

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, June 15, 1965.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

GOVERNOR'S ILLNESS.

The PRESIDENT: I have received a message from his Excellency the Governor, who desires me to convey to all honourable members and the staff his sincere thanks for the kind thoughts and good wishes conveyed to him on their behalf during his recent illness.

QUESTIONS

OVERLAND EXPRESS LUGGAGE.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Railways a reply to a question I asked on May 25 about facilities for handling passengers' personal luggage to and from railway carriages?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have a reply, which confirms my previous statement that some provisions were already made. There are two licensed luggage porters on the Adelaide station who handle a considerable amount of passenger luggage both on arrival and on departure of country passenger trains. A nominal charge is made for this service. In addition, six four-wheeled luggage carriers, which are available for the use of passengers and for which no charge is made, were placed on the platform about two months ago. Arrangements are being made to acquire an additional six trolleys of this type.

TOW TRUCK OPERATORS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked on May 13 about tow truck operators?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I do not want to touch on the particular case that possibly caused this question to be asked as I understand it is *sub judice*, but I have received a long report about the activities of these tow truck operators. I have not had an opportunity of studying it as I have been out of the State recently, but it appears that legislation is needed to correct the present position. In order that the position may be thoroughly examined I have gone so far as to request that a Bill be drawn up so that Cabinet can appreciate the many ramifications involved. Glancing at the report, I have no doubt that sooner or later legislation will be introduced to cover the position referred to by the honourable member.

TRAIN TOILETS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my question of May 26 last dealing with toilet facilities on trains?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have a reply to the following effect, that it is correct that the "300" and "400" class diesel rail cars operating the services between Adelaide and Gawler are not equipped with toilet facilities, nor is the provision of such facilities deemed to be justified in view of the length of the journey and particularly when compared with facilities provided on other means of transport.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: As Adelaide to Gawler by rail is about 25 miles and there are many short stops on the way, which necessitate, I imagine, a trip lasting between 35 and 45 minutes, will the Minister personally take up this matter with the Railways Commissioner to see whether this position can be rectified, in view of the reply he has just given?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes.

SCHOOL TEACHERS.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Education, a further explanation in answer to a question I asked about school teachers on May 27?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. I asked my colleague for further information and I have received the following report:

The reply that I gave previously was an accurate answer to your very precise and specific question, "How many young people who gained their Leaving certificates at the 1964 public examinations applied to the Education Department for admission to the teachers training colleges in S.A., and how many of these applicants were rejected?" The newspaper statement by the former Minister of Education made absolutely no reference to the Leaving certificate and his figures were correct. What he did point out was the promising trend that students who had been studying for the Leaving examination were not asking to enter teachers colleges immediately but were asking to remain at school to study in Leaving Honours classes.

The honourable member obviously required more information than he asked for in his question, to which he was given an accurate answer. However, I give the following explanation of the selection of candidates for entry to teachers college: 1,733 candidates lodged applications to enter teachers college in February, 1965. Of these 596 made their first application to the Education Department; 682 had held Honours teaching scholarships in 1964.

and 350 had held Leaving teaching scholarships; 55 had been junior teachers in 1964, and 50 had been teaching scholars on leave. 790 of these applicants sat for the Leaving examination in 1964, the remaining 943 sat for the Leaving Honours examination or other examinations. 1,165 students were admitted to the teachers colleges in February, 1965, and 567 of the applicants were rejected. Of those rejected 78 had gained the Leaving certificate in 1964 and 49 had gained the Leaving certificate in 1963 but had done badly in the Leaving Honours examination and were also rejected. The remainder were rejected because of insufficient academic qualifications or because they were considered unsuitable on other grounds.

FIELD PEAS.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of May 18 regarding the incidence of weevil in field peas in the agricultural areas of South Australia and the steps the department has taken to combat it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, has obtained from the Agriculture Department a report, which reads as follows:

There are five main practices involved in controlling infestations of pea weevil, viz:

1. sowing of clean seed,
2. spraying pea crops at fortnightly intervals from the time they commence flowering,
3. harvesting pea crops as soon as they are ripe,
4. fumigating all peas immediately after harvest, and
5. destroying crop residues as soon as possible after harvest.

Growers in the affected areas will need to consider all aspects of control. Peas infested by pea weevil are of considerably lowered viability, so that heavily infested peas are unsuitable for use as seed. With the exception of a few crops in the Gawler-One Tree Hill area, the level of infestation in last season's crops was low, often much less than one per cent, so that growers' own seed will be quite satisfactory for the coming season, provided it is fumigated before sowing. While the varieties of peas being grown are generally satisfactory, growers in the affected areas have been advised to obtain stocks of seed from the Turretfield Research Centre of the Department of Agriculture.

This seed has been harvested from lines selected for evenness of time of commencement to flower, a factor which will facilitate the timing of insecticide applications. Where the plants in a crop flower over an extended period, growers may have to make an extra application of insecticide to ensure satisfactory control. Turretfield seed was available for both the most common pea varieties grown, viz., White Brunswick and Early Dun. All but about 100 bushels of White Brunswick has now been sold. Higher acreages will be sown at Turretfield this season. Once growers have obtained

selected seed it is anticipated that they will build up their own supplies and only occasional renewal of seed stocks would be necessary thereafter. During 1964-65 season many growers had unsatisfactory results from fumigation. These failures are attributed to poor fumigation techniques; careful sealing is essential to ensure that the chamber in which the fumigation is conducted is completely air-tight. This problem has been recognized and it is proposed that the Department of Agriculture will make available in leaflet form directions for fumigation before the coming harvest.

GILES POINT FACILITIES.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In the last issue of the *Sunday Mail* there appeared in large black type the words "No Giles Point deep-sea port for a year". The Minister of Agriculture is on record as having said there is no likelihood of this port being established, and that was supported by the Minister of Works. The article pointed out that a committee had been set up, comprising the General Manager of the Harbors Board (Mr. J. R. Sainsbury), the Chief of the Plant Industry Division of the Department of Agriculture (Mr. A. J. Walker), and the Secretary of the Transport Control Board (Mr. D. W. Holden). Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government considered the appointment to the committee of a representative of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, as well as an active primary producer? If the answer is "No", will the Government take the necessary steps to have representatives of those groups included as members of the committee? If the answer is "Yes", will the Government disclose the reason for representatives of those groups not being included?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As the question involves policy, I ask the honourable member to place it on the Notice Paper.

GAWLER COURTHOUSE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of May 26 in connection with the reconstruction of the Gawler courthouse?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My colleague, the Minister of Works, intimates that the contract for renovations to the Gawler courthouse was let on May 26, 1965.

BAROSSA HOSPITAL.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: As I shall be addressing a meeting of my constituents in the Barossa district within the next few days, can

the Minister of Health say when the first patients will be received in the new Government hospital to be built in the Barossa district, and when the hospital will be completed? Both these matters were mentioned in the Premier's policy speech as being urgent.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I could give a typical reply to the question if I cared to, but I merely tell the honourable member that his guess is as good as mine.

MYPOLONGA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of May 27 about the Mypolonga water supply?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague, the Minister of Lands, has replied that neither he nor his department is aware of any promise to Mypolonga growers by the former Minister of Lands for a stock and domestic water supply for Mypolonga. In due course, my colleague will indicate his intention.

SOUTH-EAST AIR SERVICE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: An advertisement that appeared in the *South-East Times*, the *Border Watch*, the *Penola Pennant*, the *Naracoorte Herald* and the *Kingston Leader* during the recent election campaign said, "Labor will give you a better air service." Can the Minister of Transport say when this promised improvement will be made?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall have an inquiry made and obtain a reply for the honourable member as soon as I can.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

East Marden, Campbelltown, Sydenham,
Darley and Paradise Sewerage Scheme,
Highbury Sewerage Scheme,
Kapinnie to Mount Hope Railway Line,
Reconstruction of Main Outfall Sewer from
Torrens Road to Islington Road,
Reorganization of Sewerage System to
improve facilities for General Motors-
Holden's Proprietary Limited and Actil
Ltd.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from May 26. Page 234).

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I should like first to congratulate the Labor Party on its success at the recent State election. Since the last Parliament met two very important political events have occurred in Australia; one was the defeat in South Australia of the Playford Government after its very long term in office, and the other was the defeat in New South Wales of the Labor Government after its almost equally long term of office. I was in Sydney when the result of the New South Wales election was finally reached, and I recall that the then Premier (Mr. Renshaw) said, rather philosophically I thought, "In a democracy no-one should be sorry when the Government is changed." I think there is much truth in those words. Here, the former Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) took the sporting approach and said that he congratulated the victors and thought that we all should work now in the interests of the people. I think we all agree with that sentiment, too.

Sir Thomas assessed his defeat very quickly and moved out of office equally quickly. I remember a few years ago—three, to be exact—after the previous State election the Labor Party thought it had, or claimed that it had, defeated the Government, and actually went to the extent of dressing up one of its members in fancy dress and putting him on television, apparently throwing a ball at a wicket and claiming that the batsman, who of course was Sir Thomas Playford, had not accepted the umpire's decision. In politics there is only one umpire's decision, and that is a majority on the floor of the House concerned. The Labor Party on that occasion did not have a majority on the floor of the House, and Sir Thomas's Government enjoyed another full three years of office. I should like to ask now who on that occasion was disputing the umpire's decision. It was not the Liberals.

I congratulate the new Ministers on appointment to their high offices, and wish them all the success that I can, compatible with my membership of a Party of a different colour. We have excellent men as Ministers, and we all know and respect them. I like to feel that we are friends outside the Chamber, although we have many differences inside. I will not emphasize the friendship too much, because I read the other day that I had been called a silver tail—whatever that is—and if I did

emphasize the friendship it might not do them any good in certain quarters. I would not wish to do them any harm.

I often seem to get the opportunity to be the first to extend congratulations, and I have that opportunity this time. I should like to be the first speaker in this Council to congratulate the Hon. Sir Norman Jude, and to call him by this name, on the very well-deserved honour bestowed on him by Her Majesty the Queen. I know from the reception to my comment that all members join with me in it. I also congratulate a very distinguished ex-member of this Council in the person of the Hon. Sir Collier Cudmore, who celebrated his 80th birthday last Sunday. I know honourable members all wish him well.

While referring to Sir Norman Jude, I congratulate the present Government on its broad-minded attitude in allowing the Honours List from the previous Government to go on to Her Majesty. I know it is against their policy to recommend these honours, and I think it was a good and proper action on their part to let the list of the previous Government, which it made while in office, go on to the authorities overseas.

As a matter of coincidence, the Chief Secretary and I, I think, entered this Council on the same day nine years ago. He seems to have got on a bit better than I. He has not only risen to Ministerial rank, but he has risen to the top position of Leader of the Government in this Chamber, while I have remained firmly glued to my back bench, apparently in the Grip of Tarzan.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is the education you get when you sit in the other seat that counts!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Looking back in this way, I find it rather a sad reflection that from the day when the Hon. Mr. Shard and I entered this Chamber only seven honourable members are now left here. But that is in the course of life and many excellent new members have replaced those who have retired. When I say that we have good men now, I refer to the members of both Parties.

I join honourable members in congratulating the Playford-McEwin Administration on its long term of office and the wonderful work it did for this State. Without trying to make invidious comparisons, I say that if the new Government can do anything like the job the last Government did it will be doing very well. I also congratulate Sir Lyell on being appointed Leader of the Liberal and Country League Party in this Chamber. The habit of a quarter

of a century is difficult to break, and we are still calling Sir Lyell occasionally "the Chief". In fact, I have heard another Chief call him "Chief".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It will always be so.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: We can excuse ourselves by saying that we mean the Chief of the Caledonian Society. We congratulate him. Even if it is an Irishman's rise, it is the best we have to offer him at the moment. I come now to making a few general observations on the political situation in South Australia as I see it. If I enter into some particularities I protect myself by saying that I do not want to be bound at this stage as regards future happenings, because, when I come to judge any particular piece of legislation, I want to see chapter and verse of it. There are different ways of doing things: some things can be accepted while others cannot be. So I protect myself in that way and say that I shall consider the details of all legislation as it comes along.

My personal charter will be just the same as it always has been since I have been here. I do not need to change my approach to anything. I will use my judgment on what I ought or ought not to support, as I always have done, whether it is introduced by my Party or the other Party. I shall certainly support the new Government's measures where I consider they have the steady will of the people behind them. I shall try to help to improve legislation wherever I can, as I always do. I shall oppose radical moves that I feel would not be the permanent will of the people. I emphasize the words "permanent will". This brings me to the age-old question of mandate: what mandate has the Government really got? I have been looking up this question because I have always had my own ideas about the circumstances in which we now find ourselves and what our attitude should be. I quote briefly from two books I found in the Parliamentary Library. One is entitled *Elections and Electors*, by Ross. The extract reads:

But in fact a single issue cannot be taken separately in an election: there are always a number of others on the carpet at the same time. These facts make nonsense of most of the talk of a party getting a "mandate" from the country for this or that item of its programme. Even the exceptionally intelligent and well-informed elector has no means of indicating that, though he votes for such-and-such a candidate, he disagrees strongly with a particular item or items in the candidate's programme.

Then I have another short extract from a book called *Parliament*, written by one Jennings, not the honourable member for Enfield, and it reads:

It is, probably, universally admitted that under our system of representation (or any other) a general election cannot produce a clear expression of opinion on any particular issue.

I do not want to weary the Council with long quotations, but, if any member is interested in the subject, I recommend those two books to him; there are many others of a similar nature in the library.

The Hon. C. C. Kingston said something in 1900. This is an extract from *Hansard* of that year, written in the third person as it was in those days, so it may sound strange to present-day members. He said, or is reported to have said:

But just as he held that the Council should be a Chamber of Revision and Review, so also he held that once the popular will had been permanently ascertained on a question, then it was the duty of both Houses of Parliament to give expression to the popular sentiment and legislative effect.

Honourable members will notice the word "permanently" emphasized there, and I see no reason to find anything wrong in that.

I should like now to look at one or two points of Labor's policy in this relationship. I do not want to touch too heavily on any one of them at this stage, but the first is the proposed amalgamation of the State Savings Bank with the State Bank of South Australia, which was mentioned in the Government's policy speech. I cannot find anything in the Governor's Speech relating to this matter. Ministers can correct me if I am wrong, but I have looked through it several times and this does not seem to have been mentioned. However, I notice that the Premier has said that he has three years in which to put this policy into effect. No doubt the Government has found other more urgent matters to deal with. This suggests that the Government is possibly not over-enthusiastic about the matter. As a matter of fact, I thought when it was in the policy speech that it was one of those things put in for good measure. The Labor Party ransacked the catalogue to find out what the Playford Government had not done and as the trading banks have savings banks the Government thought it could put the two banks together.

As one who has had experience of banking, I feel that there are no insuperable difficulties in the way, but it would be much more difficult to branch out from a savings bank into a trading bank than from a trading bank into a

savings bank. I do not want to enlarge on the detail of that, but anyone who knows anything about banking will appreciate the difficulties that exist. The State Savings Bank is very much the bigger institution at the moment. Deposits there, according to the last balance sheet, were £152,000,000, whereas customers' accounts in the State Bank, apart from Government funds of course, stood at £16,800,000—less than one-ninth of the money in the other bank. Of course, the State Savings Bank has many times more branches than the State Bank has. I think it has about 120 branches and 738 agencies, against the State Bank's 33 and 16, so one will see that this proposed amalgamation would mean more of the Savings Bank taking over trading bank duties than the opposite way around. I do not know that there is any great advantage to be gained by this proposed amalgamation. On the other hand, provided proper safeguards are included in the measure, one does not see at this stage any particular reason why it should not be done if the powers that be think it should be done. However, if and when the Government brings along a Bill to this effect, we will all, no doubt, have a look at it and make up our minds on what our attitude on the matter should be.

This year the Budget will be presented in pounds but it is going to finish up in dollars, which is a rather interesting situation to arrive at. I am one of those people who believe that we will have to do as is mooted in Great Britain and go into the metric system of weights and measures as well in order to get full advantage out of the decimal system. The changeover is going to create a lot of difficulties. However, if we care to count our fingers and toes, we see that we all have built-in sets of abacus, which I think is the Chinese counting machine. We have two sets of counters on our 10 fingers and 10 toes. I believe that once we get used to the system, it is going to be of great benefit to us.

The next point I want to touch on is one that was raised by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, and it is about lotteries. I find examining what sort of mandate exists here to be a very interesting question and a very peculiar one. Shortly after the election (and this was the Government's policy right through, as I understood it) this statement appeared in the *Advertiser* of Wednesday, April 28, last:

The Premier (Mr. Walsh) said yesterday that he expected a referendum on a State lottery to be held this year. A Bill providing for a referendum would be introduced in the next

Parliamentary session. The Government would not take sides on the issue, Mr. Walsh said. It would be left to members of Parliament to exercise a free vote.

If I can unravel that in relation to this question of mandate, it seems to me to be this: if the Government has a mandate on this matter, it has a mandate to seek a mandate from the people that it will not necessarily regard as a mandate. It is all very confusing, isn't it?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think you are interpreting it incorrectly.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: No, I think it is quite right. If the Minister will follow it closely, the position is that the Government has a mandate to seek a mandate, by way of referendum, from the people and, having sought a mandate, if it gets it it says it will leave it to the consciences of individual members, which means that it will not regard it as a mandate and there will be nothing binding about it.

As I see them, mandates can be very fleeting things. For instance, I remember that at the election three years ago, the present Premier was talking about a magnificent tunnel through the hills of Adelaide. Various estimates were given and it was going to cost about \$40,000,000. On the assessment of some people, if he had then succeeded at the election (as apparently he thought he had at one stage) he would have had a mandate for this tunnel! Curiously, we did not hear anything about it in the policy speech this year and we have not heard anything about it since, although I think that, if the Government had advocated it, it would not be as enthusiastic now after coming face to face with the financial facts of life. However, suppose it had it in the policy speech at this time. Would it regard itself as being obliged to do this? Just finishing on the question of mandate, I should like to point out that we in this Chamber have our own mandate, and we have a mandate from a highly responsible section of the community. We have a mandate to look over legislation; not to frustrate the legitimate policy of the Government, but to see fair play and to see that it sticks to what it said it was going to do.

I believe that the Labor Party may well have the Legislative Council to thank for its victory at the polls, because I believe that many people who voted Labor said, "Well, I can vote Labor, because we have still got the Legislative Council if they do not do what we think they ought to do." We are called the House of second thought. I believe we are also a House of second chance. We are a

House that can give a second chance to the electors if we think that that drastic step becomes necessary, and I sincerely hope it will not become necessary. Talking about the Council brings me to our franchise, which has been mentioned in the Government's policy speech. As a franchise of responsibility, it is extremely wide. One cannot imagine one much wider. It ensures, for a start, that the head of every household (and possibly both husband and wife) has a vote, and a vote is provided for a lot of other people, such as people owning the tiniest piece of land, people renting houses, people who fought for their country, and so on. It is an excellent franchise. It could hardly be broader and it has been broadened by non-interference as the value of money as expressed in words has dropped since the franchise was first created. Let us look at what Labor says about this. I quote again from the Labor Party policy speech:

Our policy provides for the abolition of the Legislative Council. Early legislation will be introduced to provide for an alteration of the voting franchise in the Legislative Council, which will mean that every person who is entitled to a vote for the Lower House receives one also for the Upper House, pending its abolition.

I have left out a few words but they do not alter the sense. I emphasize the words "pending its abolition". In other words, the policy of the Labor Party is to abolish this Chamber altogether and we are being invited to alter the franchise of the Chamber to provide for the destruction of the House we believe in, because that is what the policy speech clearly says. This is the House we believe in and I believe it is a House that the majority of people in South Australia believe in. If it comes to a showdown we shall have the opportunity of testing their feelings on this matter.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You are afraid of adult franchise in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Honourable members will find that if this occurs the same thing will happen as happened recently in the State of New South Wales where the people said at a referendum that they wanted a Legislative Council, and in that State it is not even voted for. We have a good and wide franchise. The Minister interjecting apparently considers that there should be adult suffrage for this Council. That would merely make it a redundancy of the other House because it would be elected on the same franchise. Although I believe in the bicameral system in any event, I consider it is far better that there should be a different franchise for the two Houses.

I now wish to deal with the House of Assembly electorates. The Labor Party has been screaming the word "gerrymander" for a number of years. It is a word that we are rather sick of hearing. I suppose it is an expressive word and so it is a good word to use, except that it has been used too much. It is like the over-use of the word "image". However, what I have been saying is merely a comment on the word. Looking back to the present distribution of the House of Assembly electorates that was made in 1955 we see that only one Labor Party member spoke on it in the House of Assembly and only one in this Chamber. The Hon. Sir George Jenkins called for a division in the other place but he did not get a supporter and it was called off. In other words, the Labor Party did not vote against it at all. In this Council there was also only the one speaker for the Labor Party and no division.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Only one Labor Party speaker?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes, but several Liberal and Country League speakers. This does not suggest that at that stage there was any great sense of grievance because people with grievances are not normally silent, especially members of Parliament, who are not silent people as a rule.

A gerrymander is a positive act, of course. If anything has gone wrong with our electorates it is by effluxion of time. It is by the negative act of not having altered them sufficiently recently. This is not the fault of the last Government, as it introduced a Bill during the last Parliament to alter the electorates and another to give the right to vote for this Council to the spouse of a qualified elector. The Labor Party in its wisdom saw fit to vote against both Bills. This question of effluxion of time cuts both ways. Take, for example, the electorate of Barossa. This electorate was won by Labor at the last election because the electorates had not been re-orientated, and because of the effluxion of time the city voters had crept out and swamped the country electorate, which should still be a country electorate. That gives an answer to the question of whether there is a gerrymander or not or whether there has been one.

There is another matter that the Labor Party has been propagandizing and that is on the question of one vote one value. A number of years ago the slogan was "One man one vote" but that has now been changed

to "One vote one value". This is pure propaganda and always has been. I believe that the Labor Party supports that particular system because it considers—and I think rightly—that it is a system that suits it as a Party. It therefore considers it the best of all political systems. That is a good reason for the Labor Party to support that particular system.

This principle of one vote one value may work reasonably satisfactorily in some places. Take England, for instance, where large cities are dotted here and there throughout the countryside and the population is fairly evenly distributed. One vote one value has been more or less adopted there, but not without some difficulty and it may well be a good system for that country. However, South Australia has more than half the population of the State huddled together in the metropolitan area. Furthermore, the real wealth of the State—I emphasize the word "real"—comes from the country that is far flung, so what sort of a system would it be if it were introduced here? It would mean that the city of Adelaide would dominate the State and that the city members would swamp the country representatives in the Houses of Parliament. The State would be totally ruled by a majority from Adelaide. I am a city dweller but I do not believe that that should happen. In fact, it would be a sad day for the State in its present state of development if any such thing occurred. I would say to country people, "Wake up and have a look at these things and see where your interests lie."

Let me analyse the question of one vote one value. I do not believe that the phrase can be accurately defined, and it is certainly not capable of being put into accurate effect at all. It is also incapable of being put into effect in any definite measure that may be made of it in any practical way. When does the value come into the vote—before or after the poll? It may have one value before the count is made but it can have a totally different value after the count. For instance, if 5,000 people vote for one candidate and 4,999 people vote for another candidate, after the poll half of the votes have no value at all. So how is it possible to have one vote one value in relation to the sort of political set-up that exists at the moment? State-wide proportional representation would probably be the only way of approximating votes of equal value but I do not believe anyone would advocate that for South Australia. It would again mean that many districts would go completely unrepresented.

Having said those things, let me look at what the people of Australia and South Australia think about this matter. There was an interesting Gallup poll held recently and it was reported in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, May 25 last. The report stated:

Electors interviewed recently by the Gallup poll were evenly divided on whether country votes should have the same value as city votes. With redistributions due both Federally and in several States, people throughout Australia were asked:

"Do you think all electorates should have the same number of electors, or should country electorates have fewer people than electorates in the big cities?"

37 per cent said "All the same."

39 per cent said "Country fewer," and

24 per cent were undecided.

People in city electorates and country electorates, as separate groups, gave almost the same answers. In no State is there a majority for either "all electorates the same" or for "country electorates fewer." Australian Labor Party voters answered: All the same, 42 per cent, country fewer, 35 per cent, undecided, 23 per cent. Liberal-Country Party voters leant slightly the other way, and answered: All the same, 32 per cent, country fewer, 45 per cent, undecided, 23 per cent.

Yet the Labor Party holds out that this is absolutely the only fair method of holding elections. But the Party is not supported by its own supporters because almost half of them said quite the opposite. There are very many political systems on this earth. I believe the sensible one is the one that suits its particular location. There is and can be no absolute in this. There is no absolute method of political representation; there is nothing that is absolutely right where everything else is wrong. It is a question of concept—of what suits the people and the locality, and the environment in which they live.

I have another book out of the Parliamentary Library that I recommend to honourable members interested in political systems. It is called *Parliaments and Electoral Systems*, and is by the Institute of Electoral Research, 1962. One has only to go through the list of countries the names of which begin with "A" to see the vast range of differences there are in political systems. I will not weary the Council if I read the "A's", as there are only a few of them, but it is quite illuminating to see the different systems. Afghanistan is the first. It has an elected National Council of 171 and a Senate, which is the Upper House, of 43 appointed by the King. In Albania the first chamber, the People's Assembly, has 188 members. There are single member constituencies elected by a simple majority. It is quite a simple majority because only one candidate is

permitted for each seat, so there is nothing difficult about it. Andorra is a co-principality, and sovereignty is exercised by the President of the French Republic and the Spanish Bishop of Urgel. The franchise is of all male heads of families. It has a Parliament called a General Council consisting of 24 members. In Argentina, in certain cases the President has the power to intervene in the provinces of the federation, in which event he may declare a state of siege. The President must be a citizen or have been born in Argentina. He must also be a Roman Catholic and over 30 years of age. The next country mentioned is Australia, and as honourable members know all about that I shall not deal with it. In Austria there is a national council of 165 members elected by proportional representation from Party lists. There is a federal council of 50 appointed by the provincial legislatures. In the countries beginning with "A", honourable members will see what a vast range of political systems there is, yet the Labor Party tells us that one vote one value is the only thing. One vote one value to vote for whom? Why does the Labor Party advocate the age of 21 as being the absolute? Why doesn't it advocate the age of 18?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is a real urge for that age outside. That applies not only among the Australian Labor Party people either.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am not surprised, because 15 countries have already got that age. These countries include Soviet Russia, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and other Iron Curtain countries, and also Egypt and Indonesia. We know why they advocate that—because it suits them in that sort of country. If it is 18, why should it not be 17, 16, or even 15? Where do we end? Where is the absolute?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The argument for 18 that I hear when door-knocking—and this is not only from Labor people—is that that is when the youth of the country is called upon to defend it.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I know that, and that is really my point—that there is really no absolute. It is really a concept. Some think it should be 21, some think it should be 18, and some might say—and Labor Party people might well say this, because they claim to be a humanist Party—that as children of tender years are affected by politics and by Parliamentary decisions, and they are the citizens of the future, they should have some sort of say. How can we give them one?

The obvious way is to give it through the parents, therefore the parents will have a vote for the children. However, I advise my friends of the Labor Party not to come in on that one, because they are getting back to the Legislative Council franchise if they do: we have a "heads of family" franchise in this Chamber. That is a very good democratic method of exercising a "head of the household" vote.

I think I have said enough for us all to know that one vote one value is only one concept of what a political system ought to be. Let us have a look at what the Labor Party does in relation to one vote one value. Does it practise what it preaches? What about its method of preselecting candidates for Parliament.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The widest vote that can possibly be!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Is it one vote one value?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I understood there was a card vote.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Those who pay make the selection.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is so. I understand (and the Minister will know this better than I so I hope he will correct me if I am wrong) that under the card vote used by various large unions the members of those unions vote a card for a member elected by the majority of the voters and nominate their choice of candidate. I see the Minister is assenting. Let us see how this lines up with one vote one value. I also understand that the card has effect in relation to the total membership of the union.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No, the total effective membership.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I see. Let us take a union where 5,000 of its members are voting for one candidate and 4,000 are voting for the other. The card goes to the candidate with the 5,000 voters, but when that is used in his favour at the ballot he does not find that the 4,000 other votes are scored for his opponent. These votes go to the man the union has voted for, and it is worse than that because the value of the vote is arrived at according to the total number of effective members of the union. In other words, that vote is worth the equivalent of 9,000 members when only 5,000 have voted for one candidate and the other 4,000 have voted against him. If one could find anything more antithetic to one vote one value, I should like to know what it is. It is the exact

opposite of one vote one value to allow this method of selecting candidates, yet when it is a question of Parliamentary elections these same people say there is only one method that is fair, and that is one vote one value.

I think something approximating to our present system of voting is the fairest for South Australia. I hope that we may be able to arrive at some reasonable redistribution. I shall certainly be here to try to reach some sort of arrangement that is fair to all concerned, but it must not be a one-sided thing; it must not be a thing loaded so that only one Party can get office. It must be a system that is fair and reasonable in our particular circumstances. I was reading a paper by a student about 10 to 15 years ago. He posed various questions about political systems and said that one concept was to give political representation to local interests and local geographical districts using numbers as a gauge to measure whether the different group interests were large enough to merit separate representation.

That is not the only definition but it is one, and I think it somehow approximates to the sort of system that I think is fair and reasonable for South Australia. I do not carry this argument further now because much more will be said about it later. Labor has been propagandizing "one vote one value" for so long (and it has been practically unanswered) that I believe many people have got it into their minds that it is the only proper and fair system, whereas it is only one of a dozen. One has to exercise judgment on what is best in the interests of the people and the State where this system is to be put into operation. I think I have more or less made a statement about what my policy will be in this Chamber in the new circumstances in which we all find ourselves. I say quite categorically that I shall generally support what I call, for lack of a better term, Labor's domestic policy. Much of it, incidentally, could well be Liberal policy because much of the Labor Party's policy is the same as ours, and some of the policy that is not ours could well be ours. When I oppose a Bill I shall have substantial reasons for doing so, and I shall give those reasons in detail as and when the occasion arises. This should be the attitude of any reviewing authority and I recommend to the Government that when it finds itself in a similar position—as, for example, with the question of a fountain for the City of Adelaide—it adopt the same policy of not interfering unless it has good and substantial

reason for doing so. I shall watch the outcome of that matter and the Government's performance with considerable interest.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and in so doing I endorse the remarks of Sir Lyell McEwin with reference to yourself, Mr. President, and your continued good health. Every one of us was pleased to know of your much improved health and we were equally concerned when recently you had to be away for a day. We are happy to see you back in your accustomed place. We all wish you many more years of good health.

I hasten to join my colleagues in expressing loyalty to the Crown in the person of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, and in expressing my regret at the death of the Queen's aunt, Her Royal Highness the Princess Royal. We were most grateful to His Excellency the Governor for opening Parliament, as we have been all through his period of office, and for the splendid example he has set us all. I join with honourable members in expressing the hope that the Government will see fit to seek to extend His Excellency's stay with us, a period during which he has been so successful, if I may be permitted to say so, as Her Majesty's representative. I place on record our sincere and deep appreciation of the efforts of Sir Edrie and Lady Bastyan in the service of this State.

I wish to be associated with other speakers in expressing my deep regret at the passing of the Right Hon. Sir Winston Churchill, the greatest Englishman of our time, the greatest man of our generation, and the man to whom we owe more probably than any other person in this century. I also wish to record my regret at the passing of three former members of this Parliament, Messrs. Homburg, Corcoran and McAlees. I extend my sincere condolences to their relatives. I express my sorrow at the loss of the two gentlemen who were sitting members of this Parliament at the time of their passing. Mr. Harold Tapping, the member for Semaphore in another place, was liked and respected by all members regardless of Party. He was a friend to us all. The Hon. Ken Bardolph was a well-known and respected figure in this Council for about 24 years. I miss his friendship very much. We all extend our sympathy to the families of those two gentlemen.

I also express my regret at the retirement of two gentlemen from another place. One is Mr. Fred Walsh, the former member for

West Torrens. He was respected on all sides for his wisdom and common sense, and his sensible approach to many problems. He will be missed by us all. I do not forget the retirement of my friend Mr. Les Harding, the former member for Victoria. I express my sincere appreciation of the friendship of Mr. Harding, who was the member for his district for nine years.

The late Mr. Ken Bardolph's place in this Chamber was taken by the Hon. Don Banfield, to whom I extend a welcome and congratulations. He made his maiden speech last month. He will discover that we are all friends in this place and, although we shall have our political differences, which cannot be minimized, in this Chamber, we nevertheless are all Australians seeking the advancement of this great country. We are all friends outside the Chamber and we look forward to a happy time with the new honourable member. There are many things that Mr. Banfield said with which I could not agree, but they have been dealt with by other honourable members, so, for the most part, I shall pass over his remarks and wish him well in his new position in this Chamber.

I congratulate the Government upon its success at the polls, and especially I should like to congratulate my friends the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Local Government and the Minister of Transport. We all have a high personal regard for these gentlemen, although we differ on many matters. I join with honourable members in saying that I believe they would have achieved Cabinet rank regardless of whether they were in the Upper or Lower House.

In congratulating the Government, I notice that it secured in the other place nearly 54 per cent of the total number of seats, with a 55 per cent vote. I think the actual figure is 53.8 per cent of seats with a 55 per cent vote. I am indebted to my friend, the Hon. Don Banfield, for the figure of 55 per cent, although Mr. Hugh Hudson is reported as having said (presumably after a most exhaustive survey) that the final result of his calculations was that, if there had been only two Parties, 56 per cent would have supported the Australian Labor Party and 44 per cent the Liberal and Country Party at the last election. The Labor Party is naturally jubilant at this situation. I would point out this is not unusual. Something very much like it has happened in reverse in another place recently. This balance of 56 per cent and 44 per cent needs only a 6 per cent changeover to reverse the result.

I would not suggest to the Labor Party that it get too much up in the air about its present success. Mr. Hudson went on to say, I believe, that our present set-up is "the most vicious gerrymander in the history of Australia," or something to that effect, as did my friend Mr. Banfield in this place. Those gentlemen made this comment even though, when the last redistribution was adopted, every member of their Party supported it and, indeed, as my honourable friend Mr. Rowe said the other day, it could not have been carried if the Labor Party had not supported it. The comment that this is the most vicious gerrymander is so much poppycock, as I shall set out to prove. I have just stated that this so-called most vicious gerrymander has produced nearly 54 per cent of the seats in another place from a 55 per cent vote. This is an indisputable fact and there is nothing vicious about it. The difference between the percentage of seats and the percentage of votes was only a little more than 1 per cent.

Let us look a little farther afield into a State to which Sir Arthur Rymill referred earlier this afternoon, a State that has been controlled by Labor for 24 years. New South Wales, so far from the Legislative Council being an elected House, has a nominated House, and the members are nominated for a 12-year term. As has been said previously, when the New South Wales people were asked to approve of the abolition of the Legislative Council they rejected the proposal decisively. In New South Wales, which had been controlled by the Labor Party for 24 years, having regard to the size of the Legislative Assembly, I think the Liberal Party should have gained about 53 seats out of 94 if there was to be somewhere near the right proportion according to the vote. So far from being able to do that from a 55 per cent poll, it was able to secure only barely 50 per cent of the seats. That is, from a 55 per cent poll it will have to depend for a majority upon two Independents. Which is the worse—nearly 54 per cent of the seats in the Lower House from a 55 per cent poll, as in South Australia, or barely 50 per cent of the seats from a 55 per cent poll, as in New South Wales, which, as I said, had been controlled by the Labor Party for a long time? New South Wales produced a more disproportionate result than was produced in South Australia.

The most vicious type of gerrymander, to use the term of my friends in the Labor Party, that has ever been envisaged in Australia is, as the Hon. Mrs. Cooper said recently, the plan that has been foreshadowed by the

Labor Party in this State. I believe that if the Labor Party has another look at this matter it will have second thoughts, because in my opinion it is a most vicious set-up.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It could not be worse than what we have now.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The last redistribution has been in operation for 10 years. The actual position has existed since 1857, but the last redistribution, for which every member of the honourable member's Party voted, has operated since 1955. It is, nevertheless, obvious that there is a need for some adjustment of boundaries in South Australia. Both Parties agree about this. As I just said, 10 years have passed and some anomalies must have occurred. They have occurred in the Commonwealth Parliament for the same reason. Some districts in that Parliament have more than 100,000 constituents, while others have about 28,000 to 30,000. These anomalies do occur if a redistribution is postponed for any length of time.

The two Parties agree about the need for a redistribution of boundaries. They disagree only—and it is a very big "only"—upon the method of redistribution. However, the Liberal and Country League Party believes that a balanced redistribution is necessary and we remind the Government that, but for its opposition, there would be at this moment in both Houses approximately an equal number of members from the city and from the country. There would also be a very large increase in the number of persons eligible to vote for the Upper House, and probably twice as many Labor members in this Chamber as there are at present.

If we look at the position in other States we find that in New South Wales there are about an equal number of members from the city and from the country, which is what we suggested here. Queensland has three different types of seat. I understand that the quotas in Queensland are 13,000 for city seats, 12,000 for country—city seats and 9,000 for rural seats. In Western Australia there are three different types of seat. Our Premier, for whom I have considerable personal regard, has gone on record as saying that he believes in the so-called one vote one value system, and here again I refer to a system to which Sir Arthur Rymill referred in some detail when he spoke earlier today.

I have my own particular slant on this subject and wish to deal with it. The Premier has gone on record that he believes in the so-called one vote one value system, except for the district of Frome, because he suddenly said, in

effect, in a television interview that he favoured a tolerance of not less than 40 per cent. He is happy for districts generally to contain 10,000 constituents, but for Frome 6,000 is enough! Why is that? Is it because of his sudden concern for the outback, the long distances, great disabilities and the impossibility of a member being able to serve the people adequately, or is it because under a one vote one value system Frome would be lost to the Labor Party? I believe that the latter is the real reason why the Premier suddenly became concerned about the district of Frome, and I believe he may get similar ideas when he examines the position of some of his other country members, should they be brought under this strict equalization of seats as far as numbers go.

What is this so-called one vote one value system? Is it a mere numerical figure of, say, 10,000 electors within a three-mile radius, who may have, incidentally, access to everything in the way of modern amenities, transport, power, water, good roads and easy communication with each other and with their member? Another member with 10,000 electors in a radius of, say, 100 miles may have a district without most of the services I have enumerated, and without the electors having ready communication between themselves or with their member. In this the sort of thing that one vote one value means? This is exactly what the Labor Party envisages and, to my mind, it is completely inequitable. Is the one value the mere equalization of population per member, or, rather, should it be some attempt to have one value in terms of service to the constituents?

I believe most emphatically that there should be some attempt to give some sort of equality in terms of service, as distinct from mere equality of numbers, to all South Australians. I know that it will never be achieved by the Labor Party's so-called one vote one value policy. We would get nearer to it with a system of equal representation of the city and country in both Houses, as we envisaged when we introduced in the last Parliament a Bill that the Labor Party opposed.

We would also get nearer to it if the Labor Party in any proposals it may bring down were to underline the words "community of interest" and remove the words "with a rural influence". With the words "with a rural interest" included the result would be exactly as was said about the district of Barossa, where a small pocket in a part of the area completely controlled the vote. I believe this to be wrong.

I challenge the Labor Party, when it brings down a Bill, to consider this in an objective way and to insert these words "community of interest" because they are a necessary part of any proper district redistribution.

I believe we should then get nearer to the terms of equality of service to the constituents than merely equality of members. We would get nearer to it if the Government were to take a realistic view of the city of Adelaide as it now is, not as it was, but as it now is and is going to be. It is developing and must continue to develop approximately 20 miles to the north and 20 miles to the south, because it cannot expand to the east or west. I think the Labor Party will recognize that this is a fact. It should not try to include nearly half of the expanding city in so-called country districts. If the words "with a rural influence" were added, it would mean no rural power at all, because those areas would be dominated by the city, as in the case of Barossa. I trust that the Labor Party will consider this development of the city of Adelaide to the north and south, because its geographical peculiarity is something that should be considered in any redistribution. I hope that the Labor Party will in future consideration of this matter take note of what I have said with regard to community of interest and the shape of the city of Adelaide.

I deplore the Government's intention to tamper with the Constitution. We are a sovereign State with an autonomous Constitution, which means that it can be altered only by an absolute majority of both Houses and then there must be Royal assent. It is hardly likely in these days that the Royal assent would be withheld to any Bill passed by this Parliament. Therefore, any successful move to abolish this Council would make the alteration of our Constitution subject only to the whim of one House. An irresponsible House of Assembly could alter its term of election, say, to 20 years. This could easily be done, and it is precisely the type of thing that has preceded the introduction of totalitarian Governments overseas in the past, and it is dangerous.

I emphasize that any move to abolish this Chamber with the autonomous Constitution that we have is extremely dangerous. The Labor Party has said that it has a mandate to abolish the Council. Sir Arthur Rymill had much to say earlier today on the matter of a mandate, and I appreciated those comments. I do not believe that the Labor Party has a mandate to abolish the Council. The Premier

said he would introduce an alteration to the voting franchise of the Council; but this will take time. The public would be justified in inferring that it would take time. It would mean an alteration in the rolls, because the Council and Assembly districts do not precisely coincide. This also would take time to alter. The Premier said he would seek an alteration to the Council voting franchise so that every person entitled to vote for the Lower House would get a vote for the Upper House, pending its abolition.

I looked for the meaning of "pending", and found three of four dictionaries with differing meanings. It can mean "awaiting decision", "undecided", "awaiting action" or "until". In using "pending" the Premier, whether or not he intended to do so, gave the public every reason to believe that this act of abolishing the Council was something the Labor Government may have in mind for the future, rather than now. It certainly helped the public to understand that nothing precipitate would happen at present. It reminded me that the Curtin Government said, during the Second World War, that there would be no socialization in its term of office. The public accepted this and supported the Government. I believe that the Premier has given the public every opportunity to think that the words "pending its abolition" mean, together with the other steps he proposes to take, that he does not intend to take any drastic action for some time. Not for a moment do I think that the Labor Party can justify its statement that it has a mandate for the abolition of the Council. If the Constitution of this State allowed a referendum as was held in New South Wales I am sure the people would decisively decide to retain this Chamber.

I note with considerable concern that paragraph 8 of the Governor's Speech says the Government intends to devise a system of co-ordination of transport. This is a free country and I do not believe there should be any form of coercion or the forcing of the public to use a specific type of transport. I agree with statements by my friends, the Hon. Mr. Octoman and the Hon. Mr. Geddes (both of whom I am happy to congratulate and welcome to this place). It was said that this kind of action would be a deplorable misuse of power and could well result in some stifling of enterprise. Public transport is not geared, and it cannot readily be geared, for large increases in the use of transport. People should not be coerced into using co-ordinated transport. Any

move to reintroduce, for example, a co-ordinated system of transport in Upper Murray areas would be extremely unpopular. I ask the Government to have another look at this matter.

In welcoming the new members for the Northern District, and in wishing them every success in Parliament, at the same time I pay a tribute to their predecessors, the Hon. Mr. Robinson and the Hon. Mr. Wilson, who gave me much helpful support and advice and who represented their district with distinction over the years. They, too, we shall miss, but we hope to see them often. We wish them well in their retirement.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill this afternoon had the privilege of being the first person in this place to congratulate the Hon. Sir Norman Jude on the honour bestowed on him by Her Majesty the Queen, and I hasten to add my congratulations. Sir Norman has served the State with distinction as a member of this Chamber for 21 years, 12 as a Minister. We congratulate him and wish him well. I am sure all members would like to see Sir Norman able to serve his country for many years to come.

I support the Hon. Mr. Octoman's remarks about agricultural education. I agree that more agricultural training is necessary at an earlier level in secondary schools because unfortunately many young farmers leave school too soon and without getting any scientific agricultural or horticultural training. This tendency to leave school too early is something that only time and further enlightenment can remedy. Time and further enlightenment are removing it, but perhaps not quickly enough. I believe we must provide more training for young farmers at secondary level. Nevertheless, I should not like to see Roseworthy Agricultural College lower its standards in any way when the present Principal (Mr. Herriott) is doing his best to raise them and improve the general standing of the college. I pay a tribute to him and his staff for the work they are doing, and I hope he will remain at Roseworthy for many years to implement his present policy. Training at this college at tertiary or semi-tertiary level, but I think there is much room for improvement at secondary schools.

In connection with this objective, last year I took a deputation of members of the National Farmers Union to the then Minister of Education (the Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson) and the Director of Education (Mr. Mander-Jones). We were well received, our representations were carefully noted, and we were invited to inspect the Urrbrae Agricultural High School at a

later date, which we did. The outcome of our discussions with the then Minister, the Director of Education, and the officers of the department at Urrbrae is that we believe it is high time in this fundamentally primary-producing State that agricultural science is made a matriculation subject and raised in status. I believe it is a reflection on our education system that this subject, in a State such as ours, is not already a matriculation subject and that because of this many boys drop it at Intermediate level. This is most unfortunate, and I believe the whole outlook on this subject needs to be reconsidered. I ask the Government to give this matter its attention.

Referring to paragraph 12 of the Governor's Speech, I support the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Geddes with reference to education in the country and particularly in relation to higher education and the provision of hostels in country centres. I think this would be a welcome innovation in the near future at strategic towns, as outlined by my friend, but some Government assistance must be given. Recently in Adelaide a luncheon was held to inaugurate an appeal for St. Philips College at Alice Springs. St. Philips is the type of college I believe my friend envisages, although I do not know whether the people in charge of it would appreciate its being called a hostel. It will serve the Alice Springs High School as a residential college for outback children and, I believe, will provide some tutorials as well. This is an example of the Commonwealth Government helping the public to help itself, and I commend to the public this venture for the benefit of outback children. I agree with the ideas put forward by the Hon. Mr. Geddes for future consideration by the South Australian Government.

I congratulate the Hon. Mr. Story and the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin on their contributions to this debate. Sir Lyell McEwin gave us a splendid account of the record of the Playford Government in its long period of office, of the splendid position in which it left the economy, and of the development of this State under the guidance of the previous Government. I congratulate the honourable gentleman on his remarks and his debunking of the fuss made about a few Parliamentary committees, which are of no real concern of government. I was particularly interested in what the Hon. Mr. Story said about the Tutor in Politics at the university (Mr. Hetherington); I believe the Hon. Mr. DeGaris also referred to him. This is not the first time I have noticed this gentleman making one-sided statements, and I have

had occasion to cross swords with him on this type of thing on a previous occasion. Like Mr. Story, I believe a tutor in political science should give both sides of the position objectively and present a well-balanced and unbiased outlook to his students and the general public. It should be the first requirement of a political tutor that he give both sides of the picture and that he give a well-balanced view.

I believe Mr. Hetherington has failed to do this. I deplore one-sided tuition, and I also deplore the nonsense reported to have been spread by the Attorney-General (Mr. Dunstan) that was, I think, headed "Pied Playford" and was printed in the university magazine *On Dit*. This was a reference by the Attorney-General to the present Leader of the Opposition in another place, and I believe the Attorney-General did himself and his Party no credit.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must not discuss a member of another place.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Very well, Sir; I stand corrected.

The PRESIDENT: Your reference to *On Dit* is all right, but you got away from it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Very well, Sir. Shortly after the election I was telephoned by a prominent Barossa Valley identity who complained to me that there had been on the previous night a meeting of grapegrowers held in the Barossa Valley at which no Liberal Party members were present. I hastened to inform him that no members from this side of politics were present because they were not invited. In common with other honourable members, I am vitally interested in the well-being of my constituents, and grapegrowers are no exception to this rule. I believe that the Government made a major blunder in only inviting its own members to attend this conference, when the grapegrowers council had said that it would like the members of Parliament for the districts concerned to be present, and not just some members. I join with my colleague the Hon. Mr. Story in protesting at this attitude. We still live in a democracy and members must not be shut out of this sort of thing, as the Premier tried to bring about in this case. Indeed, some of our members (and I mention my colleague from the Upper Murray in particular in this regard) have many years of experience and much wisdom to contribute to a conference of this nature, and some of the mistakes that the Government has made in dealing with this problem may well have been avoided had it seen fit to use the experience

of both sides of Parliament, as it should have done.

I also underline my disapproval of what my colleague has called a deliberate attempt to keep us out. I believe, however, that the Government has gained no marks for this attitude—very much the reverse, in fact. Its handling of the surplus grape problem has been inept and merits the censure of this Parliament and of the people generally. It has continually been a policy of too little too late. I was telephoned only a fortnight ago about the situation where there was still 500 tons of wine grapes and 400 tons of dual purpose grapes on the vines at the end of May. The information given to me was that the application for an additional £11,000 had been rejected.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What day of the week was that?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It was Monday, May 31. The Government had been advised by members on this side of the Council that the surplus grapes would be well above the 3,000 tons originally suggested. It must be said that the Government has now provided for the finance for processing the balance of these grapes but the dilly-dallying and the constant delays over these things in the matter of extra money being postponed caused many growers to sell grapes for which they ought to have got £20, £22 or £25 a ton, at £15 or even £13 a ton. This has not been to the credit of this Government.

I now turn to paragraph 10 of His Excellency's Speech which, as the Hon. Mr. Story and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, is the only statement of the Government on primary industry. I was both intrigued and encouraged by the last sentence, "Private industry will be encouraged to the greatest possible extent". I was intrigued because such a statement was so contrary to Labor's usual policy, and I was encouraged because I thought the Government might even mean it. However, I was soon to be disillusioned and to find out that the Government's one short paragraph on primary industry meant very little and the last sentence, to which I have just referred, meant nothing at all.

I will proceed to show why I came to that conclusion. In considering encouragement of primary industry, I recall that recently I had the privilege of visiting Tasmania on a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference. I was accompanied by Mr. Fred Walsh, a member of the Labor Party, for whom I have the highest respect. He was a co-delegate.

One of the subjects dealt with at that conference was "Land Development in Australia". Various States dealt with their progress on, at least in some instances, the reasonably good land they were still developing. When my turn came I pointed out that we were nearing the end of land development in South Australia, and that the land we were now developing was of relatively low fertility. I invited members of other States to come and see our success with this poor land when their relatively good country began to peter out. I pointed out that we had only two or three suitable areas left of any great size, that one large area was in southern Yorke Peninsula and that we intended to develop it and place a sea-port there to hasten development and we intended to use this area for the purposes of further decentralization in this State.

Now we find some completely contradictory statements made on behalf of this Government. The statement that "private industry will be encouraged to the greatest possible extent" is made a complete mockery by the announcement that the deep-sea installations at Giles Point will be deferred, that the Appila silo will be vetoed (by what authority no-one knows) and that Eyre Peninsula will not be exempted from road tax as promised by this Government. I was sorry for the Minister of Local Government who had to make this announcement. I thought that the Attorney-General, who had previously referred to Sir Thomas Playford's saying that it was not possible to exempt Eyre Peninsula as "gobbledygook," should have been the one to announce that the Labor Party had finally discovered that it could not exempt Eyre Peninsula from road tax.

These three actions of this Government give complete falsity to its claim to "encourage private industry to the greatest possible extent". Obviously, it does not mean to honour this statement in the slightest degree. It has never meant it and it made the statement with tongue in cheek. The Premier made a public statement in his policy speech which was referred to by the Hon. Mr. Rowe. I quote the Premier's remarks as follows:

The Labor Party have three of the seven members on the Public Works Committee; 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 . . . Any that are already recommended

will be proceeded with under the administration

The Premier evidently thought a lot of the Public Works Committee at that stage. Rumour has it that had he not won the election he would have been a keen candidate for membership of it. He thought a lot of it at this stage because he was using it to justify the fact that experience on this valuable committee constituted a qualification of his members for Ministerial rank. Now, so far from thinking in high terms of the committee, which recommended the Giles Point project, he is going to set its findings upon this subject lightly on one side, at least for some time, referring the project to another small committee, which I believe is a vote of no-confidence not only in the Public Works Committee, which recommended it unani- mously, but also in the three members of his Party on that committee.

The statement that the Premier made that any public works already recommended will be proceeded with has been honoured entirely in the breach rather than in the observance. The Premier has not forgotten (he has not been allowed to) that he has made the state- ment, for he said only on Tuesday, May 18, that he "recalled saying during the campaign that any promise concerning public works would be honoured". Do the Premier (for whom, as I said earlier, I have a personal regard) and the members of his Government in this place expect us to believe anything they say when they proceed categorically to disregard undertakings such as this?

With the Chairmen of the three district councils on Southern Yorke Peninsula, Messrs. J. J. Honner, J. F. Honner and W. H. Baker, I attended a deputation to the Minister of Works, the Hon. C. D. Hutchens, led by my friend and colleague the Hon. C. D. Rowe, on May 5, at which the member for Yorke Peninsula, Mr. J. R. Ferguson, and my other Midland col- leagues, the Hon. C. R. Story and the Hon. L. R. Hart, were present, to seek reconsideration by the Minister and the Government of the deferment of Giles Point—this being prior to any public announcement of the deferment. The deputation presented its case in detail and the Minister undertook to do three things. First, he undertook to have another look at the proposition himself. Secondly, he said he would take it back to Cabinet for further consideration and, thirdly, he expressed his intention to give Mr. Rowe an answer in due course. The deputation, for its part,

agreed to make no public statement until the Government had had a chance to reconsider its position.

The way in which the Minister carried out his part of the bargain was by making a pub- lic statement first thing next morning that the Giles Point project was to be deferred. That was before the Cabinet had had a chance to meet and have another look at it, because this deputation was held after noon on the previous day, after the normal meeting of Cabinet. To my knowledge, the Minister has not yet given Mr. Rowe any notification of the Govern- ment's decision. He has only given him a copy of the notes of the proceedings at that deputa- tion, which Mr. Rowe was good enough to let me peruse. Here again, this Government has honoured an undertaking given by a Minister more in the breach than in the observance and it is another instance of breaking faith with its constituents and their representatives. With reference to this deferment of Giles Point, I would like to quote the comment of a prominent gentleman in the area, Mr. J. F. Honner, the chairman of the Yorketown District Council. He said:

Postponing Giles Point is a crushing blow to the people of southern Yorke Peninsula. This area produces 4,000,000 bushels of barley and 1,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. It is the biggest barley producer for its size in the world. To get to a deep-sea port, farmers have to cart 50 miles to Ardrossan or 90 miles to Wallaroo. Those nearer the foot of the Peninsula have to cart well over 100 miles. Their only alternative is to cart to roadside receiving centres or smaller outports where they have to pay differentials of up to 1s. a bushel and have their grain taken by ketch to Port Adelaide. Differentials are costing lower Yorke Peninsula farmers £150,000 a year. On top of that, each farmer has to pay anything from £500 to £2,000 a year for cornsacks, depending on the size of his crop, together with the additional costs of twine and labour for bag sewing. The new deep sea port would do away with all this. Intense dis- appointment has resulted from the announce- ment that it has been deferred.

Mr. W. H. Baker, the Chairman of the Warooka District Council, in whose area most of the new land that is available for develop- ment is situated, made the following comment:

Most farmers around here have signed up for the bulk handling scheme and started paying tolls on the understanding that the deep-sea port was on the way. Some are carting their grain 100 miles to the top end of the penin- sula. Some Warooka farmers have already bought bulk handling equipment for their farms, such as elevators, bins, and headers.

This means that some people have spent a lot of money on bulk handling equipment and, if this deferment is prolonged, they

will only have facilities for handling grain in bags. It is most regrettable and I urge the Government to have another look at this situation.

I want to say one more thing about the Government's intention to encourage private industry to the greatest possible extent—in reverse, as it turns out—and I want to comment on the decision not to grant any further Crown land as freehold. This, of course, will do just the opposite to the Government's expressed intention. A very large proportion of the remaining land available for development is, as I have said earlier, of relatively poor quality, the sort of country that some of our interstate friends would write off at this stage; they will only come and have a look at what we have been able to do with it when they run out of more worthwhile land. This is the sort of country in which private enterprise needs every encouragement to spend a lot of money to make it a success, and a man will do this if he knows that he can really have the land and that by the sweat of his brow and spending his money he can make something out of what is now virtually nothing and be able to pass it on to his children and grandchildren. He will do these things for his family in those circumstances, but if it is only leasehold land that can be taken away from his family at some future time after all his hard work and after all the financial risks that he has taken, why should he develop it? If that was his attitude, I suggest that it would be a very natural and normal attitude. This action by the Government will militate against further development. I quote the actual wording of a letter I received (and I believe all other honourable members received) about this matter from the Hon. Mr. Bywaters, Minister of Lands:

Cabinet has decided that as a matter of policy the Government will not approve the granting of Crown lands in this State as freehold. I believe that the reaction of a primary producer as I have just instanced would be an attitude that any one of my friends on the Government front bench would think of adopting were they primary producers having to consider whether they would develop some fairly worthless land and spend a lot of money on it. Although we may expect this confused type of thinking from a Socialist Government, do they really believe that if such a policy had obtained in the past, this great State would have developed as it has? The decision of Mr. Bywaters, as communicated to all of us, is calculated to put the brakes on and not to assist private industry in any way. It is the sort of outlook that

provides only one paragraph in Government policy on primary industry, and that a poor one, and proceeds to make a mockery of it. It is the sort of outlook which, as the Hon. Mr. Rowe said, provides only one Minister for no fewer than five portfolios, four of which are concerned with primary industry, and this Minister is the most junior Minister in the Cabinet ranking. That is something that one cannot possibly follow.

On the other hand, this unimportant position which the Labor Party gives to primary industry is nothing new. In the Hill-Richards Government from 1930 to 1933, Labor attached no importance to the country areas and this was also the case in the Gunn-Hill Government from 1924 to 1927, which had one Minister for the two departments of Lands and Agriculture. Therefore, despite all the promises that have been made, we must expect this Labor Government to ignore the claims of primary industry to a considerable degree.

However, there were in His Excellency's Speech, which he delivered with the great dignity which the occasion demands, several references of value and most of them were the result of the previous Government's planning. Many announcements have been made by the present Government. They have been very vocal indeed, and, here again, most of the announcements made have been as a result of the previous Government's planning. One may expect even more noise in the future, now that the Attorney-General will have as a public relations officer one of his own campaign directors, a young man who has had no previous connection with the Public Service and who was preferred to a number of Public Service applicants. This man will be in the Attorney-General's own building in an office adjoining his own. I do hope that in due course this Government may have some achievements of its own to talk about other than deferments and prohibitions.

The achievements of the previous Government in the fields of water extensions and electricity, to name only two, are an inheritance for which this Government should be grateful. I recently had the pleasure of attending the opening of the Pata water scheme near Loxton and I congratulate the residents of this area upon this achievement and I congratulate my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Story, on the hard work that he put in to see this brought to fruition. In recent years I was glad to have a small part in persuading the then Government to proceed with the scheme, and I am happy to see it in operation. Before very long I

hope that we shall see further extensions in the Cambrai-Sedan area, and use may be made of bores on southern Yorke Peninsula to augment supplies. I know the previous Government intended to do something for these constituents and I trust the present Government will continue with those plans.

I note with pleasure Government plans for sewerage. The words "particularly for Gawler", were put in at the bottom of the announcement. I know the former Minister of Works had plans for Gawler to be seweraged as soon as possible within the next two or three years. Here again the Government has inherited a favourable position. I commend my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Hart, for his think-

ing on the unlimited use of the underground basin in the Adelaide Plains. I, too, know something of this situation. I have spoken for longer than I intended, so I shall say no more about it except to endorse Mr. Hart's comments. I commend him, also, for thoughts on the disposal of sewage from the Bolivar treatment works. It could well be used for primary production purposes. This is a great State and we have a great inheritance.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.28 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, June 16, at 2.15 p.m.