

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 6, 1969

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

PETITION: TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN presented a petition signed by 2,198 electors. It stated that the adoption of the recommendations of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was opposed by thousands of South Australian citizens. It prayed that the Government immediately reject the present M.A.T.S. recommendations on the grounds (a) that in the drawing up of any transportation plan for Adelaide there was a need first to develop a master town plan based on inner-suburban development, green belts and pleasant residential areas, and on educational, social and industrial needs of the people; (b) that the M.A.T.S. recommendations did not stress the need for a cheap, fast and more widely expanded public transport system in Adelaide; and (c) that the expenditure of the large sums required in the M.A.T.S. recommendations would leave little finance available for the development of country townships, country industries, water conservation, and irrigation, etc. It further prayed that the Government immediately cause investigations to be made to determine a more suitable and practicable plan for the development of metropolitan Adelaide consistent with the rights of citizens living a peaceful existence and within the financial means available to the State.

Received and read.

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN presented a petition from 70 persons stating that the signatories, being 16 years of age or older, were deeply convinced that the human baby began its life no later than the time of implantation of the fertilized ovum in its mother's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception), that any direct intervention to take away its life was a violation of its right to live, and that honourable members, having the responsibility to govern this State, should protect the rights of innocent individuals, particularly the helpless. The petition also stated that the unborn child was the most innocent and most in need of the protection of our laws whenever its life was in danger. The signatories realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this

State, in circumstances claimed to necessitate it on account of the life of the pregnant woman. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would not amend the law to extend the grounds on which a woman might seek an abortion but that, if honourable members considered that the law should be amended, such amendment should not extend beyond a codification which might permit current practice.

Mr. CLARK presented a similar petition from 34 members of the Elizabeth Lutheran Church.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

HEALTH SUBSIDY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commonwealth Government pays patients requiring hospitalization a subsidy of \$2 a day, as originally provided, and \$5 a day (which is an additional \$3 a day) for those patients needing intensive nursing care. The additional subsidy of \$3 a day became operative in January this year, but since then nursing homes have widely increased their charges so that the whole of the additional subsidy has been eroded. If this happens every time some assistance is given by the Commonwealth Government, patients will be as badly off as they were before the assistance was given. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say whether the Government will have an urgent investigation made into nursing home charges to see whether, in the circumstances, they should not be controlled so that relief designed to be given to patients can be retained for them instead of being entirely taken by the nursing homes involved?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague to see whether the Leader's assertion that nursing homes have increased their charges is correct in all instances and, if increases have been imposed throughout the State, I will find out whether they are to the full extent of the increase in the Commonwealth Government benefit. If they are, I will find out whether such increases are justified.

GAS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Last week I asked the Minister of Works whether, as the natural gas pipeline from Gidgealpa had been completed two months earlier than expected, the spur line to Angaston was likely to be

completed earlier and whether natural gas was likely to be made available for industry in the metropolitan area and for the cement works at Angaston earlier than originally expected. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Although the natural gas pipeline between Gidgealpa and Adelaide has been completed ahead of schedule, gas cannot be sent to Adelaide until the treatment plant at Gidgealpa is operating. The construction of the treatment plant is on schedule and is expected to be completed by the end of October in time for natural gas to be delivered to the Adelaide metropolitan area and to Angaston on the date originally forecast. The early completion of the pipeline, which is now being tested and purged, will not of itself mean that natural gas will be available to consumers earlier than originally expected.

UNDERTAKERS

Mr. JENNINGS: On Monday last a close friend of mine attended a funeral at the Enfield General Cemetery. As the mourners were gathering at the graveside a card was offered to each. On the front was depicted a floral spray, a cross and the words "In memory"; inside was a psalm, the name of the deceased and the date of death; and on the back was the name and address of the undertaker. I have been told by my reliable informant that this card was not just offered but was pressed on the mourners. Also, just as the casket was to be consigned to the grave, proceedings were held up for photographs to be taken, presumably for advertising purposes. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government to discuss this matter with the trustees of the Enfield General Cemetery Trust in an endeavour to ensure that this gruesome conduct will no longer be continued?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

TAILEM BEND WATER SCHEME

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ascertain the policy of the Engineering and Water Supply Department with respect to providing further indirect services from the Tailem Bend to Keith water scheme?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

SUMMONSES

Mr. CORCORAN: The Attorney-General will recall that last Thursday I asked him a question about a summons that had been

wrongly served on a constituent and whether he would direct bailiffs and process servers to make certain that the person on whom the process was to be served was a party to the proceedings. The Attorney-General, in reply, said that it was difficult to know what more could be done than was being done and he said that he would discuss the matter with the acting Local Court Judge. I draw the attention of the Attorney to another incident that was brought to my notice yesterday. The situation is slightly different, because my constituent is the plaintiff. He is a business man in Robe, and a debt was incurred by a person to him some time ago. He placed the matter in the hands of a reliable collecting agency and, subsequently, a summons was issued to a person in Whyalla. This person claimed not to be the person to whom the summons should have been issued, and entered a plea. The case was heard and the defendant was successful, as the court held that he was not the person who had incurred the debt. In addition, the court awarded costs to the defendant. The Attorney told me in the previous instance last week that it should be possible for my constituent to obtain costs, but in this case the court awarded costs to the defendant. Because the person lived in Whyalla and the case was heard at Robe, the costs were substantial. The plaintiff's solicitor was evidently aware that the person had entered a plea and, realizing it was the wrong person, he tried to contact the person in Whyalla to inform him that the case would be withdrawn, but he was unsuccessful. Consequently, the costs the plaintiff has to pay to the defendant are \$157. As my constituent has not yet received an account from his solicitor, the total cost may be more than \$200 by the time the case is finished. All this was incurred in an effort to recover a relatively small sum. Clause 80 of the Local Courts Act provides:

Where the plaintiff is unacquainted with the defendant's Christian name, the defendant may be described by his or her surname or by his or her surname and the initial of his or her Christian name, or by the name by which he or she is generally known (prefaced in each case by Mr., Mrs. or Miss, as the case may require) . . .

It seems that a summons can be served without the initials of the christian names being shown. In the case of the person at Whyalla who was incorrectly served with the summons, the initials were the same as those of the correct defendant but the christian names were different. Because of this occurrence so recently after the other case that I raised,

resulting in two summonses being incorrectly delivered, will the Attorney take steps, administratively or legislatively, to so change the procedure as to ensure that the christian names as well as the surnames are shown on a summons when it is issued?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think that we can do that. The reason for section 80 of the Local Courts Act is that frequently a plaintiff or an intending plaintiff does not know the christian names of the person whom he wants to sue. It would be ludicrous if such ignorance were to defeat his suit: in other words, if one had to know the full christian names of the person one wanted to sue before one could sue that person. That is why the section is in the terms in which it is. As the honourable member has read out, the section provides that, if one does not use the full christian names, one should put "Mr.", "Mrs.", or "Miss", and the initials, to give the best identification that one can. I also point out to the honourable member that an ordinary summons must also include the address of the defendant, for both identification and service.

Mr. Corcoran: An ordinary summons doesn't have to be delivered personally.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, it must either be served personally or left with some person, I think over the age of 16 years or apparently so, or apparently in charge of the particular premises. I am speaking from memory, but I have dealt with many summonses. That is required so that every effort will be made to ensure that the correct person is served. I do not draw the conclusion from what the honourable member has said that the mistake as to identity was made necessarily by any officer of the court. When the summons was issued, it must have contained an address. Providing that address would be the responsibility of the solicitor who prepared the summons, the debt collecting agent who instructed the solicitor, or the plaintiff, and it has nothing to do with the court.

My recollection (and here I am a little rusty, because it is a long time since I have been closely connected with the serving of processes of this kind) is that the court sends the summons to be served at the address shown on the summons. If the person is not there, the summons is returned with notification that the person was not there, had left the address, was now residing at Whyalla, or whatever the circumstances were. It is then

up to the plaintiff or his solicitor to have the summons redirected. All this is done to try to ensure that the correct person is served, but I cannot but think that in this case, especially as costs were awarded against the plaintiff, the mistake may have been made, and probably was made, before the summons was issued. However, in this case (as in the other case) if the honourable member would like me to consider the facts, I will certainly do so, but I do not think I can accept the suggestion that the honourable member has made for an alteration of the Act.

TAILEM BEND SCHOOL BUS

Mr. WARDLE: For many years children from Tailem Bend have been coming to the Murray Bridge High School by rail. Many months ago the Minister of Education told the Tailem Bend Primary School Committee that this would be changed late in 1969, when a bus service would be provided. Can the Minister give a progress report on the provision of that bus service?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am pleased to be able to tell the honourable member that, in order to assuage the concern of parents whose children have been travelling by train from Tailem Bend to the Murray Bridge High School, the Education Department will provide a bus service between Tailem Bend and Murray Bridge. There has long been discontent with the mode of travel and the train journey between these two towns and the advice I received only in the last couple of days is that the bus service will be ready to start operating by November 1. It could operate that date, depending on when the buses are ready for commissioning.

PORT AUGUSTA BRIDGE

Mr. McKEE: Can the Premier say when the Commonwealth Government will commence earthworks in connection with the railway bridge at Port Augusta that will serve the rail link from Port Augusta to Whyalla?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will find out for the honourable member.

DARLING RIVER

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 31 about the flow of the Darling River?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The Darling River discharges for the past 10 years were as follows:

	Darling River at Burtundy	Darling River Anabranch at Bulpunga
	acre feet	acre feet
1959-60	1,046,634	382
1960-61	127,604	Nil
1961-62	532,404	8,710
1962-63	1,462,886	20,978
1963-64	1,751,734	20,176
1964-65	1,199,572	Nil
1965-66	181,496	2,704
1966-67	46,796	2,504
1967-68	270,038	9,819
1968-69	118,000	Not
	(approx.)	available

This detail has been extracted from River Murray Commission reports. No records are available giving information on the actual Darling River discharges into the Murray River.

TEACHERS' PAY

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier a reply to my question of July 31 about uniform salaries for teachers?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The statutory body appointed to make awards fixing teachers' salaries is constituted in accordance with provisions of the Education Act. The Act provides that there shall be a Teachers Salaries Board consisting of a chairman and four members. The chairman shall be a special magistrate and shall be appointed by the Governor. Two of the members shall be appointed by the Governor, and the other members shall be a male teacher elected by male teachers and a woman teacher elected by women teachers. The Government has always honoured awards made by this tribunal and will continue to do so.

OSMOND TERRACE

Mr. BROOMHILL: My question concerns the dangerous strip of road, previously known as Tapley Hill Road but now called Osmond Terrace, extending from Anzac Highway to the Sturt River. There are three schools and a kindergarten along this road, namely, the St. Leonards Primary and Infants Schools, Our Lady of Fatima Catholic School, and the Baden Pattinson Kindergarten. If the Minister of Education is aware of the stretch of road to which I refer, she will know that it is a particularly busy section and most dangerous for children to cross. The parents of children attending these schools have raised this matter with me from time to time, and the St. Leonards Primary School Committee recently wrote to me pointing out that the Glenelg council had stated that the only crossing that

could even be considered was a monitored school crossing. The letter from the school committee states:

Unfortunately, this is the only form of crossing that we are unable to accept. This is so, because the road is about half a mile from the school, and the Education Department is reluctant to accept the responsibility of supplying and caring for the children acting as monitors. The committee accepts this as reasonable.

Nevertheless, I point out to the Minister that the committee estimates that 150 children are required to cross this road each day (children of primary and infants school age) and that this matter is causing much concern. Will the Minister consider this problem and see whether she can offer a solution that will help the parents concerned?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member.

FOOT-ROT

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I recently asked about outbreaks of foot-rot in the South-East?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Agriculture reports that it has been the standard practice of the department not to notify neighbours of, or publicize in any way, the occurrence of disease on any particular property. This policy has been dictated by the belief that, if neighbouring stockowners were notified of disease on a property, that property-owner would attempt to hide infections and thereby reduce the effectiveness of control efforts. In certain circumstances, it is considered expedient to notify neighbours of the incidence of foot-rot to prevent its spread; but the Chief Inspector of Stock does not favour any change in the general policy in this matter. I should add, however, that in the event of an outbreak of an exotic disease such as foot and mouth disease an entirely different attitude would be necessary.

HOPE VALLEY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked him on July 24 about connecting sewerage to the Hope Valley Primary School?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: An estimate of cost is currently being prepared in regard to connecting the existing toilet facilities at the Hope Valley Primary School to the deep drainage system. The work, which has been allotted a high priority, is expected to commence soon.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on July 24 concerning paving at the Hope Valley Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The current programme allows for tenders for paving at this school to be called towards the end of 1969 with a view to the work being undertaken during the 1969-70 summer period.

POTATOES

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I recently asked about potatoes?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked a question about importing potatoes. A member of the South Australian Potato Board reported to the board that potatoes received by the firm of which the proprietor was a member had been forwarded to him from Victoria on consignment.

WEST LAKES SCHEME

Mr. HURST: On July 1 last, I asked the Premier whether he would make available to the House the details of the indenture alleged to have been signed regarding the West Lakes project. Broadly outlining the principles to the House, the Premier said:

Mining leases have been correctly defined and will be terminated by the Government at an early date.

Can the Premier tell me the number of leases affected and give the intended dates on which they are to be terminated?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will refer to the previous question to see whether it is current and, in any case, will ascertain for the honourable member the present situation regarding the sand leases on the West Lakes land.

Mr. HURST: I am referring again to the Premier's reply to my question of July 1 about the West Lakes scheme. The Premier referred to specific areas where firm agreements had been made between the corporation and the Government and specified one such area, as follows:

Planning regulations have been included in the indenture to ensure a uniformly high standard of development throughout the life of the scheme.

I understand that areas of housing will come within the general scheme, and the general procedure is that, when municipalities make regulations, persons may give evidence to the appropriate committee in opposition to or in support of those regulations. Will the Premier say whether what has been done will deprive

persons that live in the present housing area of the right to make those submissions on any regulations made?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to get a report for the honourable member. I have again read his question of July 1, which was a general question, not specific on any matter such as sandhills or termination of leases. In reply to that question, I gave some lengthy detail about the development of the scheme. I shall be pleased to add to the information already given by replying further to the honourable member as soon as possible.

UPPER MURRAY POLICE HEADQUARTERS

Mr. ARNOLD: I have received a letter from the Town Clerk of the Renmark council expressing the council's concern at the effect of the new police headquarters and facilities to be provided at Berri on the existing facilities at Renmark. Will the Premier ascertain from the Chief Secretary what those effects may be?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to confer with my colleague and to bring down as much detail as I can find for the honourable member.

DERAILMENTS

Mr. VIRGO: I wish to refer to the report, tabled by the Premier in the House yesterday, of the committee to inquire into derailments within the South Australian Railways. With probably all other members and, in fact, the public, I am wondering whether trains will stay on the lines, in view of the serious position that has been revealed by this report. Without canvassing the details of the shocking state of the permanent way, I ask the Premier whether he is aware that on June 24 last his colleague the Attorney-General tabled a report, which included a certificate from the Chief Engineer and Chief Mechanical Engineer, who stated that the way and works and the rolling stock had been safely maintained during the quarter. The certificate was signed by R. J. Fitch, Commissioner. If the Premier is aware of the existence of that certificate, and as it is obviously a false one in the light of this report, will the Premier say what steps the Government has taken to have the certificate repealed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get what information I can for the honourable member. At this stage, I am not accepting his assertion that it is a false certificate. This will depend on the information I can obtain.

Obviously the honourable member has been making some detailed research, or someone has been making it for him, but whatever the case—

Mr. Clark: Someone had to do it.

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one question at a time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: —I shall be pleased to oblige the honourable member, as I usually do. I remind him that, before this committee was set up by the Government, derailments had become a tremendous problem. The committee has now reported. I said previously in the House that as long as tabling the report did not conflict with public interest I would make it available to members, and I have done so. Yesterday, when I was asked whether I would have it printed, I said I would see how many copies were available and, if sufficient were available to go around, I would not have it printed. As my inquiry this morning revealed that there are not sufficient copies, later during Question Time I will move to have the report printed so that copies will be available to all members to peruse and study.

Mr. VIRGO: My question relates to the report that the Premier laid on the table yesterday. I hope he will take this question more seriously than he did my last one, and not reply to it in the same flippant manner. Referring to his statement in the press this morning, I quote his words, as follows:

It is quite apparent from a preliminary examination that there is an urgent need to upgrade the track as well as institute other means of improving the operation of trains in South Australia.

Because of the statement that there is an urgent need to do these things, and in the interests of the travelling public and those employed on the trains, will the Government further consider the announcement by the Minister of Roads and Transport that the upgrading of the track, which was shown by this report to be so necessary, will take six years?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member will realize that not all these derailments occurred after we came to office, but I remember that many of them occurred soon after.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you blame us for it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier, not everyone else, is replying to the question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It seemed rather obvious that the honourable member was trying

to make something out of his previous question about a document being improperly signed. It is almost inevitable that similar kinds of documents were signed when his Party was in office.

Mr. Virgo: That's the first question. What about replying to this one?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Regardless of what the honourable member likes to ask now, I am replying to the question he threw up previously.

Mr. Virgo: What about replying to this one?

The SPEAKER: Order! If there is any more interruption, I will not allow the question to be replied to further. Do members not want to hear it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier cannot reply further.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Premier say whether there were considerable numbers of train derailments during 1965, 1966 and 1967? Can he also say whether the then Government conducted an independent inquiry into these derailments or whether it conducted only a departmental inquiry and simply accepted the Railways Commissioner's certificate in connection therewith?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The whip of the honourable member's question goes back to a period when my Government was not in office. I will have a search made of the files so that I can present the facts. We know that at the time the then Government had only limited financial resources to do anything: it had spent its resources. As it was broke, it might not have set up an independent inquiry. However, I will get a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

Mr. VIRGO: I criticized the Premier because he dealt with my first question flippantly, and I am now even more critical because he is turning the safety of the public into a political football. If either he or the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) had read this report they would know that the derailments occurred.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You can't take it.

Mr. VIRGO: I can take it—and I can give it, too.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Nankivell: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown is asking a question that is in order. I cannot hear what the question is, but I have to test whether it is in order. Up

to date it is in order. It will help if the honourable member is heard in silence. The member for Edwardstown.

Mr. VIRGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for drawing Government members' attention to the need for courtesy. The point I was making when I was drowned out was that the answer to the Dorothy Dixier that the member for Angas asked is contained on page 1 of this report. I wish to refer to the statement the Premier made in the press this morning.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. VIRGO: I am doing so, Mr. Speaker, and I thank members opposite for their courtesy in calling "Question". The Premier said that the Government was spending \$8,500,000 to purchase a car. Will the Premier please tell this House whether it is an M.I.C., a quad or a matisa car, and will he say whether the Government has accepted the offer of a borrowed car from Victoria together with personnel and details of its operation?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It seems rather strange to me that the honourable member should ask another question when he refused to hear the answer to his last question.

Mr. Virgo: I did not refuse: that is a lie, and you know it. Speak the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must please restrain himself.

Mr. Virgo: Make him speak the truth, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member should prevail on members of his own Party if he wants an answer to the question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member concurs in the action of members of his Party he has no right to get a reply to his subsequent question. He is only wasting the time of the House if he asks questions and does not want replies. When the honourable member talks about courtesy, I suggest that he ensures that his Party gives a little courtesy first.

Mr. Virgo: Thanks for nothing.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member's question was rather garbled. He spoke about spending \$8,500,000.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Edwardstown has asked a question that is completely in order—

Mr. Virgo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER:—and I think the information he is seeking is of public interest. The Premier, as a Minister of the Crown, has the opportunity to reply. The matter is of public importance, so, to get on with the business of the House, the Premier should answer it in silence.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Thank you, Sir. I was about to say that part of the honourable member's question seemed to indicate that \$8,500,000 was to be spent on a car of some sort.

Mr. Virgo: I did not say that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member did not say that, his question must have been somewhat garbled, because of the heat which seems to have been generated in the House by his question and which seems to have been generated since his return from another State. However, I will search the report in *Hansard* for the honourable member's benefit, get as much detail for him as I can, and reply as soon as possible.

CLARE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding the possibility of commencing a remedial class at the Clare Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Chief Psychologist of the Education Department carries out surveys of children requiring help in specialist classes on a continuous basis. Such children are also referred for specialist education by heads of schools and parents, and a record is kept of all those needing opportunity class or occupation centre attention. The current records of a recent survey in the Clare district show that there are six children in Clare and surrounding towns awaiting placement in an opportunity class. There are also four children awaiting placement in special senior classes. Opportunity classes are not set up unless there is a minimum of 12 children with a possibility of more in the district qualifying for admittance. On this basis, the number in the Clare district does not justify the establishment of a class at Clare. Consideration is given to the establishment of a remedial class when the head of the school concerned sees the need for it and refers the matter to the Psychology Branch. No such request has been received from Clare.

TEACHER SHORTAGE

Mr. CLARK: Last Thursday I sought from the Minister of Education information regarding teachers who, after resigning in South Australia, have gone to Canada. This matter having created much interest, I have received several telephone calls from people interested, as have many of my colleagues. Does the Minister now have a reply to my question?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: When I answered the honourable member's question of July 31, in which he asked how many teachers had already left South Australia to take up positions in Canada, I gave him the information I had at that time and said I would ascertain the present position.

Mr. Corcoran: You said only a few had left.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I said that six had left, as that was the report we had had. I have now found that since the beginning of this year about eight secondary teachers and four (and possibly one or two more) primary teachers from South Australia have gone to Canada. As I indicated previously, teachers are not required to give reasons for resigning. It is possible that some of the 104 teachers who, since January, have given as their reason for resignation "travel overseas" may have gone to Canada, but we have no knowledge of this. Publications in other States have indicated that teachers are coming back from Canada. It is interesting to note from one of these publications, which acknowledges the benefits of the Canadian system, that there are other aspects which may not be regarded as favourable. For the benefit of members I quote several extracts as follows:

School taxes: In Canada, much more local money is involved. Education is financed partly from school taxes paid by property owners and partly from provincial government grants. Everybody pays, even though they may not have children at school.

Working conditions: In my district the school day consists of six 50-minute periods, three before lunch and three after, with no recesses.

Corporal punishment: In many ways schools are much more permissive and less formal than ours. Yet insolence or disobedience is not tolerated: for these and other offences boys and girls are strapped.

Textbooks: Syllabuses and texts are issued from the central department. I found this procedure very frustrating as pupils' texts are all rented and vary little from year to year.

PETERBOROUGH RAMPS

Mr. CASEY: I am most concerned with the Government's attitude towards the suggested provision of handrails on the subway ramps

at Peterborough. In reply to a question, the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, told me last week that he was under the impression that the handrails were being installed at Peterborough and that he would check on it. I take it as a personal affront that I have not been informed whether or not this impression was correct. Over the last 12 months, I have asked about 12 questions on this matter, pointing out that it should have been considered because the work had been recommended by the Standards Association of Australia and because it had been requested by all the people at Peterborough during the previous year. Only in the last couple of weeks many people have asked me what the Government will do about the matter. As the Attorney-General told me last week that he thought something was being done about the matter and that he would check on it, can he say now whether he has checked on it and, if he has not, will he do so, informing me of the position?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I cannot imagine why the honourable member should feel affronted: the check is still being carried out.

BOAT SURVEY

Mr. CORCORAN: About a month ago, I asked the Minister of Marine what progress had been made regarding regulations dealing with the survey of fishing vessels in the State. In view of the fact that, to the best of my knowledge, no regulations have been laid on the table of the House, I ask the Minister again what progress has been made, when the regulations are likely to be introduced, and what vessels, if any, are to be surveyed before the fishing season commences this year.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I can inform the honourable member that Cabinet has approved the regulations, which will go before His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council tomorrow for promulgation; they will then be gazetted in the normal way and, as soon as they are available, I will lay them on the table. In other words, the normal procedure will be followed. I assure the honourable member that we have expedited the matter as much as possible. Regarding the size of the vessels, I think I said about two or three weeks ago that arrangements had been made whereby all vessels that had to be resurveyed would be resurveyed, and that priority would be given to those vessels within the State that had not previously been subject to survey.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. McKEE: At a meeting of pensioners, representing branches from Whyalla, Port Augusta, and Port Pirie, held recently at Port Pirie, I was requested to ask the Minister of Health to consider establishing eye clinics for pensioners in country Government hospitals. It was considered that the Royal Adelaide Hospital could not cope satisfactorily with the needs and requirements of country pensioners. The pensioners also claimed that having to come to Adelaide for treatment meant that they had to spend four or five days waiting to have their eyes tested for new spectacles and, in some cases, board and other expenses were costing them twice or three times as much as the spectacles were worth. In many cases pensioners were unable to make the trip because of ill-health, and some were unable to make it unaccompanied, because of their failing eyesight. For these important reasons will the Premier ask the Minister of Health to consider seriously this request?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will discuss the matter with my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

PARK LANDS

Mr. LANGLEY: On Wednesday, July 30, an article in the *Advertiser* headed "Road to Cut Parks" states, *inter alia*:

Acquisition of land in both the north and south park lands is involved in an Adelaide City Council plan for a north-south arterial road from Lower North Adelaide to Parkside. An assurance was given yesterday by the Town Clerk (Mr. R. W. Arland) that in both cases an equivalent amount of road space would revert to park lands.

After the article appeared I was contacted by two sporting bodies whose playing grounds could be affected. Also, many people consider that the park lands should not be further interfered with, because this area is used extensively for recreation and competitive sport. As the park lands are bordered by many businesses and housing projects, and as the report stated that the area of the park lands to be used for roadworks would be replaced and that Government help would be sought, will the Attorney-General ascertain from the Minister of Roads and Transport whence the extra land to replace park lands used for roadworks will be obtained in the city area?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will see what I can find out.

SEACLIFF PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: The Seacliff Primary School is separated in part from the Seacliff Infants School by Barwell Avenue and, recently, a serious accident occurred as a result of a child's crossing the road. The parents committee and the progress association, having considered this matter, think that the road should be closed. As I understand that the Minister of Education has received correspondence concerning it, will she favourably consider recommending or supporting, through the Brighton council, the closing of this road?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not recall having received correspondence on this matter. However, if, by any chance, the school committee has not written to me perhaps the honourable member can suggest that it do so. In any case, I will have investigations made.

AGRICULTURAL ADVISER

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question about the appointment of an agricultural adviser in the Southern Murray area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague states:

The need for another agricultural adviser to cover the Murray Mallee district is fully recognized, and forward planning by the department provides for an adviser to be stationed at Lameroo. However, the establishment of this position will depend on availability of the necessary funds, and it is not expected that an appointment can be made this financial year.

BUILDERS LICENSING

Mr. EVANS: Although an Act to provide for the licensing of builders has been passed, it is not in operation, because regulations are still being drafted. There is concern in the industry, both for and against the Act. I think it is a shocking measure, but that is only a personal view. Will the Minister of Housing say when these regulations are likely to be before the House?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: There have been problems about resolving this matter. I do not know whether the honourable member wants them resolved or whether he does not. However, it is open to him to express his views: I am not suggesting to the contrary. I resubmitted this matter to Cabinet this morning. It will be dealt with at the Cabinet meeting tomorrow morning and further action will be taken next week.

NARACOORTE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the Naracoorte High School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am informed that the expected enrolment at Naracoorte High School for 1970 will be 655 students, who will continue to be grouped in 19 classes. It is hoped that an additional classroom will be available for the opening of the 1970 school year and consideration is being given to the possibility of providing an additional two rooms during 1970. If this can be done all inconveniences will be removed except the inadequacy of the boys craft building. Availability of funds limits the number of schools into which extended boys craft facilities can be introduced each year. The needs of Naracoorte are well understood and provision will be recommended at an appropriate time after consideration of its claims in relation to other high schools. The smallness of the library is recognized and some improvements will be effected if the two additional classrooms mentioned by me earlier are provided. Complete upgrading can be achieved only by building a new library. The Education Department does not recommend the provision of a standard classroom as a "home base" for every class in a secondary school. This would lead to uneconomic use of the buildings. Some classes must, therefore, use specialist rooms as their "home base" and these are fitted up accordingly. Such classes go for their lessons to rooms which are available when the specialist "home base" is being used by other classes. The classes best able to handle these arrangements are the senior classes and particularly the Matriculation classes.

ELIZABETH TRANSPORT

Mr. CLARK: As the Attorney-General knows, a few weeks ago the Minister of Roads and Transport made an announcement about a bus service to Elizabeth. Many of my constituents, although not completely pleased about what they have heard so far, are most interested in the proposal and are extremely anxious to know the details of this service and when it will commence. A particular case came to my notice this morning when a constituent wrote to me saying that shortly he had to go on late shift at work, that he would be unable to travel backwards and forwards by train, and that, unless the bus service commenced soon, he would have to purchase a car, which he did not want to do

at present. Will the Attorney ask his colleague when this service will commence and obtain any other details he may have?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

WHEAT

Mr. VENNING: I understand that the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, has a reply to my question of July 29 regarding quotas for wheatgrowers in the coming harvest. When I asked the question, I said that I had a great deal of faith in the committee set up to handle the situation, but, because of the nature of the work and the condition of it, I asked the Minister to give the situation his personal attention to see whether any help was required from his department. Will he now give the reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the Secretary of the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee reports that about 11,400 application forms have been received from wheatgrowers, of whom nearly 8,000 have requested special consideration. The committee, with the assistance of officers of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited and the Australian Wheat Board, is now engaged in the tedious and time-consuming task of examining each application. Good progress is being made and it is expected that the initial examination will be completed within the next few days. A final assessment of applications set aside for further consideration will then be undertaken, after which quota forms will be distributed, probably in September. The Minister is satisfied that applications are being handled as quickly as is commensurate with the need for careful examination. He points out, however, that farmers are able to make a preliminary estimate of their quotas by applying the formula that has been publicized.

EDUCATION COMMISSION

Mr. HUDSON: Last week, it was suggested in Melbourne that it would be appropriate for the Commonwealth Government to take over the whole responsibility for tertiary education in the States. It was also suggested that the Commonwealth Government should establish an Australian schools commission to examine and determine the needs of students in Government and non-government primary, secondary and technical schools and to recommend grants that the Commonwealth should make to the States to assist in meeting the requirements of all school-age children on the basis

of needs and priorities. Will the Minister of Education say whether she is prepared to give public support to these two important policy items passed last week by the Federal Conference of the Australian Labor Party?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: A committee of inquiry is now investigating the needs of education in South Australia, and the Australian Education Council, which consists of Ministers of Education, undertook at its conference in March that it would conduct a survey of the needs of education in the various States.

ROBE BOAT HAVEN

Mr. CORCORAN: On a recent visit to Robe my attention was drawn to the need further to extend the boat haven at Lake Butler, particularly in view of the demand being made for pleasure craft to be moored in the lake for fairly long periods, especially in summer. It appears to me, after an examination of the lake, that the most appropriate place for an extension of the boat haven would be the southern end, where there appears to be ample opportunity for dredging. I suggest that all this work need not necessarily be done at once: it could be spread over five years so that it did not become a major project. This work would meet the growing need for moorings in the lake and it would be most convenient for people who travel to Robe from inland areas and use this pleasant beach resort during their holidays and in the summer. Will the Minister of Marine consider this request?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am familiar with the facilities at Lake Butler to which the honourable member has referred. I presume that the problem is connected with low clearance in some parts of the lake. The recent dredging of the entrance channel will help to solve this problem. I realize the importance of Robe to people along that part of the coastline, so I will consider the matter raised by the honourable member and see what can be done.

DERNANCOURT INFANTS SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 30 about the need for a pathway from the main building of Dernancourt Infants School to the temporary building nearby?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is usual for the Public Buildings Department to pave or gravel the area surrounding temporary buildings in order that children may be given dry access

to the classrooms. Where there is a need to connect the area surrounding the classrooms to an already established paved area, concrete slabs are used to provide a pathway. The Public Buildings Department has been asked to attend to this matter at Dernancourt.

GOATS

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the possibility of setting up a branch in the Agriculture Department to handle matters relating to goats?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague states:

The Director of Agriculture states that very few inquiries are received from goat producers for advice on goat husbandry, and the present staff of the department has been able to deal satisfactorily with inquiries in relation to milk production recording and diseases. In these circumstances, it is not considered that the establishment of a specialized section to handle problems of goat production could be justified at this juncture; but if the demand reaches proportions which would warrant the appointment of specialist staff for this purpose, every effort will be made to meet the situation.

PORT PIRIE LAND

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about Education Department land at Port Pirie?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is proposed to use the land at the corner of Balmoral Road and The Terrace, Port Pirie, to which the honourable member referred in his question, for future departmental residences.

CADELL TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Representations have been made to me that the water reticulation service to the homes of officers at the Cadell Training Centre is inadequate, I understand because the pipes are blocked with sand. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Chief Secretary and find out whether an improvement can be effected before the warmer months?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes.

EUDUNDA RAILWAY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In commending the Minister of Roads and Transport for his active policy in trying to improve the efficiency of the railway network, I ask the Attorney-General to ascertain whether the Minister has any plans to close the railway line between Eudunda and Kapunda.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask him.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. HUDSON: It has come to my attention that it has been announced in another place that the Government has now deferred the Noarlunga Freeway.

Mr. Broomhill: You must be mistaken.

Mr. HUDSON: No, I believe this further decision has now been taken. My question to the Premier on this matter is twofold. First, why was such an announcement made first in another place, members of this House not being given the benefit of that decision and the information surrounding it? Secondly, what is the purpose of this deferment? Has the Noarlunga Freeway been scrapped altogether, or are alternative routes to be investigated?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Noarlunga Freeway has not been scrapped, and the motion to be moved in the House will ask that it be accepted in principle. There is not the slightest doubt by the Government that a freeway in this area is necessary, and the Government will ask the House to endorse that proposal. However, it will refer for further investigation the matter concerning the position of the route. There is little more that I can say at this stage except that there will be no restriction on the debate to take place in this House. Whether or not members obtain the relevant information first in this House depends on their degree of interest. No question was asked about it earlier this afternoon.

Mr. Hudson: You don't change your mind every day; you just change it once a week.

The SPEAKER: Order! There must be only one question at a time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It so happens that the Minister of Roads and Transport is a member of another place.

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier's announcement and, presumably, the prior announcement by the Minister of Roads and Transport about the Noarlunga Freeway will cause a certain amount of puzzlement and concern in my area and in that of the member for Edwardstown regarding what possible alternative routes are being considered. It may be that the old route which was first approved back in 1962 and which runs to the west of the Morphettville racecourse and then south through Oaklands Park, Sturt and Darlington will again be considered. It may be, too, that the suggestion of the member for Edwardstown that the Noarlunga Freeway should follow the route of the Glenelg Expressway and then go along the Sturt River as a construction built over it, so that an absolute minimum of houses will be affected, will also be considered.

It may be that other routes lying to the west and to the east of the current Noarlunga Freeway route will also be considered. Is it possible for the Premier to say what alternatives are being considered in relation to this matter? Otherwise, while the matter is being considered, no-one in this whole area will know what might happen, and there will be a general hold-back of activity in the area.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If there is a general hold-back to all activity in the area, the honourable member bears a fairly high responsibility for it, because he has been actively involved in the area whence the protests emanate. The Government has said consistently that it will listen to what the public has to say on this plan, and it has done so. If the honourable member is in some quandary because he first pursued in this place a course that the plan was wrong and now the Government has said that it will listen to advice, then I am not responsible for that quandary.

Mr. Hudson: You didn't listen to the question.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member cannot have it both ways. If he wants the plan settled on, that is his desire and he may hold it. If he wants the plan re-investigated, then that is what is happening.

Mr. Hudson: What are the alternatives?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: From the point of view of the investigating authority, the alternatives that will be considered can be a subject for the honourable member's own calculations. If he wishes, he may submit proposals to the authority, and so may the member for Edwardstown and any other person affected by this.

Mr. Virgo: What's the use? They aren't looked at.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There may be wild statements that these proposals are not looked at or that they are ignored, but the Government's actions prove such allegations to be false.

Mr. Virgo: Rubbish!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government is acting in the interests of the people concerned. I believe that, along the lines that Opposition members have suggested, there should be a review of some of these matters. I understand that the honourable member has been active in this matter, for I have heard (and I do not know whether this is true) that he has personally canvassed the area to find out what people think. If he knows what they think, then he will know what proposals they will put to the investigating authority. In any case,

it is open to all residents and interested parties to put their case to the proper authority.

Mr. HUDSON: I direct a further question to the Premier about the Noarlunga Freeway.

Mr. Virgo: You don't think you'll get an answer, do you?

Mr. HUDSON: I believe in trying and trying again, and I usually end up getting somewhere. Can the Premier explain to members and to the people who may be affected by any new alternative or who are affected by the existing proposed route how long this re-examination will continue before the Government announces whether or not the existing route is to be adhered to or states what new route has been chosen?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: From memory, I think it is six months, but I will check that for the honourable member.

Mr. HUDSON: My question is supplementary to other questions this afternoon about the M.A.T.S. recommendations. It concerns those matters on which the Government has deferred any decision at this point of time and has simply said, "We will give a decision at some later stage." However, the people affected by such a decision are still left hanging in the air as to what will happen to them. Can the Premier indicate when these further decisions will be taken? In the future, shall we be subjected to a further series of piecemeal decisions, which seem to indicate to the public of South Australia that the Government is considering this plan in bits and pieces and taking a whole series of panic decisions? When shall we get a firm and unqualified statement of just what this Government intends to do on these matters?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, when I speak to the motion in my name on the Notice Paper. The matter that the honourable member raised earlier of how long it would take to make a decision regarding the Noarlunga Freeway in his area will depend on the amount of agreement existing in that area on where exactly the freeway should go. This is a unknown factor; possibly, the honourable member knows that better than we do but, if there is an implied criticism in our "piecemeal" way of accepting the plan that he refers to, let me remind him that his own Leader has said there should be a sectional step-by-step implementation of such a plan; this is on record. The Government has not accepted this way of dealing with the plan. It has announced the whole plan as a conception for metropolitan Adelaide trans-

portation development, and it has put it on review in a series of steps of which the honourable member is well aware. The Government has listened intently to all the representations made to it, and its resultant decisions come from representations that have been made and a reassessment of the plan. I assure the honourable member that the major parts of the plan stand, and the Government will tomorrow be asking the House to endorse in principle a freeway known as the Noarlunga Freeway. The other points the honourable member raises will be dealt with, as I have said, in my speech.

WATER RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Water Resources Committee that has been set up will visit the South-East to take evidence and, if it will, how interested parties will be notified?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I know that the Water Resources Committee, which was set up earlier this year, has been investigating many aspects referred to it, dealing mainly with the supply of water to various parts of South Australia. I know also that it has taken evidence from many organizations and individual persons interested in this extremely important subject. I hope that the committee will visit various parts of the State, and I know that it has already visited some. Further, I hope that it will be able to take evidence from any interested bodies or individuals situated in various parts of the State which may be visited. The committee has its own secretary, but for the convenience of any individual who might wish to give evidence perhaps it would be appropriate if a letter or reference were forwarded through my office to be passed directly on to the committee. I assure the honourable member that it is the Government's desire that as much evidence as possible be made available to this committee.

WEST BEACH RESERVE

Mr. BROOMHILL: I have been told by a responsible member of the community that he suspects that the West Beach Trust may intend to erect additional buildings along the front of the sand dunes in the West Beach Recreation Reserve. I am not sure whether that is correct but, as I should like guarantees from the Minister that there will be no building likely to affect the sand dunes in this area, will the Minister of Immigration and Tourism have this matter examined?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall have to inquire about it. As the honourable member knows, this reserve is run by a trust, which does not report to me in the normal course of events. However, I will inquire and ascertain what are the trust's intentions, so that I may then be able to assess just what substance is contained in the report to which the honourable member has referred.

GAOL RELEASES

Mr. VENNING: I have recently been approached by a representative of the Ministers Fraternal in the North concerning the problem of prisoners' coming out of gaol in our country areas. The situation is somewhat different regarding people released from gaol in the metropolitan area who, I understand, are able to go to the Commonwealth office where they can register as being unemployed and receive what is known as the green form, which enables them to go to the Social Services Department to get food orders and rail warrants and to make arrangements for accommodation, or whatever is required to get them to new work. Money is also made available, if necessary, in urgent cases. However, the problem in the country (Gladstone, for instance) is that there is no office of the Commonwealth department where these people are able to register. If these people go to Port Pirie there is a problem there, again, because there is no office of the Social Services Department. If the people concerned, when they come out of gaol, go to the Gladstone police, for example, without the green form showing that they have registered as being unemployed, they are picked up for vagrancy. Will the Attorney-General look into this situation to see what can be done to aid the people concerned?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I fear that most of those released from prison face problems of some description or another. There are agencies, such as the Prisoners' Aid Association, whose job it is to try to help, but I freely acknowledge that problems exist which are even more acute in the areas referred to by the honourable member, and I will see what, if anything, we can do to help.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the breaking of contracts by the Government?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Inquiries have revealed that two cases were raised by the Chamber of Manufactures, one concerning wire weaving and the other the supply of pre-

cast concrete products. In the case of the wire weaving, the chamber has expressed its satisfaction with the explanation given to it. In the case of the concrete products, a letter was forwarded by the Chief Secretary to the chamber on June 27, 1969, which it is believed will satisfy the chamber.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE

Mr. CORCORAN: Yesterday, in reply to a question that I had previously asked regarding the renovation and redecoration of Government House, the Premier said that a contract for \$10,000 has been let to a Victorian firm for refurbishing Government House and that other work was involved. Can the Premier now say how much money is involved in that additional work to be carried out at Government House?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I apologize to the honourable member for giving him an incomplete reply, but I assure him that I was not trying to conceal details of how much money was being spent on Government House. The cost of building renovations, painting, etc., being carried out at Government House, departmentally or by South Australian contractors, is \$63,500.

LEASES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last week the Minister of Lands replied to a question I had previously asked about the possibility of breaking the nexus between marginal perpetual leases and perpetual leases. I understand that the perpetual lease part of the joint lease can be made freehold. Can the Minister of Lands say whether, if the department agrees to separate the marginal perpetual lease from an existing perpetual lease, the marginal perpetual lease can be made leasehold and, subsequently, freehold?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: These cases are dealt with on their merits. For instance, freeholding is allowed as a matter of policy, and in normal circumstances there is no reason, according to the policy of which I am now speaking, why the Minister should not agree to the freeholding of the land. There is also no reason why marginal land perpetual leases cannot be changed to other forms of tenure, provided that the Minister is satisfied that the circumstances warrant it. Last week's reply indicated that much public money was spent on the marginal land scheme and, although it was not stated in the reply, the background of the scheme was such that many properties had become too small for the type of farming that the people concerned were trying to

carry on, and they could not make a living. Therefore, a Minister would approach with reserve a proposal to freehold land of that nature and thereby, in theory at least, make possible the danger of further marginal land trouble. For that reason I am guarded, but each case is dealt with on its merits. I appreciate that since the marginal lands scheme was implemented great changes have been made in agricultural methods and in the types of production carried on, and it is not necessarily marginal land any more. However, it is still land on which much public money has been spent, and one needs to be careful. I shall be glad to examine any case that is brought before me.

RAILWAYS INSTITUTE

Mr. VIRGO: As the Attorney-General is absent, I will address my question, which relates to one I asked yesterday, to the Premier. I am sure he will be relieved that I have given up the ghost at this stage in the matter relating to the railways. Yesterday, in reply to a question I asked on July 1, the Premier said that several alternatives were being investigated as a means of providing alternative accommodation for the Railways Institute. I refer the Premier to a reply he gave me on October 16, 1968 (at page 1916 of *Hansard*), when he said:

I assure the honourable member that, before the buildings—

referring to the Railways Institute, the Railway Sub-Branch of the Returned Servicemen's League and other buildings— are removed and before inconvenience may be caused in any way to the people who now use them, the Railways Commissioner will be fully consulted and alternative accommodation provided.

On July 1, I asked the Premier whether, in view of the press statements that had been made, he would re-assure the House that he would undertake to honour the promise which he gave on October 16 and which can be found on page 1916 of *Hansard* that alternative accommodation would be provided before the existing buildings were demolished, and I now repeat that question.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member has quoted my reply and I thought, having received one answer, that would be sufficient for him.

Mr. Virgo: I am asking for a reply now.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member were to go through *Hansard* he could fill a day by resubmitting questions, if he so desired. I will now give the honourable

member the same reply. I have not publicly indicated that there will be any variation; if there is any variation, it exists in the honourable member's mind only. The Minister of Works has already had conversations regarding this matter, which I assure the honourable member is in hand.

SPALDING ROAD

Mr. ALLEN: I refer to Main Road No. 379, which is the main road connecting Spalding to Burra. Negotiations that have been proceeding for some time regarding a rail crossing situated one and a half miles south of Spalding have held up work on a new bridge over Deep Creek as well as holding up survey work to be done on the road before it is sealed. Last week I heard that a decision had now been made on this railway crossing. As this will enable work on the bridge and the survey work on the road to proceed, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether a contract has been let for the construction of this bridge and, if it has, when work on the bridge will commence, and when survey work on the road will commence?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to find out.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. CASEY: Some time ago the Minister of Local Government announced that consideration was being given to extending council boundaries to take in the whole of the State, the idea being to bring South Australia into line with the Eastern States. As I have received from people in the Far North and North-East of the State many letters expressing concern at the statement attributed to the Minister, can the Premier say whether his Government intends to bring about this change and, if it does, when it contemplates making the change?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will bring down a reply for the honourable member.

DERNANCOURT PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 30 about the need for technical assistance from the Mines Department regarding the deepening of a well situated in the grounds of the Dernancourt Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is usual for the Public Buildings Department to seek advice from the Mines Department in cases of

this kind. Where information is needed concerning the likely availability of water, the quality of water and the chances of successfully sinking a bore, the advice of the Mines Department is made available readily. If the school committee will submit this matter through the Headmaster to the Director-General of Education, it will be referred to the Public Buildings Department for further action.

LAND SETTLEMENT

Mr. CORCORAN: While I was Minister of Lands steps were taken to survey and make ready for allotment land in the counties of Chandos and Buckingham, of which area the Minister of Lands will be well aware. Can he tell me what the Government intends to do with regard to making allotments of this land? Can he say how many allotments, if any, have been made, and what progress has been made with this development?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Having discussed this matter with the Director of Lands, I can say that we certainly intend to go ahead with it. Although my discussions with the Director were not recent, the result of our previous conversation was that we would look again at the conditions that would be insisted on, the size of areas, and that type of thing. As the honourable member knows, this is very difficult country, and the fact that much of the land in each lease will not be arable is appreciated. We are trying to make sure that every safeguard is taken so that soil damage can be prevented, at the same time making the conditions attractive enough so that people will want to go to the area. Therefore, although I cannot report recent progress, I will take up the matter and have a good look at it. I will probably be able to let the honourable member know a little more about it in a week or two.

GLANDORE BOYS HOME

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the erection of a recreation hall at the Glandore Boys Home (or the Windana Remand Home)?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Funds have recently been approved for the annex building from the old reformatory institution at Magill to be re-erected at the Glandore Boys Home for recreational purposes. The Public Buildings Department has advised that the work is programmed to commence late next month and be completed in December this year. I am as anxious as is the honourable member that this work should be done, and so are the officers of my department. I have made

personal and strong representations to my honourable colleague here to get the work done.

BOAT TRAILER

Mr. CORCORAN: I understand that the Department of Marine and Harbors has had discussions with the Professional Fishermen's Association at Grey about the construction of a boat trailer that would be used virtually as a slipway at Grey; in other words, the trailer would be let into the sea, the boats would be put on or taken off, and the trailer would be hauled ashore. The plans for the construction of this trailer are fairly well advanced. However, my attention has been drawn to the need for some area to be set aside at Grey for the parking of boats once they are brought on to the shore. I draw the attention of the Minister of Marine to an area that I think would be fairly convenient to the fishermen. This area is controlled or owned by the South-Eastern Drainage Board. It is located about 300 yards west of where it is proposed that the boat trailer will operate from. There are some shacks there at the moment, but the people who occupy them have been given notice that they are to quit them and to remove them from this area, and I believe that the area is to be left in its natural state from the point of time when the shacks are cleared. Would the Minister be good enough to confer with his colleague the Minister of Lands, under whom the South-Eastern Drainage Board operates, to see whether this area could not be made available for these purposes?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be pleased to look into that suggestion. "Dry parking" is the term used for this type of placing of vessels on shore. I will look into the question of the area at Grey at the same time as I examine the matter raised by the honourable member of this facility at Port MacDonnell.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mrs. BYRNE: From time to time in this House I have directed questions to the present Minister of Lands and also to previous Ministers about an area of land east of Tea Tree Gully, shown in the Town Planner's Report prepared for the metropolitan area of Adelaide as a proposed reservation under "open spaces". On the last occasion on which I asked a question about this, the Minister advised me that he would obtain an estimate from the Land Board of the cost of purchasing this area of land. Since then, on March 4 this year the Minister wrote to me as follows:

The Land Board inspected the area referred to herein on December 4, 1968. Inspection revealed that considerable quarrying industry has been established on the majority of the land which renders much of the area unsuitable for a national park and wild life reserve. Acquisition of the whole area mentioned would involve a very considerable sum of money (land purchase, disturbance to existing extractive industries and purchase of mineral and other rights which have been alienated from the Crown).

The only portion of this area considered suitable for the above purposes is an area of timbered land which runs parallel to and easterly from Perseverance Road. This land contains approximately 300 acres. (This area does not include the land subdivided for residential purposes on the eastern side of the road). Considerably more research and investigation will be needed to ascertain the approximate cost of acquiring the whole of this area, due to the very complex nature of the land ownership, including various leases and agreements.

Has the Minister anything further to report on this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Nothing optimistic. I can get a considered reply to that question, but only recently another question of the cost of purchase of some of that area came before me, and the cost of it horrified me. I do not quite know what can be done. At the moment it is a bleak prospect. Before I say anything further, I shall have to look again at the notes I have of the conversation I had about this a few days ago. I will bring those down for the honourable member.

DOCTORS' FEES

Mr. CORCORAN: The Premier recently expressed his displeasure at the increase in doctors' fees in this State. He said that he had written to the Australian Medical Association and that when he received a reply from that association he would decide what further action he would take. Has the Premier heard from the A.M.A. and, if so, what action is he taking?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have heard from the A.M.A. I was asked whether I would approve of a letter being sent to, I think, all constituent members of the A.M.A. I gave my approval, and I understand that it has been sent. I will get a reply for the honourable member about how widely it was to be sent.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 5. Page 685.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): When I obtained leave to continue I had almost concluded my remarks on the Address in Reply and had intended to deal with only one further subject. However, the events that occurred towards the conclusion of Question Time leave me, even now in this debate, to make one general comment about the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report and its consequences. I never expected, even when the Government published the report last year without saying anything about what proposals it would accept, that the people of this State would have been subjected to such a complete mismanagement as has occurred. We have been provided with a spectacle of bit by bit decision-making. There does not seem to have been overall integration and co-ordination in relation to the various decisions that have been made, and one cannot help but comment that on this overall matter the Government has displayed nothing but incompetence. It is fantastic enough that the Government should publish the actual report without first considering and determining what could and should be done within the financial resources of the State. That was fantastic enough, but the subsequent events have been even more fantastic. Although one cannot believe that this is the Government's intention, it seems to me, from what one can ascertain from the events that have taken place, that its disclosed intention has been to cause the maximum possible upset to the people in metropolitan Adelaide. However, this whole matter will be canvassed more thoroughly starting tomorrow and, one presumes, next week.

I wish to make a few remarks about the wheat industry in South Australia because I believe that the long-term prospects for wheat farmers in this State are very dim and that serious measures may have to be considered in the future. I draw attention to the contrast between the position that applied when many wheat lands were being developed in South Australia in the 1850's, the 1860's, and the 1870's, and the position that applies today. At that time, before the development of railways in Australia, no wheat could be economically produced away from an inland waterway more than about 30 miles from the nearest port, because the transport cost by bullock dray was such a high proportion in relation to the value of wheat that transport further

than 30 miles away from a port made the cost of production, including transport costs, prohibitive.

Mr. Rodda: It wasn't only the costs.

Mr. HUDSON: When one examines the way in which wheat production developed in Australia, one realizes that initially South Australia, because of its peculiar geographic and climatic conditions, became the first granary for Australia. The areas to the west of the Great Dividing Range in New South Wales and to the north and west of that range in Victoria were not suitable in the 1850's and the 1860's, before the development of railways, for the growing of wheat. Initially, they were purely wool production areas, because the value of a ton of wool was about 20 times greater than the value of a ton of wheat and, consequently, the element of transport costs as a percentage of the total value of the product was very much lower.

Mr. Rodda: Would you sooner stack a ton of wool or a ton of wheat?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not think that the member for Victoria would be wise to talk about stacking, because I remember that, when the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) was speaking, the member for Victoria interjected and was speedily and expertly stacked. South Australia's peculiar geography, governed by St. Vincent and Spencer Gulfs and the Flinders and Mount Lofty Ranges, resulted in a long tongue of agricultural land extending northwards along the shores of the gulf. This proved to be an area of potential wheat land development. In almost every instance it meant the production of wheat within 30 miles of a port. Indeed, the first railways in South Australia were almost invariably tied in with the transport of wheat to ports such as Port Pirie, Wallaroo, Port Wakefield, or Port Adelaide. At that time South Australia had the advantage over other States in wheat production, because it was able to transport to a point of shipment more economically than they could. The names of towns that exist today along the two gulfs indicate the many outports that were used. Also, this situation indicates that the 1850's became the great heyday of the sailing ship. It was then that the great circle routes were first used.

Mr. Rodda: Would you define a great circle?

Mr. HUDSON: If the member for Victoria listens he will learn something of value to him and of greater value to his own Party. Before the 19th century the absence of accurate chronometers meant that one could not sail a sailing ship on a great circle route because

there was no accurate way of measuring longitude. Consequently, it was not until accurate chronometers were developed and could be supplied regularly to sailing ships that the sailing of great circle routes became practicable. This became important to Australia, and to South Australia in particular. I imagine that most Government members would be surprised to be told that the shortest route between the Cape of Good Hope and Melbourne involves a route going as far south as latitude 66 degrees. This journey would be about 1,000 miles less in length than following a direct route along the same latitude.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Air Force navigators over here understand this.

Mr. HUDSON: I am pleased to hear that the Treasurer knows something about it.

Mr. Rodda: Tell us about the rhumb line, now that you are getting into this technical stuff.

Mr. HUDSON: Honourable members may be interested to know that the most direct route from London to Melbourne would be via the South Pole. In the 1850's with the advent of the wooden American clippers, many sailing ships sailed from North America and England directly south to Australia, without stopping *en route*; they went south into latitudes 40 degrees and 50 degrees where they had the advantage of the strong prevailing westerly winds. These wooden American clippers held the record sailing time for many years, even with the advent of steamships on these routes. A time of 63 days was recorded early in the 1850's for the journey from Liverpool to Melbourne via the Cape of Good Hope, and the sailing ship *James Baines*, too, completed the journey from Melbourne to London via Cape Horn (again using a semi-great circle route) in 63 days.

When we consider the technology of that era and the use of sailing ships, that is an absolutely fantastic achievement. It stands as one of the most extraordinary achievements that man has realized in the field of transport. The advent of the wooden American clippers altered dramatically the whole procedure for transporting goods to and from Australia, and altered the whole economy of many forms of production in Australia, and particularly in South Australia. The sailing ships continued in one form or another until about 20 years ago, in 1949. I refer honourable members to the book *The Tyranny of Distance*, by Geoffrey Blainey. At page 286 of his book, Blainey states:

After the First World War most sailing ships, deprived of coal to carry away, congregated at wheat ports in south-eastern Australia. In the year 1924-25 only 51 sailing ships called at Australian ports, and they represented just 1 per cent of the tonnage of overseas shipping in Australia; only 30 years previously sailing ships had provided half the tonnage. Once their wheat was loaded the sailing ships went to Europe by way of Cape Horn, and as they could attract no cargo in Europe they usually returned to Australia in ballast, if they returned at all. Perhaps the last sailing ship to carry Australian grain sailed away from the long jetty at Port Victoria in South Australia in 1949.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The heyday was just before the Second World War.

Mr. HUDSON: The commencement of the real heyday goes right back to the 1850's, 1860's or 1870's.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I remember 18 of them in Port Victoria at the one time.

Mr. HUDSON: Quite. That was only 35 years ago, and 30 years or more before then the greater part of the transportation of wheat would have been by sailing ship. Now, of course, the use of tramp steamers and larger and larger bulk carriers has altered the whole economics of transport for South Australia. Whereas sailing ships could use almost any point along the coast to load wheat, I understand that today South Australia has only six wheat ports, namely, Thevenard, Port Lincoln, Wallaroo, Port Pirie, Ardrossan, and Port Adelaide. Even that number greatly exceeds the number in New South Wales and Victoria.

Those States now have a tremendous advantage over South Australia in the loading of wheat, in that by far the great bulk of the output is concentrated, in the case of Victoria, at one point of shipment (Geelong) and, in the case of New South Wales, at two points of shipment (Sydney and Newcastle). As the bulk carrier gradually replaces the old form of tramp steamer (just as the tramp steamer, in time, shut out the sailing ship), so the relative advantage in transport that New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia have had over South Australia because of the existence of deep sea ports will become even more pronounced. As the wheat industry now seems likely to be in a condition of surplus, perhaps for some years, our lack of deep sea ports is indeed a serious matter, because any bulk carrier will prefer a deep sea port and, therefore, will prefer to go to some State other than South Australia to load wheat. In fact, at present, as honourable members know, the bulk carriers can come to a South Australian port only if they load

to a very limited extent here and go elsewhere to top up.

Mr. Hughes: With the deepening of the port at Wallaroo, though, ships of 50,000 tons could be brought in.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and this is the concern of the Government. What does it intend to do, and to what extent would any one of our ports have to be deepened to take the biggest bulk carriers that are likely to be on this run over the next 10 or 20 years?

Mr. Ferguson: Port Giles will take them.

Mr. HUDSON: Does the honourable member suggest that all the wheat in South Australia should be transported by road to Port Giles? Does he consider that that is feasible?

Mr. Ferguson: Some of it could be.

Mr. HUDSON: How do we handle Eyre Peninsula wheat? How do we handle wheat lying significantly further north than Wallaroo, for example? If the Government decided that Port Giles would be developed as the large wheat port, how much wheat could that port take? Could it serve all of the Mid North?

Mr. Ferguson: Wheat can be freighted more cheaply by road than by rail up to 70 miles.

Mr. HUDSON: What about after a distance of 140, 150 or 160 miles? The honourable member cannot suggest seriously that Port Giles can be the solution that will adequately meet the problems of the wheat areas of South Australia.

Mr. Ferguson: It will be helpful.

Mr. HUDSON: It will be helpful to his area.

Mr. Ferguson: And other areas.

Mr. Hughes: It would help other areas to only a limited extent.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes.

Mr. Venning: What did your former Leader, as distinct from your present Leader, say about deep sea ports in South Australia?

Mr. HUDSON: I am not beholden to anything that has been said previously on these matters: I am trying to draw the attention of honourable members, including the member for Rocky River, to the seriousness of the present position and to point out that certain decisions must be taken very soon about the deepening of at least one of the more northern ports. Otherwise, South Australia will not be able to compete effectively with New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia. I refer the member for Rocky River to the latest available report of the Australian Wheat Board, which is for the season 1967-68. At page 29 the report gives wheat production figures, and

we see that in the 1930's South Australia ranked almost equally in terms of total production with Victoria and Western Australia. New South Wales was the main wheat producer, and then Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia were about on a par. In some years, one particular State of those three produced more, and in other years another State produced more.

However, the pattern in the 1960's is quite different, and South Australia now ranks a clear fourth among the Australian States as a wheat producer. In other words, from the 1850's and 1860's to the present time, South Australia's position in wheat production has gradually deteriorated. Whereas this State was once the granary of Australia, it now ranks fourth among the Australian States in wheat production and, if the problem regarding adequate port facilities is not resolved, our position will deteriorate further. The position is likely to deteriorate as a result of the decision of the Australian Governments to enforce a quota system on all wheatgrowers.

I understand that South Australia has a higher percentage of small wheatgrowers than has any other State and, as honourable members will appreciate, if we enforce on all growers a uniform percentage reduction in the amount of wheat that will be taken by the Australian Wheat Board, the consequence for a small grower is much more serious than it is for a larger operator. The very fact that there tend to be some economies of scale will mean that the proportional cut in the net income of the wheatgrower will be greater for the small producer than for the large producer. How any Government can reasonably submit such a plan is beyond my understanding, as it will inevitably force hardship on the smaller wheatgrower in particular, because he is much less capable of turning to some other form of primary production than is the larger operator. If the land he controls is too small to operate economically as a wheat farm, it will not be economic if used for wool production.

Mr. Casey: The member for Rocky River agrees with the quota system.

Mr. HUDSON: If so, he had better have another think about it. Quite seriously, the whole tradition of settlement in South Australia resulted in a pattern of farming with a much smaller average size of farm than that which exists in the wheat areas of New South Wales and Victoria. This was part of the South Australian tradition of closer settlement, and was in line with those who supported the views

of Wakefield. It was in line with the dissenting traditions of many of the first migrants to South Australia, and it was one of the reasons why the pastoral interests as such have never been able to dominate South Australian politics as they have been able to dominate politics at various times in New South Wales and Victoria. Indeed, it is one of the reasons for the very peculiar character of the Liberal and Country League today: in South Australia we see 19 Government members in the House of Assembly, 16 of whom are farmers. How many pastoralists are among them?

Mr. Nankivell: They are all on your side.

Mr. HUDSON: The L.C.L. has been so constituted, and we can see what has happened to the pastoralists. I do not think it can be denied that if a 50 per cent quota had been imposed on what wheatgrowers delivered to the board in previous years, it would have impinged adversely on the smaller wheatgrower, relative to the larger wheatgrower. The decline in net income of the smaller wheatgrower would have been proportionately greater than that of the larger wheatgrower. I do not think it can be denied that, as the percentage of smaller wheat farms is higher in South Australia than in other States, this quota system will mean a greater proportionate cut in incomes for South Australian wheatgrowers than it will mean for New South Wales and Victorian wheatgrowers.

Mr. Rodda: You did not advance this argument before the Electoral Commission.

Mr. HUDSON: This was not an argument—

Mr. Rodda: It did not suit you.

Mr. HUDSON: It was not an argument directly related to the matters discussed before the commission. The Australian Labor Party's submissions to that commission in respect of the Mid North involved a much more satisfactory system for looking after the community of interests within the wheat-growing areas (as distinct from the areas that are pastoral to a greater extent) than did the Liberal and Country League's submission.

Mr. Casey: The L.C.L. was not interested in people.

Mr. HUDSON: We should not comment at this stage on submissions put to the Electoral Commission. We have all had our say before the commission and any further attempt to comment might be considered by the commission as an endeavour to influence its decisions. In view of the number of interjections of the members for Victoria and Albert—how beautifully they go together—I will make one comment: we know that Sir Thomas Playford promised a deep sea port for

Frome during the 1962 by-election campaign. This promise is not one that the current Government really has to keep. I presume, however, that the present Government's proposal for Frome, which gives that area a deep sea port, is aimed at honouring Sir Thomas Playford's promise. I did not think that the Government needed to go that far.

Mr. Clark: What about the atomic power station that was proposed for Lake Leake?

Mr. HUDSON: The more serious point that I want to make is that the Commonwealth Government's adoption of the quota system, the State Government's apparent support of it and the support of the member for Rocky River are not in the best interests of South Australian wheatgrowers. They will be adversely affected by this quota system in comparison with Victorian, New South Wales and Western Australian wheatgrowers. Unless there is some fairly immediate decision on the provision of deep sea port facilities in South Australia, this State will be bypassed in years to come. In order to induce ships to come to South Australian ports (if these ports stay as they are at present) we shall have to pay more for the shipment of wheat from South Australia than has to be paid by growers in New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia.

This is a matter of fundamental importance. The day of the sailing ship, with easy access to the coast from all South Australian wheatlands, meant a tremendous initial advantage to this State. Even with the advent of steam ships in the early part of the 1850's, the Australian run was kept safe for sail for many years because of the Great Circle routes sailed and because of the Roaring Forties that blew between 40° and 50° S. Lat. This meant that extremely fast times could be sailed from Liverpool to Australia on the eastern run via the Cape of Good Hope and from Australia to England via Cape Horn. However, all of this has changed: South Australia, instead of being the prime centre for wheat production in Australia, is now probably placed at the greatest disadvantage of any Australian State.

Mr. Venning: Quite true.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member admits this, and he must also admit that unless we have more than one deep sea port available (if we are to tap both Eyre Peninsula and the Mid North) to ship South Australian wheat, we shall have to pay more in transport costs, because the bulk carriers will simply refuse to come to South Australian ports in

times of plentiful wheat supply when there is a surplus in other parts of Australia. These facts are undeniable, and I do not think they have been properly considered. I suggest to members opposite that the present quota system is quite inappropriate.

Mr. Venning: Don't confuse the two issues.

Mr. HUDSON: I think they are inextricably tied together, because the nature of South Australian geography and political history has meant a different kind of wheat development from that which has taken place in the other States. This applies to the whole pattern of land settlement and to the way in which it has occurred in South Australia. It applies to the whole system of agricultural areas; to our whole tradition in relation to tenure; and to the dissenting traditions which were associated with the early South Australian development and which still characterize many areas today. Many of the towns throughout the wheat belt were Government towns and Government survey towns, all with their area of park land around them, and even that lends a peculiar characteristic to the wheat industry in South Australia.

Further, all our early railway developments in the areas concerned were governed in the main by the need to shift wheat cheaply to the nearest port. That is also a relevant matter because, to a significant extent, the characteristic of those railway developments and the way they occurred in the Nineteenth Century is in many respects still with us today and is causing us some of our problems today. Let me draw an analogy for honourable members concerning the position that applies in relation to the wheat industry as against what was done concerning the cray-fishing industry. The introduction of pot limits in the crayfishing industry meant that many fishermen had to accept a reduction in their income.

If the formula for pot limits were such that the smallest fisherman had to take the same percentage cut as the largest one took, the smallest fisherman would have been forced out of the industry. The Fishing Select Committee received clear evidence, particularly from the Port MacDonnell area, that, unless some special provision was made with respect to the number of pots that could be used by a smaller boat, the smaller fisherman simply would not be able to survive. It is a simple matter to consider what position will apply if two men have to accept a 40 per cent cut in their income.

For the person on \$10,000 a year, this means a reduction to \$6,000 a year; and for the person on \$5,000 a year, it means a cut to \$3,000. For the person on only \$3,000 a year, it means a cut to \$1,800 a year, and that person becomes virtually a basic wage earner. The ability to take the same percentage cut and still remain in the industry declines the lower one's net income declines. I believe this Government, South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, and all the wheat cockies in this Parliament should be shouting their heads off in this matter and objecting as strongly as they can to the current quota system that has been introduced. They should not be leaving it to members of the Opposition to do this for them.

Mr. Venning: The industry asked for this.

Mr. HUDSON: What do you mean? What is the wheat industry in this State? Mr. Stott, I suppose!

Mr. Venning: It is an organization consisting of about 4,000 to 5,000 members.

Mr. HUDSON: How much information was supplied to all those members, and how many have actually supported and voted for this scheme?

Mr. Venning: We had meetings all over the State.

Mr. HUDSON: Are they fully aware of the consequences? Did honourable members opposite make them fully aware of the consequences?

Mr. Venning: Members opposite are doing much stirring up and causing trouble. That is where the trouble is coming from.

Mr. HUDSON: We do not have to cause trouble, because the member for Rocky River is associated with a mistaken view. If the position had been properly put to the wheat-growers of South Australia (that a quota system involving a uniform percentage cut for everyone would mean that the smaller wheat-grower, who is more predominant in South Australia than anywhere else, would have to take a bigger proportionate cut in his net income than applied anywhere else), would they have supported the scheme? I suggest not.

I hope members opposite will consider what I have said in relation to this matter and that they will bring pressure to bear on the Government to make sure that we get some speedy decision concerning what is to be done about providing deep sea port facilities. I hope we shall not be subjected to the same kind of mismanagement and incompetence that has characterized, from start to finish,

the Government's handling of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. If members representing country districts have to put up with the kind of incompetence and mismanagement that we in the city have had to suffer from this Government, they will really be in trouble. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I take it that the Address in Reply debate is coming to a close, although I understand that one or two members of the Opposition may yet consider speaking. Although I am not certain whether any other Government member wishes to speak, I think we have exhausted our resources, after contributing to this debate at some length. I have been told by one of my colleagues that perhaps the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) is going to speak.

Mr. Corcoran: No, I'm not.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: However, that remains to be seen. I should be quite happy to hear him speak, and I am sure that I shall leave him plenty of time to speak if he wishes, as I do not intend to add to the debate at any length. I thought that at the beginning I would go through the various speeches made by members and perhaps comment briefly on the subjects they raised. However, because of the matters before Government and because of the great length of the debate, I have not had the time to go through members' individual speeches. Members have pursued their criticism or praise of Government policy, and have pursued also the matters which concern their districts and which interest them as individual members of Parliament.

In the main, I believe the speeches made have been reasonably interesting, although I may say that many have been too long. If a member wishes to make a speech in this House which will be remembered, I believe he should not speak for as long as some members have spoken. However, it is the members' prerogative, and if they desire to speak at length and perhaps have their remarks forgotten, then that result may well be achieved. There is one speech on which I will not comment in any detail. I refer to the speech made by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), which at the beginning was made in the name of decency and propriety but which ended, in fact, as the worst speech that I have ever heard in this House, and it is not fit to be contained in *Hansard*.

That speech should be ignored and should receive no further comment than that which I have made, except perhaps that I should add

that it was an insult to the intelligence of members of the House to have to read it or to have to hear it.

Having said that, I may say that the central theme of this debate relates to whether or not the Government has performed well in its first full year under review and to whether or not it is fulfilling the promises it made prior to the election. This has meant a round of criticism from members opposite and praise from Government members, tempered by some criticism in respect to their own districts following representations by councils there. I appreciate the advice offered and I assure members from both sides of the House that the Government does not resent criticism of its policy; in fact, it welcomes it. Any Government that hopes to continue to carry on must be able to measure its policies against criticism. This is the way things work in this House and I hope they always will. Therefore, although debates are sometimes spirited, no-one on this side resents criticism of Government policy, which will spur on the Government to even greater things than it has achieved in its first year of office, things of which members on this side are justly proud.

At this time, when the economy of South Australia is running well, when the Government, as I have said elsewhere, is conducting a real dialogue with the people of the State about what they want and is planning for them, making it possible for them to participate in those plans, and, when the economy is viable again, it is easy to forget the low state of affairs economically and psychologically that existed in South Australia before this Government came into office. This low point existed on a broad scale throughout the community prior to March or April, 1968. I do not want to refer again to the oft-quoted figures which show that at that time there had been a great run on Government finance. When we took office the Treasury coffers were empty and there was a large accumulated deficit. One of the first pledges I made on behalf of the Government was to re-establish financial stability in South Australia. I pay a tribute to the Treasurer (Hon. G. G. Pearson) for the outstanding work he has done in achieving last year a modest surplus in Government revenue accounts. This occurred earlier than I would have expected, considering the low point in conditions that existed when we took office. However, it was most gratifying indeed

to know he was able to achieve this, which he was able to do because of a number of reasons.

Ministers of this Government know that the Treasurer is indeed a man to reckon with when they have expenditures to propose; he believes in fully testing Ministers' financial proposals. As I was able to point out at the last Premiers' Conference in Canberra, the Treasurer made substantial savings in Government finance during the last financial year. This very intense management was aided during the year by two grants. First, there was financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government resulting from South Australia's share of the special \$12,000,000 general reimbursement grant made available earlier this year to all States according to their ratio of share, and also the additional special grant of \$2,000,000 additional assistance that I was able to negotiate with the Commonwealth on behalf of the State. These two additional grants enabled us to do better than balance the Budget. Although there have been harsh words between my Government and the Commonwealth Government and although no doubt the argument will continue in relation to Commonwealth-State financial agreements, I must pay a tribute to the Commonwealth Government, which listened so sympathetically during the year and made special grants to South Australia. We appreciate that assistance and special interest.

I look forward with interest next year to the new agreement which must be made and to the conference which will begin early in the year preceding that new agreement. Of course, the refusal of the Commonwealth Government to agree to the inclusion of these special grants early in the financial year has meant that all State Governments are uncertain about their budgeting, and it will be difficult this year to assess whether or not the Government should go into deficit financing, or how far it should go into it, in the light of expected additional Commonwealth assistance early next year. All Governments will have a rather unreal task in framing their Budgets, for I believe all Governments in Australia expect additional finance to be made available next year. However, it is still guesswork as to how large these disbursements will be.

We have come from a low point of industrial activity in South Australia, from a psychologically depressed attitude in primary industry as a result of the previous Government's attitude to the country, and from an extremely low spot in migration, to high spots of activity in all cases. I have a number of tables which

show this and with which I will deal shortly. Much criticism has been made by members opposite of additional taxation charges made by this Government during its first 15 months or so of office. Let me say that these charges, in absolute terms and in percentage terms, are below the taxation increases levied by the Walsh Government in its first two years of office. Therefore, the House can compare the facts relating to the two Governments. I have figures that show that for a large range of taxation and charge measures, including land tax, stamp duties, gift duties, liquor tax, harbour charges, rail freights and fares, State Bank contribution, hospital fees, lotteries, tram and bus fares, water rates, proceeds from the Totalizator Agency Board and so on, the total increase by the Government in the three years of the Australian Labor Party's term of office was \$14,045,000 annually. The total annual increase for the first year of this Government was \$8,910,000.

Therefore, the increase in recovery in this connection is certainly not to be decied when compared with the previous Government's performance. To illustrate how far we had gone down the ladder in relation to migration and population movement in the State, let me give the population movement figures from natural and other increases in the last few years. In 1965, the estimated net gain in South Australia's population from overseas was 18,355; from other States it was 546; there was a natural increase of 12,103; and thus the total gain for the year of 1965 was 31,004 people. There was a decline from that figure that reached a very low spot in 1967, the heyday of the previous Administration. In that year the estimated gain from oversea movements was 9,377 compared with 18,355 the previous year. The effect of interstate movement was that South Australia, instead of gaining 546, lost 6,805 people over its borders into other States.

Mr. McKee: Where did you get that figure from?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The total net gain, for the edification of the member for Port Pirie, to this State from all movement in 1967 was 2,572. The previous figure, in 1965, was 18,901. How we were being led backwards by the previous Administration! So, added to the 11,315 gain by natural population increase, the Labor Government's performance in 1967 resulted in a gain to the whole State of 13,887.

On coming into office, one of the first things I did on behalf of the State was to approach

the Commonwealth migration officer in London, saying, "We have plans for South Australia, a resurgence of industrial activity, and to promote and service this activity and to take part in it we shall need more people. I should like you to send to South Australia an increased number of migrants." I came back and spoke to the Commonwealth Minister in a similar way. I was criticized, particularly by my political opponents, for risking the jobs of those people already living in South Australia. What has been the result of this? In 1968 (for only half of which year, of course, this Government was in office) the estimated net gain from overseas was 9,523. Instead of losing nearly 7,000 from this State, as we had done the previous year, we lost 2,892, and the total net gain from all movement was 6,631—practically three times the gain of the previous year under the previous Government. Therefore, the net gain from natural population increase for the year was 17,923 compared with 13,887 the year before.

However, those figures do not show the full drama because the figures I gave in this House yesterday show that the migration inflow has stepped up dramatically since these optimistic figures I gave. Now, migration is running at the rate (for the year ending last July) of 14,540 migrants coming into South Australia, an increase of 44½ per cent on the previous Government's record; and this trend continues. Having plugged the drain of people moving out of the State by instituting better conditions and more incentives for them to remain, providing them with jobs and adding to their numbers by an increased flow of migrants from overseas, we are able to present a picture of confidence in this State which is having a real effect on industry. What do I mean when I say "having a real effect on industry"?

Mr. McKee: That is what we would all like to know.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member would like to know. Perhaps I should start by giving him and, I think, the member for Wallaroo (who criticized me for talking of a "bulging bag" on returning from overseas and producing nothing) some facts. Perhaps he does not get the *Advertiser* or the *News*; perhaps he does not read the daily press, listen to the radio or look at television. If he does, perhaps he does not believe what he reads, hears or sees. In any case, let me refresh his memory.

He will remember that I went overseas in July of last year and saw some dozens of

firms. It just so happens that whilst on that journey I interviewed the management of Texas Instruments at Dallas. I saw the people near London who in South Australia are involved in the Iplex plastics industry. In Holland I saw the firm of Krommenie and many others, of course; but the three I have mentioned announced, in the ensuing months, that they would begin to establish new ventures in South Australia. Perhaps those three are not a high enough total for my political opponents and are not to their liking. Well, they were not good enough for me, either, so I went overseas again this year and saw another group of industries. I admit that some of them were the same people but I wanted to check up on what they were doing. This time two of them announced projects whilst I was overseas visiting them.

The member for Wallaroo will be aware that International Computers Limited announced that it would install in South Australia what is known as a software factory, and that it would set up here a computer programming organization in association with the Institute of Technology in its new premises at The Levels. Wilkins Mitchell Ltd. announced that it would set up an entirely new appliances factory at Elizabeth. I thought that was rather good for the 33 days I was away, that there should be two such announcements. While overseas, I happened to see also one of the directors of a company deeply involved in the manufacture of panelboard in the South-East of South Australia. Because of my own personal negotiations before I went overseas and subsequently when I returned, that company made a significant announcement about its future operations in South Australia, an announcement that will mean that it will more than double its already large multi-million-dollar plant at Mount Gambier.

Mr. McKee: Those negotiations had been going on for some time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This was followed by an announcement (and this is not related to my oversea trip) that Pict Frozen Foods would set up a frozen food industry at Millicent and would soon be processing \$1,000,000 worth of produce at Millicent. And so it goes on. On my return from overseas, there was an announcement that Schrader-Scovill Pty. Ltd., whose managing director I saw in New York, would significantly extend its works at Elizabeth. We have had much local expansion. The House will appreciate that the recent arrangements with the Adelaide branch of Malco Industries Limited have resulted in a

new industry, in the sense that it would not otherwise have come here, by setting up in the factory purchased from the Perry-Johns-Waygood group.

The member for Port Pirie will know also that the factories that went empty during the term of office of his Government are now being filled by this Government. He would also know that the factory of Diecasters Limited at Elizabeth was purchased months ago by the Iplex company and that the Pinnock factory, which is phasing out, is being taken over by a company that has been encouraged by this Government's promotion. He would also know about the new factory that I opened at Hills Industries. What I have said indicates that many extensions are being made to existing industries.

Mr. Hughes: I hope they make a go of it, or God help the Government!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In his speech the member for Wallaroo did not admit that they existed. I could continue with details of local extensions to industries. This Government will continue to promote new industries with much verve and with far more success than was being done by the non-existent promotion that operated in this department when I took it over. While continuing to promote new industries we will never neglect existing industries, which have a tremendous breadth and scope, as anyone who moved around exhibitions and shows in this State knows. The gradual and continuing expansion of industries in this State is the greatest factor in development. I commend to members the picture presented by this State today, because for all practical purposes it is one of full employment. The present situation has created some strain in certain industries, which believe that they will have some difficulty in finding enough people to man their industrial enterprises. In the face of these details and after only a brief look at the industrial development that has continued—

Mr. McKee: What about this bag full of possibilities and certainties?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order! I will not warn the honourable member for Port Pirie again. I ask for silence. The honourable Premier.

Mr. McKee: He can't go on—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sorry if my remarks aggravate Opposition members: I have not used them in a form of aggravation. I

enumerated these details because of the criticisms that were levelled unfairly, either in ignorance or for some other reason, at this Government for not having done anything about industrial promotion. These details show that the effort has been successful and has produced an expansion such as we have not seen in this State since the days of Sir Thomas Playford. This entire Government is proud of that industrial expansion. I know that the Leader of the Opposition gave a good performance in this debate and tried to shed the responsibility for the decline, to which I referred briefly, by referring to the policies of the Commonwealth Government and to the drought.

Mr. McKee: Say something about the drought.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: From what I have heard from people in business I am certain that they were acutely effected in their thinking on industrial development in this State by the attitude of the previous Government, which did not show any interest in private and free enterprise, because it believed in restrictions.

Mr. Corcoran: Cut it out.

Mr. Clark: That's silly.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is not silly: the greatest attempt at socialistic restriction in this State, the proposed road transport restrictions, headed a series of restrictions that greatly dismayed people in the country and city areas of this State alike. In addition to this type of restriction was the lack of financial responsibility, which made people flee from South Australia; and flee they did to the extent that I have enumerated.

The criticism has been made that we do not have enough breadth of development: however, I referred briefly to industries producing from floor coverings to computers, from fasteners to new plastic irrigation systems, and from panelboard to frozen vegetables. How can the Labor Party say that this is not broad enough? The State has a broad-based industrial community, and the fact that there are certain features, such as the motor vehicle industry and shipbuilding industry, that stand out does not mean that it lacks many other complementary and often diversified industries. It may interest members to know that when the travellers to the moon were in their capsule they wore sun-visor lenses made in South Australia. That is an instance of how diversified are the industries in this State. After the first hesitant days of this Government were over it was in full and confident charge of the State's affairs. The Leader of

the Opposition appeared on television and asked people to write to me and tell me where I had gone wrong. I thought that any political Leader would have had enough support from his own dyed-in-the-wool supporters to put on a good show. I waited: I even suggested that we obtain a hand cart for the mail, but the letters only dribbled in.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The only mistake he made was that he didn't realize that few people could write in Braille.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Either the Leader's supporters could not write or would not, or perhaps they thought there was nothing to complain about: no doubt one of these possibilities existed. However, after those who had been put up to write had written—

Mr. Corcoran: Oh, no!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes. I received two from the Leader's publicity officers. One was rather an enlightening letter that stated that the writer would not go into detail about financial matters because that would be covered by another writer. I wonder whether there was some organization behind this. The write-a-whinge campaign yielded—after more than 100 and possibly 200 people who were, I suspect, put up to write had written—less than 250 letters, which were much alike and it was obvious that they were, in the main, organized.

Mr. Corcoran: A bad show, wasn't it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It was from the Leader's point of view, and it showed that he had fallen flat on his face in relation to his criticism of the Government's policy.

Mr. Freebairn: Why don't they put the member for Edwardstown on the front bench?

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

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It has given the Government much satisfaction to know that its policies have been successful, and this has greatly encouraged the Government in its future planning. Not all decisions have been easy to make, and many of them have required much time being devoted to them. It has been rather interesting to find Opposition members extolling the virtues (I think one member termed them) of intellectuals. Two important reports have been submitted to the Government; one was the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, which will be debated in this House, and the other was the report on the water supply situation.

Both reports have been prepared by people extremely well qualified in their professions.

They have shown intellectual and professional capacity, as well as honesty. These reports have been fully considered by the Government. The Opposition, during whose term of office the M.A.T.S. Report was prepared and the report relating to the Murray River substantially prepared, has rejected them. My reactionary friends opposite have gone back to reliance on their own capacity rather than on that of the intellectuals they championed during their term of office. This has been one of the greatest contrasts in its attitude. The Opposition has rejected, and continued to reject, the advice of experts, yet with another voice it extols the training of these experts and the respect we must have for them. I believe this is a rejection of the ability and standing in the community of professional people.

I will now refer to the time when this Government came to office—to the days that are very easy to forget now that South Australia is moving again. Many difficult decisions have been taken and now the electoral position in this State is being remedied by this Government, although previous Governments, of both Parties, were not able to do that. We recognize that we are headed for a future that will offer security and opportunity for South Australian citizens. I have spoken in general terms about industrial activity. The Government continues to be extremely concerned about the welfare of country people.

Mr. McKee: That's news!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, and the honourable member would be interested to know what the Government had done for Port Pirie. The Government has a long history of assisting country areas over the years and of involvement in successful decentralization. I think it is recognized, certainly around Australia and in many parts of the world, that decentralization as we now know it is not a piecemeal or haphazard affair, a matter of putting an industry in any old location. It is a matter of developing and supporting industries by Government policies and finance in particular areas related to some economic resource. Above all, we are concerned to obtain industries that are viable, those which may be established because of Government policy but which can stand economically on their own feet after their first establishment years.

The Government looks with pride at the long-term development of this State that its policies over the years have fostered. More than \$30,000,000 of Government funds has

been provided to take water to Whyalla, and many millions of dollars have been spent on housing in that city. When we consider all this in association with other Government expenditure, we understand the tremendous involvement of this community and this Government in decentralization in South Australia. I am sure the member for Port Pirie will acknowledge that, if this expenditure had not been deliberately incurred and these matters had not been deliberately planned, Whyalla could not have been developed as it has been. Without housing and water, it could not have so developed.

Then, we have the support that this Government has given to the type of industry that I have mentioned at Millicent, where local agricultural products will be processed and where the panelboard industry has been encouraged by Government policy to substantially increase its production. These types of expenditure are spread in so many areas throughout the State. The standing offers in relation to housing, water, power, and all the other Government facilities, together with the Government's industrial policy, mean much progress in decentralization. More particularly, however, this Government has reiterated its support of country areas in its day-to-day administration, and its support of long-standing policies.

This Government has re-instituted in this State the policy of the freeholding of leasehold lands and it has reiterated its belief in the freedom of road transport. The Government has said that it will actively investigate and upgrade ports in South Australia. It will continue, despite some of the references that have been made to the M.A.T.S. proposals, to increase its country road-building activities significantly. It will continue to be active in providing for the water needs of country areas, as is shown by its attitude to the Kimba water scheme and to the continuation of the Tailem Bend to Keith main. The Government has made successful representations to the Commonwealth Government as a result of which the State has benefited from a \$6,000,000 Commonwealth water resources grant. The Government takes credit for the successful completion of these negotiations. At present we have further requests before the Commonwealth Government about the Kimba water scheme.

The Housing Trust continues to build an extensive range of housing in country towns, and in recent weeks the Government has reduced the contribution required from councils

in country areas for hospitals, and local government has greatly welcomed that decision. It has decided to upgrade the railways on Eyre Peninsula significantly. I think the cost is about \$3,000,000 or \$5,000,000, and the work will be done over the next few years. We have set up a survey, under the control of the Minister of Works, of the water resources of this State. The results of that survey will become a significant base for future agricultural development, and the survey will have particular emphasis on the south-eastern parts of South Australia. I look forward to a tremendous upsurge of agricultural activity in the South-East as the water is harvested and used in that area.

We know the short-range attitude that exists in country administration. Before going overseas on my last trip, I called an urgent conference in my office about completing Port Giles as soon as possible, because of the problems caused by larger ships and the urgent problem of disposing of our large wheat surplus. Obviously, Port Giles is not the long-term solution to our problems in respect of grain shipments. However, because it was being built and because it was to be finished within a reasonable time, it cost the Government little (apart from some reorganization and some diversion of resources) to finish the project one winter earlier than had been scheduled. This happened because of my direct intervention. Since that time South Australia has been rather favourably treated in regard to wheat shipments and is getting at least its fair share of wheat shipments from Australia. It could well be that the completion of this port before the scheduled time might assist in our being able to top up ships during the coming harvest and the following harvest.

Regarding this Government's interest in country areas, I point out that it has the same attitude as that displayed by the Playford Government when it took action by Statute to reduce the impact of succession duties on country areas. This action was appreciated by many people. It is hoped that near the time the Budget is presented, or perhaps a little later, the Government will be able to make some statement on land tax and its future in relation to the new quinquennial assessment. The most urgent task confronting the Government when it took office was to change the attitude of industrialists, which attitude had resulted from the recession that developed during the Labor Government's term of office. The present Government had

to take action to correct this attitude, but it should not be thought that it has in any way relegated primary industry to a subsidiary position. Indeed, the Government regards primary industry as an essential base and as a very important activity in this State.

This regard has been demonstrated by the selection of the Hon. Mr. Story as Minister of Agriculture, and I pay a tribute to him for the tremendously detailed attention he has given to his portfolio. He has travelled long distances in meeting country people and dealing with country problems, and his efforts are solidly recognized by people throughout the length and breadth of our country areas. Without enumerating the Government's many activities and the advances it has planned and is planning for the country, I point out that the Government is extremely proud of its administration during its first 15 months of office. It believes that both primary and secondary industry will go ahead to a future that will provide security and opportunity for all.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor has intimated that he will be pleased to receive members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at Government House on Thursday, August 7, at 2.10 p.m.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend section 7 of the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act, 1968-1969. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is designed to correct an anomaly in the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act, which anomaly has been referred to in Part I of the report of the Electoral Commission. The anomaly results from the fact that, by section 7 of the Act, the metropolitan area is to be determined by reference to the Metropolitan Planning Area as defined in the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967, with certain exclusions. However, it was not realized at the time that such islands as Torrens Island and Garden Island and the Port River and adjacent waters were not included in the Metropolitan Planning Area and were accordingly, by definition, excluded from the metropolitan area for the

purposes of the principal Act, although they should logically be part of that area and not part of any country electoral district.

Clause 2 will rectify the anomaly by providing in proposed new subsection (3) that there shall also be included in the metropolitan area such islands, jetties and waters and parts of the State, being adjacent to the municipalities of Brighton, Glenelg, Henley and Grange, Marion, Port Adelaide, Salisbury, West Torrens and Woodville or adjacent to the district council districts of Munno Para and Noarlunga, as in the opinion of the commission contain or may in the future contain any Assembly elector or Assembly electors.

This matter has been canvassed in the House previously by questions. This is a simple, short Bill about which I have spoken to the Leader of the Opposition. I am sorry that copies of the Bill have not previously been made available. I shall be quite happy to adjourn consideration of this Bill on motion and to deal with it later today, if the Leader or any member of his Party would like to look at it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, and I do not see any reason for delaying it, because the anomaly needs to be cleared up. There is, however, one matter about which I ask for an assurance from the Premier. It is unusual to alter a Bill that gives instructions and terms of reference to a commission during the time it is sitting. As we are facilitating the passage of this measure, I ask the Premier that he give me an assurance that, if amendments are tacked on to it by the Upper House, they will not be accepted here without our concurrence. This is an important matter, and I ask him for that assurance. If I have it I think there will be no difficulty about the matter and that it can proceed forthwith.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): It is quite proper and logical for the Leader to seek that assurance, and I am happy to give him my word that the Government will accept no amendment whatsoever to this Bill without his or his Party's concurrence.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL In Committee.

(Continued from June 24. Page 206.)

Clause 17—"Issue of certificate and ballot-papers."

Mr. VIRGO: In view of the agreement reached between the Opposition and the Government regarding an earlier clause, I point out that the amendment that I previously intended to move is not now required and, accordingly, I do not wish to proceed with it.

Clause passed.

Clause 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Authorized witness."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

To strike out—

and

(b) by striking out the proviso to subsection (2).

This clause seeks to do two things. Although members on this side are happy with one of the provisions we are not happy with the other. At present, section 80(1)(a) contains a long list of people who are authorized witnesses, and this list was the cause of considerable confusion at the time of the Millicent by-election; in fact, it was the cause of some people's votes not being counted. We are quite happy with one provision that the Attorney-General seeks to include, enabling any person who is apparently over 18 years to be an authorized witness. Indeed, we hope that this will eventually mean that persons over the age of 18 years will not only be able to witness a vote but able also to cast a vote.

Mr. Hurst: What about voting at L.C.L. conferences?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know about that. We are not happy with paragraph (b) of this clause, relating to the provision whereby a candidate is permitted to be an authorized witness for a postal vote application. I do not see why a candidate should be debarred from doing something that he has done successfully, and without any quarrel that I know of, virtually from time immemorial. There are distinct advantages, from the point of view of many members in this place, for a candidate to be able to witness a postal vote application.

Mr. Broomhill: You aren't referring to postal vote certificates.

Mr. VIRGO: No, only to the postal vote form. Surely, when a candidate is canvassing in his district, possibly miles away from a township (as in the case of the members for Frome and Eyre, and others), it is desirable to facilitate the procedure whereby a person can obtain a postal vote. Although there may be a danger of encouraging the lodging of postal votes, there is a provision to cover this aspect. The thinking behind this move has arisen from unfortunate incidents that occurred

during the Millicent by-election, although there was never any question of malpractice or anything untoward happening.

Mr. Broomhill: Have you ever heard of anything untoward happening?

Mr. VIRGO: No. I should be pleased if the Attorney-General could cite an instance of malpractice. Until we have concrete evidence on this, we should not be asked to delete the existing provision. Indeed, I think it is desirable that a candidate should continue to enjoy a facility that he has enjoyed in the past.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): First, I should like to assure the honourable member that there is no thought in the Government's mind that the insertion of provisions relating to the age of 18 indicates any intention, or otherwise, subsequently to reduce the age for voting at elections. It is a mere coincidence that that is the age which we thought was a proper age in this particular case. No decision has been taken by the Government, as I have made it clear on other occasions in this House, about the age for voting; but we picked 18 because obviously if one looked through the list of authorized persons in the Act at present some of them could be of the age of 18, or even 17 if they were in the Navy—certainly during war-time. I do not know whether the Navy takes people of 17 now but it did in the past. We picked 18 because that is what we thought was the most convenient age for the lower limit now, except for the case I have mentioned. So I do not want any honourable member to think there is any connection between the two. However, that is a small point on which I do not expect there to be any argument.

The other matter raised by the amendment concerns the witnessing of an application for a postal vote. I thought it better to eliminate the candidate altogether so that there could be no question of a candidate influencing the vote of an elector either at that stage or at the far more important stage at which he is debarred—the actual casting of the vote. It seemed to me that we could well do this without any inconvenience as we were widening the list of those who could witness such an application. However, during the earlier stages of this debate much was said by members of the Opposition about it. I do not regard this as a matter of grave importance one way or the other and, if honourable members feel that no harm has been done in the past or will be done in the future by

allowing candidates to witness such votes, I am happy to accept that view, though I thought *ex abundante cautela* it would be better to eliminate them. However, I am easy about it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 20—"Directions for postal voting."

Mr. VIRGO: As I understand it, apart from my confusion about the earlier acceptance by the Government, the position now is that I need not proceed with my proposed amendment to this clause.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is the position: because of the compromise which we reached on clause 15, it is not necessary for the honourable member to move his amendment. However, I have an amendment which is consequential on that compromise. I move:

In new section 81(2) to strike out "for any reason the elector is (a) unable to sign his name; or (b) mark his ballot-paper without assistance, then" and insert "by reason of his illiteracy the elector is unable to sign his name".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 to 29 passed.

Clause 30—"Voting by members of either House of Parliament."

Mr. VIRGO: This clause inserts a new section 110b in the Act. It permits a member of Parliament a special concession for a period of time: it permits a member who represents an electoral district in which he does not reside to cast a vote for that electoral district. This is a privilege to which no member of Parliament is entitled. I know that the Commonwealth Act at present allows this, but that does not make it right as far as I am concerned. I do not know whether any other State Act allows this but whether it does or does not is of no importance.

What is important is that a member of Parliament when he faces an election should enjoy exactly the same privileges and concessions as does John Smith in the street who cares to nominate against him as a candidate. At election time a member of Parliament assumes the role of being a candidate for office—nothing more, nothing less. John Smith in the street by paying his \$100 (as it now is) should be in exactly the same position at the moment. Members of Parliament should enjoy only the same conditions as does any other elector in the State: he must enrol for the district in which he lives and vote in it. A member of Parliament should not enjoy special privileges because he

is a member of Parliament. I oppose the clause.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Originally, I thought this was a good idea that would bring the legislation in line with that of the Commonwealth. However, in the light of the criticism, I accept the decision of the Committee to vote against the clause.

Clause negatived.

Clauses 31 and 32 passed.

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

Clause 33—"Scrutiny of votes."

Mr. VIRGO: We wish to amend two aspects of the clause, which provides for an alteration to the present system. Now, when there is an equality of votes at an election, the returning officer for the district determines, by casting vote, the successful candidate. This clause provides that a tied ballot shall be determined by lot, but no election ought to be decided by the toss of a coin, by drawing something out of a hat, or by lottery. Regrettably, one lottery operating in Australia today, to which I think the majority of people are bitterly opposed, is the lottery for death in Vietnam. We do not want to extend that system to the Electoral Act. Most rules of debate provide that, when an equal number of votes is cast for and against a motion, the *status quo* remains.

This sound principle could be suitably adapted to the Electoral Act to provide that, if a sitting member is not defeated, he retains his seat, and to be defeated a person must have had cast against him more votes than were cast for him. The basis of our proposal is that a sitting member who is not defeated will remain a member. Of course, if a candidate was not a member at the time of the election, a fresh election ought to be held. Although I have been actively engaged in political affairs for a long time, I cannot recall any instance in Australia of a returning officer having to use a casting vote to resolve a tied election, so the chances of this occurring are extremely remote. If it ever occurs, however, the holding of a fresh election is completely justified. I do not want to give the impression that there would be fresh elections for three or four seats after every general election—this would not occur. Another important principle involved in this clause relates to the system of voting. At present the preferential voting system applies in elections for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. I move:

To strike out paragraphs (a), (b) and (c).

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As the honourable member has said, we are deal-

ing with a situation that is more theoretical than usual. He could not recall a tied election, and I cannot do so. Indeed, I hope there will never be a tied election. Whilst I think it is desirable generally that elections should be closely fought, to get elections as close as this is unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, we must concede that there is a theoretical possibility of this happening.

Last year we had experience of this possibility almost turning into an actuality, and as a result of this experience I thought something should be done to alter the present provisions of the Act. My suggestion, embodied in the clause, was that, when there was a tied election, it was unfair to put the responsibility on any one person to make a decision in the glare of publicity and it was best to decide it by lot. This has not found favour in Committee, especially amongst Opposition members, and I can see that there are powerful arguments against it. On the other hand, I can see serious objections to the proposal of the member for Edwardstown.

First (and I know he will concede this; in fact, he does so in the amendment), there is not always a sitting member. For example, at the next election for members of this Chamber, I think we all hope that there will not be any sitting members at all because, as there will have been a redistribution, there will be new seats. Therefore, at the next election the second part of the amendment relating to a fresh election in the case of a tie would have to come into effect.

This is an expensive, time-consuming and emotional business. Arguments can be advanced in favour, but I do not think that the situation altogether warrants it. I know that the member for Ridley has another variation to propose on this topic and, if I may, I should like to deal with that, too, as the whole thing is in the melting pot. With great deference to the member for Ridley, I am not much attracted to his—

The CHAIRMAN: I think the Attorney-General should reserve his remarks for a later stage, because the honourable member for Ridley has not yet moved the amendment.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is an alternative to this amendment, and that is—

The CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General may make a passing reference, but I do not think he can argue or debate it now.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: May I make the passing reference that I am not altogether attracted to his suggestion, because I think it would leave the decision in the

hands of a person who is quite close to the Government of the day (the Returning Officer for the State). At least the returning officer for the district is usually an officer in a country district that is physically divorced from the capital and, even regarding a metropolitan district, he is not as close to, say, the Minister as is the Returning Officer for the State, and is therefore less open to influence than the Returning Officer for the State may be. I say this advisedly and absolutely apart from all personalities. I do not suggest for a moment that my remarks refer particularly to Mr. Douglass; they do not.

But it is for that reason that I am not really attracted to the proposal of the member for Ridley. That being so, we have got to this position: I have put forward a proposition which has not found favour; I see grave difficulties regarding the one which the member for Edwardstown has put forward; and I have a strong objection to the proposal suggested by the member for Ridley. Therefore, my suggestion would be, rather than arguing in a three-sided way (or two-sided, I suppose, strictly at this stage), about the merits of the suggestions, each of which is open to objection, although there may be some arguments in favour of each, it is better to leave the present situation as it is.

This means that the returning officer for the district will not vote at the election, but he will have a casting vote in the case of a tie. That, too, I think attracts objections, and we all acknowledge that, but I think it is probably better to leave it than to argue about something and perhaps not come to any better arrangement than the one we have. I am prepared to agree to the striking out of paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), and then I suggest that we just leave it at that.

Amendment carried.

The CHAIRMAN: As the honourable member for Ridley has an amendment on file, to safeguard that amendment I suggest to the honourable member for Edwardstown that he move to insert new paragraphs (a) to (l) only.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

To insert the following new paragraphs:

(a) by striking out from paragraph (b) of subsection (1) the passage "and arrange the unrejected ballot-papers under the names of the respective candidates by placing in a separate parcel all those on which a first preference is indicated for the same candidate;

- (b) by striking out from paragraph (c) of subsection (1) the passage "first preference";
- (c) by striking out from paragraph (d) of subsection (1) the passage "first preference";
- (d) by striking out from subparagraph (i) of paragraph (f) of subsection (1) the passage "first preference";
- (e) by striking out paragraph (b) from subsection (4);
- (f) by striking out from paragraph (c) of subsection (4) the passage "first preference";
- (g) by striking out from paragraph (a) of subsection (5) the passage "first preference";
- (h) by striking out from paragraph (a) of subsection (5) the passage "shall, if that number constitutes an absolute majority of votes;
- (i) by striking out from subsection (5) paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e);
- (j) by striking out from subsection (6) paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) and inserting in their place the following paragraph:
 - (a) the candidate who has received the next highest number of votes shall be elected;
- (k) by striking out subsection (7) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:
 - (7) Further vacancies shall be filled by candidates in descending order which order shall be determined by reference to the number of votes received by each candidate;
- (l) by striking out subsections (8), (9) and (10);

The purpose of this amendment is to delete the existing provisions of the Electoral Act that provide for preferential voting and to insert provisions for first past the post voting, which is the most democratic way of holding an election. We do not believe there should be a provision, as exists in preferential voting, whereby some electors are given the benefit of casting two, three or more votes whilst others cast only one vote. If the electors of a certain district indicate by their voting that they want a particular candidate, any system that upsets their choice is not a good one.

It has been stated many times that preferential voting is a democratic system, but that is mythical thinking. Members of the Government are not unimpressed by the fairness of first past the post voting, because they themselves initiated it and have maintained it in the Local Government Act for as long as I can remember, so there seems to be no argument that it is wrong for elections for other forms of government. In 1962 four seats in this House were determined by preferences—

Glenelg, Light, Ridley and Torrens. In all four cases the members elected would have been elected anyway had the first past the post system been in operation. It would not have upset the result. In 1965 three seats were determined by preferences—Eyre, Chaffey and Torrens. Again, the three members elected under preferential voting would have been elected under the first past the post system. In 1968 five seats were determined by preferential voting, four of which (Alexander, Chaffey, Eyre and Ridley) would, under the first past the post system, have returned the member for the district who was returned under preferential voting. The only alteration would have been in Murray. I hope I shall never have to sit in any Parliament or hold any position having won it by the votes of somebody opposing me. Preferential voting, like proportional representation, is a godsend to splinter party groups and is not a true expression of democracy. The system of first past the post is, because it gives people the opportunity to select the person they desire, and each elector has one vote. It is not unusual for elections to be conducted on a first past the post principle, and the fact that the Commonwealth Government uses preferential voting is not a sufficient excuse to continue using that method in this State's Parliament. The method of first past the post is used in local government elections in this State, and local government is closer to the State Parliament than is the Commonwealth Parliament.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The argument of the member for Edwardstown is not valid. There could be five candidates in an election in which 100 votes are cast. Candidate A receives 21 votes; B, 19; C, 20; D, 20; and E, 20. Candidate A, with 21 votes, is elected on the system of first past the post, but 79 people voted against him. In this case the majority would not rule, because a majority voted against the candidate who was elected. It surprised me to hear the argument of the member for Edwardstown about proportional representation. At the last election for the Legislative Council District of Midland, 18,000 people voted for the Liberal candidate and about 17,000 voted for the Labor candidate, yet the Liberal Party won two seats. I do not consider that to be a verdict of the majority. If the proportional representation system had been used (and it gives the will of the people), the Labor Party would have won one seat and the Liberal Party the other. People are not getting the representation in this Parliament they should have.

The proportional representation system would reflect the will of the people, and I do not accept the contention in favour of the first past the post system: that system was outmoded many years ago.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Ridley did not state the true position with regard to the election for Midland District. He said that two candidates were wanted but that the people got only one vote.

Mr. Ryan: They got two votes.

Mr. LAWN: He said that 18,000 people voted for the Liberal and Country League, and on his illustration those voters could have had only one vote. However, they voted for two candidates. Under the proportional representation system, the surplus would have been sufficient to give the L.C.L. the second candidate. One seat would not have reverted to the Australian Labor Party simply because that Party ran second a couple of thousand votes below the L.C.L.

The honourable member is trying to suggest that the votes over the required majority are not used and that consequently the next candidate, who would have been the A.L.P. candidate, would then have had sufficient votes to be elected to the second position. That is not so. In the Senate, one Party gets hundreds of thousands of No. 1 votes, and the other Party gets some hundreds of thousands, too. However, the losing Party can get only the second and fourth places; the third and fifth candidates share in the surplus of the Party that won the election.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This is one of the member for Edwardstown's amendments which is not acceptable to the Government. There is on this matter quite a fundamental difference between the viewpoints of our two Parties. Anticipating a discussion on this matter, I had a look at the history of preferential voting in South Australia and found that it was almost exactly 40 years ago when the system was introduced here. An interesting thing is that it was introduced by a Liberal Government, the Premier of the day being the Hon. R. L. Butler, as he then was. I do not know whether the member for Edwardstown can take any comfort from this fact, but at the next election the Labor Party won. This had been the system of voting in the Commonwealth sphere for about 10 years before then, and we simply brought our system of voting into line with that of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hudson: At the Commonwealth level it was caused by pressure from the Country Party.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is quite irrelevant. The fact is it was brought in about 1918.

Mr. Hudson: Those interests have a role in South Australia, also.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As I say, we have had it for about 40 years in this State and it is, I suggest, now an accepted system of voting. The fact that it is used in Commonwealth elections is, I think, a pretty compelling reason for not changing the system, because it would be most confusing if we had one system of voting in State elections and another in Commonwealth elections.

Mr. Hudson: You could say it was you who initiated the change.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This system of voting is no more perfect than any other. We could argue until the cows came home about how democratic systems were. Each system has its disadvantages as well as its advantages. We consider this to be the best system. The first reason is that we have had it for a long time and it is accepted. Secondly, as the Commonwealth Parliament adopts this system, confusion is avoided. Further, although it is not as simple a system as the system of marking one square with a cross (that that is the simplest system of all is one of the advantages of the Opposition suggestion), this is relatively simple. There is no real difficulty about marking a series of numbers to correspond with one's preferences.

Mr. McKee: We get a high proportion of informal votes in this State.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think so. The electorate is able to handle preferential voting. To suggest otherwise would be an insult. I do not think that the honourable member's argument is valid. Counting is rather more complicated than in the first past the post system, but voters do not find the present system complicated. Above all, this system gives every elector a say in the final choice of the successful candidate, although his own first preference may have been eliminated.

Mr. Clark: People aren't the slightest bit interested in other than the one candidate they vote for.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not accept that: people have an interest in all the candidates. They may champion one candidate but, if they do not get him in, they

have a considerable interest in the one they next prefer. Often preferential voting does not have much effect on those who vote for the present Opposition Party or the present Government Party, because normally one of those Parties is at the head of the poll, so the preferences of our supporters are not often considered. The first past the post system suggested by the Opposition may mean, as the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) has pointed out, that a candidate preferred by a comparatively small proportion of the total electorate is elected. Obviously, on the mathematics of it, a candidate who has 30 per cent of the votes and is disliked by 60 per cent of the electorate may well become the member. Whatever anyone likes to say about it, this is a disadvantage of the first past the post system.

I was doing a little research on this matter before dinner, and I saw an interesting analysis of the position in England. Before the 1950 general election there, people were asked whether they would vote for the Liberal candidates if they thought the Liberals had a chance of winning the election, and nearly 30 per cent said that they would do so. Because, however, they did not think the Liberals would win the election only 10 per cent intended to vote for them. This proves that the first past the post system favours very strongly a simple two-Party system of Government, and it works to the prejudice of any smaller Party groupings.

England is far enough away for us to be fairly dispassionate about what happens there. Through the working of the system in the last 50 years, the Liberal Party has been virtually squeezed out as the Labor Party has become stronger, and the Conservatives have managed to hold their own. The Labor Party came to the fore after the turn of the century; before that there was a two-Party system, and then for nearly 30 years there were three Parties. At the least, the electoral system in England has had some influence on the decline in the fortunes of the Liberals.

What is the position in Australia? The Australian Labor Party, of course, espouses the first past the post system: it is part of the platform of the Party in this State. I am not surprised that it is because, apart from the pure theory of the thing (and I acknowledge the sincerity with which members opposite hold the views that have been expressed), the first past the post system does favour the A.L.P.

Mr. Ryan: Because it is the strongest Party.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Maybe, as a single Party. Obviously, the A.L.P. favours that system because the Parties on this side of politics in Australia are normally in coalition. In South Australia, of course, there is only the one Party (the Liberal and Country League) but in most other States and in the Commonwealth Parliament there is a coalition of the Liberal Party and the Country Party. Obviously it would be to the advantage of the A.L.P. to have the first past the post system, because this would react against the two coalition Parties. What happened in Queensland for many years? There was a system of first past the post voting in Queensland up until and including the election in 1957, and this meant that the Labor Party had an advantage in Queensland, because there was a separate Liberal Party and a separate Country Party. In any three-cornered contest the A.L.P. had a tremendous advantage, because the vote of its opponents was split. But what happened in 1957?

Mr. McKee: We know.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes. Do you mind my saying?

Mr. McKee: No.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: In 1957 the Labor Party was hoist with its own petard, because there was a split in the Labor Party in Queensland in that year, and the Queensland Labor Party ran candidates and the Australian Labor Party ran candidates. Because on that occasion the Labor vote was split, Labor was prejudiced and, of course, went out of office. I think this is a graphic illustration of the way in which an electoral system can decisively affect the result of an election.

Mr. McKee: Are you afraid of a split in your coalition in South Australia?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, not at all.

Mr. McAnaney: It's not a coalition; it's a Party.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Apart from the considerations I have already put to the Committee of the advantage which the Labor Party would gain from this, *vis-a-vis* the Liberal Party and the Country Party, there is the question which honourable members around me, while I have been speaking, have been canvassing of the position of the Democratic Labor Party. Obviously, it would be to the advantage of the A.L.P. if this system were in operation, because it would severely prejudice the D.L.P.

Mr. Clark: How many D.L.P. members have been elected to the South Australian Parliament?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: None; but it would almost certainly prejudice the chances, whatever they may be, of any of the other Labor Party's candidates ever being elected. I do not blame the Labor Party for espousing a system that would be to its advantage. That is all right; as I say, I acknowledge the sincerity with which members opposite hold their views. However, these would undoubtedly be the results of changing the system, and I think it is only fair that we should acknowledge that. Those are only some of the reasons why I am opposed (and the Government is opposed) to the first past the post system. We believe there are positive advantages in the present system, and I have already referred to four of them: the fact that it brings uniformity; the fact that it has been our system for 40 years and is well accepted; the fact that it is a comparatively simple system; and the fact that it means that every elector has a say in the final choice of the candidate. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment moved by the member for Edwardstown.

Mr. HUDSON: It seems to me that if there is to be a preferential system, the only circumstance in which such a system can be truly justified is where arrangements exist for an exhaustive ballot or even for a second ballot. A second-ballot system has, of course, existed in Australia at certain times and it is typical of the French system; that is, after an election on one Saturday at which no one candidate has an absolute majority, all except the two leading candidates are eliminated, and a further election is held on the following Saturday.

Mr. Clark: It sounds like a French system.

Mr. HUDSON: I think it originated here, actually.

Mr. Rodda: This is the grand-final system.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but there is a good argument for it, apart from the consequences for the Party workers who get driven thoroughly up the wall. The very good argument for it is that, when voting at an election under the preferential voting system that we use, most people vote for someone; they do not make a particular choice between the lesser of two evils.

Let me illustrate this by imagining an election involving three candidates—the members for Norwood, Light and Ridley. Naturally, everyone would want to vote for the member for Norwood, and they would not really care

how they distributed their preferences. (I meant to include the member for Eyre in that little election contest, and the same comment would apply.) In a three-cornered contest an elector sometimes says, "I am going to vote for Bloggs as No. 1. I could not stand it if this other character won so I shall put him last." The second one he does not bother about so he puts him second. The number of people who approach it in this way is very small but the number of people who go to a polling booth and say, "I want to express a preference for a particular candidate, be he Liberal, Labor, or anything else" is large. Most people approach it in that way.

However, under the preferential voting system, second preference votes are usually cast according to the instructions on Party how-to-vote cards, in the same way as the first preference votes are cast. This would be legitimate if most people approached an election in that way, that they felt strongly about their first preference and, if they could not have that first preference, that they felt just as strongly about their second and third preferences. The fact is that most people do not feel just as strongly about their second, third, and later preferences, and that is where the basic argument for a preferential ballot in the way we use it falls down.

With a system of an exhaustive ballot, which tends to be a ballot by exhaustion, that argument does not apply; but under our system it does. There is no way on earth whereby anyone can produce a scientific value of the extent to which second preferences are rated. Preferential voting, as we know it, gives them 100 per cent rating; first past the post gives them zero. It is a matter of judgment whether the rating is closer to 100 per cent than it is to zero. In our view, it is much closer to zero, and that is the reason for this proposal.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am at a loss to understand this business of cross voting. It seemed to me that the Labor Party espoused card voting, and cross voting would not correspond to my interpretation of card voting. We cannot have card voting and cross voting as well unless the two have some relationship to each other. The Attorney-General said he believed that most South Australians support the system of preferential voting. We find that the Australian Labor Party talks about card voting. Whenever I wish to amplify my thinking about that Party I refer to its Rule Book, and on page 18 I find no reference to preferential voting, yet this is how the present Leader was elected. I

understand that the member for Frome was the third most favoured candidate, and that he sold his preference votes. On page 18, under the heading "Method of voting at convention", the A.L.P. Rule Book states:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other rule the voting on any question before Convention shall be decided by a card system of voting.

I wish the Attorney-General would explain to me what that system means, because in my Party we work on the principle of one vote one value. On page 38 of the Labor Party's Rule Book reference is made to the House of Assembly of 56 members, and then it states, ". . . representing single electorates elected with a simple majority by the cross system of voting." This constitution was changed about the time that the Democratic Labor Party first appeared on the Australian political scene. Before that, the A.L.P. believed in a preferential system of voting, but now that it is divided between the two great wings—the Communist sympathizers and the anti-Communists—it has changed its policy from the preferential system to a cross system, and I do not have a deep understanding of the argument about the systems. If the Attorney-General says that most South Australians prefer the preferential system, I accept his word rather than the written word in the A.L.P.'s Platform.

Mr. HURST: I consider that one or two matters need to be clarified. I compliment the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) on the stand that he took. The member for Light, who talked a lot of piffle and tripe, would not have the faintest idea what he was talking about. Indeed, he did not even have enough initiative to get a rule book that was up to date. All the honourable member ever does is attempt to smear people, and this is the lowest possible level of politics. The honourable member said that the Labor Party was separated into two separate wings. I ask honourable members: how did Mr. Killen, the Commonwealth Liberal candidate, get elected in Queensland? He was elected on the Communist Party preference votes. Yet members opposite are prepared to support any system, regardless of the merits and the principles, so long as they can gain power.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Where did the majority of the Communist Party preferences go in that Commonwealth election?

Mr. HURST: Those preferences were sufficient to elect Mr. Killen, the Liberal candidate. The Attorney-General tells us that

this is an intelligent system. However, I go along with what the member for Glenelg has said: unless it is a completely exhaustive ballot it does not give the results it sets out to give; the election in Queensland proved that.

With regard to the proportional system, the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) need look only to the position in Victoria. He is quite willing to come in here on the minority vote and exercise his power and authority to enable a minority Party to govern. This is something that this Government has tried to thrust down the people's throats, but it is not acceptable to us. Surely the member for Ridley would know that the Democratic Labor Party in Victoria challenged the method of voting for the Senate. Depending on what bunch of how-to-vote tickets one picked out, one could get a different result on every occasion. Those are the words used by the court that had the opportunity to thoroughly investigate the matter. For many years the people have desired simply to vote for a particular candidate. They do not want to be inundated with theories that do not give the desired result. As the member for Edwinstown has said, immature people who are not able to decide who is the best candidate and who are given up to six bites of the cherry show clearly that they do not give the matter the mature consideration that it deserves. The system we suggest is better and would give the desired result. It would reduce the number of informal votes and we would get better representation in Parliament. After hearing the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), I am convinced that an alteration is desirable, because the fact that a candidate of that calibre can be elected shows the need for a change.

Mr. VIRGO: The member for Light, when referring to the Labor Party rules about the card system of voting, did not make plain that he was referring to a system used at meetings of our convention. If we are to compare a domestic Party matter with a Parliamentary matter, it is only fair to compare the domestic system used here with the system of electing members to the Parliament. Elections for members of Parliamentary committees are decided on the first past the post system. The member for Ridley, who expounded the virtues of proportional representation, may get some consolation from the fact that some members of our Party agree with that system, but let us not forget that 60 per cent of the electors of Ridley said that

Tom Stott should not come into this Parliament.

Mr. McAnaney: Bunkum!

Mr. VIRGO: The figures have been tabled, so I tell the member not to say "bunkum" to me. Proportional representation is a myth. I accept the point that the Party opposite strongly favours preferential voting, but our Party strongly favours the first past the post system. The Party opposite is in office because of Democratic Labor Party support. The Attorney-General said that, under the preferential system, everyone had a say in the final choice of a candidate. In 20 of the 39 seats contested at the last general election a group of electors' votes was never taken into account; as a result these people were virtually disfranchised, because they had no say in the final choice of a candidate. So, the point that preferential voting gives everyone a say is a myth. In the Murray District 168 people were given the special privilege of having two votes. They voted for Mr. Critchley, the D.L.P. candidate, and they then had a second choice—Wardle or Bywaters. If ever there was an indictment of preferential voting, we saw it in the Murray District at the last election.

Mr. GILES: Using the honourable member's own argument that 40 per cent of the electors voted for the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott), we have only to look at the rest of South Australia to discover that this situation could have existed in several seats. Therefore, we could have had about 35 per cent of the people of South Australia determining who would be in Parliament if we had used the first past the post system. Opposition members give figures in relation to the preferential system when it suits their case, but they say the first past the post system is the best way to achieve proper representation for the people of South Australia.

Mr. Hudson: In how many seats would there have been a different result if the first past the post system had operated?

Mr. GILES: If the first past the post system had operated we would not have achieved true representation of the wishes of the people.

Mr. HUGHES: The Labor Party received 53 per cent of the first preference votes, but the L.C.L. received only 42 per cent. This is the answer to those members who have been making wild statements. The member for Light said he was proud to belong to the Party that believed in one vote one value. However, if the honourable member cares to examine speeches his colleagues made during

the debate on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, he will find that those colleagues do not believe in that system. I thought the Attorney-General was a reformer and would have been quite happy to fall in with the wishes of what I consider to be the majority of people in this State.

Mr. Broomhill: He is under directions from his Party's conference.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. According to the *Advertiser* yesterday, it takes a two-thirds vote to alter any part of the constitution of his Party. I think members of the public are more intelligent than the Attorney-General gives them credit for being when he says that there would be confusion among people if we had first past the post voting for the State Parliament and preferential voting for the Commonwealth Parliament. He overlooks the fact that at all local government elections it is first past the post voting. If we were to introduce proportional representation, I think there would be real confusion among the people.

Indeed, I think that if he took the trouble to find out, the Attorney-General would find that most people did not fully understand what it involved. I doubt whether every member here understands what proportional representation means. We should not force anyone to vote for a person for whom he does not wish to vote. In the case of preferential voting, the voter has no alternative but to record a vote in favour of someone for whom he may have no desire to vote, and I do not think that system should be continued. I think it would be acceptable to the majority of people in the State if we had a first past the post system and, if we can please the majority, we are carrying out democracy.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Loveday and Riches.
Noes—Messrs. Ferguson and 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.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I move:

To insert the following new paragraphs:

(a) by inserting in subsection (11) after the passage "returning officer" twice occurring in each case the passage "for the State";

and

(b) by inserting in subsection (12) after the passage "returning officer" the passage "for the State".

Where both candidates receive an equal number of votes, the Returning Officer for the State should decide the issue and not the local returning officer. The local returning officer knows local matters, but I do not think it is fair that a man in his position should have to decide who the elected candidate will be. I have always had a high regard for the Returning Officer for the State, and I cannot accept the suggestion that he could be influenced by a Minister of the Crown. I believe that he, like the Auditor-General, should be responsible to Parliament, irrespective of which Party is in power. If this amendment is accepted the local returning officer could have a deliberative vote, but not a casting vote should there be a tie.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As I indicated previously, and with great respect to the member for Ridley, I repeat that the Government cannot accept this amendment. The Returning Officer for the State is closely in touch all the time with the Government of the day, far more than any local returning officer. It does not matter who the man is: he may be open to influence, even if it is unconscious influence, because of this, and whether or not he is, it will be said that he is open to that influence. If there is, as there was last year, a closely fought election in dramatic circumstances that not quite but almost affected the Government of the State, the burden on the Returning Officer for the State would be intolerable and much greater than the burden on the returning officer for the district. It is not fair to place that burden on a man who is, of necessity, so closely connected with the Government of the day, whatever its political complexion.

I had a solution to this problem and it was not acceptable, and the Opposition also had a solution that was not acceptable. This is a third solution to which I see this one very grave objection, and this makes it unacceptable to the Government anyway. As we have not been able to devise a system that is generally acceptable throughout the Committee, I think at this stage it is better to allow the present

arrangements to stand. Those arrangements have been in the Act for a long time and, while they are imperfect, I think that at least they are not open to the objections that the present amendment is.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (12)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, McAnaney, Nankivell, Stott (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Dunstan, Hall, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, McKee, Millhouse (teller), Pearson, Rodda, and Ryan, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Virgo.

Majority of 12 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Edwardstown has on file the proposed amendments to insert paragraphs (m), (n) and (o). I assume that the earlier vote was a test vote and that the honourable member would not want to proceed with these amendments.

Mr. VIRGO: That is so.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Attorney-General want to proceed with his proposed amendment?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We do not want to go on with that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that clause 33 is now a mutilated clause, the only words remaining being, "Section 125 of the principal Act is amended". I shall put the question that clause 33, as amended, be agreed to, with a view to getting a clean sheet.

Clause negatived.

Clause 34 passed.

Clause 35—"Powers of officer conducting re-count."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In new section 128 to insert the following new subsection:

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as effecting exercise of any power conferred on the Court of Disputed Returns.

The Attorney-General desires to amend section 128, which was discussed at the recount of votes in the Millicent District at the general election. Doubt was expressed about what power was conferred on the officer conducting the recount, and the Attorney apparently seeks, by clause 35, to clear this matter up. I do not know whether the clause does that but, if the Attorney is satisfied, I am. However, I think our amendment is desirable. It must

be remembered that the Court of Disputed Returns could be (and the last Court of Disputed Returns was) engaged in the recounting of votes. My amendment makes the matter quite clear.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I doubt whether this provision is really needed but *ex abundante cautela* it is probably a good idea to put it in, and I certainly do not oppose the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 36 negatived.

Clauses 37 to 42 passed.

Clause 43—"Prohibition of certain electoral posters."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

To strike out paragraph (a).

The clause as it stands is in line with the provisions currently in the Commonwealth Electoral Act allowing for posters of 1,200 square inches, but we are not greatly impressed with posters of this size. The principal Act at present provides for a poster of 120 sq. in., and we must consider the aesthetic effect of posters in the city and suburbs at election time. I readily concede that a poster of 120 sq. in., if it is pasted on every electric light pole, does not greatly enhance a suburban area. However, the only posters I saw at the last State election were those pasted by the D.L.P. and the L.C.L. The A.L.P. has long since given away this rather corny sort of advertising. I do not believe that, with the experiment we have had over the past three, four or five years (I just forget when the Commonwealth Act was amended), we have benefited greatly. I think these signs are ugly. If they are done properly, they may be all right, but some of the Parties resort to the use of cardboard, which buckles and looks untidy, and I do not think there is any merit in altering the present provision. Basically, this Bill was introduced to rectify anomalies that were shown as a result of the Millicent by-election. For those reasons, I oppose any increase in size of election posters.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I hope the member will not press this amendment. The reason for increasing the size from 120 sq. in. to 1,200 sq. in. is to bring this matter into line with the size applying in regard to Commonwealth election posters. I have rather admired the posters, placed on roadsides, and so on, at Commonwealth election time; they are iridescent and, I think, rather effective. I think the A.L.P. was the first Party to use these. They are usually 30in. by

40in., which is not very big, but that does take up the whole of the 1,200 sq. in. The provision in the Bill would not allow a big hoarding or anything larger than 30in. by 40in. to be used, but it would bring uniformity with the Commonwealth without doing any harm. Further, the limitation on the size of electoral posters was merely a war-time measure to stop waste of paper, as it was then regarded. Having done some research on this, I find that before 1946 there was no prohibition in the Commonwealth Act against the size of posters, but, under the old National Security Act regulations, during the war there had been a prohibition. Then, in 1946, when the National Security Act regulations were coming to an end, the Commonwealth Parliament amended the Act to restrict the size to 60 sq. in. That remained the case in Commonwealth elections until 1961, when it was increased to the present size of 1,200 sq. in.

In South Australia prior to 1955 we brought in the restriction of 120 sq. in., and it has remained that ever since. However, there is no intrinsic merit in having a restriction. Mr. Douglass, the Returning Officer for the State, was in Queensland during its last State election, and he tells us that in Queensland there is no restriction on the size of posters. He said he did not see any. Economics, too, governs the size of posters. Because there is a restriction on the size of Commonwealth election posters, we can at least go to that size without causing any harm. I am prepared to accept the next of the honourable member's three amendments. It would mean that there would not be any posters of any description of a size larger than 1,200 sq. in. between elections. I do not know whether it is proper (I hope it is not improper) to make such a suggestion, but I hope it will help members opposite to see that this provision is, if not desirable in their eyes, at least not so objectionable as to warrant our voting against it.

Mr. HUDSON: It has always seemed to me that the use of any posters in an election is unnecessary. They only disfigure the landscape, and they cannot possibly do anything to persuade any elector of intelligence which way to vote. I suppose the only possible argument that can be used for posters is that they bring home to people that there is an election on and possibly induce some people to vote who otherwise might not. For some Commonwealth election campaigns I have been loaded with posters

measuring 40in. by 30in. with which to go out into my local area. Each time, the workers on each side spend their time slashing the posters of the other side and leaving them in bits and pieces. The only consequence is that there is a mess left around the place and there is no real gain.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:
To strike out paragraph (c) and insert the following paragraph:

(c) by striking out subsection (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection:—

(2) A person shall not write, draw or depict any electoral matter directly on—

(a) any roadway or footpath;

or

(b) any building, vehicle, vessel, fence, hoarding or structure of any kind without the permission (proof of which shall lie upon him) of the owner of that building, vehicle, vessel, fence, hoarding or structure.

Penalty: Four hundred dollars.

We have discovered that the apparently harmless practice of having a sticker on the window of a motor vehicle is probably contrary to the Act. The possible difficulty created by this practice is cleared up by this amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:
After paragraph (c) to insert:

and
(d) by striking out subsection (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:—

(2a) It is hereby declared that the application of subsection (1) and subsection (2) of this section extends in relation to an election or referendum although the writ for that election or referendum has not been issued.

(3) Nothing in this section shall prohibit—

(a) the posting up, exhibiting, writing, drawing or depicting of a sign on or at the office or committee room of a candidate or political party indicating only that the office or room is the office or committee room of the candidate or party and specifying the name of the candidate or the names of the candidates or the name of the party concerned;

or

- (b) the projection by means of cinematograph or other similar apparatus of electoral matter onto a screen in a public theatre, hall or premises used for public entertainment.

This amendment seeks to make clear that the restriction in the size of a hoarding applies for all times. The present Act places a restriction on the size of a poster without indicating the time for the restriction. There seems to be some doubt about whether it applies at all stages or whether it applies only after the issue of the writ. We believe that if there is to be a restriction (and both the Opposition and the Government have agreed that there should be), this restriction ought to apply at all times. New subsection (3) merely reiterates the question of what is allowed in committee rooms and in respect of the projection by means of cinematograph or similar apparatus of electoral matter on a screen of a picture theatre.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 44 to 46 passed.

Clause 47—"Requisites of petition."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In new section 170 (4) to strike out "a statement of the facts on which he proposes to reply" and insert "a reply".

This subsection deals with the newly constituted Court of Disputed Returns. Our amendment relates to a person who proposes to contest a petition that has been served on the Court of Disputed Returns. I think this amendment, too, is acceptable to the Attorney-General.

Amendment carried.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

To strike out new subsection (5) and insert: (5) A reply referred to in subsection (4) of this section shall—

- (a) set out the facts upon which the person referred to in that subsection proposes to reply;
- (b) ask for the relief to which that person claims to be entitled;
- (c) be signed by that person;
- and
- (d) be attested by two witnesses whose occupations and addresses are stated.

The Committee having amended subsection (4), it is necessary for me to move this new subsection in lieu of the subsection now in the Bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 48 passed.

Clause 49—"Right of Returning Officer for the State to be represented."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In new section 172 to strike out "and to be represented".

New section 172 provides for the Returning Officer for the State, by leave of the court, to enter an appearance, and the provision includes the words "and to be represented and to be heard thereon". We consider that the words "and to be represented" are superfluous, and I understand that the Attorney-General accepts the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 50 passed.

Clause 51—"Power of Court."

Mr. VIRGO moved:

After "amended" to insert "(a)"; after "(ca)" to insert "with the consent of the parties to the proceedings,"; and after new paragraph (ca) to insert:

- (b) by inserting after paragraph (h) of subsection (1) the following paragraph:—

(ha) to amend or allow the amendment of any petition or reply:

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 52 and 53 passed.

Clause 54—"Copies of petition and order to be sent to Clerk of House affected."

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

To strike out new section 187a and insert the following new section:

187a. Any party to any proceedings arising from the petition may be represented by counsel or solicitor.

My amendment provides that any party to any proceedings may be represented by counsel.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I support the amendment. This matter was pointed out by the Law Society, and I much appreciate the honourable member's putting right what was a weakness in the Bill.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (55 to 58) passed.

New clause 10a—"Issue of writ."

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

10a. Section 50 of the principal Act is amended—

- (a) by inserting in subsection (1) after the passage "subsection (2)" the passage "and subject to subsection (1a) of this section";

and

- (b) by inserting after subsection (1) the following subsection:—

(1a) The Governor shall not issue a writ for an election until after at least two days' notice of his intention so to do has been given by notice published in a daily newspaper circulating in the State.

Its purpose is to provide a safeguard against the issue of a writ without due notice being given. I know of no occasion when this has occurred, but I draw the Committee's attention to a situation that could well occur and cause much consternation. We have altered to 12 noon the time when a writ shall be deemed to have been issued, and it is quite reasonable to suggest that, at 2 p.m., 3 p.m., or 4 p.m., the Governor may actually issue the writ, which then becomes effective as from 12 noon. Of course, with the issuing of the writ the rolls automatically close. Between 12 noon and 2 p.m., 3 p.m. or 4 p.m. (when the writ is physically issued) alterations to the roll may be made in the various offices of the electoral registrars.

Once a writ is issued it has to apply from 12 noon, and then the panic starts, as a result of alterations made after 12 noon. This situation is intolerable and, while we are considering this legislation, we should prevent its occurring. My amendment provides that the Governor shall be required to give at least two days' notice of his intention to issue a writ. This gives the registrars adequate notice of what will happen, and it should not impede proceedings.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I agree to this new clause.

New clause inserted.

New clause 18a—"Lost postal ballot-paper."

Mr. VIRGO: I move to insert the following new clause:

18a. Section 79 of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is enacted and inserted therein in its place:—

79. Notwithstanding anything in section 78 of this Act where an elector to whom a postal vote certificate and a postal ballot-paper has been posted pursuant to section 75 of this Act, satisfies a returning officer or presiding officer that he has not received that postal vote certificate or postal ballot-paper then that elector if he is otherwise qualified to vote may—

(a) be permitted to vote;

or

(b) be issued with a further postal vote certificate and postal ballot-paper (which shall be deemed to have been issued to him under section 75 of this Act)

as the case requires.

This seeks to overcome an anomaly in the Act. At the time of the Millicent by-election, two people from Kingston were going to Victoria. They filled in their applications for postal votes before they went, and travelled to Victoria, having given a Victorian address on the application form. The wife received her postal ballot-paper and certificate, but the husband did not, and much money was spent on telephone calls because, naturally enough, they were Labor voters. Under the existing provisions of the Act, it is not possible to re-issue another postal ballot-paper or certificate unless the person concerned goes back to a polling booth on polling day and signs a statement to the effect that he has never received his postal vote.

If he does this, he is entitled to obtain a fresh vote. However, the ludicrous part of it is that, if the person concerned could go to a polling booth on polling day, he should not have obtained a postal vote in the first place, because he was not eligible. This clause allows the returning officer to issue a fresh postal vote to any person who he is satisfied has not received the postal ballot-paper and certificate that was forwarded to him. Every postal vote that is returned is checked off with the applications, and the signature is also checked. Therefore, if two certificates came back from the one person, it would be detected immediately.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I agree to the new clause being inserted.

New clause inserted.

Mr. VIRGO: As far as I can see, the other new clauses I have had placed on the file are consequential on our implementing the principle of a first past the post system. Consequently, I do not wish to proceed with these other new clauses.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 7, at 2 p.m.