

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, May 25, 1965.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

WHYALLA HOSPITAL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Is the new hospital at Whyalla referred to in today's press statement by the Chief Secretary, at a cost to the Government of £600,000, the same hospital wing as was approved by the Playford Government, consisting of six storeys to increase the bed capacity from 80 to more than 180 at an estimated cost of £900,000, which is now in an advanced stage of construction and towards which a Government grant of £76,623 was paid in 1963-64? The sum of £280,000 was provided in last year's Estimates to meet current expenditure and an equivalent sum will be required in the forthcoming Estimates for the completion of the work.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, it is for the building of the hospital at Whyalla, which work was commenced by the previous Government and which is being continued by the present Government. The sum was mentioned in the statement because there was a departure by the Government in placing a representative from the Under Secretary's office on the board to watch spending in the interests of the ratepayers of South Australia. Because £900,000 was a large sum, it was thought necessary to have a representative on the board to watch the expenditure and inform the Government accordingly. The hospital board, at the suggestion of the Government, readily agreed to have a Government representative on the board.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Will the Government, as a matter of policy, appoint nominees to all boards where Government grants are involved?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That matter has not been considered. This was considered only in relation to the Whyalla hospital because of the extra large sum involved, and because of negotiations with the Whyalla City Commission on the amount it will continue to pay to the Government.

COOPER PEDY WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: My question relates to an article that appeared in the *Mail* over the week-end, headed "Where water is more precious than opal", referring to Coober Pedy. The article stated that water is supplied from a catchment tank, which is almost dry, at a rate of 44 gallons a person a fortnight, and it is expected that, when this tank is dry, water will be supplied from a bore 100 miles distant at a cost of 10s. for every 44 gallons. The article then stated:

A couple of years ago the Government had plans to put down a bore and install a solar system, but nothing ever came of it.

Members will remember that in the Estimates some time ago the sum of £10,000 was made available for the installation of a desalination plant at Coober Pedy, dependent on finding water in that area. When I visited Coober Pedy in company with the then Minister of Mines (Sir Lyell McEwin) on February 4 a Mines Department boring plant was in that area exploring for water. Can the Minister of Mines say whether this plant has been withdrawn from the area, and will he obtain a progress report on water exploration there?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will obtain a report on this matter and notify the honourable member when I receive it.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked on May 18 about printing costs?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. The honourable member asked "Can the Chief Secretary say what was the cost involved in printing those 13 papers?" The answer is that the total cost amounted to £3,984, of which £1,496 was charged against Legislature Miscellaneous, and the balance of £2,488 was paid by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics for the Statistical Register of South Australia, Parts I, II, V and VI, so that these papers can be included in the Blue Book (Annual Volume of Parliamentary Papers).

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Chief Secretary, representing the Attorney-General, a reply to my question of May 19 about justices of the peace and the proposed new categories?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: These matters are still under consideration. It is not anticipated that an announcement will be made until the review of the organization of courts of minor jurisdiction currently proceeding has been completed.

SCHOOL TEACHERS.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Education, a reply to a question I asked last Thursday about teachers and their qualifications?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I answered some parts of the question last week but could not answer it all. The remainder of the answer is that, first, the names of young people who gained their Leaving certificates in 1964 have not yet been published by the Public Examinations Board. However, 350 who have passed in four or more subjects applied for admission to the teachers training colleges. Of these, 78 were rejected. Secondly, 1,502 married women teachers are employed in primary schools. Of these, 676 have gained passes in four or more Leaving subjects. The Education Department does not keep records of passes at Intermediate level.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on May 18 about a water supply for the Kimba area?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: As the honourable member is aware from the announcement that the Minister of Works made in March, Cabinet has approved the construction of a pipeline from Lock to Kimba at an estimated cost of £1,132,000. The scheme involves the laying of about 68 miles of pipe from Lock to Kimba, the installation of three pumping stations and the construction of a balancing service reservoir near Darke Peak. The new pipeline will serve Kimba and Darke Peak and farms along the route of the main. Water will also be available for several branch mains extending some miles into farming areas. The Government's decision followed favourable recommendations by the Public Works Standing Committee and the Engineer-in-Chief. It had been proposed originally to supply Kimba with River Murray water by means of a pipeline from Iron Knob, but the project had been deferred to enable the department to continue its investigations into the Polda Basin on Eyre Peninsula, which, it was thought, could supply enough water to give a reliable and valuable addition to the limited water resources on Eyre Peninsula, including a large area of farm land between Lock and Kimba. As a result of these investigations, the Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan) had reported that the Polda Basin could be relied upon to supply substantial quantities of water year in and

year out without any serious deterioration in quality, and, secondly, that the quantity available from this source would be sufficient to provide more water for further development of the areas already served. However, in recommending the Kimba scheme, Mr. Dridan considered it unwise that additional heavy commitments should be made until a great deal more is known about the Polda Basin.

The Lock to Kimba pipeline will be of immense benefit to the towns of Darke Peak and Kimba and the rural areas to be served. Kimba will be able to enjoy the amenities that most other towns in the State have enjoyed for years, and many farmers will be spared the onerous and costly task of carting water for domestic and stock purposes. The Engineer-in-Chief considered it prudent to provide for the enlargement of the trunk main over portion of the scheme and to incorporate two branch mains running west of the town of Darke Peak into the hundred of Darke. Present planning anticipates commencement of the construction of the pipeline early in 1966.

GILES POINT FACILITIES.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked on May 19 as to whether the Government, in setting up the committee of inquiry into bulk handling facilities throughout South Australia, will make provision for adequate primary producer representation, whether the bulk handling authority will be represented, when the committee will be required to present its report, and whether, when the report is presented, the information will be given to all members representing Yorke Peninsula rather than to only the two members mentioned in the reply given by the Minister?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The committee that my colleague, the Minister of Marine, has in mind is a small one, which would not have any sectional interests represented upon it. The committee will be asked to examine the economics of the whole of the existing and proposed future bulk handling installations in South Australia. There will not be any limitations on the committee. As its personnel has not yet been decided by Cabinet, I am unable to reply to that part of the honourable member's question.

HOUSING TRUST HOUSES.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Housing, a reply to my question of May 19 regarding Housing Trust houses?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My colleague, the Minister of Housing, has supplied the following answer:

Funds for the maintenance and repair of its houses are set aside from its income by the Housing Trust. The trust has no intention of reducing its maintenance expenditure as it realizes that adequate and regular maintenance of its houses is essential.

GAWLER HOSPITAL.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Last week I asked a question of the Minister of Health regarding the reconstruction of the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler. Has he any information on this matter?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have a report that states:

Cabinet has approved of the hospital board calling for tenders for improvements and extensions to the hospital, the work to be spread over the financial years 1965-66 and 1966-67. A Government subsidy of £2 for £1 will be paid.

SOUTH ROAD.

The Hon. SIR ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. SIR ARTHUR RYMILL: For some time I have been noting the excellent progress that has been made with the fine new South Road that has been constructed down to and through Reynella, but lately there does not seem to be much activity on that road. Will the Minister of Roads tell me whether the work has been slowed down or whether it has ceased altogether and, if so, why? I am referring to the end of the new Reynella by-pass section, not to the Darlington end.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: To my knowledge the work has not been slowed down but it could have been delayed owing to the acquisition of land in the Noarlunga area, as recently a considerable area of land has been acquired in that district council area for the purpose of the continuation of the work of remaking the South Road.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Following on that question I ask the Minister when this road is likely to reach the Hackham crossing?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have heard a lot about this crossing from time to time but when the road will reach it I am unable to say. However, I assure the honourable member that when it does reach the crossing due consideration will be given to the siting of the road with a view to eliminating the complaints that the honourable member has had from time to time relating to that crossing.

SUPREME COURT LISTS.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of last week concerning Supreme Court lists?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My colleague the Attorney-General has informed me that consideration of whether another Supreme Court judge should be appointed has been deferred until receipt of the report currently being prepared on proposals for courts of intermediate jurisdiction. It is expected that a decision will be made within two months.

GAWLER RIVER BRIDGE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question of last week referring to the replacement of the Angle Vale bridge over the Gawler River?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Plans have been completed and tenders for the construction of a new bridge over the Gawler River will be called within two months.

OVERLAND EXPRESS LUGGAGE.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: People travelling on the overland express usually find it necessary to carry luggage, often quite heavy luggage, a considerable distance along the platform before reaching their sleeping car. Many travellers are almost exhausted by the time they reach their allotted berths; in fact some people are reluctant to travel on the railways because of conditions applying to personal luggage. Will the Minister of Railways ask the railway authorities to provide some suitable means of conveying passengers' luggage to and from carriages?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I was under the impression that some provisions already existed for the carriage of passengers' luggage. However, I will obtain a full reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

ANZAC HIGHWAY.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: A year or two ago there was quite a lot of talk about congestion on the Anzac Highway, much of which is in my district, and about how traffic conditions could be alleviated. I often pass along that road, and I cannot remember the last time I saw a bicycle using the track on

either side of the road. It has occurred to me for some time that if the track were eliminated an extra lane could probably be provided on the highway. Will the Minister of Roads say whether the Government will consider this matter and whether it will have a traffic count made in relation to the utilization of these cycle tracks?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will ask for a report, and give a reply later.

WINE GRAPES.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On May 13 I asked the Chief Secretary what the Government intended to do about the surplus of grapes over and above the 3,000 tons for which some arrangement had already been made. I am now reliably informed that the Government estimate of a 3,000-ton surplus will be reached perhaps in the next day or two and that a considerable quantity of wine grapes will still be left on the vines. In view of this, can the Chief Secretary say what Government plans will be for the disposal of these additional surplus grapes?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I cannot say any more than I did previously but, as the honourable member has raised the matter again, I will take it up with the Premier and give a reply as soon as possible.

VENEREAL DISEASE.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Has the Minister of Health obtained a report in reply to a question I asked on May 13 about a press report referring to a startling increase in venereal disease in this State?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have obtained a lengthy report. As it is too long for me to read to the Council, I will make it available to any honourable member if required. The Principal Medical Officer (Public Health) submitted a report on the article in the *News* referring to the increase in venereal disease, and his report can be summarized as follows:

Some of the statistics quoted from overseas sources accurately represent existing conditions. Others represent trends in events only. Statistics relating to South Australia have no statistical meaning. Opinions of the British Medical Association must be regarded as authoritative for Great Britain, and those of the World Health Organization as authoritative for the world as a whole. No information is available to confirm statements made by the author of the article that referred to South Australia. Available statistics suggest that there may have been an increase in the incidence of gonorrhoea

and syphilis in South Australia recently. This increase has been under consideration by health authorities. Possible recommendations to deal with the situation are (1) request for additional staff for Department of Public Health; and (2) recommendation that gonorrhoea and syphilis be proclaimed notifiable diseases under the Health Act.

It will be readily understood that the last two recommendations have not been considered by Cabinet. I shall be happy to make the full report available to the Leader of the Opposition or any honourable member.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Recently I witnessed a television programme known as *Four Corners*, which would be familiar to all honourable members, in which this subject was discussed. I particularly noted that the announcer on that programme said that South Australia was the only State in which figures regarding the incidence of venereal disease were not available, as South Australia was the only State in which it was not a notifiable disease. I understood from his reply that the Minister of Health said that some consideration would be given towards making this a notifiable disease. Will the Minister say whether my interpretation is correct?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. One of the recommendations made to assist in this matter was that venereal disease be made a notifiable disease. I said it would be understood that the matter had not yet been to Cabinet, but I assure the honourable member and the Council that the recommendations made by Dr. McQueen, who is the senior medical officer, will be placed before Cabinet.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Some time ago plans were prepared for two passing bays on what is known as the new Mount Barker road, one between Crafers and Stirling and the other between Stirling and Aldgate. Unfortunately, the work was held up because of the necessity to remove an underground P.M.G. cable. In view of the urgency to speed up the increasing up traffic, will the Minister of Roads endeavour to have this matter given a high priority?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes.

TOWN PLANNING.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (on notice): With regard to the statements made by the Govern-

ment that it proposes to put "teeth" into the town planning legislation—

- (a) By what means does the Government propose to obtain a title to freehold land in the inner suburban areas so that redevelopment can take place?
- (b) Will persons living in substandard homes be obliged to leave their houses so that redevelopment plans can proceed?
- (c) If possession of substandard homes is not to be obtained, how is it proposed to implement the Government's redevelopment proposals?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The precise form of governmental action to obtain long-range inner suburban redevelopment can be determined only when the detailed plans for redevelopment have been prepared and adopted. Negotiations for the completion of such plans are being undertaken with the local governing authorities concerned. At this stage, therefore, it is not possible to give a more precise answer.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (on notice):

1. When was the Public Relations Officer appointed to his position?
2. What is his salary?
3. Where is his office?
4. Is he available for interview by members of the public?
5. What has been his principal work since his appointment?
6. Does he assist in the preparation of statements made by the Premier and the Attorney-General over a commercial broadcasting station?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The replies are:

1. Commenced duties May 3, 1965, on temporary appointment pending medical examination.
2. £1,562 per annum.
3. At present he is accommodated temporarily in the Registrar-General of Deeds Department in Flinders House. When the Parliamentary Draftsman moves to occupy the former Premier's suite, he will be accommodated in one of the rooms formerly occupied by the staff of the Parliamentary Draftsman, at 24 Flinders Street.
4. Yes.
5. The gathering of material for public relations campaigns for the Aboriginal Affairs Department and the Town Planner.
6. No.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS FUNDS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris, for the Hon. H. K. KEMP (on notice): Will the Government ensure that sufficient funds are made available under the Loans to Producers Act to meet the very large capital expenditure which must be made in the fresh fruit, canning and wine industries to handle the very large crop increases which are inevitable over the next five years as well as the rapidly increasing production which must be handled by co-operatives serving the dairying and fishing industries?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am informed by the Honourable the Treasurer that the provisions by the Government under the Loans to Producers Act this financial year will be of record dimensions and considerably in excess of the provisions estimated by the previous Government. The future provisions will be determined having regard to relative priorities, the requirements from Loan funds for other purposes, and the aggregate Loan funds available.

The honourable member may be assured the Government is fully appreciative of the importance of the needs of the co-operatives serving the fresh fruit, canning, winemaking, dairying and fishing industries. It will meet those reasonable needs as best it can within the limits of available finance.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Council do now proceed to elect by ballot two Members of this Council to be members of the Council of the University of Adelaide.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, the Hons. F. J. Potter and A. J. Shard were declared elected.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from May 20. Page 119.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): In supporting the motion I congratulate the mover, seconder and other members who had the honour to make their maiden speeches last week. As I listened to their remarks, I was made clearly aware of the changes that have occurred in the composition of this Council in six years. The changes have involved almost half the members of this place. We have lost six members by death,

some while serving here, and it does no harm to remember them by name and the example they set. The members to whom I refer were the Hon. Sir Walter Duncan, the Hon. Mr. Condon, the Hon. Mr. Melrose, the Hon. Mr. Edmonds, the Hon. Mr. Hookings, and, most recently, the Hon. Mr. Bardolph.

At the end of last session the Hon. Mr. Robinson and the Hon. Mr. Wilson retired after many years of valuable service to the State. Earlier the Hon. Mr. Giles had resigned to serve in another sphere. I hope that the new members will receive the same courtesy and respect as has been customarily given in this Chamber. I know from personal experience that, far from being a Chamber split by political antagonism, this place has worked consistently, irrespective of Party consideration, for the benefit of the State. The good feeling and tolerance within the Council, together with the high quality of the debates, have set standards for emulation in other political spheres. I believe that this Council will continue to act wisely on behalf of the people and continue to judge with impartiality measures affecting the State. The debates in this place can be a valuable aid to any Government, and I trust the Council will be able to assist the present Government in maintaining the democratic Legislature that has been such an outstanding success in South Australia for many years.

The Council has always provided most competent Ministers and wise counsel to the Government. I believe it is doing so now, and I congratulate the present Ministers on their appointments. I closely examined his Excellency's Speech and discovered that most of the developmental work referred to therein had already been dealt with in the previous Government's statements, and that the work mentioned in the Governor's Speech was mainly a summary of matters coming to fruition from the previous Government's programme. Therefore, I do not propose at this stage to deal closely with the main items mentioned. My only comment is that there does not seem to be much reference in the Government's proposals to new projects to develop this State in connection with country roads, water supplies and electricity services. It was with great disappointment that I found no reference to the proposed construction of a single country road or highway. It is to be hoped that in the future we shall not have a Government that keeps in mind only the metropolitan area and the people employed in metropolitan industry.

Turning now to the Speech in detail, I note that paragraph 4 announces the creation of a Premier's Department, charged with helping in the establishment of new industries, the expansion of old ones and the decentralization of industry. In this connection I hope the Government will set up an advisory committee of economic and industrial experts, and that when further decentralization is planned the Government will be motivated by a genuine desire to build up country areas and not promote decentralization solely for the purpose of strengthening political interests in borderline electoral districts.

Paragraph 5 refers to an amount of £100,000 to be made available to the State Bank for the purchase of existing houses. Members know as well as I that in order to buy a two or three-bedroom house, even an older one in a reasonable condition that would be approved by a lending authority, £4,500 to £5,500 is required. If the Government makes this sum of £100,000 available for the purchase of houses, only 18 to 20 houses can be fully financed. I hope the Government will soon find sufficient money to enable this matter to be developed further than the mere minimum required to fulfil the election promise.

In paragraph 8 I notice with some misgivings that the various forms of transport, both passenger and freight, are to be co-ordinated, apparently with a view to forcing more freight on to the railways and forcing more passengers to use the system. This paragraph, in conjunction with the Government's pre-election policy speech, seems to suggest that in some quarters there is still a refusal to recognize the great merit of road and air transport.

Outworn shibboleths represented by this type of legislation stand in the way of industrial progress and could set this State back 25 years, and it can only satisfy the old clamour of more work for the railway labour force and railway workshops. Just think of the frustration, delay, uneconomic handling and general difficulties that would be associated with transporting goods if this proposal eventuates. Goods would be loaded on a van at their place of origin, taken to, say, Mile End, put in their place in a queue and held up interminably, be unloaded, re-loaded on the train, carried by rail to the nearest station to their destination, unloaded, left standing while various formalities were completed, re-loaded on a van, taken by van to their ultimate destination and then unloaded for the last time.

It will undoubtedly cost the State many millions of pounds if the quick and efficient methods of post-war years are to be hamstrung and partly destroyed.

Paragraph 9 refers to the formation of an Aborigines lands trust, and includes the following sentence that I do not understand:

This will be the first State in Australia to provide land rights for its indigenous people.

As far as I know, Aborigines may now own land in any part of Australia. Paragraph 20 refers to the Government's intention to give effect to the Town Planning Committee's report. This report should be considered as having been carefully thought out for the future development of the State, but portions of it should be supported by enabling laws and regulations only as and when the time is appropriate for action to be taken in connection with the schemes. For example, where land for sports reserves is recommended it will be necessary to take action and provide money for that purpose as soon as it is evident that the land will be lost to posterity as public land. Action must be taken as and when money becomes available. The real danger is that an Act will be passed containing too wide a cover and providing too many arbitrary and regulatory powers, whereby injustice will be done to landowners and to other interested parties, simply because the Government or some town planning authority is ambitious far beyond the finances available. This is not a problem unique to South Australia. It has happened in other States, notably New South Wales where development in many areas has been jeopardized by too ambitious planning, too much freedom in enabling legislation, and insufficient finance. Surely we do not want to see South Australia's town planning scheme fall into disrepute because of enthusiastic misplanning? After all, the Town Planning Committee's report has many facets to it, some good and some not so good. Peculiarly, it seems to be the belief of our town planners and others that it is a bad thing to have houses and beautiful gardens built on the slopes of our hills, but that it is all right to have those same hills blasted into oblivion in half a dozen places by high explosives.

Paragraph 22 indicates, apparently, that we shall be asked to consider alterations to the Constitution of this State. This seems to be something that is attempted by every Labor Government when it comes to power. There seems to be an insatiable desire to alter Constitutions, whether Commonwealth or State. After the Second World War we had such experience

in the Commonwealth sphere with Dr. Evatt's numerous ambitious schemes for constitutional alteration. We now have in South Australia a Labor Government and in its ranks we have a lawyer with the burning desire to fiddle with the Constitution of the State. All such attempts to alter a well-established Constitution seem to lead in one direction, namely, to remove the safeguards that have operated in our Australian democracy so satisfactorily for many years, and, at the same time, to make it easier for the Labor Party to gain overwhelming permanent political control.

Before proceeding further with paragraph 22 I want to refer to the constant reiteration that the Government has a mandate to do everything referred to in its election promises. It surely must be admitted that an elector has only one vote and that he can vote only "Yes" or "No" on one question at a time. It cannot be claimed that he has expressed an opinion with his one vote on whether he wants free school books or a new hospital at Modbury and at the same time has expressed an opinion with that vote on the desirability or otherwise of transport reorganization. The Government would be well advised to consider whether it has a mandate to tamper with the Constitution. To imagine that a man who voted for the Labor Party because of its promises in some social welfare matter has also expressed his opinion on constitutional alteration is ridiculous, and it must spell its own disaster. The idea that a Government is given a clear mandate from the people can apply only when an election has been fought on one proposition only, such as whether a nation should have conscription, whether a nation should accept a higher rate of taxation, or some other single or clearly defined proposition. Such elections have frequently occurred. The one held in South Australia last March was not one of them. To claim that an elector has clearly expressed his belief on a dozen different matters with only one vote is as absurd as saying to a man, "Do you beat your wife?", "Are you a practising Christian?", "Should adolescents have more home discipline?", "Do you believe in murder?" and then say, "Answer in one word 'Yes' or 'No' to all that." Let us hear less about the Government's being given an all-over mandate to do everything that it promised to do, however ill-defined, in its policy speech.

The current proposal to alter our Constitution seems to be designed, so far as one hears, to increase the size of the House of Assembly by having a greater number of metropolitan

seats, and to alter the suffrage for the Legislative Council so that a large metropolitan vote will be able to swamp it as a preliminary to an attempt to abolish it altogether. If this intention succeeds it will do two things. First, it will reduce the voice of the country people to an impotent whisper, and, secondly, it will produce the biggest gerrymander in Australia since the notorious action of the Queensland Labor Government years ago. I have been freely informed outside the Chamber that if these constitutional alterations are put through South Australia will have an immovable Labor Government for the next 25 years. In fact, one leading citizen, who is not a supporter of my Party, put the figure at nearer 300 years.

The Government, in paragraph 22, stated that alterations to the Constitution are necessary to improve the system for resolving deadlocks between the Assembly and the Council. The major question is, of course, "What deadlocks?" For almost a century the bicameral system has worked to the State's advantage. Not one member here can remember an occasion when a deadlock has been said rightfully to have occurred. Certainly nothing of that nature has occurred that has been disadvantageous to the State. It seems to have been forgotten that the object of the bicameral system is to have two opinions on every Bill. The fact that the two opinions are sometimes at variance does not mean that democracy is dead, that it is moribund or no longer functions. The basic test of any legislation is that if it appeals to both Houses as being desirable for the State it is probably good legislation. If it is rejected by one House or the other it is possible that it is class legislation and, therefore, undesirable for the State. This is not a deadlock or an impossible position; it is simply democracy working at its best. These words are not meant to be an analysis of the two-House system, which has been found to be the most satisfactory type of Parliament in the world's biggest democracies; they are merely a brief comment on the Labor Party's never-ending struggle to stifle all voices but its own. I wish to devote the last part of my speech to matters of education. In paragraph 12, His Excellency said:

The Government will appoint a committee to report on the measures to be taken to achieve the integration of high schools and technical high schools into a system of comprehensive high schools.

It would be a very wise move if the Government went farther and established a committee to consider the possibility of incorporating the

existing Institute of Technology in the structure of the university. Now that a second university is being established at Bedford Park it hardly seems necessary to maintain the Institute of Technology as it is at present constituted because, after all, it is in close proximity to the university and in some cases is doing similar work. Considerable economies could be made if this second set of administrative and overhead costs could be eliminated. Moreover, it would raise the status of the work at present being done at the institute if its activities were satisfactorily integrated within the existing university structure.

On the general subject of education, I draw attention to some important figures. In the year ended June 30, 1964, the net cost of education to Consolidated Revenue in this State was £23,062,000, which was an increase of £2,705,000 on the previous year. This increase was due partly to increased grants to the university but mainly to the higher cost of education in State schools. In the past five years the net cost of education has risen by 93 per cent in this State, and this has been due only partly to an increase in population. During this five year period the increase in the net cost, related to the mean population, was about 72 per cent—from £13 3s. 4d. to £22 12s. 2d. This figure should interest us greatly, as it gives the lie direct to pre-election statements made about this State's expenditure on education. The latest figures available show that during 1962-63 the Australia-wide expenditure from Revenue on education was £16 4s. 4d. per capita, whereas the South Australian expenditure was £17 16s. 6d. This shows clearly that South Australia has been spending virtually 10 per cent more on education per capita than has Australia as a whole. This is a magnificent effort for a State like South Australia, which has been so heavily involved in vast developmental schemes. This statement gathers even more significance when one sees that personal income per capita in South Australia for the same year was £532, compared with the Australia-wide figure of £568. These figures are the official statistician's figures, and they show that, whereas the average South Australian earns less than the average Australian, he spends more on education.

We were all greatly honoured by the presence of His Excellency the Governor at the opening of Parliament, and I join with other members in wishing both His Excellency and Lady Bastyan good health and happiness while they remain in South Australia.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): It is a great pleasure to me to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency. In doing so, I endorse the remarks made by other speakers regarding the excellent service rendered by former members of this Chamber. I congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion on the able way in which they made their speeches, and I welcome the Hon. Mr. Banfield, the Hon. Mr. Octoman and the Hon. Mr. Geddes to this Chamber. I believe that in these three new members we have valuable acquisitions, and I look forward to being associated with them for many years. I congratulate the Government on the success it achieved at the last elections, and I particularly congratulate the members of this place who have been appointed Ministers. I believe we are fortunate in the calibre of the men we have here. The Liberal and Country League Government, under Sir Thomas Playford, lasted for almost 26 years, and I remind the new Ministers that unless they do better their time will be already running out, as they have only 25 years and 9 months left. However, if asked to give my estimate, I would say they have only 29 months left, and perhaps this will be reduced to 29 weeks.

I take this opportunity to express to the heads of all the departments that were under my direction while Attorney-General my sincere appreciation for all the help they gave me. Their work was of a high standard, and was most satisfactory in every way. I sincerely appreciated it. I mention particularly the first secretary I had after my appointment, Mr. John White, who is now Secretary to the Premier. I also mention the secretary who followed him, Mr. Langcake. Both were most efficient in their work and served me extraordinarily well. The Secretary for Labour and Industry, Mr. Lindsay Bowes, who is a very efficient officer, co-operated with me in every way during the 10 years I was in the Attorney-General's office. I refer also to my chauffeur, Mr. Ray Thompson, who was with me during my whole term as Minister. I express to him my thanks and appreciation for his courtesies during that long period.

I also thank the electors of Midland for what I can regard only as a very good vote at the last election. As most honourable members know, during the last three years about 3,500 extra voters were placed on the Midland roll, but notwithstanding that we finished with a majority almost equal to that gained three years previously. I think that calls for my

sincere appreciation, as well as the thanks of my colleague, the Hon. L. R. Hart. We deeply appreciate the confidence displayed in us, and we shall do our best to see that it is not betrayed. I believe much of my success was due to the excellent support I received from my immediate colleague in Midland, the Hon. L. R. Hart, and from the two other members for the Midland District, the Hon. Mr. Story and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who have worked tirelessly during the time they have been in Parliament and have established for themselves a reputation that will be the envy of many other members. I want at this stage also to express my appreciation of the work of the former Premier, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford. I do this because I believe that, with the remarkable development that occurred in the State under his leadership, we have a record of achievement that will not be equalled for many years to come. Only time will show the worth of his work and the wisdom of his administration.

When he left the Treasury benches the State's financial position was stable. We had a condition of full employment, new industries were being announced almost daily and there was great growth in both the country and the city areas. I need mention only the development of Whyalla during his term of office, the tremendous development at Mount Gambier and in the South-East of the State, the development of soldier settlement in the Loxton area and the Upper Murray towns, the great achievement in establishing the Leigh Creek coalfield, with all that it means to industry both today and in the future, and the construction of the Port Augusta powerhouse. I am waiting with a patience that will not take long to be exhausted to hear from the present Government just what its proposals are to match the development of Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Loxton and Leigh Creek. We have heard from the Opposition over many years that it proposes to make a special effort to see that decentralization is brought about in this State. I shall wait with much interest to hear something of its firm proposals on these matters rather than the airy promises which is as far as the Government has been able to go so far.

I also mention to this Council and the public generally the debt that we all owe to the former Chief Secretary, the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, for the work that he contributed for many years towards the development of our State. He was a most efficient Minister in every way. He managed the financial affairs relating to his department satisfactorily and although that

sometimes meant, as indeed it must mean to a responsible Minister, that he could not accede to every request made to him, nevertheless under his jurisdiction the Health Department and the Hospitals Department reached a great standard of progress. I want to place particularly on record my appreciation of the work that he did whilst he was in office. I also express to my former colleagues in Cabinet the great satisfaction I had in the term I served in the Cabinet and say that we were a happy Cabinet. As the years go by the public will realize the worth of the work done over many years by the Playford Government.

I want to turn now to what will be the main point of my speech this afternoon. Although for the rest of my speech I take the responsibility myself in this matter which I propose to raise now, I know I have the support of my colleagues in the Midland District—the Hons. Mr. Story, Mr. Hart and Mr. Dawkins—and also of the member in another place for Yorke Peninsula, Mr. Ferguson. I refer to the Government's decision to delay the construction of works at Giles Point. This may be a matter that will interest only the people of Yorke Peninsula directly but this deferment by this Government goes much further than that: it means a cancellation of a firm promise made by the Government on this matter before the last elections. Before I have completed my remarks I shall have something to say about this continual repetition of breaking solemn promises made on the eve of an election. It is a feature that I had hoped would not creep into this Administration but which unfortunately is becoming more evident every day.

In order that there may be a record of the facts of this matter, I propose to weary the Council at greater length than I would have done otherwise so that people will appreciate the serious nature of the decision taken by the Government in this matter, a decision that was taken without conferring with the interested people and without any notice whatsoever, which I believe the Government will live, if it does live, to regret.

This matter of a deep sea port at Giles Point goes back to November 20, 1959, on which day Mr. J. F. Honner, the Chairman of the Yorketown District Council, called a special meeting to consider the difficulties that primary producers at the southern end of Yorke Peninsula were suffering. That was done because, before that date, there was a trade between Edithburgh and Tasmania and New Zealand, which enabled wheat to be shipped direct from

Edithburgh to Tasmania. For reasons into which I need not now go, that was terminated, and the effect of the termination of that trade was that overnight the differential payment that the growers had to meet was increased from one penny to 9.89 pence a bushel, an increase of almost 9d. a bushel, which meant that the people in that area felt they had to do something to protect their own interests. A deputation waited on the former Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, on March 10, 1960, when he promised that an investigation would be made into the possibility of establishing better deep-sea facilities in that area.

On June 8, 1961, the three councils on the lower portion of Yorke Peninsula—the Yorketown council, the Warooka council and the Minlaton council—all combined to present a united front on this matter. As had been promised by the former Premier, lengthy and comprehensive investigations were made. I do not want to go into all the details of those: suffice it to say that the Harbors Board was satisfied that the point for these deep-sea loading facilities was what is now known as Giles Point. It prepared four separate proposals, any one of which it felt would meet the requirements of that area. On January 10, 1964, a meeting was called at Minlaton to give an opportunity for the growers to hear the proposals. I went over and addressed the meeting, at which there were 450 growers present. It was the largest and most enthusiastic political meeting I have ever attended. I submitted details of the proposals and suggested that the one I favoured was that which provided for a berth of 38ft. at low water, making provision for ships up to 33ft. draught and a tonnage of 25,000 tons dead weight, with a provision ultimately to increase the depth available. I suggested to the meeting that it should take great care and prepare an adequate case to be presented to the Public Works Committee. Following that, on May 27, 1964, the Public Works Committee took evidence on this matter. I want to congratulate the chairmen of the three district councils, Mr. J. J. Honner, Mr. J. F. Honner and Mr. W. H. Baker, and their committees for the pains they took in the preparation of their evidence. It has been said to me that this was done efficiently and effectively. That evidence showed that, if this installation was provided, at least 100,000 tons of grain would be available to use it each year. The present Minister of Works in making a statement has suggested a figure of 75,000 tons, but he has no justification for reducing the total figure because the

evidence submitted to the Public Works Committee showed that there was justification for accepting the figure of 100,000 tons. On December 1 last the Public Works Committee unanimously recommended that that proposal should proceed and I point out that at that stage there were on that committee three members of the then Opposition, one being the Hon. Mr. Bevan, who is now a Minister in this House. As soon as that decision was made, the Minister of Works of the day, the Hon. G. G. Pearson, made the announcement that the work would proceed and I addressed meetings at Yorke Peninsula, stating publicly the firm undertaking of the previous Government that this work would proceed without delay. That was followed, to the great satisfaction of the people of Yorke Peninsula, by a statement by the present Premier, Mr. Walsh, in his policy speech, and I propose to read an extract from that statement. He said:

The Labor Party have three of the seven members on the Public Works Committee and you can therefore appreciate that we are well versed in the methods that are adopted before any of these public works are commenced. The point I am more concerned to make known to the people of this State is that any public works recommended by the Government which are estimated to cost £100,000 or more must be referred to the Public Works Committee. Then I come to the special part of the statement, which is tremendously important for our present purposes. He said:

Any that are already recommended will be proceeded with under the administration and we have the assurance of the industrial organizations that wherever it is possible to speed up the completion of these works and others that may be recommended, they will do their utmost to assist.

That statement by the then Leader of the Opposition was supported by the Australian Labor Party candidate for Yorke Peninsula, Mr. Kennedy, in the *Advertiser* of March 4, when he said:

We also feel there is urgent need for a deep sea port at Port Giles, as has been promised by the Government on innumerable occasions.

On the same day, in the local paper, the *Pioneer*, Mr. Kennedy made a statement as follows:

The Australian Labor Party would see the fruition of the bulk handling and deep sea port facilities at Port Giles rather than it be a mere promise.

On the undertaking of the Playford Government and those statements by Mr. Walsh and the Australian Labor Party candidate for Yorke Peninsula, the people on the southern

end believed that their case was secure and that, whatever Government was returned, this work would proceed. Consequently, after the election they took no direct action. They thought that things were going along according to plan. No statement was made by the Government that there was any alteration of its intention, although, as we all know, there were numerous publicity statements almost every day in the press about what it proposed to do. It was not until a short time ago that, not having heard anything about this matter, Mr. J. F. Honner, Chairman of the District Council of Yorketown, made an inquiry of the Minister of Works as to what was the position and then, to his complete astonishment, he was informed that the work had been deferred. He could not be told what the word "deferred" meant, or for how long the matter would be deferred. He immediately contacted me and I was completely dumbfounded by the answer that was given, because I believed that the Australian Labor Party would honour its promise and that this work would proceed quickly. It was left to us to decide what action we should take at that point of time.

My first reaction was to ask the Minister of Works to visit Yorke Peninsula to address a public meeting and explain the reason for the deferment. If I had followed that course, I would have been able to assure him of a good attendance at the meeting and an enthusiastic reception. We thought of going direct to the Premier to ask his assistance in the matter; we thought of making a public statement and of making it a public issue and we considered what action we might take when Parliament met, but we put all those alternatives aside, because we thought that the proper thing to do was to go to the Minister concerned before there was any public debate or controversy or before any statements were made that would be embarrassing to the Government or to the Minister, so that he would have an opportunity to reconsider the position. We did that because we thought it was the proper thing to do in fairness to the Government and because, at a meeting of all the local government bodies on Yorke Peninsula held at Warooka before this announcement was made, it was decided to bring a deputation to the Minister and ask that the work be expedited.

No public statement was made before we saw the Minister of Works. When we met him, he listened patiently to us but still indicated that the work would be deferred and he made what I think is one of the most remarkable statements any Minister would make. That

was that there were some matters that had to be considered in regard to deep sea ports in South Australia and that he was referring this matter to a committee to be appointed from the Department of Works. That seemed to me to be a most extraordinary procedure to follow. We all know that for many years the Public Works Committee has been set up to inquire into proposals such as this; we know that it is a statutory committee; we know that it is a non-Party committee; we know that it has the powers of a Royal Commission, that it investigated this matter very thoroughly over a considerable number of months and that it came to a unanimous decision that this work should proceed. Now we are faced with a suggestion that a decision of that committee is to be placed on the side and that this matter is to be considered by some committee that has no statutory authority, no standing in the eyes of the public, and the personnel of which is still not known. That is a most unsatisfactory situation as far as the people of southern Yorke Peninsula are concerned. I do not propose to argue the merits of this proposal, because that matter is not at issue. The merits have already been decided by the Public Works Committee, which recommended in favour of it, but I want to make some other points.

The Australian Labor Party, in its policy speech, did give a firm undertaking that this matter would be proceeded with. There are thousands of acres of land in the foot of Yorke Peninsula that are dependent on a satisfactory outport to enable their development to take place, so the establishment of this port is right in line with the Australian Labor Party's policy of decentralization. However, if this port is not to proceed and if these people are to be loaded with an additional 9d. differential for their wheat and barley products, then much of this area will be uneconomic for farming. Furthermore, on the strength of the promise made by this Government and the previous Government that this port would proceed, people bought land in the area. I think it is most unfortunate that this decision was taken without reference to the people concerned. The least that might have been done was for the Government to confer with local interests and consider the views and feelings of those people before the decision to defer was brought into effect.

Many farmers on the bottom of Yorke Peninsula acted to their detriment on the faith of these promises. Large numbers signed authorities to become members of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, which

meant that an amount of 3d. a bushel was deducted in respect of every grain of wheat and barley delivered to enable the co-operative to have finance to proceed with this and other projects. The farmers did that because they thought the port and bulk handling facilities would be established. Last week another very unfortunate statement was made by the Government. That was that there are to be no bulk silos erected except at railway sidings. How one interprets that statement in relation to Yorke Peninsula is beyond my comprehension. As everyone knows, there are no railways on Yorke Peninsula south of Melton, Paskeville, Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta, and the lower portion of the peninsula would be 60, 80 or 100 miles from those towns. The announcement means that we cannot have silos or bulk handling in that area, and the establishment of a deep sea port is being denied those people. That there will not be any more silos is a bitter pill for them to swallow.

I know that when the Minister of Works received the deputation he said that more outports exist in South Australia than exist in other States and that he had to look at that matter in relation to South Australia. Because certain things happen in New South Wales it does not mean that the same set of circumstances should apply here, and I believe that the case rests on entirely different grounds. In fact, the bulk handling authorities and the wheat authorities in Australia are pleased that this State has so many outports because there is difficulty in handling the present wheat crop in Australia owing to the lack of outports. It has been of great assistance to the local bulk handling authority that so many outports do exist in South Australia.

Another point is that severe congestion occurs at Ardrossan and Wallaroo because wheat from the lower areas is delivered there. If the Giles Point project is not to go ahead, that congestion will become worse. Therefore, this is an issue that affects not only the people at the southern end of Yorke Peninsula but also the people at the northern end. It may be considered that I am making too large an issue of this matter but the failure to proceed with this project and the failure to provide bulk loading facilities will mean a difference of at least 6d. a bushel on all grain delivered by the farmers on the southern end of the peninsula. That means a difference of between £300 and £500 a year to their income. They will not appreciate the fact that they have been given a bill of between £8 and £10 a week for the rest of their lives because of the failure of

this Government to honour the promises made and repeated on numerous occasions.

The other point I want to mention is that the previous Government said that deep sea loading facilities must be provided on an economic basis. In other words, they must meet interest on the amount of capital invested. To make Giles Point an economic proposition it was agreed that a differential of 3d. a bushel should be imposed on wheat and barley delivered to that port. That has been suggested by the Public Works Committee and accepted unanimously by the people in that area. Therefore, I can see no reason for the decision of this Government to defer this project. I believe the Government has not given the real reason why it has been deferred. The Government put forward the idea of appointing a committee to investigate the project, but I believe that the real reason is a shortage of finance in the Loan fund. If that is so, and if the Government had been honest about it and said that the project must be deferred for a year or two and had then given the members of our Party an opportunity to discuss the proposal, we would have been happy to accept it, but we will not accept the breaking of a solemn promise given by the Government, nor will we accept the idea of complete, indefinite deferment.

I have laboured this point, but I consider every member of Parliament has some points to bring forward for his electors that he considers are more important than others, and this is a proposal that I have lived with ever since 1959. It is something that many of my constituents on Yorke Peninsula were hopeful would come to fruition. I trust that the Government will realize the wisdom of my remarks and that a solution of the problem will be found. We have handled this matter in a way that would not cause the Government any embarrassment. We approached the Minister before making any public statement and gave him ample opportunity to consider it. I trust that, from what has been said today and as a result of representations made by myself and my colleagues, this matter will have the Government's attention.

I now turn to other matters that I consider should be ventilated at this stage. Not only have we had a complete about-face on Giles Point, but also a complete reversal of form on other matters included in the policy speech of the Labor Party that were made as firm propositions during the election campaign. Reference has been made to the Government's

complete about-face with regard to road maintenance charges on Eyre Peninsula. That is a matter causing concern, as the previous Government took the view that it was not possible to exempt Eyre Peninsula from the road maintenance charges. That view was taken on legal advice tendered to the then Government and, although that advice was not given over my signature, it was obtained from a more competent authority than myself. However, I concurred in that opinion and it was acted upon. I went to Eyre Peninsula myself and addressed meetings in two areas on the peninsula and encountered considerable opposition to the proposal to introduce this road maintenance charge and also to the fact that we were not prepared to exempt Eyre Peninsula. Consequently, I considered that a great responsibility rested on me if it turned out that my advice at the time was wrong, and I waited anxiously to see what would happen.

Shortly after the election I read in the press that the Premier was going to Port Lincoln to address a meeting and I thought, "This is an opportunity he has taken to tell the people that next week they will be exempt from the road maintenance charge." However, he came home and no announcement was made. A little later I read in the press that the Attorney-General was going to address a meeting of the Rotary Club at Port Lincoln and I thought, "Obviously, since he is the legal officer of the Government, he will be the logical person to make an announcement with regard to the exemption of Eyre Peninsula from the road maintenance charge." I was in fear and trembling that he would say that he would produce evidence that would prove me wrong. However, it seems that instead of dealing with road maintenance, he talked on another subject that appears to me to be of interest. This is what he said:

I have often been asked, "Why is it you enter politics, as any politics are a dirty business. Why should one bother oneself with this sort of thing?" My reply to that sort of question usually is, "Well, do you believe that the political life of the community should be left to people who act in an unsatisfactory manner, to the crooks and the rogues and the people who involve themselves with the dirty politics you talk about?" The fact is that if one is to have satisfactory politics you must have people who are prepared to dedicate themselves to the things they believe to be right in community activity.

I do not know whether the Attorney-General considers that he has dedicated himself to the things that are right or should be right for the community, but it is interesting that he

should have spoken in that strain instead of dealing with road maintenance charges while he was at Port Lincoln. We have had the Giles Point episode, the episode regarding road maintenance charges, the threatened control of transport (which will be serious to the country areas of this State), and the complete failure by the Government to produce any satisfactory proposals for decentralization. Very little was said in the Governor's Speech about decentralization, and we have heard nothing about it since. I do not know what the Government proposes. I was at Wallaroo at the week-end and was asked when the Government intended to honour its proposal to establish an industry there, but I could not give a reply. I should like to know from a Minister when the Government will have a proposal for that area. Promises have been made by the Party opposite, ever since the by-election following the death of Mr. Larry Heath, that something would be done at Wallaroo.

We also have a serious position in the allocation of the portfolios of Repatriation, Lands, Irrigation, Agriculture and Forests to one Minister, that Minister being the one lowest in order of precedence in the Cabinet. In view of the importance of country areas to the State, having all these portfolios under the control of one Minister indicates the complete disregard of the present Government for country areas.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Hasn't that always been Labor policy?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: It has. I point to the long string of broken promises and the complete disregard by the present Government of country interests. Do the Ministers think it reasonable that they should come along with an electoral proposal that would reduce country representation to about one-third of the total and make the metropolitan representation about two-thirds of the total? Unless I am more convinced than I am now about the manner in which this Government will or will not develop country areas and recognize their interests, I shall not be prepared to support such a proposal. In view of the things that have occurred in the last few weeks and the way promises have been broken, if a proposal is brought before us to place control of the people's bank under the Treasurer, and enable the passbooks of the people and their children to be passed around the Cabinet table for everyone to peruse, I shall not support it.

In the election campaign the Playford Government was grossly misrepresented on many aspects by the Party opposite. We went to

the election with the boundaries as they were, but that was never the wish of the Playford Government. My Party introduced a Bill in the Lower House in 1962 that had the effect of giving equal representation to city and country interests. It was eminently fair to both Parties, and would have been supported by any reasonable person. However, it was not passed because of Labor Party opposition, and we were left with the districts as they were. The 1955 redistribution was made only because of the support of the Labor Party. As honourable members will remember, in the Lower House the Liberal and Country League had only 21 members, one of whom was opposed to the measure and voted against it. Then there was the Speaker, so it had only 19 members on the floor in favour of the measure. We could not have got the redistribution proposals through the House without the support of the Opposition, so the electoral basis upon which the people voted at the last election could not have been brought into being without the support of the Labor Party. It would have been corrected and placed on a basis giving equal representation for country and city areas if it had not been for the opposition of the Labor Party during the last Parliament, yet we have had to carry the blame for the electoral gerrymander referred to by the Labor Party during the election campaign. I think the attitude adopted was most unfair.

I turn now to the Legislative Council. We have been criticized because of the franchise for this Chamber and because fewer people vote for it than for the other place. It was never intended that the franchise should be as limited as it is now, however. We introduced a Bill in another place providing that, where a husband was qualified to vote, his wife would have a vote for this Council, irrespective of whether she possessed the other qualifications, and that where the wife was entitled to vote the husband would also be entitled to vote. That would have increased greatly the number of voters for this Chamber, but it was opposed by the Labor Party, so one of the reasons for the low number on the Legislative Council roll is the attitude of that Party.

I believe in the bicameral system of government. If one studied the history of the British system of government one would find that it operated most satisfactorily where there had been the bicameral system. I firmly believe that if a bicameral system is to operate effectively there must be different electoral districts and a different franchise for the two Chambers. This is the opinion of the people

who have had most experience in this matter. In New South Wales there is a nominated Upper House. This would be subject to much more criticism than would the franchise of this Chamber, yet even in that State the people voted for the retention of the Upper House despite the campaign carried out over the years for its abolition. I believe that in due course the people of this State will see the wisdom of retaining this Council with a franchise different from that of the other place. I also believe from my 16 years' experience here, and from my knowledge of the present situation, that this Council will not prove obstructive but will act in the best interests of the whole State.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: In your opinion the Commonwealth Parliament of Australia is wrongly elected?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: No, I do not think it is, but we can deal with that on another occasion.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The same principle must be involved, though?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Another matter about which I am not happy is the appointment of a public relations officer by this Government. The position was advertised on March 30, and the advertisement stated that the appointee was to be under the control of the Attorney-General. The following is a description of the qualifications required:

The public relations officer will be required to prepare newspaper and magazine articles, scripts for television talks and films, and address meetings. Salary £1,502-£2,252. Could lead to an overall public relations staff to publicize the Government's welfare work in all its ramifications.

When I saw that advertisement, it appeared to me that this could lead to his being a publicity officer for the Party that happened to be in power at the time and not a publicity officer in the interests of the welfare of the State. My fears in that matter have not been allayed, because I understand from a press report and from information given to me today that the officer has been appointed, and that there were 16 applications for the position, all from within the Public Service. From my knowledge of the Public Service, I would say that many of those applicants would be well qualified gentlemen. If the person appointed is not in fact a member of the Public Service, as I understand the rules and regulations of the Public Service, he has to satisfy the Public Service Commissioner that he has better qualifications and is more suited to the task than

anyone inside the service. Apparently, the Government was satisfied on that matter. I do not criticize it on that ground because I do not know the appointee or his qualifications, but it seems remarkable that he was, I believe, the Secretary of the Adelaide University Labor Club and actively associated with the Attorney-General in his recent political campaign in Norwood, and with certain pamphlets put out by the Australian Labor Party during the last election, which were scattered widely—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not propose to refer particularly to the pamphlets, or to produce them in this Chamber. All I wish to say is that these pamphlets, which to my mind are not very satisfactory, were published by the Adelaide University Labor Club. I do no more at this stage than point out that 16 people, who were members of the Public Service, have been overlooked in connection with this appointment and that the gentleman appointed is a prominent member of the Adelaide University Labor Club and was actively associated with the Attorney-General in his election campaign in Norwood. I have the gravest misgivings about the propriety of the appointment and the justification for spending public money to the extent of over £1,500 a year (£30 a week) for what is largely publicity purely for the Government, and more particularly publicity for one Minister. It may be that as time passes I shall be able to say more about this matter, but I leave it at that for the moment.

Another unsatisfactory situation that occurred before the last election was the criticism that the Australian Labor Party made of the Government for not proceeding with the implementation of the Town Planning Act. That criticism was unfair because the Act specifically provided that the people of this State were to have a period of 12 months in which to lodge objections to the plan, and that those objections had to be considered before the plan was implemented. Section 3 of the amending Act, assented to on December 12, 1963, reads:

(1) The committee shall within twelve months from the passing of the Town Planning Act Amendment Act, 1963, call for, receive and consider objections and representations from any person relating to the report of the committee submitted to the Minister pursuant to section 28, or any matters referred to therein.

(2) The committee may from time to time recommend to the Minister the amendment or variation of the report of the committee submitted to the Minister pursuant to section 28. Any recommended amendment or variation so recommended shall be laid before both Houses

of Parliament, and shall not be made to the report until such amendment or variation (as the case may be) has lain before both Houses for fourteen sitting days, and either no notice disagreeing with it has been given in either House during that period, or, if any such notice has been so given, the same or all such motions if more than one is or are negatived.

That section of the Act was assented to on December 12, 1963, so that the period for objection to be raised to the Act did not expire until December 12, 1964. Therefore, if the Government was not to override the provisions made by Parliament in this matter, and the wishes of the people who wanted to lodge objections, it had to act contrary to the Act. As everyone knows, the last session of the last Parliament was completed before that date, so we had no opportunity of considering amendments or of bringing the Town Planning Act into force and putting "teeth" into it, as this Labor Party proposes to do. In the circumstances, the television item on this and the Government's public criticism of it were certainly not justified unless it feels it can override the provisions of an Act of Parliament, and the views of people vitally affected by these town planning proposals. When I was at the Attorney-General's office, numerous objections were lodged to this metropolitan plan. I forwarded them to the Town Planner for his consideration and comments. They were amendments that would seriously affect the property rights of individuals in all sections of the metropolitan area. Although the Government through its Minister says that it proposes to "put teeth" into its town planning legislation, the whole thing is full of difficulties and problems.

I asked what I thought was a simple question, or series of questions, and I got the answers today. I wanted the Government to indicate to me how far it was going with this proposal to redevelop the inner areas. A full-page statement appeared in the press on this matter and photographs were shown of the redevelopment to take place. I was firmly of the opinion that something concrete had been worked out. In order to ascertain the position, I asked the Minister:

- (a) By what means does the Government propose to obtain a title to freehold land in the inner suburban areas so that redevelopment can take place?
- (b) Will persons living in substandard homes be obliged to leave their houses so that redevelopment plans can proceed?
- (c) If possession of substandard homes is not to be obtained, how is it proposed to implement the Government's redevelopment proposals?

I asked those questions because a firm statement had been made on this matter in the press, and the answer I got was virtually, "We have not thought about these things yet. We shall need more time to consider them and we will then see what we can do." That is the position with regard to not only town planning but also the co-ordination of transport. We were told at election time that early proposals would be brought down on this matter, but nothing has happened so far. It may be fortunate that that is the position. We heard that a Minister had gone to Sydney to inquire into proposals regarding the co-ordination of transport. If as a result of his trip he proposes to introduce transport control legislation similar to that obtaining in New South Wales, he will not find a very receptive ear as far as I am concerned. After the Minister had returned he sent some officers to New South Wales to learn about this matter. No doubt in the distant future we shall hear some detailed proposals.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I have not sent officers over since my return.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I understood from the press that the Minister had sent officers to that State after his return. If I have misquoted the position, I tender my apologies to him. In some instances we have a complete negation of promises made by the Government; in some matters we have a postponement of promises made by the Government; and in other matters it does not seem to be able to tell us what are its proposals. As I said at the beginning of my speech, my own assessment of this Government's time in office was 29 months. Now, having thought more about the matters I have dealt with today, my estimate is about 29 weeks.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): Mr. President, I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. With other members I express my appreciation of the service rendered to this State by His Excellency the Governor as Her Majesty's representative. I also express my appreciation of the dignity with which His Excellency opened this session of the new Parliament. I am pleased with the suggestion by the Leader of my Party, Sir Lyell McEwin, that an extra term should be given to His Excellency. Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan have endeared themselves to all South Australians and I am certain that a re-appointment for an extra term would meet with the unqualified support of all sections of the State.

I regret the passing of three former members. I should like to mention two because I had much to do with them. First, Mr. Bardolph gave me, as a new member, much encouragement, assistance and advice for which I shall always be grateful. When I came here as a new member and saw the seat that I was to occupy, I was somewhat disconcerted, because I saw that I would be completely surrounded by members of the Labor Party. However, I did not have much need to worry for I found after a while that I was at home in this particular corner. I express my appreciation for the help and assistance given to me by Mr. Bardolph. Secondly, I refer to Mr. Corcoran, who represented Millicent from 1956 to 1962 and, prior to that, represented the district of Victoria. I pay a tribute to him because he was a man who recognized a loyalty far beyond the usual bounds of Party loyalty. He had a deep respect for the heritage and tradition that we all hold dear. It was a heritage and tradition to which he gave considerable service. He was a man whose character immediately impressed itself upon one. To the families of the three former members, Mr. Tapping, Mr. Corcoran and Mr. Bardolph, I extend my sympathy.

I congratulate the new members who have entered this Chamber as a result of the recent elections, and on their contributions to this debate. I believe that in the new representatives of the Northern District we have two worthy successors to Mr. Robinson and Mr. Wilson. I will miss the slow measured tread of Mr. Robinson down the passage in the basement as compared with the staccato movement of Mr. Wilson. Both Mr. Octoman and Mr. Geddes demonstrated a wide knowledge of the district they represent, and they dealt particularly with matters of which they had a considerable knowledge. Mr. Banfield demonstrated a vigorous approach in the material he presented to this Council. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Story that these new members will be able to devote themselves to the task of serving the State in this House of Review. I have no doubt that some disagreements will arise; but I am certain that this Chamber will be able to work in harmony and with wisdom in the service of the people. This is the first time that we have seen a change of Government in South Australia in 32 years. Of that period, for 27 years we have had what one may term the Playford-McEwin Administration, and it was an administration that, for length of service, broke most of the records in the British Commonwealth of Nations. I believe some appraisal

should be made at this juncture of the difficulties that faced that Administration. We are all aware of the grave developmental difficulties and disabilities that face South Australia. This is a dry State, virtually a desert State. In fact, it is the driest in the Commonwealth. It is lacking in the natural resources that go to give a State a dynamic economy. Perhaps I can demonstrate how dry it is. South Australia has 82.8 per cent of its area in the under 10in. rainfall category, as compared with 37.6 per cent in the rest of Australia. South Australia has 13.9 per cent of its area in the 10 to 20in. rainfall bracket, whereas the figure for the rest of Australia is 30.8 per cent. In the 20in. and over group, the South Australian figure is 3.3 per cent, as compared with 31.6 per cent for the rest of Australia.

We have only one river in South Australia that can be termed a useful river for development purposes, and it is shared with two other States, Victoria and New South Wales. We have no high-grade coal deposit, yet without a doubt during the period of the last Administration, despite all the developmental difficulties and disabilities, we have seen a period of dynamic growth. We have seen tremendous strides in the generation and reticulation of power. We have seen the rather remarkable development of the low-grade coal deposit at Leigh Creek. Great progress has been made in the development and reticulation of our water resources, this State having the highest percentage of people in the Commonwealth who can turn on a Government tap. It pressed on with the development of a first-class highway system. One could go on speaking about the development of South Australia from, say, 1938-39 to the present time.

I will quote from Mr. Banfield's remarks, and then I hope to refute his claim and show the worth of the previous Administration by giving statistical evidence. Mr. Banfield said:

They were denied their rights because a Government elected by the minority for the sole purpose of looking after the selfish interests of 40 per cent of the people and not the welfare of the community and State generally.

The figures I propose to give deal with the position in 1938-39, compared with the position revealed by the latest statistical figures for the year 1962-63. It shows the percentage increase for each State of Australia, and then puts the States in their order of growth. The populations of the States in 1938-39 were New South Wales 2,735,000, Victoria 1,872,000, Queensland

1,008,000, South Australia 595,100, Western Australia 466,900, and Tasmania 237,600. In 1962-63 the population was: New South Wales, 4,015,000; Victoria, 3,022,000; Queensland, 1,551,000; South Australia, 999,000; Western Australia, 764,400; Tasmania, 362,100. The percentage increase over the period 1938-39 to 1962-63 has been: New South Wales, 46.8; Victoria, 61.4; Queensland, 53.8; South Australia, 67.8; Western Australia 39; and Tasmania, 52.7. The order of growth over that period is South Australia first, Victoria second, Queensland third, Tasmania fourth, New South Wales fifth and Western Australia sixth.

The next table I wish to present concerns the net value of production in each State, both primary and secondary. In 1938-39 the figures were: New South Wales, £152,263,000, Victoria, £103,398,000; Queensland, £61,247,000; South Australia, £30,446,000; Western Australia, £27,460,000; and Tasmania £13,541,000. The corresponding figures in 1962-63 were: New South Wales £1,497,091,000; Victoria, £1,136,111,000; Queensland, £447,294,000; South Australia £317,998,000; Western Australia £236,334,000; and Tasmania, £110,767,000. The percentage growth of each State during that period in the net value of primary and secondary production was Victoria, 998; South Australia, 944; New South Wales, 883; Western Australia, 760; Tasmania, 717; and Queensland, 630. The growth in the net value of primary and secondary production for South Australia places this State second in the Commonwealth.

Figures on motor vehicle registrations were difficult to obtain because the system varies from State to State. The figures I shall quote cover the increase in motor registrations during the last 12 months in the various States. They are: New South Wales, an increase of 17.7 per cent; Victoria, 22 per cent; Queensland, 33.3 per cent; South Australia, 31.9 per cent; Western Australia, 19.2 per cent; and Tasmania, 20.6 per cent. That places the States in the following order: Queensland, South Australia, Victoria, Tasmania, Western Australia and New South Wales.

The next table deals with unemployment. Rather than take the figures of 1938-39 on their own I have taken the average figure from 1928 to 1939 in South Australia and in all other States. The average figure over that period shows New South Wales with an average unemployment of 19.8 per cent; Victoria, 15.9 per cent; Queensland, 10.6 per cent, South

Australia, 19.9 per cent; Western Australia, 15.4 per cent; and Tasmania, 15.3 per cent. During that period South Australia had the highest unemployment rate in the Commonwealth and then came New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia, Tasmania and Queensland. The latest figures, of April, 1965, show that Victoria has the lowest percentage of unemployment with 0.7 per cent and South Australia, the second lowest, has 0.8 per cent. These tables illustrate the general improvement in economic conditions in South Australia over the period of the Playford-McEwin administration.

The next table concerns the total production per capita in the various States of the Commonwealth. The average for the whole of Australia during the period 1930 to 1938 was £47.61. The South Australian average over that period was £42.87, the lowest in Australia. If we take an index figure of 100 as the average of the production per capita in Australia, the South Australian figure is 88. The most recent figures that I can find on the total production—and I have been assured by some experts that my figures are wrong and that the South Australian figures are better than I make them out to be—show South Australia in third position with an average total production of £315 per capita. The improvement in South Australia's position during this period can easily be seen.

The final table I desire to present concerns State development over the period 1948-49 to 1962-63. I have taken a number of factors into consideration and compared them by giving a percentage increase for that period. For example, taking the base rate as 100 in 1948-49, I have reached a figure showing the position in 1962-63. In population the increased percentage for that period in New South Wales has been 131; Victoria, 143; Queensland, 137; South Australia, 150; Western Australia, 146; and Tasmania, 135. Those figures place South Australia in first position. Of wool produced, the percentage increases are: New South Wales, 150; Victoria, 155; Queensland, 148; South Australia, 182; Western Australia, 185; and Tasmania 206, and this places South Australia in third position.

Of wheat produced the percentage increases during that period are: New South Wales, 168; Victoria, 138; Queensland, 131; South Australia, 147; Western Australia, 200; and Tasmania 200, thus placing South Australia in fourth position. In area cropped, the percentage increases are: New South Wales, 156;

Victoria, 136; Queensland, 179; South Australia, 146; Western Australia, 178; and Tasmania, 114, thus placing South Australia again in fourth position.

In area under pasture during that period the percentage increases area: New South Wales, 364; Victoria, 217; Queensland, 220; South Australia, 581; Western Australia, 311; and Tasmania, 245, placing South Australia in first position. The percentage increase in factory employment was: New South Wales, 126; Victoria, 136; Queensland, 127; South Australia, 139; Western Australia, 139; and Tasmania, 136. South Australia is in first position there. The percentage increase in timber produced was: New South Wales, 108; Victoria, 111; Queensland, 84; South Australia, 213; Western Australia, 147; and Tasmania, 124. South Australia is in first position in this respect also. The percentage increase in power generated in the various States was: New South Wales, 301; Victoria, 283; Queensland, 349; South Australia, 412; Western Australia, 305; and Tasmania, 329. Once again South Australia is in first position. In power produced per capita, the percentage increases were: New South Wales, 230; Victoria, 198; Queensland, 256; South Australia, 274; Western Australia, 209; and Tasmania, 244. In this, South Australia is also in first position during that period. If one takes an average of all these percentage increases in the various developmental projects one finds that South Australia has had the most dynamic developing economy of any Australian State.

The next table I have is of State taxation. In the period from 1928-29 to 1938-39 the average State taxation levied per capita was: New South Wales, £6 5s. 4d.; Victoria, £5 2s. 7d.; Queensland, £6 18s. 5d.; South Australia, £6 5s. 9d.; Western Australia, £5 9s. 6d.; and Tasmania, £4 1s. 9d. The order of severity of taxation was: Queensland, South Australia, New South Wales, Western Australia, Victoria and Tasmania. In 1962-63 State taxation (not including revenue from lotteries and poker machines) was: New South Wales, £19 18s. 11d.; Victoria, £19 2s. 5d.; Queensland, £17 3s. 11d.; South Australia, £13 17s. 2d.; Western Australia, £15 0s. 10d.; and Tasmania, £14 1s. 3d. The order of severity was New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania, and then South Australia.

I turn now to savings bank deposits. The percentage increase in 1963-64 over 1962-63 was: New South Wales, 10.1; Victoria, 11.4;

Queensland, 13.7; South Australia, 11.6; Western Australia, 12.4; and Tasmania, 9.6. South Australia was in third position. The average deposit per capita was: New South Wales, £192 2s.; Victoria, £236 12s.; Queensland, £170 18s.; South Australia, £230 4s.; Western Australia, £151 16s.; and Tasmania, £170 18s. South Australia was in second position, after Victoria. Before giving the next table I refer to a statement made by the Hon. Mr. Banfield, who said:

It is gratifying to see that the Government intends to spend higher amounts on education. This State has for a number of years been well below other States in the amount spent on education per capita.

I am pleased that the Hon. Mrs. Cooper also dealt with this, so I shall confine myself to dealing with one table. In 1938-39 the States spent the following sums per capita on education: New South Wales, 38s. 9d.; Victoria, 32s. 7d.; Queensland, 37s. 10d.; South Australia, 35s. 10d.; Western Australia, 36s. 5d.; and Tasmania, 32s. In 1938-39 the order was New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia, South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania. In 1962-63 the States spent as follows: New South Wales, 328s. 11d.; Victoria, 330s. 3d.; Queensland, 253s. 11d.; South Australia, 356s. 6d., Western Australia, 352s. 3d.; and Tasmania, 378s. 2d. The order then was Tasmania, South Australia, Western Australia, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. In this context it is interesting to consider university expenditure per capita in the various States. In 1962-63 this was: New South Wales, 27s. 7d.; Victoria, 15s. 4d.; Queensland, 17s. 9d.; South Australia, 38s. 5d.; Western Australia, 27s. 8d.; and Tasmania, 27s. 7d. These figures show that South Australia is spending more per capita than is any other State in the Commonwealth.

I have given these figures at length to demonstrate that this new Government has inherited an economically progressive and prosperous State. By comparison, over the period from 1938-39 until the present time it has had the most dynamic and developing economy of any State of Australia. Surely some credit must be given to this administration. In praising that administration, I also pay a tribute to a constructive and moderate Opposition; I freely acknowledge this. However, we must also grant that this Chamber, as an independent House of Review, has also played its part, bringing as it has a wide experience in all fields of activity in this State to the legislation placed before it. It is interesting to note

that last session 90 amendments were moved in this Chamber and that only one Bill was defeated. Many of these amendments could be looked upon as radical amendments introducing completely new concepts into our legislation; indeed, introducing concepts that do not exist in any other State's legislation. I believe there is a campaign in this State to create an unfavourable impression in the minds of the people about the role of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Are you getting the breeze up?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I thought you were because of your propaganda praising the Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. I gave your Party a good run. I think the Leader of my Party dealt effectively with the appointment of sessional committees. We all realize, as was pointed out by the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, that these were Parliamentary and not Government committees, and in no way do they affect the administration of the Government. Yet we saw the Legislative Council being charged by the Premier of this State with adopting a dictatorial attitude and being arrogant. The Hon. Mr. Story dealt effectively with an article that appeared in the *Sunday Mail*. I am pleased that last Sunday Mr. Story was given publicity in that newspaper for his contentions on this matter. He said he felt that the previous article was biased. It may not have been biased but it was designed to mislead. Mr. Story also dealt with an article appearing in *On Dit* on March 25, 1965. He dealt with this fully and effectively although he did not quote the whole article. He dealt with subjects under two headings entitled "Pied Playford" and "Rabbits". I point out one thing that Mr. Story overlooked in this article headed "Dunstan Cools Down". It reads:

From his speech the problems rest largely on the shoulders of the L.C.L. majority in the Upper House.

But it is not to that article that I wish to refer now. On March 11, 1965, *On Dit* had another article along similar lines. It points out that four of the seats of the Legislative Council are held by the A.L.P. and continues:

The rest of the seats are filled by men who seem to answer only to God, and that God, it would appear, is a 19th Century Tory. Since this little group consistently knocked back Playford's Bills, we can rest assured they will do everything they can to humiliate the Labor Government and stifle any effective programme. This is my third year as a member of this Chamber and during the time I have been

here I have never seen this picture that is portrayed in this article.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You would not in the circumstances then existing, naturally.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We agree, but it does say that this little group consistently knocked back Playford's Bills. I have already pointed out that last year we defeated one Bill, and that Bill which was passed by another place I do not think anyone on reflection would say should be on our Statute Book. But it assumes that we "answer only to God, and that God, it would appear, is a 19th Century Tory".

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I notice it refers to men only; it does not refer to women.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is true, but the writer knows little about the Legislative Council anyway. It has been pointed out that 90 amendments were introduced into this Chamber last year, many of which were radical amendments carried by the back-benchers of the L.C.L. in this Chamber against the opposition of the three Ministers of the Government, who were in a slightly different position, and with the support of the conservative members of the A.L.P. in this Chamber. I do not mind these rather red-blooded intellectuals letting off steam, but I at least ask that, before they make these comments, they spend a little time on some research into exactly how this Council operates.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Brother, you've not heard anything yet!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Once again we see the picture of this Council being thrown up in an unfavourable light in the minds of people and being portrayed as an ultra-conservative body answering only to a 19th century Tory God. I am certain that this writer knows nothing about the Legislative Council at least on the last two or three years of its operation. I trust that people are not misled by this adverse publicity and that they realize that amendments are not introduced into this Chamber lightly, nor are they introduced on straight Party lines or by people pledged to a Party line. We are not here to embarrass or humiliate the Government; we are here to review dispassionately and independently the legislation that comes before us.

Already in this debate we have heard much talk about a mandate. I am pleased that the Honourable Mrs. Cooper dealt with that. We have also heard much said about the ton-mile tax on Eyre Peninsula. This has been put forward in various ways, but I put the problem this way. I want to assume for the moment that

the Government decides to exempt Eyre Peninsula from the ton-mile tax and that the necessary legislation comes before this Chamber. I say the Legislative Council would be acting responsibly if it rejected the removal of the ton-mile tax from Eyre Peninsula. If that be the case, would we in this Chamber be charged with taking an action contrary to the will of the people? I think that the Government, by its attitude to this question, has already admitted that the removal of the ton-mile tax on Eyre Peninsula was an election gimmick. In so doing it is at least acting responsibly and I appreciate the frankness with which the Minister of Local Government replied to the question directed to him on that point.

Then we can ask ourselves whether the Government has a mandate to take a referendum on lotteries. Has it a mandate to go to the people and say, "Do you agree that this State should introduce a lottery?" The Government has a mandate, for example, to introduce a system of free school books, but let us realize that this policy could lead to undesirable developments in education in South Australia. Already the Minister of Education (Mr. Loveday) has indicated the Government's policy on autonomous teachers training colleges, as recommended in the Martin Report on Education. Let me now read this quotation from the *Advertiser* of May 19 last:

The Minister of Education (Mr. Loveday) said yesterday that he was completely opposed to the establishment of autonomous teacher training colleges in the manner recommended in the Commonwealth Government's Martin Report on education.

Mr. Loveday said that the Martin committee advocated the development of autonomous teachers colleges, under the control of a board of education, but outside the control of the State education department.

It advanced the astonishing argument that such colleges would be a "welcome means of introducing a greater measure of variety of outlook into Australian education."

"This argument appears to have no sound foundation," Mr. Loveday said.

We all realize that in South Australia the Minister is responsible and has the final say in all education matters at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels. This inflexible attitude demonstrated by the Minister of Education could lead to the Education Department becoming all-powerful, and any independence in our education system as recommended by the Martin report could be doomed to remain just a recommendation. I should like to add to this attitude the possibilities on the question of free books. If one looks at those possibilities one can see that the

Legislative Council has an important role to play in seeing that our education system does not stagnate into a massive controlled business, with no means of developing the new ideas or independence mentioned in the Martin report.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Is that an indication of your attitude when the Bill comes up?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. I am saying I believe that the Government has a mandate to introduce free books, but that other matters behind this question must be looked at.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It does not seem now that it has such a mandate?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: A few things in this mandate make one wonder whether it is a mythical mandate. The Council has an important role to play. The independence of thought evidenced in this Chamber since I have been a member will be appreciated by the people more than has been the case in the past. I believe some people would like to precipitate a constitutional crisis in South Australia as soon as possible. There is enough evidence to prove that some people have set their sails for a collision course with the Legislative Council.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Like they did in Victoria?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Mr. Bolte has done a lot of strange things. There is no evidence at present to indicate that it is remotely necessary. All members in this Chamber would admit that the Government has a mandate.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Which ones did they pick?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We shall have to wait and see. The deliberations in this Chamber will consider that factor. At the same time, we will see developing in this place a wisdom that will be separated from the political passions of another place. I refer again to a statement made by Mr. Banfield. I am sorry I have been picking on him so much.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Keep going. We are learning from you.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I believe that some statements should be answered. Among other things Mr. Banfield referred to "the vicious and undemocratic gerrymander of electorates brought about by the Parties at present in opposition".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We shall have to "un-gerrymander" them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If the Minister wants a definition of "gerrymander" we can go into that. I think that this claim that South Australia had a gerrymander is a complete misuse of the word.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: They did not vote against it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think the Hon. Mr. Rowe pointed that out. The history of South Australia up to 1955 is very interesting. During 1856, before the inauguration of responsible government in this State, a Select Committee was appointed, consisting of the Surveyor-General, Messrs. Forster, Baker, Reynolds and Kingston, to consider, among other things, the number of electoral districts in the House of Assembly. The committee was guided by the principle that was generally approved by the Council that the division of the colony into electoral districts should be based as far as practicable on population. In its report the Select Committee admitted that the attempt to carry out rigidly the principle of apportioning representation to population had been abandoned. The divisions were agreed to by the Council as recommended by the Select Committee. While it is interesting to see the full recommendations, the following examples indicate the committee's thinking on this matter. In the City of Adelaide district the number of members was six and the total population per member was 3,093. In the district of Murray, the number of members was one and the total population figure 1,305. In Victoria, with one member, the population figure was 1,814. In Flinders, with one member, the figure was 926. In the period 1861-1871 alterations were made to the boundaries and in the number of members to a district, but the principle of representation was unaltered from the original finding of the 1856 Select Committee. In 1879 a Bill was introduced altering boundaries and representation. After the second reading, the Bill was referred to a Select Committee, which made several more recommendations. The committee was unanimous in the opinion that representation upon the basis of population alone was undesirable, as it gave undue voting power to the centres of population. From 1856 to the present time, there have been many inquiries by Select Committees and commissions into this question of electoral districts and representation, but the accepted principle has remained the same. I think the present position was adequately dealt with by Mr. Rowe. The Labor Party supported in the House of Assembly the present redistribution. Only one voice was raised against it, the voice of Sir George Jenkins. It is interesting to read the report of the debate on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill (Electoral Boundaries) of 1955. The following statement was made by

the Hon. F. J. Condon, Leader of the Opposition, at page 930 of 1955 *Hansard*:

This Bill has received very speedy consideration in the House of Assembly and I do not think we should delay it because, as far as I know, there is very little opposition to the recommendations of the commission following an amendment of the Act last year. When the Bill was introduced last year in the Council I opposed it because it was unfair, unjust and unwarranted, and because it particularly dealt with only one House. This afternoon we are asked to consider legislation that has very little effect on this Council, but if the House of Assembly wants this legislation passed I do not think we should offer any serious objections.

The Honourable Sir Wallace Sandford, in the same debate, stated:

When the Leader of the Opposition spoke to the Bill last week he argued that it had received very speedy consideration in the House of Assembly and that this constituted a reason for its being dealt with more promptly by this Chamber. In my view, however, if that House accords a subject insufficient attention it is all the more the duty of this House of review to accord it more time.

It is interesting to note that eight speeches were made on the Bill in this Council, as against two in another place. I recall that the Hon. Mr. Banfield used the words "vicious gerrymander". It is also interesting to note that at the last election the Australian Labor Party polled about 55 per cent of the votes cast, and that it held about 55 per cent of the seats in the Assembly. Probably "vicious" is not the correct word. The main point is that this is not a gerrymander, and, above all, not a Playford gerrymander. It is in accordance with the considered opinion of Select Committees since 1856, and it is this particular charge to which I particularly object.

I have no doubt that we are going to hear much more about mandates and electoral reforms. I wonder what is the Government's mandate on this matter of electoral reform. This catch-phrase of "one vote one value" seems to have engaged much attention, and already two statements have been made that seem to contradict the fact that this will be the plan that comes before us.

I also support Mr. Story when he says that the Governor's Speech devotes only one small paragraph to the agricultural, pastoral and primary production areas of the State. I was disappointed with the Premier's policy speech because the only mention of matters affecting primary production was the appointment of a land utilization council.

I want to refer to one matter that concerns the District of Southern. This is the growth of the fishing industry since the end of the Second World War. This industry began

operating with limited facilities in the early years, but it has made considerable growth in the last 10 or 20 years. Recently a boat haven was constructed at Robe. This South-East coast is inhospitable. About 250 professional fishing boats operate along the coast, apart from some smaller boats that come from as far away as Mildura, the Murray Valley and the western districts of Victoria. There is only one reliable haven along the whole of that coast, and it is at Robe. I hope to see further work done in supplying more reliable havens on the South-East coast at such places as Beachport, Port MacDonnell, South End and Cape Jaffa.

A considerable sum of money is invested in the fishing industry, which has grown rapidly in recent years. I suggest that the Government investigate the matter of increasing amenities for the fishing industry.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You did not move for any of these things before last March.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I did, and I was concerned about the boat havens. I thought

that when the haven at Robe was completed work would be done at other ports in the South-East.

Finally, I congratulate Mr. Shard, Mr. Bevan and Mr. Kneebone on attaining Cabinet rank. Members on this side of the Chamber realized after March 6 that these three gentlemen would be occupying the front benches in this Chamber. Some criticism was made about the Government having little choice in the selection of Ministers for this Chamber, but I have no hesitation in supporting the comments of my Leader that the three Ministers we have in this place are respected by all on this side, and that they would have attained Ministerial rank in any House in which they served.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.10 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, May 26, at 2.15 p.m.