a general confession to indicate his guilt (not just an ordinary guilt but a great guilt).

Mr. Burdon: Do you think he would accept an invitation from you to enlarge on it?

Mr. HUDSON: I doubt it. I think he is under instructions to keep quiet, and I shall be interested to see whether or not he does keep quiet.

Mr. Virgo: If you bait him long enough he will get up.

Mr. HUDSON: No, I do not think so, because members opposite are not free to get up and say what they please.

Mr. Virgo: They tell us they are.

Mr. HUDSON: They say they are free to cross the floor, too, but mark my words: not one Government member will get up to speak in this debate and, when the vote on the second reading is taken, all of them, like the flock of sheep they are, will tamely support the dictates of the Treasurer. Of course, the Treasurer needs revenue so badly that he must lay down the law to his cohorts behind him.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You're being personal.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not being personal. I did not single out any one member or the Treasurer, who is the shepherd with the flock of sheep leading them to the slaughter of the second reading debate. I hope the price he will get for them when he sells the carcasses will be better than any member of the Opposition

would be prepared to pay. The Bill acts regressively so far as taxation is concerned. There are few taxes at the State or Commonwealth level in our community which have a progressive effect and which tax according to the capacity to pay. The Commonwealth income tax is one, the State land tax is another, and the gift duty (which the Treasurer will be introducing, I hope) will be another. If it is, the Opposition will be pleased to support him and give him such honest and fulsome support that he will be embarrassed.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I have just been studying that legislation.

Mr. HUDSON: Very good. If it is like the proposal I saw on one occasion I shall be delighted to support it. I hope the Treasurer will not be too embarrassed by my support and that of other Opposition members. The only other form of available taxation which would have a progressive impact is succession duties, which I have dealt with before in this House and which the Government, because of the dishonest—I will not say "dishonest", because I think it was more a stand taken in opposition largely as a result of a failure to understand the provisions of that Bill than for any other reason, and the failure to understand does not imply any form of dishonesty. Nevertheless, that opposition to the Labor Government's succession duties proposal has now put the Government in the position where, as a Government, it cannot introduce a succession duties amendment Bill without disrupting its supporters and causing a tremendous uproar in another place. Apparently, the Government already has enough problems on its hands with its colleagues in another place not to buy a row with them on succession duties.

The result of all this has been that the Government has introduced the Bolte measure here in South Australia, a measure which is not progressive in its impact on the community. It has a number of undesirable features and it may ultimately lead in Australia to the same kinds of tax that exist everywhere in the United States of America. In the U.S.A., every State has a turnover tax or a purchase tax, usually varying between 3 per cent and 5 per cent, and on every single transaction this purchase tax is paid; it is added to every single transaction, except those in value of less than \$1, although in some States it applies to sums below \$1. When the Premier was in the U.S.A. recently (and if he had to pay any hotel bills I hope someone paid them on his behalf), he would have

discovered that 3 per cent, 4 per cent or 5 per cent was added to his bills, depending on the amount of the State's turnover tax. The same tax is added to grocery and restaurant bills. Of course, these purchase taxes are reliable sources of revenue which is why they are so popular in the U.S.A. They are really the way to get revenue in.

Mr. Riches: Isn't this Bill a step in that direction?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, I am coming to that. Not only do the purchase taxes in the U.S.A. bring in revenue, but they also have a growth element built into them. If there is any inflation in the community then, because of the flat-rate purchase tax, the State automatically gets more revenue. Inflation and wage rises therefore do not have the same effect of throwing a Budget into deficit as they did previously, because the inflation and wage rises occur throughout the whole community (the hotel bill rises from \$15 a day to \$20 a day and the State gets 5 per cent of \$20 instead of 5 per cent of \$15) and as a result the State gets more revenue. As the population grows and as money income rises without any prices change, so that the real income of the community is increasing, the State Government gets more revenue. In the U.S.A., the turnover tax has been the tax which has enabled the individual State Governments to attract additional revenue each year as a result of the overall growth of the economy.

Many people have spoken about the favourable position of the Commonwealth Government as a result of income tax, which leads to automatic growth of revenue to the Commonwealth Government. Over the last 12 years or so there has been little change in the overall rates of Commonwealth income tax because the Commonwealth Government automatically receives more revenue from any growth in income throughout the community, and this is doubled up in the case of income tax because of its progressive nature. Therefore, without any adjustment of the position of Commonwealth-State financial relations (and one can only assume from the expression on the face of the Premier today that he did not have a very successful conference and that his colleagues from the other States informed him that there was little likelihood of those hard-hearted characters in Canberra altering their attitude towards the State Governments), it is probable that the Bill marks the beginning of a permanent turnover tax in South Australia. It may well mark the beginning of a tax that ultimately rises to the kind of level that

currently exists in the U.S.A., namely a figure of 3 per cent to 5 per cent on all purchases instead of the figure that currently applies in this Bill of .1 per cent.

I should think that the Prime Minister's announcement today that there will not be an election this year makes it still less likely that the States will receive a reasonable deal from the Commonwealth Government in the foreseeable future. We all know that the Commonwealth Government is on the verge of introducing serious restrictive measures into the Australian economy: the beginnings of a credit squeeze are already apparent. We have had the announcement of higher interest rates and this has been gradually extended over the whole interest rate structure in recent months. We had the announcement at the end of last week of an increased call by the Reserve Bank of funds into special reserve deposit, the traditional sign that the Reserve Bank is getting panicky and is putting the brakes on the banking system. In those circumstances, we also know that the Australian balance of payments position is likely to be adverse and to become more adverse, with a tendency for imports to outrun further and further the level of exports and with a cutting off of a good part of the flow of capital into Australia, at least temporarily. In fact, when one examines the present position and compares it with the position in 1960, one finds a degree of similarity. Many honourable members will remember that 1960 was the year after the drought in 1959 and the year in which the stock exchange boom came to an end at the end of September, much the same time that it has ended this year, and the October figures for imports rose to a record level.

It was those October import figures that caused the extremely drastic measures announced by the late Harold Holt, who was then Commonwealth Treasurer, in November. Undoubtedly, the decision of the Commonwealth Government whether to hold an election this year was a fairly critical decision as far as the immediate prospects of the Australian economy were concerned, and the fact that the election has been postponed indicates clearly that the Commonwealth Government will, in the next few months, put on the brakes very severely indeed. While it is doing that throughout the whole economy, it will not give the States a better deal.

Mr. Riches: Do you agree that there is any necessity to put on the brakes?

Mr. HUDSON: When the Commonwealth Liberal-Country Party Government will not contemplate exchange control of any kind, the

only way that it has to control the adverse balance of payments is by putting the pressure on internally so that the demand for imports will fall: in other words, creating unemployment internally in order to prevent the external balance of payments position from getting out of hand. If I were the Premier or the Treasurer, I would tell the Minister of Labour and Industry not to get too cocky about the latest unemployment figures. That is because their mates in Canberra will get tough, and the position in South Australia will soon become worse. The Premier or the Treasurer will be able to do little about this. If the Commonwealth Government goes to town with a credit squeeze, this State will be on the receiving end, but the Treasurer's Budget will not be on the receiving end so far as revenue is concerned. His problems will become more difficult and he will not be able to adopt any positive policies to offset any adverse economic effects within the South Australian community. Moreover, he will get the blame for any adverse effect.

There will be some rough justice in that, because when the Commonwealth Government previously took action that had an adverse effect in South Australia, members of the present Government, who were then in Opposition, blamed the Labor Government, notwithstanding that the Labor Government could not do anything about those effects. We shall take much pleasure in seeing the wriggings and writhings of members opposite to try to get out from under by trying to dissociate themselves from their colleagues in Canberra. However, so far as the ordinary people are concerned, they will not be dissociated.

One feature of this Bill that I find rather alarming is that I do not see any provision to allow for the off-setting of double, triple or quadruple counting. Take the case of newspapers, which could well appeal to certain of my listeners. Duty will have to be paid on receipts that arise as a result of payment for newsprint and duty will have to be paid as a result of receipts from the public for newspapers. The money paid for newspapers includes the cost of newsprint, but the duty has already been levied on the receipts associated with newsprint so that, in fact, it will be levied twice. Several situations exist where on one product this duty will be levied more than once, and may be levied twice, thrice or more, depending on how disintegrated the productive process is within the community.

For a can of peas the cannery and the grocer are involved in the payment of this duty

as a result of money received, and when the can of peas is sold to the wholesaler of groceries a further receipt arises and a further duty is payable. A further receipt arises when the wholesaler passes the can of peas to the retailer, and duty is payable again. A further receipt of money arises when the can of peas is sold to the final consumer. If the can of peas is sold to a restaurant that involves a further payment of duty, and when the ordinary customer, like you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has peas with his steak and kidney pudding and pays for his meal there will be a further payment of duty to the State Government. It is easy to devise examples where the final payment may involve duty that is effectively 1 per cent of the price although it started off at .1 per cent, all arising as a result of double counting and of the principle contained in this Bill, that wherever a receipt of money is involved a duty shall be levied at the rate of 1c for \$10 or any part thereof, apart from the listed exemptions in clause 6.

Mr. Riches: Does the newspaper reader pay when he buys the newspaper?

Mr. HUDSON: The newspaper company has had a cushioning effect as a result of the marvellous increase in price that it received on the changeover to decimal currency. Undoubtedly, there is a bit of fat there. One would expect that the newspapers concerned would be able to pay all of this duty without passing it on to the ordinary reader. However, I have little doubt that those who advertise in newspapers will pay more.

Mr. Riches: What about a country newspaper that does not have the fat?

Mr. HUDSON: Perhaps some of them will go out of business or, alternatively, as most country newspapers rely on advertising revenue they will have to charge more for advertising space in order to cover their costs. Because country newspapers do not have the large circulation of metropolitan dailies, if costs become a serious factor the only really effective way of obtaining extra revenue will be to raise advertising rates. I expect that the main consequences of this Bill on newspapers will not be revealed in newspaper prices but in their advertising rates.

Mr. Riches: But the newspaper proprietors will have to pay the tax.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. If they do not raise their advertising rates there will be lower profits and lower dividends, and this will never do. In fact, the position is so serious that I believe there is some danger that the *Advertiser* will publish an editorial adverse to a

Liberal Government in South Australia, and if this happens it will be a record. I believe that the problems of the current Government are such that serious consideration is being given within the four walls of the Adelaide Club to the Government's position, and, following this consideration, it is not inconceivable that an adverse editorial will appear in the not too distant future.

Mr. Lawn: I will never see that day.

Mr. Virgo: Many members opposite claim they don't know where the Adelaide Club is.

Mr. Venning: That is right.

Mr. HUDSON: It is only the small fry who can claim they do not know. The tall poppies, particularly those in the other place, and particularly those with titles, know where the Adelaide Club is. We have it on good authority that the Government's really basic support is in danger of being withdrawn. I read the *Advertiser* when I first wake up in the morning; I read it at this time so that my blood pressure will not rise too much as I am still only half awake then. Many people who wake up and read the adverse editorial will not really know what is happening, and, of course, this Government will not know what is happening, because, without the *Advertiser's* uncritical support at the last election, the Government would not have received 43 per cent of the vote. It would have been battling to receive 33 per cent. We have not yet had any explanation about the problem of double counting that arises from this form of taxation.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think you will get it?

Mr. HUDSON: No. In the United States of America the problem of double counting is avoided by levying the tax only upon the final purchase of the product. So, in relation to any form of production or in relation to the provision of any type of service, the tax is paid only once and, of course, it is only because of the guarantee that the tax is paid only once that rates as high as 5 per cent can be tolerated. However, if there is double counting, a rate of even 1 per cent could lead to an effective rate, so far as the final consumer is concerned, of 6, 7 or even 8 per cent, if the whole productive process is sufficiently broken down into separate steps.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think prices will go up now that there is no price control?

Mr. HUDSON: In some cases there could be an impact on prices. In other cases the impact of a .1 per cent increase in the total charge on turnover will not be great.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think certain people will take advantage of this?

Mr. HUDSON: On any one product, if a tax is being paid which amounts to .1, .2 or .3 per cent of the price, the price cannot be effectively raised to cover it unless the item concerned is selling at a high price, so .1 per cent on \$10 means that \$10.01 can now be charged instead of \$10.

Mr. Virgo: You may pay the 1c on a \$1 bill, too.

Mr. HUDSON: Manufacturers will tend to increase the price on one or two of their lines and leave the others unchanged, hoping to cover it that way.

Mr. Broomhill: The public will pay, whichever way it goes.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but in some cases there is a little difficulty in the way of small businesses in effectively passing on the tax. The corner delicatessen, for example, will have a little difficulty in avoiding the full impact of the tax, and I think the effect of the tax on the delicatessen and on all other small businesses will be a reduction in their profitability. Of course, here we are dealing with business that is only marginally profitable, anyway; most small businesses make a go of things only as a result of working excessively long hours. The impact of this tax on the average service station will be to cut into the return of the proprietor, whose operation is invariably controlled by the oil company. He cannot make his own price; he must accept the terms given him and pay the rent imposed on him by the oil company for his site, and he must abide by the price of the petrol and the oil he sells as that determined by the oil company. He will be required by the oil company to bear the full impact of this tax and, unless the State Government permits him to pass on the tax in the form of a higher price for petrol, that will be a clear-cut case in which the full burden of the tax will be borne by the proprietor.

However, these examples are fairly rare and involve cases of small business (the man whom the member for Stirling likes to laud—the man whom members opposite should be trying to protect instead of cut down). Those who have a monopoly in the community, and those who have a business that supplies a large section of a particular market, are in the best position to pass on any increase in costs by raising prices, and they will be the ones who will bear the tax the least; they will be the ones effectively able to pass on the tax to the ordinary consumer.

Mr. Lawn: How will farm implements be affected?

Mr. HUDSON: If the farm implement consists of different parts that are produced through different companies, and if there is a manufacturing concern and then a wholesaling and retailing outlet, the tax on farm implements could be paid three or four times, and that will not be the only item which the country man uses and which will carry this tax.

Mr. Lawn: What about motor vehicles?

Mr. HUDSON: Less so, because the motor vehicle manufacturing business is pretty well integrated. Some parts it uses are brought in from outside companies and, to some extent, this could lead to double counting but not to the same extent as would be found in a separate business.

Mr. Lawn: Isn't the vehicle sold to the dealer, and the dealer sells it again?

Mr. HUDSON: Where that occurs there will be double counting, but it will not be nearly as great as in the case of canned peas to which I referred earlier. The Leader of the Opposition has already dealt with the extent to which this tax will fall on the small man in the community and has made the broad outlines of the Opposition's attack on this measure. He has made it clear that the Opposition does not deny that the Government needs more revenue. The Opposition does not deny that this State, together with every other State, is not getting a fair deal from the Commonwealth Government in respect of income tax reimbursements, but it denies that the Government has the right to levy this form of taxation when the only mandate it has is a mandate to get out of office. What the Premier said in his election speech is not worth tuppence. Nobody voted for the Government.

Mr. McAnaney: Nobody?

Mr. HUDSON: Not a majority.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the country people?

Mr. HUDSON: I suppose it is the country people who are really behind this turnover tax which the Treasurer (and the Government) is imposing and which will be supported by all the 16 country members of the 19 members of the Government Party! I suppose that is what the country people voted for! Well, that is what they are going to get, and members of the Opposition and others in the community will not lose any time in telling country people just what has happened.

Mr. Clark: It's our duty to do so.

Mr. HUDSON: That is right. I think the country people are already beginning to be

aware of the member for Stirling who, if he is not careful, will lose some of the 80 per cent who voted for him in his fine little pocket borough—

Mr. Clark: A rotten borough.

Mr. HUDSON: Apart from the others living there, it is almost a rotten borough. I can see his 80 per cent vote declining to 60 per cent or perhaps even to 55 per cent.

Mr. Virgo: He might even lose the seat.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know about that but, if we only had the funds to print some of his speeches and circulate them in his district, I think we would have a real chance. The Government is not tapping the sources of revenue available to the State: it is by this measure following on its erstwhile colleague Sir Henry Bolte, a man whom the Government often criticizes.

Mr. Clark: With a good deal of justice, too.

Mr. HUDSON: Quite. The Government has often represented him in this Chamber as a man not to be trusted, but it knows where to go when it wants more revenue.

Mr. Lawn: Sir Thomas Playford didn't trust him.

Mr. HUDSON: No, and I doubt whether he would have copied him.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the Tasmanian Premier? He introduced this tax.

Mr. HUDSON: That may be so, but my point is that this Government is introducing such a tax in South Australia and, with other sources of revenue still available of a progressive kind that are not being tackled by the Government, the Opposition regards this measure as totally wrong and as a scandal to the whole community in South Australia, because this Government, supported by only a minority of the people, was elected under a rotten electoral system. Before the election it said nothing about taxation or other revenue proposals for fear of losing votes, but in its first Budget it has introduced a whole series of revenue measures which are wrong in outline and conception and which demonstrate the Government's complete lack of credibility and the distortions and untruths which Government members mouthed on many occasions when in Opposition. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): Mr. Deputy Speaker—

Mr. Rodda: Here is the member who writes to his constituents.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is pleasing to hear the cackles of mirth from Government members, almost the first sound they have

uttered for the last hour, with the exception of a few remarks from the member for Stirling, who has been spurred into action at last. In view of the complete reversal of everything said before the last election, I could not help thinking that members opposite must have received their instructions and that probably over their desks at the moment they have a little text: "In these circumstances silence is golden". It reminds me of an old Yorkshire proverb: "See all, hear all, say nowt", and no wonder they are saying "nowt" in this debate.

Mr. Clark: They haven't got much to laugh about.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: When one reads what was said by the Minister of Works, the Treasurer and the member for Stirling about a similar measure the Labor Government introduced one wonders whether one is in an Alice in Wonderland atmosphere, because it just does not make sense. In fact, the member for Stirling said, when a similar measure was before the House during the term of the Labor Government (although it certainly did not provide for anything nearly so harsh), that this sort of thing was completely out of date, yet now he is saying nothing at all.

Mr. Corcoran: But he will vote for this measure.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, although we have been led to believe that he has the most modern views on taxation and finance. However, he will now vote for something more completely out of date than the measure we introduced. I am surprised that the member for Stirling has reduced his standards so greatly in this short space of time. I wonder why this is so, particularly in view of the fact that he has such freedom of action: he has the right to cross the floor and to do anything—he is the complete rugged individual. The sad aspect is that another form of regressive taxation is being imposed and that it will tend, as the Leader of the Opposition said earlier, to stay put because of the difficulty of removing it. It gives the Commonwealth Government another excuse for postponing its thinking about improving Commonwealth-State financial relationships because, while the State can somehow stagger on by getting revenue, even though by a regressive method, the incentive of the Commonwealth to improve the relationship with the State is lessened.

Certainly, we can discern no desire so far by the Commonwealth Government to improve those relationships. We on this side remember vividly being chided when we were in office for criticizing the Commonwealth for failing

to come to the aid of the States with better relations in the financial field. We were told many times that we did not appreciate the generosity of the Commonwealth Government. However, now the story is different. I do not remember seeing any favourable pronouncement after the last meeting of State Premiers. All I read was that another meeting would be held and that it was hoped to meet the Prime Minister in the future, so we do not seem to have come much further towards solving the problem.

This measure will fasten even further regressive taxation legislation on the State. Naturally, the impact on the poorest people will be the greatest proportionately. Those with large families make more smaller purchases than do families without children or people with ample funds. Obviously, the payment of these duties will apply to all these transactions, so the effects of the regressive taxation will be felt worst by those with big families and on low incomes. Those with the larger income can always purchase on a better basis than those on lower incomes: they buy in larger quantities, get better discounts and are always on the favourable end of the stick in doing day-to-day business. **The impact of regressive measures always falls hardest on those who can least afford to pay.**

The member for Glenelg spoke of the effect on small businesses and said that many of these businesses survive only because the owners work long hours. I think all members know the rapid turnover in the ownership of delicatessens and other small businesses. Many owners cannot stand the pace after a few years. The long hours get them down and, even though they are making a profit little better than wages, their health will not stand the strain. We all recognize the present continual drift of business towards monopolies, and this cannot benefit the consumer generally. The legislation we are considering must have an added effect on that situation. So far, there does not seem to be any debate on this matter from Government members but, as I said earlier, that is understandable. They have to reverse what they said when we

introduced a measure which was similar but which was most modest and moderate compared with this one and would not have affected people in the same way.

Mr. Clark: They are going to give a silent vote.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Of course. It is absurd to imagine that they have any mandate from the people of this State, bearing in mind what they said before the last election.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I, too, oppose the Bill. I regret that the Treasurer is not here to hear what I am about to read, but perhaps the Premier may pass it on to him and remind him of what he said on Armistice Day three years ago. The Hon. G. G. Pearson (member for Flinders) at page 2780 of *Hansard* on November 11, 1965, when speaking in the debate on the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill, said:

This is just another dose of medicine that the community is being compelled to swallow, as a result of trusting the promises made by the then Leader of the Opposition during the election campaign.

I can think of no better words to describe the current position.

Mr. Clark: We told them what we were going to do.

Mr. VIRGO: That is correct. The member for Flinders went on to say:

In the last week or two one Bill after another has been introduced into the House severely increasing taxation, and it seems that before the session is done we shall have traversed the whole field of taxation available to the State Government. In every case we shall have witnessed substantial increases in charges to the public in one way or another. Already, a long list of charges have been raised.

I do not know of any more appropriate words that could be used in this debate than the words the present Treasurer used on Armistice Day, 1965. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 16, at 2 p.m.