

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, June 30, 1966.

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

### QUESTIONS

#### BRUCE BOXES.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture an answer to my recent question about Bruce boxes?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. This matter was referred to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture. I understand that the honourable member had asked for the report on this matter to be made available to him. The Minister of Agriculture replies that the statement by the honourable member that the Government has in several ways committed our whole fruit industry to use the Bruce box is entirely false. The introduction to South Australia of the Bruce box has been done by private enterprise. The citrus industry appointed a committee called the Citrus Packaging and Handling Research Committee. The committee was comprised of representatives from the packing houses, the Murray Citrus Growers Association, grower representatives, and an officer of the Agriculture Department. This was in 1960 when the former Government was in office. Reports prepared for this committee are available for the honourable member. This does not commit anyone to use the Bruce box.

The Minister of Agriculture arranged for the Woods and Forests Department, private casemakers and a horticultural adviser to discuss with the Citrus Organization Committee the question of what type of container should be used for packing citrus. The Citrus Organization Committee has decided that, for export, the standard bushel case should be used, and that for local marketing the choice should be optional. There is no suggestion for the packaging of other fruit. The Hon. Mr. Kemp apparently is concerned with the apple and pear industry, where secondhand citrus cases are used for the marketing of apples and pears, and fears that, if the dump bushel cases are no longer used for citrus, they will have to purchase new cases which are readily available. That is the answer supplied by the Minister of Agriculture. In addition to that, he has made the full reports available, which I have here and which the honourable member can take away to peruse at his leisure.

#### CHOWILLA DAM.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We understand that the Chowilla dam will be commenced in the fairly near future and it will be necessary to construct a railway line from near Yamba to the dam site. Certain landholders in the Paringa and Murtho areas have had notice to treat in connection with the railway reserve. The Minister may not be able to give me the information I require immediately, but I ask him to consider the matter and report, first, whether the constructing authority will be the South Australian Railways; secondly, whether that reserve will be permanently vested in the Minister of Transport; and thirdly, whether up to the present consideration has been given to the destruction and burning of noxious weeds on this reserve which at present is not being cropped by farmers because they have been so instructed.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It is possible that I can answer some of the matters raised by the honourable member with regard to the railways, but in order to give the whole story I will get a report and reply at a later date.

#### POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On Tuesday last I inquired of the Minister of Health regarding Sabin anti-poliomyelitis vaccine and the Minister was good enough to indicate that he would probably be able to give me a reply today. Is that reply available?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: For obvious reasons I desired to expedite the reply to this question. It is as follows:

Sabin vaccine has the advantage that it is taken by mouth and does not require injection. Therefore Health Departments throughout Australia have been studying its effects in other places for several years. Salk vaccine in our own experience has proved extremely effective and completely safe. Before making a change we must be able to assure the public that Sabin vaccine is just as effective and safe. At a meeting of the National Health and Medical Research Council in Adelaide last month (May 1966), this expert body decided that the evidence was now sufficient to say that Sabin vaccine was as safe and effective as Salk.

Tasmania has been using Sabin for some 12 months. All other State Governments except Victoria are being advised to change to Sabin vaccine as soon as practicable. For technical reasons it is preferable in a hot dry climate to begin using Sabin vaccine in autumn. It

is hoped that sufficient supplies will be available by next autumn, to make the change at that time. It is proposed to distribute the vaccine through local boards of health as is now done with Salk vaccine. The Department of Public Health will continue to supply it in remote areas where there is no local government, and to special groups.

#### WORKS PROGRAMME.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My question concerns part of the report of the Highways and Local Government Department for 1964-65, pages 27 to 28, under the heading "Materials Branch" which concerns pavement services, material investigation, bridge foundation investigation and other like matters. Part of the report reads:

There was insufficient staff available to carry out all the investigations requested and of the 173 projects listed approximately 40 were completed.

Would the Minister advise first, have any important works been delayed because of the lack of staff in this branch; secondly, are there any private organizations available in the State to carry out this type of work; and, thirdly, will the Government consider making use of those facilities, if available?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The first question is whether any major works have been delayed. I understand that they have not been. As a matter of fact, the Highways Department has been fully occupied for the whole 12 months so far as the works programme is concerned. Secondly, there is a shortage of various skilled artisans, not only in the Highways Department but also in other departments. In these circumstances and when there is important work to be performed, I have signed numerous authorities for the employment of private persons to do the work that we ourselves could not do. The third question is irrelevant, because we have done this in the past and, doubtless, it will be done in the future.

#### PORT PIRIE LINE.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: My question refers to rail standardization and the proposal to convert the Port Pirie to Adelaide 5ft. 3in. gauge to standard gauge, in conjunction with the standardization of the Broken

Hill line. I realize that this project is subject to agreement with the Commonwealth Government and that agreement has not yet been reached. I also realize that it is necessary to plan a project such as this so that estimated costs can be submitted. Can the Minister of Transport say what stage the planning for standardization of the Port Pirie to Adelaide line has reached, with particular reference to the Merriton-Crystal Brook area?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Plans and alternative plans have been examined in relation to this section of line and we hope that the work will follow closely on the completion of standardization of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie section. No finality has been reached as to what plan will be adopted for this work and, therefore, no advance planning has been finalized. An attempt will be made to reach a decision at a conference between the Commonwealth Government and the South Australian Government that I hope will take place in the near future, because some decision has to be made regarding the section from Cockburn to Broken Hill. I cannot answer the question regarding what stage the planning has reached, because alternative plans have been submitted regarding the Merriton-Crystal Brook area, and these will be considered on their merit in relation to the overall route.

#### STOCKWELL MAIN.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Public Works Committee recently recommended, after investigation, the construction of a main from Swan Reach to Stockwell to supply the water needs of the area that it will traverse and also to augment supplies to the Warren reservoir. The cost of the main will be about \$8,000,000. This work was projected by the previous Government but has been referred to the Public Works Committee by the present Government. In view of the urgency of the work, can the Minister of Labour and Industry, who represents the Minister of Works, say whether it is intended to proceed with the project immediately?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the question to my colleague and obtain a report as soon as possible.

## RAILWAY SIGNS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On the Balaklava-Gladstone railway line the Yacka station has a small illuminated sign, which can be seen at night by passengers sitting in the trains, and which is a great help to them. To my knowledge there is no similar illuminated sign at other stations on the line from Balaklava to Gladstone. Can the Minister say whether it is possible to have a similar illuminated sign at stations on this line to assist passengers travelling at night?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will obtain a report and inform the honourable member as soon as possible.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 29. Page 154.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I do not agree with many matters in His Excellency's Speech, but I must say that I agree with paragraphs 1 to 4. The first paragraph says:

I have called you together for the dispatch of business.

That is a good reason for us to be here. I also agree with paragraphs 2, 3 and 4. I join with other members, principally the mover and seconder of the motion, who covered this matter fully, with regard to the death of eminent past members and I, too, express my sympathy to the bereaved. Paragraph 5 is one paragraph that I cannot get along with very well. It says:

The Premier's Department has actively pursued the Government's policy for the attraction of new industries to the State and the expansion of existing enterprises. The recent decision of Chrysler (Aust.) Ltd. to erect a multi-million dollar plant near Port Stanvac and inquiries from other sources are evidence of the success of this policy and of the confidence which industrial and commercial interests have in the prosperity of the State.

I question the statement that the Premier's Department has actively pursued the Government's policy.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It has cost more money.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It has cost more money, and I understood that one of the principal reasons for having a Premier's Department (and it was done by regulation) so

soon after the Government took office was that the department would be expanded specifically for the purpose of attracting industry.

I remember that Mr. Lloyd Hourigan was the officer appointed to the particular position—and a very good officer he is, too—but shortly after his appointment he accepted the position of secretary to the Public Works Committee. I have not been able to get much information that this section of the Premier's Department has either actively pursued the matter or has settled down to being an administrative unit for that purpose. In fact, I think we have never had less industry attracted to the State since the time when Sir Richard Butler, as Premier and Treasurer, reduced the company tax to attract industry to this State.

We are pleased that Chrysler (Aust.) Ltd. intends to expand its industry in South Australia. It gives us encouragement to know that a company of this size intends to expand here. I am dreadfully sorry, as one who is closely associated with the products of one company, to see that Diecasters has left the State, because it was a firm well-established in the earlier stages of the terrific expansion of secondary industry that took place just after the First World War, primarily because of the efforts of Sir Thomas Playford.

Great criticism has been levelled at Sir Thomas's activity—that he was the Premier's Department, that he handled everything and that, therefore, we were not getting the maximum that this State could get in industries. We set up an Industries Department, or a section of the Premier's Department, for attracting industry. I do not believe that if we put four Bachelors of Commerce into that department at present and sent them all on roving commissions they would attract much more industry, because the climate has to be right for industry to come to a State. There must be security so that it knows that it can not only survive for the first few months but also get under way and get profitable returns from the money it has invested. There are a few words that the politicians are well aware of. We know how easily they slide off the tongues and lips of people. One of them is the word "decentralization". It is such an easy word to say and sounds very good. We who have been here for a few years have heard decentralization spoken of by the Labor Party at every drop of the hat in the past; yet I have hardly heard it mentioned lately, except when we had a Bill before this Council dealing with road and railway transport.

After this Government has been in office for 15 months or so, I should have thought we would see some real plans for decentralization in this State. This is the big bold plan that I thought we would see. I doubt whether any industry has been set up in our country areas in the past year or so. I cannot think of any, but my friends may put me right on this point.

When I vacated the position of Chairman of the Industries Development Committee I think we had two references still to go, and, if my memory serves me aright, those were the only two references that that committee had had before it since the change of Government. One of those dealt with a project on Yorke Peninsula and the other with a project at Murray Bridge. There was an application by one factory that was being built by the Housing Trust to rehouse an existing industry in South Australia, Townmotors, and that has been opened recently by the Premier. I would not say that decentralization was actually booming. I know of two industries that were assisted by the Industries Development Committee but are finding it difficult to get along at present. I also know that several references that have been put forward will not be continued with because of financial difficulties. I mention these things only because it seems to me that we have to keep on reminding people that we were not such a bad crowd after all and that the State was not such a bad place as the Labor Party tried to make out it was in that rather remarkable document which, I hope, will remain with me for many years as an exhibit—the Australian Labor Party's policy speech of Friday, February 19, 1965.

I agree with what is happening with natural gas. At present I think we are making real progress with our Mines Department and with private enterprise. We have spent a tremendous amount of money in the Gidgealpa and other northern areas of this State, to say nothing of what has been done in other parts. The Government (wisely, in my opinion) has had its experts overseas. The Minister of Mines has accompanied them and will be in a position, I have no doubt, if and when it is decided it is economic to bring natural gas into the more commercialized parts of this State, to assist with his observations.

The Mines Department expanded greatly when, as Minister of Mines, the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin took a personal interest in our mineral resources. If the Mines Department continues to apply itself, we shall find copper in this State in sufficient quantities to make

its extraction worth while. With the further exploration of the Murray Basin, which extends towards the South-East, I think we shall find gas and oil supplies in that area.

Paragraph 8 of His Excellency's Speech deals with the Department of Social Welfare. One would think that this department was one of the revenue-earning departments of the Government, because great pride is taken in saying, "The work of the Social Welfare Department continues to expand", as though it is a great and wonderful thing. We do not judge that department by the way in which it will expand; we should make the conditions so good that the Department of Social Welfare does not need to expand to any great extent. Rather, people should be given an opportunity to deal with their own problems, wherever possible. I am not in any way saying that we should not look after people unable to care for themselves but I am saying that to be very proud of the fact that this department is expanding seems to me to indicate that there is a reason why it needs to expand.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Because people get better treatment now than under the previous Government.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is questionable because, strange as it may seem, I have much to do with cases in the Upper Murray area. People come to me with their problems. I do not know that they get any better treatment now than they used to get.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They can use a loaned television set now, which they could not before.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Maybe that, to the honourable member, is an extremely important thing.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No; but it is something that these people should be able to enjoy.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think there are other important things that the Department of Social Welfare should look at before it considers whether these people should have a television set or not. The department's attitude is more on the humane side.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Erring husbands are now in the net.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member raises a most interesting point—the fact that we pass a piece of legislation and say, "Look at what we have done. We are good 'blokes"; but the net is still fairly widely meshed. I would say that the erring husband takes catching.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There are some cunning ones!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I believe that few have actually been snared in this new net. These things make magnificent propaganda instruments: they sound and look good. Getting down to brass tacks, we know that it has cost much money to make these alterations in the Department of Social Welfare, and we saw it in the Supplementary Estimates dealt with the other day.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you suggest the money is being wasted?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I don't know about that, as we have not had the opportunity of reading what the Auditor-General has to say about it, but it is obvious that the department has grossly overspent. In his policy speech the present Premier strongly criticized the Playford Government for not being more accurate in its estimates, and implied that it showed inefficiency on the part of the Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Some of the salaries now being paid were not paid in the past.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is so, and some of those salaries bear no relationship to the Department of Social Welfare. In effect, they are public relations people and are not being used in social service work. One or two of the recipients of salaries from a generous Government are doing anything but social service work, as can be seen by attending various meetings being held in connection with the present uncommitted war to the north of Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Uncommitted or undeclared war?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am not going to argue with my honourable friend about the degree, but we are at war.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: If we are at war, surely he is not affected by it?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think that every right-thinking Australian is affected and will be more affected if some people do not take more interest in it, but that is a Commonwealth matter. I am not going to risk being ruled out of order by the President; so I will proceed as I intended, although I know the Hon. Mr. Banfield would like to get me off that line of thought.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He is trying to help the honourable member.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He is helping me, too. Another interesting paragraph deals with provisions relating to oversea maintenance, and it appears that more legislation will be intro-

duced to deal with the fellow who absconds from this country. He will be interested to know that. Portion of paragraph 8 reads:

Co-operation between the Department of Social Welfare and the Department of Aboriginal Affairs is very close and the facilities of the former department are being used to a greater extent for Aborigines.

I will be a member of a deputation that will wait on the Chief Secretary later this afternoon regarding the Aboriginal Affairs Department. I do not think that the evidence to be presented to the Minister will indicate a close liaison between the departments mentioned. In fact, I would think that the Minister in charge of the Aboriginal Affairs Department would be anything but co-operative with the Hospitals Department, which the Chief Secretary has the honour to lead. However, the matter is *sub judice* and I do not want to put the Chief Secretary "off-side" before I start.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I thought the honourable member was having a practice run.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: As usual, I am out in front on that one.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Paragraph 9 was adequately dealt with by the Hon. Mr. Hill yesterday. It reads:

My Government is pursuing a strong and forward-looking policy in connection with the welfare of Aborigines and persons of Aboriginal blood. The Housing programme has been expedited and other projects, including the further increase in welfare services, consolidation of developmental programmes and further expansion will be vigorously pursued. The Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill will be re-introduced and a Bill to prohibit discrimination on the grounds of race or colour will be laid before you.

The matter of the housing of Aborigines received the attention of the previous Minister, the Hon. G. G. Pearson, and I believe his approach to the matter of persons of Aboriginal blood was good and realistic. His work for the Gerard Mission on the River Murray was excellent, and it is now a pattern for the other reserves in South Australia. The Hon. G. G. Pearson did not make nearly as much song and dance about his activities as has been made since.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He was not allowed to!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not know what grounds the Chief Secretary has for saying that, because the Hon. G. G. Pearson was a very able Minister and effectively dealt with the work of his department. Legislation passed in this State was as forward-looking as any in the

Commonwealth. Aborigines were given all the rights that they required, and it must not be forgotten that an amendment by Labor members in another place took out the clause dealing with the drinking rights of Aborigines. Within a few days of the new Government taking office and the Attorney-General taking over that department, laws were brought into effect by regulation. Further, I do not think it can be said that the previous Government held back the Aborigines in any way by not granting them the right to drink. After all, it is a question open to a good deal of conjecture, and in parts of the State, even today, I believe some people would not agree that the Aborigines are being advanced by "this great step forward in social justice" as it is called.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That could be said about some Europeans being allowed to drink.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is so, but they have had the right for a long time.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is not to say they have advanced.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Various organizations were set up to look after these groups of Europeans. The Government is also going to pursue this active aggressive policy in connection with educational services. However, I am stumped, because I do not know the present policy of the Government on education. We have had many conflicting press reports. When a Leader of a Party enunciates his policy (as was done on February 19, 1965) one can usually say, "The policy of this Government when elected will be so and so," because the members of the Party in the House (if it is a Liberal Party, of course) would be able to interpret it to the people.

However, we have had much confusion, particularly in regard to various forms of aid, and I am not sure what is the position. We are told in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech that the Government has approved the provision of school books without charge to parents of children in both State and private primary schools and that the scheme will operate from the beginning of 1967. However, there still seems to be conjecture about whether the Government will be allowed to do this.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I do not think you will get any interjections on this.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: What worries me is that I do not know whether the Government is yet fully clear whether it will be allowed to give free books to children at private pri-

mary schools, because I do not think the proposal has yet been approved by its peers.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Would you like a little wager?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I thought the honourable member would deal with this in his Address in Reply speech.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It looked clear enough to me.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It looked clear to me. However, there seems to have been a slip in the betting and the proposal may not come to pass. There are other bedtime stories in this document that have not come to pass. I want to be sure that we are going to get these free books. I am fortified, because a publication edited by Mr. King of the teachers institute, which does not lean to my brand of politics does not seem to be in agreement with what this Minister is doing in regard to free school books.

I have read other documents prepared by Mr. King and Mr. Read and I do not think either of those gentlemen is noted for being on-side with my particular brand of politics. They have exhorted members not to support anything in the way of aid that will take away any money from the State schools. A publication called *Saitnews* of June 15, 1966, contained proposals by the Teachers Institute that did not coincide with those of the Minister, whose statement precedes the report. The report says that the institute's policy on free books in relation to primary schools was decided as follows:

That the purchase and distribution of books by the school should continue at least as at present, except that there be a monetary grant to parents.

The second point made is that the children should own the books, and the third is that the choice of books must remain with the school. The fourth point is that the list of recommended books must not be restricted or reduced and should be amended as required.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They do suggest that teachers get behind the policy of the Government now that the policy has been stated.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why not read that?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I shall read it. The honourable member has taken some time to study this. I thought he would have raised it in his Address in Reply speech because, if the Government was proud and perfectly sure of this, it would have been expanding on it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We did that before and we were elected to bring the promise into operation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The last paragraph reads:

All these disadvantages would be overcome if the Government agreed to extend the system of Progress Allowances to Primary schools. A suitable sliding scale of allowances for each grade has, in fact, been worked out and submitted to the Education Department by S.A.I.T.

The report then says:

Whatever our views on this matter, we appeal to all teachers to do their utmost to make the proposed scheme work in the interests of our students.

That paragraph is not strong praise.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They realize that it is Government policy to bring it into operation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think they realize that the iron-bound hand of the Federal Executive must be heeded and that the Minister will not be allowed the slightest flexibility in altering what has been laid down as dogma. They say, "We have to have something, so we will take this, but we do not like it." I think these people might find themselves in that position. I would think that this system would be the greatest nightmare to the average headmaster, because he would have to adjudicate on whether a book is still worth 60c, if that was its original cost, whether the child has taken 5c or 20c from its value, or whether it is a write-off. He would have to do those things to be able to say whether the book could be passed on. If he considered the book too badly damaged to be passed on he would have to claim from the parents the amount of money necessary to replace it. He would have to adjudicate on whether the book could be used for one or two years.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: And he has to collect the money.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He collects now, from the sale of books.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He is compensated at present by an arrangement in the department whereby he or somebody that he nominates to be the purveyor of books receives the monetary consideration, but there will be no monetary consideration in this. Further, children transfer from one school to another and one of the interesting places in this connection is Smithfield, where the migrant hostel is beside the school. Every time a migrant ship arrives there is an intake at the hostel and the migrants stay there for about six or

eight weeks, and then move on somewhere else. Each time these children move on their books have to be withdrawn from them and the children are re-issued with new books at the next place. To me, that is too much.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You want standardization?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: If they went to another school and their books were not of any use, it would not be of any advantage to them.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In an endeavour to give flexibility, if they carried away the books from their school to the next school, as the honourable member is suggesting, quite probably they would not be using them at all in another school, because he is saying here that he will still allow them the right to choose some books at least. We have standard readers today, which go from grades 3, 4, 5 and so on, but the only thing they will be able to retain is the dictionary that is provided by the Education Department—a luxury I do not think I had until I was about 15 and could afford to buy one, which probably accounts for some of my disabilities now.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Did you use it well? You still put a different interpretation on things.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I may put interpretations exactly as they are written here. The other thing they are allowed to keep is the atlas. How many years is an atlas current when you issue one to every child in the school? I do not know; they change regularly. We only need a coup d'etat somewhere and the whole atlas is out. These, I imagine, are going to cost a good deal of money and, therefore, we would expect them to have a fairly long life but, to my way of thinking, issuing every child with an atlas and a dictionary, whether he wants them or not, is taking things a bit far at primary school level.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't you think they use them at primary school?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, but my recollection of atlases is that not everybody had an atlas but something that cost about 1½d., which was quite adequate for what they were doing in the lower grades. As they advanced towards grade 7 standard they obtained a much better book. This is going to be a repetition, in my opinion, of this rather grandiose socialistic set-up that we have seen in the Aborigines Department and the Social Services Department—a bit bigger, better and

brighter. I have no objection at all to spending money on education, but what I do object to is sending a "Rolls Royce to do the job of a T-model Ford," and that is what is going to happen.

For the last 10 years or so I have been endeavouring to make it apparent that we have not nearly sufficient rental houses in country areas. These rental houses in country areas have a very important place in the economy and in decentralization. We cannot expect small industries and people who are subject to quick transfer to the country to purchase houses or put down deposits on houses; it is quite impracticable. We have been short of rental houses for years and never, I suppose, have we been shorter than at present.

I am not saying anything that Mr. Ramsay of the Housing Trust does not know, because I have had frequent discussions with him on this important matter, but we are in need of at least 80 rental houses from Walkerie to the border. We are going to be even shorter because we have the Chowilla dam looming up in front of us. People employed on the Chowilla dam will not all live on the dam site; a number of them will be senior personnel in the subcontractor and contractor gangs, and they will want to leave their wives and children nearer to the metropolis. We are desperately short and, in fact, I believe this situation is holding back the progress of some country towns. I know the problem in Whyalla, and I am not decrying it at all. That city must go on if the State is to progress.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can be reasonably well off at Whyalla.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: At the moment, but it can still use more.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I don't want you to tie up Whyalla with the rest of the State.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is about a six weeks' wait for a house for employees of the company.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I was told this morning that it was immediate.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It may be immediate at the moment, but it was about a six weeks' wait for employees who had a job to go to. That situation is to go on, because we have to get jobs for people wherever we can.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: From the trend of your speech it could be inferred that what you are saying also applied at Whyalla. I am only trying to make the point clear for you.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Thank you very much.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Is Whyalla a country town?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Very much so.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister will have an opportunity later on if he wishes to speak.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I doubt whether I will.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is quite some time since I spoke; I have almost forgotten where I was.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I was only trying to be helpful.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: You were very helpful, Mr. Minister. In case I was confusing the issue, I was merely saying I realize a lot of housing is needed at Whyalla, and I do not think that is any excuse or justification for the scarcity of houses in some other areas. I think the Hon. Mr. Hill covered the points on housing yesterday extremely well.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I do not think you were referring to a large country city when you spoke of Whyalla?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, I was talking about ordinary country towns.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You mentioned Whyalla.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, I mentioned Whyalla. Items 21, 22 and 23 all probably point to the fact that this Government will go down in history with a number of things ticked up against it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: A few crosses, too.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This Government must go down in history as a great Government of Royal Commissions and inquiries, and expensive ones at that. One Minister told us they would be a boost to the economy. You have a real industry with the Royal Commissions and inquiries that are sitting at present: people are using petrol to get from one place to another; other people are employed at typing and using paper and all sorts of things.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't you want to get the facts?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Many of the facts are patently clear at the present moment and many of these issues are being handed over to inquiries, select committees and Royal Commissions, because the Government is not game to grasp the nettle and bring down legislation. We have a Royal Commission on Licensing at the present moment; we have had them before. We have had road and railway inquiries before—some of them fairly recently. What these people



are going to find out that the last ones did not find out, I am not sure. We have had our problems with proposals for a totalizator agency board, which have been with us for a considerable time. The last Government was prepared to legislate on this matter. We have had a referendum on a lottery; we have not seen the lottery, although about 79 per cent of the people decided that we would have one. It has taken all this time and we are still being told that we may get some legislation soon.

Surely 79 per cent is conclusive enough to allow the Government to get on with the job if it really wants a lottery, but the present Premier and the majority of his supporters thought it would be a good thing to have a lottery until it had the responsibility of getting one and working out how it could be made to pay.

We have the Royal Commission on Local Government Boundaries in the South-East continuing its inquiries and its report is expected within a few weeks. It has been working on the inquiry for some considerable time. We have a committee examining the Local Government Act with an eminent Queen's Counsel from another State involved, and it looks as though it may be another 12 months to two years before this committee brings down its report. I do not know; it is quite remarkable how this State just struggled along up to the date of the last election. It is amazing. It must have been just at the point of complete exhaustion, if we listen to this sort of stuff being put over by the Labor Party. The administration is being brushed up and we are going to see where the inefficiency is in Government departments.

We are talking about multi-million dollar buildings in various parts of the city to house all sorts of departments. There is no doubt that the Public Service of this State needs better conditions in some departments but we talk quite airily about a few million dollars here and a few million dollars there. When all is said and done, the administration until the change of Government was going along very well. On matters of administration there was no criticism by the general public. The few extra things that the Government threw in as bait at the election may have changed some people over for a period to try to get some of these adjustments—I do not doubt that. But I rather doubt whether, when people have seen what it will cost them to have all these wonderful things, there will be so many of them so engrossed at the next election.

I will not talk on the Government's policy on a State insurance office, because that legislation will be forthcoming. We have dealt with lotteries, off-course betting and the adoption of children. These matters are wide and varied. I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. I could not agree with many things they said but I liked the way in which they said them. I am sure we were impressed by the manner in which the Lieutenant-Governor performed the ceremony of the opening of Parliament. He has given very long service to the State, and has a fine record. It will not be long before His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan are back in South Australia. I speak for most South Australians when I say that we are always pleased to receive Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan back to this State. Most of us still feel that we have a strong loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and the Crown. I support the motion.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I, too, congratulate the mover (the Minister of Transport) and the seconder (Hon. D. H. L. Banfield) on the way in which they moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, although I did feel, as did Sir Lyell McEwin, some sympathy for them in the rather restricted material available to them. I also felt that both the mover and seconder lacked the sparkle of enthusiasm that was shown in moving and seconding the last motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply,

It is interesting in this connection to note that Mr. Banfield, as a new member to this Chamber, has made more speeches than any other floor member of the Labor Party in either House of Parliament. This is good. It shows Mr. Banfield's interest both inside and outside this Chamber. I support the mover and seconder in the sentiments expressed about the visit to South Australia of the Queen Mother. I am certain that the public's response indicated that affection that people hold for this country, it being clear that the love of their country is symbolized in the person of the Monarch. I express appreciation of the services of the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Mellis Napier, and of the manner in which he performed the ceremony of the opening of Parliament, in the absence of His Excellency Sir Edric Bastyan. We all look forward to the return of Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan from their well-earned rest overseas.

I join, too, in the tributes paid to members of Parliament who have died during the past year. Sir Richard Butler had a fine Parliamentary career. I believe he laid the foundations for the economic growth and development of this State. Rapid industrial development took place from 1933-34 up to the present time. These policies were, of course, continued by the Playford administration, and we are all very proud of the growth and development of this State compared with that of other States. These policies were conscious economic policies framed in the period of premiership of Sir Richard Butler. I refer also to the passing of Mr. E. J. Craigie and Mr. A. V. Thompson. I pay a particular tribute to Sir Frank Perry, who was a member of this Chamber. He made a magnificent contribution not only to the industrial life of this State but also to its Parliamentary life. I also want to pay my tribute to him for his kindness and the advice and help he gave me when I was a new member. I am sure all honourable members will endorse my saying that Sir Frank Perry took a keen interest in a new member and went out of his way to be of assistance wherever possible.

The Hon. Mr. Story went through His Excellency's Speech almost with a fine tooth-comb. I do not intend to follow suit but should like to refer to some parts of it. First, paragraph 10 states:

My Government continues to pursue an active and progressive policy in connection with educational services.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield said it was pleasing to see that the Government continued to pursue an active and progressive policy in connection with educational services. Further on, he had this to say: "Indeed, this Government although only in office for about 15 months has already fulfilled about 70 per cent of the promises made prior to the last election." I have a high regard for the honourable member but his previous venture into mathematics, when he tried to convince the Council that on the election of the Hon. Mr. Hill the Labor Party had increased its support considerably, leads me to suspect his figure of 70 per cent of the election promises. We have had in South Australia an education campaign seeking more funds for education. In fact, this campaign has been undertaken throughout the whole of Australia. I have no doubt that many honourable members have been involved and have been approached about it. Indeed, many members of Parliament are taking an

active part in the campaign. Unfortunately, politics have been introduced into it, and that can only harm its ultimate outcome. From what I have seen of the campaign so far, insufficient attention has been given to the role of the State in education: all attention has been focused on the demand for more money from the Commonwealth. The word "crisis" has been used, but if the crisis is so acute what justification is there for the Government to venture into the field of free school books? Despite the argument that not enough is being spent on education, it is a fact that if all the money spent by the various Governments in Australia were added together it would show that in the past 10 years spending in any one year had increased by 12 per cent on any previous year. In no other activity where Government money has been spent has there been a regular yearly increase in expenditure over the period of anything like the increase on education.

A document that has received much publicity in this campaign is entitled "Some Needs of Australian Education", produced by the Australian Educational Council, which consists of State Ministers of Education. This publication has been kept up to date since 1960, and it sets out the amount of money the various Ministers said would be needed for each successive year to meet the requirements of an increasing school population, whilst at the same time providing for improvements in the education system. In every year since 1960 the target figure laid down as being desirable has been exceeded in the field of recurring expenditure on education. When we examine the position of education at State level some interesting figures emerge. The following table shows the percentage of consolidated revenue devoted to education in every State, as calculated from figures compiled by the Commonwealth Statistician in preparation of information for the Commonwealth Grants Commission. The relevant years are 1963-64 and 1964-65. Here is the table:

State.	1963-64.	1964-65.
Victoria . . . . .	29.8	31.0
Queensland . . . . .	31.8	32.5
New South Wales . . . . .	23.8	24.4
South Australia . . . . .	24.9	22.7
Western Australia . . . . .	23.1	23.2

An examination of these figures shows that the percentage of consolidated revenue spent by South Australia on education actually dropped from 1963-64 to 1964-65. Although no figures are available for 1965-66 I am certain that a further deterioration has taken place. The campaign so far has directed its attention to the Commonwealth. I believe that not

enough attention has been focused on the management of education in this State. I point out to educators and parents that they should aim at more than one target in any applications for more money, and remember that the Commonwealth is not the only target.

I believe the Commonwealth will maintain its increasing financial commitments on education, but I am concerned about this campaign in South Australia developing a political characteristic and pointing in one direction only. I believe that when the figures for 1965-66 are published they will reveal that South Australia has not faced up to the problem as well as it should have done.

I now refer to paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech, which I believe contains the only reference to forestry. It reads:

My Government will continue to pursue policies designed to make full use of the potential of the State in agriculture, mining, land settlement, irrigation, forestry and other fields.

I have dealt with forestry on previous occasions, but I intend mentioning it again as I believe it is the most economic way in which we can get increased plantings of softwoods in South Australia. I have dealt previously with the necessity throughout Australia to adopt a policy that will increase these plantings. I quote the following from the *Border Watch* of three or four months ago, under the heading "Subsidy on Pine Land":

If the Commonwealth Government agrees to subsidize a soft-wood programme, South Australia will ask that its subsidy be spent on buying land suitable for *Pinus radiata*, instead of subsidizing plantings. Stating this on his return from New Guinea on Sunday, the Minister of Forests (Mr. G. A. Bywaters) said South Australia had almost reached the limit of new plantings and in five years there would be no land available. Mr. Bywaters attended the third meeting of the Australian Forestry Council in New Guinea last week. He said an extra 75,000 acres of tree planting each year in Australia was involved in the soft-wood programme discussed at the meeting. The suggested programme would continue until the year 2,000.

I am concerned about the statement that the money being made available by the Commonwealth would be used for buying land suitable for *Pinus radiata*, and not for subsidizing plantings. The only conclusion I can come to is that the words "instead of subsidizing plantings" refer particularly to the views I have put before this Chamber on previous occasions. We are grateful to the Commonwealth for the interest being taken in the development of forestry in Australia.

I repeat that the problem of increasing our softwood plantations is not being handled in the most economic way. The Government has already purchased much land in the South-East for pine plantations. It is already in a high state of production in other forms of agricultural pursuits. I direct attention to the fact that I ascertained in a survey that in the South-East about 80,000 acres of land not completely suitable for other agricultural development could be economically used for the growing of softwoods.

I know that I have advanced these arguments previously. However, the land is available if a suitable scheme can be worked out. One difficulty is that the land is part of areas already being farmed and is scattered throughout the South-East in varying acreages with, perhaps, about 50 acres here or 100 acres there, and this does not make the land attractive to the Woods and Forests Department. I have urged previously that the Government should investigate a scheme to encourage tree farming. Such schemes are in operation in other parts of the world and I think that the total area under tree farms in the United States of America is 50,000,000 acres, whereas there was no tree farming scheme in operation in that country in 1939.

In New Zealand woodlot legislation enables trees to be planted under the control of the farmers. I do not envisage the introduction of a subsidy scheme. In 1964, our Minister of Agriculture prepared a Bill but, unfortunately, there were a few things wrong with it and it did not come before Parliament. The attitude of our present Government in the matter of encouraging woodlot farming has caused us to slip further behind.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am not an authority on this, but I think the Minister is examining something.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I say that because of the report in the *Border Watch*, in which the Minister said:

If the Commonwealth Government agrees to subsidize a softwoods programme, S.A. will ask that its subsidy be spent on buying land suitable for *pinus radiata* instead of subsidizing plantings.

I can only think that this statement was made in reply to what I had said. However, my scheme does not envisage the payment of subsidies to farmers, but is purely an assistance programme.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Minister is pursuing a policy whereby he may be able to obtain more money from the Commonwealth Government somewhat along the lines you

have suggested. However, I am not an authority on the matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thank the Chief Secretary. When the previous Minister prepared a Bill difficulties arose regarding the arrangement between the Commonwealth and the State and the matter was dropped.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am sure that the Minister is pursuing a policy with the intention of considerably increasing the plantings in the South-East.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am not arguing that point. It is easy to increase plantings by buying some top-grade land, but I do not think that is warranted when 80,000 acres of second-grade land that does not interest the Woods and Forests Department is available to be placed under softwoods.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I give you an assurance that the Minister's attention will be drawn to your remarks.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Wouldn't the Government be opposed to private tree planting?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cannot answer that. I do not know why it should, because that is the only way in which these areas can be used economically. The department does not wish to buy the land, because there are areas in various places.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It would be safer from the fire risk point of view to have the forests scattered, wouldn't it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. Accurate figures can be produced on site quality. The best quality pines will be grown on site quality No. 1. Allowing an interest rate on capital of 6 per cent, and an 8 per cent rate for fire insurance, a return of about \$16 an acre a year can be obtained.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: That would affect land tax assessments, wouldn't it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have looked at the last assessment and I think the assessment would be affected. I now wish to deal with the omissions from the opening Speech.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Are you going to speak for long?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is a lengthy subject and I could speak for a long time about what is not in the Speech.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I thought it was the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech to which you were replying.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am glad the Hon. Mr. Banfield has returned to the Chamber because his knowledge of mathematics may assist me. During the last session three Bills were defeated in this Chamber and the Government

said that they were vital to its policy. The first Bill concerned transport, the second dealt with succession duties, and the third was a Bill on electoral reform. Yet, there is no mention in the Speech of any of those Bills. The logical explanation of why the Bill dealing with transport has not been mentioned is that a Royal Commission is now inquiring into the matter. The omission of any mention of the other two Bills leads most people to wonder why these vital matters have been dropped.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You have not given any indication of a change of heart, so why mention them?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: A reference to previous opening Speeches will show that those matters kept coming up. Is it reasonable to assume that the Government admits that the Legislative Council has been correct?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is an admission that it has not changed in numbers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I can believe that in the case of succession duties the reason is that the Government admits that last session the Council was right. I recall that very late on the last day of the debate on that Bill in this place there was a complete lack of spirit among Government members. I remember that the Hon. Mr. Banfield was sunk deep in his seat in the corner and hidden by the pillar. He was adopting a different attitude from the tenacity and truculence he showed a few days previously when he delivered his speech. I emphasize that the Chief Secretary skipped very lightly over matters in his reply, and that he did not answer very interesting questions that members had asked. I also remember a magnificent advertisement appearing in all the local papers.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: An incorrect advertisement.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. I always appreciate the honesty of the Labor members in this Chamber. I appreciated it particularly several days ago when I had a slight disagreement on figures with the Chief Secretary, who after checking, admitted mine were correct. I also appreciate that in the debate on the Succession Duties Bill last session there was a lack of spirit and a coldness when Government members in this Chamber realized that in the measure they had been sold a pup.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You screamed a lot on the last day, and I had to speak.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Members know that what I say is true. It was commented on by members in this place how throughout the

debate there had been a truculence and certainty in the minds of Government members, and that how, on the last day, the spirit had gone because they realized that they had been led up the garden path.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: By that time they had counted heads.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not think that is a reason. I think the Hon. Mr. Banfield will agree that they were led up the garden path on the matter of succession duties. I am prepared to accept as a reason for the omission of succession duties from this year's opening Speech that the Council was right.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are the only one giving that reason, so you must agree to it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am following it up logically.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Logic is not much good, numbers count.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Not always.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Give us an instance where they have not.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I can give a number of instances. It is not difficult on our side to know when a matter has been put logically. Our side is always interested in the logical side of the debate.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is today's funny story.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: What about electoral reform? Why didn't that appear in this year's opening Speech?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Are you going to support it this year?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This is a matter of policy on which the Government has hung its hat for so long. This is the mast to which the Labor Party has pegged its colours for 10 or 12 years.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You clearly indicate that you are not interested in democracy.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If members opposite follow my argument they might come to a different conclusion. This is the mast to which the Labor Party has nailed its political colours for many years, as I intend to show by reading an article by the now Attorney-General in a magazine called *Voice*. The Party has put its faith in the meaningless phrase about one vote one value. On the other hand, the Liberal and Country League has not placed the same political emphasis on electoral reform. We have not placed the same political emphasis on electoral reform as has the Labor Party, and I think members will agree

with that. The emphasis placed by our Party has been more on development and economic security. The Labor Party's emphasis has been along the lines of a political gerrymander. I think members will see that that is true.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is not likely that we are going to lay any stress on what you engineered over many years.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We will investigate this matter shortly and we will come to a conclusion about why there is no mention of electoral reform in the opening Speech this year. There is a logical reason why it is so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Yes, 16 to 4.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is not the reason. Our Party has always believed in adequate country representation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Yes, five to one.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Let us now trace the history in this matter and see where it leads.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Have you adequate representation now?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will deal with that in a moment. In 1856, before the inauguration of responsible Government in South Australia, a Select Committee was appointed, consisting of the Surveyor-General, Messrs. Forster, Baker, Reynolds and Kingston, to consider the number of electoral districts, among other things, for the House of Assembly. They were guided by the principle that they understood was generally approved by the Council. It was that the division of the Colony into electoral districts should, as far as practicable, be based on population. When the Select Committee made its report, it admitted that the attempt to carry out rigidly the principle of apportioning representation to population had been abandoned. The divisions recommended by the Select Committee were agreed to and, although it is interesting to see the full recommendation, the examples I shall give will suffice. It was recommended that in the city of Adelaide the total population represented by each member should be 3,093; in Murray 1,305; in Victoria, 1,814; and in Flinders, 926. This was the first step: the Council asked a Select Committee to consider boundaries for the new House of Assembly and it agreed that the colony should be divided into electoral districts based, as far as practicable, on population, and this was the recommendation made by the Committee. This was a long time before the development of any political Party, as before 1890 practically every member was an Independent.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Who appointed them?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Legislative Council.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I am talking about the Legislative Council. Who appointed its members?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not think it matters in this context. I think that is taking it too far. We shall see how far the Labor Party got and what it did. In 1861 and 1871 alterations were made to boundaries and the number of members to each electoral district, but the principle of representation was unaltered from the original findings of the 1856 Select Committee. In 1879 a Bill was introduced to alter boundaries and representation, and after it passed the second reading it was referred to a Select Committee. The Committee made several recommendations, one of which was that it was unanimously of the opinion that representation upon the basis of population alone was undesirable, as it would give undue power to centres of population.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Who were the members of the Select Committee?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cannot say, but that information can be obtained from the library.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Were there any Labor Party members?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There was no development of Parties until 1888.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Or workers' representatives.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There were in 1890, when the Labour Party as a machine had 10 members. From 1856 until the present time many inquiries were made by Select Committees and Commissions about districts and representation, and in 1901 there was a further alteration to give a city representation of 12 and a country representation of 30. In 1936 the two-to-one ratio was established.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Who introduced that Bill?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Government of the time.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about giving some of the comments made at the time? They appear in *Hansard*.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will do that, but first I should like to refer to an article which appeared in a magazine called *Voice* and which was written by the Labor member for Norwood, Mr. Dunstan, who is now the Attorney-General. It is a long article and

I shall leave out the first part, although it gives an indication of the thinking of the present Attorney-General. The article states:

It was this "democratic" body (the Legislative Council) which decided on South Australia's present Constitution in 1856; a Lower House elected by manhood suffrage and with secret ballot, and an Upper House elected on a property franchise. There were, and are, no effective deadlock provisions. The Upper House has an absolute right of veto over anything which the Lower House passes. The only difference in powers of the Houses lay in the fact that money Bills had to be initiated in the House of Assembly. The Lower House was not then gerrymandered. The quota of electors was substantially similar throughout the electorates, except in a very few instances where transport and geographical difficulties made that a practical impossibility. The electorate of the city of Adelaide had six members, each with a quota of 566 electors.

I have quoted from *Responsible Government* written by Mr. G. Combe and have shown that the total population represented by each member in the city of Adelaide was 3,093, yet in this article is the statement that the city of Adelaide had six members who each had a quota of 566 electors. The article continues:

Mount Barker (in the Adelaide Hills) had two members with a quota of 506. Barossa (in the plains of the Midlands) had two members each with a quota of 512.

The Attorney-General claimed that there had been no gerrymandering in the Lower House and that there was one vote one value, but the facts are entirely different, as in the city of Adelaide there was one member representing not 566 but over 3,000, and in Flinders one member represented 926.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Didn't you say there were six members to 3,000 in the City of Adelaide?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is where my friend has gone astray.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: And it is not the first time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, we have many instances of misinformation from this source. Adequate country representation began in 1856 and has been carried on, but at no stage has the Labor Party wanted to alter it. That is amazing, but it is true. In an article prepared by the Department of History at the University of Adelaide on this matter the following was said:

This was partly because the Labor Party was prepared to concede the weight of some of their opponents' arguments—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Weight of numbers!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, this was when the Labor Party did not govern and was prepared to concede some of the arguments of opponents. The article continues:

but mainly it was because the system then in force had left them with a fair share of office. Of the 15 separate administrations formed between 1901 and 1936, seven were Labor.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What is the figure since 1936?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Right through that period the Labor Party at no time made very strenuous attempts to alter the quota.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did the Labor Party ever have control of the Legislative Council?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not think so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: At no time did it have an opportunity to govern.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Legislative Council is still here, which answers that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It suits us the way you are going; it will not be here much longer.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think I am getting along fairly well. Honourable members seem to be enjoying it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You are always right for a laugh!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I said I could believe that the omission of succession duties from the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech was possibly due to the fact that the Government accepted the decision of the Legislative Council. However, I have difficulty in believing this in regard to electoral reform. I should like now to look at the position in Queensland. It will be agreed that in many ways Queensland is the State most like South Australia. It is a large State.

Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Except that it has not an Upper House.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is quite true, but that is a disadvantage to the Labor Party in Queensland, because it cannot draw up legislation and have it knocked back and blame somebody else. We know where it stands in Queensland.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. DeGaris is making a speech and I think it is only fair that he should be allowed to make it without interruption. Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I want to look at the Queensland Electoral Redistribution Bill of 1949. As has been said, there is a one-house system there. Whatever the Government

there puts up, it knows it can pass. It cannot put up a Bill and have it knocked back by a hostile Legislative Council.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: As we have here.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: They increased the representation in the House in Queensland in 1949 from 62 to 75 members. They divided the State into four zones—the Metropolitan zone, the South-Eastern zone (which includes the agricultural and dairying industries), the Northern zone (which includes the sugar-growing and mining industries), and the Western zone (which takes in the pastoral industry). The Act specified the number of seats per zone. The 1949 redistribution Bill broke up these zones in this way:

Zone.	Seats.	Quota.
Metropolitan . . . . .	24	10,795
South-Eastern . . . . .	28	9,373
Northern . . . . .	13	7,696
Western . . . . .	10	4,613

By 1956 the position had drifted in this manner. As an example, the metropolitan seat of Mount Gravatt had a roll of 26,307, as opposed to Mackenzie in the Western zone, with a roll of 4,848. From the 1956 election the following position emerged. In the Metropolitan zone the Labor Party won 17 seats with a vote of 145,000; the Liberal and Country Parties won seven seats with 125,000 votes. In the South-Eastern zone the Labor Party won 14 seats with 110,000 votes, and the Liberal and Country Parties won 14 seats with 117,000 votes. In the Northern zone the Labor Party won nine seats with 52,000 votes, and the Liberal and Country Party won two seats with 36,000 votes. In the Western zone the Labor Party won nine seats with 27,000 votes, and the Liberal and Country Parties won one seat with 18,000 votes. We can see that in Queensland, which is roughly parallel to South Australia, there has been no attempt to alter exactly the same concept that we have had in South Australia. Indeed, if we look at a few more figures, we shall see that in every zone one Party polled a certain number of votes, and its percentage of seats was well above that percentage. Let us compare the positions in the two States. Let us take the Metropolitan zone of Queensland, where the Labor Party won 17 seats with 145,000 votes, as opposed to the Liberal and Country Parties' seven seats with 125,000 votes. Now let us look at the metropolitan area in South Australia, where we see where this magnificent Playford gerrymander has got us. I take the Commonwealth figures.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Take the State, not the Commonwealth, figures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The only way we can look at this is by taking the Commonwealth figures.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You take first of all the State figures for Queensland and then you take something to suit your argument here.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In Queensland, to start with, we cannot look at this question because of the Labor Party's idea of voting by a cross. Therefore, there can be no appreciation of the relative positions. If there had not been a split in the Labor Party, it would still be in power in Queensland, and even with possibly a 20 per cent vote. The Liberal and Country Party had 44 per cent of the votes in the metropolitan area of Adelaide at the last Commonwealth election, and the Australian Labor Party had 56 per cent (taking the combined A.L.P. and L.C.L. votes as 100 per cent). However, at the last State election, in the metropolitan area the L.C.L. won only 20 per cent of the seats. This is the essential difference in the comparison between Queensland and South Australia.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There is no comparison.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is a comparison.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There is no comparison whatever. Give us the State figures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Minister can look at the State figures, but he will find exactly the same result. If there had been a gerrymander—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What do you mean—“if”?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: —we would have won more than three seats out of 13 in the metropolitan area. That cannot be denied.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is impossible for you.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Minister can look at the figures until he is blue in the face, but he will find that what I am saying is correct. Going back to Queensland, I should like to quote what Mr. Davis said:

But despite the evidence of political advantages no complete verdict can yet be delivered on the ethics of the system, for it still must be considered in the background of the State's needs. The problem of rural representation has long been a major issue in Queensland . . . Exactly the same thing applies to South Australia. While I have been comparing Queensland with South Australia, if we want to see what a gerrymander really is, let us look at the set-up in Queensland and we shall find out.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I agree with you on the set-up today.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: But we cannot dodge the fact that our electoral system has come to us from the first Parliament in 1856. Commission after commission has inquired into this matter, and there has been Labor administration after Labor administration with no great pressure to alter it. In 1956 we suddenly had this pressurized propaganda, that we were suffering under a Playford gerrymander.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If it was so fair for all those years, what are you so afraid of now?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Honourable members do not seem to appreciate what I am saying. In the early years of the Labor Party in Queensland, it stood for the literal application of this emotional and impossible-to-define term “one vote one value”. In the early days, from 1890 to 1910, there was this constant pressure on the Labor Party in Queensland for the rigid application of “one vote one value”; yet, when that Party got into power, it took the matter further for more rural representation. The same thing happened in South Australia, where we had seven Labor administrations from 1901 to 1936. No great attempt was made to change that ratio. I should like to quote from page 419 of *Queensland Parliamentary Debates* of 1910, when David Bowman was Leader of the Labor Party. Up to that time, the Labor Party had constantly agitated for the principle of one vote one value. Mr. Bowman said:

You cannot in a sparsely populated country like Queensland truly apply that principle as you can in centres where you have close population . . . it would be unfair to bring the principle of one vote one value down to a basis where all votes would be equal in Queensland. My objection to the Bill is that I do not think it is liberal enough to some of those far Western and Northern electorates.

He was speaking in the debate on a redistribution Bill and said that the Bill did not go far enough.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: He was a moderate.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: All Bowmans are. In 1915 the Labor Party came to office in Queensland but no effort was made to change the position.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are not suggesting that no effort has been made here, are you?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I refer again to an article published from the University of Adelaide Department of History.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Why don't you quote from the L.C.L. convention?



The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I shall ask my friend, the Hon. Mr. Story, to find the place in the report.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Who is making this speech?

The PRESIDENT: It seems that speeches are being made on one side of the Chamber as much as the other.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In 1915 the Labor Party came to office in Queensland and after 1922 it did not have a hostile Upper House to deal with. In 1930 the Moore Government, which was a Country-Progressive-National Government, took office and at that time the Leader of the Labor Party was Mr. W. Forgan Smith. The Labor Party strongly opposed a measure for the alteration of the electoral boundaries in Queensland and Forgan Smith said, as reported in *Queensland Parliamentary Debates*, 1931, at page 852:

A principle of representative government is being violated. A principle of representative government in a democracy is that, so far as it is humanly possible, each vote shall be of equal value: but in this case the Government are perpetuating a system whereby one electorate can have 3,200 votes fewer than an adjoining electorate and yet have the same influence in Parliament.

We have seen the Labor Party demanding one vote one value and we have also seen the Leader of the Party, David Bowman, criticizing this and saying that there should be more rural representation but in the next 20 years a Labor Government made no effort to give effect to this. A different Government wanted to change the boundaries and Forgan Smith said that one vote one value was the only system. When Labor came to office three years later, Forgan Smith was Premier of Queensland. There was no Upper House and he had a free hand. No attempt was made to make an alteration until 1949, when the Labor Party increased rural representation to a far greater extent than that existing in South Australia. Looking at the record of the Labor Party on electoral redistribution, I ask why electoral reform is not mentioned in His Excellency's Speech.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The answer is still the same, 16 L.C.L. members to four Labor.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. The answer is the same as we found in Queensland between 1910 and 1930. The Labor Party does not want a redistribution in South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why didn't you give us an opportunity to show you?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The history of South Australia and of Queensland shows that. Surely what happened in Queensland is sufficient to convince anybody.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It wasn't the Labor Party here that threw it out.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is my opinion that the Labor Party does not want a redistribution in South Australia. It is perfectly happy with the present position, because over the years it has given them a fair share of office. I now turn to this information written by a person of the University of Adelaide Department of History. Arguments have been put forward that the gerrymander in this State has kept the Labor Party out of office, but that is utter nonsense.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Your sins have caught up with you.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cited the metropolitan area, where we got 44 per cent of the votes but received only 20 per cent of the seats in the House of Assembly. I desire to quote from *The Australian Quarterly* of June, 1956, figures that have been compiled by using the results obtained at the Commonwealth election nearest in time to the State election concerned in the uncontested districts and in those where one of the major Parties did not stand (for example, where an A.L.P. and a Communist were the only candidates).

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Where are those figures from?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The writer from the University of Adelaide Department of History.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It depends on who writes them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is so much distortion in the Attorney-General's report that one can put it away as being biased.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: One writer may be just as biased as the other one.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Here we have something written by a person—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How can you say he isn't biased if you don't know him?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have argued with the Chief Secretary on statistics recently and he has agreed that I was right. I think he will agree about this if he examines it. The following table sets out the votes obtained at South Australian elections:

Year	L.C.L.	A.L.P.	Others
1938 . . .	83,413	76,094	65,780
1941 . . .	81,116	70,244	57,742
1944 . . .	144,317	157,115	57,383

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did we take office in 1944?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Yet, we received about 157,000 votes and your Party received 144,000.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: At the 1947 election, the figures were:

L.C.L.	A.L.P.	Others
180,595	159,421	61,419

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How many uncontested seats were there in the metropolitan area?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think that, if honourable members listen and speak afterwards if they want to—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He cannot, Sir. He has spoken. Those figures depend on who prepares them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have tried to select some authority that would not be biased. We have seen much of this stuff put over, Mr. President. The Minister was not in the Council earlier when I referred to the branding of the Playford gerrymander.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The first to refer to the gerrymander was one by the name of Samuel Lawn.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Perhaps he did not have the ability to put things into words as well as we have here. Since 1856 it is claimed that we have been gerrymandered in this State. All the Playford regime has done has been to carry on the original concept. Even if we had one vote one value, there would have been no alteration except on probably two occasions in the last 30 years when there would have been an alteration in the House of Assembly. I do not believe that this Government wants any redistribution—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You cannot catch us that way.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think I have argued the point logically. The Government is perfectly happy to continue, as they have in

Queensland. This is a parallel case! In this Chamber we have men who are able to think logically and without bias and bitterness in a political argument. We should somehow give a lead to the State for a reasonable redistribution programme.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You had the opportunity last session when the Bill was introduced.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There were two Bills, but one did not get here. One was for 20 seats in the metropolitan area and 20 in the country that was introduced by the previous Government. That Bill did not get here, as it was defeated in another place. The other Bill dealt with this so-called one vote one value, but it varied so much from the Labor Party's own principles and contained so much other material that it was not possible for us to give it reasonable consideration. I believe that people in this State want redistribution, but will not have a bar of this so-called one vote one value. They will not have a bar of the intricate variations that the Government introduced into its own philosophy. I am certain that redistribution is possible and that the people should have it. Possibly this Chamber will be able to look at things in a way that is outside the political heat of another place, and be able to give a lead to the State in a reasonable redistribution. I have tried to point out the difficulty we had last session.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The opportunity was there.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not agree. The Council should give a lead towards some reasonable redistribution. I support the motion.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.29 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 5, at 2.15 p.m.