

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 8, 1975

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION

Mr. OLSON presented a petition signed by 191 electors of South Australia praying that the House would not support any alteration in the present Education Act in relation to religious education.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On September 30 last, the member for Light asked a question concerning the unfortunate death of an inmate at McNally Training Centre on September 25. I have now received the report of the officer of the Crown Law Department who investigated events relating to the death of Garnet James Wanganeen, 14, at McNally Training Centre on that date. This report states that Garnet Wanganeen had been remanded to McNally to appear in the Adelaide Juvenile Court on October 2; that he had been placed in the cabin to maintain discipline in the unit; that he was in the cabin for about 25 minutes; and that he died of carbon monoxide poisoning from a burning mattress. The report makes some criticism of the procedure followed for confinement in cabins, but I consider it would be improper to discuss matters relating to the fatality until the inquest to be held by the State Coroner is completed. However, the report makes a number of recommendations designed to minimise the likelihood of a similar occurrence, and these recommendations are being or have been implemented already. They include the installation of suitable call devices in all cabins, improved ventilation, the replacement of the mattresses with the advice of the fire authorities, and improved supervision and search procedures. The full report will be made available to the Coroner, and it will be further considered after the Coroner has given his finding.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

RAILWAYS DEFICIT

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (October 1).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the majority of cases the difference between the actual payments by a department for salaries and wages in the immediate past year and the appropriation sought for salaries and wages in the current year will be accounted for by two factors:

- (a) increased rates due to awards, etc., and
- (b) increased numbers of employees.

In the case of the Railways Department, because the labour force is not increasing, the only significant factor presently is (a). In 1973-74 the actual payments for salaries and wages were about \$43 900 000. Late in that year there were several wage movements which had a heavy carry-over cost into 1974-75: that is to say, a heavy additional cost in paying those higher rates for a full 12 months in 1974-75 as compared to only a part of the year 1973-74. The estimate of that additional cost was about \$9 400 000. The proposed appropriation put before Parliament for

1974-75 was \$57 300 000, which was \$13 400 000 above the actual payments of 1973-74. There is, therefore, about \$4 000 000 to be explained by other factors. The reintroduction of pay-roll tax liability for departments was responsible for \$2 600 000 and the remaining \$1 400 000 was provided to finance the carry-over effect of a greater maintenance effort started during 1973-74. The proposed appropriation of \$57 300 000 for 1974-75 could be described as the estimated cost of employing the labour force at June 30, 1974, at wage and salary rates effective on June 30, 1974. The actual salary and wage bill for 1974-75 was \$60 200 000, which was \$2 900 000 above estimate. The cost of increases in salary and wage rates granted during 1974-75 was about \$3 500 000, but this cost was offset to the extent of about \$600 000 by savings arising from a reduction in the labour force.

The proposed appropriation of \$62 900 000 for 1975-76 is about \$2 700 000 above the actual payments for 1974-75. This is accounted for by the carry-over costs of wage and salary awards which became effective during 1974-75, that is to say the additional cost of paying those higher rates for a full 12 months in 1975-76 as compared to only a part of the year 1974-75. The proposed appropriation of \$62 900 000 for 1975-76 could be described as the estimated cost of employing the labour force at June 30, 1975, at wage and salary rates effective on June 30, 1975. The main differences between the situations in which the estimates for 1974-75 and 1975-76 were prepared can be seen from the following:

	1974-75 \$ millions	1975-6 \$ millions
Carry-over effect of wage awards ..	9.4	2.7
Reintroduction of pay-roll tax .. .	2.6	—
Carry-over effect of increased maintenance effect	1.4	—
	<u>13.4</u>	<u>2.7</u>

The general method of presentation of the Railways Department estimates is in line with that adopted generally for all departments in recent years and I have no grounds for believing the estimates for 1975-76 to be inaccurate. It may be of interest to note that in the past there has been a lack of consistency in the way individual departments have been affected by increased rates of salaries and wages. Railwaymen have received increases of proportions at times different from teachers and the latter different from public servants, etc. Under a procedure of indexation there will tend to be more consistency in movement as between individual departments.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The philosophy behind Governments providing consumers with protection is well known but may bear repetition. It is that, in today's market place, the consumer is faced with a vast array of goods, many of them complex electronic or mechanical items. The "buyer beware" of days gone by can no longer be reasonably applied, as the individual purchaser has no means of acquiring the necessary expertise in so wide an area to protect himself. On the other hand, the trader in a particular item should have sufficient knowledge of that commodity to be at a distinct advantage over the ordinary buyer when a deal is being discussed. To counter this advantage consumer protection legislation has been introduced in many countries and in all States of Australia. All members of the public, when buying items for their own

personal use, are protected by the Acts passed in this State. However, when a person is buying items for his business it is considered that he has some expertise in that field or he would not have entered that particular sphere. Besides these considerations, a Government must examine the practicality of the situation. At present the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch faces an enormous problem in coping with the volume of consumer complaints on the existing basis, as is illustrated by the following figures:

Year	Complaints accepted for investigation	Inquiries
1973	3 231	25 000
1974	4 769	46 000
Percentage increase	48	84

It is expected that the number of complaints accepted for investigation this year will exceed 6 000, whereas those on hand as at September 1, 1975, either being investigated or awaiting investigation, numbered 618. For this reason alone it would be out of the question to extend the commissioner's function to intervene in disputes between business men, even if that course were desirable on other grounds, as a large increase in staff would be required. Further, other States generally have adopted a similar policy, whereas New South Wales, Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory, by the definition of consumer in their respective Acts, specifically exclude such transactions. Where business men encounter problems in their dealings, they have two courses of action (where the sum involved is less than \$500); recourse to the Small Claims Court at very little cost or, if the sum involved exceeds \$500, normal legal proceedings through a solicitor.

TEACHERS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Education say why former teachers and private degree and diploma graduates have been placed near the bottom of the priority order for the employment of teachers next year, and what are the details of education finances and school staffing as sought by the South Australian Institute of Teachers? Last week it was reported that because of reduced Commonwealth finances Cabinet had been obliged to approve a priority order for the employment of teachers. The institute says that, because of this priority system, some teachers will not be employed, and that it cannot support the plan until information on finances and staffing is forthcoming. The information it is seeking includes staffing statistics for 1975 and projections for 1976, and detailed figures on the financial provision for education in South Australia from Commonwealth and State sources in the last and present financial years. It wishes (and it has a right) to know what the future holds for them regarding employment and class sizes; so do the parents of students and, indeed, the students themselves.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The information which the institute has sought from me and which I will be forwarding to it in relation to financial arrangements for this financial year and for the past financial year is information which the Leader already has, because it was made available to him in the Budget. That is the information which I will be providing to the institute.

Dr. Tonkin: It hasn't changed?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Not at all. How, in fact, could it have changed? Our State Budget was introduced after the Commonwealth Budget, and the only money I have available to me as Minister is money which the House has voted to me in the State Budget. There has been no internal reallocation of financial resources as between Government departments following the Budget. There is no

secret about that: it is information which will be available to the institute and which is already in a public document, namely, the Budget, which has been approved by the House. Regarding the priorities themselves, the Government believes it has a responsibility to those people who committed themselves to us some time ago as a result of their entry into teaching courses at the colleges of advanced education. This is especially true of bonded scholars and less true, but still valid, of those on unbonded scholarships. So, the Government considers that, in the event that we are unable to employ everyone who offers for employment (and that is yet to be determined), a set of priorities must be set up. Those people who are already in the system but who are on leave for some reason or other obviously must be re-employed, and then those people who are graduating from the colleges should get the next priority. As I have previously said in the House, if it should prove that the allocation that has been voted to me is insufficient to employ all of the people in those categories, I have a guarantee from my colleague that additional money will be made available to me. It is still by no means certain that I will be placed in that position. The position will be clouded until such time as the accurate figures as to resignations and people presently in the system are known. I can only repeat what I said in response to a not entirely dissimilar question asked by, I think, the member for Mitcham yesterday: that those people who will be seeking employment with the Education Department in the coming year should apply as soon as possible so that the situation can be clarified.

SAFETY HELMETS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether distributors of motor cycle equipment are selling goods not approved by the Standards Association of Australia? It has been brought to my notice that motor cyclists have bought safety helmets that are below standard and not of an approved type. Further, it seems many of these helmets are coming from overseas, and the buyer is concerned about his safety should an accident occur.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Regrettably, I have to say that in this State at present safety helmets which are essential for the well-being of people riding motor cycles and of pillion passengers are publicly on sale in stores in South Australia but which do not conform to the Standards Association requirements. This is a real trap for people who presumably would buy a helmet of this nature believing that they were protected and, in fact, they are not. Following an inspection of various stores to determine the situation, I have now asked the Australian Minister for Science and Consumer Affairs whether he is willing to promulgate a regulation under section 62 of the Trade Practices Act to prohibit the sale of helmets that do not conform to the Australian Standards Association requirements. We were successful in being able to do this in relation to buoyancy vests and, as a result of that action, people are now able to buy them in the confidence that they are approved and are capable of doing what is intended. In the case of helmets that is not so at present, but I hope the Australian Government will promulgate a regulation soon so that people buying these protective devices will be able to do so confident of obtaining the protection needed.

SPENCER GULF POLLUTION

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister for the Environment obtain information from the Spencer Gulf Pollution Committee whether improvement to the natural environment has been achieved to the waters of Spencer Gulf close to Whyalla, and particularly the False Bay area?

I remind the Minister that, since this committee has been appointed, the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, as an example, has initiated certain anti-pollution facilities, particularly in its blast furnace area. I should be interested to know whether the establishment of these facilities has played a major part in easing the polluting of waters around Whyalla, and whether further action may have to be considered by the committee.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am well aware of the activities to try to reduce pollution problems in this area. I have not seen recently details (nor do I know whether they are available) of readings taken in the area before the changes to which the honourable member has referred took place, and since then, but they probably are available. I will consult the committee to ascertain whether information can be provided for the honourable member.

CAVAN BRIDGE

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Transport say when the Cavan bridge will be replaced, and what alternative routes will be used by the great volume of traffic now using that bridge when replacement work is in progress? As all members are aware, almost all traffic to Western Australia and the Northern Territory, and indeed all domestic traffic to the north and west of the State, uses this bridge. Its replacement is of extreme interest to all members and to many citizens of the State. The bridge is now in poor condition. I understand it was built about 50 years ago when it was not expected to have to carry the volume of traffic that now uses it. Therefore, its safety must be considered to be suspect. In addition, it is a bottleneck for all traffic. When roadworks on each side of the bridge are completed, the increased flow of traffic will create worse bottlenecks on both sides of the bridge. My constituents continually ask me when the bridge will be replaced. On September 9, the member for Rocky River, in a Question on Notice, asked the Minister "are plans in hand to build another road bridge on the Port Wakefield Road?" The Minister replied in one word, "Yes". As the Minister obviously has all the facts about this matter, I await his advice.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reply I gave to the member for Rocky River was correct: a new bridge is to be built over the railway line at Dry Creek to accommodate the additional traffic using it. I do not accept the innuendo of the member for Goyder that the bridge is in poor condition and its safety is in question. Engineers of the Highways Department examine constantly all structures and the Dry Creek bridge is no exception. Although it is not capable of carrying the four lanes of traffic that the improved roadworks are designed to carry, I do not believe there is any evidence to support the claim that the safety of the bridge is in question. I believe it is completely safe.

Mr. Dean Brown: The position is—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am trying to answer the member for Goyder and if the honourable member will keep quiet it will be better for this House. Engineers of the Highways Department have drawn up plans to build a duplicate bridge rather than a replacement bridge, but the implementation of those plans has been delayed because of the work associated with the standard gauge. Until we know exactly the area required for the standard gauge connection to Crystal Brook, obviously it will not be possible to provide the bridge connection for the road network. Details of alignments and other matters will be known soon. Design work for the bridge is progressing

and construction will be scheduled as soon as funds are available. I do not think this will happen during the financial year ahead. My recollection is that we are making a temporary arrangement to accommodate the many vehicles expected at the Inter-Dominion trotting carnival to be held in February or March, 1976. I will try to get a positive date for the bridge work for the honourable member and let him have it.

CAR INDUSTRY

Mr. WHITTEN: Does the Minister of Labour and Industry know that employees of General Motors-Holden's at Woodville are concerned about their future employment?

Mr. Gunn: Get rid of Scott and—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: A shop steward in the automatic transmission section of G.M.H. has told me that during the past 12 months 80 employees have been removed from that section as a result of the importation from Germany of component parts used in automatic gearboxes. The Minister knows that when employees are concerned about their employment industrial disputation is likely to occur. This employee has informed me that the company intends to import more component parts to be used in automatic gearboxes, and this will greatly reduce employment at Woodville. If the Minister is not aware of this situation, will he make some inquiries about it?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not aware of the situation; in fact, I have no idea whether the component parts are made here or are imported. However, I can certainly understand the anxiety employees at G.M.H. at Woodville feel about their employment and welfare. In those circumstances, I will obtain a full report for the honourable member to ascertain what is happening, and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

OVERLAND EXPRESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Minister of Transport satisfied that proper arrangements have been made to protect passengers travelling on the Overland from annoyance and violence caused by other people travelling on the train? My question is supplementary to a series of questions which I put on notice last week and which the Minister replied to yesterday. When I asked those questions I had in mind the unfortunate incident that occurred on September 7 last when, on my information (and this comes not only from the newspapers but also from personal communication), many passengers who were sitting up in the train, including about 50 girl guides who had been to Adelaide to attend (I forget what the function was called)—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: A jamboree.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was avoiding that word. Anyway, the girls spent a week at Clarendon and were returning home. Before the express reached Keith they were literally terrorised by a couple of drunken louts who were absolutely out of control. When I asked the questions of the Minister I referred to that evening but, in his reply, he does not even mention annoyance to any passengers but refers simply to a couple of railway staff who tried to control the louts. I can tell the Minister (and he will not need to be told, because he will know this simply as a matter of common sense—and he has plenty of that) that this incident and similar incidents have done much harm to the Railways Department and to the likelihood of its carrying passengers of this kind in future. In my Question on Notice, I asked the Minister whether any further action had been taken since the incident occurred to prevent a recurrence, but this matter

was not referred to in his reply. The reply was obviously from the Railways Department, which was trying to put the best construction on what was an extremely unsavoury incident. Similar incidents must not be allowed to occur if the Railways Department is to continue to carry passengers. It is to give the Minister the opportunity to explain *vis a vis* the passengers who were terrorised that I ask the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am disappointed that the member for Mitcham did not appreciate my reply yesterday to his Question on Notice. I thought it was a fairly full reply having regard to the extent of the information available at that time. As soon as I saw accounts of the incident, I called for a report on the matter, but when I saw it I was not satisfied with it—not from the railways viewpoint; because of the scant information available at that time, it appeared to me that people responsible for dispensing the law had not acted as I would have liked them to act. However, I stress that I was not in possession of all the facts, and asked for full details of the incident. Those details have not yet been provided, and I regret that that is the situation. I believe that Railways Department staff who man trains do all that is expected of them. Bouncers are not needed, as some people have suggested, in every carriage. Nevertheless, I believe that people buying a ticket to travel by train, whether they are travelling from Adelaide to Bowden or from Adelaide to Brisbane, are entitled to expect protection and a safe and comfortable journey free from being harassed and molested by other people on the train. I have always adopted that policy in this area. I hope I can pursue the matter and, either personally or by representation to other quarters, achieve that objective. I think the House ought to know (and I imagine the honourable member should know, because of his association with his only colleague in another Parliament, in the Senate) that the Senate now has passed the railways transfer Bill. The legislation has now been passed by the four Houses of Parliament concerned at long last and, of course, as a result of that, the Overland becomes the property of the Australian National Railways Commission. Notwithstanding that, South Australia, in a general way, is involved, and I, as Minister, certainly will continue my interest so that the people of this State and other people who travel to or from Adelaide are properly safeguarded.

EDUCATION AUTHORITIES

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Minister of Education say whether he has examined the Australia Government's proposal to amalgamate the Universities Commission and the Commission on Advanced Education, and whether he is satisfied that this is a realistic proposal to ensure a continuing rational use of those resources that the community commits to the tertiary education area? Further, under the new arrangements, will the traditional autonomy of these institutions be safeguarded? This matter is of much importance so far as tertiary education is concerned. I know that it has occupied much time at recent meetings of the University of Adelaide Council, the members of which are concerned that some of the autonomy that they so jealously prize may be lost under this new arrangement.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I suppose it is true to say that, in the modern age, no tertiary institution has the sort of autonomy that traditionally was associated with the completely privately-funded universities many years ago. All tertiary institutions these days depend heavily on Governments for the funds to enable them to operate and, of course, within the Australian context

in the past few years, they have depended on the Australian Government, so no tertiary institution is completely autonomous or self-sufficient. However, the universities operate under Statute, and there is no suggestion that that should be changed. True, in May this year the Prime Minister announced that a panel had been appointed to recommend to Cabinet what legislation and other action would be necessary to bring about the formation of a Tertiary Education Commission. The members of the panel are Mr. K. N. Jones, Professor P. H. Karmel of the Universities Commission, and Mr. T. B. Swanson of the present Commission on Advanced Education, so both types of institution, the universities and the colleges of advanced education, are strongly represented on that panel by the Chairmen of their existing commissions. I understand that the proposal that has been outlined to the Australian Government is that there should be a Tertiary Education Commission, which should, in turn, be serviced by two statutory commissions, one a Universities Council and another an Advanced Education Council. One of the tasks of the new commission is to promote balanced development in tertiary education and another is to recognise the present distinctions between the universities and the colleges of advanced education. It is not intended to blur the existing distinctions between the two classes of body and, if people operating in either of the two institutions have a fear that that is intended, I think that is a matter on which they can be reassured here and now. I think we understand that the colleges of advanced education have a stronger vocational orientation, that the universities have a higher research component, and so on.

There are those obvious distinctions, and they will remain. In addition, the State legislation under which these bodies have been established will be retained. The advantages to Australia generally in terms of what has been proposed here are, as I see them, twofold. First, there will be a further rationalisation in the allocation of funds to the tertiary sector in general. There will be a more formal process whereby decisions can be taken whether funds to be made available for a tertiary education institution in, say, a college in the western part of Victoria should be made available to the college or to the university. Secondly, there can be a more formal aspect of the decision-making process, whereby courses are rationalised between the two kinds of institution. There are always problems about this matter, such as the debate about whether a school of engineering should be at Flinders University or at the South Australian Institute of Technology. These are the sorts of problem that, of course, can be grappled with by the new commission, representing, as it will, the viewpoints of both sectors of the tertiary field. In addition, of course, State structures such as our Board of Advanced Education will continue as at present, so I think I can reassure the honourable member on the matters that he has raised.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My attention has been drawn to an article in the *News* today on page 8 headed "Has Liberal Movement made a deal on Labor Preferences?" The clear implication of that article is that there may be a deal between the Liberal Movement and the Australian Labor Party that the Liberal Movement would support the Bill for electoral

reform, which is now before the House, in exchange for A.L.P. preferences at the next election. I take this first opportunity to say for myself, and for my colleagues, both State and Federal (because I have discussed the matter with Senator Steele Hall), that this implication is utterly false. There has been no deal and no discussion on a deal between the two Parties nor even, so far as we are aware, a suggestion of such a deal. I support that Bill, so does my colleague the member for Goyder, and so will our colleagues in another place on a matter of principle. I have supported that principle ever since before I came into Parliament many years ago. The L.M. as a Party has unswervingly supported that principle since its formation 3½ years ago. I have inquired of my Parliamentary colleagues, and each of them tells me that they have never made any suggestion of such a deal, and I do not believe from my inquiries that any other member of the L.M. has ever suggested it. The article is mischievous, and the idea for it, I believe, emanated from the Liberal Party.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. TONKIN: I will try to make a personal explanation and keep within the terms of Standing Orders in doing so, but, in reference to the last remark of the member for Mitcham, I give a categorical assurance that such an idea did not emanate from the Liberal Party, certainly not from members in this House.

LOTTERY AND GAMING REGULATIONS

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That the regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1974, made on May 29, 1975, and laid on the table of this House on June 10, 1975, be disallowed.

In essence, the regulations ban ticket-dispensing machines that offer cash prizes and chocolate wheels or roulette wheels that offer such prizes. I have no argument regarding the chocolate wheel as we know it or about the roulette wheel that offers cash prizes. Regrettably, we cannot amend regulation, and I believe that there is in these regulations a form of discrimination against the ticket-dispensing machines that offer cash prizes.

We have the conflict here regarding licensed clubs and fund-raising organisations (it is particularly so in licensed clubs) that have facilities to sell bottles of beer or cans of beer. Those places can have beer-ticket dispensing machines, but the clubs that have not that type of licence are restricted to the cash-ticket system for fund-raising. The evidence given to the Subordinate Legislation Committee by Mr. Curnow, on behalf of the various sporting clubs, follows my thoughts on the matter. He described the mechanical machines, or the ticket-dispensing machines, as units of about 406 millimetres by about 228 millimetres. That is the type of machine I am concerned about: I am not concerned about any other type of machine.

The machine is a simple piece of equipment that is attached to a wall. It has nothing to attract a person to it, except a prize, or whatever it is. That machine does not in any way resemble a poker machine, but when this regulation was brought in it was stated that it did. In the meantime, certain manufacturers of various types of ticket-dispensing machines have gone to great lengths to develop a console type of machine, with flashing lights and various types of design, and such machines probably are more elaborate than any poker machines I have seen in Sydney. This is where the problem arises: if we allow one type, can we prevent another type?

The pity of it is that the regulations cannot be amended to permit one type of machine and ban the others that I will describe later. To put the matter in its right perspective, I point out that there are about 800 licensed hotels in the State which could have installed on their premises ticket dispensing machines offering from one can to 24 bottles of beer as a prize. The method for operating the latest type of machine in licensed hotels is that one inserts a 20c coin; flashing lights go on all over the place, and the machine indicates whether one has won a prize, and one does not receive a ticket unless one has won a prize. On that type machine, the prizes range from one bottle to several bottles, and when the top prize is won an alternative prize of \$15 cash is offered. As I understand it, under the existing regulations that machine is virtually illegal, and under the regulation in question it should be illegal, because it offers beer or cash as prizes. This is where the problem lies. The hotels have an advantage over licensed clubs such as football clubs. I believe that only four out of the 10 league football clubs are permitted to sell bottled beer on the premises to be taken away, and those organisations are at a disadvantage because they cannot sell beer tickets from machines.

The biggest problem with sporting clubs and social clubs that assist charities is fund raising. There is nothing worse than going into a sporting club and being continually hounded by people to buy tickets in raffles for turkeys, etc. If there was a simple machine on the wall, it would be up to the club patron to decide whether or not to insert 20c. If he gets a cash prize or a box of chocolates, I see no harm in that, but I believe that we are discriminating against the licensed clubs which are not permitted to allow bottles of beer to be taken away from their premises. Those licensed clubs believe that they are at a disadvantage. Other problems are associated with this matter, and they became complex, as I understand it, having studied the evidence given before the S.L.C. The evidence given by the first company that introduced these cash ticket-dispensing machines (the small machines suspended on the wall) was that they were acceptable. What followed then was the elaborate type of machine. Mr. DeGeorge, a State lotteries officer, gave evidence as follows:

Initially the company Marlborough Stationers introduced the vending machines and they were acceptable units. They were a simple wall-mounted unit about 16in. by 8in. and it was simply operated. It gave out a sealed ticket on the insertion of a coin.

Every time a person put in 20c, he received a ticket. Mr. DeGeorge's evidence continues:

Some clubs in South Australia were beginning to realise that this would save a fair bit of administrative problems and they started using various forms of this machine . . .

In all of the sporting clubs I have attended the administration problem results from the fact that the work is carried out by voluntary labour. People go around selling tickets in various raffles, and I am not aware of any club that uses paid staff inside the club for purely fund-raising purposes. Certainly, paid staff are used to pay out the prizes, but not necessarily for selling the tickets. This automation of ticket selling does not mean that there would be any reduction in staff. To the contrary, I believe that the clubs which have benefited from the use of these machines have suffered considerably in their fund-raising efforts and have had to use other methods, such as getting additional committee members to help out. This is where the problem lies, because, in a small machine which contains 1 000 tickets and into which 20c coins are inserted, there is a great chance that the money received will balance with the number of tickets issued. In a club that I attended

a couple of weeks ago, between 400 and 500 people were present. Raffle tickets were being offered from an open box. People were dipping into the box and taking out tickets, and throwing money into the box. I said to the person in charge, "What chance have you of balancing the cash?" He said, "No chance in hell. Since we have lost the cash ticket machines, we have never balanced. If people win 50c, they give another 20c and take out another three tickets. All the money is thrown into a box, and that is where the difficulty arises. If we had a simple machine such as a postage stamp machine people would get something from it, and we could balance that part. The only difficulty is in paying out the prize money. The tickets should balance with the sum of money available for the prize money."

I do not sympathise with those who have tried to expand on that type of machine and who have tried to induce people to invest their money. Those who have tried to promote machines that do not issue tickets, which are the closest I have seen to a poker machine, cut across the whole argument. It is a pity that we cannot amend the regulations to permit one type of machine because, by doing that, we could restrict the number of machines to two a club. Alternatively, we have the strange situation where, under the Lottery and Gaming Act, any group of people can form a social club. Nine members here could form a social club and ask a licensed hotel to install a machine for us, and we could use the profits from the machine, have a meeting every week and get a free lunch. No-one would know exactly what happened. That, again, is a loophole in the system. We restrict the machines to licensed clubs, so they are properly supervised.

If it was left to the club to arrange the printing of its own tickets (and this happens), the tickets could be stapled; they would not be automatically sealed tickets. I have been told that it has been known for some people to use a type of sealed ticket on which two types of staple are used—the small staple for the prizes and the large staple for the tickets that do not carry a prize. The committee members go to an open box, sift through the tickets, taking those with the small staples, so they are always on a winner. The dispensing machine would do away with that practice, as it issues a fully-sealed ticket. The whole situation regarding lotteries, raffles and the methods of legalised fund-raising in the State needs a thorough investigation by a Select Committee or a group of people specialised in the field to investigate the matter thoroughly and to introduce strict guidelines.

I am sure that no honourable member would support the introduction of poker machines, and I am not advocating that. All I am advocating is that we authorise one type of ticket-dispensing machine that must give a ticket when the requisite money is inserted and that the sign denoting the prizes to be paid should be at least two metres away from the machine so that a person must go away from the machine to see what he has won and go to a counter or to the bar to receive the prize. This would impose strict limitations so that no-one could be accused of hanging around the machine, and we could not be accused of encouraging the poker-type machine operation. This could be achieved by regulation. If we could amend the regulations, that is what I advocate. I commend my motion to the House because I believe the regulations should be withdrawn and a fresh set of regulations be drawn up within the next 24 hours to cover any situation that may arise by the disallowance of the regulations. I believe that this could be done.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment): I strongly oppose the motion, and do not think that the honourable member's arguments are very convincing. Nevertheless, I do not question his motives, because clearly what he is trying to do is support certain sporting organisations that wish to have the benefit of the additional finance that would come to them as a result of the possible increased use of machines such as those disallowed under these regulations. While I can appreciate the honourable member's interest in some sporting groups of this kind and can understand what he is aiming to do, it is the logic of what he is doing that I strongly oppose. I think most members will appreciate that some time ago the Government decided to assist clubs to raise funds for their various activities by permitting them to introduce vending machines that would enable beer tickets to be dispensed.

The arguments in favour of such machines (that people would not have to go around selling tickets and time would not be taken up dispensing the tickets) were overwhelming. It was said that this could all be relieved by the use of a machine into which the club member could insert some money and, if a winning ticket came out, he would present this to the bar and receive a prize. The intention to try to ensure that these machines were used in this way was commendable, and this worked well. It is obvious that people try to take advantage of a situation. This has occurred, and it is the reason why the regulations are being considered by us today. The machine was gradually changed so that the operation I described changed to one where, instead of the ticket that came out indicating that the holder was entitled to a number of bottles of beer, it stated that the person was entitled to a cash prize. The honourable member may say that there is nothing harmful in that practice, but the next step, on his own logic, is that, instead of the machine pressing out a coupon that contains a piece of paper saying that the holder of the ticket is entitled to 50c, 20c or \$1, the machine could dispense cash. People may then ask what is the difference between a machine that dispenses a ticket and a machine that immediately dispenses a sum of money to the person operating it. The difference is so marginal that there would be an unanswerable case for poker machines to be introduced into the State.

There is no need for me to point out that this Government is opposed to the principle of having poker machines. Accordingly, it has introduced the regulation to ensure that the operation of these machines varies from the operation of poker machines in that a ticket stating the value of the prize is issued rather than the money itself. I believe that the reasons for the regulation are quite sound.

The honourable member has said as part of his argument that there ought to be some uniformity regarding the use of these machines in hotels and clubs because some have an advantage over others. The honourable member knows that the Government has shown sympathy towards clubs that wanted to sell liquor and thereby to make a profit, such profit going back to the club to the advantage of its members. Nevertheless, we recognised at the time, and I think we still ought to recognise, that if we are to have adequate liquor laws in this State and we are to expect hotels to provide an adequate standard in relation to the drinking habits of our community, we must give them the opportunity to make their business profitable enough for them to provide such services to the community. They therefore need to be in some protected position against the club, which has none of those responsibilities. If we are to give clubs every provision or every benefit that applies to the hotel industry, we will find that standards that we have

come to expect from hotels in South Australia will be downgraded, and I am certain members would not support that. I believe that we should not disallow the regulations, which have been made to protect the existing position, with which all members would agree, of permitting machines to dispense beer tickets to cut down on the costs of the club from directly selling tickets to their members. That is what we were attempting to achieve when we first made the step. Any alteration in that direction to the extent which we have seen and which has led to the introduction of this regulation would be a backward step towards the legalising of poker machines in this State. Not only the Government but members of this Parliament generally have clearly expressed themselves in opposition to poker machines, and accordingly I would ask the House to reject the motion.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I, too, oppose the motion, and I should like to make my contribution to this debate as the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which considered this regulation and approved it. The committee was unanimous in its decision in respect of the adoption of this regulation. It did not want to inhibit sporting bodies in their search of funds, but it had to recognise that poker machines or anything similar to poker machines are abhorrent to this Government and, I believe, to the Opposition and also most people in the State. The regulation was contested by Mr. Curnow, who is the Secretary Manager of the Glenelg Football Club. He told us that he represented licensed clubs, stating that he was representing 10 league football clubs in this State. He outlined the procedures that were adopted in the production of these tickets from the dispensing machine. In his evidence, he stated that the machines could not be considered as being similar to poker machines, because, if a prize is due from a poker machine, cash falls into the bowl at the base of the machine. That statement is correct. He stated, in respect of the machines he was advocating, that a ticket or an envelope, not actual cash, fell out. I could not see any difference, because, with a poker machine, there is cash in a bowl, and the other type of machine issues a ticket that is cashed on being presented.

Mr. Curnow stated that it would be expected that a person, upon receiving a ticket that entitled him to a prize, would cash the ticket at the desk, wherever this may be located. He then stated that this would not necessarily be so and, of course, it is not so, because if a person has \$10 and he wants to put \$10 worth of 20c coins through the machine he does not open every envelope and, if he gets a prize, cash that prize and come back to the machine. As applies in relation to poker machines, a person stays until he gets blisters on his fingers. This was not enough to convince the committee. Mr. Curnow did everything possible to convince the committee of his point of view.

We also had as a witness Mr. DeGeorge, Lotteries Officer in the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, who was questioned closely. He believed that the machines were similar to poker machines, if not in the mechanical operation at least because of the results achieved. In his evidence he stated:

Initially the company introduced the vending machines and they were acceptable units. They were a simple wall-mounted unit about 16in. by 8in. and it was simply operated. It gave out a sealed ticket on the insertion of a coin. Some clubs in South Australia were beginning to realise that this would save a fair bit of administrative problems, and they started using various forms of this machine which would entice the public because the appearance would be more attractive. The new types of machines were more like poker machines; they had flashing lights and they worked on a computerised programme giving out random prizes on the insertion of a coin. The units were all right but it

was believed they could create problems. Following that all sorts of changes were made to make them look more and more like poker machines in appearance.

I am not suggesting that those whom Mr. Curnow represented resorted to this practice, but Mr. DeGeorge said that his department had inspected many machines, and they were becoming more like poker machines. He said that a manufacturer had already selected a football club that he hoped would use his system. This was a row of machines with flashing lights looking like ordinary poker machines, with a man standing at the end of the row changing notes for people who wanted to use coins in the machines. The committee unanimously determined, after hearing the evidence, that the machines were similar to poker machines and that it would be undesirable for them to be installed in South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: It wasn't unanimous.

Mr. WELLS: It was.

Mr. Mathwin: No, it wasn't.

Mr. WELLS: It was a unanimous decision of the committee and you supported it, and the evidence will show that, especially your last question. I quote from the evidence as follows:

MR. MATHWIN: You said that the situation got so bad that they wanted to introduce cash machines, but there is a difference between a ticket machine and a cash machine: obviously, a cash machine would be like a poker machine. The similarity goes close. This is a similarity we took into account.

This is what you said, and you cannot deny that you supported the committee's decision. It was a unanimous decision, and you were part of that committee.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Florey to refer to other honourable members as "honourable members" and not "you".

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member supported the decision. Tickets are bought in bundles of 1 000 and placed in a machine: among those tickets are those that carry a cash prize, but no-one is supposed to know where they are positioned and when they are dispensed. Mr. DeGeorge said that malpractices had occurred. He did not name any swimming, football, horse, or rowing club, but he said that some managements removed tickets which should have been placed in the machine and which were cash-bearing tickets.

Mr. Becker: That's impossible.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson will be able to reply when closing the debate.

Mr. Becker: Mr. DeGeorge said that, but he's wrong.

Mr. WELLS: Mr. DeGeorge said that malpractices had and could take place, because all of the 1 000 tickets in a bundle were not inserted in the machine, and among the tickets removed were cash prize tickets. I am not disparaging any football club that was represented by Mr. Curnow, but this action has been taken and could be repeated. Mr. DeGeorge did not say that any of the group represented by Mr. Curnow had played any part in this sort of tactic. It seems that members of the public had continually complained to the department about the introduction of these machines in clubs, demanding to know what the Government was doing in allowing them to be used as cash-dispensing machines. However, not one person told the department that he approved of the machines or said that he agreed with their introduction. The operation of the machines should have returned a 25 per cent profit for each machine: each one was expected to return \$75 for each \$100 invested.

Poker machines operate on a similar basis, although it is usually a 60-40 basis: this percentage can be adjusted by the owner to suit his desires. It must be remembered that the introduction of poker machines has been resisted by this Government and all members, because it is the antithesis of what is required for the welfare of our people, and machines that dispense cash prizes are close enough to being poker machines to be described as poker machines. The Government, the committee, and the member for Glenelg fear that, if these machines were allowed to operate (and they would soon extend in operation), they would be more vicious in their operation, so that we would be confronted with the fact that poker machines had crept in in circumstances that I have been describing. The committee approached this matter with goodwill because we had no desire to upset fund-raising activities within sporting clubs but we had a duty to examine witnesses. We were not convinced that the machines were for the benefit of the South Australian public, so we unanimously decided that no action be taken regarding the regulations. I ask members to support the committee and defeat the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I oppose the motion. I was approached about this matter, I think at the end of last year, by the manufacturer of the machines, who told me that he had many thousands of dollars tied up in these machines. He does not live in my district (I think he lives in the District of Fisher), but he sought my help. I was sympathetic to him on this ground but when he described the machine to me it was obvious, as has been said, that the machine is so similar to a poker machine that to allow the use of the machine would be tantamount to agreeing to the introduction of poker machines in South Australia. If we had this machine it would not be long before the genuine article was here. The pressure for the next little step to be taken for the introduction of poker machines would be so great that it would be impossible to resist. On behalf of this man, I protest that he has been, I think, unfairly treated.

I am not sure how he could have been treated more fairly except to have given him more to quit his stocks. He went into this business genuinely, he sank much money into it, he is a local manufacturer, and he has been caught. It could be said he took a risk, but he will suffer more from the passing of this regulation than will the clubs whose representatives gave evidence because they can turn to another form of fund-raising but he is stuck with a considerable loss in equipment and finished machines. I do not think there is anything we can do about that; I could not think of anything that could be done to help him. However, it is an example of the way in which an arbitrary Government decision can affect ordinary citizens to their detriment. Even though I had the greatest sympathy with him, I did not suggest moving the disallowance of this regulation, and, having seen my attitude about it, he did not suggest I should do so. Despite what I have said on behalf of this gentleman, I must oppose the motion.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I was a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee when this regulation came before it. I thought I had educated the member for Glenelg then to understand what this matter is all about, but apparently I failed; perhaps he is still confused because the member for Florey has said that the member for Glenelg supported the decision of the committee. I have been associated with this type of machine for some time because of my association with a football club in my city. The practice has grown from what was a friendly relationship between a hotel supplier and a football club to one of big business. Originally, the dispensing of tickets was under-

taken for two purposes. The hotel supplier saw it as a way of boosting his bottled beer sales, and the football club saw it as a way of increasing income for the football club, independent of the football club itself.

The process has grown from a manual dispensing arrangement where the tickets were sold over the bar counter for prizes of bottled beer to the elaborate machines now in operation. The machine the member for Hanson was talking about was the original machine introduced as a beer ticket dispenser. However, the price of bottled beer has increased, and it is uneconomical to run this type of dispensing machine for bottled beer tickets. The new machines look like robots; they are very fancy and when a winning ticket is dispensed coloured lights flash so that a winner would think he had struck E.T.S.A. It is so close to a poker machine (it has a handle) that I would not like to enter into an argument about whether or not it is a poker machine. The machine in hotels now dispense cash prize tickets, and it worries me that the profits are said to go to charity but no-one has yet been able to tell me what charities receive the profits.

Mr. Gunn: Charity starts at home.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I believe charity does start at home, but I have yet to be told that the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, or any other charity receives anything at all from the profits of these machines. The member for Hanson, by moving this motion, is doing exactly what he says he does not want to do. He said he does not support the introduction of poker machines, but I ask him where he starts and where he finishes on this question, because I can assure him that the hotelkeepers have now come up with another gimmick. They have started social clubs within the hotels, but I have not seen a constitution of such a social club and I do not know whether or not the profits of the social club go to a charity. I am inclined to think that the whole idea behind the cash prize machines in hotels is to make more profits for the hotel. I cannot prove that, but I have a sinking feeling that this is what it is all about. If this motion is accepted, the next step will be poker machines. There is no question about that. We are so close to that situation now that it is not funny. If we let the position continue, the economy of hotels and football clubs will depend on the machine. I assure the member for Hanson that what he is trying to do is simply to play into the hands of big hotelkeepers and big football clubs. I do not know whether the Glenelg Football Club is fully licensed, but, if it is, that is why it wants the disallowance of this regulation. I oppose the motion because to accept such a suggestion is a step backward. If we accept the suggestion, we could have the possibility of poker machines being introduced through the back door into this State.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I have never heard such ill-informed, ignorant debate in all my time in the House. I am—

Mr. Max Brown: Dumbfounded?

Mr. BECKER: Yes, because I did not believe members of Parliament could be so ignorant on an issue that must be of great concern to them. I can understand members speaking against a measure on principle, no matter what that principle might be, if they are opposed to any form of gambling, but to say that a ticket dispensing machine can be likened to a poker machine is utter nonsense. I made that point clear in my remarks earlier in this debate. I have studied fully and have gone over and over the evidence given by Mr. DeGeorge on this matter, and I am convinced that he is confused. That is why I appealed, when I spoke

previously in this debate, for the Government to look at the whole area of fund-raising through lottery activities, dispensing machines, and so forth. The Minister made it clear that the regulations were to protect hotels. I am standing up not for hotels but for licensed clubs, because they are not being given a fair go. I have adopted that stand for some time, because this matter affects league football clubs, bowling clubs, cricket clubs, social clubs, and all other forms of club. They are the organisations that are really struggling today. It is the committee members of those organisations who must earn money for them. A ticket dispensing machine dispenses a ticket that entitles the recipient to a prize. It would not matter whether a person put money into a postage stamp machine or a cigarette machine: beer ticket machines are acceptable. What I have seen here today is the greatest discrimination I have seen in my life.

Why should any club be allowed to install a beer ticket dispensing machine but not a cash dispensing machine. The member for Fisher told me that a person in his district was offering beer at \$4 a dozen because he had won so many bottles of beer from beer ticket raffles. This is what happens. What we have in place of the machine is a system of buying a ticket and picking it out of a box. In a butcher or chemist shop, this type of ticket is on sale today. These businesses do not offer cash prizes and customers have to buy goods from them. That is an inconvenience. Either we have lotteries in this State or we do not have them. There is no way known that the machine I am talking about resembles a poker machine. The committee that investigated the matter is confused, the witness called by the Government is confused, and members of this House are completely ignorant on this subject. There is a vast difference between a poker machine and a ticket dispensing machine.

Mr. Max Brown: What is the difference?

Mr. BECKER: The member for Whyalla can interject, but—

Mr. Max Brown: I want to know what is the difference.

Mr. BECKER: It was his city that caused the problem. It was a hotel in Whyalla that caused the problem on this issue by displaying a sign which stated, "Why go to Tasmania and lose your money at the casino? Do it here." Ticket dispensing machines were introduced at the Clarence Park Bowling Club and the Edwardstown Bowling Club. I am not necessarily taking sides with league football clubs, but they were installed at bowling clubs. That is where the former Chief Secretary saw one. What is the difference if a form of betting is automated? It is already automated. Why cannot people insert 20c into a machine, and receive a ticket stating whether they have won a prize? People are not allowed to do that, but they can certainly buy beer in that way. It is sheer discrimination to react in the way members have reacted in letting down sporting and social clubs in this State.

Motion negatived.

SUPERPHOSPHATE BOUNTY

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Federal Government should immediately accept the report of the Industries Assistance Commission which recommends the reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty.

Members on this side and, I believe, most people who live in rural areas of Australia—

Mr. Keneally: Including Mr. Fraser.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I will have something to say to you about the superphosphate bounty.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not use the term "you".

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall be guided by your impartial ruling. People who live in rural areas of Australia are aware that the Australian Government has taken a particular dislike to country people. In its three years of disastrous policies (and one could spend a whole hour listing them) the Commonwealth Government made an early decision which caused concern and hardship and which has prevented agriculture from making the contribution to the Australian economy that it should have made. That decision was the removal of the superphosphate bounty. After much criticism was made by representatives of rural industry, by members of this House, by the Agriculture Department, by our own Minister of Agriculture at the time, Mr. Casey, and across the nation, the Prime Minister in his usual ham-fisted manner decided he would refer this matter to the Industries Assistance Commission, which was set up by him to examine what sort of support certain industries should receive. The commission examined the matter and issued its report on July 31, 1975. I will quote from page 28 of the report, which sets out the recommendations, as follows:

The Industries Assistance Commission recommends that, pending completion of its inquiry on the Minister's reference and the Government's consideration of the full report on that reference, the consumption of phosphatic fertilisers be assisted by restoration of the bounty previously payable under the provisions of the Phosphate Fertilisers Bounty Act, 1963-1971.

One commissioner dissented, but the decision was a majority decision. One must consider the reasons why the majority reported as it did. The disturbing feature of the report was that the Prime Minister, having set up the commission, asked it to report, and, when it eventually reported to Parliament, he took the opportunity of Parliamentary privilege to reflect on the integrity of two members of the commission who recommended the reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty. I should like to refer to an article that appeared in the *Stock Journal* of September 4, 1975, which is headed "Whitlam dismisses I.A.C. report on super bounty as 'rather pathetic'." If anything is pathetic, it is the leadership and direction the Prime Minister has given to this nation. The decision to curtail the superphosphate bounty was the culmination of the disastrous policies of the Australian Government that have affected every citizen of this nation.

Today, we have a situation where there is no incentive for private industry to reinvest to produce goods so the whole nation can prosper and so that we have goods to export; all we have is record unemployment, record inflation, the highest interest rates in the history of this country, and the most incompetent Government that has ever occupied the Treasury benches in Canberra. Let us consider the history of the superphosphate bounty and see why it was introduced. For that purpose I should like to quote from page 33 of the I.A.C. report:

The objectives of the 1963 Act may be inferred from statements during the second reading debate:

a Superphosphate bounty "... will encourage the most economic use of our agriculture resources and in particular, will act as stimulus to further expansion in pasture improvement"; "Not only will the subsidy reduce farmers' costs and assist to increase their production but it will also increase the volume of production that Australia has for export and thus will enable us to earn more overseas funds."

If that was done, we might not have to go cap in hand to the Middle East oil sheiks and ask for loans to try to assist the economy. The report also states:

"restore the balance of profitability between the primary industries and the secondary and tertiary industries."

The Prime Minister cannot infer correctly that those who make submissions to the Industries Assistance Commission were not competent and versed in the economy or in agriculture. The organisations that made representations included:

Adelaide & Wallaroo Fertilizers Ltd.; Agricultural Business Research Institute, University of New England; Alpine Aviation Pty. Ltd.; Australian Farmers Federation; Australian Fertilizer Services Association; Australian Fertilizers Limited; The Australian Institute of Agricultural Science; Australian Wheatgrowers Federation;—

of which we have the Secretary in South Australia—

Australian Woolgrowers and Graziers Council; Australian Wool and Meat Producers Federation; and Department of Northern Australia.

What has been the result of the decision not to reintroduce the superphosphate bounty? I pointed out in this House soon after the Australian Government started to attack rural industry and private enterprise that there would be a downturn in employment in this State and across Australia in secondary industry associated with the production of agricultural equipment. A report in the *Stock Journal* of August 28 last states:

South Australian unionists want reintroduction of super bounty: The shop committee at Horwood Bagshaw Limited's Mile End factory, representing about 125 workers, has called on the Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, for prompt reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty.

The committee made its plea in a telegram to the Prime Minister on Thursday:

"We are very concerned about the depressed state of the agricultural implement manufacturing industry.

"It has been obvious, from our point of view, that since the lifting of the super bounty, demand for our products has fallen alarmingly.

"Retrenchments, affecting about 500 people, have occurred since September, 1974.

"It is not unfair to say the action taken by your Government with regards to the super bounty has had a serious effect on this industry.

"Unless action is taken immediately, the future for those people still employed in this industry is to say the least grim.

"Therefore, we feel the prompt reintroduction of the super bounty should be of primary concern to your Government.

"This action will assist the farmer and our ailing industry."

The telegram followed the announcement on Thursday by the company's general manager, Mr. J. S. Carter, of the retrenchment of 42 employees from the Mile End plant and 15 from the Edwardstown plant, effective on September 2.

Early in July 130 workers at the company's Mile End and Mannum plants were laid off.

Two interesting comments are made in the report, one by the Executive Officer of the Stock Owners' Association, congratulating members of the union, and another by Mr. Grant Andrews, General Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, also commending those people for the action they had taken. This State and the national depend heavily for export income on agricultural industry from the broad spectrum.

The foundation of this great country was laid in primary production and in mining. If we want to achieve for the people of this State what they deserve and what they are entitled to have, Governments and Parliaments must take sensible actions that are designed to increase productivity. We have in this country the potential to be one of the major food producing countries in the world. Millions of people to the north of Australia are starving, and we have

the opportunity to assist. All that is necessary is that the Commonwealth Government and this State Government accept their responsibilities. If those Governments put aside their socialist philosophy, which is aimed at destroying the free enterprise system and the family farming concept, which has built up the tremendous assets that we have today in agriculture, the position can be improved. The reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty, which is a consumer subsidy, will assist the nation.

Mr. Keneally: And it's a socialist one.

Mr. GUNN: The cost to continue this subsidy is small considering the overall receipts by the Commonwealth Government. The member for Stuart continues to make naive and silly interjections. He knows nothing about agriculture and has a dislike for people in agriculture. Therefore, he ought to make a sensible contribution rather than try to downgrade people who are engaged in agriculture. I earnestly ask the House to pass the motion so that it can be transmitted to the Prime Minister. Let us hope that, if that is done, it will have some effect on that arrogant gentleman.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the motion, and I support the member for Eyre right down the line. The recommendation by the Industries Assistance Commission to the Commonwealth Government that the superphosphate subsidy should be reintroduced is an important issue to primary producers. However, that is not the only important aspect in relation to I.A.C. Even today we see that the commission has recommended that assistance to the beef industry also should be provided by the Commonwealth Government. The big burning question is what will be done in this regard.

The Commonwealth Government has not taken notice of any recommendation by the commission in any evidence that the commission has compiled or in anything that the commission has put forward in a report to that Government. As the member for Eyre has said, the amount of money involved in the superphosphate subsidy is small in relation to the total overall benefit, and this applies not only in relation to the primary producers of the State or our secondary industries but also to the Commonwealth Treasury, which will get back in taxation from all those areas of revenue much more than the \$60 000 000 involved in the superphosphate subsidy. The member for Eyre this afternoon is asking the Commonwealth Government to implement that I.A.C. recommendation, and I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, a referendum should be held to decide whether daylight saving should continue in South Australia.

This matter has caused much concern to people, particularly those in my district, the District of Flinders, and other country districts in South Australia. Their concern is that they have not had the opportunity to make a judgment on what is basically a social issue. The purpose of the motion is to allow the people to exercise their democratic right. We have heard Government members say in the past few days that they are the bastions of democracy and that they stand for the rights of people: now they have the opportunity to express themselves in a similar way. I call on those members to support the motion.

A referendum has been held in Western Australia, where an enlightened, intelligent and democratic Government led by Sir Charles Court took the matter to the people.

The result was that daylight saving was rejected, and the figures were as follows: total number of votes cast in the affirmative, 250 644; total cast in the negative, 290 179; and 5 289 were informal. That referendum allowed the people to decide, and they spoke out loudly. The interesting point that came out of the referendum was that many people in the metropolitan area of Western Australia voted against daylight saving. I understand that the enlightened New South Wales Government will take a similar step, because it has received considerable criticism of daylight saving. I understand that a petition, containing about 40 000 signatures, was presented to the New South Wales Premier, and he has agreed to instigate a referendum so that the people may decide. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted.

CASUAL SENATE VACANCIES

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:
That this House:

- (a) is of the opinion that the choice of a Senator to fill a casual vacancy is, by section 15 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, the sole responsibility of the Houses of Parliament of the States, or, if the Houses of Parliament of the States are not in session, of the Governor of the State acting upon the advice of his Executive Council;
- (b) wholeheartedly support and commends to the Parliaments of all States the practice which prevailed from 1949 whereby the States, when casual vacancies have occurred, have chosen a Senator from the same political Party as the Senator who died or resigned, and on the advice of that political Party; and
- (c) resolve that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

The terms of my motion are self-explanatory, and they arise, in particular, from two recent occurrences where Senate vacancies have occurred in the Senate representation for the States of Queensland and New South Wales. On both of those occasions, those Senate vacancies have been filled not by members of an Opposition Party (and certainly not in any way could it be said by members of the Party from which the Senate vacancies came) and certainly not on the recommendation of the political Party of the original Senator. We do not believe that that is a desirable practice, and we do not support it. I have moved my motion to ensure that it is apparent to everyone in South Australia that the Liberal Party here believes that the convention that has applied since 1949 should continue to apply. If one looks at *Australian Senate Practice*, Fourth Edition, J. R. Odgers, it is clear from that that the States are not constitutionally bound to act as the convention dictates. I quote from that publication:

In the choice of a Senator to fill a casual vacancy, the members of the Houses of Parliament of a State are free to choose whom they may. They are not, for instance, bound to choose a person from the same political Party as that to which a deceased or retired Senator belonged.

Between 1907 and 1946, there were 14 examples of casual Senate vacancies being filled by nominees of a different Party affiliation. However, since the introduction of proportional representation and up until the end of 1974, the States have without exception (in fact, on 18 occasions) filled vacancies by the appointment of Senators belonging to the same political Party as the vacating Senators. We believe that this should be the position. I quote again from *Australian Senate Practice*:

Clearly, the general desire is to maintain the *status quo* in the filling of casual vacancies.

It is clear, too, that there are difficulties in expressing this principle in the Constitution. The Joint Committee on Constitutional Review, in 1958, was unable to find a form of amendment that would satisfactorily express the object it had in mind. Since 1949, we have had the convention whereby Senators are appointed to a vacancy from the same political Party on the advice of that political Party. As the business before us on private members' day is considerable, I will not take up the time of the House any longer now. I therefore, having put the Party's position clearly on the line and having expressed it in the terms of my motion, seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That in the opinion of this House, Standing Order No. 57 should be amended forthwith to restore to every member the right to move the adjournment of the House at any time.

My reason for moving this motion is that last session, I think it was (during the last Parliament before the election), when the Government had a good majority in the House, it was able to change a number of Standing Orders, despite the opposition of members on this side. One of the Standing Orders changed was allegedly, according to the then Attorney-General (now His Honor Mr. Justice King), so as to streamline the procedures of the House. However, that was not the only or even the main object of the changes which were made. The real object of the changes was to increase the hold of the Government of the day over the House and to ensure that it dominated what went on here. One of the things private members of this place lost at that time was the right to move the adjournment of the House at any time.

To a layman, that may not seem to be of great importance but, traditionally, the moving of the motion for the adjournment of the House against the opposition of the Government has been tantamount to a motion of no confidence in the Government, and the Premier (I am pleased to see him in the House on this occasion) will recall only too well that it was the moving of this motion in April, 1968, which brought his Government crashing down. What happened was that we had an election. The state of the House was as it is now. The numbers were a bit different: we did not have such a big House then, whereas we have plenty of members now. On the opening day, at the first convenient opportunity the then Leader of the Opposition (now Senator Hall) moved "That the House do now adjourn", and the motion was put to a vote. The Independent member (Mr. Stott) voted for it. He was by that time the Speaker. The motion was therefore passed, and the Premier walked across to Government House and resigned. So one can see the importance of the adjournment motion.

I have no doubt that, when the Labor Party devised this change in the Standing Orders of the House, it had that incident in mind. It is one which those of us who were here will not ever forget. Of course, this does not matter much at a time when the Government has a working majority in this place, but now when the situation is different it does matter because there is a real chance that the adjournment motion could be moved by a private member and could be carried; there is no doubt about that. I should like to see the right to move the adjournment motion restored. Another reason for my motion is that if the numbers were with us, (and I use that term loosely) against the Government on any matter, I just do not know how you, Mr. Speaker, or maybe the Clerk of the House, would

untangle the mess that would occur if there were a majority in favour of the adjournment but, pursuant to Standing Orders, it was not competent for a member to move for the adjournment. I do know what would happen.

Probably the House would eventually be adjourned by you, Mr. Speaker, because of disorder. We would then have a collision between our Standing Orders and the numbers in this House. Of course, it is more likely to happen (and I am speaking theoretically) with the present constitution of the House than at other times, but it could happen at any time. It is absurd to have a Standing Order that could lead to such a collision because, if the majority of members wanted to adjourn the House but were prevented merely by the technicality of a Standing Order, that would be an absurd and undesirable result, and I do not know how you, Sir, would get over it. It is for that reason that I have moved this motion. You will remember that I raised this matter when I asked you a question in this House; as I recall it, the only question you have had so far.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I thought you had to call him "the Speaker", and not "you".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am speaking directly to the gentleman. The Minister can take a point of order.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I just want you to watch your manners.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You are not a good one to take that point.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will continue with the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I asked that the Standing Orders Committee be called together to consider this, among other matters, and when we got the result of that meeting it was "no change recommended". That is not surprising, given the composition of the Standing Orders Committee. Therefore, I did the only other thing that could be done and that was to move this motion as an expression of the opinion of the House. I regard this as of very great importance. Other undesirable features in the Standing Orders were forced on the House by the Labor Party when it had a comfortable majority, but this is the most undesirable, and that is why I have started with this one. I believe that the traditional right of a member of the House to move the adjournment as a mark of displeasure with the Government should be restored. I therefore ask members to support the motion.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): In seconding the motion, I agree with what the member for Mitcham has said. A totally impossible situation pertains now under Standing Order 57. In fact, the whole of Standing Order 57, compared with the situation that pertained before the Standing Orders were changed, is totally unsatisfactory. This matter has been the subject of some considerable discussion between me and various officers, and it has caused some concern. I take the point the honourable member for Mitcham has made: it is impossible for an ordinary member to move the adjournment of the House, even though a majority of members of the House may wish the House to adjourn. The motion must be moved by a Minister. Although there is always a possibility, providing that there is a constitutional majority of the House, that Standing Orders could be suspended for this purpose, it is not always possible in an evenly balanced House such as this to bring that situation about.

Mr. Millhouse: I'm not sure even that could be used.

Dr. TONKIN: It has just occurred to me that that is one way out of it. Presumably this Standing Order

prohibits private members from moving the adjournment and presumably Standing Orders, if they prohibited private members from moving the adjournment, can be suspended to enable private members to move it. That matter might have to be tested some time. The whole Standing Order is most unsatisfactory, and I quote it for the benefit of honourable members as follows:

A motion for the adjournment of the House may be moved only by a Minister—

That is objectionable in itself. Then there is the following rather involved sentence:

and shall be moved not later than 10 p.m. on Tuesdays and Wednesdays and 5 p.m. on Thursdays, unless otherwise ordered by the House, pursuant to a motion, moved by a Minister—

a Minister again—

at any time, without notice and put forthwith from the Chair, without debate.

I have never seen in any Standing Order in any House anywhere so many governing provisions. It is very reminiscent of the drafting of the former Attorney-General (Mr. Justice King). This means, in effect, that a Minister could move the adjournment of the House at 2.5 p.m., five minutes after the House had actually begun sitting. He could move the motion at any time, and the question must be put without debate, without question, without any qualification at all. As I think this is fundamentally against the process of free speech as recognised by the Westminster system of Parliamentary democracy, I support the motion.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

RURAL LAND TAX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Boundy:

That, in the opinion of this House, rural land tax should be abolished.

(Continued from September 10. Page 646.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. Invariably, members will find a group of people to whom they believe some special concessions should be given. The Government has to decide on the appropriate level of service that it believes the Government should provide and seek the necessary funds in an equitable way. A decrease in revenue in one area means either an increase in revenue from another area or the reduction of the overall level of services. Most taxes and charges in this State affect specific groups: for instance, the liquor turnover tax (because it is passed on to consumers) affects one group of people, the drinkers; the cigarette turnover tax affects one section of the community, the smokers. On the other hand, some members ask why special concessions in rates and taxes should be given to pensioners. We give these concessions, and we also give pensions to rural landowners in respect of land tax. Some people would say that, since a similar concession is not given to other forms of payment of land tax, the concession should not be given to rural landholders. However, the honourable member wants to remove rural land tax altogether and give a further concession to rural landholders.

Mr. Chapman: And to others.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This motion is for rural land tax to be abolished, and it is in relation to rural land that the concession is proposed. The corollary of that is that we have a reduction of about \$1 000 000 of services or that we increase land tax on the remaining land to recoup that amount of revenue. The overwhelming majority of land tax is paid by urban dwellers and urban industry and commercial enterprises, and only a small part of land tax is paid by holders of rural properties. They receive

a considerable concession, and that is in addition to provisions we now have for giving them subsidies on rural water supplies out of the revenue raised from the those who pay urban land tax and water rates. The honourable member wants to provide more. With great respect, there are limits to which we can go.

The fact that some other States have abolished rural land taxes does not mean that is right to do so, and I believe that the present division of responsibility between urban dwellers and rural holdings is in no way really to the disadvantage of holders of rural property, who receive concessions in a marked degree not available to others in the community. At the same time, they seek that we should extend services to provide to them similar services to those existing in urban areas, as far as practicable, and, as a result, a wide series of subsidies and supports of rural dwellers occurs in our budgetary provisions. At this stage I do not believe we are justified in going further. I believe the present division of responsibility in tax is reasonable. There is an exemption of \$40 000 before tax is payable on land used for primary production, and that is as far as the State can reasonably go now. I do not intend to transfer this area of revenue responsibility to people in the urban areas of this State, and that would be the result of what the honourable member proposes, unless specific services were to be reduced.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): In supporting this motion, I consider I am consistent, because in the previous Parliament the Opposition originated two amendments to the Act to abolish rural land tax. I moved one and, from memory, the member for Light moved the other, and many reasons were advanced in support of such actions. When new taxation is imposed, and to substantiate the extension of existing taxation measures, the Treasurer always compares us to other States. To substantiate his arguments, he refers to present Liberal or Liberal and Country Party Governments in other States and past ones in Canberra. On the same basis, I suggest that we should follow New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and Queensland and abolish rural land tax. This afternoon the Treasurer referred to taxation imposed on smokers and drinkers, but there is a difference, because those people do not pay a tax in respect of their livelihood, whereas a primary producer does.

Perhaps some say that may be a greater reason why such a person should pay tax on land, but there is a great difference between land owned by a primary producer and the plant involved in secondary industry. A farmer pays tax on land that is his only means of production, whether cereal growing, raising stock, or pasturing. His land is a tool of trade, as is his plant. However, secondary industry does not pay a tax on its plant or on its means of production, but pays a tax only on land on which the establishment is located. I know of an establishment in a country town that pays about \$100 to \$200 land tax, but on that site is situated an industry which has plant worth about \$250 000 and which produces between \$1 000 000 and \$2 000 000 worth of commodities a year. Yet no tax is paid on that plant. The Treasurer spoke about the houses of the city dweller. I am not saying that the country dweller should not pay land tax on the land on which his house stands. When the Treasurer was asked recently what revenue would be received from rural land tax, he replied, "\$1 250 000". That figure did not include rural land within the metropolitan planning area.

It amazes me that this sum seems so close to sums given previously, yet the amount of revenue expected from land tax for the whole State this year is between \$18 000 000 and

\$19 000 000. I am sure the average country landholder is paying much more in land tax than he was paying previously, and with the implementation of the equalisation plan all landholders will be paying more. I therefore consider that the sum quoted by the Treasurer is small. I consider that this tax should be abolished for the reasons I have given. Many other examples of rural land tax inequities can be given, so I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 655.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): When addressing myself to this Bill previously, I said that the retail shopkeepers in Rundle Street had been told by the Premier and me to consult their own organisation, the Retail Traders Association. They have now done that and they were told in strong terms that the majority of retailers in South Australia did not desire any extension of shop trading hours. As proof of that, I would like to quote a letter I have received from Mr. V. F. Whittenbury, who is a Director of Judds Shoe Stores Proprietary Limited. The letter states:

For your consideration and information I enclose a copy of a letter I have written to Mr. Millhouse. I sincerely trust you will oppose his legislation so that stability and sanity will survive in our industry.

That letter is important in itself because it refers to the stability and sanity in the industry, the words of a person who is engaged actively in retail trading and who would understand it in its entirety. For my benefit he enclosed a copy of the letter sent to the member for Mitcham, as follows:

Re trading hours: The report in this morning's *Advertiser* indicates that you do not understand the issue of the so-called "Rebel Traders". With the exception of three or four craft type bric-a-brac traders, the others already have extended licences.

He is referring to the exempt shops in the city. The letter continues:

They are only pressing for extended hours for the owner shopkeeper who does not employ labour. The introduction of unrestricted trading hours will bring chaos, hardship, and bitter employee relations in an industry which has managed stability, efficiency and good public relations, despite keen competition. Please consider these points:

1. Do you also propose to allow shopkeepers to determine employees wage rates, sick leave provisions, penalties, holidays, etc.?
2. Have you considered the implications of large-scale employment of casual labour?
3. To be fair, will you promote the opening of post offices, banks, Government offices, etc., on Friday night and/or Saturday morning?
4. Do you realise that the vast majority of our customers are completely satisfied with the 45 hours per week we now open, and consider that they have ample time to shop?
5. A roster system is of no value to the average shopkeeper employing relatively few assistants. If his shop is open, he must be there.

I urge you to reconsider your proposed legislation.

I do not know whether the member for Mitcham replied to that letter; I have not been given a copy of the reply, if he did reply. The letter is pertinent to this issue. It is from a man who has been engaged actively in retail trading for many years and he opposes strongly any extension to trading hours. I have received that impression from all the traders to whom I have spoken, with the possible exception of those traders at the east end of Rundle Street who want to open, or who did want to open. During the past four or

five Friday evenings my inspectors have been consistently visiting that area and have given me a full report on what has been happening.

When the shops first opened on a Friday night some months ago, about 2 000 people were in the area to look and possibly buy, but I believe they were there mostly to look because it was entertaining; it was a concept of shopping we had not seen in Adelaide for three or four years and obviously it aroused some interest. On the last four or five Friday evenings, only one of the rebel traders has been open; the others having failed to make a success of this venture. In fact, last Friday evening only about five people were in the whole area. That was an indication of whether people wanted late night trading and whether it would be successful.

I do not believe it can be successful in that area, because of the limited number of goods available to customers to purchase. What would be the situation if we extended trading hours in all parts of the city? Obviously the Government could not extend trading hours only in Rundle Street, or Melbourne Street or some other place, because it would encourage unfair trading practice, because trading would be conducted to the disadvantage of other retail traders. If extended trading hours were allowed on a large scale, what would be the outcome for businesses in Rundle Street East? I suggest there would not be five people in the area, because of greater competition and the limited range of goods available. These people would be hoist on their own petard.

Mr. Millhouse: So you're protecting them from themselves.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is right. If these people thought about and examined the situation they would back off. The other matter to be considered (and it is an important matter in my view and has been considered by the instigator of this matter) is that of the increased costs that must obviously occur in this industry if trading hours are extended. The extension of trading hours has been tried before when Bills to this effect have been introduced. If extended trading hours are to be introduced at night obviously penalty rates in that area will also have to be increased, because employees working in that industry will be working more than the prescribed number of hours they are required to work under their awards.

Alternatively, if a roster system could be arranged they would be working outside the spread of hours, so the rate could be double time or time and a quarter; I am not sure of the award provision. Will the shopkeeper pick up the tab for the additional wages bill, accept it and pay the wages of his staff who are required to work overtime or outside the normal spread of hours? I say advisedly and strongly that he will not do so and that the additional costs will be passed on to the general public, thus deliberately creating an inflationary situation. Prices would soar for food, clothing and other commodities and we in South Australia would be heading for a disastrous situation.

Let us examine in some detail the history of this type of legislation. For a long time in South Australia we heard nothing about extended shopping hours. Suddenly, in 1971, the then Leader of the Opposition (now Senator R. S. Hall) introduced, on October 20, 1971, a Bill to extend Friday night shopping. The Bill was defeated on Party lines or thereabouts on April 6, 1972, by 25 votes to 16 votes. All members who were engaged actively in Parliamentary procedures at that time would remember the activity that the measure created. The Government believed it had a responsibility to try to solve the problem. The Hon. Dave

McKee (Minister of Labour and Industry as he then was), on March 15, 1972, introduced a Bill into the House which, in my opinion, was a sensible Bill.

It extended trading hours on Friday night and included a provision to ensure that appropriate penalty rates were paid to employees working in the industry affected. The same situation would apply equally today. If this measure were successful (although it does not take into consideration penalty rates), it would have to be amended for that purpose. I can see no other way out. The Hon. D. H. McKee's Bill was passed in this House (as was expected) and was amended in the Legislative Council. However, following a conference of House managers agreement could not be reached on the Bill. So, both Senator Hall and the Hon. D. H. McKee introduced Bills at a time when the impasse was rife.

No-one could deny that, in 1972, there was agitation in the outlying metropolitan area (not so much in the city) to extend trading hours. Both Bills failed as the parties could not agree. About three years later, without any agitation or public consensus that would make anyone believe honestly there was a desire for night shopping out of the blue Rundle Street traders decided to open and to abuse flagrantly the law. No-one apart from those people is agitating strongly for extended trading hours. If other people are agitating for extended trading hours they are doing it mildly. I have heard no other agitation other than that from the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: You're hoping the problem will go away.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is so. In fact, it has already vanished. The only person in South Australia that I know who is still agitating for extended shopping hours is the member for Mitcham. I have already said that only one of the six shops that was opening some weeks ago is still opening. To the best of the knowledge of my inspectors who are watching the matter closely no other traders are opening. In fact, there is no customer demand for them to open. I put this question to the member for Mitcham and ask him to reply to it: "Why have these traders closed down?" If there was customer agitation and people were still visiting the bottom end of Rundle Street, surely those businesses would survive. It is a positive fact of life that these traders have decided to close their shops because they are not getting customers. They opened at first regardless of what the Premier and I said to them, of inspectors visiting their shops and telling them they were breaching the law, or of being summonsed to appear before the Industrial Court. For some weeks the venture was probably profitable, but only in isolation.

Had these traders had competition in other areas of the State they would have done no better trading after hours than they would do trading during normal working hours. Certainly the situation has changed, and one must ask why. Obviously, they are getting no customers. It is fruitless for them to open when it is completely worthless to them. The only person (and I understand his name is Micklem) who opened last Friday evening had only one customer in his shop. As I can see no reason for this legislation, I oppose it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The Liberal Party supports the liberalisation of shopping provisions for the South Australian community.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you support the Bill?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am about to comment on that. We want the liberalisation of shopping provisions,

but it will be necessary to vote against the Bill for various reasons. The Bill, as presented to the House, excludes eight of the appropriate sections of the original Act as it relates to shopping hours. The whole of section 15, which relates to trading hours, would be deleted under the provisions of this Bill. We believe it would be unfortunate, even though we support the extension of shopping hours, especially the provisions that should apply. In no way will our voting against the Bill be taken, I hope, by people outside the House (people in the media and others), as opposing the liberalisation of shopping hours.

It is Liberal Party policy, and it has been enunciated clearly by the Leader of the Opposition in a press statement on August 26, this year, that we support this concept. The member for Mitcham has introduced the Bill in such a form that it will delete all reference to shop trading hours.

Mr. Millhouse: Tell us why? You've said it three times now.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If I can continue putting the case both for and against, I should like to do so. First, we should assess the effects of removing all restrictions whatever. The cost of commodities would no doubt increase if this measure were passed. It is difficult to ascertain exactly what that increase would be. On my assessment after talking to many traders, it seems that the cost of one to two evenings shopping would increase the wage cost by 10 per cent to 20 per cent. If it did, and as wages make up 30 per cent of the gross income, it would seem that automatically there would be an increase in the retail cost of goods of between 4 per cent and 7 per cent. It also seems that opening shops generally on one evening a week for three hours would increase the overhead costs by 2.9 per cent.

These figures have been backed up somewhat by the increases in cost in other States. Another effect that seems likely is that we would lose Saturday morning shopping. Unfortunately, I think a certain amount of trading-off is being done. Some people say that we either accept Saturday morning trading, with no extension of shopping hours, or we lose Saturday morning and have one evening a week. I believe this trading-off has been done deliberately by the trade unions concerned, to make sure that the community voted against extended shopping hours in the referendum. I believe that was the main reason why that referendum was lost. I think most people would accept that the community wanted extended shopping provisions.

Secondly, I think the complete removal of all shopping-hour restrictions would cause problems regarding public transport. It is obvious that extended public transport facilities would have to be made available in the evening if all shops were open, and, if all limitations were removed, extensions would have to be made not only on Saturday morning but also on five evenings during the week, and we must assess the cost of that to the community.

The other point is that obviously the extension of shopping hours on a general basis would automatically tend to force a change in the regulations regarding employees and, instead of working on the so-called five-and-a-half day week, employees would be brought back to a five-day week. That would mean that the extra half a day would be worked at overtime rates, which also automatically would increase costs. Therefore, if all reference to shop trading hours were removed from the Act, it would become obvious that costs of retail items would increase and the cost to the community, particularly through public transport, would be increased.

Mr. Millhouse: Have all those things happened in Victoria and, if so, will Victoria revert to some system of control?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think the position is widely accepted and if the honourable member had done his homework, which obviously he has not done, he would know that Victoria works on a somewhat different Industrial Code from the Industrial Code here. Shop assistants in South Australia work on a five-and-a-half day week, and in Victoria they work only a five-day week.

Mr. Millhouse: You're avoiding my question. Has it increased costs in Victoria?

Mr. HARRISON: I rise on a point of order. This is not Question Time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport has the floor.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am amazed that the member for Mitcham obviously has not even looked at the real differences between Victoria and South Australia. There have been increases in cost in Victoria, and the member for Mitcham probably knows that. He must also appreciate that there is a five-day working week there for shop assistants and a five-and-a-half-day working week here. The situation regarding costs is entirely different. The Liberal Party would liberalise the shopping provisions in several ways, and I will deal with them briefly. First, we would extensively increase the list of exempt goods. When one examines that list carefully, one sees that it is ludicrous at present. A person can buy basically any beauty item and certain items of food. All other goods, for some reason or other, seem to be unobtainable. I am surprised that a person can buy panti-hose and stockings, but not socks.

Mr. Millhouse: Doesn't that show the absurdity of the whole system?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I agree, and that is what the Liberal Party is looking at. The provisions are ridiculous. A person may buy a rabbit but not a rabbit cage. I could put to the member for Mitcham a provision that all shops could stay open on one evening a week, which means we still must retain these clauses, but it would give greatly improved provisions. Is the honourable member opposing that? I suspect that the member for Mitcham has not thought through the implications of the provisions that he has thrown forth. Secondly, the Liberal Party would extend the list of exempt shops, and I will give some examples in this regard. Pet shops are not exempt but aquarium shops are. I think that is ludicrous. In other words, a person may buy a fish, but he may not buy other pets. Again, a person may buy a rabbit but I am not sure exactly where, because any shop that could be classified as a pet shop is not listed under the fourth schedule in the Industrial Code.

There are other ludicrous examples. One more recent example is that the Government removed from the exempt list and placed under the powers of this clause the word "yards". This meant that new car yards, used car yards, caravan yards, and other types of yard were no longer able to trade whenever they liked. I have already spoken out against this provision. The implication is that a person can buy a used car only in the restricted trading hours in the Act.

Groceries can be bought during the lunch hour or between 5 and 5.30 p.m. (although there is provision in the Act for a person to buy many food items at other hours), but it is not possible to buy a used car in half an hour. Obviously, a person would need to shop around among several dealers, test drive the vehicles, and invariably take

a vehicle for a mechanical inspection. That could not be done between 5 and 5.30 p.m. by a person who worked from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., and it could not be done during that person's lunch hour. Therefore, in the interests of consumer protection, car yards should be removed from the Act or, if the Government is not willing to do that, they should be placed in the list of exempt shops. All yards could be included in the exemption. I make a plea to the Government to do this quickly, because I understand that the new provision has come into operation from August 1 and that it is causing much difficulty in the sale of used cars.

By comparison, a person may buy a block of land or a house, either of which involves a larger sum of money, but he cannot buy a car, which also may involve a large sum of money. The third area that we are concerned about is the small family shop. If all reference to trading hours was excluded, one effect would be that the small family shop would be under a great threat. Unfortunately, the member for Mitcham has not mentioned this matter, but I think he realises that that would be the case.

The corner shop survives because it can trade in certain items on the exempt list, whereas it would be uneconomic for a supermarket to open just to sell those goods. The small family business must be encouraged, and it is unfortunate to see more and more of our business going to larger and larger organisations. Therefore, we are looking specifically at provisions to allow the small family-owned business shop to remain open, and here we would place a provision that the shop must employ only family labour. In this way, we believe that a small family concern could remain open and trade efficiently in a large number of items, without necessarily requiring all shops to be open on five nights a week. One unfortunate aspect relates to the efforts being made to try to give Adelaide a festival atmosphere. That is an excellent move that I applaud, but how could we create a true festival atmosphere when the centre of the city is sterile commercially after 5.30 p.m. on week days and after 11.30 a.m. on Saturday? The way to create a festival atmosphere is to ensure that the centre of the area, where people are likely to come, is commercially viable at all hours.

Mr. Millhouse: How would you do that?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Think of the commercial aspects of Kings Cross.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Kings Cross has certain advantages that Adelaide could well adopt.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you mean that type of area?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am not sure what the Minister means by the commercial aspects of Kings Cross.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's a very commercial place.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport must continue with the debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think that an area such as Melbourne Street, North Adelaide, could well be allowed to develop so that most of the shops trading in certain items could be allowed to stay open. By doing so, we could create a real atmosphere, particularly on a Friday evening, and that would apply even in the Rundle Street area. I see no reason why, under the provisions I have outlined, most of the Rundle Street traders and the so-called rebels who have been remaining open could not remain open under the extended list of exempt shops and exempt goods. That is our policy, because we support the liberalisation of shopping provisions and hours, par-

ticularly in relation to exempt goods and exempt shops but, unfortunately, we will vote against the Bill because of the way in which it has been presented. If it had been presented without completely removing all the sections from the original Act, we would have amended it accordingly and supported the amendments right through.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was ill considered.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Mitcham speaks, he closes the debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have to demolish only two Speakers: one is the Minister of Labour and Industry and the other is his pretender shadow, the member for Davenport.

Mr. Max Brown: He won't be his shadow for long.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will see about that. I will begin with the Minister. He made a start some weeks ago and said that he was against the Bill, and this afternoon, having had sufficient time, apparently, to prepare his remarks (he has had about five weeks), he made two points only in opposing the Bill. The first is that it is only a little group of Rundle Street traders who wanted it, and their venture has failed and, secondly, that it would create inflation in South Australia.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And there was no demand for it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I will take off from that point. I told him when I spoke in the debate previously that the response on *This Day Tonight* was overwhelmingly in favour of it, but he brushed that aside by saying that it was of no value whatever and that it meant nothing.

Mr. Max Brown: And ill-organised.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Let me tell him of a survey which has been conducted on this matter and which I think will show that it is more than the Rundle Street East traders who have this in mind.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Who conducted the survey?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Peter Gardner & Associates, of 152 Magill Road, Norwood, ran the survey between September 15 and September 29, and 818 people, selected at random, and representative of the metropolitan area by age and sex, over the age of 18 years, were polled. So it was, as far as one can tell, a reasonable guide to opinion on this matter. Let me tell the Minister now (because I can see that I have managed to kindle some interest) what the result was. The result was that 87.4 per cent thought that shops should be allowed to remain open; 7.9 per cent thought that they should not be allowed to open, and 4.6 per cent expressed no opinion. That is a fairly strong majority.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Where were all those voters at the referendum?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let the Minister ask his colleagues in Mawson, Playford and Tea Tree Gully where those electors were. Those are the facts. The survey shows that well over 85 per cent of people were in favour of these hours, and it is not satisfactory from the Minister's point of view or from that of his Party to concentrate on what has happened in Rundle Street East. While what happened down there was the immediate trigger for my introduction of the Bill, I have always (and I think my record will stand up on this) supported the liberalisation of shopping hours in South Australia. That is one thing I put to the Minister. He was good enough to tell me that he was going to quote from the letter which Mr. Whittenbury wrote to me. If the Minister could

quote from only one letter from one trader in favour of his point of view he has not done very well, but it absolves me from doing more than quoting one letter against him. I will quote from a letter written by Mr. Ian Hall, who is the Secretary of the Kangaroo Island Tourist Association, and whose letter is on letterhead of the District Council of Kingscote. His letter, dated August 28, states:

It is with great pleasure that I learn of your stand on behalf of the small business houses, or in fact any privately operated business, inasmuch as you propose to present a bill to Parliament which will provide for a less restricted avenue of trading hours. Although I very much personally support your point of view I also am anxious to let you know that the Kangaroo Island Tourist Association has twice considered this subject within the last 15 months and is very keen on having the local shops extend their trading hours. However, some of the members of the local retail traders' association do not share the same enthusiasm for this proposal and accordingly the matter has not been discussed at their meetings. Mind you, so widespread is the apathy amongst the retail traders that no meetings have been conducted or attended by the retail traders' association within the last 15 months. Consequently, the tourist association has made little progress in this matter. The main purpose of this letter is to indicate local support for your proposed Bill and a copy of this letter has been forwarded to the member for Alexandra, Mr. Ted Chapman, in the hope that he will appreciate that some members of the community and local traders are anxious to have trading hours extended. I wrote back and said to him, in part:

I hope, in view of what you have written, that your local member (Mr. Chapman) will support me when a vote is taken on it.

We will see whether or not he does. That is one letter which matches the one letter the Minister was able to bring forward. I will now deal with the question of inflation and increased costs, and here I come to the point made by the member for Davenport also in opposing this Bill. I point out that the proposals which I make in the Bill are substantially in effect in Victoria now, although there is, I think from memory, a prohibition against opening from Saturday lunch time and on Sunday. I would cut the lot out. That is a small rider. I remind the member for Davenport about what happened in Victoria. The former Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, announced that the Government intended to liberalise shopping hours. Immediately there was an outcry from those with vested interests, probably the same as those who spoke to the member for Davenport. Sir Henry said, "All right, we won't have any restrictions at all. You can work it out for yourselves." Despite the howls of anguish, he introduced a Bill substantially the same as mine that was more sweeping than the Bill intended to be introduced originally.

If the member for Davenport or the Minister (if he can understand me) look at the figures, they will see that there has been no appreciable increase in costs in Victoria as shown by the consumer price index. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and there has been no suggestion in Victoria about having restrictions because of increased costs or because of unrest among shop assistants. One wonders why the Government is so bitterly opposed to this legislation. We know that there are Labor Party members who support it, but, as they are bound by a Caucus decision, they can do nothing. The only explanation is that the Government is in the hands of trade unions, and particularly of the union controlled by Mr. Teddy Goldsworthy, who is one of the strongest supporters of the Premier at the Trades Hall and in the Labor Party. Neither the Premier nor the Government can afford to offend him. We therefore get the obstinate, unthinking attitude of no change, because the union has said there will be no change.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I have never consulted him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister may not have consulted Mr. Goldsworthy, but he knows about it, because Mr. Goldsworthy has made no secret of his opinion on this matter. That is the Government's situation: let us now consider the comments of the member for Davenport. I suspect that he was arguing against his own convictions and that he would like (as I know several other Liberal members would like) to be able to support this Bill, because after all it is a principle of liberalism that people should be allowed to make their own decisions. That is the principle that impelled me to introduce this measure. Why should not shopkeepers, traders, and others decide when they shall open and close and make the necessary arrangements with their employees? No member of the Liberal Party can answer that question in any way other than that these people should be allowed to do that.

The passing of the Bill does not mean there need be any change in the present hours of trading. If people do not want to trade at night, at the weekend, or early in the morning (if there is no demand), they do not have to change from the present hours. The Bill leaves it to individuals to decide instead of having the decision made for them. The further the member for Davenport went in trying to apologise for opposing the Bill the more difficulties he fell into. He gave examples of exempted goods and of the anomalies. As I have said, they cannot be overcome, because, whilst we have a list of exempt and non-exempt goods, there will always be anomalies. The further we go in exempting goods (and apparently the Liberal Party wanted to go further, although we were not vouchsafed details) the more anomalies there will be, the more absurd it will be, and the less reason there will be for having any restrictions on trading. Both the Liberal Party and Labor Party are opposed to liberalisation, because of pressure from different quarters. The pressure on the Government is from the unions, and on the Liberal Party it is from retail traders, who have determined their attitude.

I say to members of both Parties opposing the Bill that it is inevitable that sooner or later there will be a liberalisation of shopping hours in this State, I believe to the extent that I advocate in this Bill. This issue will not go away, as the Minister and his colleagues hope it will. It will always be there, and sooner or later there will have to be (if they are still in office) a change of heart by them. The sooner the liberalisation comes the less painful it will be to the Minister and the Government. I say the same thing to the Liberal Party members. Obviously, this Bill will not pass, but it will not be the last time the matter is introduced. Members of the Labor and the Liberal Parties will eventually be obliged to change their minds, as members of the Liberal Party are at present being obliged to change their minds on another matter of fundamental importance. I am disappointed at the attitude of the Parties and am surprised at the so-called arguments advanced against the Bill, but I warn both sides that this is not the last time the matter will come before the House. It will not be allowed to disappear from this place or from the community, and the changes that the Liberal Movement is advocating will come sooner or later.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (2)—Messrs. Boundy and Millhouse (teller).

Noes (41)—Messrs. Abbott, Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Corcoran, Coumbe, Duncan, Dunstan, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, Mathwin, McRae, Olson, Payne, Rodda, Russack, Simmons,

Slater, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Virgo, Wardle, Wells, Whitten, Wotton, and Wright (teller).

Majority of 39 for the Noes.
Second reading thus negatived.

LITTER CONTROL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 997.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): This Bill is identical to the Bill introduced by the member for Eyre during the last session, so much so that the second reading speech given by the member for Chaffey was exactly the same as the speech made by the member for Eyre in August last year. At that time I told the House that the Government believed that there was a need for improvement in litter control but that such improvements ought to be included in the Local Government Act. The Bill I introduced subsequently, which passed all stages in this House, contained those provisions, but regrettably, because the Bill had not passed all stages in the Upper House when Parliament was prorogued because the Opposition used its numbers to throw out the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill, the Local Government Bill lapsed automatically.

Mr. Mathwin: But—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Glenelg can put whatever construction on it he likes. I am giving him facts. He might not like them, but they are the facts. The Government is adding one or two other provisions to the Local Government Bill that lapsed automatically with the prorogation of Parliament. This Bill will be re-introduced during this Parliament, and it will contain the litter provisions contained in the original Bill. These provisions will meet the needs of the Bill introduced by the member for Chaffey. The Government believes these provisions ought to be in the Local Government Act, and it is taking the necessary steps to have them there. Had it not been for the event to which I have already referred, the provisions would already have been law. I hope they will be law soon. I ask the House to reject this Bill so that the provisions can be put where they ought to be, that is, in the Local Government Act.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONCORDE AIRCRAFT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Becker:

That this House object to the Concorde aircraft using Adelaide Airport as an alternative landing site on a regular basis.

(Continued from October 1. Page 999.)

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment): Last week I obtained leave to continue my remarks because I was expecting some information to be released by the Commonwealth Department of Transport that would provide the official result of noise monitoring programmes that that department undertook when the Concorde was in Australia recently. Regrettably, that report is not yet available, but I am told it will be available some time next week and it will be made public. Nevertheless, I believe the House will be interested in the measurements taken and recorded by an officer of the State Environment Department who visited Tullamarine when the Concorde was in Melbourne on two occasions about two months ago. The measurements show that on one approach the Concorde registered 115.5 decibels, compared to the Fokker Friendship (92 decibels) and the Boeing 727 (94 decibels). The measurement taken the other day for the Fokker Friendship was 81 decibels, for the Boeing 727 it was 93

decibels, and for the Concorde it was 114 decibels. Members can therefore see a fairly significant increase in the noise level of the Concorde when compared to other aircraft. The environment officer also stated:

The monitoring sites were all at approximately the same altitude as the airstrip. However, at Adelaide Airport, noise problems associated with the approach to or take off from the eastern end of the runway running south-west to north-east would be made worse by the increased elevation with increased distance from the runway and the houses extending to the perimeter of the airport. Thus the Concorde approach would have a considerable impact certainly from the airport back to North Adelaide, and may be even farther if the approach was made from the north-east. If the approach was made from the sea, runway 05, the North Glenelg residential area would be greatly disturbed. At Adelaide it is proposed that the Concorde will take off out to sea on runway 23, thus the major noise impact under these circumstances would be upon the North Glenelg residential area where levels would be expected to be unpleasantly high.

As a result of that sort of report it is clear that the State Government is not pleased about the prospect of the Concorde's visiting Adelaide. We are looking forward to the information we will get from the office of the Commonwealth Minister for Transport on this matter. Even if the Concorde stands up to tests conducted by the Commonwealth Department for Environment and uses Australia as a base, Adelaide was to be used as an alternative airport only on days when there could be problems at Tullamarine Airport. However, members would be aware that the State Government has resisted firmly any proposals put forward from time to time by Commonwealth Governments to use Adelaide Airport between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. We believe that the curfew that now exists is in the community interest. We are unwilling for aircraft to land at Adelaide, unless the reason is urgent. That has always been the State Government's approach, and we hope it will continue to be our approach.

The State Government certainly does not want the Concorde aircraft to land at Adelaide Airport during the evening. Approaches have been made to the Australian Government indicating the line of approach I have just outlined, and saying that we are far from pleased with its suggestion that Adelaide should be used as an alternative airport for the Concorde. This approach is made despite estimates varying from a suggested visit of Concorde every three years to a visit every nine years by its being diverted to Adelaide. It is clear that the tremendous noise associated with the Concorde would mean it would not be in the community interest for a State with an airport in a built-up area to allow Concorde to use the airport.

Mr. Mathwin: What is the length of time involved?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not have information about the time taken from take-off to the time the noise level abates, but I will undertake to give it to the honourable member. I have been pressing at Ministers' conferences that once the report of the Commonwealth Department of Transport is available, the Australian Government should set up a public inquiry to take evidence from the community about whether the fringe decision should be made to allow the Concorde to use Australian air space. Naturally, people living in Melbourne could well share the views of the South Australian Government and wish to make submissions about the noise problem the Concorde could create if it used Tullamarine on a regular basis. Despite this matter, the State environment departments are obliged to ensure that, before any decision is made to use Tullamarine, apart from this State Government's objection to the Concorde using Adelaide Airport, that the use of Concorde in Australia, and the build up of

fleets of Concorde that could follow, would not have an extremely harmful effect on mankind generally because of its likely effect on the ozone layer. I refer to the following article about the ozone layer:

Concentrations of less than 0.8 p.p.m. have been shown to interfere with the functioning of human lungs. Adverse effects of vision have been detected at levels between 0.2 and 0.5 p.p.m. The health-giving properties of the gas are mythical. It isn't ozone that smells good at the seaside; there's no more there than at ground level anywhere. However, we'd be lost without the stuff. The stratosphere, the region of the atmosphere about 15-60 km above ground, contains ozone in concentrations ranging up to more than 10 p.p.m. This is the shield that stops most of the sun's skin-cancer-causing and sunburning ultraviolet radiation from reaching us. If that shield goes, we fry, which is why people were so concerned a few years ago when it was suggested that exhaust gases from supersonic passenger jets would set off reactions in the stratosphere that could drastically reduce ozone concentrations. I have read several articles of this nature and a number of scientific journals on the subject. In fact, I have obtained as many of them as I could and, after reading them, one concludes that little is known about the ozone layer, because little research has been done and because interest has really arisen only in the past few years. The conclusion generally reached is that the use of the Concorde will probably not cause any significant reduction in that layer; the study undertaken by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation confirmed that view. I can find no real authority that goes further than that. Frankly, I believe that the risk we may be taking in interfering with the ozone layer cannot be taken lightly. Accordingly, I believe that any public inquiry into the matter should look at that aspect as a far more important issue than the noise problem referred to by the honourable member.

The South Australian Government has been active in trying to reduce as far as possible community inconvenience at Adelaide Airport. An officer of our State Planning Office, with a member of the Australian Government, has formed a committee to ascertain where a suitable alternative South Australian airport could be sited in years to come. That work is proceeding satisfactorily and a recommendation should be made soon. The South Australian Government has gone to considerable trouble to protect the metropolitan community by insisting that the curfew to which I have referred is applied. Generally speaking, it is fair to say that the Government generally accepts the point made by the honourable member in his motion, which states:

That this House object to the Concorde aircraft using Adelaide Airport as an alternative landing site on a regular basis.

The motion would be more significant if it were amended in a minor way. Accordingly, I move:

To strike out all words after "House" and insert "support the actions of the State Government to reduce noise levels of aircraft at the Adelaide Airport, and further support the Government's objective of preventing the Concorde from using Adelaide Airport as an alternative landing site on a regular basis."

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I accept the amendment and I thank the Minister and the Government for their concern about and consideration of this matter. The Minister has given figures that prove that the Concorde could be intolerable to the residents of Adelaide, and the aircraft could be flying into Australia at least three times a week. Even though it may not be forced to come to Adelaide each time, we could expect it to come here sometimes. We in Adelaide are concerned, and the amendment gives us what we are seeking. I commend it to the House.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

CADET CORPS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Mathwin:

That this House disagree with the decision of the Commonwealth Government to abolish all Army Cadet Corps in Australia, because it will take away from the youth of Australia another opportunity to develop self confidence and responsibility; and calls upon the Commonwealth Labor Government to rescind its decision to abolish School Army Cadet Corps forthwith.

(Continued from September 10. Page 658.)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): When I sought leave to continue my remarks, I said that I would examine the Millar report, to which the member for Glenelg had referred, and also examine the reasons for the Australian Government's decision not to retain the Army Cadet Corps in schools throughout Australia. I think I stated that the cost to the Australian Government of the corps was about \$7 000 000, but that was not correct. The amount spent on Army cadets in Australia is \$10 000 000 annually and, if naval and air cadets are included, the cost is about \$11 500 000.

Mr. Mathwin: It's only \$1 000 000 in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, that is correct. I also stated that I believed that there probably were better areas of training for the youth of this country than those provided by the corps, and I think it is fairly significant that the leaders of the Commonwealth Department of Defence recommended to the Minister for Defence that he no longer continue the Army School Cadet Corps, because they considered that the Government was not getting full value for the money spent. I can understand people becoming a little uptight when something that was inaugurated more than 100 years ago is done away with, but when one considers that this does not encroach into every school (it operates only in a few selected schools, and I think about 16 in South Australia have cadet units operating), I think one realise that this activity is extremely limited.

I could quote several matters for the honourable member, because I have looked at reports, and comments have been made to me by Commonwealth Ministers, not only by the Minister for Defence. I spoke to the Minister for Tourism, and Recreation, because that Minister is involved. I think it is interesting to note that a survey conducted by the National Youth Council of Australia at the request of the latter Minister found that cadets were among the least popular forms of youth activity among all age groups studied. The Minister indicated recently that he did not support the retention of cadets as a means of youth training. Further, the Commonwealth Minister for Education has stated that, if the corps did not exist, it would not be introduced today for educational reasons. Therefore, the only justification for continued funding by the Department of Defence relates to military value, and I think the Commonwealth Minister for Defence (Mr. Morrison) explained recently that his decision to disband the Army Cadet Corps was made on the recommendation of the Army, which had assured him, as I have stated, that the cost effectiveness of cadet training could not be justified from the viewpoint of its contribution to defence.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Was that from the Army?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is a statement by Mr. Morrison, referring to his advisers.

Mr. Mathwin: Not the Millar report?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It was from the Army, not from the Millar report, which related to the Citizen Military Forces, as well as to cadets. I will refer later to that report. The authorities assured the Minister that the fact that the effectiveness of the cadet training could not be justified from the viewpoint of its contribution to the

defence of Australia was essentially the case since the Australian Government had taken action to increase the effectiveness of the Army reserve and since emphasis on military-type activities for the school cadets had been reduced in favour of adventure training. I think that in South Australia we have an example of that. I think it is the Pembroke school that has gone into adventure training to take the place of the cadet unit that existed previously. I think it had its passing-out parade before the decision to abolish the corps was made. The Leader of the Opposition indicates that the parade will take place next week. Other schools are considering the position realistically and taking action wisely. More benefit will accrue to the students than was the case with the cadet training. I want to let the honourable member know that the Commonwealth Government's decision was not based on wishy-washy information. The matter was considered by the Defence Force Development Committee (the most authoritative source of advice available to the Minister for Defence on defence capability matters), which formally advised that abolition of school cadets would have no adverse effect on capabilities but would release service manpower for other purposes. The report on the Army Cadet Corps prepared by the committee of inquiry into the Citizen Military Forces (the Millar report) states:

The military value of cadets—

and the honourable member quoted from the report—is small and does not of itself justify the present annual allocation of funds and regular Army manpower.

Those comments were endorsed by the Chief of the General Staff and the Military Board. The report states that the costs and effectiveness of cadet training cannot be justified from the viewpoint of its contribution to the defence of Australia. The military value of cadets so assessed in the Millar report is only the level of achievement reached at the end of their cadet experience, which is about the standard reached in two to three weeks of full-time training in a regular Army recruit training system. That will give some idea of the standard they reached over the period they were involved in the corps. I think that they went in at 14 years of age and went right through to Matriculation or whatever and, if they stayed for the whole of that period, their effectiveness has been gauged to amount to only two to three weeks of full-time training in a regular Army recruit training camp.

The maintenance of the corps is an expensive scheme that directly costs the Army about \$10 000 000 a year; it employs 330 regular Army personnel and 35 civilians, and there are subsequent indirect commitments not included in the cost. These indirect costs have been estimated to represent about 100 man years of effort or at least another \$1 000 000. So, the real cost would be nearly \$11 000 000 for the corps throughout Australia. Of that sum, about \$1 000 000 is spent in South Australia, and the scheme reaches only 5 per cent of boys in the relevant age group, or about 35 000 out of 697 000 throughout Australia. One can see that it has had an impact on only a small number of people compared to the total and, moreover, the scheme is available to only 16 per cent of the schools with male enrolments.

Mr. Morrison, the Minister for Defence, said in Parliament recently that the \$10 000 000 needed to support the Army Cadet Corps each year or \$11 500 000 when the cost for Naval and Air Cadets was added could buy a squadron of Hercules aircraft. I am sure that the member for Glenelg will recall the recently reported comments by an Army officer during a training camp for cadets at the El Alamein camp. The officer (Captain Kevin Freer) is reported to have said of training there:

What we are doing is not realistic in the Army sense. We increased the number of incidents to keep interest up. The lads are not interested in walking for hours with nothing happening as in a real situation. We are looking for them to enjoy themselves, not trying to make practical soldiers.

That was his view on the training involved with cadets, and no doubt he was speaking from experience. The Millar report also made the following point:

That cadets' military activities ceased on discharge and "only a small proportion of them" ever went into full-time or reserve armed forces.

While it is true that more than 50 per cent of entrants to the Royal Military College, Duntroon, are former school cadets, only about 36 per cent of them say that it was their cadet service that influenced them to apply. The Millar report also tells of youths who were deterred from any form of military service because of their experience in cadet corps. The report also makes the following point:

It is very clear that funds spent on cadets could be spent in ways which would add more to Australia's present defence capacity.

I appreciate that the decision to disband the corps will probably come as a disappointment to many boys concerned, their parents and schools, but I believe that the decision will be accepted by those who are genuinely concerned with the need to protect our national interest by ensuring that our defence resources are not used for activities that do not contribute to our defence capabilities. I reiterate that this is a matter entirely for the Australian Government and I believe that, although the honourable member has framed his motion in such a way that the House disagrees with the decision of the Federal Government to abolish all cadet corps in Australia, I have to disagree with him. I cannot support that contention. I believe that, if the Australian Government by this decision has taken an opportunity away from some of the lads who attended schools that were able to avail themselves of this training, and if it wants to spread itself more evenly than in the past, it ought to come to the party and help the States to finance more youth activity than it has previously.

In other words, the \$10 000 000 that has been saved as a result of the disbandment of the corps should not of necessity go to defence spending. I believe that the Australian Minister for Tourism and Recreation should ensure that the Australian Government spends more than it has in the past in this way (and I am not criticising the sum it has already provided to the States), so that the kinds of activity being developed at Pembroke School can be developed in many other schools throughout the State. For this reason I move to amend the motion as follows:

To strike out all words after "House" and insert "considers that the Australian Government be urged to provide more funds for youth activities in this State following its decision to discontinue the Army Cadet Corps".

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the amendment, because it would create the opportunity for a greater participation by all youths in some form of useful activity, not necessarily combined only with Army training. The member for Glenelg has said that the present number of cadets in South Australia is 1 668, and most of them are from colleges and private schools. I do not want to cast aspersions on the corps, the Army or the corp's organisers, but it appears to me that, regarding the sum of public money spent, greater value could be obtained for more youths in some form of training not necessarily devoted to Army training. I question many of the arguments of the member for Glenelg. I should like to know how many of the cadets follow a career associated with the training they received in the corps and whether the

training gives them any assistance that could be of value to them in other fields. The member for Glenelg made the point that this was the chance for some activity or holiday. When I interjected "Holiday?", the honourable member said it was a holiday and the chance to get away and have good training.

Mr. Mathwin: I was referring to under-privileged children: don't misrepresent me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg will have the chance to reply when he closes the debate.

Mr. SLATER: I do not believe they are under-privileged children: rather they are privileged. It costs the Australian taxpayer about \$10 000 000, and in South Australia the cost for the cadet corps is \$1 000 000 a year. We must consider whether value is being received for the outlay of such a considerable amount, and I do not think it is. The Millar report suggested that the corps had small military value and some indefinite educational and social value. The report's most significant recommendation states:

That the Australian Government consider fostering regional youth co-ordinating committees designed to draw on all relevant resources within the country, including the armed forces, to extend existing opportunities for youth and provide new avenues for them to develop their skills to live in society and in the whole Australian environment, to enjoy a richer life, and to be more fitted for service to their fellow men.

That is in line with the amendment moved by the Deputy Premier, and I support that amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I, like the Deputy Premier, am surprised at this motion, because it is not the sort of thing that should concern us as a State Parliament. The member for Glenelg has invited me to speak in the debate, and I support the motion, although with considerable reservations. Therefore, I oppose the amendment, although there is nothing wrong with it as an idea. The member for Gilles said that the most significant recommendation of the Millar committee was the last one, but he conveniently overlooked the first one, which is a direct negative of what the Commonwealth Government has done and which states:

That the present Army cadets system be retained, with modifications, and on a totally voluntary basis during peace time.

My support for the motion rests solidly on that recommendation. The Millar committee was originally appointed to inquire into Citizen Military Forces, and I give full marks to the present Commonwealth Government for introducing that inquiry. Previous Liberal and Country Party Governments had done little for the C.M.F. for a long time. The committee made valuable recommendations on the role of the C.M.F., and those recommendations are now being implemented. The Government then asked the Millar committee to report on cadets, and paragraph 1.1. of the introduction to the report states:

In a letter dated May 28, 1973, to the Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry into the Citizen Military Forces, the Minister for Defence requested the committee to undertake, in conjunction with that inquiry, "a full examination of the usefulness and cost of the Australian (Army) Cadet Corps, and to form an opinion as to whether or not the continued maintenance of the school cadet system is justified".

The Millar committee did that and made recommendations, but the Commonwealth Government is now flying in the face of those recommendations. Why the devil did it get a report at all, if it did not intend to accept the recommendations? It is all very well for us, having nothing to do with cadets, to make a snap judgment on political

grounds about whether the decision is right or wrong. The Millar committee spent more than 12 months inquiring, and came to the conclusion that the system should be retained. Now, we are invited by the Government, in opposition to the motion, to support the Commonwealth Government in its ignoring of the recommendations of the Millar committee. If it had not been for the recommendation that was made after much consideration, inquiry, and inspection, I would hesitate to support the member for Glenelg. From my experience I know that the cadet system is not 100 per cent satisfactory, and we would be silly to say that it is. Few school cadets enter the C.M.F., because many of them are put off because of their experience in the cadets.

Many cadet officers, with the best will in the world (and I am not criticising them), have not had any military experience; they are school masters in uniform, and cannot do the job. The member for Florey would appreciate that situation better than any other member. These people do not have the capacity and, therefore, they mess it up. Cadets are fooled about, do not like it, and are put off the Army system. I find it incongruous to see a young man with flowing locks poking out from a forage cap. To me it is wrong, although they tell me I am a square to say that. Perhaps I am. Standards in the cadet corps are not high, and I would have had doubts about the value of the system if it were not for the fact that the Millar committee came to an opposite conclusion and recommended that the system should be retained. That is why I support the motion.

The system has now gone: it depends on how long the present Commonwealth Government will last whether the system has gone for ever. The Liberals have said they will reverse that decision, and in the light of the committee's report and recommendations I think they should. If they do not, I suggest an alternative to the present system. C.M.F. units should be empowered to do what the Territorial units do in the United Kingdom (I think, too, regular units do it, because there is a mixture now): they have their own regimental cadets, and have the responsibility of looking after and training them, at school level, and in imbuing them with a sense of identity with the regiment at school level. That is something we could do. The University Regiment, which has two affiliated school cadet units (Christian Brothers College and Pulteney Grammar School), looks after them to some extent. If there is a rifle-shooting or other competition in which we are all involved, cadets come with us and we help them with their training. A number of our best junior officers have come from those schools, especially Pulteney. I cannot think of anyone from C.B.C. at the moment.

However, that is the idea of the system and it does, to some extent, work. I think the system could be further developed. If the cadet corps, as such, is to be disbanded it would be a good idea to introduce regimental cadets along the lines followed in the United Kingdom. That would be a more satisfactory system, because members of the Australian Regular Army and the Citizens Military Force already in C.M.F. units would have the opportunity to train cadets. I suggest that alternative. I support the motion. I am not against the principle behind the amendment, but I believe it is definitely second best, and I oppose it at this stage.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I am utterly opposed to the motion and support the amendment. It will take me only a short time to say exactly where I stand on the issue of cadet training. It has nothing to do with what the

member for Mitcham would suggest is my political standpoint. The purpose of military training of any kind is to instruct the participant in the art of war and to develop within the individual an ability to destroy and kill. The very suggestion that this type of training should be inflicted on children of impressionable age, whether voluntarily or otherwise, is despicable, immoral, and unworthy of the support of any individual, let alone any Parliament.

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): It never ceases to amaze me that some members opposite are the first to complain about the types of film that are unsuitable for children or about the types of programme that are shown on television. They maintain that films and television programmes that show acts of violence are against the best interests of the community. They are also the first to complain that firearms are available to teenagers who can wreak destruction on mankind. Also, they are the first to try to instil fear into the community that Australia will be over-run by hordes of invaders from Asia or some other part of the world who desire to take over Australia.

It would be more to their credit if, instead of supporting the cadet scheme, they agreed to spend about \$10 000 000 (the sum it cost, to maintain the cadet scheme) on aid for the people they believe will invade Australia. The money could be used to provide medicine for, or food to alleviate the problem of starvation in, other parts of the world. As the Deputy Premier has pointed out, the \$10 000 000 expenditure is not simply being discontinued for the sake of the sum involved; it is being stopped on advice of the Chief of the General Staff, who maintained that the training the cadets were receiving was practically worthless, as any full-time member of the Regular Army would glean in a fortnight the same knowledge it has taken a member of a cadet corps to learn in an entire course.

Mr. Mathwin: It took more than a fortnight in 1939.

Mr. OLSON: We all know what happened in 1939.

Mr. Mathwin: You must have forgotten about it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. OLSON: One can understand the desire to make teenagers in our community better citizens. If the sum of \$1 000 000, which is the estimated sum necessary to train a cadet corps in South Australia, was used to build community centres in under-privileged areas, areas such as I have the honour to represent, that money and those centres would be a greater value and benefit and would make children better citizens than they would be under the present cadet training system. About 1 668 cadets are able to participate in the cadet training scheme in South Australia. If \$1 000 000 was provided for the purposes I have outlined, many more of our younger people could become better citizens and be in better physical condition.

We need no additional cadet training corps but additional community centres, with trained people who can impart knowledge to any child who is interested in, say, sport where discipline is needed. Today's children do not have to be stood over with discipline; they must be talked to so that they understand what is being said. Many people are trying to stand over our young people and are not getting far with them. People have to speak the language that children understand, and interest children in pastimes that are of benefit to them. It is in that way that people will get the support of children and make better citizens of them. The member for Glenelg said members of the cadet corps are being trained in fieldcraft, in the art of prismatic compass reading, and cleanliness. I could imagine going to a community centre at Osborne or Taperoo and saying that

I wanted to spend \$1 000 000 to make children clean. I know how far I would get if I did that. The money involved in this scheme would be spent more adequately if it were devoted to fostering greater interest in community centres in this State.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

SAILORS AND SOLDIERS MEMORIAL HALL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence, recommending no amendment to the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the report be noted.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I was a member of the Select Committee, and I believe that I most certainly state the views of members on this side when I say that we are fully in agreement with the report.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMISSION)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 1135.)

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): When I spoke last evening, I reminded the House about the size of the two largest districts in South Australia, compared to the size of various oversea countries. I stated that Spain, which I visited last year, was the third largest country in Europe, comprising about 180 000 square miles, whilst the District of Frome comprised 148 000 square miles. We can understand how some countries of Europe are smaller than one of the larger districts in South Australia. I also pointed out last evening that more than two-thirds of the District of Frome was outside council areas, and the member for Eyre has the same problem.

The average man in the street may say that that is an advantage, because there is little work for a member to carry out in those areas, but there is much more work, particularly regarding roads, outside local government areas than inside them. There are 11 councils in my district, and I have always made it a golden rule not to interfere in local government. I tell people who approach me with local government problems to go to their councillor, as such problems are matters for the local government body. My role is to liaise between councils and government, and that arrangement works well. All councils realise that, and it saves the member much work.

However, that is not the case in the outback area. There are many thousands of kilometres of roads outside local government areas. Apart from the main arterial roads, the Highways Department tries to keep roads to the various station homesteads in reasonable condition, and many hundreds of kilometres of road are serviced in this way. This involves much work for the member because, there being no council to approach, he must be approached. The member for Kavel stated that in country areas members spend many hours travelling. He stated that it took much longer to travel to a meeting than was spent in conducting the meeting. A fortnight ago I went to Copley, to a gymkana. I had been asked to donate and present a trophy. The round trip was more than 800 kilometres.

I spent ten hours driving there and back, three hours at the sports meeting, two hours doing local business in the township, so I was away from home for 15 hours.

All members of this House represent people and, if everyone had the same amount of interest, it could be said that there was an argument for one vote one value, especially if the population was evenly distributed in every district. However, in a district in a country area we have more private enterprise than anything else, and anyone connected with private enterprise has more problems and business interests. This creates work for the member. A member in a country area would have more work to do than would a member in the metropolitan area. The figures for the United Kingdom were referred to yesterday, and anyone would think that, as it is a densely-populated country, one could argue for one vote one value there, but the figures quoted show that there is a variation in districts between 26 000 and 90 000, and from that we can see the difficulty that we would have in South Australia.

District offices for members have been referred to and, on paper, an excellent amenity seems to have been given to members. Having an electoral office helps considerably but, unfortunately, some country members have difficulty knowing where to put the office to gain most service from it. With the co-operation of the Minister of Works, the member for Eyre and I have our district offices in Parliament House. Yesterday, the member for Goyder said that this was an excellent set-up, but I thought he was speaking from inexperience: I could not agree with him. It is the best of a bad situation. It is nowhere near a satisfactory arrangement, but it is better than the old system, under which we used to have to do our own work. At present, with my office in the city and when the House is not sitting, I have to travel about 320 kilometres to the electoral office and back each day, necessitating an 18-hour day. On the other hand, if the electoral office was in Peterborough, which is my biggest centre, I would have a 160 km round trip to the office. That would also be a burden, and I do not think people from Oodnadatta would come to Peterborough, or that people from Eudunda would travel 160 km to Peterborough. The member for Goyder was wrong when he said that it was an ideal set-up to have my office in the city.

Country members are given few additional privileges from those of metropolitan members. Before I took on Frome, the then member was permitted two commercial flights a year to Oodnadatta to service that area but, when I took over the area, the commercial flights were discontinued. I asked the Premier whether he would allow me to have a charter flight in place of the commercial flights. It was agreed to, and soon thereafter another small company commenced commercial flights to Oodnadatta, so I asked the Premier to rescind his decision to give me back the commercial flights, and he did that. I can fly to Oodnadatta and spend four hours there before flying back, at a cost of \$120 to the Government.

Mr. Whitten: How many constituents are there in Oodnadatta?

Mr. ALLEN: That is beside the point, but they have to be represented, too. Every member is allowed six single flights a year anywhere in South Australia, and each member is also allowed an interstate flight once a year. Those six single flights anywhere in South Australia are of little use to me, because, apart from the flight to Oodnadatta that I have mentioned, the only other commercial flight in my district is to Leigh Creek. If I fly

there, I have to drive 160 km to Adelaide and then fly 320 km back, whereas if I drive to Leigh Creek the distance is 320 km. So, it is quicker to drive to Leigh Creek than for me to motor to Adelaide and fly there. I have the second largest district in the State, yet no more facilities are granted to me than are granted to metropolitan members, and that needs some alteration.

The member for Kavel referred yesterday to education. This is another problem that members in large country electorates, particularly the member for Eyre and I, have to cope with, because of the distinct problem regarding education in the outer areas. I was approached last weekend at the Blinman races by a station manager who was paying 42 per cent of his salary to educate his children. That is a bad state of affairs, and it illustrates the additional work that members in the outer areas have to help people with their education problems. Yesterday, the member for Stuart referred to reversing the charges for telephone calls to the electorate office, but I know nothing about that. I can ring my office here and reverse the charges, because my office is in Parliament House, but I know of nowhere where I can ring an electorate office and reverse the charges. It could be said that I am unlucky in representing such a large area, but the people are wonderful, the hospitality is excellent, and I have no regrets about representing these people. I do not believe that a member should be asked to carry such a heavy load, and that is why I hope that we will see some amendments to the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the Bill. One of the statements made during the debate was probably the truest statement that has been made thus far in the general sense, namely, "There is no perfect voting system, at least not permanently." That is a fact of life. Members on both sides have mentioned various voting systems throughout the world, and the one that tended to be considered with the greatest degree of vigour was the West German system. Recently, I had the opportunity of discussing with some of the originators of that system in Bonn the detail of the system as it has applied in West Germany over a long time, and I found that, with changed political fortunes and with difficult attitudes and approaches, even the West Germans are no longer completely satisfied with their system. There is strong talk of change to their system, which has existed since the end of the Second World War.

In Sweden, the people say that a few years ago they recognised that their system, which was similar to that of West Germany, was a workable and worthwhile system; yet at present, in a Parliament of 350, the voting is evenly divided on vital issues, the ruling Socialist Party, plus the Communist Party, having only the same number of votes (150) as have the other three Parties together. Such is the case with major issues, even including defence, the Budget, and all other matters. In recent years, these issues have been decided on the flip of a coin. With the stalemate situation that arises where there is an evenly divided House, so that the processes of Parliament and Government can continue a final decision has been made on the flip of a coin as to whether the Government's programme or the Opposition's programme shall be effective for the period before the next debate on the vital issue. They recognise the need to offset this situation and, in future elections, they will have an uneven number of members of the House, hoping they will be able to have a situation where there will always be one more vote on the one side or the other.

I come back to the situation close at hand. The Bill is a series of proposals put forward by various members of the House, accepted by the Government, and placed in a Bill which could only be called accommodating. I believe that I can say that, in the sense that the Government, at the election, indicated that it wanted one vote one value. It did not spell it out further than that. I was proud to suggest that there should be an independent electoral commission, and that provision has been included in the Bill in a genuine effort to ensure there will be no future gerrymander. It may be argued whether this Bill introduced by the Labor Party will allow such a situation to arise, whether it is a gerrymander, a Donnymander, or a Hudsonmander. Because of the statements of the Minister of Mines and Energy, it will be important for the Australian Labor Party to ensure that it appears before the commission and indicates its desire for a situation that does not allow for disproportionate distribution. Perhaps the Labor Party will be willing to do so, but I hope that the Government's representations to the commission will be to ensure the prevention of a gerrymander.

It will be the responsibility of the Government, others in the community, and Opposition members to make representations to the commission, by whatever means the commission allows, to ensure that representation will be a true reflection of the desires of the people, and that in determining the physical boundaries all features contained in the Bill will be properly considered. I refer particularly to the situation applying to members who will continue to represent country interests. I recognise the importance of distance and the ability of individuals to represent their electors properly, and this will be an important issue to be determined by the commission. It is important that the problems outlined by the member for Frome should also be considered: I believe that the Bill provides that that will be the situation. I am sure that Opposition members will ensure that proper consideration will be given to all these matters. In South Australia we cannot accept any form of final distribution that fails to allow the people of this State to move away from what has for many years been claimed by people involved in politics as an intolerable voting system. The responsibility of all members is apparent, and one that I accept. I trust that all members will accept this challenge applying to their determinations as presented to the commission.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill to its second reading, because I believe it can be improved. We have not been told the name of the judge who will be a commissioner: other members of the commission have been named by their position, but they will not live forever. We are passing a Bill that gives power to political Parties to appoint people in future who may have a political bias. These Parties may be more concerned with that approach in relation to the officers than with their duties. I claim that my district has the largest number of electors of any Liberal-held seat in this Parliament. It contains 33 schools or places of learning, each with a committee, a council, or a welfare club, each of whom makes calls on its member of Parliament. I do not mind this responsibility, but it is a heavier workload than is present in any other metropolitan seat, including those of Mawson and Tea Tree Gully. In addition, there is not a reasonable public transport service for many of these areas. The Minister has denied private transport to many schools in what is the coldest and wettest part of the State. I am sure that my district has been neglected more in the past five years than has any other metropolitan district: it has the largest number of

unsewered houses, the biggest waiting list for new schools and new kindergartens, and it has the largest waiting list in the metropolitan area for moneys to be used on unsealed roads.

Mr. Jennings: Because of its member.

Mr. EVANS: The people I represent know how often I have raised their cause and tried to rectify some of the errors of judgment made by this Government. I refer now to country areas. Whatever Party represents them, no doubt people living in these areas are the most disadvantaged people in the community concerning the benefit of Government facilities. Immediately the Government thinks of farmers it attacks, because it hates farmers. The Government's philosophy shows that hatred, and its actions prove it. In rural areas there are large and small towns, and many people living in those areas support the A.L.P. There are probably a few A.L.P. supporters left in your area, Mr. Speaker. Where would those people prefer to live if they had a family of six children? Would they prefer to live in a country town with no hospital, no doctor, no television (but I am not sure that that is an asset), no kindergarten, little remedial teaching assistance for children who are handicapped in any way, and no dental facilities? Even if they seek professional advice in any area, they must travel to a major regional town or to Adelaide. It is a real burden on these people.

People in country areas are the most disadvantaged section of our community, especially those people who are average wage-earners. Many country people cannot afford the telephone, let alone the cost of trunk calls. As was stated in a recent letter to a newspaper, country people cannot gain the benefit of any bargains offered in the city. The cost of every facet of living, except housing rental charges and meat, is dearer in the country than it is in the city. Yet Government members rely on country people when elections are held for the Senate, the Legislative Council, the House or Representatives and, to some extent, the House of Assembly. I can see a real need for country people to have the advantage of representation. If it is not to be Parliamentary representation, by having the numbers in this House (and I do not object to that theory), we must bend over backwards to offer them and the members serving them the extra services.

What use is public transport to a pensioner who lives in a country town where there is no public transport? Those pensioners do not get concessions, and cannot live in the city, because accommodation is not available for them. They are marooned with no real benefit accruing from what they helped to provide in the early part of their lives. How many people living in the country and receiving an average income can come to the city and enjoy the benefits of the Festival Theatre that cost \$15 000 000 of taxpayers' money? How many of them can gain any appreciation from that great monstrosity to them that has used \$15 000 000 of taxes? Country areas have been represented by 19 members in this place but, under this measure, it is possible they will be represented by only 13 members. I accept that concept if we offer country people and the members serving them other services.

The average age of most farmers is about 55. My son wished to become a farmer, but I recommended that he should not do so because I believed the future in that area was not stable. What chance has a young person from the country to use the facilities of adult education or to learn a trade or profession? He has no chance. Young people in the metropolitan area can attend evening classes. Some evening classes are provided for ethnic groups, and I approve of that. Adult education courses are offered to people

so that they can learn different trades and professions from those they now practise. People living in major country towns have that opportunity, too, but that is not the position of other country people. That matter should be seriously considered.

In country areas the burden is placed on the family to take children long distances to play sport, whereas in the city children can catch a bus or go by car to the playing field. Professional or semi-professional coaches are available in the city, but are not available in remote areas of the State. Young people in country areas have little chance of learning better skills in sport unless they are freaks, born with extra sporting talents, and a scout brings them to the city to an environment which is totally strange to them and which they cannot understand. Are country people within driving distance of entering an apprenticeship? Can they catch a bus to their employment? What opportunities are there for young people in the country to learn a trade?

Those people are forced to stay on the farm or to take on a job that they do not like. They might leave home and come to the city into an environment to which they cannot adapt and which they do not understand. All these matters place country people at a disadvantage. I hope we can do something to help in this area. The member for Mitcham referred to the situation in 1969. The member for Victoria would certainly remember that situation, because I was a problem to the Party then and he was sent to "throttle" me—in other words, to stop me from making comments. The Leader of the Party wanted me to toe the line and accept the 47-seat plan. At that time, I believed in an independent commission, which was to be more independent than the one provided for in this measure. The political Parties had to agree on who should be appointed to that commission. I believe there is room in the long term for political manoeuvring with appointments that can be made under this measure.

Mr. Jennings: That's a reflection.

Mr. EVANS: It is not. The member for Ross Smith and other members cannot guarantee the type of politician that can be elected in future. This measure will be part of the Constitution and cannot be removed. We do not know what type of member will be elected in future.

Mr. Jennings: In that case, it's a reflection on the people of South Australia.

Mr. EVANS: People living in other democracies in the world have trusted the people they have elected, only to find out that they have elected the wrong people. The member for Ross Smith would be the first to refer to them if he thought that was a method of attacking my argument. He knows the countries to which I am referring. I have no grouch with the judges of this State. However, politicians are human beings and power for the sake of power, with egotism, can do strange things to respectable people. There is merit in saying that the appointee should have 75 per cent support of Parliament. I know that the chances of this being achieved are remote, but if it is not achieved the results can be serious. Our appointment of the Ombudsman has caused no complaints. I make no accusation against any persons concerned or about the appointment the Government will make, but no-one can guarantee that that is a safeguard.

Mr. Jennings: Will you ever get a complete safeguard?

Mr. EVANS: No, but we can get closer to it and satisfy Party politicians on both sides by voting in the House. New section 83 (b) provides that one of the terms

of reference for the commission is the population of each proposed electoral district. The provision does not refer to the number of electors, and the commission can create districts in the city with numbers of electors smaller than the number in districts in the country. Doubtless, some people who work on these terms of reference had that in mind, and they will submit that there are in the community unnaturalised persons and many children, and so the numbers should be lower. People who rely on the 10 per cent tolerance being given in favour of the country could be surprised. New section 83 (b) will cause some people to lean heavily on the commission to use the tolerance of 10 per cent to allow lower numbers to the metropolitan area.

I do not deny that politicians represent the people in the community, but the Constitution deals with electors, and they elect politicians. The Government says that increased workload for politicians is part of the deal, but I do not believe that the people who are not electors create enough workload to warrant our having this provision in the Constitution. I have stated in three debates since 1969 that having equal numbers in electoral districts is the perfect system, and that should be the rule when all else is equal. All else is not equal in South Australia and never will be. The Adelaide metropolitan area holds the balance of power, with 28 members representing it and only 19 representing the remainder of the State. That is an advantage of nine in voting power in the House.

Mr. Whitten: What about when it was 26 to 13 the other way?

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member was not here then, but he will find that everyone in the House supported the change to the present system, which at the recent election provided an evenly divided vote and an evenly divided House. If you had made a different decision, Mr. Speaker, there would have been a different Bill before this House. Doubtless, my Party may have had some different terms of reference if it had been in power, but I do not think the principles would have been very different. I do not think that the principles that the Leader of the Opposition was pushing were far from this Bill.

I support the second reading, but Parliament has greater responsibility to people in the remote areas who may not have the opportunity to use some of the facilities that even the farmer who is better off can use. We need those people for public and private work and to keep the State running. I hope that the Government does not believe that it can kick those people in the teeth and forget them because it does not get a majority of their votes.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I sincerely support the Bill without tongue in cheek, but some members have had their tongue in their cheek. One thing I want to put straight is the incorrect and completely misleading statement that the member for Fisher has just made about every member supporting the last change. The facts are (and the member for Fisher conveniently ignored them) that, when the Millicent by-election was held as a result of the findings of the Court of Disputed Returns, the then Leader of the Liberal and Country League (Steele Hall) accepted a challenge issued by the Premier that, if Labor won the by-election, he, Steele Hall, would give effect to Labor's policy as enunciated before the 1968 election but if the Liberals won Millicent he would give effect to the L.C.L. policy. He had the courage to live up to his convictions; because Labor won, he gave effect to its policy. That is why there was a unanimous vote in this House, but the member for Fisher has forgotten to mention any of that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why have you changed that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We have not changed our policy. Before the member for Kavel came here, the Labor Party regarded that as a stepping stone to the policy of one vote one value. Before then there was a two to one loading in favour of the L.C.L. that had been introduced in the 1930's. It was designed to keep that Party in office for 20 years and it kept it in office for 33 years. It was the greatest gerrymander Australia had ever seen. It was even worse than Bjelke-Petersen's gerrymander, and no-one would have thought that possible. South Australia was recognised throughout the world as having the worst gerrymander of electoral districts in any place that claimed to be a democracy. It was a disgrace.

Regarding what the member for Fisher has said about "this monstrosity of a Festival Theatre", I say shame on him, because the Festival Theatre is one of the greatest things South Australia has. That is typical of the thinking of people, such as the member for Fisher and other members of his Party.

Mr. Mathwin: Give him a drink of water.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Never mind that. If the honourable member had stayed in England he would not have had to suffer the humiliation of the gerrymander imposed for 40 years by the Party he chose. The trouble with members opposite, who are giving tongue-in-cheek support to electoral reform because their Party's policy demands it, is that they know that this is the end of the road. No longer will politicians from the Liberal Party be able to manipulate electoral boundaries and the number of electors in districts so that the Liberal Party can gain office without anything like a majority of voters.

This is the biggest problem they face today; the day of reckoning is here. The plain facts are that this manipulation time is over, and it is no wonder that members opposite are so upset and are looking to the future with considerable worry because they know that, for the first time in South Australia's history, they cannot gain office unless they get a majority of votes, and they have not done that since Adam wore short pants. Sir Thomas Playford continued as Premier without a majority of votes for so long that the members of his Government believed that they were annointed, not appointed. No longer can the Opposition rig electoral boundaries. Let us look at what happened in the various districts. What happened to that little whippersnapper from Davenport at the last election?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I should like the honourable Minister to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member for Davenport, the new young member for Davenport—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would like the honourable Minister to withdraw the remark he made.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order. I think that, under Standing Orders, it is necessary to apologise and then withdraw the remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Minister to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I certainly withdraw the remark and point out—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker; Standing Orders specifically state that the honourable member is to apologise and to withdraw the remark. I ask the Minister to apologise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Minister to apologise.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If it will help the member for Davenport, I apologise and point out to him that at the recent election he lost 15.3 per cent of the Liberal votes. No wonder he is looking for apologies, and no wonder that he and his colleagues are in trouble. What happened to the member for Torrens: 15.1 per cent of his vote went down the drain.

Mr. Coumbe: I'm still here.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Good on you but, with a bit more drift, the Liberal Movement will take over from the honourable member. Let us have a look at the Leader. He lost 14.5 per cent and, on that score, he got the leadership, because the member for Light lost 15.4 per cent. The member for Glenelg lost 14.6 per cent of his vote. These are the people who want to get back into office with a reduced vote. They want to go on gerrymandering as they have done in the past.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has the floor.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I feel deeply sorry for Opposition members, because they are in a real bind. They are in a situation where they know that time has caught up with them. They know that the electorate is seeing through their sham. They know that in 1965, 1968, 1970, 1973 and 1975 the Premier went to the people and sought a mandate to introduce electoral democracy in South Australia. Today, the day of reckoning is here, and no longer will electoral gerrymandering be an election policy. No longer will the Premier and all other democratic individuals have to go to the people and ask for their support, because the Labor Party has consistently got that support through the ballot box at election after election.

This evening, we are facing the third and final step in introducing democratic Government in South Australia. The first step was to the credit of the Steele Hall Government, when it introduced an electoral redistribution Bill and, as a result of that, we had a distribution by the very people who were this evening criticised by the member for Fisher as not being responsible. They are the very people who will be appointed under the Bill to redistribute in future. When the Liberal Party presented its evidence before the commission, it was represented by Mr. Isaachsen (a lawyer) and the former member for Heysen (Mr. McAnaney). They had no difficulty in presenting a case on the basis of there being a tolerance of 10 per cent; yet the member for Kavel asked last evening how a commission could give effect to a decision that required no more than a 10 per cent tolerance. I suggest that he go to the library, get hold of the commission's report, and see what it did. It had no difficulty, and the Liberal Party representatives had no difficulty in presenting their case; we had no difficulty either.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That was 1968.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It does not matter whether it was 1968 or 1978: it was a 10 per cent tolerance on metropolitan districts. That principle was there then, and it is simply now being applied to districts throughout the State. What we must remember and ask ourselves is one simple question: whom do we represent here—people, sheep or broad acres? Those who represent sheep and broad acres should get out the door now.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I'll get that report.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope you do, and that you read it. Obviously, you have not read that important report of the commission.

Mr. MATHWIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister is referring to members as "you", and I believe that this transgresses Standing Orders. I think it should be "honourable member", when the Minister refers to the member for Kavel.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order, but I am sure that honourable members on both sides are speaking in this way. I should like all honourable members to use "honourable member" instead of "you".

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am disturbed to hear a member of Parliament say that there should be room in electoral redistributions for manoeuvring on a political basis. That is most reprehensible. What we have done in this Bill is completely correct: that is, not only have we provided for terms of redistribution on a one vote one value basis so that every elector in this State has his voice heard in Parliament, but equally important is the fact that no longer will politicians with ulterior motives be able to manipulate things. If the members for Victoria, Mount Gambier, and Millicent sincerely believe that they would not be able to represent a district of about 16 500 electors (because that is what the quota will be), I have it on good authority that the present Commonwealth member for Barker (who is to resign) who has represented districts three times that size for many years, would be willing to take over from any one or all of them. The same applies in the North: I think Bert Kelly would rather have a district in this State of 16 500 electors than the district he now represents. What disabilities have been suffered by the electors because of the size of the Commonwealth districts?

Mr. Venning: You wouldn't know.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unfortunately, the member for Rocky River is so encircled in his little area that he has never got around to the rest of the State. How does he think the Commonwealth member for Grey adequately represents his area?

Mr. Dean Brown: He doesn't, from what I've heard.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is what the honourable member would like to think, but the vote in his district has increased, because that honourable member is capable of representing his district, and any talk of such members not being able to represent adequately their electors is so much ballyhoo and nonsense. I support the Bill and hope that people with a democratic attitude will do the same.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I refer briefly to the ridiculous points raised by the Minister of Transport. I hardly see the relevance of the Festival Theatre to this Bill. The Minister suggested that members who represent sheep and broad acres (even though people may live in those areas) should get out the door. That comment sadly reflects the views of the Australian Labor Party Government, and shows that it has no regard for people in country areas.

Mr. Wells: He said broad acres and sheep instead of people.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister implied that members representing areas with broad acres and sheep in them should leave the House immediately. The Minister raised the old issue of one vote one value, to which I will refer later, and also referred to Commonwealth districts. All Commonwealth districts are far larger than are State

districts. Will the Minister adopt the same argument and ensure that all districts will contain about 40 000 to 50 000 electors rather than the 16 500 provided for in the Bill? If the Minister uses that argument for the country why does he not apply the same principle to himself? He said that the vote for the member for Grey has been increasing: I suggest that at the next election that vote will come tumbling down. If I use the Minister's logic, can I assume that when the vote is reduced the member has not been representing adequately people in his district? To maintain a democratic system of government it is imperative that the voting system be as fair and equitable as possible. Some years ago the distribution of voters in South Australia allowed the Playford Government to be returned to office after receiving less than 50 per cent of the overall vote. That sort of electoral distribution cannot and should not be defended. When I became a member of Parliament 2½ years ago, one of the things I promised myself was that I would never support or maintain an electoral system that was not fair and equitable. This Bill seems to have the fundamental basis for an equitable voting system, although making all districts about the same size does not guarantee one vote one value, as the Premier seems naively to believe. Obviously, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Transport believe the same thing. The phrase "one vote one value" must mean that one vote has the same value as any other vote in electing the Government and that the Government must receive at least 50 per cent of the preferred vote to win. With districts of equal size, it is possible, through an unbalanced distribution of voters, for political Parties to ensure one Party is returned to government with less than 50 per cent of the preferred votes. Dr. Neal Blewett, speaking on *This Day Tonight* this evening, referred to this uneven distribution of voters as a differential concentration of majorities. He is a political scientist who is only too willing to admit that, even with districts of equal size, it is possible for a political Party to gain power with well below 50 per cent of the overall vote.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Was he pleased with that?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: He did not express a view. He was an A.L.P. candidate at the recent election, and he admitted that that could be the case. He was referring specifically in his discussion to this Bill when he used the phrase "differential concentration of majorities". We need to make clear that, even with districts of equal size, there is no guarantee that the electoral system is absolutely fair. A possible, and even likely redistribution of districts of equal size in South Australia on the basis put forward by the Government, indicates that the Labor Party could gain Government in South Australia with as little as 45 per cent of the preferred vote. If such a redistribution does occur, Mr. Dunstan and his Government will be guilty of being hypocrites and of perpetuating the injustices they for so long condemned.

Such an electoral redistribution would replace the Playford gerrymander with a dishonest "Donnymander". However, the basis is in this Bill for a fair and honest electoral redistribution, so it is up to the commissioners to ensure that we in South Australia get that fair and equitable redistribution. To ensure a fair redistribution, I will support the Leader's proposed amendment, because it will guarantee not only that districts will be equal in size but also that a Government will need to receive at least 50 per cent of the preferred vote to govern. If members are sincere in the statements they have made about electoral justice, they will support the proposed amendment. All Government members who have spoken to this Bill have said that it is important to have a fair system

that will ensure that any Party returned to the Government receives about 50 per cent or more of the preferred vote. The Government's Bill has no such guarantee, but the Leader's proposed amendment gives that guarantee, and I urge all members to support it.

Much has been said about maintaining the standard of country representation. One country member already represents almost 40 per cent of the area of this State, and another is not far behind it. It would be unfortunate to reduce severely the standard of representation by reducing the number of country districts by between six and eight. With the ever-increasing power of Government and the complexity of the Public Service (an unfortunate reality in a modern society) it is imperative that a country voter has as much opportunity as a city voter to solve these problems. Improved communications and transport have helped, but the present standards must be maintained. It is for that reason that I strongly support an increase in the number of districts so that the number of existing country districts can be maintained while still achieving the objectives of districts of equal size.

If members are concerned about the welfare of all people in this State they will support the Leader's proposed amendment to increase the number of seats. From the comments of the Minister of Transport, I perceive that he cares about no-one outside the metropolitan area, so I do not expect that he will support the proposed amendment. I hope the Bill is amended, because I would then support it with no hesitation. If the proposed amendments are accepted, the Bill will improve electoral redistribution that has existed previously in this State. The Bill in its existing form will not guarantee a fair and equitable distribution of votes, and people who blindly accept the Bill as fulfilling the concept of one vote one value are fools. It is unfortunate that I should have to say that, because it implies that the Premier, the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the member for Mitcham are fools for supporting that ideal. I support the second reading of the Bill, and I will support the Leader's proposed amendment and the third reading.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): For the sake of South Australia and South Australians, I support the Bill only to the second reading. When this Bill is considered in relation to the rest of Australia, it is a shocker. We know that a redistribution was necessary in this State, but it should be carried out on the basis not of taking away country seats and putting them in the metropolitan area but, if necessary, of giving additional seats to the metropolitan area. It has been stated in this debate, especially by members opposite, that country members in this Parliament are concerned about their seats. I do not accept that: each country member is concerned about country representation slipping away. When one analyses the situation, one sees that most members on this side would, if necessary, have a good job to go to if they lost their seat in Parliament. However, that is not the point. Country representation must be retained in this State.

Why has this sort of legislation been introduced in South Australia? Western Australia considers country areas and has three different categories of district, the number of voters in each district varying considerably. A redistribution is being carried out now in Western Australia, but country seats are not being taken away and given to the metropolitan area. The 24 country seats in Western Australia will be retained, although some will be redrawn. A redistribution in the metropolitan area will provide an additional four seats. The same situation applies in Vic-

toria, where, although the number of metropolitan seats in the Legislative Assembly will be increased, that will not be to the detriment of country areas; additional seats will be provided in areas with increased population.

Why is it that people in South Australia have to accept a Bill such as this? I know that the A.L.P. does not care about country areas, areas where production takes place and from which exports still amount to 50 per cent of this country's exports. The Labor Party considers the economy of this State is such that, if necessary, foodstuffs can be imported from other areas. Communist countries in which production has fallen short have had to purchase grain from Australia because of the lack of initiative to produce sufficient for themselves, and a similar position will develop in South Australia under this Government.

The Minister of Transport has proved this evening that he is not aware of the problems of country representation and the inability of members to service those areas. The Bill can give one value in only one way, and that is on actual numerical strength. It cannot possibly give one value in terms of service by the members to the elector. No member can give the same value in service to, say, 12 000 constituents in a large, sparsely-populated district, in which many of the advantages and amenities of city life are missing, as another member could give to a well-developed and compact district that has the same number of voters. The one value of which the A.L.P. talks is numerical only and is unrealistic in terms of service to the electorate. Although it has been said that members in rural areas represent sheep, trees, and what have you, it is important to service those areas to encourage sufficient people to live there and conduct their vocation, which is mostly farming. The average age of a farmer is 55 years, and this Bill will not assist to get people to live in these areas and so maintain production. We must retain at least the present country representation, but this measure will take away about five or six country districts.

Additional districts should be established to give South Australia 53 districts. Much has been said in opposition to this, particularly by the Liberal Movement, which considers that we should retain 47 districts, but Western Australia and Victoria have given additional representation in the metropolitan areas. The Government in this State has no thought about cost in any other area, so I do not know why it should have in this case. The cost of an additional member is about \$1.50 a head of population in the area, and that is not a high price to pay for good representation or to retain representation in the rural areas, while at the same time creating additional districts in the metropolitan area apart from the present 47 districts.

Getting from one end of a country district to another involves many hours of travelling, even at present, and I know of no country member who works 35 hours a week in his district. Country members would probably work 70 hours a week to attend to the area. I know that the District of Frome is an extreme case, but it enables a comparison to be made between the cost of servicing that district and the cost of servicing the district that the Minister of Transport represents. That Minister had no sympathy for country areas, but he and many of his colleagues could service their districts on a pushbike, before breakfast. The difference in electoral expenses as between country members and metropolitan members is not sufficient. Country members are often away from their families, and they often have to stay away overnight to avoid travelling. I do not think the problems should be increased, but this Bill does increase them.

I am amazed that, although the commission has not been appointed, members opposite seem to have the thing cut and dried in relation to where the boundaries will go. The Minister of Mines and Energy seems to know the position, and the mastermind, with the assistance of the computer operator on the Government side, seems to have got the thing down to a fine art. A member of the Liberal Movement had much to say about the Bill. I have known the member for Mitcham for a long time, having known him in our Party when he was a Young Liberal. Three Young Liberals, namely, the member for Mitcham, Mr. Stokes and Mr. Ian Wilson, had much to say in the Party in days gone by, and the member for Mitcham, at that young age, had an obsession about one vote one value. With an immature mind and with the obsession I have mentioned, in 1955 he entered Parliament, and he has been here for 20 years. Only recently has he started to fly the flag again for one vote one value. I am concerned that his colleague should follow him so closely without any serious thought of or application to the effect that supporting this legislation will have not only on his own area but on country areas in the main. I point out to the member for Goyder that one of the objects of the Australian Labor Party's platform is the democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution, and exchange. One may ask what that has to do with the Bill, but I remind the honourable member that a fire is stamped out in its early stages; one does not wait until a bush fire is raging before taking stock of the situation and doing something about it. I wonder what the honourable member's constituents will say.

Mr. Boundy: They have been asked twice.

Mr. VENNING: I wonder what they will say when they see and read what he has had to say in the debate with regard to country representation and when the A.L.P., having entrenched itself in government, has introduced a further aspect of its policy, namely, that of socialising and utilising the economic assets of the State—and that refers to rural land. I give him a word of warning. I am disappointed that he has taken this attitude, because I have followed his activities in the House and I have seen him cross the Chamber following his Leader like "Mary had a little lamb". Knowing his background, it grieves me to find that he has not decided to think for himself on these matters. Even today in Canberra Senator Hall once again continued the vendetta of the L.M. against members of both Houses of the South Australian Parliament with regard to his attitude towards this legislation. It is most noticeable to those with whom he comes in contact that it is a vendetta, because, immediately he was informed of the Bill before the House, he cited members who would possibly lose their seats as a result of this redistribution.

Comments have been made about why the ex-member for Millicent chose to give away his country seat and come to the city. He has my sympathy in this regard, because of the weight of his duties, and he has not been the only member in my time to do that. I recall that the former member for Frome left the country and took a Legislative Council area in the city. So it is not unusual for country members, after a period of representation, to seek an area that is easier for them to handle.

I support the Bill to the second reading stage and hope that Government members will see fit to support fore-shadowed Opposition amendments to retain country representation to the degree that now applies. I would be pleased to support an increase in numbers in the metropolitan area, but in no circumstances would I do so at

the expense of country areas. As one member has said, it would be like robbing Peter to pay Paul, and I do not believe that that is or should be the intention of the legislation.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I support the second reading somewhat hesitantly, because I certainly do not know all the answers in respect of redistribution, and I doubt whether many members would know all the answers with regard to a perfect or an ideal redistribution. I agree with many aspects of the Bill. I agree to the setting up of the commission and to those whom the commission should comprise, and I believe in taking into account in the redistribution the community of interest. I believe that as few people as possible should be disturbed in the redistribution, and I believe in many other aspects. I believe that the Commissioners' decision should be final, and not subject to Parliament. Community of interest must be one of the most important factors in the commission's decision, and this subject concerns me greatly.

Some time ago I read a report in the *Advertiser* in which it was stated that it was possible that a Norton Summit applegrower might find himself in the same electoral district as a voter in Magill. I think it important that people in a district be politically compatible. One of our former Premiers (Hon. Frank Walsh) said that, because people grew apples in Norton Summit and other people ate them in Magill, it made them politically compatible. Much has been said in the debate about what must be best for the country and for the city and, in so many cases, they have been treated as different identities. In representing Heysen, I represent an electorate that consists both of country and urban interests, and the more I get to know my constituents the more I realise that there is basically no difference between people living in Crafers and people living in Milang: I believe that they are equally genuine in what they believe. They believe, as I do, that they should be entitled to fight for and expect their own rights.

I agree with much of this Bill, but people in my district believe that there should be proper country representation in the same way as there should be proper urban representation. Much has been said about the hardship that blokes on the land are up against at present, and the member for Fisher this evening ably referred to this matter. They are over-taxed and lacking incentive. Private enterprise is being slapped in so many ways: we all know that is happening. I am disturbed that this Bill can only worsen the situation for the man on the land, because it will lessen the effectiveness of his representation. It is extremely important that all people should have adequate representation.

When speaking about country people, I am referring not to those in my district or those in the outer metropolitan area but to those in the sparsely populated areas of the West Coast, the Far North, and the South-East. If we are to be good members and represent our districts properly, we should be able to get to know and understand our districts and the people comprising them. You, Mr. Speaker, and I are new members. I am sure that you will agree that it is extremely important for us to get to know the people of our districts. It is important for them to be near their member, and also important that the district office be accessible so that they can get to know their member and the member will get to know his constituents. I do not agree with the statement by the member for Goyder. It is extremely important that a member should travel around his district, be part of it, and be part of the people living in it. It will be impossible for the 13 or 14 country members (if this Bill is passed) to give their

districts the standard of service and representation that can be given by the 33 or 34 city members. I do not believe that primary producers, graziers, or anyone else on the land think that they are any better than anyone else.

I do not believe that they think their vote is of more value than that of the city bloke. Many people on properties in country areas have chosen to live there and have taken up the hard work, long hours, and lack of incentive that are part of being on the land at present. However, these people should have adequate representation in this House and, for that reason, I believe that this Bill is a discriminatory move against adequate country representation. I do not believe a person's financial value to the community has any bearing on his right to more than a vote equal to that of others. The member for Mitcham said that he wanted a fair electoral distribution: I agree. It would be fair if country people had adequate and fair representation as well as those living in the metropolitan area. I understand the immense problems the members for Mawson, Tea Tree Gully, Elizabeth, and Fisher have in looking after people in their districts, and I appreciate the importance of providing for new seats in those areas.

It is important, whether in the country or city, that people should have as much contact as possible with the member and his office. As a new member, I believe strongly that we should make the district office the centre of our activities. It should be there for all people to visit in order to express their views and their concerns, so that their member can adequately represent them in this House. There should be more seats in the metropolitan area, and the suburbs of Adelaide should be cared for, but not at the expense of country people.

It would be rather nice to forget Party politics, but it is natural for all Parties to be looking to what is best for each Party and not for the whole State. However, it is impossible to forget policies. We all believe in policies, and those policies go to make up Parties. The member for Mitcham has also said that we lack faith in what we believe. Surprisingly, I disagree with that statement. I know what I stand for, and I know what my people want and expect of me. I was elected to represent all people to the best of my ability, and people expect proper representation for all. I believe "all people" are most important words in regard to this Bill. A system of equality of electors in each district does not produce votes of equal value, and it denies the principle of fair and effective representation for each elector. One vote one value sounds great and looks good on paper, but does not work in practice, if people are to have a vote of equal value. The Labor Party concept of one vote one value as applied to South Australia in districts of equal voting population will not achieve a true representation of the overall vote in the House of Assembly representation. In selecting electoral boundaries we should improve the situation for all people in this State, whether they be in the city or the country. All people deserve equal representation. I believe, as do most members in the House, that the electoral system should be indisputably fair for everyone in South Australia. I should like to ensure that no Party could achieve government without gaining 50 per cent of the preferred vote. That certainly does not mean the election of a Government on a minority vote.

The system of one vote one value, or the equality of voters in each district, significantly favours the A.L.P., because it could govern with substantially less than the 46 per cent of first preference votes it gained at the recent election. This Bill will entrench the Labor Party

in Government for the time being. Despite the performance of the Minister of Transport this evening, I am not too pessimistic because I, and many other people in this State, believe that the days of the Dunstan Government are numbered. Today in South Australia we face challenges more serious than we have ever faced before. South Australia is in desperate need of positive action and sound economic management. People are now looking to the Opposition Parties to form a Government that will return stability to the State and security to its people. The rural sector has been totally neglected and abused by this Government. The man on the land is looking to a new Government to give him the opportunity again to obtain maximum efficiency in his enterprise. This change is coming, despite any boundary changes.

The metropolitan or urban dweller is also concerned about job security, unemployment, housing, inflation, and financial mismanagement. People are looking to the Liberal Party and its policies for an answer; they are looking to the Opposition to form a new Government. That time is not far away, because people are realising that the policies of the Liberal Party mean that the price of freedom and doing nothing about it, is losing freedom and being able to do nothing about it. People are looking to the Opposition to form a Government that will bring freedom to the individual.

I believe we can and will win Government in our own right despite the boundary situation. Each vote should have equal value and should be an equal vote for equal representation. All people in South Australia should be equally represented by their member, whether those voters live in North Adelaide or on a station in the northernmost part of the State. I support most of the Bill but I certainly do not believe in selling out country representation.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the second reading. In introducing the Bill the Premier said:

This Bill gives effect to the Government election mandate to ensure that the single-member electorates of the House of Assembly are redistributed on the basis of one vote one value; that is, with as nearly as practicable equal numbers of voters in each electoral district, but with a tolerance from an electoral quota of 10 per cent either way.

On one hand he talks about one vote one value and on the other hand he talks about "a tolerance from an electoral quota of 10 per cent either way". In theory, one vote one value sounds good, but to bring it about in practical terms seems to me to be extremely difficult. How can it be achieved? In 1970 we were told that South Australia had the ultimate electoral system. Not long after many districts exceeded their quota. Today, of the 28 metropolitan seats in the House of Assembly, 26 of them are over-quota. If their theory is accepted of each district having about 16 600 voters, there would be only two exceptions (one Liberal and one Labor seat), because all other seats would be over-quota and there would need to be a tremendous reshuffle in the metropolitan area.

To do this, and to achieve the aim of those who have a fixation about one vote one value, means that some country seats will disappear. Members who represent country seats are concerned about country representation. It would be fair and reasonable to say that country people have a higher recognition ratio of their member of Parliament than do people in the metropolitan area; that is because country people are closer in their relationships, in their community interests and because the country is what it is. Having been born in the country, I know that this relationship is appreciated and protected. I can therefore understand why

country people do not want to lose personal contact with their member.

This contact will be lost, and I feel sorry for people living in country areas because they could be at a great disadvantage. I do not know how that situation can be overcome. I know this measure will be passed in the name of political democracy. Representing a district of 20 000 voters and a population of about 22 000 people, I do not find the work any harder now than it was five years ago when there were 16 500 voters in my district. Looking after a city seat is no problem. True, I could ride a bicycle around my district. I cannot imagine that being done in the Districts of Frome and Eyre if they were combined to give almost the same number of voters.

It would be most unfair to expect one member to represent that area. Irrespective of what is contained in this Bill, the commissioners must make a recommendation which, in some areas, will make one vote one value, even with the 10 per cent tolerance, impossible. One can see why some members are promoting the theory of one vote one value. When we consider the recent election results (and unfortunately the electoral report is not to hand), we see that of the first preference votes cast in the July election there were nine city seats where first preference votes for the winning candidate exceeded 60 per cent of the total vote and that there were 12 city seats where that first preference vote exceeded 55 per cent. Of the 19 country seats, in only four seats did this first preference vote exceed 60 per cent of the votes cast and only in six did it exceed 55 per cent. There is therefore a greater block of votes in certain areas in the city than in the country. If we allocate the preferences fairly and reasonably, we see that, of the 28 districts in the city, 15 have more than a 60 per cent vote for the successful candidate and 11 of them are held by Labor. There are only three districts with under 55 per cent going to the winner, and they are held by Labor. In the country, after allocating preferences, 14 districts have more than 60 per cent for the winner, and two of them are held by Labor.

It seems that there are many safe districts in the country, but that is not a true reflection. If we divide the State into districts of 16 500 voters, we get a different result. Members of my Party have said that certain districts will disappear, and certain other members could have difficulty. The shovelling of votes into the metropolitan area must favour the Government strongly. I cannot understand the member for Mitcham, who in theory supports one vote one value. Our Party policy is along the lines of equal representation, but I cannot understand how the member for Mitcham can support the Bill if he believes he is genuinely working to defeat the Government. He has reminded us of the State platform of the Liberal Party on the matter, and I will repeat it. It states:

The Liberal Party supports:

An electoral system which guarantees as nearly as possible—

- (i) the right to equality of representation for each elector in the State irrespective of where he lives;
- (ii) that each vote shall have an equal electoral value in determining Government.

A preferential system of voting.

For those reasons, I support the second reading, but I am sceptical about the reasons behind the legislation. We on this side may have little or no chance to establish further protection. The Bill will be binding, and the Premier is proud of that. In his second reading explanation he states that all future redistributions will be on the basis set out in the Bill. He also states that there will be

periodic redistributions and that the redistributions that the commission determine will be in accordance with the Constitution. The Premier also states:

In other words, electoral redistributions will not be subject to political manipulation by a Government which might chance to have a majority in both Houses at any one time. . . .

The Premier also stated that the administration would not be subject to political interference. Another provision in the Bill is that we will be unable to amend the legislation once it has been passed. There is also provision for single member districts, and I hope that there is never an alteration of that. I believe it is the fairest system we can get in a Lower House, and I hope that there will not be any moves in future to change it. I have seen the results of the recent election, as prepared for us privately, and the position is obvious to members of my committee and of my Party.

We accept the Government's challenge to accept a redistribution and we accept the policy that has been paraded, but I warn the Government that we will take the fight right up to it. Even though some may believe that this redistribution could be to the Government's everlasting benefit, I believe that it will not be. With the same hard work and determination as shown in the recent election and as shown by the Labor Party, we could win the next State election. We will set out to do that, because it is our role, as the present Opposition, to form the next Government in this State.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Many members have said that they will support the Bill through the second reading and third reading stages, but I will not commit myself to that. If the occasion arises during either of those stages when members are called on to divide and declare their individual position, I will oppose the measure. I agree with the principle of redistribution of boundaries at Commonwealth Government, State Government, and local government level as and when required, and I believe that we in South Australia are in a situation where, in the interests of this Assembly and of the fair and proper representation of people, a redistribution of Assembly district boundaries is necessary.

In recognising that, we should adopt the principle, as nearly as possible, of equality of each elector's vote, and accordingly each such vote should count equally. However, we have an extremely heavily and densely-populated metropolitan centre in Adelaide and a sparsely scattered population in the rest of the State. We must observe the principle of recognition in those scattered districts, where people are entitled to fair service and representation. I was extremely interested to hear the Minister of Transport say earlier that members were speaking with tongue in cheek, on the one hand supporting the Bill and on the other hand knocking the Government for introducing it. I believe that, if the Liberal Party had been in government, we would have seen the need to introduce such a Bill, but several principles in the present Bill defeat our principles. For example, it is only proper that an independent commission should decide and delineate the boundaries of the Assembly districts, but one hardly enters the reading of the Bill before finding in clause 4 that, superimposed on that independent procedure, is a Government direction that there shall be 47 members elected in South Australia. I suggest that there is little point in saying that we will give the matter to an independent commission, and then directing it as set out in clause 4. If an independent commission decides that, to serve properly the people of the State,

there should be more or less than 47 members, I believe that that right ought to remain.

The criteria I support should be laid down and should involve the service to the electors across the State, and it should take into account those measures which will ensure that the people will be served at this level in the way in which they deserve to be served. If it takes 47 or 57, or less than 47 members in the House to achieve this, I believe that the independent commission should decide that. The Minister of Transport said that the Government has had since 1968 a mandate to introduce a Bill to amend the Constitution Act and incorporate the one vote one value principle. He may even have said 1965, but certainly in 1968, 1970, 1973 and 1975 the Minister claimed that this matter was put to the electorate by his Party and repeatedly supported, thereby giving the Government that mandate. I think this is like many other matters put to the electorate in the pre-election speeches: many people do not understand the impact of the remarks and, even if they do understand, they tend to be gullible enough to accept that, when the Government introduces such a measure, it will be fair and reasonable. Despite that, whether or not the public understood the matter being put before them before those elections, let us look back over these years.

In 1970, the Labor Party gained power with a seven majority; in 1973, it had a four majority; in 1975, but for the back-scratch arrangement, it had no majority other than that support from the Speaker. In other words, despite the electoral promises and the warnings of a redistribution on a one vote one value basis and other matters, the Government's position has gradually deteriorated over that period. It has deteriorated mainly in the country areas to a point where the Government is represented only by members in the iron triangle. The Opposition represents all other districts outside the metropolitan area. Therefore, in view of that unique Opposition representation, the Government has no other alternative, in order to erode that area, but to reduce the opportunity for representatives to exist, thereby reducing the number of seats outside the metropolitan area. The Government has not been able to win country seats fairly at the polls, but has progressively lost them. There is therefore no alternative but to introduce this Bill which, whatever may have been spelled out in the Premier's second reading explanation, or promoted from the other side of the House, has the clear effect of an erosion of representation outside the metropolitan area.

The Government has progressively lost representation in the outer areas, and I will refer to a few of those districts. We are still vividly aware of the situation at this year's election in which the member for Mount Gambier replaced an A.L.P. member in a seat held by the A.L.P. for many years. The member for Millicent won a seat in the South-East previously held by one of the Government's members and his family before him for many years. In the Riverland area, the present member for Chaffey replaced Mr. Curren, who held that seat for the A.L.P. for several years. The member for Murray, by his good service to the district and the community and by his calibre generally, took over that A.L.P. seat from Mr. Bywaters, and the Government had held that seat for 12 years.

This has been the position throughout the country where the Government has gradually lost its support. With all due respect to the members representing those areas, I believe that it was the Government's policy that killed its own members in the rural districts to which I

have referred. The Government failed for a long time to recognise the value of the outer metropolitan area to the State and, accordingly, it has seen its own members slaughtered one by one over the years until we have reached the stage where only the three towns in the iron triangle carry the A.L.P. flag.

Some Opposition members have related the details of their own districts, describing the difficulties involved in servicing some of the vast areas they represent. I have not been here long enough to be able to compare the amount of work involved in my district with that involved in other districts. It has been brought to my notice, and to the notice of all electors in the State, that the Minister of Works, when he was the member for Millicent, found that he could not continue to serve that vast area and be divorced from his electors and his family, and so he threw in the towel and gave up.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. CHAPMAN: That was one example in which a member found the isolation between him and his electors and him and his family had a physical and mental effect. Such features should be considered seriously when any suggestion to expand areas is discussed. To retain a fair and reasonable country representation it will be necessary to increase the number of members of this House. Parts of the metropolitan area have grown rapidly, and I accept that additional seats are necessary to cope with this growth, but I cannot accept the argument that the State cannot afford to pay additional members of Parliament. An additional workload warrants more members. From 1970 to 1974 there was a 38 per cent increase in the number of public servants, and a realistic increase in the number of members of Parliament would not amount to anything like that increase. It has been said that the Government could not afford the expense of any increase in the number of members; it should have acted more responsibly when it dreamed up the Monarto scheme. As reported on August 13, about \$12 000 000 was spent in order to service this area of need to cater for a surplus of people in metropolitan Adelaide.

On September 18, a report in the *Advertiser* stated that, in order to complete that pipe-dream of Monarto, about \$1 000 000 000 would be necessary. Although that was an unofficial figure, it was reported following considerable calculation by the shadow Minister for Development. If one section of the community can justify that sort of attention, surely the representation of the whole State deserves to be considered. I am not the slightest bit embarrassed to support the principle that, if there is a growing need for representation, the number of members in this House should be increased, particularly if it means servicing additional districts and retaining a fair and proper representation for country areas. I take to task the member for Goyder for what he has said in this debate. He knows, as well as we do, that the outer metropolitan area has suffered from disadvantages that are not experienced by those living in Adelaide. Those areas have suffered from not only the effect of seasonal conditions but they have also had to suffer from the efforts of a thoughtless Government.

Recently, both State and Commonwealth Governments have been unsympathetic toward that primary-producing area. The honourable member knows how those people

have their backs to the wall, but he had the cheek and audacity yesterday to sell those country people down the drain. He may have thought in his tiny mind that he was referring only to the District of Goyder, but the principle he expounded would have a serious and unreasonable effect on all country areas. I was disgusted by his attitude. I do not know what the attitude of his electors is towards his remarks and I do not know whether they will know about them, but I will be surprised if he is supported by those in that part of the outer metropolitan area that is in his district. Fair-minded people in the metropolitan area would hold the same opinion as I do with regard to his attitude. Not only did he reflect on his colleagues in the Opposition, but he also reflected an opinion that is not generally supported throughout the State. If the honourable member continues in that vein, I wonder why he does not join the Government, because he is of no value to us while carrying on in that way.

The situation in the District of Alexandra is unique, as it involves two areas geographically divided by Backstairs Passage, and this situation has created some difficulties in my keeping close to all parts of my district. It is a unique situation, because it is the first time in Australian political history that someone from an offshore island has ever represented a State Parliament. Although that may be of little significance to the House or the State generally, it is recognised and appreciated by the islanders. They will be forever grateful for having home-grown representation. Because of the nature of my district, it is necessary that I spend most of my time away from the island in order to serve the mainland sections of the district. I know the matter of service has raised comment in this place from time to time, but I have tried desperately to serve well all my electors.

Even if a larger area is added to my district, I believe I can still handle it; I am not panicking about future service for the voters of Alexandra, whatever may be its new shape. If the district is to be extended, the community of interest will be maintained and its truly rural atmosphere will also be maintained. No matter how the boundaries are adjusted, the district will be represented by the Liberal Party, the Party to which I hope to belong for some time.

I support the principle of changing boundaries at all levels of government, whether it be Commonwealth, State, or local government, because it should be done when necessary. If we are to hand over this responsibility to an autonomous and independent body, it must be done properly. We should not fool around with it in a biased way as suggested by the Bill. After reading the Bill and listening to the Premier's second reading explanation, and after hearing members opposite speak, it is obvious that the Government has no alternative but to reduce voting power where it cannot get support and increase it where it sees a hope of survival. I end on a note of confidence: whatever gerrymander is created by this measure, against the unpopular policies held by the Labor Government, we will win subsequent elections.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I will make only four brief points in this debate. I agree with members on this side that there is a need to change existing electoral boundaries. I am sure members appreciate the situation faced by the members for Tea Tree Gully, Fisher, and Mawson, to name just a few who have an enormous number of voters in their districts. It seems that the House is unanimous in accepting that there is a need for boundary change. I support the second reading of the Bill. I appreciate that an independent commission is to be established to decide boundary issues.

I have always believed that when political Parties have to decide on electoral boundaries there is room for manipulation. Until the boundary redistribution is taken out of the hands of Party politics, the system would seem to be biased.

Setting up an independent commission to draw up new boundaries is good. I hope the commission will examine submissions from political Parties and people who will try to convince the commission about boundary changes because of various underlying principles, and that it will be fair, just and will try to achieve many of the fundamental principles (the basic objectives) of the Bill. I wholeheartedly support the concept of an independent commission being created and agree with the basic principle of one vote one value on the basis of the equality of people, which is a fundamental issue. People realise that this matter cannot be taken entirely in isolation, because it is not a decision of that nature. The ideal of one vote one value must provide people with value for any vote cast. Although I agree it is wrong that some country districts are half the size of metropolitan seats, a system half-way between the present system and a 10 per cent tolerance provided in this measure would, to some degree, make up for the value that is lost in a vote because a person lives in an isolated area. I therefore believe that a 10 per cent tolerance is not exorbitant; it is a bare minimum. I hope the commission will look at the value of votes that will be lost in certain seats because of the inability of people who deserve to be represented and to have a member within reach and realise that a slight value will drift from a vote on that account. Although my district is small, about 112 kilometres by 64 kilometres, under this measure the size of the district will be increased. I am busy enough now representing 12 500 people. They deserve to have a member as near to them as I am, and I will have to spread my activities and time over a larger area. It has been said that some members spend as long travelling as they spend at a function, and this is a matter of the physical time of the member, so, to give full value, I consider that it is reasonable to have a slight variation to give all electors that facility. I support the second reading.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): First, I indicate my support for the Bill. I have always taken a keen interest and have spoken on any matter dealing with redistribution or electoral matters that has come before the House since I have been a member, and I do not intend to cast a silent vote this evening. I think the Bill can be improved, and that is a matter for a later stage. At this stage, I say that I agree with the principles in it. As Mallory said in *Morte d'Arthur*, the old order changeth, yielding place to new.

During the term of office either of the late Frank Walsh's Government or of the first Dunstan Government, there was a move for a 56-district House of Assembly, retaining the 26 districts in the then country area and having 30 districts in the metropolitan area. The metropolitan area of that time was not quite the same as the metropolitan area at present designated, and we would have had districts of almost pocket-handkerchief size. That proposal was not successful, and the next move was made by the L.C.L. Government in 1968-69, when there was a move by the members of that Party to change from a system, which was completely unbalanced and which reflected little credit on the L.C.L. The change made then was a distinct improvement on the position that obtained previously.

The first election held on that basis was the premature election of 1970, and the effect of the change was to alter the position that then obtained of having 26 country districts and 13 metropolitan districts, and the change was made

on the basis of a much smaller metropolitan area than the newly designated metropolitan area. The term "remainder of the State" is used for the other districts. We have 19 districts in that area at present, and the Bill before us will change some of them. There will be more so-called city districts.

If we divide the present number of 780 000 electors by 47, we get a quota of about 16 600. The 10 per cent tolerance up and down gives an upper limit of 18 260 and a lower limit of 14 940. So, we are working between about 18 000 and about 15 000, and districts in the lower range will be those that will grow, while those in the upper range will be those that are fairly stable with not much growth. There will be little change in the inner or older metropolitan districts such as Norwood, Torrens, and Unley.

However, there will be considerable change in the outer fringe metropolitan districts, with a spillover from what is now regarded as the metropolitan area, portion of the districts outside being gobbled up. Therefore, there will certainly be an increase in the so-called city or metropolitan districts. The principle involved is important to me. Many interpretations have been placed on the term "one vote one value" and, regardless of how carefully one draws a Bill or gives guidelines to a commission, the whole thing can depend dramatically on where a line is drawn regarding any district. In the city, a difference of six or seven streets in the location of the line could make a difference in the representation.

I deeply appreciate the comments made by my colleagues from the country and wholeheartedly defend their right to give their points of view. I appreciate their difficulties. Some city district numbers will be down to about 16 000, and some members will have a much easier time than their counterparts in the country will have. There is a difference between the way members work, some being assiduous and some not so assiduous. The entrenchment is a new concept for the House of Assembly, although there is a provision for it regarding the Legislative Council.

I wonder why the Premier has provided a minimum of five years. The present Act refers to seven years, which is a fringe area of compensation, shall we say, that can be considered. A period of five years may be too short, because I do not think the electors want their boundaries changed too frequently. They have Commonwealth elections, State elections, and local government elections to contend with.

The Bill has been introduced at a most interesting time. It was the 1970 election which I said was a premature election. At that time, the second Dunstan Government was formed, and it entered the House with a majority of seven. Since that time the Labor Party has seen that majority whittled away. In that time, the combined Opposition has helped whittle away that majority until we have an evenly balanced House today. Having got to the position where the Government was undoubtedly in some difficulty, the Premier introduced this measure. That is a completely political point of view. I must say that, because I have already indicated my support, as a pragmatist, for the Bill. I think the comments that have been made by my colleagues regarding improvements that may be made to the Bill can be better handled in Committee, and I will content myself, as the final speaker, by indicating my support for the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I point out that, if the honourable Premier speaks, it will close the debate. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The members of the Opposition can hardly be said to have spoken with one voice on this measure, because there have been significant differences between the approaches of various members. Some Opposition members have suggested that a single-member electorate system with an equality of voting strengths is a gross gerrymander (somehow a means of providing an unfair electoral distribution), whereas other Opposition members have indicated that a single-member electorate system is a proper basis for representation in the House, and did not suggest that an independent electoral commission operating a single-member electoral system would produce an unfair result or distortion of electoral results. I suggest to the Opposition members who suggested that there was some kind of deep electoral plot by the Australian Labor Party that their remarks were wholly unjustified; they cannot be justified on previous statements of their own Party federally or on statements made by members of their Party on other occasions. The only reasons advanced by some Opposition members were advanced to try to engender a little heat in a situation where they find their own stand basically indefensible.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition waxed eloquent when he rose: he said a lot. He suggested that there was some grand inconsistency between previous attitudes of this Party and what we are now proposing in the measure. The basis of his contention was that we had said on many occasions that it was unjust that, for many years in South Australia, the Labor Party had polled a substantial plurality of votes and that the Liberal Party had been in office under that system with a minority of votes. There is nothing inconsistent between that position and the position which obtains under this measure. The honourable member, in quoting from speeches I had made previously, carefully did not quote the whole of the speeches, because time and again in this House I have said that the basic principle of the Labor Party is a principle of one vote one value, that we stood for equality of electoral districts in numbers of population, and that we believed that this was the basis on which any fair system should operate and the only basis on which a single-member electorate system could operate and accord with the principles of electoral justice.

If any honourable member wishes to research my speeches, he will see that I quoted time and time again (and the member for Torrens, who has been here longer than the Deputy Leader, will remember the times that I did so) the Chief Justice of the United States of America and a whole series of cases of districting the U.S.A. State and Federal districts arising from the principle in the U.S. Constitution that there should be equality of electoral value. The decision of the U.S. Supreme Court quite properly was that there should be single-member districts and that there should be equality of voting numbers. As Earl Warren rightly said in those cases, "Representatives represent electors, people—not acres, not wealth, not sheep, and not the space between electors—but electors."

Mr. Goldsworthy: We still have to traverse the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member then turned his attention to a proposal put to this House to retain the old number of country members before the 1970 distribution. We proposed at that time that there should be an increase in the number of members of the House to 56, based on a number of arguments which members have put today about the difficulty of representing country districts because of space, communication problems, etc.

That was our policy at the 1968 election, and I well remember the answer of the Liberal Party on it. In the Murray District, full-page advertisements were taken in the local paper about the enormity of the proposition of increasing the number of members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Millhouse: I wrote them myself.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sure the honourable member did.

Mr. Coumbe: By 17.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, at the moment the proposition is only three short: that is what is proposed by the Opposition now. Opposition members campaigned in several country districts saying that it was grossly improper to increase the number of the members of the House and to provide the kind of country representation which we then argued for and which we are now talking about, and they won. The electors did not want that kind of increase in the number of members of the House, and we accepted the verdict of the electors.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But the population has increased since then.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member may have made his contribution, but he is not that good. The position we then faced was that it was clear that the electors did not believe that, in the establishment of the principle of one vote one value, there should be a considerable increase in the number of members of the House at that time. So, we altered our policy to reduce the number of members we proposed the House should have. We reduced it to 48, and we went to the Millicent by-election on that figure. During that election (as the Minister of Transport has pointed out), the then Leader of the Opposition said that he would accept the verdict of the electors. We then compromised in the subsequent measure before the House, which we supported. It did not go the full distance that we believed it should go; nevertheless, it was an improvement on the existing system, and we compromised on 47.

Mr. Venning: Compromise now!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, because the honourable member's Party has taken the question to the electors, and they have voted on it, on the advocacy of members opposite. In these circumstances, we changed our policy in relation to the number of members, but we did not change our policy about one vote one value. I know that Opposition members had some suspicion about the proposals of the Labor Party; indeed, the member for Mitcham gave voice to them in his pamphlet. I believe he will pay us the tribute now of saying that his suspicions were ill-founded, because I say that, if my Party were to depart from the principle of one vote one value and tried to do the sort of thing that the member for Mitcham suggested we might do, I would not be its Leader and I would not even be a member of the Party. I have stood on this issue ever since I entered politics. Opposition members have said that, as a youth, I was a supporter of the Liberal Party. I used to issue how-to-vote cards for that Party, but it taught me a lesson on this issue. I asked, "How can one call oneself a Liberal and support a Party that maintains an electoral system of this kind? No-one who believes in democracy could do that." I refused to have anything further to do with that Party. I was then 17 years of age, and I have never regretted my decision.

Dr. Tonkin: You're becoming more and more a conservative now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I would not say that. Today, the Leader indulged his sense of comedy and said I was a prisoner of the radical left: he is not consistent. This measure provides a fair system of electoral distribution according to all tenets of writers on democracy. All classic texts on democracy would approve what is being done, and none of them would criticise a basis of representation of this kind. It is not the case that a distribution of this kind automatically favours the Labor Party. A single-member electorate system anywhere in Australia historically has disadvantaged the Labor Party, because many times in single-member electorate distribution systems the Labor Party has had considerable votes tied up in large majorities in industrial areas. That was the case that led many times to the Labor Party adopting proposals for proportional representation. We have not accepted this latterly as a basis of one vote one value in the Labor Party in South Australia, because we believe in the value of the single-member electorate system, as in that system members are effectively agents for their districts. It is not possible for them similarly to be agents in multi-member districts and under proportional representation. That is why we believe in the need to maintain a single-member electorate system in this House, although historically that system has disadvantaged Labor interests in politics in Australia. The only reason why Opposition members are protesting that somehow this is to the advantage of the Labor Party is that they are saying, "Well, we are going to lose some seats we now hold." They are now convinced that they will not win any of the new seats in or bordering on the metropolitan area.

Mr. Venning: That's not the point.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is the point; otherwise, Opposition members would have no basis for their argument. Obviously, they fear that seats in the metropolitan area will go to either the Labor Party or to the Liberal Movement, not because the concentration of votes in those areas necessarily favours the Labor Party or indeed the Liberal Movement, but because we will be better at getting votes.

Mr. Millhouse: That's right: that's what they're afraid of.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no basis for such an argument. The proposals that Opposition members have made to allow the electoral commission to make various political decisions at large is not an argument in favour of democracy, because it is an argument to deprive voters from making a rightful political decision about their future. I do not believe that there is any reason to suppose that electors of this State intend to abdicate their right to decide politically as to how they should be represented. No democratic proposal would take from electors a basic political decision of this kind and give it to people who have no more political expertise than has any other voter. They must have some expertise in the area designated for the work of the electoral commission, but that does not make them experts in political view that would enable them to dictate such a view to the people of the State. Political decisions are for the electors, and that is how they will remain under this proposal. Such decisions have been made by electors so far on this issue when it has been put to them. I believe the people of this State have overwhelmingly voted time and again for the principle of one vote one value on the basis of a single-member electorate system. They want it, they are determined to have it, and they will get it.

The SPEAKER: Order! As this Bill amends the Constitution Act and provides for an alteration of the Constitution of the Parliament, its second reading requires to be carried by an absolute majority. In accordance with Standing Order 298, ring the bells.

The bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 298, I count the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question: "That this Bill be now read a second time." For the question, say "Aye"; against, say "No". I hear no dissentient voice and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER: I declare the second reading of this Bill to have been passed with the requisite absolute majority, and it may now be proceeded with.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders) moved:

That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

Mr. BLACKER: I have moved this motion on the ground that the Labor Government went to the polls on the principle of one vote one value. In so doing, it asked the people to cast their votes on the pretext that they would be represented on a one vote one value basis, each vote having an equal value. The anomaly in the Government's proposal was highlighted immediately because not only does the Bill embody the principle of one vote one value but also it provides for equal size electorates. This anomaly has been demonstrated many times. Because we have an equal number of constituents in single-member districts, it does not necessarily mean that we have one vote one value.

The SPEAKER: Order! Private conversations are becoming too audible in the Chamber.

Mr. BLACKER: To this end, I believe it is only right and proper that the people of South Australia should be permitted to have this Bill examined by a Select Committee, receiving submissions from members of the community. I propose that such a Select Committee should comprise three Government members and two Opposition members, receiving submissions until the first week of the Parliamentary sitting next February. This will allow the Select Committee time over the Christmas adjournment to receive evidence. This motion is not intended to hold up the Government's so-called mandate to proceed with the Bill because, after all, an election has only just been held, and it will be at least 2½ years before we are required to go to the polls again. Never will the people of South Australia or the Government have had more time in which to consider this matter. There will be ample time for a Select Committee to receive submissions from the community, investigate them, and report to Parliament, and for boundaries to be drafted before the next election is held. If there is not time to do this now, there will never be time. That is why I believe this is the ideal time to advance such a proposal.

Another aspect of the matter is that the voting system is being changed and, whenever a change is in vogue, we should examine all possible proposals that can be advanced to ensure that the State has the best possible voting system that a Select Committee can recommend. Electoral committees, persons interested in electoral matters, or political Parties should be able to present their views to a Select Committee so that the Government's concept of one vote

one value can be adequately examined and, if the committee deems fit, recommended. This is what we are looking for.

The Government has asked for one vote one value, so surely it is right for the people to expect to receive it. It has already been demonstrated, not only by Opposition members but also by Government members, as well as by the Premier when closing the second reading debate, that the single-member electorate proposal does not affect the one vote one value principle. In fact, the Premier claimed that in many cases single-member electorates have been to the Labor Party's disadvantage.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the honourable member that he must not cover ground that has already been covered in the debate. He must only give his reasons for moving this motion that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. BLACKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologise for drifting off the mark. The point has been adequately made that we need to examine other voting procedures in order to ensure that the Government's mandate is adequately expressed. Two aspects have emerged from the election and from the Government's claim to have a mandate for the proposal of one vote one value. One is to eliminate any weighting towards a certain sector. More to the point, the essential requirement is to ensure that the principle of one vote one value applies. This matter can be examined thoroughly only by a Select Committee, on which I have suggested that the Government have a majority of members to ensure that its proposal is adequately carried forward. The appointment of a Select Committee will reflect several things from the Government's point of view. It will show whether the Government is genuine in its desire to provide a one vote one value system for the people, whether it will merely proceed on the pretext of single-member districts and regard that as being good enough for the time being, or whether it is desired that this Bill become law as soon as possible in the expectation of a possible early election.

I fear that the failure (and this has been indicated to me) to have a Select Committee appointed, which after all will delay the implementation of the legislation for only two or three months, when the next election is not expected to be held for another 2½ years, is an indication of the Government's panic attitude in wanting to get the Bill through as soon as possible, so that if necessary an early election can be held. I will not speak further on this matter, because my attitude and the reasons for moving that a Select Committee be set up are clear. By moving that a Select Committee be set up I am not trying to reintroduce country weighting (as much as I believe in it). All I want to do is guarantee for the people of South Australia that the mandate claimed so forcibly by the Australian Labor Party is presented to the people in the true concept of one vote one value. After all, it has been demonstrated on more than one occasion by everyone who has spoken to the Bill that, under a single-member district system, that concept is just not possible.

When the Government claims it believes in the principle of one vote one value, an equal number of electors in each district with single-member districts, those three factors are inconsistent and cannot be substantiated as pursuing the concept of one vote one value or equal representation. The Bill should be referred to a Select Committee so that South Australians can express their views adequately and to ensure that the principle of one vote one value is implemented for the people of this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. The purpose of setting up a Select Committee is to provide the House with facts and information especially about interests which the House does not have at earlier stages when the measure is being debated. There can be no question of the facts of this matter being available to the House, or of their having been debated here and in public forums for decades. It has been a prime matter of debate in this Parliament since I have been a member here. The member for Ross Smith and I have been here longer than has any other member in the House.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's too long!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been much public debate and information brought forward on this issue. People have had ample opportunity to have the proposals of the various Parties put to them over many years, and they have voted on it. What this Government has said at election time is clear: there would be one vote one value on the basis of single-member districts with an equality of voters in each district.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's inconsistent.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member regards that as being inconsistent, I can only say that the majority of people who write about this issue do not agree with him. The highest authorities support a system of this kind. The electors of this State have had it put to them that this was to be done, and overwhelmingly they have voted many times in South Australia in support of such a system.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It was not too overwhelming at the recent election.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Time and again electors have voted heavily in favour of the system, and the honourable member knows perfectly well that that is so. In fact, this was the only way in which the issue was put to them at the recent election, because the Liberal Party did not bother to talk about the issues of what was to be put before Parliament; all it could talk about was inflation and what was happening in Canberra. The Labor Party was specific on this issue, and was returned to Government on that basis. There is no basis for further debate on this matter before a Select Committee, because that is not the forum that should decide this matter any longer. The electors have decided, not once but many times. There is no point in our having further discussions in a Select Committee, which would only be a furtherance of debate; it would not elicit further information, because all the information necessary on this topic is already before the House.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the motion. One of the fundamental rights of a democracy should be that people who are to be affected by any legislation have the right at least to put their point of view before a properly constituted committee set up to hear their views and to make recommendations. The Premier has in no way justified his opposition to the motion. He went into a series of arguments that were unrelated to the motion and did not reply properly to it. This Bill makes a fundamental change in the electoral system of the State, and many people who hold strong views about this change should have an opportunity to express those views to a Select Committee. No fair-minded or just person should deny them that right. It will not slow down the operations of Parliament, which

has about 2½ years to run, so what difference will it make? Is the Premier frightened to allow the matter to be put before a Select Committee? It would appear from the arguments he has put this evening that he does not want members of the community to air their views. He referred to the highest authorities. Who are they? Has he contact with the highest authorities?

Mr. Duncan: Certainly not you—

Mr. GUNN: The way the honourable member is interjecting (I should say the Minister-elect), he will be more than on the moon after the public of South Australia has had an opportunity to deal with him and his left-wing colleagues. The public should have the opportunity to make a mature judgment on this matter. We are fully aware that it is the Premier's moment of glory when a measure that he has advocated is about to be put into operation. This evening he is going hand-in-hand with the member for Mitcham. What an interesting duet!

Mr. Venning: What a wonderful marriage!

Mr. GUNN: It is a marriage of convenience on this occasion.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member to order because he is drifting away from the matter under discussion. The honourable member must remain within the bounds of the motion.

Mr. GUNN: Quite, but, Mr. Speaker, you did not draw the Premier's attention to that matter, but I will not labour that point.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not in any way reflect on the Chair.

Mr. GUNN: I was not reflecting on the Chair; I was making an observation.

The SPEAKER: It was still heavily veiled.

Mr. GUNN: That, Sir, is a matter of interpretation. I support the motion and am disappointed in the Premier's attitude.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I thank the member for his support. I am disappointed with the Premier's attitude towards it. After all, the Government has indicated the anomalies that exist in the present electoral system and the fact that it is impossible, with single-member districts, for a true one vote one value system to apply. That is what motivated me to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. The time is opportune, as regards the next election, and the whole electoral system is being discussed publicly. If ever there was a time for this matter to be discussed by a Select Committee, now is the time.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker (teller), Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Boundy, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Kenally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Arnold. No—Mr. Duncan.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Number of members of House of Assembly."

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In new section 27 to strike out "The House of Assembly shall" and insert:

(1) Until the day on which the first general election of members of the House of Assembly is held next after the commencement of the Constitution Act Amendment Act (No. 5), 1975, the House of Assembly shall continue to";

and after "vote." to insert:

(2) On and after the day referred to in subsection (1) of this section the House of Assembly shall consist of fifty-three members elected by the inhabitants of the State legally qualified to vote.

The arguments in favour of this increase in the size of the House have been advanced by many members on this side, and the difficulties of country members in adequately representing their districts, particularly if those districts are increased in size, have been eloquently expressed. I point out to the Premier, who has dealt with this subject and prejudged the issue in his summing up, that since the last redistribution in 1969 the voting population has increased by more than 150 000 people. This warrants some consideration being given to increasing the size of the House, regardless of any other consideration. Further, the Premier's opposition to a proposal to increase the size of the House seems to be based on nothing more or less than some sort of reaction to the sort of treatment he received at the hands of a Liberal Government in times gone by, following a proposal he put up for an increase in the size of the House. My proposal will not in any way change the principle underlying this Bill, the principle of equal numbers of voters in electoral districts; the Premier knows that. My amendments will make a little easier the job of a country member representing a district that will undoubtedly be enlarged, even if these added seats are created.

It is important that a member can service his district and that country electors have the same degree of representation and service that they get now. If the district is to be enlarged, it must not be enlarged to an extent where it becomes impossible to give adequate country representation. The facts speak for themselves. My amendments will ensure that the task of representing enlarged country districts does not become impossible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the amendment and will briefly reply to the arguments that the Leader has now put forward. He said that the purpose of the 53 districts is to provide for better country representation and to prevent too great an enlargement of country districts. To go further than his previous argument on this score, he says that at least we would be justified in increasing the number of districts to 53 because of an increase of 150 000 in the voting population since the most recent redistribution. I have not checked that figure.

The Leader may well be right, but I suggest that he check the figures for country districts, because he will not find that that increase occurred there. Since the purpose of this measure is to see that country districts are not greatly enlarged, we cannot use the increase in voting population as a justification for that position, because most of the increase in population has occurred in city districts, where the present redistribution will reduce the number of voters per member. With great respect, I do not think the argument stands up.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I oppose this amendment. It is naked self-interest on the part of members of the Liberal Party. The Premier has exposed the speciousness of their assumption that the extra six members will be in country areas. The Leader is not as naive as he is pretending to be. All of his members, certainly those from the country and

I think those from the city as well, have bleated about the reduction in country representation.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There it is. At the most, one of those extra six members would come from the country areas. There is no purpose in having the additional members in the city. The Liberal Party is utterly without principle. A few weeks ago it supported an increase in the Ministry that would cost \$100 000 a year. I condemned the Liberal Party for that and I condemned the Government for it. Now members of the Liberal Party have put up a proposal for six extra members, each of whom would cost \$30 000 a year, including the cost of their much vaunted district office. They would be willing to cost the taxpayers \$180 000 to save one or two of their rural districts.

I interjected when the Premier, in replying to the second reading debate, was dealing with the proposals of 1968 to increase the number of members. Members of the Liberal Party were not then too proud to tell the electorate that we were not willing to increase indefinitely the number of members, and we won just enough votes in Chaffey and Murray to get the Labor Party out. The advertisements that we put in the country press in the last week of the campaign, when it was too late for the Labor Party to reply (it had no reply), turned the tide in those two districts. The advertisements were a denial of the Labor Party proposal to increase the number of members. Now the Liberal Party suggests an increase, when the significance of all State Parliaments is being reduced. Yet the cost to the taxpayer is to be increased. As there is no justification for the amendment, I oppose it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Unfortunately, the member for Mitcham imputes base motives to us. We are speaking in the interests of the people we serve. The task of representing country districts will be made more difficult by this Bill, and the service given will be much less complete. It was all very well for the Premier, in his reply to the second reading debate, to dismiss the proposal by saying, "We advocated this some years ago and we have changed our minds." In an earlier debate, the Premier stated:

I have seen in the newspapers suggestions that "You do not need more members in the House. What you need is more balance." The way to get balance and maintain the present servicing of country areas is to increase the number of members in the House. It is perfectly feasible, perfectly proper and well based in the history of this State and its Parliamentary institutions and those of the other States, for, Mr. Speaker, even taking the increase in population that has occurred in South Australia, if we were to take the proportionate increase since 1938, we would have a bigger House than 56 members, to give proper representation to the increase in population. So there cannot be any denying of the right to increase the number of members in this House, and, what is more, it would make it a much more workable House.

The Premier has stated that we act in this place as agents for our districts. If I was a commercial agent and had a choice about the area I represented, I would choose an area around which I could travel in 10 minutes on a bicycle rather than one that I took days to travel around at 100 kilometres an hour. On our calculations, the Bill intends to dismantle six country districts. We cannot prevent the dilution of country representation. I am not suggesting that the six extra seats would replace country seats, but the situation would be ameliorated to some extent because one would expect at least two to be in the country. More money will now be spent on Parliamentary representation by city members, and less of the Government's resources will be spent on country representation. I speak as a country member for the people I represent in my attempts

to give them adequate and proper representation, and that task will be immeasurably more difficult when this Bill is passed.

I do not care what the member for Mitcham imputes to me. I know my motives and those of other members on this side. The member for Mitcham said that the Ministry had been increased. The Premier and Government members say that the work load has increased and that Ministers work 16 hours a day. Since we have the idea of members of Parliament acting as agents for their districts, has not their work load increased? I know of the calls made on members of Parliament. I know what goes through the office of the member for Murray, for instance, and the member for Gouger is another member who comes to mind, looking only along the front bench. I do not care whether the Premier has decided to change his mind because of some press reports. We are arguing for proper, decent and reasonable representation for country districts, as was endorsed by the recently elected member for Pirie in his interview with Rex Jory, reported in the *News*. The Government is hell-bent on bulldozing this legislation through. I do not care what is imputed to us by the Government or those who support it. I know the motives impelling me in this debate, and they are shared by members on this side. Ours is not an unreasonable proposition if we are trying to save something in terms of reasonable representation for country people. In view of what I have read to the House about the Premier's reasoning in 1962, he cannot say glibly that he has changed his mind; it is not good enough.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I support the amendment, and in reply to the member for Mitcham I support the remarks made by the member for Kavel. I am not ashamed to say why I support the amendment. I am proud to speak the voice of the minority, the country electors in this State. Their voice has been reduced to a whisper in this House, being ventilated by only a few members on this side; certainly, the country sector of South Australia is not supported by the Government, nor is it supported any more by either member of the Liberal Movement. In his remarks a few moments ago, the member for Mitcham endorsed that comment, and, from what the member for Goyder said yesterday, it is clear that he is here only for the joyride. He entered this place in an armchair and I suggest he is hanging on by the skin of his teeth. There is no way in the world, in my view, that a country district will support a man who sells it out for political expediency or that of his Party, and that is exactly what happened in this place yesterday.

I am not ashamed to support the country voice on this occasion and to support the amendment, which proposes to retain at least a fair number of members on behalf of country areas. While there are 20 on this side of the House, a number have a general responsibility to the State and a particular responsibility to the metropolitan districts they represent. While we accept and welcome their support in the Liberal Party, only a dozen or so directly represent country people in this House. It is only proper that, when the occasion arises, we say what we believe in. I am proud to add my comments in support of the minority group, which deserves that its voice shall be heard.

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously the Premier will not accept this amendment; nevertheless, we will persevere. I am rather disappointed in the member for Mitcham for endeavouring to suggest that I said in some way or another that we proposed that the six new seats to be created should go to the country. I cannot imagine that he could be so naive

as to believe that that was possible. By increasing the number of seats we will be reducing the size of the quota for all seats, whether city or country. It certainly will not in any way adversely affect representation in the city to do that; it may mean the difference between relatively adequate representation in country areas, particularly in large districts, and poor representation. There is precedent for this increase in every other State in this Commonwealth, where increases in the size of Parliaments have kept pace with population changes. I shall be disappointed indeed, but not surprised, if the Premier does not accept the amendment.

Mr. GUNN: I, too, support the amendment and I am disappointed in the attitude adopted by the member for Mitcham and the Premier. We were accused by the member for Mitcham of having no credibility. I am not ashamed to support this proposition. I would be failing in my obligation as a member representing a large and difficult district if I did not do so. The charge laid is unfounded and unworthy, and it has no skerrick of truth in it. The member for Mitcham could not justify it. He is sitting back and smiling, and I am not surprised, because he has engaged in a marriage of convenience with the Premier, whom I understand he has always accused of being a political foe. On this occasion, however, the member believes there is a certain amount of political gain to be had out of the exercise he and the member for Goyder have engaged in. The member for Goyder, of course, has sold his constituents down the drain, and he has proved that he is nothing more than an agent for the member for Mitcham. The people in his area and the extra area that will be tacked on to his existing district will judge him accordingly. I am confident that they will make the right decision.

Mr. Boundy: And so they will.

Mr. GUNN: There is no doubt that it will not be in the honourable gentleman's favour. The member for Mitcham indicated the astronomical cost associated with a proposition of this nature. If this Bill passes (and obviously it will) and the member for Stuart and perhaps the member for Pirie have to cover large tracts of South Australia, there will be a clamour for more staff, more facilities, more air travel, and the right to charter (something which some of us have requested but which has not been made available to us), so that they can properly represent their enlarged districts. Perhaps, however, they may adopt the typical Labor Party attitude that the numbers are not there and therefore those people can be ignored. The type of representation that the current Federal member for Grey adopts is to ignore them—they do not count. The Premier is the master of half truths and of telling untruths, and wrapping them in a pleasant bundle. Parliamentary representation is comparatively cheap when we consider the overall benefits to the State. I do not want to see the voice of country people smothered so that they do not have adequate representation. I think it was Mr. Trudeau who said that, when the rural vote represents about 2 per cent of the electorate, they do not count, and that is also the Labor Party's attitude. The Labor Party wants to downgrade country people as second-class citizens. I am not saying that city people are not entitled to fair and just representation, because I have always supported a fair electoral system, but the system in the Bill does not represent a fair and just system. The Labor Party is completely under the influence of the extreme left-wing element in the Trades and Labor Council. One would think that people such as Mr. Carmichael—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is not relevant to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I support the amendment.

Mr. VENNING: I, too, support the amendment. Many Opposition members represent rural areas, and why should the legislation be such that the *status quo* will not be retained, or something similar to it? We believe that there is a need for additional seats in the metropolitan area, but why rob the country to pay the city? Opposition members are concerned not with self-interest but with the effects the legislation, if passed without amendment, will have on the State's rural areas.

Mr. BLACKER: I support the amendment, because it in no way conflicts with the principle of one vote one value as presented by the Government. The amendment is an attempt to enable country members still to be able to represent their districts without facing an excessive increase in the size of those districts. The amendment would mean country districts would remain relatively static, whereas the metropolitan districts would be decreased in size. Consequently, the work load on the metropolitan members would be reduced, whereas under the amendment the work load on country members would remain the same. If we are to continue with a 47-seat House under the terms of the Bill, the country seats will certainly increase in size and so will the difficulties of representation.

Could the Premier continue to act as Premier of this State if he represented a country district properly? I do not think it would be humanly or physically possible for a country member of an outlying country district to be able to carry out the responsibilities of State Premier and the other portfolios with distinction and in the way in which they deserve to be carried out. Is the line to be drawn between country and metropolitan representation to be drawn between what is physically possible and what is not physically possible? I think that every member should be entitled to hold the highest office, if suitably qualified, but why should he be denied that privilege or be restricted in his political future simply because of the district he represents and the time he has available to give his constituents?

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russell, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Boundy, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Arnold. No—Mr. Duncan.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—"Assembly districts."

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

In new subsection (5), after "Assembly", to insert "from time to time".

This is largely a drafting amendment. We believed it was covered in the original measure, but the Solicitor-General has recommended, to make it completely clear that the number of members of the House was not being entrenched, that these words be inserted.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6 passed.

79

Clause 7—"Enactment of Part V of principal Act."

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

In new section 83 to insert the following new paragraph: (aa) the extent to which the representation in the House of Assembly reflected the views of the electors as evidenced by a majority of votes cast and counted towards the election of candidates at the general election or general elections that occurred since the last redistribution.

This clause, which will become one of the matters to be taken into account by the electoral commission, tries to sum up (and I think it does it succinctly) the need for the principle that has been referred to consistently during the debate on this Bill by the Premier, by other speakers on the Government side and, I think, by almost every speaker on the Opposition side—the principle that no Party or group of Parties should attain Government unless it has attained a majority of the preferred vote. This is a fundamental. Indeed, we were told, when this Bill was brought in, that it was being brought in to achieve this very purpose. If that is so, I believe it should be written in as one of the matters to be taken into account.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I oppose the amendment. It is an extraordinary proposal, which will mean that the electoral commission is utterly confused. How precisely it is to carry out this instruction in drawing electoral boundaries in a single-member electorate system beggars my imagination. The gravamen of the Leader's contention is that, under a single-member electorate system, it is conceivably possible that one Party will have a considerable concentration of votes in a certain number of electorates.

Dr. Tonkin: Professor Blewitt speaks of a differential concentration of majorities.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is a very succinct way of putting it—a differential concentration of majorities. Therefore, marginally, one Party can get more seats than another Party although it does not have more votes. The margin is not likely to be very great, but it is conceivably possible under a single-member electorate system. It is unlikely, and the cases in which it will happen will be rare; it is remote, but it could conceivably happen. How precisely do we then draw electoral boundaries to see that under a single-member electorate system it does not happen? This is what the Leader has not explained. What he is doing is introducing the traditional criticism of the proportional representationists of any single-member electorate system; that is, that under such a system we can have a number of majorities concentrated heavily in certain districts and, if those votes were spread more widely over the districts, there could be a different representation of the Parties; but what the Leader is talking about is something that inevitably comes from a single-member electorate system. It is one of the criticisms of that system, but it is not something that we can overcome by drawing electoral boundaries according to concentrations of particular political points of view. In fact, specifically, the electoral commissioners should not draw boundaries according to the political points of view of the electors. That is just what they ought not to be doing, because, if they do that, they will introduce Party politics into their consideration of electoral boundaries.

Mr. Chapman: That is all right if it's A.L.P. thinking, but not otherwise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I have already pointed out to the honourable member, this differential concentration of majorities works regularly to the Labor Party's disadvantage, because most regularly the large concentrations

of particular political points of view have been in districts held by the Labor Party.

Mr. Chapman: When history suits you, you repeat it, but you didn't accept the history event that the member for Kavel pointed out.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has not explained what precisely the electoral commission is to do in accordance with this instruction. It is apparently to examine the last election, see how the Parties fared in various districts, and allot boundaries accordingly to try to spread the majorities. That is not a possible system. Indeed, that is the very proposal under which we would get what is, technically, a gerrymander. Although that word has been much misused during the debate, a gerrymander comes from the specific strange drawing of electoral boundaries in order to suit certain political majorities. I do not believe that that is a principle that we should introduce into this matter. We should keep Party politics out of the commission's considerations.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Liberal Movement will not support this amendment. I adopt the arguments that have been used by the Premier and will add a few more of my own. It ill behoves anyone in the so-called Liberal Party to complain about things like this after the record of that Party (for which I must bear some part of the responsibility) in staying in office election after election on a minority vote. But, of course, if one looks at this amendment, one sees that it is meaningless. If we inserted it in the Bill, the electoral commissioners would simply ignore it. Of course, there is no way in which they could be obliged to take any notice of this and, if it was inserted, they would not know what it meant, anyway. What does it mean? The electoral commissioners will have to look to see what was the popular vote in comparison with the seats won at a previous election. They will have to look back to the past to set the boundaries for the future. But, having done that, what will it mean to the electoral commissioners?

Mr. Chapman: Why don't you sit down and let the Leader answer?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid that he cannot do so. Indeed, he had the greatest difficulty explaining to the House, or to anyone privately, what he means by it, but it does not lead anywhere, if it is analysed. What does it matter what the reflection was at the last election? How will that help the electoral commissioners to draw boundaries for the next and subsequent elections? There is nothing that gives any guide to that. As the Premier has said, the answer is that the Liberal Party wants to have its cake and eat it, too. It is committed to a system of single-member districts, and one of the disadvantages of that system is that there can be representation in the House that does not exactly correspond to representation in the district. This is not the way to cure this matter: the only way to cure it is to leave the single-member system and go to a system of proportional representation.

The members of the Liberal Party know that, but they are not willing to say it. They want to add some meaningless jumble to the Bill, but for what reason I cannot imagine. There is no point whatever in putting this in the Bill. I suspect it may be that they want to fail on this amendment to give some, anyway, of their members an excuse for voting against the Bill on the third reading, as they obviously wanted to vote against it on the second reading.

Amendment negated.

Dr. TONKIN: I move.

In new section 83 to strike out paragraph (b); and to insert the following new paragraph:

(ba) the relative density of the population in the various parts of each proposed electoral district;

I have moved this amendment because the population of each proposed electoral district bears no relationship to the voting population. There are many districts in which certain people are not entitled to a vote, in which there is a high proportion of young people, and in which there are people who have recently arrived from overseas but who have not yet attained Australian citizenship. For this reason, the Opposition sees no reason for having the population of each district considered, unless it is considered in terms of the relative density of the population; in other words, how thinly apart they are spread. From that point of view, we believe that population should be considered. However, from the point of view of population itself, we do not think it should be considered.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is saying that we cannot consider the population, the problems facing a district in relation to services, and so on, but that we should have regard to the space between the various elements of the population and make a decision on that score. I do not believe that is a proper way to proceed. The question of feasibility of communication of members has been duly catered for later in the instructions to the commission, and I believe that that is the proper way to proceed with the matter.

Amendment negated.

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

In new section 83 to insert the following new paragraph:

(da) the means of travel available to, and the time likely to be spent in travel by, a parliamentary representative for the proposed electoral district;

While this may not be a large factor in the commission's considerations, I think it should be considered. Once again, this matter has been supported by many Opposition members, particularly those from country areas. In this respect, I refer particularly to the members for Alexandra, Frome, Eyre, and Mallee, who experience extreme difficulty travelling to and from various parts of their districts and between their districts and Adelaide. This matter should be considered by the commission when it is examining and drawing up boundaries.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question that must be decided is what is the feasibility of communication between the member of Parliament and his constituents, and that is perfectly well covered by paragraph (e). The Leader's amendment does not seem to me to be something that should be added to the new section. He says clearly that they must take into account the feasibility of communication between electors affected by the redistribution and their Parliamentary representatives in the House of Assembly, and "communication" means communication in all forms.

Amendment negated.

[Midnight]

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

In new subsection 86 (2), before "Rules", to strike out "the"; and in new section 86 (9) to strike out "delivered" and insert "determined".

These amendments correct two clerical errors: it is normal to refer to "Rules of Court" and not "the Rules of Court," and the word "delivered" should be "determined". These are drafting errors.

Amendments carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In new section 88 (2) (a) (i), after "number", to insert "(whether that number be one or more than one)".

We have all agreed that there should be no entrenchment of the system of single-member districts. Indeed, much debate ensued about proportional representation and other matters. We are all committed to single-member districts but, at some time in the future, other members may believe otherwise, and there should be an opportunity to convert to a system of proportional representation without being required to hold a referendum. New section 88 (2) (a) (i) refers to the Chief Justice issuing a certificate and relates to that matter. It was pointed out to me that it is conceivable that an argument could be mounted that, although we have not in terms entrenched new section 27, which provides for 47 members, we have entrenched to a large extent new section 32, which provides in subsection (4):

Each electoral district shall return one member of the House of Assembly.

If a timid Chief Justice in future should regard that as "entrenched", he may not be willing to issue a certificate if there were a desire to convert to a system of proportional representation. This provision will be inserted once and for all, so we should make absolutely certain that any argument can be excluded. By including the words "(whether that number be one or more than one)" we take away altogether the possibility of that argument being used.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I accept the amendment, which perhaps is made in an excess of caution. However, I do not believe the amendment presents any difficulties. It could well be that we could face the difficulty outlined.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Mitcham has stated in relation to another matter that the Liberal Party had not considered proportional representation. That matter could arise in future if we are to overcome some of the difficulties that become apparent in single-member districts. I am not attracted to the idea, but I have no doubt that the occasion could arise, so I support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 and title passed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Although the principle of a permanent and independent electoral commission divorced from political control is a principle that will be supported by all members, members on this side have expressed considerable concern about certain aspects of this legislation, because it is believed they are not in the best interests of the total community. As the Bill comes out of Committee, it provides for districts of equal voting population. There is still a potential for a gerrymander, and the increased difficulties of providing effective country representation are unchanged. We believe that no group should govern without a majority of the preferred vote. There is still concern that this Bill will not guarantee that that principle will be achieved. However, the passage of the Bill is assured.

Any advantage that may accrue to the Labor Party as a result of this redistribution will not be sufficient to offset the growing disenchantment that electors now display towards Labor Governments in Canberra and in this State. Concern for the well being and the prosperity of the people of this State and the enthusiastic implementation of imaginative measures to restore and further that well

being and prosperity will change the Government in South Australia. Whatever the nature of the redistribution, the Liberal Party will contest the next election with all the increased vigour, enthusiasm, knowledge, experience and concern now at its command. Because of these factors, the Labor Party will be defeated, and we will win the election.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying something on behalf of the green triangle, or what is left of it or will be left of it. The Bill comes from Committee spelling out an inadequate representation in that area. All hell is breaking loose this evening in the South-East. I do not know whether I will go down to the South-East on Friday to hold the hand of a distinguished person of this State, but I probably will. On behalf of that important area of South Australia, whilst it remains as such, I want to say how sad I am that we should be in this situation. It is indeed a historic occasion in this Parliament that we may never see the same situation that has hitherto been the case.

I was extremely sad to hear some of the conflicting views expressed on this side of the House. I hope the Premier was sincere when he said he believed sincerely that this measure would be good for the State. Unfortunately, I do not share that view. I do not believe the Government appreciates what is manifest in this measure. It has been popularly said that six seats will be removed from the country area, and that there could be more. I fear that it will be more than six. Nevertheless, that does not detract from the grave duty that will descend on members who are charged with representing country districts. It will not be an easy task for them. The comparison was made when the Bill was passing through its stages that we were considering not hectares or sheep but people. The country areas of this State have seen some gallant pioneers, and some people are still doing an excellent job in earning oversea income for this great State. This Bill ends an era, and it pays no regard to country people, who have contributed so much to the State. I therefore express my viewpoint on behalf of the people of the South-East.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I, too, express my concern about the manner in which this Bill has emerged from Committee. Country members and country people will remember this day for a long time. Country members will have a greater work load than they have ever had before. Most country members make a genuine attempt to represent their constituents. No doubt the Government is delighted that the Bill has gone through, unfortunately with the blessing of the Liberal Movement. I express my concern that country people, particularly those in sparsely-settled areas, will miss out on representation that they justly deserve.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): This Bill, as it comes from Committee, is totally unsatisfactory. We have arrived at an unfortunate situation. The people of South Australia will look back on this day and remember that this was the day that the Dunstan Government endeavoured to entrench itself in power by way of a possible gerrymander, a retrograde and undemocratic step without any electoral principle. It is an occasion when people in sparsely-populated areas will be denied their democratic right—a right to fair and just representation, no matter from which side of the House it comes. It is a sad occasion when a Government adopts such a belligerent and undemocratic attitude.

The SPEAKER: As this is a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, and as it provides for an alteration to the Constitution of the Parliament, the third reading requires to be carried by an absolute majority. In accordance with Standing Order 298, ring the bells.

The bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 298, I count the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question: "That this Bill be now read a third

time." For the question, say "Aye"; against, say "No". As I hear no dissentient voice and there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the question passes in the affirmative. I declare the third reading to be carried by the requisite absolute majority.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.17 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 9, at 2 p.m.