HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 6, 1968

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ABORTION LAW

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My attention has been drawn to a report in this morning's *Advertiser* which, headed "Seating of R.C. Urged", states, in part:

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Dunstan) told a deputation from the Abortion Law Reform Association of South Australia yesterday that he favoured the seating of a Roman Catholic on the Select Committee to inquire into State abortion laws. A member of the deputation, Mr. A. Van Rood, said after the meeting that Mr. Dunstan felt a liberal-minded and thoughtful Roman Catholic could contribute much to any discussion on abortion law reform . . . Mr. Dunstan had said he felt there was a great deal of public sentiment in favour of far-reaching reform in the abortion laws. However, he considered that the public could expect something better than the abortion laws recently adopted in the United Kingdom.

The remainder of the report does not refer specifically to any views expressed by me. I saw a deputation yesterday of members of the Abortion Law Reform Association and, after I had a discussion with them, they asked me whether a press statement could be made as a result of that discussion. I said that they could say that I, expressing views personally (not as the Leader of my Party, because my Party has no specific policy on this matter, and each member is free to take his own stand on it), believed that there was a public sentiment in favour of some measure of reform and that I was not committed to any specific kind of reform, because I did not consider myself at this stage sufficiently well informed on the matter to be able to take a committed view, but I agreed that there were some unsatisfactory features about the United Kingdom legislation.

That was all that I agreed should be said. However, in the course of the discussion with the association, when it queried the membership of the committee, I said I believed that, as the Roman Catholic community of South Australia was very much concerned with this reform of the law, it would be an advantage to Parliament if someone with a Roman Catholic background could sit on the committee. I did not distinguish between some Roman Catholics and others as to whether they were liberal-minded, thoughtful, or not. I said what I have outlined to the House, and I think that the report as it has been given to the press must have resulted from some misunderstanding of what I said, so I hasten to clear up the matter publicly at the earliest opportunity.

QUESTIONS

SPRINGTON MINERALS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Mines a reply to my recent question about mineral exploration work carried on in the Springton area of my district?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: A special mining lease has been granted to Australian Blue Metal Proprietary Limited in the Springton area. The company is carrying out a vigorous exploration programme to determine the extent and quality of the white clays in the area. The matter of establishing an industry based on the material has not been seriously considered, pending the above investigations.

KINGSTON SOUTH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CORCORAN: My question concerns the extension of the town water supply at Kingston in the South-East to the area known as Kingston South. I have raised this matter from time to time over the years as a result of representations made to me by people living permanently in the area and also by people who reside in seaside residences from time to time in the course of a year. Recently some concern was expressed that, as a result of water not being provided to this area, development is not going ahead as expected and that people are going to other places, such as Robe, to seek land. The residents of Kingston are naturally a little alarmed at this development although, as I have not personally observed this, I do not know what substance there is for the alarm. However, realizing the great potential in the area, I point out that the added facility of a reticulated water supply would undoubtedly lead to speedier development. Although I am sure the Minister of Works and officers of his department are fully aware of all the circumstances, will the Minister examine this matter with a view to providing, if possible, the extension of the water supply as soon as practicable?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will look into the matter for the honourable member and give him a report.

NARACOORTE CROSSING

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked a fortnight ago about the Naracoorte crossing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It appears that the prime reason for accidents at the location is inattentiveness on the part of some motorists. An inspection has revealed the growth of grass is not such as to restrict visibility except possibly to the drivers of very low cars. However, to remove this possible hazard, the grass will be mown. An investigation will also be put in hand to determine whether any traffic control measures can be adopted to improve safety at the intersection.

WHYALLA LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about full local government at Whyalla?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Local Government has informed me that the committee appointed by the Government to investigate the introduction of local government under the Local Government Act in Whyalla met for the first time on Friday, October 4. The committee has invited, by letter, various interested organizations to submit views to the committee, first, in writing, and followed by discussions if requested by the organization and/or considered necessary by the committee. The committee will also hold discussions with the present commission.

The organizations have been asked to submit their views in writing by the middle of November. This will be followed shortly thereafter, if necessary, by personal discussion. The committee will then invite, by public notice, representations from any other interested persons. The committee will proceed with its task as fast as possible.

EGGS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question about payments from the Poultry Industry Trust Fund?

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

The Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board reports that the balance of funds held in reserve in the Poultry Industry Trust Fund at June 30, 1968, was $528,604. To this amount may be added the sum of about $456,000, being compensation as a result of the devaluation of currency by Britain and other countries last November. This information has been announced by the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony) on behalf of the Commonwealth Government. The Chairman states that the final trading results of the Australian Egg Board for 1967-68 cannot be completed until the net proceeds of the sale of export eggs and egg products for that year have been received. The funds from that source, however, are expected to be greater than originally estimated. The absolute figure from that source is not expected to be known until early in 1969. The aggregation of all funds made it possible for C.E.M.A., at its last meeting, to increase the basic price of eggs and pulp upon which reimbursements were made. In addition, the actual reimbursement rates were also increased. Following those increases, State boards were in a position to increase immediately the advance prices for eggs to producers for current production. Administratively, it is not possible to adjust prices on past production.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister a reply to my question of October 21 in which I referred to criticism at a meeting at Saddleworth of the action of a previous Government in introducing the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia plan without first conducting a poll of growers?

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

As the honourable member has already been informed, the Commonwealth Egg Marketing Plan is based on Commonwealth legislation. The Crown solicitor has expressed the opinion that, whilst there does not appear to be any provision in the relevant legislation about the taking of a poll of producers to ascertain their views in regard to the plan, the results of such a poll, if conducted, would not affect their obligations under the scheme. He has advised that South Australia may withdraw from the plan only insofar as it may decline to collect the Commonwealth's hen levy through the South Australian Egg Board. However, producers would still be obliged to pay the levy under the existing Commonwealth legislation.

HUGHES ESTATE

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question about the intended activities of the Housing Trust at Hughes Estate, Henley Beach?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the trust reports that there has been a slackening off in the trust's building

programme at Hughes Estate, Henley Beach, and the programme had to be stopped owing to complications arising from the provision of a main stormwater drain. This drain has now been completed, the balance of an existing contract (about 42 houses) will be sited in this area, and work will commence again soon.

MISSING PARCELS

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question about the loss of parcels consigned by rail?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Inquiries have disclosed that, of three parcels consigned to Berri and reported missing, two have since been accounted for; the third parcel is still missing, and credit has been allowed the consignee by the sender. Office records of the Railways Department indicate that, between January 1 this year and September 30, 224 parcels were reported missing; of these, 140 were recovered, and the remainder have not yet been accounted for.

FORBES PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. VIRGO: Part of the Forbes Primary School property fronts Marion Road, the property being mainly in Thomas Street. A block of land on a corner of Marion Road and Thomas Street is at present used for semi-industrial purposes, and this prevents the expansion of the schoolground. It was rumoured some weeks ago that this property was to be sold, and I was informed by the Chairman of the school committee that the Headmaster wrote to the department pointing out that this land would be available and also that it was desirable to acquire it to provide additional room for the schoolchildren. I am told that the reply the Headmaster received from the department stated that as the school had over 10 acres further action was unlikely. This decision concerns me, because this one chance in a lifetime is being passed over: the property now has a "For Sale" notice on it. As a matter of urgency, will the Minister of Education investigate this matter and possibly take an option on the property pending a full inquiry with a view to purchase?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to get a report on this matter as soon as possible.

JAMESTOWN BUS SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question concerning the Jamestown bus service?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: During the period July 1 to September 30, 1968, the train to which the honourable member referred arrived in Adelaide on time or less than 10 minutes late on 64 occasions and only on 15 occasions was it later than 10 minutes. Everything possible is done to achieve on-time arrivals of all passenger trains, but speed restrictions associated with standardization work on the Peterborough Division are causing delays to the Broken Hill express, with the result that this train has been badly affected. Unfortunately, there is little prospect of a substantial improvement until standardization is completed, but the situation does not warrant an extension of the Jamestown-Riverton coordinated bus service. Nevertheless, on October 17, because the Broken Hill express departed Terowie 97 minutes late the bus was dispatched from Riverton to Gawler to avoid an unacceptable wait at Riverton. This was done at the discretion of the train controller, and is normal practice.

OAKLANDS TREES

Mr. HUDSON: I have asked previous questions concerning the protection of trees in the Oaklands railway yard and the limiting of any action by the Railways Department to the removal of unsafe branches, and whether details of the contract that had been issued by the Railways Department conformed to the decision of the Minister of Roads and Transport. As I understand the Attorney-General has a reply, will he give it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The reply is that no contract has yet been let.

VENUS BAY STORE

Mr. EDWARDS: Earlier this session I asked the Attorney-General a question concerning a retail store licence for the sale of beer and wine at the Venus Bay store of Messrs. C. B. and J. I. Kelly. The reply stated that this town was within five miles of the nearest hotel at Port Kenny. During a visit last week to part of my district I travelled from Port Kenny to Venus Bay and calculated the mileage. With me was the Minister of Agriculture, and we considered that the distance was exactly nine miles.

Mr. Corcoran: As the crow flies?

Mr. EDWARDS: When we asked the storekeeper how the distance of five miles was calculated he said that it was straight across the bay. If the Attorney-General were at Venus Bay and wanted to get a drink at 5 o'clock, would he walk across the bay or drive around the shore?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: He could fly over.

Mr. EDWARDS: Even if the trip were made by boat, the distance would be more than five miles from Port Kenny. Will the Attorney-General reconsider the issue of a licence for this store?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think I would employ any of the means that have been suggested by way of interjection. If I were feeling very fit I would swim, otherwise I would run around the shore.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You could talk your way around it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I could talk my way out of anything, but not around it. This matter was considered by the House last session, but at that time we did not have the benefit of the honourable member's presence, although his predecessor was here and took part in the debates. It was a decision of the House that the distance be five miles and this was to be measured, as I heard the member for Millicent saying, as the crow flies: in other words, in a direct line, not taking into account any geographical features of the locality. As I know this matter is causing the honourable member considerable concern, I will consider whether this is a proper matter on which to introduce an amendment in the general licensing Bill, which I hope to introduce in the next few weeks. I cannot give an undertaking that there will be such an amendment in the Bill, but I will consider it.

HAY CARTING

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of October 22 about permits issued to hay-carting contractors?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: For some years past the Road Traffic Board has issued wide-load permits, pursuant to section 143 of the Road Traffic Act, for the cartage of hay, on condition that there was no travel on Saturdays, Sundays or public holidays unless extenuating circumstances justified travel on these days. There has been no change in this policy since 1961.

FRUIT FLY

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of October 10 regarding the removal of quarantine regulations that were imposed at Port Augusta as a result of the outbreak of fruit fly 12 months ago?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that it is customary to continue a fruit fly quarantine proclamation for a full fruit season following the outbreak—in this case until the ripening and clearance of peaches in March-April, 1969. If no trace is found at that time, the area will be freed from quarantine.

RAIL CONCESSIONS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of October 9 concerning excursion fares?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister reports that a variety of excursion fares were available on the State rail system until 1941, when they were all suspended. The only one that was reinstated was the week-end excursion, which is still available. It is considered doubtful whether the introduction of day excursions would result in any increased revenue. However, the South Australian Railways does provide a return ticket for less than twice the single fare, something which does not apply on some other railway systems. In December, 1966, special excursion fares from metropolitan stations to beaches, as well as a special train from North Gawler to Semaphore each Sunday, were introduced. However, the public response to these efforts to promote rail travel was so poor that the special fares and the train were discontinued in February, 1967. My colleague has advised me that, apparently, the amount of the fare is not a deterrent to rail patronage, but that the ever increasing use of the private motor car is a deterrent.

NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on October 22 about the further widening of the North-East Road at Modbury and Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Design and land acquisition for the progressive widening of the North-East Road beyond Smart Road are in hand. At this stage, it appears that construction will commence early in 1969-70.

PORT WAKEFIELD CROSSING

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about traffic counts at the Port Wakefield railway crossing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No counts have been carried out at the crossing itself. The latest count, taken at a location 1½ miles north of the crossing, was made in August, 1967. The count, which covered a period of 24 hours, recorded a total of 2,540 vehicles. The estimated average daily traffic over the crossing at present is 2,500 vehicles.

Mr. FERGUSON: Because of the many requests being made to the Minister of Roads and Transport for the provision of flashing lights at level crossings, I had better stake my claim before the orders run out. I was interested in the reply that, in effect, a daily average of 2,500 vehicles passed over the railway crossing at Port Wakefield, because if each of those vehicles stopped at the crossing for one minute, the total delay would be 40 hours a day or 15,000 hours a year! Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether, because of the tremendous volume of traffic going over this crossing, a special priority cannot be given to providing flashing lights there?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am sure that, under this Government, the orders will never run out. I will certainly take up the matter with my colleague and see that the request has high priority.

TAILEM BEND BUILDING

Mr. WARDLE: A building in the Tailem Bend station yard, which was used many years ago for the freezing of carcasses, is now an eye-sore and seems to be redundant. Although I presume this building was erected by a private firm, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether, if it is no longer required, it may be removed?

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

TUNA

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of September 24 about a draft agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the Japanese Government regarding future fishing operations by the Japanese in waters off Australia and its Territories?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am informed that, during the honourable member's term of office as Minister of Agriculture, the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry wrote to him about the discussions between Japanese and Australian officials on the entry of Japanese tuna long-line vessels into Australian ports, and the 12-mile exclusive fishing zone. South Australia has always refused right of entry (except in extreme emergencies) into its ports of Japanese tuna long-liners. Tasmania, Queensland and Western Australia have permitted their entry for the trade gained in victualling these ships. In the agreement reached between Japan and Australia, South Australia's refusal to give right of entry was upheld. Japanese tuna long-liners operating on the high seas fish a mature stock of southern bluefin tuna, whereas South Australian tuna fishermen have always fished the immature portion of the same southern bluefin stock. According to Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization studies, the Japanese effort has not had any effect on the tuna stocks in this State. The fluctuations in catch to date are believed to be due to environmental influences.

MILLICENT RAILWAY YARD

Mr. CORCORAN: On two previous occasions I have asked questions of the Attorney-General, to be conveyed to the Minister of Roads and Transport, about the condition of the Millicent railway yard and, subsequent to both occasions, action has been taken by the Railways Department to attempt to rectify the unsatisfactory situation at that yard. However, last Saturday week I was approached by a deputation comprising representatives of 11 contractors, with whom I visited the railway yard. Although action was taken to grade the yard and recover spilt superphosphate, which the Minister previously said was the cause of the problem, I point out that the work done has led to water lying in the area whence material has been removed. In general, the condition of the railway yard is such that, as I have said before, it needs at least a general upgrading. Will the Attorney-General again ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to see whether something more substantial cannot be done to improve this yard? This yard is a busy one and, with the present season being experienced, no doubt much use will soon be made of the yard, which is a very good prospect for the Railways Department. I should be grateful if the Attorney-General would have his colleague again examine the matter with a view to effecting a substantial improvement to the yard.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I should have been disappointed if no action had been taken as a result of the undertaking given the honourable member regarding this matter. I will take up the honourable member's further inquiry with my colleague and, of course, I hope that further action will ensue.

DAIRYING

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Lands obtain a report from the Minister of Agriculture on what progress is being made between the State Governments and the Commonwealth Government in finalizing the dairy farm reconstruction scheme, so that it may be implemented?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister a reply to my recent question about Commonwealth assistance for the aggregation of dairying properties?

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

Following the offer from the Prime Minister of Commonwealth Government assistance in the marginal dairy farm reconstruction scheme, details of the proposal are being studied by officers of the Treasury, Lands and Agriculture Departments. I understand that a similar procedure is being adopted in other States. Subject to satisfactory agreement being reached between the Commonwealth and States, I would expect that the Commonwealth would need to pass appropriate legislation to provide for the scheme.

DESALINATION

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about the Japanese method of desalination?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The report submitted to me is as follows:

The article, "Desalination, Fresh Water is like Liquid Gold", which appeared in the September edition of *Economic Partner* was read with interest. In it are several broad statements and projections into the future. The specific figures are given among the rather sweeping statements made; however, the already wellknown processes with the notable exception of reverse osmosis are mentioned. The process which has been given particular attention and development in Japan is the multistage flash-distillation process, which has been found to be the most economical in other countries in situations where abundant cheap power or fuel and seaboard sitings are available. We are aware that a Japanese tenderer was recently successful in competition with the British firm of Weir Westgarth in gaining a contract in Kuwait. The equipment successfully tendered was once again of the multistage flash-distillation type. Here again, cheap fuel is available, no alternative source of water can be obtained, and the economy balance is favourable to desalination. Figures produced elsewhere in the world indicate that, where power is available in large quantities and low rates, it is possible to desalinate at perhaps 50c/1,000 gallons, a figure which can be described as being within striking distance of the cost of harnessing water by normal means.

Such low figures are based on the construction of major nuclear power stations coupled with desalination installations and with adjacent dense, very large industrial loads. The whole question of desalination is very much under consideration both by ourselves and the Australian Water Resources Council. At this time only limited application is justifiable in South Australia, such as, for example, at Coober Pedy where solar distillation has been used for some time and where a reverse osmosis plant will be commissioned early in 1969. Experience gained from these small installations will be valuable and there is continuing collaboration and interchange of data between ourselves and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization on the performance of equipment at Coober Pedy and research centres.

MOIETIES

Mr. BURDON: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about moieties charged by councils?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The charging of moieties by councils to abutting ratepayers is a matter over which the Highways Department has no jurisdiction. It is not related in any way to the acquisition of land. Irrespective of whether the department acquired a strip of land for widening Penola Road, the corporation could still charge a moiety of $1 a foot for kerbing and water-tabling, provided no moiety had been collected previously. It was not incumbent on the department to inform ratepayers of this when negotiating for the land, nor would it be permissible to make any additional reimbursement to them because of the moieties being charged.

KINGSTON BRIDGE

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about when work will start on the Kingston bridge project?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The specification for the construction of the river flat embankments is at present being prepared, and it is expected that work will commence early in the new year. Although the design of the bridge itself is in hand, it is not expected that bridge construction will commence before July, 1970.

PETERBOROUGH RAMPS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport replies to a series of questions I have asked about the ramps to be constructed at Peterborough under the rail standardization agreement?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague has informed me that the Railways Commissioner has no liability to provide access across the railways in station yards for use by the general public. Where such access is provided for departmental purposes, as at Peterborough, no objection has been raised against persons taking advantage of it in order to pass from one side of the railway reserve to the other. In some instances, where subways with ramp access have been provided for departmental purposes, the Commissioner has agreed, upon request, to the attachment by other parties of handrails for the convenience of infirm persons who may use the facility as a crossing place. The intallation of such handrails is not related to the operation of the railways. Level crossings are provided at each end of the Peterborough station yard and these are about 2,500ft. apart. One of these crossings is protected by flashing lights and the other by a departmental employee.

Mr. CASEY: Apparently, the Railways Commissioner claims that he has no liability to provide handrails at ramps under railway lines or on railway property, but I hope the Attorney-General will point out to his colleague that times are changing. A booklet has been issued by the Standards Association of Australia setting out recommended practices for the design of public buildings and facilities, particularly for access by handicapped persons, and these are being adopted throughout the business world. The Associated Chamber of Manufactures, the Commonwealth Department of Works, the Commonwealth Experimental Building Station, the departments of local government, the Division of Building Research (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization), housing authorities, the Institution of Engineers (Australia), lending bodies, the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, and universities, were associated with preparing the code, and all contribute to the welfare of the general public in some way, and particularly to the welfare of incapacitated people. A recent television programme dealt extensively with new buildings being erected throughout Australia, and these buildings have adopted the standards code so that the results benefited the general public. Where a railway service operates in a town, and where subways are to be used, the people who use the railways naturally use the subways, and I think that the position today is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to debate the question.

Mr. CASEY: I point out to the Attorney-General that, if these organizations and other authorities are following the practice as set out in the standards code, I think the Railways Commissioner should do the same. Will the Attorney-General again refer this question to his colleague, inform him of what I have said, and obtain another reply soon?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will pass on the message.

MERRITON CROSSING

Mr. VENNING: At present the Highways Department is widening and sealing the road that passes over the Merriton railway crossing. When the work is completed, much traffic will use the road and will travel faster than was previously the case. As the installation of flashing lights at this crossing would help drivers greatly, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider having them installed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am sure my colleague will be happy to consider that suggestion.

BUS FARES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked a fortnight ago whether bus fares would rise following the announced increase in the salaries and wages of Municipal Tramways Trust employees?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Bus and tram fares in respect of the first and second sections have been increased from 5c and 10c respectively to 10c and 15c, with effect from November 3, 1968.

HOVE CROSSING

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the provision of a storage lane to enable a right turn to be made from Brighton Road into Addison Road at the Hove railway crossing?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The widened section of Brighton Road extends 200ft. south of Addison Road, and thus apparently provides enough room for a storage lane for traffic from Brighton Road south wishing to turn right into Addison Road. However, to ensure safe operation of such a lane, several hundred feet of approach median would be necessary to allow sheltering of the right turn vehicle to the south, as was done in the north side of the crossing. The widening has not yet proceeded far enough south to allow such an approach to be constructed.

FLINDERS STREET SCHOOL

Mr. McANANEY: I noticed the recent announcement that, after many years of service to the State, the Flinders Street Primary School was to close. The announcement also stated that adult education classes would be held in this building in the future. In view of the several organizations interested in adult education, can the Minister of Education ascertain what form these classes will take and what alterations will be necessary to the building to make it suitable for the classes?

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

HANSARD DISTRIBUTION

Mr. VIRGO: In view of the tenor of the reply I received yesterday from you, Mr. Speaker, to my question about *Hansard* distribution, it would appear that this question should be directed to the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary. In the reply you gave me yesterday, Sir, you said that the Chief Secretary, in 1958, had authorized the free supply of copies of *Hansard* to all high, technical high, area, and higher primary schools. Your reply further stated that about 191 schools were entitled to receive the copies, although apparently only 109 were actually receiving them. When I first asked this question I was concerned (and I still am concerned) to have copies of *Hansard* supplied to all schools. I believe that primary schools and certainly private schools have a keen interest in the affairs of Parliament.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Put them on your free list. I do.

Mr. VIRGO: I am pleased to hear the Attorney-General say that, because—

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is addressed not to the Attorney-General but to the Premier.

Mr. VIRGO: When the Attorney-General interjected, I realized that he was out of order, but I was pleased at what he said. Will the Premier take up with the Chief Secretary the proposal that copies of *Hansard* be made available, free of charge, to all private and primary schools now receiving copies from members such as the Attorney-General and me, and to other private and primary schools that may in future request copies?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will take this matter up with my colleague in another place, but I remind the honourable member that many members supply, at their own expense, copies of *Hansard* to various organizations. I suppose that members meet from their electorate allowance the cost of many additional copies. It is not unusual for members to send as many as 50 copies to people in their respective districts.

Mr. Corcoran: I have 48 on my list.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think I have about the same number on my list, so distributions to schools can be arranged easily by the honourable member if he uses some of his electorate allowance for this purpose. One headmaster wrote to me, asking me to desist from sending copies to the school, but I do not know whether at that time he had the honour and privilege of reading speeches by the member for Edwardstown.

SEALS

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about the shooting of seals at Point Labatt?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture has furnished the following reply:

It is illegal to take or kill seals or porpoises for any purpose, and the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department will take action against any person found using seals or porpoises for cray-bait. The department is considering action to give greater protection to the seal colony at Seal Bay on Point Labatt; but I make an earnest appeal to the public to assist in the apprehension of offenders by reporting to the department details of the names, or car or boat registration numbers or any other information which could be used in evidence against people observed illegally capturing or destroying seals and porpoises.

WILLSDEN SCHOOL

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the possibility of progressively reconstructing the Willsden school by the use of Samcon buildings?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have now received from the Public Buildings Department a report regarding the suggestion that the timber-frame buildings at Willsden be replaced in stages by Samcon construction. To do this 16 classrooms, a standard administration unit, activity room, library, shelter, toilet and ablution facilities, and other ancillary accommodation would be needed. The Education Department intends to ask the Public Buildings Department to prepare sketch plans and estimates for the complete replacement of the wooden buildings by a new school in Samcon construction to be carried out in two stages, and that stage I be done as soon as practicable.

Stage I is intended to consist of the administration block, shelter area and eight classrooms. The project would have to be submitted to the Public Works Committee.

The present Samcon programme is fully committed until June, 1970, so that stage I would not be possible until at least that date. As I told the honourable member in reply to his question on September 24, a contract was let in June for painting and renovation at the existing school. While this was being done, the library, which was too small, would be changed over to a larger more satisfactory room; the library was to be converted to a staff room and the staff room was to be used for storage purposes. It was felt that this would meet some of the immediate criticism of the school committee. With regard to the replacement of wooden buildings, I can only say that the problem is well known and that it will receive attention as soon as practicable.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works any further information consequent upon the many questions I have asked about improvements and extensions at the Port Pirie Hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Following the last question asked by the honourable member, I inquired as promised and found that over the years many schemes had been produced by the Public Buildings Department, at the request of the hospital authorities in Port Pirie. However, I am sorry to say that on each occasion on which the department has prepared suitable plans to meet the requirements of the client department requests for further facilities and for extensions to buildings have been made, obviously delaying the work to which the honourable member refers and which he desires to have done. Some of this work could have been done in the past if the additional facilities had not been requested from time to time. The department has now received from the hospital authorities what I consider to be fairly substantial and final requirements: in other words, the brief is fairly complete. The department is now engaged on working up the final drawings and the costing of this proposal. When this has been done and the results approved by the Hospitals Department, Cabinet will consider the matter, with a view to referring it to the Public Works Committee for inquiry and report.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of September 24 about an area of land at Tea Tree Gully and whether the Government has immediate plans to purchase it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As the cost of land in this area is extremely high for national park or open space reservations, it has been arranged for the Land Board to make a valuation of the land, after which further action will be considered. Generally, the cost of land in this area makes it difficult for any Government to acquire it, but I will give the honourable member further information when the Land Board has made a valuation.

LIBRARIANS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On October 16, and again on October 22, the Minister of Education gave me information about the provision of multiple copies of textbooks at the teachers colleges and, in her reply of October 16, she said:

Regarding the provision the Minister is making for additional staff to administer the multiple collections, additional professional and ancillary staff for 1968-69 has already been determined. A total of 27 additional professional staff (including three lecturer-librarians) and 13 additional ancillary staff (including four library assistants) will be appointed to teachers colleges from the beginning of 1969.

From the reply it is not clear whether the 27 additional professional staff plus the 13 additional ancillary staff are to perform duties in connection with multiple copy collections or whether the additional three lecturer-librarians and four library assistants will be engaged in this work. Has the Minister details of the breakdown of the figures and of the colleges at which they will be employed? Further, can she say for how many courses of study the multiple copy collections will cater? Also, how many books will there be in each collection, and for how many hours each day will sections of the libraries containing the multiple copies be open for students' use?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: In reply to the first part of this three-part question (that concerning the breakdown of the additional professional and ancillary staff), the deployment of staff at each teachers college is a matter for the Principal. In general, the three additional lecturer-librarians and four library assistants would be specifically engaged in library duties but, undoubtedly, Principals will make use of other professional and ancillary

staff in order to ensure the smooth working of the system of multiple copies of textbooks.

In reply to the question concerning at which teachers colleges the three additional lecturer-librarians and four additional library assistants will be appointed, the appointments will be made as follows:

Adelaide Teachers College, nil.
Bedford Park Teachers College, one lecturer-librarian, one library assistant.
Wattle Park Teachers College, one lecturer-librarian, two library assistants.
Western Teachers College, nil.
Salisbury Teachers College, one lecturer-librarian, one library assistant.

These staff members will be appointed by January 1, 1969. The Director-General of Education is taking steps to have an additional four library assistants appointed from July 1, 1969 (one at Bedford Park Teachers College, two at Wattle Park Teachers College, one at Western Teachers College). Each Principal decides on the kinds of professional and ancillary staff for his college.

In reply to the questions about how many courses of study multiple copies of courses of study will cater for in each teachers college, how many books are in the respective collections, and how many hours a day college libraries will be open for study use, the Principals of the teachers colleges and their staffs are working on the matters of multiple copies of textbooks.

RELAXA TABS

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently, a constituent of mine contacted me about Relaxa Tabs, which are tablets easily obtainable at chemist shops. Although, taken normally, these tablets may have no ill effects, they may, if taken freely, have a detrimental effect on people addicted to them, because such people become erratic and seem to live in a different world. In at least one Australian State these tablets are issued only by a doctor's order. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health to consider ensuring that these tablets can be obtained only on a doctor's order so that they can be issued only to people who require them?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will refer this matter to my colleague for a report.

MENINGIE DRAINAGE

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question relates to a proposed effluent drainage scheme for the township of Meningie. I understand that this scheme has been approved, that sketch plans have been prepared by the Public Health Department, but that there is some problem in obtaining the fully detailed plans necessary for the council to call tenders for the contract work to construct the scheme. It may be there is a problem in the department in relation to draftsmen. If there is such a problem, can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say whether some of the planning could not be farmed out to outside engineering consultants? If this cannot be done, can the department employ extra draftsmen so that the plans can be prepared and so that such schemes (of which, I understand, there are many) can be started as soon as possible?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will refer the matter to my colleague for a report.

COUNCIL PLANT

Mr. GILES: Complaints have been received about a certain method of operation by the Highways Department throughout my area for some time and this has culminated in a leading article in the Mount Barker *Courier*, dated October 30, which states in part:

Another good example of the efficient having to suffer because of the inefficiency of others is to be found in higher fees paid for the use of council machinery by the Highways Department. It is alleged that the department works out hire fees, according to the amount of money it costs the council to keep a machine working. This means that the council which takes care of its machinery gets less hire fees than the council which neglects its machinery. In other words the council which looks after, for example, its D4 tractor changes the oil regularly, and does little maintenance jobs on it to keep it in tip-top order for normal running fees, receives less hire fees than the council which treats its tractor roughly, and which, therefore, costs a great deal more to run than the first mentioned. If all councils received equal hire rates in grant work for their machines, the council with the efficient machinery would get a greater amount of road work done for the same money than would the council with the inefficient machinery. It is time someone remembered that "efficiency" is another form of "economy".

Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, say whether the statements in the leading article are correct? If they are, could this form of hiring be changed in order to encourage efficiency and also to encourage councils to look after their machinery?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will inquire.

WATER CHARGES

Mr. RICHES: Has the Premier a reply to my question of October 24 regarding water charges to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited under terms of the agreement between

the Government and the company, as a result of the Auditor-General's suggestion that this matter be reviewed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The present Indenture Acts provide the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla with water under conditions established during the war years. However, the Indenture Acts do not preclude negotiation in regard to conditions of supply, and present investigations are being made to provide information on which discussions can be undertaken with the company.

DRAINAGE RATES

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of September 24 about drainage rates?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked a question about the additional revenue that would be derived from the recent increase in the drainage rate and the purpose for which it would be used. The Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board reports that the recent increase of the drainage rate from 3¾ per cent to 5 per cent will result in additional revenue of $18,500. In accordance with section 48 of the South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1931-1959, the additional funds will be applied towards the maintenance and management of the drainage system and the annual charge for the appreciation of the structures associated with the system.

UNDERGROUND RAILWAY

Mr. VIRGO: On October 15, the Premier undertook to obtain some information for me regarding the proposed underground railway, including the radius of the curvature of the proposed line and the speed at which a train could travel over the curve. Will he please give me the reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The committee, in determining the feasibility of the use of Elder Park as a festival hall site, examined, as a factor affecting feasibility, the underground railway route proposed in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. Observations by the committee on the M.A.T.S. proposal are described in the committee's report. To achieve its aim in resolving feasibility and to establish the feasibility of the development plan described, it was necessary to ascertain that the line proposed by the M.A.T.S. could be relocated. To this end the committee sought technical information from both the Railways and Highways and Local Government Departments. Based on the information obtained, which included the minimum acceptable radius curvature, the committee ascertained the feasibility of relocating the M.A.T.S. line. The committee, however, did not propose the relocation on a definite curvature or line, as it would not be practicable to do so until the design, exact location and orientation of a festival hall is known. For this reason also, the line illustrated in the committee's report was not drawn to scale. To attempt at this time a specific answer to the honourable member's question would be premature.

WHYALLA ROAD SERVICES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of October 8 about the loss of parcel traffic from Whyalla by the Railways Department to road transport?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The former co-ordinated rail-road service operating between Adelaide and Whyalla ceased as from April 1, 1968, when it was replaced by a direct road service. As a result of the cancellation of the co-ordinated rail-road service the Railways Department does not have any parcels traffic to Whyalla. Since April 1, 1968, anyone may carry freight in the State. Bus licensees may also pick up and put down parcels anywhere along their route, provided they comply with the conditions of their licence.

BANKSIA PARK SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: On June 28, 1967, a conference was held between officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Tea Tree Gully City Council concerning sewerage plans for the Tea Tree Gully area, particularly drainage area No. 2. This matter was the subject of a question I asked the previous Minister of Works on July 5, 1967, to which I received a reply on July 13, 1967. I refer specifically to a section of this area that was under discussion at that conference: namely, an area known as Banksia Park, bordered by Hancock and Grenfell Roads, Elizabeth Street and Launceston Avenue. It was agreed between the two parties that a common effluent drainage scheme should be installed in this section of the area by the Tea Tree Gully council. Dissatisfaction existed with this decision, because of preference for the installation of deep drainage by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and a petition signed by residents of this area expressing this viewpoint was served on the former Minister of Local Government in March last.

This common drain disposal scheme was approved by the present Minister of Local Government pursuant to the provisions of section 530c of the Local Government Act and was gazetted on May 30, 1968, thus giving the Tea Tree Gully council the authority to go ahead with the scheme. As during the past week I was approached by some residents of this area expressing dissatisfaction with the council's installing a common effluent scheme, because of the preference for E. & W.S. Department deep drainage, I ask the Minister of Works, if the decision made at the conference was reversed thus providing for the department to sewer the area, instead of a common effluent drainage scheme being installed by the Tea Tree Gully council, when the work then to be undertaken by the department may commence. I should be pleased if the Minister would treat this matter as urgent.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: It will be treated as urgent. I am not aware of the matters in the conference referred to by the honourable member, but I admire her for the research she has undertaken in preparing this question, because it will enable me to treat the matter more urgently than would otherwise be possible and to obtain a reply more promptly. I am aware of some of the problems facing residents in this area. Under the scheme referred to and approved by the Public Works Committee a few years ago, not all the areas in the district council area with which the honourable member is concerned can be connected to Engineering and Water Supply Department sewerage schemes. However, I will examine the matters raised and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

ORANGE JUICE

Mr. ARNOLD: Last month the Manager of Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative entered into negotiations with the Commonwealth Minister for Health regarding the lowering of the brix reading of 12 degrees, which is set as a standard for navel orange juice. This standard was set when navel oranges were used primarily for canning purposes. Today, however, although the navel orange is not used for canning, there is an outlet for navel orange juice in cordial manufacturing. The co-operative desires this standard to be lowered from 12 degrees to 10 degrees to enable the processing of navel oranges to start much earlier. If this lowering occurs, considerably more navel oranges will be able to be processed, thus alleviating the pressure on the fresh fruit market. This matter having been taken up by the Manager of the co-operative, will the Premier do what he can to assist, as any action taken may have a large bearing on next year's navel crop?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member's question reminds me that earlier this year, during the controversy that surrounded the dumping of surplus navel oranges, I asked a person involved in the treatment of oranges why they could not be juiced, and I was told that seldom were navel oranges used for juicing. I believe there is a problem in the processing, and this problem may well be connected with the one to which the honourable member has referred. In any case, navel oranges do not keep under the same processing as is applied to valencia oranges and are more difficult to handle. I believe that every attempt should be made to avert the dumping of oranges in times of over-supply, and I will take up this point with the Commonwealth authority (in this instance I believe the Minister for Health) putting the industry's problem concerning the chemical composition of the juice.

BOOLEROO CENTRE ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the letting of a contract for a crushing plant to be installed at Magna Hill on the Murray Town to Booleroo Centre road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Tenders have been called, and it is hoped that a contract will soon be let.

MIGRANTS

Mr. McANANEY: Over the radio this week I heard a representative of the Master Builders Association, who was a member of a panel on a certain programme, asked (by a person telephoning in to the station) a question about housing, and the panel member said that at present the housing situation was good and that the biggest problem in the industry concerned the shortage of skilled men, many of whom had left the State over the last year or two in order to obtain assured employment elsewhere. Will the Premier, as Minister of Industrial Development, say whether any action has been taken to inform migrants coming to Australia of the changing position in this State and also to attract skilled workers back to South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The migration picture in South Australia has changed

dramatically in the last few years. In 1963-64, South Australia took more than 18 per cent of Australia's total number of migrants. This was almost twice our per capita share of migrants. In the last financial year, however, the net gain in migration had fallen to less than 3 per cent; I think it stood at about 2.7 per cent. During the same year, it was estimated that thousands of people left the State. It is inherent in the figure that the 2.7 per cent was the net gain from migration: a greater percentage of people entering this State has been counter-balanced by a large number leaving the State. One therefore views this position with alarm; it is, of course, the result of a reduction in employment opportunities that occurred in South Australia in the last several years. The Government is aware that in certain activities and industries in South Australia a shortage of labour may emerge and, with this in mind, I am taking steps to have impressed on the Commonwealth migration authorities the need to consider South Australia's position carefully. The authorities may be asked to send more migrants to this State.

EASTERN STANDARD TIME

Mr. RODDA: I have been approached by dairymen in the southern part of my district (and I understand dairymen in other parts of the South-East have approached their members), about the mooted change to Eastern Standard Time. These dairy farmers have told me that they are concerned that the change will have an undesirable effect on the dairying industry because milk pick-ups will be earlier and milking will have to be done in the dark. They are also unhappy because at present there is a tendency to milk cows in the cool of the evening in the summer months and, with the new time, this would involve a longer day. As they have asked me to express their concern to the Government by asking a question, will the Premier comment on this matter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I asked two active dairy farmers last week whether they were worried about the possible change in South Australia from Central Standard Time to Eastern Standard Time. They said they had no worries whatever in this regard and that such a change would in no way have a damaging effect on their operations or milk pick-ups. That is all I can point to in regard to the dairying industry. I have received some representations from the general farming community opposing this change. As this matter is being discussed at present, I have instituted a preliminary survey, of the consequences and desirability of such a change, to be undertaken by the Industrial Development Department. Perhaps it might help the honourable member if I read short extracts from a preliminary report I have received, as follows:

There is a substantial case for the adoption of Eastern Standard Time in South Australia. The arguments used in favour of this move appear stronger overall than those used against a change. The advantages to secondary industry (manufacturing) and tertiary industries (wholesale and retailing establishments, banks, transportation firms, etc.) in competing more effectively and so cutting operating costs would seem to outweigh the cost disabilities predicted by farmers' organizations. The rises in farm costs are rather uncertain and may be of negligible impact with slight variations in working practice. Some adjustments in organizational arrangements would need to be made and, in particular, it would be desirable to arrange for school starting times, by the clock, to be half an hour later in the western part of the State. This would prevent any extra hardship during winter months being imposed on young children who would otherwise be catching buses a long way from school in very dark and often wet conditions. Drive-in cinemas would be faced with reduced patronage in summer months. In leisure activities, most individuals would have much to gain from an extra 30 minutes of light in the evenings both at the end of working days and for weekend activities. Protests from farmers organizations, not being entirely logically based, would probably fade away once they had experience working with the new times. Conditions in rural areas have changed considerably since the war-time experiment in daylight saving. Farmers today are both more flexible in attitude and share many of the rest of the community's interest in leisure pursuits.

What I have read from that reasonably comprehensive report of the officer examining the matter will indicate to the honourable member that there are many reasons why this change should be made. However, it is not a simple change to institute, as some people would find it difficult to adjust. For that reason, I have told representatives of drive-in theatres, for instance, that no capricious or quick change will be instituted but that there will be full consultation with the industry. I have told them that their representations will be heard fully and that all aspects will be considered. Therefore, the honourable member can rest assured that the matter will be fully considered. I assure him he can in good faith tell his constituents that, whatever views they may have, there will be ample time for them to put those views to the Government before any change is made.

POULTRY DISEASE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of October 15 whether there was any suspicion that the dread disease of the poultry industry (infectious laryngo-tracheitis) was being spread around South Australia by the activities of the gentleman appointed by the South Australian Egg Board to count hens for the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities levy?

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

The Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board reports that the board is well aware of the prevalence of infectious laryngotracheitis (I.L.T.) in poultry flocks in South Australia. All board officers are, and have always been, equipped with suitable protective clothing, with goloshes-type footwear with plastic over-boots. The over-boots are destroyed after inspection, but before leaving the property, and the goloshes are swabbed in strong disinfectant. As a further safeguard, inspectors are issued with plastic overalls, which are immersed in disinfectant after each use.

SAMCON SCHOOLS

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the possibility of stepping up the construction of Samcon schools?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: This is one of the few outstanding questions to which I have not been able to get a reply. I have looked carefully into this question. However, the honourable member will appreciate that it will take some time to obtain a reply, because several matters are involved not only relating to manpower but also relating to the forward procurement of materials and the finance for them. I should have a reply available for the honourable member by Tuesday of next week.

CHIRONOMID MIDGES

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question about the effect of chironomid midges in the Barmera area?

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

The Acting Director of Agriculture reports that arrangements have been made for the departmental entomologist (Mr. P. R. Birks), in collaboration with the Clerk of the Barmera District Council (Mr. A. W. Chiles), to collect information about the presence and movement of chironomid midges preparatory to further assessment and determination of control work by Mr. Birks. Detailed knowledge of the massing and movement of midges under differing weather conditions is essential before effective control measures can be undertaken, and Mr. Chiles is gathering this information. Mr. Birks expects to be in the district for several days this month and will be contacting responsible authorities concerned with this problem.

NATIVE PLANTS PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 2081.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): The Government and I have no objection to the purposes of the Bill, and the Government would not wish to defeat it. However, I consider that it would be better if protection of the Sturt pea were afforded by way of proclamation. The Minister of Agriculture and I have been asked questions about the Sturt pea and, in September, the Minister undertook to do what was in his power. The Minister and I, as well as members who have asked questions, agree that the despoliation of the Sturt pea is ridiculous, pointless and thoughtless. It is an act of vandalism and should be prevented, if possible. There is no justification for the sort of ravage that has been described by the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches).

I do not want to give the impression that the Government has had an afterthought and is trying to proclaim the measure, thus making the Bill before the House unnecessary, but I consider that the proclamation will do more to protect the Sturt pea than would the provisions of this Bill. After being asked questions, the Minister of Agriculture referred the matter to the Flora and Fauna Advisory Committee, which has met in October and agreed that the plant should be proclaimed as a protected plant. On October 17, the Crown Solicitor was requested to prepare a proclamation to include the Sturt pea in the Schedule to the Native Plants Protection Act. A draft proclamation was submitted to Cabinet on November 4, but the matter has not yet been submitted to His Excellency in Executive Council. The wording of the draft proclamation is mainly formal, but it adds *Clianthus formosus* (the botanical name of the Sturt pea) to the Act. The Act at present provides:

"protected wild flower" or "protected native plant" means any wild flower or native plant which has been notified pursuant to this Act by the Governor to be a wild flower or native plant protected under this Act.

Other sections deal with the legal protection that scheduled plants enjoy, and there are

prohibitions. The Bill now before the House follows closely the wording of the Act and includes other measures that bring the Act up to date, such as the altering of some old titles, the changing of currency, and so on. The main provision is clause 5, which inserts in the principal Act new section 5a, which preserves the Sturt pea against digging up and removal by the root, with the exceptions prescribed. The honourable member is to be commended for what he has done. However, he has omitted to give to the Sturt pea the protection that is afforded to proclaimed plants against sale or exposure for sale, and unless the Bill is amended—

Mr. Casey: There is an amendment on the file.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have not seen that. Unless the Bill is amended and the Sturt pea added to the Schedule, there will be no protection against sale or exposure for sale. The member for Frome has said there is an amendment on the file.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister would not be in order in discussing the amendment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will not discuss it but, at first glance, it does not seem to prohibit the sale or exposure for sale of the Sturt pea: this protection can be given only by proclamation and inclusion in the Schedule to the Act. I do not mind what is done about the matter and I shall be guided by the member for Stuart. I certainly have no objection to the Bill and I would tell the Minister of Agriculture that this House had no objection to going ahead with the proclamation which has been prepared and which will go to Executive Council, thereby affording protection. I leave the matter to the honourable member to decide his attitude. The wording of the Bill is slightly different, as it protects the plant from being pulled up by the roots, subject to exceptions.

I discussed the matter with the honourable member for Stuart before the House met today, and I think he agreed not to proceed much further with the measure this afternoon. The Director of the Botanic Garden, who is also Chairman of the National Park Commission and a member of the Flora and Fauna Advisory Committee (which has considered this proclamation), has said he is preparing a report on the whole matter of native plant protection. He is dissatisfied with the protection that is now being given to native plants under the Act but he says that he is not able to give a complete report at present. I have spoken to him and he has confirmed that he wants more time to do this. He is examining legislation in other States which goes further than our legislation and which, as I understand it, makes a general prohibition on the removal of any native plants on these lands (that is, roadsides, public reserves and the like). In other words, all native plants would be included in the Schedule. He is also examining the implications as they apply to South Australia before making a full recommendation. He strongly agrees with the sentiments expressed by the sponsor of this Bill and by me, that we should protect the Sturt pea. The reasons are many: not only to leave them for tourists but also, from a conservation point of view, it is most desirable that this vandalism do not occur.

A further note from the Director of the Botanic Garden states that Professor Robertson (Professor of Botany at the University of Adelaide) is also concerned about the protection of native plants, and these gentlemen, having consulted on this matter, want the Flora and Fauna Advisory Committee to discuss it more fully when the Director completes his report. Several other complications arise with further tightening of the Act, including possible conflict with the Soil Conservation Act and the control over non-governmental bodies as well as Government organizations. The Director of the Botanic Garden has suggested to me that, before making a more far-reaching approach to this legislation, I should wait until his report has been completed and has been fully considered. When that has been done we shall be able to strengthen the provisions to protect native plants generally. By arrangement with the member for Stuart, who is in no particular hurry because this year's season for Sturt pea is now over, we consider that the matter need not be decided today, and I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1929.)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I understand from something the Leader said outside the House that he introduced this Bill because the Government, as usual according to him, was doing nothing about the matter. I was quite surprised—

Mr. Casey: You were furious!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, only surprised, because I never get angry with my opponents.

Mr. Broomhill: Did it stir you into action?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, and if the honourable member had been awake he would have seen public announcements in the press and on television that the Government intended to introduce a Licensing Bill and asking for suggestions about amendments to make to the Act so that it would work more smoothly. I think the member for West Torrens must have missed these announcements, as did the Leader, because by the time the Leader announced that he intended to do something I had already received many suggestions from members of the public. I am happy to say that I hope that within the next fortnight or so (I hope no longer than that) I shall be able to introduce a Bill to amend the Licensing Act that will cover several of the matters that have been suggested to me. It seems that the Leader also missed my announcement. I cannot help feeling that maybe he did not miss it, but if he did not I am disappointed that he was not prepared to co-operate with me by making the suggestions to me so that I could incorporate them in the general Bill to come before the House. He did not see fit to give his suggestions to me directly, but he put them in a Bill. Therefore, they were not considered with the 30 or 40 other suggestions that had come to me, not all of which I may be able to include in the Bill, but many of which I shall be able to.

The Leader preferred to introduce his own Bill dealing with three matters—wine licences, hiring of halls (a matter we had mentioned specifically in our policy speech), and the defence to a prosecution in certain circumstances. I am happy to be able to tell the Leader that I do not object to the principle behind any of these amendments but, unfortunately, I have to say, with great deference and respect to him, that the way he has couched the amendments is so unsatisfactory as not to be acceptable to the Government.

Perhaps I should say something about this aspect of his Bill. The first amendment is to section 23 of the Act. As he explained, it is to allow licensing to sell wine at certain museums and places of historical interest. He did not explain where these places were situated, and I do not know whether he has any specific spot in mind, but the idea behind it is not a bad one. I have three or perhaps four objections to the present clause 2 of his Bill. First, he said:

. . . except in respect of the premises of a *bona fide* museum or art gallery in or close to an area of the State where more than one vigneron's licence has been granted . . .

The words "area of the State" are not defined and, when I specifically asked him whether he had any definition or guidance to the court as to the area covered, he said airily that there was not, because there were other matters in the Act on which the court had to exercise its discretion. I suggest that "area of the State" is too broad and indefinite and that there should be some definition to indicate that Parliament means either the Barossa Valley, or McLaren Vale, or the whole or nine-tenths of the State. There is no guidance here. That is my first objection to it.

The next objection is that it says "where more than one vigneron's licence has been granted". What the Leader really means is where more than one vigneron's licence is in force, because strictly the licences are granted by the Licensing Court at Adelaide and, although this provision is susceptible of amendment quite easily, it is undoubtedly deficient in the drafting. The general comment I make about clause 2 (*a*) is that it would make a very clumsy section. Section 23 (2) provides:

No new wine licence shall be granted after the commencement of this Act.

That is short, definite and to the point. Then the Leader would add this long and rambling exception. From a drafting viewpoint, perhaps to use the phrase he used yesterday, it is workable but not workmanlike. I should not like to see it included in this form. A more serious defect occurs in clause 2 (*b*), by which the Leader would insert a passage in section 23 (3), so that the relevant part of that section would provide:

Every wine licence in force at the commencement of this Act or granted pursuant to subsection (2) hereof may be renewed from time to time.

The Leader has missed the point. Licences are not in fact granted in pursuance of section 23 (2), which merely sets a qualification on the granting of licences; it does not grant licences. There is no doubt (and I am sure the honourable Leader would agree) that this amendment in clause 2 (*b*) would be ineffective because it refers to a subsection of section 23 which does not do what the amendment assumes it does. I suggest that the whole of clause 2 and the whole of the matter dealing with this amendment need redrawing, and I hope the honourable Leader will not want to proceed with it at the moment.

I now come to the second matter the Leader dealt with. This question was included in the policy speech and we promised to take action on it. It concerns the letting of halls for which a permit is in force. There is nothing wrong with the sentiment behind the amendment. Indeed, it is one the Government supports, but there are again a few deficiences in the way in which the Leader has set out to remedy the situation. First, new subsection (7) of section 67 provides:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the letting out of club premises or any part thereof . . .

I point out to the Leader (and he should have known this; I think he referred to the Glenelg Returned Servicemen's League case), that at the moment there is nothing in the Act that prohibits the letting out of club premises: it is a question of common law. It is the very nature of a club. The Licensing Court Judge (Judge Johnston) has held, following the High Court decision, that a club is to be available for the exclusive use of its members. It is because of the definition which does not arise out of the Act that the Leader has put the interpretation of section 67 he has. There is nothing in the Act itself. It is the common law which has to be altered. That in itself is an unhappy turn of phrase. Another defect in the Leader's suggested new subsection (7) is that it provides:

. . . on occasions other than periods in respect of which a permit under this section has been granted to the club . . .

I know that permits have frequently been granted by the Licensing Court for periods of up to 12 months and, strictly construed as the amendment is drawn, it would mean that the club premises could not be let during that period. No doubt, what the Leader meant to say was that there would be no bar to the letting of such premises during periods in which liquor is not to be supplied pursuant to the permit which has been granted by the court. I am afraid that the object he has in mind would be defeated by the way in which he has drafted his amendment. That, I think, shows at present that the Leader's clause 3 is not in an acceptable form.

Clause 4 is, of course, *pari materia* with clause 3, and what I have said about clause 3 applies also to clause 4. Clause 5 is the clause that gives a defence to persons charged with supplying a minor with liquor when the supply is pursuant to a permit issued under section 66. I am grateful to the Leader for having drawn this matter to my attention, even though he has done it in a roundabout way, and we will try to remedy this defect. Although the amending clause provides a defence to a prosecution arising out of section 66 of the Act, for some reason the Leader has put this into section 153 of the Act which, from a drafting point of view, is not acceptable.

Mr. Corcoran: Why not?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Because section 153 deals with the sale and supply of liquor on licensed premises, whereas this concerns a defence on permitted premises. This is the advice I have had, and it is good professional advice. This defence should be in section 66, not in section 153.

Mr. Corcoran: It doesn't make any difference.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is only a matter of good drafting. I know the Leader fancies himself as a legal man.

Mr. Corcoran: So do you.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: And he has good reason to, as he is an eminent member of the profession and a member of the senior bar in this State but he, like me, is not a trained draftsman, although we have messed about and fiddled with Bills in this place—he for 15 years and I for 13 years. In these matters it is better to get professional advice than to try to do the job oneself. In this case the Leader has done the job himself and the result is not a felicitous one. What I propose to the Leader is that he do not proceed further with the Bill at the moment, because I am prepared to give him an undertaking on behalf of the Government to include all three of these matters in the Bill I shall be introducing very shortly. The same object will be achieved. I am not holding myself out as a better draftsman, but I think the Leader will agree with me that, if we have these matters drafted in proper form by the Parliamentary Draftsman, the end result will be more satisfactory. I hope that the Leader will be prepared to accept my undertaking and not proceed with the Bill at the moment. If he desires to proceed today, I am afraid that, because of the deficiencies I have mentioned, I will have to oppose the second reading.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): We have just heard what is a typical approach of the Attorney-General to anything that is done by a member on this side. The Attorney-General was petulant, almost schoolboyish, when he claimed that we on this side were activated merely by an announcement he had made which was reported in the press to the effect that he was going to do something about the

Licensing Act. It seems that the Attorney-General honestly believes that, if we in this House wish to do anything that may affect something under his control, we should first tell him about it and let him do it himself. The Attorney-General well knows that, having private members' time, we have a perfect right to introduce a Bill on any matter that concerns the House. To speak as he did, takes something way from the Attorney-General. I think it is about time that he and certain other members in this House woke up to themselves and got on with the business before us. The Attorney-General may have a point when he says that the provisions in this Bill may be included in his Bill; indeed, that may be the tidier way of considering these matters. However, I assure the Attorney-General that we did not introduce this Bill simply because we thought he was going to introduce something else on the matter.

When the Licensing Bill was being debated last session, I think every one of us realized that, because of the size and complicated nature of the measure, anomalies would arise. This has, in fact, occurred; I am aware of anomalies, and no doubt the Attorney-General has been approached concerning matters that are not contained in this Bill. However, I will certainly have something to say about those matters if they are not included in the Attorney-General's Bill. The three relevant provisions contained in the Bill, together with the matters of which the Leader gave notice today, are completely desirable and will, if implemented, improve the Act. I do not think there is any point in pursuing the Attorney-General's argument about the so-called mistakes in the Bill. Even with my limited experience in examining Bills, and without any legal training, I think I can prove that the provisions sought by the Leader represent exactly what he wants to do, although perhaps not what the Attorney-General wants to do, and I think this must be clear to everyone.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I know that the Attorney-General has a habit of harping about anyone's draftsmanship when he himself has not been involved or is in some way responsible. When he was on this side, he made a habit of calling in question the draftsmanship of a man who is acknowledged to be one of the best draftsmen in Australia. But this was his constant habit, and the sort of pettifogging to which the Attorney-General is prepared to go is evident from his speech this afternoon: for instance, regarding his sole objection to the amendment which it is urgent we should make in this House, it is not a question of waiting for the Attorney-General to be ready and to have received all the submissions from people around the State. People are being convicted every week under the booth permit provision at the moment, contrary, I believe, to the wishes of every member of this House. Barmen are unable to protect themselves in relation to serving a person under age by asking that person whether or not he is, in fact, under age. There is no defence; it is an absolute liability if anyone under age is served by a barman under a booth permit. The Attorney-General's sole objection to this clause is that I have extended the defence, which exists in relation to barmen in licensed premises, to booth permits.

Mr. Corcoran: He does not argue that you won't do that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, he says it is the form of the thing. I have simply said that the defence which exists under the licensed premises section should extend to cases regarding booth permits, and the Attorney-General has said this is infelicitous and unworkmanlike draftsmanship. I do not know whether the Attorney-General has read the blooming Act, the administration for which he is responsible, but this sort of thing occurs all the way through it. At the moment, under the section of the Act relating to the closing of bars, the persons who are not to be allowed in bars after lawful trading hours are all persons other than excepted persons, and we find the excepted persons not in that section but in many sections earlier in a proviso relating to something quite different. Section 126, which relates to the power of the court to close hotels on Saturday afternoons, contains the following proviso:

> Provided that nothing in this section shall relate to the sale or supply to or consumption of liquor by the licensee, any member of his family living or staying on the premises, any servant of the licensee living or staying on the premises, or any *bona fide* lodger (which persons are in this Act called "excepted persons"), if the liquor is not drunk in any bar-room on the licensee's premises.

Mr. Broomhill: When did that go in?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General was in this House when the provision went through, and that was not one of the matters he raised on the subject of infelicitous drafting. In fact, it is much simpler drafting to extend the defence in the section relating to barmen in licensed premises to the booth permit section than it is to write in and repeat that defence in the same words in section 66.

This is no new principle of drafting at all. I can only conclude that this, as so much else with which the Attorney-General has to deal and which is introduced from this side of the House, is refused by him simply because—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It's funny you didn't say that a fortnight ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is exactly the same sort of thing that has occurred in relation to the Age of Majority (Reduction) Bill, where the Attorney said, in effect, "You have introduced a measure but I will not let you pass it." If the Attorney were concerned to get this done in a short time by this House (and it is urgent that these matters be dealt with), he would let it go through and allow some small amendments in Committee.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It isn't a small amendment; it needs large-scale amendments to make the thing work.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Large-scale amendments are not needed to make it work. Let me deal with another objection raised by the Attorney. He cannot deny that, in relation to the defence of barmen on booth permits, the provision would work perfectly well. He simply wants us to repeat some wording in section 66 instead of accepting the defence in the later section. Regarding the provisions relating to clubs, one of his main objections is that the proposed proviso begins, "Nothing in this Act shall be construed, etc." His objection is that the judge has acted on the common law. I doubt greatly that an amendment is necessary, because this Act is a code and the presence of the words put in the proviso is sufficient, in my view, to work on the might of the court in relation to these matters. However, if the Attorney believes there is something that needs to be covered here, he would find no difficulty from members on this side in his adding the words "or at law". That would not be a difficult amendment to make. In fact, most of the other points he has raised are pettifogging in the extreme. He is splitting hairs and endeavouring to find objections where there are none.

Also, because of the example I gave a few moments ago, it is vital that the House do something fairly urgently. Because excepted persons are described in the way in question, any barman who does not leave or stays on the premises of a hotel commits an offence by being in a bar-room even during the time that customers are supposed to be cleared out of the bar-room, and certainly during the cleaning-up period. Therefore, it is necessary for us to act on this matter fairly urgently.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You haven't given us much chance to find out about this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only say that matters of this kind are drawn fairly regularly to my attention, as they were when I was Attorney-General. The Attorney-General is in charge of the administration of this Act, and I should have thought he would receive the same kind of complaint. However, I am interested in getting these things dealt with as soon as possible, and we could deal with them this afternoon if the Attorney were not determined to see to it that we do not have a chance to deal with them.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You're being uncharitable; we want these things to work.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They would work perfectly well if the Attorney were prepared to co-operate with us in putting some amendments into the measure about which he would not find us too difficult.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Will you go away and draw up the amendments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am perfectly prepared to co-operate with the Attorney in doing that. If he will give me an undertaking that, if we satisfy his draftsman, we get this measure through next Wednesday, instead of waiting for his Bill, then we can get it done. Otherwise, what the Attorney faces me with is that, if I press this measure now, then it will be impossible for him to introduce these same matters in substance this session.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What I asked you to do was to let the thing stand until my Bill was in the House. I've given you an undertaking to include all these things in the Bill in a proper form.

Mr. Hudson: Why not amend this Bill?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Because I believe it is too difficult to do it, the way the Leader has drawn it.

Mr. Hudson: What if the Leader asks leave to have the amendments included?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I suggest that the Leader ask leave to continue.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will see whether I can negotiate with the Attorney to get something done as soon as possible. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

OPTICIANS ACT REGULATION

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I move:

That regulation 2 of the regulations under the Opticians Act, 1920-1963, in respect of

advertising, made on September 12, 1968, and laid on the table of this House on September 17, 1968, be disallowed.

The regulation in which I am interested is one of three that have been considered by the Subordinate Legislation Committee recently; two of the alterations made have been minor. One regulation simply alters fees slightly and the other makes provision for reciprocal arrangements between opticians in South Australia and in other States. However, the regulation to which I take exception is that which deals with advertising by opticians. I will read the previous regulation together with the amended regulation so that members can understand the situation. The old regulation provides:

Regulation 36 of the principal regulations is revoked and the following regulation is substituted in lieu thereof—

36. (1) In this regulation the word "advertise" means—

(*a*) to cause any advertisement to be inserted in any newspaper or periodical;

(*b*) to publish, issue or circulate, or cause to be published, issued or circulated, any notice, circular letter, circular or other like document.

The alteration I object to comes about as a result of the following:

Subregulation (1) of regulation 36 of the principal regulations is amended by inserting after the word "cause", wherever it appears therein, the words "permit or allow".

This means that, in relation to the provisions that apply to opticians, the following will apply:

(*a*) to cause permit or allow any advertisement to be inserted in any newspaper or periodical;

(*b*) to publish, issue or circulate, or cause permit or allow to be published, issued or circulated, any notice, circular letter, circular or other like document.

On the surface this seems to be a fairly innocent sort of alteration to the regulation. All members appreciate that it is common in the medical, dental and legal professions to have prohibitions, for ethical reasons, against advertising by people in those professions. There is no need for me to go into detail about the reasons for these prohibitions.

However, in relation to opticians, a somewhat unusual situation exists in South Australia. The old regulations that have applied since 1947 have caused no real problem within the industry. The alteration sought is designed for a specific purpose. I am not sure whether Government members knew the real reason for the regulations or whether they accepted them as an innocent and minor amendment to the present restrictions on advertising by opticians. I hope that the Premier and other Ministers have not fully understood the position (although they are obliged to check these things) and that they will support me in disallowance of the regulations.

It may be of interest to explain the position in relation to at least one optician in South Australia. For many years this optician has provided to the members of many organizations (such as social clubs, trade unions, Public Service organizations, women's organizations and welfare clubs) a discount of 25 per cent in respect of the cost of optical services for members and their families, subject to production of *bona fide* proof of membership. In these circumstances, it is only to be expected that the officials of the organizations notify members of the availability of this privilege, and they do this in many ways. Some organizations include a notification in their journal or newspapers, or by way of a notice on the accounts sent to members. The notification is also included on receipt holders, and stickers are attached to accounts or other documents sent to members, telling them of this service.

This regulation is designed to prevent organizations from notifying their members of the availability of this privilege. I consider it quite wrong to hold an optician responsible for the action of an official of an organization in telling members that they and their families are eligible for a discount. If the Government genuinely wants to prevent discounts being given by opticians (although I would not agree to that), it should take other steps and not do it by such a back-door method as these amendments to the regulations.

Western Australia, Tasmania and Victoria do not restrict opticians in this way, and I do not see any justification for imposing such a restriction here. I agree that, from the point of view of business ethics, opticians should not be permitted to advertise their services in newspapers and by other means, but the old regulations fully cover that. This amendment holds an optician responsible for the actions of people over whom he has no control: all he does for these people is provide a discount. I hope that the Government will reconsider this matter. In order to give members an

opportunity of knowing the type of notification given to members of organizations, the following is typical of the many that I have examined:

The Board of Management of this union has appointed—

and the name and address of the optician are given—

as its official optician. It has also been arranged that all members and their families will receive a genuine reduction of 25 per cent on the cost of all optical services by producing their current quarterly ticket when paying their account.

In my opinion, that is not advertising. However, I consider that the regulation should be disallowed now rather than have organizations testing the matter at law. The old regulation has operated since 1947, and discounts have probably been available for most of that time. The Optometrical Association has made many approaches to previous Governments to have implemented a regulation similar to the one I am seeking to have disallowed, but those Governments did not agree with the representations: they considered it wrong to act by regulation to make one person responsible for the actions of another. If there was any fear that advertising was giving rise to unethical practices, I would not object to action being taken.

However, the advertising of the type to which I have referred cannot have that effect. The old regulations cover any unethical advertising by an optician. Despite the restrictions generally, the opportunity has been provided, within the regulations, for opticians to place advertisements and public notices in newspapers. These are shown in the form of a copy of one that I have, and are usually printed under the heading of "Public Notices" showing the optician's name and address, stating that he is an optometrist and quoting the telephone number for appointment. This is not an advertisement in the true sense, but it encourages people to visit the optometrist for treatment. If members compare what members of the profession can place in a newspaper with the type of notice appearing in the organization's journal they will realize there is little difference. No suggestion is made by the people who publish the notices that an optician has superior qualifications: it is a notice informing people that the benefit is available and that a discount is available to members of these organizations and their families. The Government should consider closely the proposal, and if it believes that action is warranted in order to prevent the provision of the discount that is available to members then it should not be done in this fashion. The Government should disallow this regulation and if it opposes the application of discounts throughout the industry it should take steps to overcome this problem. I ask members to support the motion.

The Hon. R. S. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Virgo:

(For wording of motion, see page 1756.)

(Continued from October 9. Page 1761.)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I have discussed this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport and he has supplied me with notes in answer to the motion and to the speech given by the member for Edwardstown when moving it. The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was commenced in 1965 with the objective of examining the future transportation needs in metropolitan Adelaide up to the year 1986, and making recommendations for the extensions and improvements of the overall transportation system considered necessary to meet these needs. To undertake this comprehensive study of transportation in metropolitan Adelaide, the Government of the day established a joint steering committee, comprising the chief administrators of the five principal agencies concerned with transportation in metropolitan Adelaide. The membership of this committee, known as the joint steering committee, was—the Commissioner of Highways (Chairman), Director of Planning, Railways Commissioner, General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust, and Town Clerk, City of Adelaide.

A report containing the findings of the study and recommendations for the future development of transport services and facilities in metropolitan Adelaide was submitted to the Government by the joint steering committee in August of 1968. The Government, after giving preliminary consideration to the report realized the vast social and financial implications. The Government also realized that transportation planning for a large metropolitan area cannot be approached on a purely technical basis, and that there are many social and aesthetic considerations that must be weighed, together with technical engineering and economic considerations. Accordingly, the Government decided to make the report available for public consideration and review for a period of six months.

All councils within the metropolitan planning area, and any individuals or organizations which may wish so to do, have been invited to make submissions concerning the proposals contained in the report. By this means, the Government will be well informed of both the technical and non-technical aspects of this matter when it makes a decision as to further action as a result of the recommendations it has received. The transportation system proposed in the M.A.T.S. Report represents a further refinement of the transportation recommendations contained in the development proposals prepared by the Town Planning Committee and published in the form of the development plan of March, 1962. The need for further investigation of transportation requirements and refinements of the proposals was stressed by the Town Planner and the Commissioner of Highways in a joint submission to the Government in 1965, when the establishment of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was recommended.

The transportation proposals contained in the development plan were of a "broad brush" nature. As this plan dealt with the many aspects of overall development of the metropolitan area, a greater degree of detail with regard to the transportation proposals would not have been appropriate. The information published in the 1962 development proposals was adequate to allow everybody concerned to see the general type of transportation system that would be required by the pattern of development proposed in the development plan. There has been a period of some five years between the publication of the development plan and the release of the M.A.T.S. Report, and formal machinery was established for the submission and hearings of objections in relation to the development plan.

The relative emphasis to be given road, rail, and bus transport was investigated by both the Town Planning Committee in preparing the development plan, and by the study in preparing the present proposals. Both studies arrived at essentially the same conclusions in this respect. The system of freeways proposed in 1962 provided for a north-south freeway passing to the west of the central city area, and extending to the developing areas to both the north and the south; a freeway along the present Port Road; a freeway to serve the developing Modbury area; a further connection from Modbury to Port Adelaide; and a distribution of freeway traffic near the outer limits of the Adelaide park lands. I am glad to see the member for Edwardstown, the mover of the motion, now present in the House.

Mr. Virgo: The mover of the motion had to attend a telephone call from a constituent. The Attorney will have to accept my apology for not being here earlier.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I accept the honourable member's apology and I am interested in his explanation. The system of freeways now proposed, while differing in detail, is essentially similar in principle. Two notable changes from the previous proposals are the introduction of the Hills Freeway, from Walkerville to Crafers via Mitcham, and the Foothills Expressway linking from Mitcham to Burbank. Both the Town Planning Committee and the M.A.T.S. Report have recommended limited rail improvements, and improvement and extensions of the passenger bus services. To speak now of withdrawing the M.A.T.S. plan is to suggest that the public should be deprived of the opportunity of examining the proposals and of making suggestions as to what may be unacceptable and require changing—as to what variations should be made in the relative emphasis given the technical requirements, and the non-technical, social and aesthetic factors.

I cannot see what the Opposition means by withdrawing the M.A.T.S. proposal. How does one physically do that now that it is public? Do we take back all the copies and tell people that they have to forget all they have seen and read about it? What the honourable member is asking us to do is, in fact, an impossibility, because once information is known generally to the public it cannot be recalled. The member for Edwardstown has been happy to take this line, but has not been questioned on it.

Mr. Virgo: Let us hear your words and not the Minister's approach to it. Have you a view on it, because I have given mine?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The comments from which I am reading are the views of the Government.

Mr. Virgo: I would not be too sure about that: there may be another split in the Cabinet about this.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member has my assurance on that point. Because the Minister of Roads and Transport is in another place, his turn of phrase is gentler then mine would be. Returning to the motion, the honourable member's suggestion is a strange suggestion, particularly as the broad principle of the plan and the general development proposals

on which the present plan is based were published more than five years ago, and in spite of a number of objections made in connection with these earlier proposals, the previous Government saw fit to proclaim the development plan an authorized development plan in 1967. In so doing, the previous Government (a Labor Government) endorsed the principle of the transportation system that is now proposed in the M.A.T.S. Report. Judging from the objections received in connection with the 1962 development plan, and also the comments that have been made so far in connection with the M.A.T.S. plan, there seems little dissatisfaction in the community with the principle of the transportation proposals. People are concerned with the detail of the plan, and, with the exceptions that have been mentioned, it is only in detail that the present proposals differ from those of the 1962 development plan.

How can the Government assess public requirements in connection with future transportation proposals, and ensure that the plan to be adopted approaches these requirements as nearly as is practicable, if the public is to be denied the opportunity to comment on the proposals that the Government has received? That is saying, in other words, what I have already said. It is impossible to withdraw the plan or withdraw the proposals now.

Mr. Virgo: You can't unscramble the eggs once you have made an omelet.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The five principal agencies concerned with transportation in metropolitan Adelaide have, with the assistance of consultants, undertaken an extensive investigation extending over three years, and have now submitted their recommendations. The agencies have satisfied themselves that the necessary investigations have been undertaken, and the recommendations contained in the report, which has been prepared by the consultants, are generally endorsed by the joint steering committee. Would the honourable member have the Government withdraw the report and refer it back to the transport agencies for a further three years' investigation?

Mr. Virgo: Not refer it back, but withdraw it. If I had to refer it back I would not refer it to a body that is incompetent.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Would the honourable member forget it altogether?

Mr. Virgo: No, I would withdraw it and refer it to a competent body: not to the Yanks, but to Australians.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Has the honourable member any specific suggestions?

Mr. Virgo: Yes, I have.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We would be glad to hear them, but we have not heard them yet.

Mr. Virgo: If the Government can't run its business it should get out and let someone else do it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It seems that the honourable member can only reply to me with abuse. He should give me a direct answer, and we would then be better off. He cannot answer, because he has no idea of what to say.

Mr. Virgo: That's not true.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Why not tell us to whom it should be referred.

Mr. Virgo: I have put my suggestions and have had them wiped off.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I invite the honourable member again to make suggestions, but he does not seem to want to do so. Would he suggest that yet a third planning committee be established to now review both the work of the Town Planning Committee and of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study? The Government is of the opinion that the correct procedure now is to make the report available for public review and comment, as it has done. The joint steering committee brought together the agency concerned with overall development in the Adelaide metropolitan area, the State road authority, the two public transport authorities, and the central city government. This committee had a wider representation than is usual in both Australia and oversea practices in the planning of transportation for major urban areas.

Mr. Virgo: The Adelaide City Council really looks after its ratepayers!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member had better argue that with the member for Adelaide. Through the technical capacity of the five participating agencies, the joint steering committee had available to it a highly competent staff with a wide range of professional disciplines. Senior technical officers of these agencies, the Assistant Commissioner (Planning) of the Highways and Local Government Department, the Deputy Director of Planning, the Assistant to the General Traffic Manager of the South Australian Railways, the Traffic Planning Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust, and the City Engineer, City of Adelaide, formed a technical committee to advise the joint steering committee on the conduct of the study and the development of the proposals.

Recognizing that the staff of the local agencies had limited experience in modern transportation planning techniques, the joint steering committee recommended the appointment

of competent transportation planning consultants to advise it on the conduct and direction of the study. A prospectus was issued and consultants were invited to submit proposals. After considering a number of proposals, the joint steering committee recommended the appointment of De Leuw Cather and Company of Chicago, Rankine and Hill of Sydney, and Allen M. Voorhees and Associates Incorporated, of Washington. These firms, which had submitted a joint proposal, have had vast experience in the field of modern transportation planning. The member for Edwardstown will notice that one of the three specialists in this project was, in fact, Australian, and if he were not blinded by his prejudice against Americans he should acknowledge the experience and value to us of the other two partners.

In addition to the oversea experience brought by the consultants, several members of the joint steering and technical advisory committees have had oversea experience. The Chairman of the technical advisory committee and the Executive Engineer for the study have both undertaken 12 months' study courses in the United States of America, in addition to extensive professional studies in Australia. The Government believes that the joint steering committee has been in a position to learn from many mistakes that have been made overseas in connection with transportation planning, and has indeed taken full advantage of this position in developing the present proposals. In support of his suggestion that the rail proposals are not sound in principle, the member for Edwardstown has commented at length on the rail proposals in the Edwardstown-Goodwood area. He seems to be under the misunderstanding that the prime reason for the realignment of the rail line to make use of the right of way of the present Glenelg tramline is to avoid a rail-road grade separation at the Emerson crossing. The honourable member can be assured that this is not so, as in fact, there are numerous technical reasons for this proposed relocation.

The honourable member seems to be under another misunderstanding; that being that a rail-road grade separation would not be required where the Christie Downs line crosses the Blackwood line. On this matter, the honourable member can be assured that for technical reasons it is considered essential that such a grade separation be provided.

Mr. Virgo: What are these technical difficulties?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member will be patient all will be made plain. I will make it plain to the honourable member but I am sure he would never admit it. The rail proposals contained in the M.A.T.S. Report were developed, principally, by the staff of De Leuw Cather and Company. This firm has had extensive experience in railway engineering, and the Government and the joint steering committee for the study have the utmost confidence in the railway engineering work done by this firm. The proposals submitted by the consultant were reviewed by the technical staff of the South Australian Railways—

Mr. Virgo: This is completely untrue: it has never been submitted to the technical staff of the South Australian Railways Department.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If it is untrue we will have the allegation of the honourable member tested, and we will give members of the House the result of that test.

Mr. Virgo: I hope you do.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The proposals have been endorsed by the joint steering committee of the transportation study, of which the Railways Commissioner is a member. The best advice available to the Government at this stage indicates that the rail proposals included in the M.A.T.S. Report are consistent with modern railway engineering practice, and are completely sound in principle.

A number of alternative rail proposals in the Edwardstown and Goodwood areas were examined in the course of the transportation study. Alternatives other than the recommended plan, which has been published in the report, are possible, and these have varying degrees of effect on housing, and are of varying costs. The particular alternative selected for recommendation represents the most desirable compromise. It is understood that submissions will be forthcoming on this matter, and it is the Government's intention to give serious submissions every consideration, and, if found necessary, to vary the proposals as put forward in the M.A.T.S. Report. Of course, I should like to emphasize again, as we have emphasized ever since the report was made public, that we are not committed to it. It is available to the public for consideration and comment for six months, after which the Government will make a decision on it.

The Government is satisfied that every practical consideration has been given social and aesthetic considerations in the development

of the M.A.T.S. proposals. It cannot be expected that satisfactory transportation arrangements to meet future travel demands can be effected without considerable social disturbance. In many instances in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, social and aesthetic criteria overshadowed the purely engineering and economic criteria in the decision making. There are many instances where a more satisfactory engineering solution could be found, or where purely economic considerations would dictate a greater social disturbance than that represented by the present proposals.

To ensure that due regard was given social factors in the transportation study, a panel was assigned the task of first selecting social criteria to be used in the evaluation of alternatives, and then developing a score system representing the degree to which the various criteria were complied with. Alternative proposals were then rated on the basis of the predetermined score system, so that the various elements could be compared one with the other. The methods used in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study to ensure that due regard was given the non-technical factors have attracted much interest, both in Australia and overseas. Inquiries seeking information on the methods used have come from as far afield as Washington in the United States.

It must be appreciated that reasonable engineering standards must be met. The best we can hope to achieve is a compromise between engineering and social requirements. The Government will be pleased to have considered any submissions aimed at further reducing the social interference associated with the further development of transportation facilities and services. The keynote of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study has been that the plan must be practicable and workable, and within the financial resources expected to be available. The whole study has been influenced very largely by economic considerations. The prospectus of the study which provided the basis of the work by the consultant stated, in part, that—

the broad objective of the study is to devise a workable, acceptable and adaptable plan to guide traffic and transport of metropolitan Adelaide up to the year 1986. The study must be conducted and presented in such a form that continuing surveillance, refinement and amendment is practicable both during the period up to 1986 and beyond . . .

To further guide the work of the consultants and local staff, planning goals were defined as follows:

The plan should guide and, where necessary, direct the growth of the Adelaide metropolitan area in such a way as to preserve and enhance the social and economic welfare of the community as a whole.

Mr. Virgo: It sounds as though it has done a terrifically good job that way!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: All these things were being done while the honourable member's Party was in office. His influence on the Party was only from the Trades Hall at that time, but I think it was fairly real. The next goal was as follows:

The plan should be within the financial capabilities of the community. Compromises may have to be made therefore between the ideal and the obtainable.

A further requirement set by the joint steering committee states:

The total cost to the community both in first cost and in continuing maintenance and operating expenses, should be justified by sound economic analyses and the plan should be achievable within financial resources likely to be available.

Mr. Virgo: Who wrote this speech for you?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member was not in the Chamber, as he should have been, to look after his own business. Otherwise, he would know the answer to that question.

Mr. Virgo: It was not my business: it was my constituents' business.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown has made his speech. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The estimated costs of implementing the M.A.T.S. proposals are as follows:

	$	$
Road:		
Freeways and expressways . .	299,300,000	
Arterial roads, rail crossings and proposed Port River crossing	137,200,000	
Total, Road . . .		436,500,000
Rail:		
Rolling stock . .	32,000,000	
King William Street Subway	32,800,000	
Other line improvements .	14,300,000	
Total, Rail . . .		79,100,000
Bus:		
Rolling stock . .	26,900,000	
Depots, etc. . . .	1,500,000	
Total, Bus . . .		28,400,000
Parking		30,000,000
Total		574,000,000

Cost estimates have generally been based on current rates. Insofar as road projects are concerned—and the road projects represent 76 per cent of the overall cost—it is not acknowledged that unit rates will necessarily increase with the general inflationary increase in the cost structure. Larger scale road construction operations in the future will afford the opportunity to organize the works on a much larger scale, the letting of larger contracts, and the more effective use of larger plant. Also, with increasing mechanization of large scale road works, the labour content represents an ever reducing proportion of the total cost.

These factors will tend to reduce unit rates whereas the inflationary factors in the general cost structure will tend to increase unit rates. It remains to be seen which is the more powerful influence in relation to future road works. It is of interest to note that unit construction costs of the Highways and Local Government Department have not increased in recent years in keeping with the general increase in the cost structure. It is important to recognize that, whilst cost estimates have been based on current rates, so also have estimates of the revenue expected to be available for carrying out the works.

Principal sources of funds available for road works to the Highways and Local Government Department are State motor taxation, road maintenance contributions and Commonwealth grants to the State for road purposes. While the cost of the road proposals put forward in the M.A.T.S. plan amounts to $436,500,000 the total funds expected to be available to the department over the next 20 years is expected to exceed $1,000,000,000.

Mr. Virgo: Is that before or after you reduce the ton-mile tax?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is interjecting rather too much.

Mr. Virgo: Are you objecting?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I was merely suggesting that, as the honourable member is in charge of the matter, it is usual—and the honourable member will learn this if he remains here long enough—for such a member to be in the House. This estimate of revenue assumes no increase in the rates of State motor taxation or of road maintenance contributions. In respect of the Commonwealth grants it assumes merely a continuation of the increasing trend that has applied over the past 10 years. It is not a matter of the M.A.T.S. road proposals being beyond the available financial resources. It is rather a matter of what proportion of the funds expected to be available can be directed towards the metropolitan area. It should not be assumed that all road proposals contained in the plan should be financed entirely from Highways Department funds. The city of Adelaide will be involved in some of the road proposals.

The public transport proposals are estimated to cost $107,500,000. Of this, $58,900,000 will be required for rail and bus rolling stock, and this figure includes the cost of replacing and expanding the privately-operated bus fleet, in addition to that of the M.T.T. While funds for the improvement of public transport services are dependent on State Government allocation, the Government recognizes that failure to allow public transport to play its role in a correctly balanced transportation system would be extremely expensive in terms of the additional expenditure required on roads and in terms of the additional social cost involved.

It has been estimated that an investment of about $30,000,000 will be required to carry out the proposed parking programme of the city of Adelaide that has been endorsed by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. This figure represents the total sum by both the city of Adelaide and private interests. The substantial progress already made by the city in its five-year parking programme has been largely financed by loan funds because of the council's limited resources and its commitments in other fields. The matter of the availability of funds for future parking requirements will be the subject of further consideration by the Government. No-one will deny that the cost of allowing traffic congestion to develop would be very high indeed.

Mr. Virgo: Where is the finance to come from for the public transport section?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is showing that he is no-one by interjecting. With few exceptions, arterial roads in metropolitan Adelaide are capable of handling today's traffic volumes. Estimates of future travel, however, indicate that total vehicle-miles of travel in metropolitan Adelaide will more than double, increasing from 4,120,000 vehicle-miles on a week day in 1965 to about 9,500,000 vehicle-miles in 1968. It is evident that we are headed for chronic traffic congestion unless drastic action is taken, and taken soon. Direct benefits to the users of roads and public transport services recommended in the plan will result from savings of time due to higher operating speeds on freeways, and rapid transit rail services. It

is estimated that by 1986 the savings on this account will benefit the community by $28,000,000 annually.

As a result of improved operating conditions on roads resulting from the proposals of the study, it is estimated that by 1986 road users will save a further $43,900,000 annually because of lower vehicle operating costs. I hope the member for Edwardstown is listening to these figures. Saving in operating costs of road vehicles attributable to those passengers diverted to public transport (who would otherwise use motor cars) is estimated at a further $5,500,000 annually by 1986. The diversion of travellers to public transport will reduce the demand for car parking in the central city area by 3,000 spaces, representing a saving of about $6,000,000. In the Adelaide metropolitan area the current fatality rate in car accidents is equivalent to seven fatalities for each 100,000,000 vehicle-miles of travel. Studies in 30 States of the United States of America indicate that the fatality rate on freeways averages less than two for each 100,000,000 vehicle-miles of travel. It is estimated that between now and 1986 the safer operating conditions prevailing on freeways recommended by the study will represent a saving of 350 lives. For the reasons I have given, the Government opposes the motion.

Mr. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION ACT REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. R. Loveday.

(For wording of motion, see page 1761.)

(Continued from October 16. Page 1938.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): It is not often that I find myself in agreement with the remarks made by members opposite, but on the subject of trainee teacher allowances I find my sympathies rather in line with those of the Opposition. If the regulations that have been gazetted are not disallowed, they will change radically the present system of payments to trainee teachers at teachers training colleges in South Australia. Members will realize that under the present system each student is reimbursed the equivalent of a fare on public transport to and from his home and travelling from one college to another in the course of his scholastic duties, less 20c. That allowance is paid each day whether or not the student avails himself of public transport. We all know that in some cases, because of the proximity of their homes to the colleges they attend, some students are able to claim a fairly substantial travelling allowance while, in fact, they may travel only short distances. As an example, a student whose home may be at Burnside and who attends the Wattle Park Teachers College (in which case he would probably travel direct from Burnside to Wattle Park) may be entitled to claim a travelling allowance part-way into the city and to the training college and return to his home. Therefore, we must agree that at least in some cases students are able to obtain a higher travelling allowance than they are morally entitled to receive, even though the form a student fills out states that he is entitled to claim the equivalent allowance of the public transport fare to the college and return, less 20c. The wording on that form is as follows:

Payment is made in respect of travel from home to a teachers college, university, institute of technology or other place where instruction is given. It is recognized that students may not travel by public transport; but whatever form of conveyance is used, they may claim the cost of travel by public transport from home to college and return in excess of 20c a day.

It can be seen, therefore, that this form sets out quite clearly what the students are entitled to claim. From representations made to me by many students, it seems that they have been satisfied in the past with the way in which the travelling allowances have been paid. They admit that in a few cases students are able to claim a higher travelling allowance than they are entitled in equity to claim, but in general the travelling allowances have not been abused.

Coincident with the abandonment of the travelling allowance each student has been entitled to claim there will, in its place, be an aggregate figure that will provide each student with a travelling allowance averaged on all students attending teachers colleges in South Australia, plus an allowance for books. However, on the contra side of the account, it must be admitted that the present book loans in respect of teachers colleges do in some cases greatly exceed the figure the Minister has allowed as the book equivalent in her composite sum. I know that some students from the Adelaide Teachers College who are taking university units, which would involve them in great expense if they had to buy their books, are at present receiving generous loans of textbooks, and this is indeed a help to them.

One of the compensating factors that the Minister has agreed to will be the supply of multiple copies of textbooks to every teachers college in South Australia as well as the

provision of a base list of reference books for every course that students in our teachers colleges are taking. Members will appreciate that this is a large order. I have been informed that upwards of 4,000 separate titles will be provided in one library and, if the ratio of one book to 20 students is to be maintained, it will be a substantial collection. This will apply to every teachers college where students are taking a vast range of subjects at the university or the Institute of Technology, or are taking domestic courses within those training colleges.

Members will know that the regulation now before the House is somewhat different in form from what it was when it was first introduced. I have played a substantial part in the changes that have been made, because I was dissatisfied with the regulation when it was first promulgated. The students at our teachers colleges have conducted themselves with commendable restraint in this matter. They have been affected seriously by this change in allowances, and I believe that the change should not have applied to students already in our teachers colleges, because they entered the colleges under certain conditions of service and pay, and I do not believe those conditions should have been changed suddenly without proper consultation or arrangement with them.

If the Government wished to change the travelling allowances, such a change should have applied only to those students entering teachers colleges next year for the first time, and students at present in our colleges should have been able to continue with the present travelling allowance arrangement and book loan scheme. I refer members to the Minister's remarks when she addressed the House in this debate on October 16. She said:

> The Government intends to set up a committee before the Estimates are prepared next year, comprising people like the Under Treasurer and the Auditor-General, who were loud in their criticism of the existing method of allocating allowances, the lack of control over travelling allowances, and the provision of textbooks on loan. Also, there could be a representative of the principals of the five teachers training colleges on the committee. I am not saying positively who will be on the committee, but it will comprise people at that level.

A little later she said:

> I am saying that a committee will be set up, that it will be of a high level, and that it will review the method of distributing allowances.

One of the concessions the Minister has made since the regulation was first tabled is to announce that the Government has undertaken to set up a review committee so that everyone concerned with education in South Australia will know whether the system is working well and not to the disadvantage of the students. The Minister gave me a personal assurance that she would set up this committee of inquiry, because it was one of the conditions upon which I insisted before I would agree not to vote with the Opposition Party to disallow these regulations. The Minister's assurance to me was that one of the members of that committee would be one of the Principals of the South Australian teachers colleges. I expect the Minister to honour that undertaking. There is no personal reflection on the Minister at all. I merely want my remarks to appear in *Hansard* so that they will be there against my name. The Minister gave me an assurance that one of the members of that committee would be one of the Principals of our teachers colleges; the wording of the debate on October 16 would not quite indicate that, but that is what the Minister has assured me.

I visited three of the teachers colleges after the regulations were introduced to see for myself what sort of provision was made in each of these three colleges for housing the multiple copies of textbooks that the Minister has undertaken to introduce. I visited the Wattle Park, the Adelaide and the Western Teachers Colleges. I expect the Western Teachers College will have adequate room to house these multiple copies, but I doubt very much whether the Wattle Park and the Adelaide Teachers Colleges can properly house these books.

The Minister has assured me that provision will be made, but I point out that we are now in November and the next academic year will start in three months' time, so only three months is left for the Education Department machinery to turn in order to provide the facilities for all these multiple copies that will appear in our teachers colleges. Although it does not appear in *Hansard*, the Minister has given me a personal assurance that every textbook required for every course that each student takes at each college will be provided. It is on those two conditions—first, that a committee will be set up to inquire into the way the regulations are working and, secondly, that there will be proper provision for all the multiple copies—that I will not support the Opposition in its motion for disallowance. Again, I stress how disappointed I am that this particular regulation has been brought down: it should apply only to students

coming into our teachers colleges for the first time next year. Students now in our teachers colleges have been unjustly treated in having this change in trainee-teacher allowances forced upon them.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): With my colleague the member for Light, I visited the Adelaide and the Western Teachers Colleges. I think it is fair to say that the people there are concerned about this change, but it is also fair to say that they appreciate the need for it. The Minister has not had an easy task to face up to in bringing down these regulations. She has given an assurance that the Auditor-General, the Under Treasurer and one of the Principals of teachers training colleges will form this committee to investigate the matter before the next Estimates are brought down. I would be happy for the Under Treasurer, the Auditor-General and either Mr. Pfitzner (of Adelaide Teachers College) or Mr. Williams (of the Western Teachers College) to review the situation in the light of these regulations.

The member for Light has taken a major interest in these regulations. Indeed, he has made commendable research into this matter. I was pleased to be able to visit those two colleges and am sorry I was not able to visit the other one. I am sure that there will be teething troubles. However, the Government has shown its practical interest in the matter by agreeing to set up a special committee to examine the effect of these regulations.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): It has been interesting to listen to the remarks of the two speakers who have just resumed their seats and to hear from at least one of them that the students have been treated unjustly. This, of course, is what we on this side of the House have been maintaining since we spoke on this matter and moved that the regulations be disallowed. That was the basic reason for urging this disallowance. I listened with great interest to what the member for Light said. Obviously, he has taken the trouble to make contact with the student teachers and to find out for himself that what we have been saying about these things is basically correct.

It is interesting to hear him say that he made conditions in connection with how he would cast his vote. In view of his approach and attitude to members on this side in the past, I find it hard to believe that he would vote with us on anything. Still, he has told us that he would have voted with us had not the Minister agreed to the conditions that the committee to be set up would have upon it one of the Principals of our teachers training colleges and that all textbooks required would be available for next year's work.

During my previous remarks on this matter, I have emphasized that there is grave doubt indeed whether under this new scheme the colleges would have sufficient accommodation for the books. This has virtually been admitted by the member for Light regarding the Wattle Park and Adelaide Teachers Colleges. I am certain that the load that will be placed on the Barr Smith Library and upon all the libraries at the teachers colleges will be severe indeed. As I have said before, the Barr Smith Library, in its present condition, is really unable to carry any further load. It is well known to everyone associated with education that it is already overloaded.

Whether or not the Minister has been obliged to agree to these conditions is something members on this side of the House are unlikely to know, but the Minister has adopted a most uncompromising attitude in all her remarks in the debates on this matter. I will now turn to some of the statements she made on October 16. The information we have received from the Minister has been remarkable, in a number of instances, for its inaccuracy. In her speech on October 16, regarding the new system, she said:

> The Government is introducing a new method that will put trainee teachers on a parity with other tertiary students, a status to which trainee teachers have long laid claim.

She suggests that this is something the student teachers have really been looking for, and that they will be happy indeed to have their status on a line with other tertiary students. Of course, that is quite contrary to fact, as was pointed out in a letter to the *Advertiser* of September 25 by David J. Smith (President of the Adelaide Teachers College Students Representative Council). The letter carried 82 other signatures and stated:

> There are basic differences between Commonwealth scholarships and student teachers which the Minister failed to point out in her comment that our allowances are "more generous". Commonwealth scholars are not taxed; their parents can claim them as dependants for tax purposes; they do not have to pay their own medical benefits; their parents receive child endowment; their educational expenses are regarded as tax deductible; and they are not bonded.

These are all essential matters of difference. Here again, the Minister put arguments that simply do not bear inspection. The Minister also said:

By the very method that has been employed to compute the new increase an average is established. This being so, of course it is obvious that half the students will benefit (and for the information of honourable members I have had relayed to me in the last two or three weeks the delight of a not inconsiderable number of trainee students at their particular good fortune, as they have benefited from this regulation) and, just as obviously, because it is an average, half will not be as well off.

I am surprised that a Minister of Education should apparently get some satisfaction from the delight of a number of students at the benefit they will receive at the expense of other students, because obviously the students who will benefit have not found it necessary to have this increase before. They were in a situation where they were not entitled to travelling allowances to the extent that other students were and, as a consequence of certain allowances of these latter students who had to travel further more often being decreased, those students will now benefit; yet this is held up as a matter of satisfaction. I believe this should be regarded as something in which there is no satisfaction. In fact, it should be regarded as a matter of great concern. After all, surely the policy that should be followed in this type of situation should be to assist where the need is greatest and not take away from students in that position and give to those whose need is the least. The Minister also said:

I cannot accept the argument of the member for Whyalla that students, with their parents, have every reason to expect that the conditions on which they entered into their present careers as student teachers would at least be maintained.

People who enter into student-teacher agreements expect the conditions to be at least maintained. In this regard, let me say that it has been claimed that we will now treat the students more as adults. If that were the case, we would not achieve that through this regulation, because we would not treat any body of adults by making their conditions worse than they are at present after they had entered into something where the conditions were laid out clearly. We know what the result would be if an adult body were treated in this way, and this was pointed out in a letter to the *Advertiser* of October 24 by Peter Mitchell (President of the Students Representative Council of the Western Teachers College). That letter states:

Mrs. Steele has repeatedly denied that there is any breach of contract on the grounds that "allowances could be varied" at any time. However, a basic right or privilege, faithfully promised to all students, has been taken away. This cannot be glossed over merely as a change in the allowance.

The two letters to which I have referred this afternoon also point out that no adult body would be treated in such a way because it would believe its expectations would be honoured. The students thought they had every reason to believe there would be no diminution of the benefits they received through their allowances.

The Minister made a point about the advertisement, which the students and the South Australian Institute of Teachers placed in the *Advertiser,* and called it a very misleading advertisement. Of course, the Minister used statistics in her speech, showing the allowances that are now current in teachers colleges in other States, and placed alongside those figures the allowances that would obtain in South Australia from the beginning of next year. Obviously, student-teacher allowances in other States may be adjusted upwards in the interim, and the only fair comparison, when statistics are used in this way, is to use figures that represent the same circumstances in all cases. This criticism of the advertisement in the *Advertiser* does not have great weight, because the Minister has been far from accurate on a number of points. Referring to my remarks about the pupil-teacher ratio (I had drawn attention to the fact that we needed far more teachers of quality in order that we might improve the ratio), the Minister said:

For the year 1968 there has been the biggest net gain overall to the department of teachers retained by the department since 1964, which was the last full year the Liberal and Country League Government was in office.

I do not know what that statement was meant to imply but, if it was meant to imply that the improved situation was due to the present L.C.L. Government's coming into office, I should like to take issue with that strongly. Obviously, the present improvement has been caused by the action of the Labor Government during the last three years. We provided equal pay for equal work for women teachers (implementation over five years); provision of accouchement leave for women teachers for a period before and after the birth of a baby, thus enabling them to retain continuity of service; waiving of existing bond liability when women teachers leave to take care of a child; continuous employment of women teachers on marriage; provision of flats for single women teachers in country towns; and refresher courses for married female ex-teachers before re-employment. Obviously, these all had a considerable effect

in improving the position, none of which was caused by the advent of the present Government.

I turn to the statement by the Minister that this decision regarding the regulation has been made with the full approval of Principals of teachers colleges who favour the new system of allowances with which the provision of textbooks is associated. I am informed on the best authority that this is not a full statement of the position and that the Principals of our colleges favour the new system of allowances, provided that the allowances are adequate, and that is a different thing. It is perfectly obvious to everyone that the allowances are not adequate. The Minister said that students were trained and were then guaranteed a job at the end of their training. David Smith, in his letter to the *Advertiser*, pointed out that the agreement specifically stated that the Minister should not be bound to provide employment as a teacher for the students. I have no doubt that most of these students do enter the department as teachers, but they are not guaranteed employment.

Mr. Clark: Wasn't something said about a position anywhere in the world?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That may be so, but it is not necessary to take my point further. The real issue in this question is the way in which this matter has been accomplished and the injustice inflicted on those students whose parents will have to find additional money in order to meet the cost of travelling expenses and textbooks, because I am not convinced that the provision of books as described by the Minister will be adequate to meet the needs of students next year. I shall be most surprised if that is the case. Whether the books are sufficient or not, the fact remains that travelling allowances as prescribed will be utterly inadequate for many students. The Minister has admitted this by telling us that half the students are delighted, because they will benefit from the misfortune of the others who will be short of the necessary money to provide for travelling allowances.

The member for Glenelg quoted the case of a student who travelled from Seacliff to Magill every day and who told him that her travelling expenses would be about $170 or $180 a year. If this student made a reasonable expenditure on books this, added to her travelling expenses, meant that it would cost her about $250 a year, for which she will receive $105. She will be worse off, and there are many similar cases. I do not intend to cover all the ground again, but I have drawn attention to the numerous inaccuracies in the information that has been given to this House by the Minister. We were first told that the Government did not intend to save money by this action, but the prime motive in introducing this regulation was the saving of money. This fact was revealed during the debate. I am quite prepared to admit that the present system is not all that is to be desired but, it seems to me, it could have been altered in a different way.

We have suggested that a zoning system should be instituted: it could be combined with concessions on public transport, and the member for Glenelg, when elaborating on this suggestion, pointed out that a yearly travelling allowance could have been provided and that every student and the department would have known at the beginning of the year precisely what the student would be paid as a travelling allowance. The old administrative problems associated with filling in travel claim forms could have been eliminated and there would have been no injustice to those students who will lose what they badly need for the purpose of travelling allowances. As we know, many students are in a much more unfortunate position than are others because of travel between colleges, between the college annexes, and to the universities, and all these differences could have been adjusted by a zoning allowance with a special allowance to meet problems at a particular college.

Mr. Rodda: Why didn't you do something about this when you were the Minister and you knew the problem existed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have a list of the things that the Labor Government did in education and it was impossible to accomplish everything in the short time available to us. That is a sufficient answer for the honourable member. I emphasize that we have heard this afternoon that a special committee is to be set up to deal with the matter, I presume, of student allowances in general.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: I did not say that today. I said it a fortnight ago.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A committee is to be set up to examine this particular subject. Surely, it would be a good idea if two students' representatives were included on this committee as well as the Principal from one of the colleges. That is what should have been done in the first place and should surely be done when this committee is set up. The fact that the committee is to be set up shows that the regulation is unsatisfactory.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: There is still time—perhaps I can speak over the noise from the member for Stirling.

Mr. McAnaney: Keep on the rails, then.

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

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am on the rails and I am entitled to my opinion about the reasons for setting up this committee. If a perfect solution was available under this regulation the committee would not have been set up. Earlier I said that the students' allowances should not be subject to alteration by any Government when it felt like it, but that there should be a proper arrangement whereby they were adjusted in accordance with the cost of living. Perhaps that will sink in, too, as a number of other things have sunk in that have come from this side of the House.

The Minister has denied that what we said had anything to do with her raising the original proposal from $85 to $105, but no-one believes this. We were told that this was the average amount, when the amount that was being spent was divided up. However, when the figures were obtained, this was found to be incorrect. I would not have said these things again today if I had not received so many interjections from members on the Government side. If they want the full truth about this matter they will get it, and it is time they listened to it. I am not going to allow myself to be diverted by these interjections, which we are so used to receiving from the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney).

There is still an opportunity for the Government to do the right thing, to accept our suggestions, to put into operation a zoning arrangement and to pay the students the travelling allowances that they need. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) has pointed out that the students attending teachers colleges are usually the sons and daughters of those parents who could not otherwise send them to a tertiary institution. In fact, the research carried out by the Education Department officers has shown that, if it were not for the allowances, 46 per cent of our students would never be at the colleges.

We should have the right to expect accurate information during discussions on this matter, but I say that we have not received it—and this has been deliberate. We have been misled from the start by the figures and information given. There is still time to rectify the injustice done to many students in our teachers colleges. I hope members opposite will have the good conscience to support the motion to disallow these regulations and do the right thing by the students.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday (teller), McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele (teller), Messrs. Teusner, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hutchens and Jennings. Noes—Messrs. Giles and Nankivell.

The SPEAKER: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes I give my casting vote to the Noes, so the question passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

[*Sitting suspended from* 6.2 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1967. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Stamp Duties Act to provide for the levy of a stamp duty on certificates of compulsory third party insurance that are lodged with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles in accordance with section 21 of the Motor Vehicles Act, together with applications to register motor vehicles. Similar levies are made in Victoria, in the form of a surcharge levied under the Motor Car Act, and in Western Australia in the form of a surcharge levied pursuant to the Motor Vehicles (Third Party Insurance Surcharge) Act. In Tasmania a charge is levied against the insurance companies in respect of each such policy issued, thus leaving it to the companies to recover from their clients. The rate of the levy in each of those States is the same, namely, $2 on each annual certificate of insurance.

In this Bill it is proposed to levy a stamp duty of $2 on certificates of insurance lodged

with applications to register vehicles for 12 months and $1 on certificates of insurance lodged with applications to register vehicles for six months. The duty will be denoted on the certificate or interim certificate of registration or on some other appropriate form issued by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles with the approval of the Commissioner. It is proposed that the total proceeds of the duty shall be paid to the Hospitals Fund and used exclusively for the purposes of public hospitals and Government-subsidized hospitals. The present general charge for vehicular accident cases in public hospitals is $12.50 a day. In the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which handles the majority of accident cases, the average daily cost of treating and maintaining a patient in 1968-69 will be about $26. In the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which also treats a high proportion of accident cases, the average daily cost this year will exceed $30. The problem of actual costs being much greater than fees charged is also faced by other Government hospitals and by the many subsidized hospitals to which the Government must give considerable financial support each year. As honourable members know, the moneys available in the Hospitals Fund from lottery and Totalizator Agency Board operations, to be supplemented by this special stamp duty, are allocated, administratively, first towards meeting the increased grants to subsidized hospitals and then towards the increased costs of Government hospitals.

It should be noted that duty is payable only in respect of certificates of insurance lodged with the Registrar on the making of an application to register a motor vehicle. It follows, therefore, that no duty will be payable in respect of certificates issued in connection with vehicles that are exempt from registration. These include fire-fighting vehicles, certain primary producers' vehicles and other vehicles that travel on roads only for repairs to be effected at the nearest repair shop. Likewise, no duty will be payable in respect of certificates required to enable the vehicles to travel on a permit—for example, isolated journeys by heavy equipment, primary producers' vehicles that use roads only to travel between different parts of the owner's farm property.

Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be proclaimed. This provision is necessary because related to this Bill is a Bill to make certain consequential amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act, and it would be essential that both these Bills be brought into operation at the same time. Clause 3 amends the heading preceding section 42a of the Act indicating that stamp duty will apply to certificates of insurance as well as to applications for motor vehicle registration. Clause 4 is a drafting amendment by which the definition of "application to register a motor vehicle" is redrafted by excluding therefrom the exception relating to any application by a person for renewal of his existing registration. This exception has been converted by clause 9 (*a*) to Exemption 15 of the exemptions (in the Second Schedule) to the liability to pay duty on every application to register a motor vehicle. The effect of the present law is not changed by the amendment.

Clause 5 amends section 42b of the Act to provide that the stamp duty on the insurance certificate is to be paid to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles at the time of making an application to register a motor vehicle. This is the same as the procedure already laid down for the payment of duty on application to register or to transfer the registration of a motor vehicle. The duty will be denoted by cash register imprint or by impressed stamp, or by both. It also provides that the duty in respect of the certificates of insurance shall be paid to the Hospitals Fund and used in the same manner and for the same purposes as moneys derived from lotteries and Totalizator Agency Board activities and paid into the Hospitals Fund.

Clauses 6 and 7 merely extend the present application of sections 42c and 42d, which deal at present with claims for exemption and for refunds of over-payments of stamp duty on applications for registration or for the transfer of the registration of motor vehicles, to stamp duty in respect of insurance certificates. The Commissioner's authority to make refunds in certain cases is extended to permit him to authorize the Registrar to make refunds on his behalf. Clause 8 amends section 42e of the principal Act by widening the regulation-making power to include power to repeal, vary or add to the exemptions to the liability to pay duty on certificates of insurance. The section already contains a similar power in relation to exemptions to the liability to pay duty on applications for registration of motor vehicles.

The opportunity is taken in clause 9 to amend the Second Schedule by including in the list of exemptions shown in the Act relating to applications to register or transfer registration of vehicles the various exemptions that have been prescribed by regulation since the original statutory exemptions were enacted in 1964. This means that, instead of our having

to search the *Gazettes,* all the exemptions will appear in the Act. Exemption No. 10 is reworded so as to exempt not only municipal and district councils but also bodies wholly constituted by municipal and district councils and carrying out certain council functions. The "controlling authorities" mentioned in this exemption are authorities formed by councils co-operating to carry out functions such as weed and vermin control, drainage, etc. This clause also adds the further exemption (Exemption No. 15) that I mentioned earlier to make it quite clear that duty on an application to register a motor vehicle is not payable if, immediately before the date of the application, the vehicle was registered in the name of the applicant in any State or Territory of the Commonwealth.

Clause 9 also inserts in the Second Schedule the new item "Certificate of insurance" and sets out the appropriate rates of duty of $2 where the vehicle is to be registered for 12 months, and $1 where it is to be registered for six months. It then sets out the various exemptions to this duty, which follow very closely the exemption from duty on applications to register or transfer registrations of motor vehicles. They apply to certificates of insurance lodged—

(1) by persons who are entitled to free registration;
(2) for registration of trailers;
(3) by the Crown and statutory bodies of the Crown;
(4) to register large passenger buses;
(5) by local government authorities and certain authorities constituted of local government authorities;
(6) by certain incapacitated ex-servicemen; and
(7) by certain incapacitated civilians.

I commend the Bill to members and seek the indulgence of the House to deal expeditiously with this Bill and the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), both of which are related Bills and complementary to one another.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1968. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank members for their courtesy in enabling me to give the second reading explanations of this Bill and of the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill (No. 2). This Bill is complementary to the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), 1968, which I just laid before this House. As honourable members are aware, that Bill amends the Stamp Duties Act to provide for the levy of a stamp duty on certificates of compulsory third party insurance that are lodged with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles under section 21 of the Motor Vehicles Act at the time of making application for the registration of the motor vehicles to which the certificates relate. Provision is made in clause 2 for the Bill to be brought into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. The reason for this provision is to ensure that this Bill and the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill (No. 2), which is related to it, are brought into operation at the same time.

Clause 3 amends the definition of "stamp duty" in section 5 of the principal Act, because at present that definition is restricted in its meaning to stamp duty on an application for the registration or transfer of registration of a motor vehicle. The definition in its amended form would be wide enough to catch up stamp duty on certificates of insurance as well. Clauses 4 and 5a make drafting amendments to sections 11 and 16, respectively, of the principal Act. Clauses 5 (*b*), 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13 and 14 amend various other provisions of the principal Act so as to ensure that payment of the stamp duty imposed by the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) is received by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles before registering a motor vehicle or before issuing a permit authorizing the use of a motor vehicle pending its registration. Clause 11 amends subsection (3) of section 43 of the principal Act which provides that, if the registration fee or the stamp duty payable on registration of a motor vehicle, or both, are paid by cheque which is dishonoured, the registration is to be deemed void. The clause merely extends the application of the sections to cases where the stamp duty on a certificate of insurance is paid by a cheque that is subsequently dishonoured.

Clause 12 requires the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, when registering a motor vehicle, to issue to the owner not only a registration label but also a certificate or an interim certificate of registration relating to the motor vehicle. This is the present practice, and it is being written into the Act because provision is made in the Stamp Duties Act Amendment

Bill (No. 2) for the stamp duty on the relevant certificate of insurance to be denoted on the certificate or interim certificate of registration issued by the Registrar in relation to the vehicle in question.

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

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from November 5. Page 2239.)

Clause 8—"Other functions and duties of the Commission."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In subclause (6) after "thereby" to strike out "(disregarding any fraction)" and insert "(calculated to the nearest integral number)".

I find it difficult to notice any consistency in Committee. Earlier, it was pointed out that it was reasonable to have inconsistencies throughout the Bill and that it was proper to calculate to the nearest integral number in each instance. We decided that in subclause (2), but for some reason there was a contrary decision on subclause (4). We should try to make the Bill as consistent as we can. We have no justification, when fixing the quotients for the country quota, to disregard fractions: the only purpose for doing so is to gain some advantage. This amendment is a proper move, because there is no logic in disregarding fractions.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (7) (*b*) after "than" to strike out "fifteen" and insert "ten".

We have established different quotas for metropolitan districts and country districts, and we have already provided in the clause that the departure from the quotas so established should not be more than 10 per cent. There is no difficulty in providing that same tolerance from the quota in country districts as in metropolitan districts. Why should there be a differentiation in this matter? We have already provided a tolerance between the two districts by differentiating between country and metropolitan quotas, so there is no question of tolerance from the general State quota: that is already provided for.

What I propose here is to get some variation from the separate quotas so established, and the variation does not need in these circumstances to go beyond 10 per cent. Indeed, in the Constitution Reform Committee's report in the Commonwealth Parliament, which was subscribed to by Liberal Party members in this State, it was proposed that the total departure be not more than 10 per cent. If that can be accomplished in the Commonwealth sphere, there is not the slightest reason why we should go further in respect of tolerance from the quota in the country than we do in the city. The aim is to get districts as nearly equal in number as is possible in each area and, if this aim is valid, then we should not depart by more than 10 per cent from the quota in each of these areas.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): The figure of 15 per cent is provided specifically to cater for the wide variation in the area and in the character of country districts. If the Leader of the Opposition remembers the Bill with which he was associated in 1965, he will realize that two seats could have had a very small number of electors under that legislation. The object was to provide an extreme weighting of value to electors in two districts because of their sparse population and vast areas. This situation still exists today.

Mr. Corcoran: That is not correct.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think I recall that the variation in the Labor Party's Bill was 15 per cent.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That was 15 per cent from the basic State quota.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: We are arguing whether this should be 15 per cent up or down, according to the country quota. In the relation between one seat and another in the country, the variation was just as great. Two districts could have varied by 15 per cent up or down at that time.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It had to be related to the State quota, not the special country quota.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: All these matters have been canvassed fairly widely during the second reading debate. We have already said it would be a pity to split certain areas for the sake of perhaps only a few hundred voters. In this respect I instance Mount Gambier, where I think the 15 per cent tolerance would be appreciated.

I consider that there is a very real need to give freedom to the commissioners, because I believe that any sound commissioners would use their discretion wisely. There would be no reason at all, other than practical ones, for the commissioners to make variations at all. Of course, it is possible that districts like Wallaroo, Yorke Peninsula, Rocky River, or my own district of Gouger will disappear in a redistribution, and possibly it would be necessary also to split a town like Kadina.

I think the Committee can rest assured that the commissioners will not capriciously use the 15 per cent tolerance up or down; they will merely meet practical situations. The Government believes that this clause should pass in its present form.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier has based his argument on two practical considerations. One is that there are certain sparsely settled areas which need a considerable tolerance from the quota, and the other is that we should be able to have, in country cities, a larger number than the country quota. He instanced Mount Gambier, and said that we could go to 15 per cent above the quota in order to keep the whole of the city of Mount Gambier together. This is just the situation about which the Australian Labor Party has been talking at some length.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: I said it would be done to meet a practical situation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If it is to be used in this way, then in fact it is to be used to put electors in country cities at a disadvantage compared with the remainder of the country area.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: It is a small variation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not small at all. The Premier knows perfectly well that in a quota of this size a few hundred electors can make a considerable difference to the actual effect of a vote in a country area. There is no necessity at all, given the fact that we have already provided a departure from the State quota, to provide a further 15 per cent tolerance; a 10 per cent tolerance is as much as is needed, even to cope with sparsely settled areas. The Premier has referred to the Bill introduced previously by my Party. That Bill provided a 15 per cent tolerance from the quota, but that was one State quota, not a separate quota for country areas. It provided that one could go beyond that quota for two country districts of a sparsely settled nature, but the overriding provision for the commission was that all electorates should be as nearly equal as practicable, but that is not an overriding principle in this Bill. The departure of 15 per cent from the already differentiated quota for country areas can mean that this will be far beyond 15 per cent from the State quota. It has already been revealed by the Premier that the purpose of this tolerance from the quota is not merely to get below the quota to cope with the difficulty of servicing country areas but to affect adversely the electors of Mount Gambier, Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta by providing that they do not have the same voice in this Parliament as the remainder of the country area of this State do. If that is the position (and it is quite clearly so, from the example given by the Premier), what we have been saying about this special 15 per cent tolerance from an already considerable differentiation from the State quota is perfectly valid and true. There is no justification why country cities should require a greater number of voters to elect a member to the State Parliament than is the position elsewhere. Those people should no more be second-class citizens than are people who live in other urban areas of the State.

If the honourable member needs to go back and read a little elementary instruction on this measure, I commend to him what he obviously has not taken the trouble to read: the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States of America on this very principle. As the Chief Justice of that court said, if the voting power of any citizen is diminished he is thereby that much less a citizen. Any advantage to a citizen living in one place means a disadvantage to a citizen living elsewhere. In this country we should have no second-class citizens: all persons should be equal citizens of the country in having an effective voice and say in the laws that govern them.

Any member who says that there should be more citizens to elect a member to Parliament in the country cities of South Australia than in another country area is saying that those country citizens are second-class citizens compared with those who are advantaged under the scheme. It is wrong to depart from the quota to this extent. Agreeing to a differentiation in the general State quota is a great compromise in principles by the members of my Party. We do not believe there should be a differentiation between citizens anywhere; but, in order to try to get some measure of reform, we have been prepared to go to certain lengths. However, this is going further, for the specific purpose of ensuring that the L.C.L. is taking advantage of the fact that there are to be more citizens required in a country city to elect a member to the Parliament than in the remainder of the country area. That is just the sort of thing that has been perpetrated by the Country Party and Liberal Party coalition in Queensland, where the quota required in country cities is larger than the quota required in the city areas.

Mr. Lawn: And the Stott-Hall coalition Government is going to keep it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was the previous Premier of this State who went to Queensland to advise them how to cut up their country districts.

Mr. Lawn: And he did a very good job.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He did a very effective job.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the Labor Party gerrymander there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I agree that that was wrong. I have said it was wrong ever since I entered the Labor Party and ever since I have stood up in this place.

The Hon. R. R. Millhouse: I have not heard it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am quite prepared to point out the places in *Hansard* where I have said it repeatedly. Under that electoral arrangement, which was wrong, never was it the case that the Labor Party did not have a majority of votes when in Government. In Queensland, however, an arrangement was made that keeps a minority Government in office, an arrangement specifically designed to disadvantage every urban area. The Government claimed it believed in decentralization, but the citizens most disadvantaged by the electoral arrangement were the citizens of country cities. From what the Premier has said, it is clear that the citizens of Mount Gambier, for instance, may well be placed at a disadvantage in these circumstances, as the Government can go to the full 15 per cent to keep them in one place. In those circumstances, they will be very much disadvantaged compared with the electors elsewhere in the country districts, in those areas upon which the L.C.L. generally relies for its numbers for support in this Chamber. There should be no differentiation in the tolerance of the quota between the metropolitan and the country areas.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Leader is trying to wring the last ounce of emotional propaganda he can get from the passage of this electoral reform measure. His argument is becoming a little shabby. One can understand, I suppose, the political advantage the Leader is trying to get. He has lived on it for a long time. When the question is settled in South Australia, I wonder what he will talk about then. I am a little tired of being told we have a trick in every phrase and word in the Bill, that we are suspect in what we are doing, and that everything in the Bill is designed to achieve a Liberal and Country League victory. We are accused of all sorts of horrible things, and it is said that we have planned every part of the Bill for our purpose. Yesterday the Leader pointed to Victoria and New South Wales and extolled the system in those States compared with the system proposed in the Bill. What is the position with country districts in Victoria? Do the numbers vary? Do they make provision for country towns to a greater extent than this Bill does?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Glenelg can make his own speech.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You asked questions: don't you want answers?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yesterday the Leader extolled the position in Victoria, yet Victoria deliberately sets out to create provincial seats.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What is the tolerance, though?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As at the last election in Victoria, nearly all the provincial seats had enrolments of about 23,000. Metropolitan enrolments vary from 30,000 to 24,000, with an average of about 26,000 to 27,000. The provincial seats have an average of about 23,000, and the rural seats vary from 21,000 to 17,000, with an average of about 19,000. There is a difference in degree in what is being proposed for this State. We suggest a tolerance of 15 per cent and the Leader says he wants 10 per cent. However, he says the whole thing is crook because we want 5 per cent more. He talks about the variation from the central State quota in the Bill. However, if he looks at the Bill his Party drew up, he will see that it provided that country districts could be 15 per cent up or 15 per cent down.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: From the State quota.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes. However, under that Bill, in an extreme case, one country seat could be 15 per cent below the State quota and another 15 per cent above, and the degree of difference is the same.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It couldn't possibly have occurred, as you know perfectly well.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That is written in the Leader's own Bill. The Leader knows his Bill provided, for country seats, for a 15 per cent variation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was a 15 per cent tolerance from the general State quota.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am not arguing about that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Do your arithmetic. You couldn't get 15 per cent difference on 26 country districts.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Leader can argue that point. Yesterday he extolled the situation in Victoria, which provides for the very thing he is criticizing this evening. We are concerned with a difference in degree, and surely the Leader is not saying that we should stop at 10 per cent if that means a great inconvenience to the community. Surely he is not saying that the difference between 10 per cent up and down and 15 per cent up and down is a rank injustice.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Of course it is, as there is a departure from the State quota already.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Leader is fond of referring to findings of the United States of America Supreme Court. The figures there show a variation from 500,000 to 300,000 in congressional quotas. Because of the geographical difficulties in some of the States, there are practical difficulties under the principle extolled by the Leader. These have to be met and they are being met in a practical way in the United States, while we are meeting them in a practical way here.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I challenge the Premier to quote any case in the United States where the United States Supreme Court has agreed to a districting that provides a congressional district with 500,000 and another with 300,000, because that is completely beyond the tolerance that the court has laid down as the requirements, and where attempts have been made to get congressional districts of that kind the court has disallowed the districting and required the allocation for that district to be in the State at large. Some cases such as he has mentioned have been condemned by the United States Supreme Court. The Premier is confused in his arithmetic when he said that because the Labor Party agreed to a 15 per cent tolerance from a general State quota it was differentiating 15 per cent above or below the position in country districts. He knows that is not so. If he did the sums required to arrive at the situation for country districts under our Bill, he could not have obtained 15 per cent above or below the quota, because it was not possible. He is clearly ignoring the fact that we have already departed from the State quota in giving a considerable weighting to country districts. The average city district will be 58.5 per cent to 60 per cent larger in numbers of voters than the average country district, and the Premier is proposing to depart from that 15 per cent above or below in country districts. From the example he gave in relation to Mount Gambier, he clearly proposes that that quota be exceeded. There is a clear inconsistency in the Bill in order to maintain the position in favour of the L.C.L. Clearly, the Liberal Party is determined to be inconsistent with what it has established in the Bill, in order to establish a preference in favour of Liberal voting areas in country districts. The Victorian country tolerance is 10 per cent. They established a country quota there that was differential from the metropolitan quota, but there is not nearly such a difference as is being established here. And the Government proposes to go 15 per cent beyond it! There is no justification for this—it runs completely counter to what has already been established in the Bill to get some kind of approximation to equal voting power.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): The Leader of the Opposition always speaks in extravagant terms when he is trying to make a point. He has concentrated on the extreme case. Clause 8 (1) (*a*) provides that the commission shall:

(i) divide the metropolitan area, in accordance with this section, into proposed Assembly districts that are approximately equal;

(ii) divide the country area, in accordance with this section, into proposed Assembly districts that are approximately equal;

This is the overriding instruction to the commission—to divide the two areas of the State into electoral districts that are approximately equal. Subclause (7) provides that any departure in the metropolitan area of 10 per cent either way will be regarded as approximately equal and in the country areas the figure is 15 per cent, but the overriding instruction to the commission is to make them approximately equal, and there is no reason to expect that it will deliberately try to go to the extremes either way.

Mr. Corcoran: Why put it in?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In case it is necessary, in one or two instances. The Premier has already mentioned Mount Gambier and Whyalla, and the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned Port Augusta and Port Pirie. I do not know the precise figures but these are obviously the areas in which this may be necessary. Fifteen per cent above the country quota is the extreme limit, and there is no reason to expect that we will go above it. The Opposition is concentrating its fire on subclause (7), but it conveniently overlooks the provision that governs this subclause—that is,

subclause (1). In every community it is necessary to have tolerances, and we have worked them out in this Bill on a perfectly logical and rational basis. It is not meant to be a gerrymander. Indeed, this Bill has been hailed universally as one of the greatest single advances that have ever been made in this field.

Mr. Hudson: You could still have a gerrymander and yet make an advance, as the situation has been so bad.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is not the case, and the honourable member knows it. We all know how the wind was taken out of the Opposition's sails when it first heard of this scheme. This is for a tolerance within an area of the State one way or the other of 15 per cent. A tolerance of 15 per cent is not new. In the 1965 Bill the then Government had to go to 15 per cent, although at that time its own policy was for a 10 per cent tolerance. It quietly changed that afterwards to make it conform to what it had to do with two sparsely-populated areas of the State in the north and in the far west.

We have done it in another form in this instance, and to call this a gerrymander and to start to fulminate, as the honourable member used to do up to the time of the introduction of this Bill, is sheer and utter nonsense. He is trying to make a political point out of nothing. I ask members opposite not to go to extremes but to look at all the provisions of the Bill on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are accustomed in this place to have lectures on the law and legal interpretation from the Attorney-General, but I would have thought that a little elementary examination of his own Bill would tell him that what he has just said to the Committee is sheer, utter, bumbling nonsense. He says (and I ask him to listen carefully and dispassionately to this) that subclause (7) is governed by the overriding provisions of subclause (1) (*a*), which provides:

> Subject to this Act, the Commission shall for the purposes of this Act divide the country area, in accordance with this section, into proposed Assembly districts that are approximately equal.

The Attorney-General would have us believe that these words "approximately equal" mean in that context, and as an overriding provision on the remaining subclauses, what the average citizen would take them to mean, that is, approximately equal; but unfortunately for the Attorney-General the very subclause to which he refers defines the words "approximately equal" as being in a specialist sense in this Bill. Subclause (7) provides:

> For the purposes of paragraph (*a*) of subsection (1) of this section—
>
> (*b*) the proposed Assembly districts into which the country area is divided by the Commission shall be regarded as approximately equal if no such proposed Assembly district contains a number of Assembly electors that is more than fifteen per centum above or below the country quota.

Therefore, there is no overriding provision that the commission has to get equality, for this subclause defines the words in what the Attorney says are the overriding provisions. After all the lectures I have heard from him on the meaning of drafting of Bills, my mind boggles at this suggestion. I was so exercised by this particular bit of drafting, which was carefully defining the words "approximately equal" to mean nothing of the kind, that in a later amendment I had carefully to except that amendment from the definition the Attorney-General had written into the Bill in order to get to an overriding direction to the commission for equality to be its aim.

If the Attorney looks at the Bill he will see that is vitally necessary if we are aiming at equality. It is not a question of extremes, because we need not achieve equality. Indeed, the Bill does not provide that we should try to achieve equality: it provides only that we must get within 15 per cent above or below it, and that is the aim.

Mr. ALLEN: I was interested to hear the Leader remark about the four country cities that would be affected by this 15 per cent loading. However, I point out that Whyalla would be the only city that would exceed the 10 per cent loading. In June this year its voting population was 10,917, which would be 13 per cent over a country quota of 9,646. To get down to the 10 per cent, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, it would be necessary to transfer 500 people from Whyalla to Eyre, and I am afraid that community of interest would have to be considered there.

The Leader cited Port Pirie as a country city where the 13 per cent loading would apply, but in order to give Port Pirie a country quota of 9,646 we would have to add to it the whole of the subdivision of Port Germein, which is at present in the District of Stuart. Even then, Port Pirie would be 2 per cent below the country quota. Then, having taken the subdivision of Port Germein away from Stuart, it would be necessary for Stuart to take in the subdivisions of Melrose, Carrieton, Hawker, Beltana, and Cockburn, but it would still be 4 per cent below the country quota. Therefore, I do not see how he can nominate

Port Pirie or Port Augusta as a country city that would be affected by the suggested loading. Mount Gambier, which had a voting population of 10,142 in June this year, would be only 5 per cent above the country quota, so Whyalla would be the only country seat that would be affected by this clause.

Mr. VIRGO: I should have thought that the Attorney-General would wait and listen to the debate on the clauses of the Bill because, after all, he is Minister-in-Charge of the Electoral Department. Further, he was quick to pass a derogatory remark about me this afternoon when I returned to the Chamber after talking to a constituent on the telephone. The further one goes, the more one realizes how mockery is made of the title of the Bill, which is to provide for the appointment of a commission that shall report on the electoral divisions of this State. However, as the member for Burra, the Premier and the Attorney-General have already made clear, we are by the terms of this Bill taking over the role of the commission. That is making a farce of the whole position.

The member for Burra referred to the redistribution plan and spoke about the community of interest of the subdivisions. However, I do not know why he did not refer to that last night when we were talking about Gawler, Elizabeth and Smithfield. There was community of interest there.

The Attorney-General said that this clause provided for a 15 per cent tolerance throughout the whole State. I said, "No, it does not." He then said, "The member for Edwardstown is at his worst this evening." I suggest, however, that the Attorney-General read clause 8 (7) (*a*), because that provides for a tolerance of 10 per cent for the metropolitan area, whereas (*b*) provides for a tolerance of 15 per cent for the country areas. The Premier has given us some kind of explanation. He said, "The way the Opposition is talking, anyone would think there was a trick in every clause." Let us look at some of the clauses. What happened to clause 7? What happened to clause 8, the loading of country districts compared with the city, the 15 per cent weighting? What happened to this integral number that we asked to be put in? Are these all the "tricks" the Premier was referring to? One cannot but wonder whether the Premier may be concerned about an area that he himself represents so that it may be condensed to the smallest area possible. The Attorney-General said that subclause (1) (*a*) overrides subclause (7). Will the Attorney instruct the commissioners in accordance with that statement? Will he instruct them to disregard the terms of subclause (7), which states that Assembly districts shall be approximately equal. Will he say that subclause (1) (*a*) overrides that? He must tell members whether he will instruct the commission in that regard. I should like the Premier to say whether the L.C.L. will make submissions to the commission and, if it will, whether it will tell it that it should disregard the instruction about 10 per cent or 15 per cent. It is not just a matter of 10 per cent or 15 per cent: it is a matter of having consistency. If there is to be a 15 per cent tolerance in country areas it must also apply in the city. However, we believe the tolerance should be not more than 10 per cent for either the city or the country.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think we are getting a little stirred up with what is a reasonably small difference of opinion. The member for Edwardstown must realize that other parts of the world, which subscribe to the principle of one vote one value—

Mr. Virgo: We are distributing South Australia, not other parts of the world.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member's Leader has leaned heavily on references to other parts of the world to justify his stand on the matter, and that is why I referred to them; I am sure the honourable member would not preclude me from replying to the Leader. I apologize to the Leader because I did not give the correct figures in regard to the congressional quotas in America. I spoke from memory and the figures I quoted were greater than the actual quotas. However, the difference in many States in America is still significant. As the Leader made great play about the position in America (as if to say that all States there now have the one vote one value system), I will give these figures.

Mr. Hudson: Can you say whether or not they are figures immediately after the redistribution?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: They are from the *Congressional District Date Book* for January, 1965, to December, 1966, and they are after redistricting.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: After redistricting ordered by the court.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The figures I will give are of extreme cases which, of course, are fairly easy to get together. There are difficulties in this regard in the U.S.A., which

country the Leader is fond of using as a basis for his arguments. I will give figures for three States where the discrepancies are great. At the date to which I have referred (and I suppose the figures are still substantially the same, although the population would have changed somewhat), the highest enrolment in Georgia was 456,000 and the lowest 330,000; in Alabama the highest was 502,000 and the lowest 366,000; and in Indiana the highest was 454,000 and the lowest 370,000. In addition, there were some inescapable further discrepancies (and they are inescapable because two States in the United States of America have single members).

Mr. Hudson: Like Tasmania?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This is a special case. Alaska had 129,000 enrolled electors, Nevada had 285,000, and Hawaii had 316,000 but had two congressional members at large, as had New Mexico, with 476,000 electors.

Mr. Hudson: Apart from the two single-member States, the figures you quoted did not give any discrepancy greater than 40 per cent, yet this Bill will allow a discrepancy of 100 per cent.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The discrepancies in the United States are far greater than the Leader would have the Committee believe. I quote from a book, which is available in the library, (and no doubt the Leader has read it) entitled *Reapportioning Legislatures,* edited by Howard D. Hamilton. Much material in this book would justify a one vote one value approach. I have never said that I believe in the ideal situation, and something is obviously necessary in a State with one of the most centralized populations in Australia.

Mr. Virgo: And one of the greatest gerrymanders in Australia, too.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: We will never get anywhere if the member for Edwardstown keeps referring to the past. As members on this side do not want those conditions to continue we are compromising in this Bill. It is useless for Opposition members to say that a disparity in value of votes does not exist after a court ruling in the United States, because it does, and it is caused by particular difficulties that have been recognized in that community. An article entitled "Criteria Reflected in Recent Appointments" by Malcolm E. Jewell states:

The Supreme Court has refused to set any mathematical limits on the variations from equality that may be permitted in the population of districts, although some lower courts have used mathematical standards in judging apportionment plans. These courts have sometimes referred to the minimum percentage of voters that could theoretically elect a legislative majority or to the average deviation in the size of districts, but the standard most frequently used is the maximum deviation. The figure most often cited by the courts as a standard is a 15 per cent deviation above or below the perfect size district. The 15 per cent maximum deviation has been accepted by many state legislatures either as an absolute limit or as a standard with only a few exceptions, but it is by no means universally applicable to the realities of legislative apportionment. Geographical factors and the rigidity of county boundary lines have led some legislative bodies to exceed this limit. Kentucky, for example, was one of the first states after the *Baker* decision to reapportion primarily on the basis of population equality, and the law has not been challenged in the courts. But the presence of 120 counties and 100 single-member House districts guarantees deviations in excess of 15 per cent. There are several counties in that state that would be at least 25 per cent below average if they had two representatives and at least 25 per cent above average if they had only one member. In Wyoming, with its many sparsely populated counties, an apportionment put into effect by court order had variations up to 33 per cent.

There are important variations because of the practical difficulties of that situation. The article continues:

Most state legislatures have preferred to accept larger variations in the size of districts rather than to break up counties into pieces in the formation of districts. The Supreme Court has made it clear that the goal of population equality does not require that county lines be ignored. The main argument for retaining county lines is that in most states the county is a significant political unit with a community of interests and often a degree of socio-economic homogeneity. In some states local legislation is extensively used, and for this reason the county deserves representation. An additional reason for maintaining county boundaries is that these help to minimize gerrymandering. As the Supreme Court has said, indiscriminate districting without regard to county lines is an "invitation to gerrymandering".

To start splitting communities is an invitation to gerrymander. In this instance the commission will be given a free hand to draw up, within the limits set by the Bill of 15 per cent up or down, electoral districts in the rural areas. I believe it is very little different from the extremes referred to here in the U.S.A. after the court decision. It is well to recognize that, although the basis of the court decision is one vote one value (this is not argued here), what we are saying here is that we have particular difficulties as great as in many of these instances—a most centralized population and a situation of extremes. We are adopting a

proper approach in respect of the lines of action left to the commission—and they are very wide. I cannot see why we are getting into such an argumentative mood over the matter of difference of size of electoral districts which, because of physical and practical difficulties, is very little greater than that which existed in the country referred to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know how the Premier can imagine that a maximum 40 per cent difference occurring in a State of the U.S.A. justifies the maximum 100 per cent difference allowed under this Bill. If the Premier suggests that a 100 per cent difference between districts is no different from a 40 per cent difference, then I suggest he should learn a little arithmetic.

Mr. EVANS: The Leader of the Opposition has said, "Who would believe in having greater numbers in large country towns than in the smaller country centres and in sparsely populated areas?" Yet he is the one person I have heard say that he believes a member of Parliament should act as an effective agent. Surely the density of the population affects a Parliamentarian's capacity to act as an effective agent. I believe in this 15 per cent loading because I believe that in large country towns a member can act as an effective agent much more easily than can the member who represents a sparsely populated area.

Mr. Virgo: You are trying to protect your own electoral district.

Mr. EVANS: I am not. The Leader of the Opposition implied this, although the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) disagreed with him—

Mr. Burdon: Why pick on a man who is not here?

Mr. EVANS: I cannot help that. I cannot help it if the honourable member is not here. He would use any statement I had made, and he would not bat an eye-lid as he did so. I sincerely believe that it is the effectiveness and availability of the agent that counts. I would prefer to represent an electoral district like Mount Gambier with 15,000 people than a sparsely populated area with 6,000 or 7,000 people. In its 1965 Bill the then Labor Government advocated two special seats that had only half as many electors as the other country districts. The appropriate variation would have been provided under the terms of reference in that Bill. The Leader said that what was important was the availability of the Parliamentarian to act as an agent. That is what we on this side are concerned about, and that is why I support a 15 per cent tolerance.

Mr. CASEY: The member for Onkaparinga said he agreed that in some country areas there should be a minimum quota so that in other country areas that embrace larger towns there could be a maximum quota. It does not take much thought to work out exactly what is going to happen to the electoral boundaries in the North and West of this State. The District of Flinders includes the large town of Port Lincoln. This district is, I think, only about 411 below the minimum quota for the country, so obviously we will take that number of electors (or perhaps about 500) away from Eyre and give them to Flinders. That was referred to a short time ago by the member for Burra (Mr. Allen).

Now Eyre has to grow in size, so it will take electors from the District of Whyalla. Then, of course, we will keep these two seats as low as we possibly can because they are both large areas. We then get to Port Augusta at the top of the gulf. This is an unusual one, and it is the example that absolutely cramps the argument of the member for Onkaparinga, because here we have a large industrial city. I agree with the member for Burra that the only thing that can be done here is to include Port Augusta in a district that will extend to the Northern Territory border, because there is no other way for it to go. How does the argument of the member for Onkaparinga stand up there? It cannot stand up, because it is absolutely ridiculous.

I have quoted three country areas. Two of those will be represented by L.C.L. members, and those districts will be kept to the absolute minimum of 10 per cent below. The other one, which probably will be the largest of the three by far, will have 10 per cent over the country quota because it will have to include Port Augusta. Problems are associated not with broad acres but with people. I would be one of the few members in this Chamber to realize that, because I represent the second largest electoral district in the State, and I know exactly what travelling is involved. I also know the problems of people.

Mr. Ferguson: And broad acres.

Mr. CASEY: There are no problems in broad acres, and there never have been. To suggest otherwise is just nonsense. If the member for Yorke Peninsula can demonstrate to me how broad acres involve a member of Parliament in as much work as do the problems of people, I shall be very pleased to

listen to him. We must keep these areas as small as possible. This will not apply to Port Augusta, the centre of the Stuart District.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Leader said that the extremes under this Bill could result in a 100 per cent difference between the lowest and highest quota. I did not use the extremes in comparison with the United States system, but I will now. The lowest to the highest provides a variation between 129,000 and 502,000, which is just under 400 per cent. There are other examples: Nevada has 205,000 compared with 502,000; there are two members at large in Hawaii, each with 160,000 voters, and there are two members at large in New Mexico, each with about 142,000 voters, compared with 502,000. I did not think it would be necessary to use these extremes. However, now that the Leader has used them I thought I must use another two examples that exist in the country on which he based his argument.

Mr. ALLEN: The member for Frome mentioned the Flinders District and suggested that it would need another 500 people to fill its quota, but 2,096 people would have to be taken from Eyre to get Flinders up to its quota. The honourable member challenged the figures I used previously, and I now challenge him to prove that they are incorrect.

Mr. EVANS: I did not say what I thought the minimum and maximum should be. I said I believed in the principle that a person representing a densely populated area should have a larger quota than a person representing a sparsely populated area, and I still believe that, as the Leader has implied he does.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Giles.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes. The amendment therefore passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9—"Matters for consideration by the commission."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (1) (*a*) (iv) before "population" to insert "present population and the likely increase or decrease within the next seven years after the commencement of this Act in the".

The purpose of this amendment is to take into account obvious shifts in population that can be forecast. It is clear this is a relevant matter in electoral redistricting; it is certainly a matter taken into account by the Commonwealth Electoral Commission. In many districts change in population and population growth is considerable. Particularly is this so in relation to areas such as Whyalla, and it is so in relation to certain areas to the south of Adelaide. On occasions it has certainly been so in areas immediately to the north of Adelaide within the newly defined metropolitan area. This provision is certainly desirable if we are to have a redistribution that takes some account of what the population growth is likely to be. In some cases we can anticipate that population will be static, but in other cases there can be rapid changes in population which, in a short time, can throw completely out of alignment the redistricting undertaken by the commission. This is obviously a matter that ought to be taken into account. As it is something normally taken into account by permanent commissions elsewhere, I urge the Government to accept this amendment.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As it stands, the clause does not preclude the commission from doing just what the Leader desires it should be able to do. However, his amendment would make it mandatory that it should do so. I have no desire to tie the commission's hands either way; I prefer to leave the matter so that the commission can have full regard to this matter if it desires to do so. I do not support the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: The definition of "metropolitan area" ties the hands of the commission in just this respect, because it requires the commission to take into account the extent of the population development from a residential or non-primary producing point of view to determine the metropolitan area, and the commission must look ahead for seven years. As that is already determined, surely to be consistent we should do the same thing in this case. Let us examine what is likely to occur in the outer fringe of the metropolitan area. As the Bill stands, the average number of electors in a metropolitan seat will be about 15,300. If this commission took the same course as the 1963 commision (which had no instruction on population trends), then we

would find that these metropolitan seats would all have enrolments of about 15,300: that would mean that these outer metropolitan seats, where the heavy population growth takes place, would, in seven years, have enrolments of 30,000 or more. That is just the kind of situation that we want to avoid.

Let us take the Premier's general attitude to the Bill at its face value. He has said that this proposal represents a substantial move away from the existing gerrymander. It is not as far as we would have liked to go, but we agree that it is substantial step away. It is important to ensure that in three of four years' time we are not faced with the same situation where we have the two districts covering, say, Elizabeth and Salisbury and a third covering Para Hills and part of Tea Tree Gully and Modbury all having 24,000 or 25,000 electors, and within five years having 30,000 or more. This is conceivable unless the commission is instructed to take into account the trend of population. In certain areas where the population will expand this will happen, particularly in Morphett Vale, Christies Beach, Noarlunga, the area around Crafers and Stirling, the area around Tea Tree Gully and Modbury, parts of the Northfield subdivision, Para Hills, Elizabeth and Salisbury.

With about 430,000 electors in the metropolitan area, if there is an annual expansion of three per cent or four per cent in the total number of electors (that is, 12 per cent in three years) the increase on 430,000 means about an extra 52,000 electors. About 40,000 of that extra 52,000 will be concentrated in the extremities of the defined metropolitan area, in about four or five electoral districts. Each of those seats will increase by 8,000 to 10,000 electors, and within three years of this redistribution seats on the extreme fringe of the metropolitan area, instead of averaging about 15,000 electors, will contain about 23,000 to 25,000, and within six years they will contain more than 30,000. At the same time, some country seats would contain about 8,000 electors. If that situation is to arise in six years the whole basis of what the Premier wants to achieve by this Bill is destroyed. It is important that the trend of population should be considered by the commission: it is as important as any of the other matters that are mandatory for the commission to consider. If this amendment is not accepted, the basis of what the Premier calls reform will be destroyed within six years and called into question within three years. Therefore, I ask the Premier to reconsider this matter.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I cannot accept that the whole basis of this redistribution will be destroyed if this amendment is not carried. The commission is told that it shall have regard to the population of the proposed Assembly districts and the parts thereof, so it can already consider the population of an area. It can use its own discretion and alter metropolitan electoral district quotas by 10 per cent either way and country electoral district quotas by 15 per cent either way. The proposed addition does not increase the latitude of variation: it only draws attention to it. No-one is preventing the commission from making adjustments. It would not capriciously do it: it would have to have a reason. If the honourable member's reason is good, the commission will surely observe it.

Mr. Hudson: It did not do it in 1963.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is not the same commission. I do not think we should tie the commission's hands to that extent. If the honourable member would like to draw further attention to it, I should be happy to include it in paragraph (*b*).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful to the Premier for his offer of compromise, which I cheerfully accept. Consequently, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment with a view to moving another.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

After subclause (1) (*b*) (i) to strike out "and"; and after subclause (1) (*b*) (ii) to insert "and (iii) the likely increase or decrease in population within proposed Assembly districts within the next seven years after the commencement of this Act."

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

At the end of subclause (1) to insert the following:

> Subject to subsection (1) of this section and to the requirement that the number of Assembly electors in any proposed Assembly district shall be as nearly equal to the metropolitan quota or the country quota for the purposes of section 8 of this Act (as the case may be) as is, pursuant to that subsection, practicable.

The purpose of this amendment is to do just what the Attorney-General earlier said the Bill did but which, with great respect to him, it does not: that is to say, the aim of the commission shall be to get as nearly to the quota as is practicable, and that shall be an overriding factor in the matter. In other words, the commission is not simply to accept

these words "approximately equal" as meaning "approximately equal" in the lay sense, because under the terms of the Act at the moment they do not mean that.

What we are concerned to see is that in drawing the boundaries the commission, subject to the various qualifications and things it has to look to, shall aim to get as near to the quota as is practicable in each area, and that that is an overriding requirement to the commission. The purpose is to make certain that while one can draw boundaries so that towns or townships fall within an area, if that is a reasonably convenient and practicable thing, that can be done without straining the purposes of the Bill. We do not want to have the commission using the extremes of the tolerance in country areas simply to push a town or township into one particular area. The basic thing it must do, as far as is practicable, is to get as near to the quota as it can. Of course, it must have regard to the things it is told it must have regard to, and it may have regard to other matters in arriving at what is reasonable and practicable in the circumstances.

Earlier, this is what the Attorney-General said the Bill aimed to do. He said that clause 8 (1) (*a*) provided the necessity for the commission to get as near as practicable to the quota but, as I pointed out to him afterwards, because of a specific definition that he has written into the Bill it does not provide for the commission to get as near to the quota as possible given the other factors that it must consider. This makes it clear that the commission will not go to the extremes of the quota simply for the sake of putting the whole of a township into one district if that distorts the object of getting as near as practicable to the quota. However, this can be done if by drawing the boundaries this is a reasonably practical thing to do, given the overriding provision that the commission must look to.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I regard the Leader's last two moves as somewhat contradictory. We have just drawn the attention of the commission to the provision for likely movements in population, but there is no instruction of what this means. Whether it means that it will be above or below the quota, I do not know. The reasons will be in the minds of the commission. I do not believe we should tie the commission further with an overriding clause. When are the matters in paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) subordinate to the clause we are now inserting? In whose judgment do they become subordinate? It must be in the judgment of the commission. Surely the commission will already have made that decision. Therefore, why should it be tied in this way? We have already tied the commission to within 10 per cent above or below the quota in the city and 15 per cent above or below the quota in the country. We have passed mandatory and permissive provisions. There is no inbuilt standard whether they are subordinate to the overriding provision that the Leader wants inserted. I have faith in the commissioners, whoever they may be, as I am sure all members have. I understand what the Leader is trying to do, but I do not want to tie the commission's hands further. Therefore, I cannot accept this amendment, for the reasons that I could not accept the last amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General has already told us this evening that the aim of the commission will be to get as near as possible to the quota.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You do not think this is contradictory to your last amendment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, because it says clearly "subject to subsection (1)". Therefore, the question is what is as near as reasonably practicable given those other considerations. In other words, the commission must aim at equality, but it can consider these other things when coming to its final decision. If it is not to aim at equality, what is to be approximately equal within the terms of clause 8? The words "approximately equal" are made not to mean approximately equal in the ordinary sense by the special provision of clause 8. What I am trying to do is to say, "Look; although that has a specialist meaning given the limits within which you may draw the thing, you have to remember that what you are trying to achieve is equality, and that is all." If the Attorney-General said that that was what clause 8 aimed at, all we are doing is to spell it out here clearly, that this is what the aim is to be, to try to get equality as near as reasonably practicable.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader has paid me the compliment of trying to bolster a weak argument by using my name. He must not do that sort of thing. In fact, what I said before does not support the propositions he is now advancing. This amendment is merely an attempt (although not very effective) to restrict the discretion that we have already given to the electoral commission to go 10 per cent or 15 per cent above

or below the quota in the metropolitan or country areas, respectively. As the Premier has already indicated, we are not prepared to tie the hands of the commission any further by putting a rider such as this in the clause. I stick to what I said, that clause 8 (1) is the governing factor.

Mr. Corcoran: Overriding.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is the overriding provision and we are not prepared to insert another one to try to cut down the discretion we have just given. After all, clause 9 (2) at present reads fairly vaguely:

Where in the opinion of the Commission a portion of a city, town or township is likely to fall within a proposed Assembly district in the country area, the Commission shall endeavour, as far as possible and expedient—

That is fairly mild language—"shall endeavour, as far as possible and expedient"—

to include the whole of that city, town or township within that proposed Assembly district.

That is sufficient on its own. It is a fairly mild direction to the commission, anyway. We are certainly not prepared to add the further rider that the Opposition wants to add.

Mr. VIRGO: The Attorney-General has obviously forgotten his own words. He made it quite plain. I asked him about it after he had left the Chamber and reminded him of the statement he had made. I asked him then, "Would you instruct the commission that clause 8 (1) (*a*) and (*b*) was the overriding clause?" He said he would but I do not think he would.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I shall have no power to instruct the commission.

Mr. VIRGO: They are his words. His statement is that he is expecting the commission to place a somewhat slanted interpretation on the Bill in an endeavour to arrive at its duties. The expression "We do not want to tie the commission's hands; we want to give it a free hand" is continually being used. Who is fooling whom on that one? I did not notice any giving of a "free hand" last night in deciding whether Gawler was a part of the metropolitan area. We asked the Government to give the commission a free hand in that respect, but it was not prepared to do so. I point out that, when the commission meets, it will look at the Bill to seek its terms of reference; it will not look at *Hansard* to see the opinions of the Attorney-General or the Premier. It will not seek my opinions, either.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I'm sure of that.

Mr. VIRGO: I hope the Minister will tell his constituents in Torrens that he voted to make them second-class citizens compared to the constituents of Eyre, for instance. The three metropolitan members on the Government front benches, by their votes, have demoted their constituents to second-class citizens. Although members opposite admit that the amendment will not greatly change the provision in the Bill, they will not vote for it, their only reason being that it would tie the hands of the commission.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: And they have tied the commission's hands in every other way.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. We have a responsibility to provide for the commission a clear set of instructions on how it should go about its task.

Mr. Edwards: How many second-class citizens are there in your district?

Mr. VIRGO: By his vote, the member for Eyre has made every constituent in my district a second-class citizen, because the votes of constituents in my district will be worth only half as much as those of constituents in Eyre. I urge members opposite to accept this amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Giles.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I record my vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 12) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Bill recommitted.

Clause 8—"Other functions and duties of the Commission"—reconsidered.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In subclause (1) (*b*) to strike out "subject to subsection (8) of this section, adjust and".

This amendment was explained previously by the member for Glenelg so I shall not cover the ground again.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government, having considered this amendment, believes that it would give rise to more complications than would arise under the present provision. If the Council boundaries are left and cannot be consequentially adjusted, subdivisions will be drawn as parts of the new Assembly districts but they must conform, where they are adjacent, to the existing boundaries of Council districts. It would not be practicable to have new subdivisions crossing Council boundaries. This being the case, we are immediately putting a limiting factor on the subdivisions right throughout the State where they are adjacent to the present Council boundaries.

If the Bill passes in its present form, the new subdivisions can be drawn regardless of the situation of the present Council boundaries, and after they are drawn the Council boundaries may be adjusted right throughout the State to follow the same principle they are now following but with the convenience of being able to turn corners and to fit in the new subdivisions. The only effect they can have in the political sense in the metropolitan area is that certain areas may be taken out or put in. If a new Assembly district on the border of one of the two Council districts in the metropolitan area had the substantial majority of its electors in the metropolitan area, the smaller proportion outside of the district would come into the metropolitan area, but if the reverse applied that area would not come into the metropolitan area. Therefore, this could work either way, and it could only be determined after the commission had drawn its Assembly boundaries.

Therefore, there is no overall principle here of any certainty of anything going anywhere. It is a matter of give and take right around the metropolitan area in relation to the new Assembly districts as they are drawn and the way they fall substantially in or out of the present metropolitan area. The Council district we are considering is not the enlarged metropolitan area but the existing Council districts in the metropolitan area. I must admit that last night I thought that Elizabeth might come in.

Mr. Clark: That is exactly what I thought.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I thought that until my attention was drawn today to the words "substantially within that Council district". There is no rule of thumb to say that some area automatically will come in or go out. Obviously, it will be a random matter. The commission will draw its Assembly districts without regard to Council districts, which we all believe must also be reapportioned before another election takes place. Therefore, the commission will draw its Assembly districts and then look at the existing Council boundaries. It will then consider which parts, if any, of the present two Council districts in the metropolitan area lie substantially within or without the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hudson: What are you proposing for the country?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Paragraph (*b*) provides that such consequential amendments shall be made to other Council districts as the commission thinks necessary to ensure that each Council district consists of two or more whole proposed Assembly districts.

Mr. Hudson: Why won't you do the same for the country?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You misled us last night.

Mr. Hudson: I did not.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I was under a misapprehension last night. The difference is that there would be a much smaller number of seats in the country than in the city. To answer the honourable member fully I would have to refer back to the second reading explanation. However, I assure him that no trickery is involved.

Mr. HUDSON: It pains me to have to rise on this matter, because I thought we had gone through all this last night and that the Premier would have been prepared to accept it. I said last night that about 5,000 electors from Midland, from one Assembly district, could be brought into Central No. 1, and that the same thing could happen with another Assembly district.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: They could go out, too.

Mr. HUDSON: They could, although that is not likely. This depends partly on the shape of the district but, for instance, if there is a population around Para Hills, Elizabeth and Salisbury sufficient for two and a bit seats, and if the bit of a seat is added to the Northfield subdivision to make another Assembly district, then that part in Midland (if less than 50 per cent of the Assembly district so created) goes into Central No. 1.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: If it is added to a metropolitan district.

Mr. HUDSON: That is right. Therefore, if a seat comprising 9,000 electors from the Northfield subdivision and 6,000 from the current St. Kilda and Gawler subdivisions were created, there would be a metropolitan seat of 15,000 electors, most of whom would be in Central No. 1. Again, the adjustment involved in this would be to the disadvantage of the Labor Party in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: There could be an election for the Council before three years only on a double dissolution, so there cannot be a re-apportionment for that time.

Mr. HUDSON: We would like to have a re-apportionment, but we could not say that we would agree to any such re-apportionment suggested by the Government. Indeed, we were not prepared to agree to the re-apportionment proposed by the Government in 1963. There is a further problem here in that a re-apportionment has to be agreed to by the Legislative Council, and its agreement is much more difficult to get than an agreement here. Under the Leader's amendment, a subdivision could not cross over a Legislative Council district boundary. The existing Legislative Council districts already consist of whole subdivisions so there is no subdivision that currently crosses over a Legislative Council boundary. Of necessity this is the case. The problem to which the Premier refers could occur only if the commission desired to create new subdivisions partly out of a subdivision of one Legislative Council district and partly out of a subdivision of another Legislative Council district, and joined the two together to cross over a Legislative Council boundary.

The history of electoral commissions is clear-cut on this matter. Invariably, they cut up existing subdivisions or cut a little off one. The Light District is an example of a subdivision being created by cutting up existing ones. The Saddleworth subdivision was created by lopping off a piece from another one. What an electoral commission almost invariably does is to cut up existing subdivisions, because inevitably by growth of population subdivisions become too large. For example, the Brighton subdivision contains 24,500 electors.

Mr. Clark: What about Gawler, with 35,000 electors in one subdivision?

Mr. HUDSON: This sort of subdivision is impossible from the point of view of the Electoral Department. Electoral commissions like to cut them up and produce subdivisions of only a few thousand people, if they can, provided they have convenient polling places, which is important.

First, I strongly urge on the Government that what the Premier says could happen and could therefore restrict the commission in its working is not likely to happen; secondly, the commission already operates under this sort of restriction in respect of all the Commonwealth electoral boundaries, because the agreement between the Commonwealth and the State requires that any new subdivision must lie entirely within an Assembly district and within a Commonwealth electoral district; so, if an Assembly district is to cross over a Commonwealth boundary, a new subdivision has to be created. This is an invariable rule that State electoral commissions follow. Even more so does the Commonwealth Electoral Commission. Any new subdivision created by the recent Commonwealth Electoral Commission had to lie entirely within an existing House of Assembly district, so the Commonwealth Electoral Commission in South Australia was subject to 39 restrictions, not 12. We are saying, "In addition to the 12 restrictions imposed upon the Commonwealth electoral boundaries, let us have five more imposed by the existing Legislative Council district boundaries". This is not as restrictive as the restriction on the Commonwealth Electoral Commission.

I do not see why the Government will not accept this amendment. The situation created by it would be a little more complicated, but not anywhere near as complicated as the situation confronting the Commonwealth Electoral Commission. I should like further consideration given to the matter, particularly as it is left in an anomalous fashion so far as the country is concerned *vis-a-vis* the city. We are given a firm rule for the adjustment of Legislative Council boundaries for Central No. 1 and Central No. 2; there is no firm rule regarding the adjustment between Northern and Midland; and there is no rule for the adjustment of boundaries between Midland and Southern. Why is there a distinction in subclause (8) between paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*)? It seems again that provision is made for country areas. Possibly someone has already worked out the kind of distribution that could apply in country districts and has worked out that, by the provisions, some part of L.C.L. voting in Midlands could go into Southern.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You are too suspicious.

Mr. HUDSON: We have every right to be suspicious, having lived in a State where a gerrymander has applied since 1938. The Premier said he would introduce a re-apportionment Bill for the Council but he could not

guarantee that he would get a compromise with us and, if he could do that, he could not guarantee that he would get the Bill through the Upper House. The only sure thing is the existing Council boundaries: they are bad enough, but we would rather stick with them than buy a pig in a poke. I ask the Premier to reconsider this matter, as the amendment involves no serious complications.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Glenelg has pointed out real problems, and it is not, by any means, clear that there will not be substantial alterations to Council boundaries by means of this provision. They could considerably affect the situation in the Council without Parliament having given complete consideration to the basis on which the redistribution of the Council could take place. It is best to leave the Council boundaries as they stand at present until Parliament can consider them as a whole. I do not think this would involve any administrative difficulty.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Several good reasons exist why the Council boundaries should be altered consequentially as we propose to do. Today, I checked with the Returning Officer for the State and was told that there were no administrative difficulties. The most significant (although not particularly significant) alterations to be made under clause 8 (8) are in Central No. 1 and Central No. 2 Districts, to make sure that they contain whole Assembly districts. This applies also to Midland and Southern Districts. This has been the traditional pattern, and section 19 of the Constitution provides that the Legislative Council districts shall comprise Assembly districts set out in the Second Schedule. If the boundaries are not altered at all (as is envisaged in the Opposition's amendment) we are running counter to that section in the Constitution, because it implies that there must be whole Assembly districts in Council districts. The Government is ensuring that the Council districts remain substantially as they are now, but that they contain whole Assembly districts. That is what is provided in subclause (8), paragraph (*a*) of which provides:

> Where, in the opinion of the commission, any Council district falls wholly or substantially within the metropolitan area—

that is, Central No. 1 and Central No. 2—

> the boundaries of that Council district shall be adjusted and redefined so as to incorporate those proposed Assembly districts within the metropolitan area which, in the opinion of the commission, fall wholly or substantially within that Council district.

This means that we do not have bits of new metropolitan Assembly electoral districts jutting out of or into Central No. 1 and Central No. 2, which will simply be readjusted so that the boundaries coincide with whole Assembly districts. Regarding the other three Council districts, subclause (8) (*b*) provides:

> Such consequential adjustments shall be made to other Council districts as the commission thinks necessary to ensure that each Council district consists of two or more whole proposed Assembly districts.

There will be some readjustments in the boundaries of the Midland and Northern Districts because of the new Assembly districts, but they will only be consequential adjustments to conform with what has always been the constitutional position in South Australia—that Assembly districts are wholly contained in Council districts. If we accept the Opposition's amendments, this principle will be breached and we will immediately run into some difficulty in connection with the Constitution. Opposition members were concerned last night—for the first time—about the relationship between this House and the Legislative Council. I can assure them that what they were worried about will not happen. We have made certain of this today by discussion with some honourable members of another place.

Mr. Broomhill: Did you discuss the other Bill, too?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No; we discussed only this Bill. The tender concern of the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) need not worry us at all. There will be no difficulty over this.

Mr. VIRGO: I am stunned at the Attorney-General's explanation that, traditionally, a whole Assembly district has been within a Council district, and that this is a principle we must observe. Where is the principle? I cannot see any principle associated with this—a tradition, yes; but principle, no.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I can support my statement.

Mr. VIRGO: I shall be delighted to hear the Minister do so.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The principle is that, if boundaries coincide, there will be less confusion in the minds of electors. If the boundaries for Assembly and Council districts do not coincide, there will obviously be a more confusing pattern of electoral boundaries than there will be if they do coincide. This is a matter of common sense.

Mr. VIRGO: I agree that it may be a matter of common sense, and I also concede

that it may be a matter of tradition. However, I thought the Attorney was going to tell us how it was a matter of principle. Unfortunately, other than saying that it would cause less confusion for electors, he said nothing. Do we interpret this to mean that we will not see the Government bring in a redistribution to put some democracy into the Legislative Council before the next State elections?

Mr. Broomhill: Obviously, we have to.

Mr. VIRGO: I had hoped (and I think all the people of South Australia had hoped) that once we had got over the problem of the Assembly to the best of the ability of this Chamber, with 19 members on each side, we would then be looking at the Legislative Council. The only way confusion can be caused to the electors is for the Legislative Council boundaries as they will be arising from this Bill, with the fiddling around with the boundaries, to remain unaltered. This to me is extremely disappointing, and I think it will be extremely disappointing to the people of South Australia.

The other point on which the Attorney-General laid some stress concerned the provisions of the Constitution. The Attorney knows better than I do that when the commission completes its job under this Bill it must present its report to both Houses of Parliament, following which the Government will have to introduce a Constitution Act Amendment Bill. One of the things it must do is alter the Third Schedule of the Constitution Act which sets out the existing 39 Assembly districts by name and by description. The whole of that schedule will have to be amended to contain the names and descriptions of the 47 new districts. Surely no-one is seriously suggesting that there would be any difficulty at that stage in altering the Second Schedule, which sets out the names and descriptions of the Legislative Council electoral districts.

There is really no substance in the case the Attorney-General has put up. I think the weakness of his case is further highlighted by the fact that he admitted (and more power to his elbow for doing so) that the Returning Officer for the State had told him that there were no administrative difficulties in this. In fact, the difficulties we have had placed before us as the opposition to the Leader's amendment are of the making of Government members.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I cannot agree that the reasons put up for retaining the Council boundaries in their present form are as worthy as the reasons for allowing consequential alterations. I think we have each put up a case and that it is a matter of opinion which is the better. I believe my arguments in this regard are more sound. The fears that have been expressed by members opposite are completely unfounded when one reads the initial part of subclause (8), which provides:

For the purposes of paragraph (*b*) of subsection (1) of this section, the Commission shall, as far as practicable, retain the existing boundaries of Council districts.

Paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) then provide for the consequential alteration of the boundaries. Indeed, paragraph (*a*) ties this up clearly. No accident can happen and there is no difference of opinion between the Parties on this question: we all know there must be give and take on these boundaries. The member for Glenelg is worried about paragraph (*b*) and believes there may be cause for an unknown factor, but it is not intended that there shall be a different effect.

This matter will be governed by the drawing of the new Assembly districts. The same procedure, if applied to the country, would have a far more dramatic political effect than this give-and-take method in the metropolitan area. If the Opposition would prefer a further safeguard I should be happy to strike out the last two lines in paragraph (*b*) and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

. . . without substantially altering the boundaries of those districts.

The paragraph would then provide:

Such consequential amendments shall be made to other Council districts as the Commission thinks necessary without substantially altering the boundaries of those districts.

Surely that would preclude any capricious action or thought of intention to alter the existing Legislative Council boundaries. If the member for Glenelg put himself in the place of the commissioners he would understand that he would not be acting in accordance with this Bill if he made an alteration that was not consequential.

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier is aware that the whole of subclause (8) relates to subclause (1) (*b*) and that this redefinition of the five existing Council districts takes place after the proposed Assembly districts have been created by the commission, because subclause (1) (*b*) states:

. . . adjust and redefine the areas of the five existing Council districts in terms of the proposed Assembly districts.

So, we cannot adjust the Council districts until we have the proposed Assembly district boundaries. What puzzles me is that for Central No. 1 District and Central No. 2 District a precise formula is laid down for their relationship to each other or to Midland District or Southern District, but not as between Northern District and Midland District or Midland District and Southern District. This is where the Opposition is having difficulty. The Premier's proposal, although marginally a little better, does not lay down the precise formula for the adjustment of other Council boundaries that applies to the boundaries of Central No. 1 and Central No. 2.

I, for one, know one adjustment that will certainly occur under paragraph (*a*): the metropolitan area of the current district of Glenelg will be extended to include the areas of Morphett Vale, Christies Beach, Port Noarlunga, and so on. If the commission goes as far as the Commonwealth electoral commission went, it will bring in about 10,000 people. If it goes a little further (which it is expected to, in line with the 1963 approach), about 11,500 people from the existing subdivision of Morphett Vale will come into the metropolitan area. That number will have to be added to the 4,500 or so from the southern part of my district to create a new Assembly district. This means, under paragraph (*a*) that the 4,500 from the southern part of my district, which is the part that normally votes Labor, will go out of Central No. 2, where they might do the Australian Labor Party some good, into Southern, where they will do it no good at all. That is one adjustment that must occur: it is unavoidable. The rule under paragraph (*a*) would require that adjustment to take place, and it is to the disadvantage of the Labor Party.

All I want to put to the Premier is this: do you want to get such a boundary that, when the proposals come back from the electoral commission, we discover that as a result of all these consequential adjustments of Legislative Council boundaries we are confronted with a redistribution of Legislative Council boundaries, which makes it even worse for the Labor Party in Central No. 2, Midland and Northern? Is that what the hope is? Is that the basis on which there will be no difficulty with the Legislative Council? Why not write in a hard and fast rule to apply to boundaries between Northern and Midland and Midland and Southern: that is, if any proposed Assembly district lies wholly or substantially within the current Legislative Council district of Northern, it goes into Northern; and, if it lies wholly or substantially within the current Legislative Council district of Midland or Southern, it goes into Midland or Southern? Why does the Government include in the Bill a rule regarding Central No. 1 and Central No. 2? Why cannot words similar to those applying to adjustments between Central No. 1 and Central No. 2 apply in other cases? I believe paragraph (*b*) should provide, in effect, "Such consequential adjustments shall be made to other Council districts as the commission thinks necessary to ensure that any proposed Assembly district, which falls wholly or predominantly within an existing Legislative Council district, shall be placed into that Legislative Council district."

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Giles.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As my other amendments to this clause were consequential on the amendment that has been lost, I see no point in proceeding with them.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I move:

In subclause (8) (*a*) to strike out "substantially" twice occurring and insert "predominantly".

This amendment will ensure that where it is necessary to adjust the boundaries of existing Council districts so as to incorporate whole proposed Assembly districts, the commission must incorporate in every council district that lies wholly or predominantly (that is, more than 50 per cent in area) in the metropolitan area those proposed Assembly districts within the metropolitan area which fall wholly or predominantly (that is, more than 50 per cent in area) within that Council district. As at present drafted the commission is required to include in every Council district that lies wholly or substantially (this could be less than 50 per cent in area) in the metropolitan area those proposed Assembly districts within the

metropolitan area which lie wholly or substantially within that Council district. The amendment would, in effect, ensure that where the greater part of a proposed Assembly district in the metropolitan area falls within a Council district the boundaries of that Council district are to be adjusted to include that proposed Assembly district. This confirms what I have explained to the Committee will happen under that clause, and "predominantly" is considered to be a better word than "substantially" in this context.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I move:

In subclause (8) (*b*) to strike out "to ensure that each Council district consists of two or more whole proposed Assembly districts" and to insert "without substantially altering the present boundaries of those Council districts".

I am moving this amendment in an effort to allay some fears that have been expressed by the Opposition in respect of redrawing Legislative Council district boundaries.

Amendment carried; clause as further amended passed.

Bill reported with further amendments. Committee's reports adopted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) moved: *That this Bill be now read a third time.*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition is naturally disappointed that major amendments that it sought to make to this Bill have not been agreed to. At the outset the measure that came before this House was not one that we thought provided in any way for a fair redistribution but, as has been said previously, we believed it was an improvement on the present iniquitous system. We sought to get something which more nearly approximated to our own views and to the views which certainly predominate in this country as to the degree of departure one can go to from the principle of one vote one value and still be reasonably in line with that principle. However, we have been unable to do this.

I can only express the disappointment of the Opposition. We are prepared to allow the Bill to pass the third reading, because there is a substantial improvement in the present system forecast here. However, we have some worries about the ways in which the commission will have to operate in the circumstances, and naturally enough we will reserve our right to scrutinize the report of the commission before any Constitution Act Amendment Bill is dealt with in this House. At the same time, since this does represent a compromise, and in order to get something done, we will go along with it, albeit with some reluctance.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I have listened to the debates on this matter with great interest, and I want to put another point of view. This Bill does what the Leader has said it does. I think there is need for a redistribution. However, I remind the House, and particularly the Leader, that the country people will have less representation in this House than they have enjoyed hitherto. I would be the last to deny city people adequate representation, and perhaps we should not growl too much about the reduced country representation. However, I, like the Leader, will look closely at the commission's report and study its consequences in the interests of country people. I support the third reading.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): We have heard on previous occasions charges from members of the Government that the Opposition agreed to the 1956 redistribution. In my short time in this House, this accusation has often been thrown at us. The Leader has already made it clear on behalf of the Opposition that the support we give to this third reading is only a qualified support. We are disappointed because all the substantial amendments we tried to move to the Bill were defeated, and because the Government often did not really bother to present a reasonable argument but merely voted the proposals out. This was very disappointing. The Leader certainly spoke for me when he expressed his disappointment at the Government's attitude on this, and I am sure he spoke for every member of the Opposition.

I rise on this occasion to express the Opposition's feelings on the matter so that no member of the Government will be able to accuse any member of the Opposition in future, if criticisms come up about this proposal, that after all the Opposition voted for it. We want to make sure that that sort of accusation is never thrown across this Chamber again.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 7, at 2 p.m.