

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 31, 1968

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS**RAILWAY SERVICES**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: A number of people have asked me and other members of Parliament to clarify a question regarding the closing of railway lines. It has been alleged (I am not sure whether the allegation is soundly based) that the Minister in his statement said that the question of closing any railway line would be referred to the Public Works Committee. I understand that a reference is made to the Public Works Committee only when a line is to be taken up, not when it is proposed simply to close the line. Can the Minister say whether I am correct in saying that the closing of a railway line does not have to be referred to the Public Works Committee, only the taking up of a line?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall obtain a tabulated reply to the Leader's question, so that the reply may be completely understood and so that it will be in absolute detail for him. I shall bring down this reply as soon as possible.

KULPARA SCHOOL

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yesterday, together with a Mr. Daniel, who I believe is the Chairman of the Kulpara Primary School committee, and Mr. Gordon Couch, I inspected the school and schoolhouse at Kulpara, at the northern end of Yorke Peninsula. I was surprised and very disappointed to see the very poor condition of both these buildings. The schoolhouse has, I believe, been condemned; at least, no-one is living in it at present. The schoolteacher understood that the house was in poor condition when he applied for an appointment to the school, but he believed the house was livable. After my inspection I believe it is not livable and, in point of fact,

he is boarding privately in the district whilst his wife and three children live in the city. I should think the building is 70 or 80 years old and it is badly cracked throughout. Since it is so far below standard I believe it is true to say that it has been condemned. Thirty-six children attend the school, which is staffed by two teachers, and I understand it is not proposed to close the school and send the children elsewhere; if this is so, this matter needs immediate attention. A new schoolhouse and a new school should be built. Will the Minister bring this serious matter to the notice of the Minister of Education and will he inform me: first, whether it is possible that a new school and a new schoolhouse can be built; and, secondly, whether it is the Education Department's policy to keep the Kulpara Primary School open?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall refer this question to my colleague and bring down a reply as quickly as possible.

KINGSTON ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Can the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, say what plans the Electricity Trust has for the supply of electricity to the Kingston area in the South-East?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I shall certainly take the matter up with the Minister of Works and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

VIRGINIA WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I have asked questions in this Council previously regarding a reticulated water supply to the districts of Two Wells and Virginia. In fact, on August 22 last year when I asked a question on this subject the then Minister replied to the effect that the scheme to supply this area was of considerable magnitude and that it was doubtful whether sufficient Loan funds would be available until 1969-70. As the development of this area is virtually brought to a standstill through the lack of water supplies, will the present Government consider giving this project a higher priority?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I appreciate the importance of this question, and I will certainly take the matter up with the Minister of Works.

ISLINGTON CROSSING

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have been perturbed for a considerable time over a crossing at Islington, and last Saturday when I crossed there again my impression regarding its shortcomings was confirmed. Unfortunately, an accident occurred there yesterday, although this has nothing to do with my question. I realize that there are flashing lights there, and I am not saying whose fault it was that the accident occurred. What perturbs me is that Regency Road from Hampstead Road has been widened the full length down to Torrens Road near Cheltenham. The road narrows considerably at this particular crossing at Islington, and the approach to this crossing from the east does not allow a good view and therefore the crossing is a dangerous one. As this crossing carries very heavy traffic at times, it means that much of the traffic is brought towards the centre. If the Minister does not know this crossing, will he have a look at it, and can he say whether the Railways Department intends to widen that crossing at some time in the future? If this is not to be done, will he inquire the reason?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I know the crossing to which the Leader has referred, and I know also that an unfortunate accident occurred there yesterday. We have a crossing committee which deals with the question of priority for making crossings safer than they are at present by various systems of signals. I will refer this matter to that committee and also to the Railways Department, and when I receive the necessary reports I will bring them down for the Leader.

FLUORIDATION

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Following the Government's announcement yesterday regarding the introduction of fluoride to our water (which honourable members were no doubt interested to hear), I now ask the Minister of Health whether the Government intends to extend such fluoridation to the outer city and nearer country areas served by the South Para, Barossa and Warren reservoirs?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The answer to the honourable member's question is "Yes".

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: As there have been conflicting estimates in our newspapers of the cost of fluoridation equipment (one

being \$80,000; another \$160,000) will the Minister of Health comment on such discrepancy?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: At the moment any estimate of costs can only be speculation. It is expected, however, that it would not exceed \$200,000; although it may be somewhat less than that. As members would appreciate, until we know exactly what machinery is necessary the full cost cannot be ascertained. Research regarding the supply of fluoride tablets to children in this State has taken place, but the cost of this would be much more than that of adding fluoride to the water supply.

HACKHAM SPEED LIMIT

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: On the road to Victor Harbour is a small city that honourable members may or may not have heard of: Hackham. After 10 or 12 years of pressure from a back-bencher in this place, someone did something about straightening out that ridiculous labyrinth at the crossing. The road now goes straight through, which is convenient for motorists. However, the 35 miles an hour speed limit signs surrounding this small city, which consists of two shops (both of which are off the main road as they have virtually a private service road for themselves), still remain. This is very inconvenient to motorists and there are many thousands of them during the week. I notice that the speed limit is not generally observed, which suggests to me that the public seem to know what they are doing in that area. I have made private representations to the Minister of Roads to save time in this matter and, indeed, I think he may have made inquiries or taken steps in relation to it. Could he now tell me what is the present position?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Every time I have crossed over the railway line at Hackham since I took office I have thought of the honourable member and I have thought to myself on each occasion that I must take up the question of the speed limit because he will draw my attention to the matter again. As he said, he did this and, upon inquiring of the Highways Department, I found (and he will be pleased with this reply) that a speed limit of 45 miles an hour has been fixed between Morphett Vale and Hackham, but the zone finishes on

the Adelaide side of the railway crossing. This means that there is now an unrestricted speed limit over the railway crossing at Hackham. I understand that the signs to this effect have not yet been erected because the whole matter is still being processed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 30. Page 293.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I join with other honourable members in extending my congratulations to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor upon the manner in which he opened Parliament. I also congratulate him upon the splendid way in which he is serving the State at present. As he has now regained good health after the illness he suffered a short while ago, I wish him continued good health for many years to come.

I join, too, with honourable members in extending my sympathy to the relatives of the five deceased members of Parliament whose names were mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. Particularly do I extend condolences to Mrs. Walsh, as Mr. Francis Henry Walsh was the only member of the five whom I knew personally. I had great regard and respect for him.

I commend the speakers in this debate so far for their contributions and thank those honourable members who have extended to me their good wishes as a result of my Ministerial appointment. I take this opportunity to answer the queries raised and comments made by honourable members during this debate on matters coming within my administration. Also, I shall report to this Council upon some of the important matters in which I have been involved within my portfolios in the last 3½ months.

On Tuesday, July 23, the Hon. Mr. Kemp mentioned a points demerit scheme in regard to the issuing of drivers' licences. The Australian Transport Advisory Council has as one of its committees a Driver Improvement Committee, which, amongst its many recommendations, has recommended that probationary licences be issued in each State. Superintendent Vogelesang and Mr. Strutton (Registrar of Motor Vehicles) came to see me about the introduction of probationary licences and during that discussion the matter of a points demerit scheme arose. One of the

real problems in regard to the issuing of probationary licences is that the dangerous driver who is shrewd tends to exercise care during the period of his probationary licence: he knows when the period of the licence will end and so he controls himself during that time.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What is the time—12 months?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not sure of the actual time recommended by this committee but at the expiration of that time that type of driver feels free to take charge of the road, so to speak, and of course he creates havoc then by being a dangerous driver. I am keen to have the whole matter of a points demerit scheme investigated here. Indeed, the Registrar at present is carrying out that investigation. As the Hon. Mr. Kemp has mentioned, it means in simple terms that a driver who commits offences has points marked down against him.

If I may again refer to the dangerous driver that I mentioned under the probationary scheme, right from the start of his driving points begin to mount up and he is then influenced to control himself. It forces him, therefore, to exercise care because he fears that ultimately his score will reach that number at which his licence will be suspended. So it forces people who tend to be careless on the road to exercise care. I think the scheme has much merit.

On the other hand, it is a big change and therefore must be investigated fully before the Government considers it. The inquiry being carried out by Mr. Strutton is taking time. I understand that at present he is awaiting some information from overseas on this matter but I can assure the Hon. Mr. Kemp that we appreciate his point that we should look at it; we are doing that and in due course we shall be able to announce whether or not we propose to introduce a points demerit scheme for drivers' licences in South Australia.

On the same day the Hon. Mr. Whyte mentioned the Birdsville Track. It has been announced that over a five-year period approximately \$3,000,000 will be spent on the Birdsville Track. That will make this route an all-weather road between Marree and Birdsville, which, as honourable members know, is just north of our border in Queensland. The South Australian Government some time ago carried out a feasibility study of the Birdsville Track, and some interesting figures were brought to light in that investigation.

I understand it was not fully accepted by the Commonwealth Government but the worth of the track and its worth particularly to South Australia when it will be upgraded into an all-weather road can be judged in some way by estimates that appear in the feasibility study. The report claims that in a normal year about 10,000 head of stock come down the Birdsville Track at present and that, if the road was upgraded as recommended in the report, because of the better standard of road a considerable expansion of pastoralist interests would take place in the north-eastern corner of the State and great use of the road would be made by interests in the Channel country in Queensland, to the extent that over an 11-year period there would be an increase of over 14,000 on the 10,000 head of stock, making a total exceeding 24,000 head of stock coming down that track to the markets in South Australia.

So the Government places great importance upon this particular development. We have men from the Highways Department up there now doing engineering and design work and we hope to get on to it as quickly as possible. It will be of great benefit to South Australia when the Birdsville Track is completed in that manner.

The Hon. Mr. Whyte also mentioned the Port Augusta bridge. With him, I am sorry that we cannot begin the actual construction work as soon as we had planned. At present the pre-construction work is continuing with a considerable amount of land purchase being involved because, as the Hon. Mr. Whyte knows, the approaches to the bridge come right back on the eastern side through the township. It all takes time.

The design work has also taken time and it is expected that early in 1970 tenders will be called for the construction of that bridge. In the same speech, the Hon. Mr. Whyte mentioned the road from Port Augusta to Alice Springs. At present the Highways Department would very much like to see more money being spent and more work being done on this road, but it has problems in respect of both finance and resources. Consequently, this road, which should be a highway, is causing much worry. I have, however, asked the Highways Department to carry out a feasibility study on this road, which will be fairly similar to that which was carried out some time ago on the Birdsville Track.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Isn't the Commonwealth Government at present undertaking a study in relation to the resiting of the line?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have heard that the Commonwealth Government is carrying out studies in relation to resiting the north-south railway line, but I have not heard that it is carrying out any investigations into resiting the Alice Springs road.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I am speaking about the railway line.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thought the honourable member was speaking about the railway line, but I was not talking about it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I should appreciate it if the Minister would obtain the information about the railway line.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Perhaps we should deal with one thing at a time. I shall deal with the matter raised by the honourable member later. Regarding the Alice Springs road, I know the Commonwealth Government is particularly interested in the southern end of it, between Port Augusta and a point near Wirappa. Generally speaking, this is a South Australian road and the purpose of the feasibility study is to make an approach to the Commonwealth Government for finance in order to make it an all-weather road.

It is extremely important from both the national and the State viewpoint that we have a first-rate highway running north-south from Darwin to Adelaide. Of course, there is a bitumen road from Darwin to Alice Springs. The improvement of this road south of Alice Springs, particularly the portion in South Australia which extends to Port Augusta, will complete an all-weather highway.

It is particularly important from South Australia's viewpoint, because throughout Australia there is undoubtedly a trend to develop east-west road traffic flow. The large amount of money being spent in Western Australia and Queensland on roads is being spent particularly on east-west roads and, unless this State can develop this north-south complex, it will tend to be left out of things in respect of pastoral and mineral traffic, which will ultimately tend to travel east-west and by-pass South Australia, particularly the southern part of this State.

I believe it is reasonable for South Australia to look to the Commonwealth Government for a considerable portion of the cost of this road. We intend, therefore, to approach the Commonwealth Government armed with a detailed study. We can only guess what its attitude will be. I have briefly mentioned the question of this highway to the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport

and I hope that we shall receive a sympathetic hearing from the Commonwealth Government when we put our case.

The Hon. Mr. Whyte also referred to the roadworks needed in the main streets of some of the towns in his electoral district, particularly Penong, Kingoonya and Coober Pedy. I am keen to see whether we can establish local government in some of these northern towns and also in the western town of Penong. If it can be established, some of the problems to which the honourable member has referred will be overcome.

It is noteworthy that the whole of Western Australia is covered by local government; indeed, practically the whole of the areas of all States except South Australia is covered by local government, yet in this State only about one-fifth of the area is covered by this form of government. It is in centres such as Coober Pedy that some move should be instituted towards this end.

The Local Government Act Revision Committee has investigated this matter. I do not think the committee will deal in detail with this matter in its report, which I expect early next year, but after its issue I intend to discuss the matter further with officers in my department. We intend to see whether we can achieve the goal of spreading local government to some of the regions I have named.

The Hon. Mr. Whyte then said he hoped that some more work on the Eyre Highway would be carried out. I have publicly announced that the Government intends to make another approach to the Commonwealth Government for aid to complete the sealing of this road. I know the previous Government also tried to obtain such assistance.

We cannot afford to take money that is needed for roads in more populated areas and allocate it to this work, although we see our way clear to go as far as Penong in due course. After Western Australia completes the sealing of the Eyre Highway to the South Australian border in about a year's time, the remaining 310 miles within South Australia will be the only unsealed portion of National Route No. 1, which extends from Cairns to a point 700 miles north of Perth.

If financial assistance were given to South Australia to enable completion of this link from Penong to the border the work would, in the view of the Highways Department, be accomplished over a six-year period; consequently, any financial assistance required would be at a rate very little in excess of \$1,000,000 a year.

Since the submission of the original report the traffic volume on this section of road has continued to increase. The traffic during the last financial year totalled nearly 27,000 vehicles, or an average of 73 vehicles a day. This represents a 25 per cent increase over the previous corresponding period, and a 70 per cent increase over the corresponding period two years ago. So, we see the great rate of increase of traffic over the Eyre Highway.

Honourable members can well appreciate what a great benefit sealing this section of the highway would be to Western Australia, which State has already agreed to give us every possible assistance and support in our approach to the Commonwealth Government for this aid.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: This was done by the State Government last year. The joint application by Western Australia and South Australia for assistance was turned down cold by the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Of course, we must not let things lie when we are refused help from the Commonwealth: we simply have to keep at it, and that is what the present Government intends to do.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You complained about our turning to the Commonwealth Government for help.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We intend to do it. I have had some discussions on this matter with Mr. Sinclair, the Commonwealth Minister, and I hope that the Commonwealth will not give the same reply as it gave previously to the application from South Australia for aid to complete this road.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Again I wish you luck.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr. Whyte also mentioned the proposed rail link from Port Augusta to Whyalla. This, too, is a matter on which the previous Government had some contact with the Commonwealth Government. Here again we intend to proceed and again ask that the Commonwealth expedite its plans to complete this link on the standard gauge, for it would be of great benefit to South Australia, to Whyalla, and to the South Australian Railways, because the steel produced at Whyalla would make ideal freight for rail transport.

When the standard gauge between Port Pirie and Broken Hill is completed, if this short railway could be built by the Commonwealth we would be able to transport these products by rail from Whyalla directly to the eastern seaboard, and the South Australian Railways would gain considerable revenue from the

section of the railway between Port Pirie and Broken Hill. I hope that the Commonwealth will make an announcement in the relatively near future that it intends to build this railway link between Port Augusta and Whyalla.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Has the Broken Hill Proprietary Company indicated that it would be happy to have rail transportation for its products?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The investigation has been carried out entirely by the Commonwealth Railways: our Railways Department has not become involved with the details to which the honourable member has referred. The proposal I want to see the Commonwealth consider and, indeed, institute is for the Commonwealth to build a Commonwealth railway. I have no doubt that questions such as these have been dealt with by the Commonwealth department concerned.

The honourable member also mentioned the railway to which the Hon. Mr. Bevan referred a few moments ago (the northern railway between Port Augusta and Alice Springs) and said that he understood it was being re-planned at present. Also, the Hon. Mr. Bevan mentioned that he thought some redesign and re-routing was being considered for this railway. Obviously, a better route should be found for this railway because, as we all know, the present line is subjected to considerable flooding in the North, and much delay and great expense is involved.

To the west of the present line, away from the lakes and the creeks, there is higher ground. I hope that the Commonwealth completes the planning it has in train regarding this line. I hope it proceeds with those plans and that it builds a first-rate railway line to the north of South Australia as soon as possible. One cannot help querying whether such a line should stop at Alice Springs, as the present one does.

We have had mineral finds and there is much mineral activity farther north than Alice Springs, and it might well be an economical proposition for the Commonwealth to consider extending a new line farther north than Alice Springs and taking it to some of these areas that are being developed.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: It should then connect direct to Whyalla and link with the Eyre Peninsula system.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think I will content myself with asking the Commonwealth to rebuild the northern line, but on a much better

route than at present, and to consider taking it farther north. Of course, we in South Australia would like to ship many of our mineral products from our ports in the gulf. We have some excellent ports, notably the deep water harbour at Wallaroo. Some minerals are already being shipped from Port Pirie.

I think this whole traffic could develop, and it would be of great benefit to South Australia if the Commonwealth could see its way clear to upgrade the whole plan concerning the north-south railway.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Is the Minister aware that there is already an agreement with the Commonwealth that that line should be completed to Darwin? That was consequent on ceding the Northern Territory.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Give them time; that is only 50 years ago.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr. Rowe last Wednesday referred to the road between Moonta and Agery, about which he and a delegation led by him came to see me recently, and asked me to consider that matter further. However, I regret that now that it has been fully considered I am unable to help him with the sealing of that road, and I have written him accordingly. The department intends to keep the whole matter in mind. When I am in that area I intend to inspect that road personally, and I hope that before long we will be able to give the honourable member better news than we have been able to give him on this occasion.

The Hon. Mr. Rowe also referred to the problems that would occur to employees of industry in this State when those industries were affected by any proposal in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. He made the point (I think it was a very good one) that some of the factories in the western suburbs had employees who had been working in them for many years and who were settled in housing around them.

He claimed that if these factories were forced to move out into new areas and on new sites, considerable inconvenience would be occasioned to those employees. I appreciate this whole problem of displacement. The question has arisen regarding our railway rationalization scheme, and it causes me considerable concern. We are living in a world of rapid change, and change is being accepted much more today than it was some time ago.

I hope that, if the problems envisaged by the Hon. Mr. Rowe regarding these employees do occur, industry will take the employees'

into its confidence and discuss the problems with them fully and adequately over a fairly long period. I hope that many of the problems envisaged under this heading will not be as serious ultimately as it now appears they might be.

The Hon. Mr. Rowe also mentioned road transport superseding some of the passenger train services in his district, and indicated that he thought fares on the buses might be lower than those being charged by the railways. The Transport Control Board is at present conducting inquiries, and it appears that the road fares will be less (in some instances considerably less) than rail fares. It appears also that the travelling time will be shorter. I believe that the bus passenger services will provide more comfortable travelling arrangements for the public. Since the all-road service to Whyalla was introduced, there has been a large increase in patronage. This indicates that people favour bus transport.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why can't the Government provide the bus transport?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Because the Government believes in private enterprise. The cost of transporting parcels by bus will be lower than the present rail charge. The Hon. Mr. Rowe and other members mentioned the possibility of waiting room accommodation at railway stations and sidings being used for the benefit of bus passengers. This point is being examined, and further inquiries are to be made. However, one of the advantages of passenger bus services is that the buses do not pick up people, or are not forced to pick up people, at a particular point within a town.

There is elasticity in their programme, and it is usually of benefit to residents if they can be picked up at several points rather than everybody having to go to one waiting room. However, if we can utilize any of the accommodation to which he referred, we will by all means do so.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins last Thursday asked whether the priority of the Murray Valley Highway could be upgraded and whether work could be done on it. As I understood his question, the road to which he referred was generally the road from Waikerie through Cadell, and then down the river to Murray Bridge.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: More particularly from Blanchetown to Murray Bridge.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The department is sympathetic and appreciates that a first-class road is needed to serve the irrigation areas more to the north of the section the honourable member mentioned, particularly the irrigation area between Cadell and Bow Hill.

Discussions have been held with the councils concerned and the Murray Valley Development League. The priority of this road is not high, but the councils along the route have agreed to give the road high priority on their applications for grants. I understand it is an open surface road and is in a reasonable condition at present. I believe, too, that work in isolated sections is now proceeding. However, I have called for a report from the Commissioner of Highways on this matter, and I hope to be able to give the honourable member a more detailed reply later.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins also mentioned the festival hall, and put forward his view that it should be a concert hall rather than a multi-purpose hall. The Government is interested in this matter, because it will provide financial assistance for the scheme. When plans were first mentioned for a festival hall, the concept was for a concert hall, not a multi-purpose hall, to be built.

Subsequent to that decision, much investigation was carried out and much research made to ascertain whether the decision to build a hall that was to be only a concert hall was a better decision than one to build a multi-purpose hall. The Adelaide City Council, which carried out this research, took much time and had many interviews on the whole matter.

It did not lightly come to its decision that a multi-purpose hall was a better proposition than was the other form of hall. Nevertheless, it came to that decision and, whilst I respect the honourable member's opinion in this matter, I know that the Adelaide City Council's investigation was so deep that the decision to change to a multi-purpose hall was the best decision.

It is interesting to note that the council had interviews with the following gentlemen before it changed its opinion: Sir Robert Helpmann, Professor David Galliver (Elder Professor of Music at the Conservatorium), Stefan Haag (Executive Director of the Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust), Mr. W. J. Mehaffey (Acoustics Engineer of the Australian Broadcasting Commission), Mr. C. Dorning (Director of J. C. Williamson Theatres Limited), Mr. Hassell (of Hassell, McConnell and Partners), the architect, and Mr. W. E. White (Manager

for South Australia of the Australian Broadcasting Commission). Mr. White was accompanied by Mr. L. Amadio (Concert Manager for the Australian Broadcasting Commission).

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins also mentioned pensioners being given the right to travel on Municipal Tramways Trust buses and wondered whether the new system that the Government had introduced was working well. From the reports I have received from the trust and from the Railways Department, I believe it is working well, and I am sure the pensioners appreciate the help that the present Government has given them.

I am looking closely into the possibility of being able to assist pensioners even further with travel concessions between Adelaide and Broken Hill. Except for some small areas north of the Murray River in New South Wales, from which I believe pensioners can travel to Melbourne, no arrangements exist for interstate travel for pensioners.

I have had representations from people in Broken Hill, and it may be possible in future for us to allow pensioners who are residents of Broken Hill to travel on our railway system to Adelaide at concession rates. Similarly, pensioners from Adelaide will then be able to travel across the border to Broken Hill.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone yesterday gave much detail of the standardization arrangements that were in train during his term of office as Minister of Transport. He mentioned several points upon which he asked me questions or queried decisions of the present Government. For instance, he mentioned the newspaper report, to which I did reply, and I completely agree with him that it was inaccurate in many ways, particularly in regard to delays in respect of standardization and costs.

The honourable member said that his Government had been particularly interested in maintaining the backloading business within Broken Hill that the railways enjoyed when their trains returned to Broken Hill after delivering ore concentrate to Port Pirie. I assure the honourable member that the present Government has made arrangements with which our officers are perfectly satisfied and which will indeed mean that we shall retain that business at the Beryl Street sidings in Broken Hill. Those arrangements have been agreed with the Commonwealth and New South Wales.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone also asked whether I had received the draft agreement concerning the standardization arrangements and the building of the railway between Cockburn and Broken Hill. He said that he had been seeking for a long time to obtain this draft from the Commonwealth Government but had been unable to secure it for perusal. This draft has now been received and at present is being studied by officers of the South Australian Railways. They will be conferring, I understand, with officers of the Commonwealth Railways on August 6 and I believe that a conference is being arranged between the respective Ministers for August 12, so that agreement can be finalized preparatory to this document being signed.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone also raised the matter of the new phase of standardization between Adelaide and Port Pirie or between Adelaide and the new East-West standard line that will run through Port Pirie. We have submitted proposals to the Commonwealth to see whether we can obtain aid through the standardization funds to build an integrated railway system north of the city to link up with the East-West standard line.

I hope the Commonwealth will see fit to agree to our proposals, which were put forward after much study by the South Australian Railways officers. They will mean much to this State, in that they will provide commerce and industry with a direct route *via* Broken Hill to the Eastern seaboard on the one standardized line.

The proposals included the linking of Wallaroo with a standard gauge line and I think that with the standard line that could be built from that centre at Wallaroo to Port Pirie and Snowtown and Gladstone, which will be on the new East-West standard line, there should be a great potential for ultimate industrial development in the Wallaroo area. We badly need this integrated system of a standard line.

The work force on the Port Pirie to Cockburn line in the Peterborough Division will finish its job of building the line as far as Cockburn before the end of this year. It will have, of course, the extra work on the line between Cockburn and Broken Hill but we are particularly concerned to upgrade the plans and decisions in regard to this new work between here and this East-West link so that we can bring that work force down to this work.

Those were the points that I noted in the speeches of honourable members so far and I hope my comments and replies satisfy them.

In the Highways Department there are some big plans and developments that will be of great benefit ultimately to the State. These include the Eyre Highway, the Alice Springs road and the Birdsville Track, to all of which I have already referred, and the main road to Broken Hill will be sealed before the end of this year. That, too, will be of great benefit to the State. Honourable members will have received a copy of the road programme of the Highways Department for this current year. I have provided each member of Parliament with a copy of that programme. I understand it is the first time that this—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: While you are dealing with that programme, have you sent out explanatory notes with every copy?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, I did.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I know of one copy that went out without them; that is why I raise the point.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I see. In that case a mistake has been made within the department.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We looked for the explanatory notes; I thought it might have been done purposely.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No; we do not do things like that. The explanation is, of course, most important and I shall recheck to see how any error like that occurred, because it was certainly my intention that this explanation be enclosed with each copy of the programme, because it is an important explanation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is what I thought; that is why I thought it might have been missed out deliberately.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The explanation was put in to benefit honourable members and to explain to them some of the circumstances regarding the issuing of this programme, which is very big, involving an expenditure throughout the State of some \$36,500,000. It deals with the manner in which every cent of Highways Department money will be spent in this current year. I am keen to allow honourable members, members of councils and indeed the public, information that will inform them fully and properly of the operations of the Highways Department.

Some of these operations are not completely understood by members of the public; some are not completely understood by members of councils, the reason being of course that the information has not been available in the past. But now for this current year it is available. I hope honourable members will find it of great assistance to them when they deal particularly with local government officials, when they raise queries with members of Parliament about allocations and grants within their respective areas.

It must be realized, of course, that the relative proportion of the work carried out by the department's forces, by local government and by contract can be varied during the year as a matter of urgency. Any variation, however, must be brought to me for approval. It is noteworthy that last year 200 variations were made, many of which were substantial. I hope that the document will be of interest and value to all honourable members as a guide in discussing road programmes and other matters with councils in their areas.

I dwelt upon the subject of gauge standardization, and I do not propose to take it any further at present. I report to this Council that the plans for the rationalization of some of our country passenger and freight railway services are proceeding. The Transport Control Board has already made inquiries so that it can make recommendations concerning the alternative road transport arrangements that will be necessary when people want these facilities after rail services have ceased.

I particularly want to bring to honourable members' notice that the Municipal Tramways Trust's loss in the past year was the lowest for 23 years; it has been reduced from what was a considerable figure some time ago to a loss in the past year of \$85,000. For some time now the loss has been getting lower each year, and I compliment the Municipal Tramways Trust's board on this result and on its successful year, which indicates the efficiency of the management and the employees.

Regarding my portfolio of local government, I am very pleased to observe that in some country areas serious discussion is being carried on regarding possible amalgamations of council areas. Town councils are having discussions with the district council whose area surrounds the township or penetrates the residential part of the township. From the economic and other viewpoints it is highly desirable that these discussions be brought to

fruition, and I urge country councils, if they have any thoughts about amalgamation, to discuss this matter.

It certainly involves much give and take on both sides, but in the long run it will benefit the people concerned, the area concerned and the local government bodies if more amalgamations of the kind now envisaged take place. One problem that has arisen is that the newly amalgamated body becomes a district council, the head of which is a chairman, not a mayor; my department is at present inquiring to see whether we can amend the Local Government Act to permit the newly amalgamated body to have a mayor, especially in areas where there is one principal town.

I commend local government, too, for the manner in which it is endeavouring to upgrade its office efficiency throughout the State. Council staffs are becoming qualified, and there is a general improvement in standards. Of course, in many municipalities and district councils there is no need for improvement, because their standards are already very high. However, in the areas where there is room for improvement, I commend councils for closely studying their affairs.

I have had some discussions regarding the question of the festival hall. I should like to report to this Council some information about the hall that I do not think has been recorded or publicized, and, as a result, there have been some misunderstandings. Early in June, I, as Minister of Local Government, was approached by the Adelaide City Council to see whether anything could be done in respect of financial aid for the festival hall and in respect of getting the scheme off the ground. The Government immediately considered the matter very carefully.

We closely studied the report that has now become known as the DeGaetani report, and we then made certain proposals to the Adelaide City Council in an endeavour to bring about an early result so that this city, indeed the whole State, could have a festival hall.

The DeGaetani report was based on aid from the Commonwealth Government; this is specifically stated in it. Mr. DeGaetani's whole investigation and approach assumed aid from the Commonwealth Government, which was refused. Consequently, the whole complexion of the matter was altered. Mr. DeGaetani also based his proposal upon a festival centre being built, not a single festival hall. The

Government believes that it is not a Government responsibility to become involved in a big arts centre; this is entirely apart from the financial considerations involved.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It would probably take as long to build as the Sydney opera house is taking.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes. Regarding financial considerations, on Mr. DeGaetani's figures, the centre could have been built for about \$4,800,000, but the Adelaide City Council rechecked this figure and came up with an estimate of \$5,300,000. The Government could not become involved with expenditure of that order.

The DeGaetani report contained three main headings; he dealt first with a performing arts council in South Australia, which he said should be established. He then dealt with the proposal to build a performing arts centre, and then with the question of the site. His proposals regarding a performing arts council were that its members should be appointed by the Premier, the chairman to be accountable to the Premier. Obviously, although some voluntary help was envisaged, it would cost much money to establish and maintain such a council.

The Government took the view that there is at present a Board of Governors of the Adelaide Festival of Arts, a committee interested in the arts, a committee which has proved itself over many years to be a very efficient and successful committee. We hoped to have discussions with that committee. We hoped to expand it with some further voluntary help so that it could influence and foster the arts in the periods between festivals, as well as at festivals.

We knew that because of its establishment a most successful voluntary system of financial assistance existed in which people in the city and in the country made gifts towards the festival of arts and the maintenance necessary on these special occasions. We thought this body, being already established, could go on performing many of the functions that the expert envisaged a new and larger body would be asked to perform; and if in later years as the city and the State grew, and as we became more affluent and it was necessary to expand its activities to encompass all the things envisaged by the expert, this could be done in due course. Therefore, this was the attitude the Government took regarding the proposed council.

Regarding the centre that was recommended, as I said, the Commonwealth Government refused financial aid. The centre included a large principal hall; a secondary hall to hold 700 to 800 people; a further open exhibition area which, if it had seats placed in it, would hold about 275 people; administrative offices for the proposed council; and other space to assist in general productions of the performing arts in South Australia.

I have already mentioned the cost. The Government took the view that it had a responsibility to try to ensure that the city and the State had a festival hall as quickly as possible. We laid emphasis on a festival hall, and so we said we would help in regard to the building of a festival hall. We also said again that if at a later date there was a need for a centre, and if at a later date some further plans became envisaged for other theatres, all these things could be examined at the time; but we wanted to assist in providing a festival hall specifically for the 1972 festival, and we wanted to provide it for the City Council to control.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Will it be ready by 1972?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It would have been, if a start could have been made immediately.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It won't be now?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is a question that is entirely up to the Adelaide City Council. Further, following in some respects this expert's report, we said, "Take the principal hall that the expert envisaged, and bring him back if need be to advise on its interior amenities and facilities." We read the expert's report on the estimated size, and we said, "Make it as recommended, in the vicinity of 2,000, and get on with the job; we are prepared to give you \$2,500,000, despite the financial position of the State."

The City Council considered that matter and came back and explained that because of the high debt charges on its contribution, and because of the estimated running losses of this proposed hall, it could not afford to enter into the deal. It estimated that its losses would be about \$145,000 a year in service charges and running costs. It estimated that the running costs alone would be \$40,000. So the Government said, "Very well, we will meet the running costs; we will go even further than our first offer, and if the

running costs amount to anything up to \$40,000, we will meet the running costs for the first 10 years."

We expected, of course, that at the end of that time the general rate revenue of the city would be much improved upon what it is at present. We made a further stipulation that if some subsidy regarding running was received from the Commonwealth in due course we would want that subsidy to take the place of the running costs. Therefore, we would not be committed to the same extent. I think anyone would agree that that was quite fair. That was our decision, and that was our proposal regarding the question of the centre. That was the second main point in the expert's report.

Then came the question of the site. Mr. DeGaetani considered in general terms three sites: the one known as Carclew, the one known as the Parade Ground and Drill Hall, and the one generally known as the Government House site. Because he planned for the centre to which I have referred, he recommended the site nearest to the main down-town area of the city where, of course, lunch-hour people would perform and visit in the proposed centre. But he was not dealing with a festival hall, as we are.

We looked at his recommended site, which is commonly known as the Government House site. That site was not only in Government House grounds: more than half of it was in the park lands to the north of Government House grounds. It was represented as being a five-acre piece of land, but on checking later it transpired that it was about 2½ acres of land. The Government said, "We want to make every endeavour not to touch or build upon the park lands around Adelaide." Therefore, we said we would not permit the use of park lands for this purpose.

We consider that that was a very wise decision to take. We then looked at the land within Government House grounds, and we looked at the whole question of Government House and its grounds. We envisaged that the Government House grounds in many years to come would become a magnificent park for the use of the people of this city and State, and we envisaged that if ever the Governor's residence was shifted for privacy or for other reasons this was a use (and the best use) to which this land could be put.

The building, of course, could be put to some purpose. For instance, it could be placed under the control of the National Trust.

We know, being quite practical on the point, that once we start giving away land in a complex such as that, the whittling process goes on and on as the years pass. Therefore, we said we would not permit the use of the Government House grounds. Subsequently, as honourable members know, the proposal was not agreed to, and the City Council in effect has said, "Well, what if we find another site?" We have said, in effect, "Our offer will stand, provided you find another site on which you have reached agreement among yourselves. The site must, of course, meet with our final approval."

We have left the door open in our endeavour to help on this whole question of the festival hall, and I defend the Government's attitude in the whole matter. We were the first Government to come down with any kind of real money for the proposal, and we have come forward with it at a time when it is very questionable whether the State can really afford to do it. We are doing our best to assist and foster the arts, and it is my firm hope that finality will be reached in the reasonably near future so that the State can benefit by the establishment of a festival hall.

I hope I have satisfied the queries that honourable members have raised. I have tried to explain to the Council (as it is my duty to explain) some of the more important issues which I have been involved in and which are important matters for this State. I am satisfied completely that upon the foundations in which I have been concerned, particularly in regard to my portfolios, over the next three years (which will be the term of the present Government) this State can be assisted by the present Government so that we can go forward and progress at the same rate as have other States of Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I join with other members in expressing appreciation to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor (Hon. Sir Mellis Napier) on his excellent speech when opening his tenth session of Parliament. I sympathize with him in his ill health and hope that he will soon recover fully and continue in good health for a long time. I join with my Leader in expressing appreciation to our former Governor, Sir Edric Bastyan, and to his wife, Lady Bastyan, who both did a marvellous job for South Australia during their stay here. I congratulate the people of Tasmania upon securing their services. I join also with other members in expressing sympathy to the families of former

members who died during the last Parliamentary recess. I refer particularly to the late Francis Henry Walsh, Ronald William Rex Hunt, Clement James Drummond Smith, Edward Daniel Alexander Bagot and John Frederick Walsh. I knew only Mr. Frank Walsh and Mr. Fred Walsh. The former was a Premier of this State, and a member of the House of Assembly for 27 years. I think everything that could be said of Frank Walsh has been said. He was a man of the people and for the people, and everything he did was directed towards improving the conditions of the people of this State.

Mr. Fred Walsh was of a similar nature in that he wanted to improve the conditions of people not only in this State but throughout Australia. For many years he gave marvellous service to the trade union movement, having been an executive member of the local Trades and Labor Council for 25 years, and an executive member of the Australian Council of Trade Unions for many years. At the same time, he combined his industrial activities with political activities and it was not to the credit of the Constitution of this State that he was denied the opportunity of holding Cabinet rank, for the people of this State frequently voted for the election of a Labor Government.

I join with other members in congratulating the three honourable members of this Council on their appointment to the Ministry. They are indeed capable and competent to carry out their job well. However, that does not take away from me the right to criticize the portfolios that they are holding. I will refer to that later on.

I was interested to see in paragraph 17 of His Excellency's Speech that the training school for mentally retarded children at Strathmont is under construction and is due to open in 1970. This has been in the offing for a long time, and I am happy to see that it is now under way. However, I point out to the Government that Strathmont is not the complete answer to this important question, because by the time it is opened it will be necessary for the Government to proceed with the construction of Elanora, which has been planned. I am sorry to hear, though, that its building programme has been put back 10 years. I suggest that it will be needed sooner and, indeed, I think five years is nearer the time when it will be needed and when its construction should take place.

Mental Health Week has just concluded, and during that week attention was drawn to some of the facilities provided for the mentally

retarded. Indeed, our attention was drawn to some facilities that should be, but have not been, provided for the mentally retarded. More Government assistance is needed, although we know that money is short. Perhaps these people are more in need of assistance than other people who are being given hand-outs by the Government. This afternoon we heard of a generous hand-out for the festival hall. Although that is a good project, I suggest that the mentally retarded people are as much in need of assistance as is the Adelaide City Council in this regard.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think you would agree that South Australia is reasonably advanced in comparison with the rest of the world in the matter of mental health facilities.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not deny that South Australia is as advanced in some directions as are the other States of the Commonwealth. Indeed, in some directions it is even more advanced. I will not say it is the most advanced in the world by any means, but the facilities that have been provided are very good. It is the lack of further facilities about which I complain. I do not think the Government should rest on its laurels and think that is the end of it, because it is not.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I agree.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I remind the Chief Secretary that the Liberal Government took a long time to move in this regard. After it received the 1924 report it did nothing about it until after 1950. The report was put in the pigeon hole and kept there. I make no apology for saying that. More Government assistance is required and the Government must proceed with Elanora. It must not sit back believing that it will not be necessary for another ten years. Nor can it sit behind the Commonwealth Sheltered Workshops Act. Under that Act the subsidy will apply only to retarded people who are able to earn a minimum of \$4 a week. Many hundreds of mentally retarded people are not able to earn that much and, therefore, the Commonwealth Act does not apply to them. I ask the Government to look into that question.

The State Government could do much more by employing retarded adults. There are plenty of retarded people in institutions working in workshops and, if the Government and employers generally were prepared to accept them, they could be given a fair go in the outside world, and would come out much better off. Surely Government departments,

such as the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Highways Department or the Electricity Trust could provide them with plenty of work. In the main, the Government is not quick in coming forward to assist people, as the charitable organizations are doing. By putting them into work it would not cost so much to run our institutions.

It is regrettable that the Hon. Mr. Kemp had to cast aspersions on Professor Richardson, who has received Government approval to travel to Russia to study what is being done in that country for retarded people. It is because of people such as the honourable member that these things are necessary in this State.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Many people do not agree with that.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Many people did not agree with the honourable member, either. It is unfortunate that the Minister of Education was misrepresented in a press report as stating that she thought South Australia was far behind the other States in what was being done for the retarded children in this State.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Is it not a fact that South Australia is at least equal to any other State in Australia in that respect, if not a little in front?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is correct; I am not denying that. Because we are a little in front, it shows how far the other States are behind; we have still a long way to go. It was unfortunate, as I say, that the Minister of Education was misrepresented, because it can create a bad impression on people who are looking for something to be done for these retarded persons. I agree that we are in some respects equal to or ahead of other States but we must never be satisfied in this regard.

I pay a tribute to Mr. Piddington, the chief psychologist in the Psychology Branch of the Education Department, who retired earlier this year. I congratulate Mr. Lasscock on his appointment, taking over from Mr. Piddington. I also pay a tribute to Mr. Sharman and his staff for the dedicated service they are giving the community. If they are allowed a free hand, they will do much more than they are doing at present; but they are doing a very good job. The Government should provide better teacher training facilities for those dealing with retarded children. At present the service provided is inadequate.

Much more could be done so that the teachers would know the latest methods of training these people, and consequently the retarded persons would benefit greatly. Earlier training for workshops should be provided at the occupation centres. At present very little is being done in this regard in Government occupation centres for the retarded children until they become 16 years of age; then a sheltered workshop is provided for them until they are 20. Training should commence on the very first day of the child's entering the centre so that he will be fit by the time he reaches the age of 16 or 20 to go out into industry, if he develops sufficiently, or to go into a sheltered workshop provided for him by various organizations throughout the State.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Will Elanora do the same type of work as Strathmont?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I understand that Elanora is to do the same type of work as Strathmont, and that Strathmont is to relieve the pressure on Glenside, but it cannot take children at present outside the institution. Because of this and the fact that these children are gradually being left and becoming orphans, it will be necessary for them to go into Elanora, and the number is increasing considerably.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Is it not a fact that Minda Home is building additions that will accommodate some of these people?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Minda Home has improved considerably over the last 12 years and is now playing a part in the community and extending the facilities there. Nevertheless, that still does not mean that the Government does not have to get on with Elanora, because the extensions to Minda Home—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: When you say "Elanora", are you not getting it mixed up with Strathmont?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No. Strathmont is under construction. The Government's thinking was that the construction of Elanora should be put back 10 years. I am drawing the Government's attention to the fact that it should go forward and be completed within five years, not 10 years. The mentally retarded child should be able to attend a kindergarten occupation centre rather than wait until eight years of age before it can attend an occupation centre, as at present. The earlier this type of training is done, the better for everybody. Some hostels should be established both in the city and in the country

areas which would give the brighter of the retarded children the opportunity to get away from the institutional life and come into the community, and the people of the community more chance to see that these retarded persons are capable of conducting themselves correctly. Generally, it would be to the benefit of the State and the person concerned if there were more small hostels around the city and in the country.

The medical profession can do much more for this type of person generally. Fifteen years ago only one or two medical practitioners were interested in the mentally retarded people because they felt, "We cannot get too much response from these people", and they possibly could not earn a living from treating that type of person, so they did not pay much attention to that sort of retardation. Doctors should be people who recognize retardation much sooner than they do at present and, having recognized the fact that a child has been born in a retarded state, they should be prepared to advise the parents at a much earlier stage that their child is retarded, which will give the parents an opportunity to look around and ascertain what facilities are available for the child and the requirements of the child in coming years. The doctors generally have fallen down on their job in this regard and they should certainly do something about it. They should also be in a position to advise parents of the facilities available for their own guidance and for the care of the retarded child. It is disheartening for a parent when she is told by the doctor that her child is mentally retarded. She asks him, "What can I do?" If he cannot come up with an answer that there are various organizations to assist these children, it is a terrible blow to the parent and in some cases it means that he or she is emotionally disturbed and becomes a burden upon the State after a mental breakdown.

Paragraph 11 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the maximum amount of money that may be lent by the State Bank under the Advances for Homes and Advances to Settlers Acts being raised from \$7,000 to \$8,000. Unless the Government makes more money available to lending institutions, it will mean that fewer people will be able to receive assistance and the waiting time will be extended; fewer houses will be built. None of these things is desirable. I do not know whether or not it is good that the Government is raising the amount of money that can be borrowed unless it will make more money

available to the lending institutions. Already we find that since this Government has taken office the value of new building work has declined considerably. His Excellency's Speech refers to the fact that it is expected that the Housing Trust will complete nearly 700 fewer houses in this financial year than it did in the previous financial year. How the Government expects the building industry to improve under those conditions I do not know. Generally speaking, the Government's image since it took office has not been encouraging. It proposes to increase road passenger services; charges for excess water have increased, which will adversely affect the market grower, which means that the cost of his production will increase and the public will pay for it later.

We have the highest percentage of unemployment in Australia and this State has recorded the highest increase of any State in cost of living figures for the last quarter. Since this Government has been in office, despite the various promises made (which we have to work out for ourselves) by the Premier in his policy speech, old and valued established industries have either packed up and gone to another State or closed down altogether. There have been substantial increases in the numbers of Housing Trust rental houses. Under those conditions, it is no wonder that, at the first opportunity the people had to express their feelings towards this Government through the ballot-box, there was a pronounced swing away from the Stott-Hall Government. On March 2 the voters were practically equally divided in their choice of a representative for Millicent, but about 10 weeks later the Labor candidate was ahead of the L.C.L. candidate by 7 per cent of the votes. Surely the Government will wake up to itself and go back to the people and see whether it has their confidence. In view of the Premier's statement that he would regard a favourable result in the Millicent by-election as a go-ahead vote for the Government's policy, it is time the Stott-Hall coalition Government resigned. In His Excellency's Speech, however, we find that the Government intends to continue with its plan to establish 45 electoral districts. The Premier did not change his mind in the light of the Millicent by-election result.

I give no credit to the Chief Secretary, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, or to the Hon. Mr. Potter, who between March 2 and June 12 were mainly responsible for taking objections to the inclusion on the Millicent electoral roll of 168 names. They did not first thoroughly check to

see whether the people concerned had died or left the electoral district, with the result that some people suffered distress and inconvenience. I suggest that the objections were taken mainly in respect of people who the honourable gentlemen thought were Labor Party supporters, not Liberal and Country League supporters. If the Chief Secretary assures me that this is not so, I shall ask him why the names of Robin Alfred Lewis and Wendy Anita Lewis, both formerly of Millicent and both known personally to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris (who knew that they had moved to Tasmania in February), had not been removed from the roll. They voted in the March 2 election. Mr. Lewis gave evidence to the Court of Disputed Returns, and his address was then given as Tasmania. Why were their names not objected to, in addition to the 168 names, if the honourable gentlemen were not attacking Labor voters? The Hon. Mr. DeGaris will find it difficult to assure me and the Millicent voters that it was purely coincidental that they were L.C.L. voters.

It was not coincidental that no objection was taken to these names. The names of Mr. and Mrs. Lewis were still on the roll in June, and they could have voted if they had wished to do so; indeed, they would have committed an offence if they had not voted. No objection was taken to these two names (the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Potter knew they were L.C.L. supporters) even though objection was being taken to 168 names. Then they say that their objections were fair dinkum and that they believed they were doing the right thing! If this is so, why did they not object to these two people?

The Minister of Local Government did not come out of this too well, when he agreed that their actions were justified. In other words, he believed that, if there was a chance of depriving some Labor supporters of the right to vote, it did not matter what inconvenience or distress was caused to them, even though there was no justification for objections being made. It is obvious that some Government members and supporters do not believe in civil liberties and the rights of individuals. The Hon. Mr. Kemp said that restrictions should be placed on certain people simply because they spoke out against the present unequal voting system, which is supported by him and members of the Government. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Potter, through their actions, say, "If people do not

vote for us, we will raise objections to their names being on the roll." This is supported by the Hon. Mr. Hill.

These descriptions of civil liberties and rights are also endorsed by Liberal Party members in other States; the Premier of New South Wales is reported in the newspapers to have said, "Run the bastards down!" when he came across obstacles in his path. This is typical of what is done in this State: "Get rid of any opposition! Do whatever is necessary, but get the opposition out of the way!"

Different interpretations can be placed on the action of the Hon. Mr. Rowe in obtaining a statutory declaration from a witness who appeared before the Court of Disputed Returns. Some may say that the witness did not know what she was talking about, but others may say that perhaps the statutory declaration was "shonky". On page 110 of the transcript of the proceedings of the Court of Disputed Returns, Mrs. Andre was asked questions by the President. The transcript reads as follows:

What prompted Mr. Rowe to telephone you and present you with this affidavit that was already typed, I imagine?—Without the filling in where I was. It was just the—it was not filled in where I was.

He presented a typed document to you, did he?—Yes; but not where I was staying or what State I was in or what time I posted it or where.

It had blanks in the document?—Yes.

Further down page 110 Mr. King asked certain questions, and the transcript is as follows:

Did you tell him on the telephone anything about the time of posting of the vote?—No.

Or the day on which you posted it?—No.

He then arrived when—the same day or a different day?—It was in the evening of the same day.

And you say he had a form partly typed with blanks in it?—Yes.

Who filled out the blanks in the form?—I signed it and read it. He wrote in what I told him to say.

On page 113, the transcript reads:

At all events, Mr. Rowe did the filling out of the document, did he?—No.

Who did that—that night, the evening he came along?—He and I were sitting together, and he wrote the answers I gave him.

About the time and place of posting?—Yes.

Did he write them out with a pen or pencil?—A biro, I think.

A biro he produced out of his pocket?—Yes.

And so it goes on, until we come to the stage where the document is dealt with. The only thing filled in in ink was the word "Grange",

which indicated where the declaration was made. We find the figure "10", which was the date and which had been crossed out and initialled. There were also two signatures in ink, one the signature of Mrs. Andre and the other that of the Hon. Mr. Rowe.

Either some hanky-panky went on, the witness was not reliable or the document was not reliable. Honourable members can put their own interpretation on it. I shall be very charitable and think that the Hon. Mr. Rowe would not deal with a document in this form, but the fact remains that the witness was on oath, which points clearly to the fact that something went wrong somewhere. Other people may not be as charitable as I have been: they may say that, in the desperate bid of the Liberal and Country League to gain office, perhaps the Hon. Mr. Rowe made a "boo-boo". I do not know. Some people did not come out of it very well.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They got their wires crossed.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I am prepared to stand up to any cross-examination or give any evidence on oath about my part in getting this affidavit.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: And Mrs. Andre, too, was prepared to say what she did. I am not here to judge either party but I do say that the people who ran after this statutory declaration did not come out of it too well as a result of the evidence given to the Court of Disputed Returns. Witnesses could remember everything that the Liberal and Country League wanted them to remember, but at the vital stage they could not even remember what day it was. I ask you, Mr. President, who was fair dinkum? I am not the judge. It is interesting to consider the inconsistencies of Government members and of Mr. Cameron, the L.C.L. candidate in the Millicent election. Mr. Cameron, prior to the declaration of the March 2 poll, when it appeared that there was a slight possibility that he might be declared elected, said, "No matter what the outcome of this election is I will not contest the Returning Officer's decision."

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: He didn't either.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Within 15 minutes of the declaration, the same gentleman said, "I must appeal to the Court of Disputed Returns; we want this thing cleared up."

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Be fair to the candidate; he may not have been allowed to make up his own mind.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No. We hear so much about the freedom L.C.L. members have in Parliament, yet we find that within 15 minutes of the declaration of the poll he said, "I must appeal to the Court of Disputed Returns." Did he do that of his own volition, or was he directed to do it by the L.C.L.? The same gentleman, during the Millicent by-election campaign when he was appearing on television with Des. Corcoran, said that he would not be controlled by the L.C.L. and that in certain circumstances he would even defy his Leader, Mr. Hall, and cross the floor to vote. How does that tie up with the report which has appeared in the press and which has not been denied that the Government Whip has such control over his members in another place that they dare not leave the Chamber to go to the toilet without his permission? He said that L.C.L. members are free to do what they like. It is obvious that they can do what they like as long as they do what they are told.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: They do it only once.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes. One member of the L.C.L. had the audacity to contest the leadership in another place, with the result that he is now kept out of the Cabinet, even though he is one of the most able men in the other place. Is it any wonder there is strife in the L.C.L. now? Is it any wonder that the Premier was not allowed to take the position of Treasurer? Is it any wonder the rumour has got about that the Premier will soon be a person from this Council and not from the other place? That Party has already had to give the position of Treasurer to another person.

When the split comes in the L.C.L., and it is coming pretty quickly, it will be interesting to see what the Cabinet line-up will be. Those who are now supporting Mr. Hall and saying, "All right, Sir" and "O.K., Sir" might be all right, but the other Cabinet Ministers will be out on a limb just as are the other bright boys because they did not support Mr. Hall for the leadership. The Premier has performed some gymnastics since taking office in what we can say is the Stott-Hall coalition. He is reported to have said, "If we win Millicent, I shall consider it an endorsement of our plan. However, if we lose Millicent I shall consider it an endorsement of the A.L.P. plan and,

of course, we will then have to compromise to achieve electoral reform." I do not consider that the L.C.L.'s plan provides for electoral reform: I say it provides for further gerrymandering of the electoral boundaries.

The Premier did not receive the endorsement of the people in Millicent; the Government was down the drain by 7 per cent compared with the A.L.P. vote in June. I find from the document I have before me that the Premier is to persist with his plan for 45 districts. We do not know when this plan is to come forward.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Tomorrow, I think.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: On Tuesday it was put off until today, and today it is put off until tomorrow; and, of course, it may be even later. The Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, criticized the Labor Government for setting up an Industrial Development Branch because he said Sir Thomas Playford was able to achieve the same result with only a typist and himself.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: A much better result.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is interesting. What do we find today? The Premier has found it such an important position that it has been necessary for him to set up an industrial department, with himself as Minister, and to make it a full-time job. He is writing himself down considerably, because he has to employ more staff, and this is the only portfolio that he can look after. In Mr. Hall's own words, Sir Thomas Playford did the work with only a typist and secretary. Mr. Hall, realizing his disabilities and the fact that he is incapable of looking after the finances of this State, has handed the position of Treasurer over to someone else and retained the position of Premier, an office created by the Labor Government. Although the Labor Party was bitterly criticized by this same gentleman for creating that position, he has now accepted it. The net result of the Premier being Minister of Industrial Development is that this State has lost more industry since he has taken over than it has gained.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Name one of them.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: What about Rosella, John Deere and the textile people? I could go on and on. People have lost confidence as a result of the L.C.L.'s coming into office and have either closed down or decided they had better shift. We heard much about the added confidence that

would be inspired, but instead many people have given away plans that they had because they have not been prepared to gamble on carrying on under an L.C.L. Government. People who had no intention of going to other States suddenly made up their minds to move away after this Government grabbed possession of the Treasury Benches on April 17.

Had the Premier put as much into getting an industry here as he put into going overseas for the sole purpose of purchasing a Dutch doll, we could have had another industry established here. The money that the Premier's trip cost could have been devoted to that purpose, and the State would have benefited, instead of only industry in Holland benefiting as a result of the sale of that doll.

The Hon. Mr. Hill, when he was in Opposition and when the announcement was made that the Labor Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) and the Hon. Mr. Bevan were going overseas, sought an assurance that there would be no further oversea visits by Ministers. However, within eight weeks after the present Government assumed office the Hon. Mr. Hill, in reply to a question, said that he was exceedingly pleased at the announcement of the Premier's coming oversea trip and that he approved of it. He did not say what benefit might accrue to the State. I suppose he was pleased because he was getting rid of an embarrassment for a few weeks. He has not been the least bit happy since the Premier's return, and I suppose he will not be happy while the Premier is at the helm. But that is not all; he has done worse than that. On July 11, 1967, when criticizing the Government for an appointment it had made, the honourable member said:

I criticize the Premier for some of his actions and statements regarding this planning—

he is there referring to the Planning Appeal Board—

because I do not think they were made with the necessary moderation and I think they will prevent our getting the best out of the Planning and Development Act ultimately. I wish to give three examples of such actions and statements where caution has been completely thrown to the wind. The first is the offering by the Premier of the office of Chairman of the Planning Appeal Committee to the senior partner in the firm of solicitors of which the Premier is a member. In saying this I am not in any way criticizing Mr. Roder, who is the gentleman in question. I do not suggest that he is in any way incapable of handling

the job; indeed, he may well be the best possible person to whom this office could be offered. I am not in any way criticizing him for accepting the office, but I do say—

and this is an important point—

that for a long time in this State, perhaps going back 100 years, the people have come to expect a very high standard of prudence in appointments made by Leaders of Government, yet here we find the Premier offering this office to a partner in his own firm, and that offer in my view cannot do anything except raise some query and some doubt.

Later, he said:

I shall not pursue the point any further, except to say that in my view it still does not conform to the accepted standards. It has, of course, brought criticism upon the Government, but that is not my affair. However, what is my affair is that it has brought criticism upon the institution of Parliament, and that is the point that has especially worried me in regard to this matter. I can only think that it was a rash appointment, but I again say that I am not criticizing Mr. Roder, for whom I have the highest respect and whose integrity I am not questioning at all.

The same applies to the Hon. Mr. Hill. I have no doubt about his integrity or capabilities, but I have doubts about whether the Premier should have given him the portfolio of local government, which embraces town planning and which would be very beneficial to people in the real estate business.

The Premier was alleged in an article in the *Advertiser* of April 9 to have said that he had had a clear undertaking from all his Ministers that they would relinquish any business connections that could have any possible effect on the administration of their portfolios. In reply to a letter published in the *Advertiser* on May 10 the Hon. Mr. Hill, the Minister of Local Government and Minister in charge of town planning, said that he was divesting himself of all interest in some private proprietary companies. That was fair enough. The first statement appeared on April 19, when the Premier said he believed that everything was fair and square and above board, but on May 11 the Hon. Mr. Hill was still divesting himself of these interests. Later, on June 8, Mr. Hill said he had divested himself of a certain directorship, but who did he put in his place? None other than his own son, yet he has the audacity to expect the people to believe that he has divested himself of all interests in the matter.

The Minister is capable, keen and energetic and, I believe, trustworthy. He could have carried out any other portfolio he wanted.

Yet, despite the Hon. Mr. Hill's criticism of the previous Government's action, the Premier saw fit to appoint him Minister of Local Government. He accepted that position before he had fully divested himself of his previous interests. Such action would, of course, bring much criticism from people outside, and he is getting that criticism simply because of the statements he made about the appointment of a person to a lesser position than that which he has accepted.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did not make myself a Queen's Counsel.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Perhaps the honourable Minister is not capable of being a Q.C. I have given him credit for being capable of doing other jobs, but he would not be capable of that. Otherwise he would have been appointed a Q.C., without a doubt. If the honourable member was prepared to accept this portfolio he would be prepared to accept such a commission.

The Hon. Mr. Rowe, too, had something to say about the appointment of Mr. Roder as Chairman of the Planning Appeal Committee. On July 12, 1967, he said:

I am not satisfied that the prime requirement of a chairman of the appeal board is that he should be a good town planner or that he should have good town planning qualifications. I think the first and foremost requirement is that he should be completely impartial and come to the position in the manner of a judge coming to his seat on the bench.

Later, he said:

Also, it does not mean that we must be people who are chasing all kinds of wisps purely for the sake of political advantage. However, I do feel that there is an obligation on us, when we think there is a possibility of a miscarriage of justice, to ventilate the matter in a dignified and proper manner.

He then went on to say that he would certainly do something about it. But, when the Hon. Mr. Rowe spoke in this debate, he did not criticize Mr. Hill's appointment, yet surely there was more reason to criticize that appointment than there was to criticize Mr. Roder's appointment. How can one trust people who do acrobatics such as I have mentioned?

These things are not said personally; they are what members opposite said when they were in Opposition. I agreed with them in July, 1967, and I agree whole-heartedly now with what they said then, but their actions show that they do not agree with what they then said.

All members of this Council realize the capabilities of the Hon. Mr. Hill. I believe he was worthy of his place in Cabinet. However, despite Mr. Hill's dictating to him that he must accept the local government portfolio, surely he need not have accepted it until he had divested himself of all his interests. Surely somebody else could have carried on for a few months and he could have made a greater effort to divest himself fully of these interests.

I now point out the inconsistencies of Government members, including the Premier last week, when at midday on one day over the radio he told the people that it would not be possible for the Government to get on with whatever it was going to do about electoral boundaries until the financial Bills had been disposed of, yet at 2.5 p.m. on that same day he gave notice of his intention to introduce a Bill on the following Tuesday, which was yesterday. Now, what are we to believe? I have no doubt that the Bill will not be introduced until after the financial matters have been discussed, but then the Premier comes along and says, "We will introduce a Bill on Tuesday." I understand it has not been introduced today. When shall we see it, if ever? In the light of these inconsistencies it is no wonder that the sincerity and credibility of this Government are at stake.

It was interesting to hear the Hon. Mr. Hart apologizing for the fact that he took an interest in the South-East drainage position. He apologized that it was not in his district, yet he wanted to draw attention to the shortcomings of the South-East drainage. This follows what happened a few days earlier when he rose on a vital matter concerning his own electoral district (the reducing of railway services) where a public meeting was called and he was very "snitchy" about the fact that he did not receive an invitation to that meeting. The honourable member cannot see his way clear to go along and defend the action of the Minister, yet he apologizes for taking an interest in the South-East drainage because it did not come within his district. I cannot work that out. He was prepared to show an interest down there but not in his own district, simply because somebody overlooked giving him an invitation to a public meeting.

The Hon. L. R. HART: On a point of order, Mr. President, I should like to draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that it was not a public meeting at Wallaroo.

The PRESIDENT: It is not a point of order. It is a comment.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I understood it was a public meeting.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: No, it was not.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The paper said it was a public meeting. When the honourable member asked a question of the Hon. Mr. Hill, he referred to "a public meeting" in the district to which he had not been invited, to which he was not interested enough to go. I can only go by what the honourable member himself says. Now he says it was not a public meeting, when everybody in the District of Wallaroo and in Midland District was invited to attend the meeting by way of public announcement; but the Hon. Mr. Hart was not prepared to go there simply because it was a reflection on the action of the Government; yet he was prepared to get up and criticize things going on in the South-East, pointing out the need for certain things to be done there. Where is his consistency? Then he gets up and says it was not a public meeting, yet in *Hansard* he is reported as saying that he did not go to the public meeting because he did not receive an invitation. I am at a loss for words!

I am also at a loss to know the mathematical formula that the Hon. Mrs. Cooper must have used when speaking about electoral distribution. She said:

The true picture is that in South Australia with votes almost equally divided the distribution worked evenly.

How can she say that the distribution worked evenly when the Party receiving over 53 per cent of the votes gets only 19 members elected in another place, the same number elected as those of another Party which received only about 44 per cent of the votes?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you sure those figures are right?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes. In fact, I am being conservative about it. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper said that the distribution worked evenly. I am not talking about the combined Stott-Hall, Communist, Social Credit, or what have you vote; I am talking about the votes received by the candidates of the Liberal and Country League, not the overall vote. Let us hear those figures.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What are they?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The figures quoted were misleading, too. They told only part of the story.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The whole tenor of the actions of the members of the present Government has been misleading.

Before and since the election, their actions and words have been misleading, so it comes as no surprise that we find misleading statements still being made by members of the Government Party. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper said that electoral distribution worked evenly, yet 63 per cent of the L.C.L. members in another place are elected from districts containing fewer than 8,000 voters each. This compares with 21 per cent of the A.L.P. members coming from electoral districts of the same size, but in districts containing more than 32,000 voters the L.C.L. has only 5.2 per cent of the members elected to another place compared with 26 per cent of the A.L.P. members elected. Yet the honourable member has the audacity to say that the distribution worked evenly. I ask for that formula because either I or the formula needs correcting.

I wish to express appreciation of the Chief Secretary's approving of what I said about retarded children. They should be above politics and should receive greater assistance from the Government than they are receiving at present. I express my appreciation to the Clerks of this Council who have guided us and helped us considerably during the previous years. I also express my appreciation to the messengers, who play their part in a dignified and helpful manner. The *Hansard* reporters will probably say later, "The Hon. Mr. Banfield gave us an easy run today." I did it deliberately because I knew they were a little worried about the position; that is why I did not speak so quickly today! I express my appreciation to the members of the *Hansard* staff for the courteous way in which they handle all speeches made by honourable members in this Chamber. I also express my appreciation of the catering staff. In spite of what the *Advertiser* says when casting a reflection on the staff and facilities of this building, I for one thank the staff because they do a magnificent job day in and day out. Sometimes they have to work all night and they are still smiling at 6 o'clock in the morning when members are scowling.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. The Hon. Mr. Kemp tackled a most important question that is causing concern to many people in South Australia. I do not support 100 per cent all the statements he made but I do admire him for the fact that he has been prepared to raise this matter which, in my opinion, is

causing much concern to the community. We recognize the Hon. Mr. Kemp as an academic and a leader in his particular field. With the basis of the argument put forward by him most honourable members in this Chamber would agree.

The Hon. Mr. Whyte in his seconding of the motion has impressed all of us with his deep sincerity, the vigour with which he represents his district and the courteous way in which he approaches his task. I support other speakers in what they have said about paragraph 3 of His Excellency's Speech. I should also like to express my appreciation to Sir Mellis Napier for opening this session, the tenth occasion on which he has performed this kind of duty, and I endorse honourable members' remarks in this regard. I also endorse the remarks made regarding paragraph 3 of His Excellency's Speech; I have previously referred to members of Parliament who have passed away during the last 12 months and I shall not enlarge on those remarks.

After the majestic logic of the Hon. Mr. Banfield and the lofty oratory we have heard from him during this debate, especially his unbiased(!) views, I believe that I must make some comments. I should like to touch on the question of the Electoral Act. The Leader of the Opposition raised this matter and I now inform the Council that the Government is considering amendments to the Act. I do not agree with the Leader that massive amendments are needed.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I did not say massive amendments, but that some important ones were needed.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: All right. I do not think any major amendment is needed. The amount of amendment required is small.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It may be small in number, but important in effect.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The final difficulty in connection with the Millicent election on March 2 related to the interpretation of the regulations. The Leader of the Opposition said that no vote should be counted unless it was in the ballot-box on the day of the election. I do not agree that this is a reasonable principle and I point out that, unless there is some way in which people can vote until the closing time of the poll, we are doing an injustice to many people.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not necessarily; if the law is altered and the people know what they must abide by, we are not being unjust to them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: South Australia has an area of more than 300,000 square miles. Sometimes not much time is allowed between the issue of writs and the date of the election. People may be denied the right to vote in many areas because, by the time their application for a postal vote reaches the electoral office and the vote is sent out and returned, the closing time of the poll has passed.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The number of such people would be minute.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That does not matter. People who have a right to vote may be denied that right if the Act provides that the ballot-paper must be in the ballot-box by the closing time of the poll.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And they may be denied the right of objection, too.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No objection was taken by any honourable member of this Council to any name on the roll. I ask the honourable member to confer with one of his colleagues in another place.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: According to an answer given recently the Chief Secretary was the prime instigator.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask the Hon. Mr. Banfield to check up on this matter with a member of the House of Assembly; he may receive a slightly different view of this matter.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is the answer given by the Attorney-General wrong?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I shall answer the honourable member's statements more fully later. I made the point that, if we do not have a system that allows people in these circumstances to have a valid vote, we may well deny the right to vote to people who have every right to have their votes counted.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Wouldn't a person know beforehand that he could not attend a polling booth?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How can the Returning Officer satisfy himself?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Commonwealth electoral office accepts any postal vote with a postmark showing a date not later than 9 a.m. on the Monday after the poll.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not 8 p.m. on the Saturday.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is what the Commonwealth accepts. A person can post a vote on Friday and, if it does not reach the Returning Officer by Saturday, then, according to the views of the Leader of the Opposition, the vote is invalid. I cannot accept that position, because it is unfair.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The Chief Secretary should get the views of the previous Crown Solicitor on this matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the last election we had an opinion submitted on this matter. It had nothing to do with the Millicent case. Under the present system, if a person can show that his vote was posted by the time the poll closed, his vote is valid. The Returning Officer has to satisfy himself that the vote was posted before the close of a poll.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That is impossible.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is not impossible.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How can he satisfy himself without interviewing everyone who has posted such a vote?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is nothing wrong with the system.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Nothing wrong with it! It cost only \$40,000 or \$50,000!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The system did not cost us this amount. What cost us that amount was an incorrect interpretation of the regulations.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Chief Secretary is entitled to his opinion, but many people have different views.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am still making the point that, if we insist on a ballot-paper being in the ballot-box by a certain time in an election where only 14 days is allowed between the issue of writs and the election, some people will be denied the vote to which they have a right. A mail truck may be bogged on the track and, consequently, the votes may not arrive in time.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It has happened that the ballot-paper was not filled in until the Monday after the poll.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It has also happened that phoney affidavits have been made.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Many things have been said about phoney affidavits that I do not accept. Regarding the Millicent election on March 2, I can state in this Council that I have knowledge of the affidavits, and no phoney ones at all were presented.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There must have been phoney ones.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There were no phoney ones. Many claims have been made in this Council on this question but we have heard only one side of this question; there are other matters that I myself should like to deal with, but I prefer not to do so. I deny the assertion that any affidavit presented in connection with the Millicent election on March 2 was anything but an honest affidavit.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Then there must have been phoney witnesses.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There were no phoney witnesses. The honourable member may laugh. I should like any honourable member to make that statement outside this Council, that a phoney affidavit was made in connection with that election.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Bravo! Another Mr. Kemp!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am saying that I should like that statement made outside this Council.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The honourable member who has interjected is just a rabble-rouser.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If a person says "I did this", how is one to prove that he did not do it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I now want to make one or two other comments on topics referred to by the Hon. Mr. Banfield.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: First, can you tell us what happened up in Frome?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I was not a member at that time, nor was I associated with the situation in Frome. I am dealing with a matter of which I have a close personal knowledge.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And bitter regrets.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I know that what I am saying is true.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: It would be interesting to know what happened in Wallaroo, too.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Continual interruptions are out of order.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Hon. Mr. Banfield claimed that the L.C.L. candidate for Millicent, Mr. Cameron, said that no matter what happened at the election he would accept the decision of the Returning Officer. I want to put this statement in its proper perspective. When that statement was made there were three matters under consideration. First, there was the fact that the Returning Officer at Millicent had voted. Secondly, two votes were admitted from overseas although they had not been correctly witnessed. I place no blame on the Returning Officer for these things happening. No matter what the Electoral Act provides, human mistakes will be made by returning officers. I pay a tribute to the Returning Officer in Millicent for the work that he did; he did a first-class job, and his efforts would compare favourably with those of any returning officer.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No-one disputes that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Mr. Cameron made that statement on the basis of the decision that the Returning Officer at Millicent had made in allowing these two votes (no-one knew who they were) and of the fact that he had voted himself. Mr. Cameron said he would not dispute the election on these matters. However, the Returning Officer for Millicent admitted, as was his right, five postal votes, which were later withdrawn as the result of a decision that the Court of Disputed Returns found was an incorrect decision. All Mr. Cameron asked was that the count be completed.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He said he would accept the Returning Officer's decision.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, and that decision was that these votes be included.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: His decision was that he declared Corcoran elected.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Court of Disputed Returns found that Mr. Corcoran was not elected.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Nor was he defeated.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The man elected was Mr. Cameron, and then Mr. Corcoran disputed the three matters which I am concerned with—the two votes from overseas and the fact that the Returning Officer voted in the election. That is the situation. Mr. Cameron at no time objected to decisions of the Returning Officer; what he objected to was

the fact that the count had not been completed, and when the Court of Disputed Returns completed the count Mr. Cameron was the elected candidate.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: At no time was he declared elected.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I want to deal with only one other matter. The Hon. Mr. Banfield said during his speech that I objected to certain people being on the roll in Millicent. That is not the position, and it never has been the position. If the honourable member confers with one of his colleagues in another place he will find that what I say is the correct position.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why be technical? Your own Attorney-General said that—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think I have allowed reasonable latitude in the debate this afternoon. The honourable member who is interjecting had a very good hearing and an opportunity to make his speech. Certain matters are being discussed by way of reply in another person's speech. I draw honourable members' attention to Standing Order No. 181 which states that repeated interjections and loud discussions are distinctly out of order. I appeal to honourable members to assist me in maintaining some sort of dignity in the debate in this Chamber. The honourable the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have made the statement that no objection was taken to any person on the Millicent roll. Evidence was available that the roll was grossly out of order, that there were many people on the roll who should not be on it. This information was supplied to the State Returning Officer. No-one knows exactly where the boundaries of the Millicent District run, and a number of people who are enrolled in Victoria belong in the Millicent District, and *vice versa*. Even towards the end of the election campaign it became quite obvious that no-one knew exactly to what district a group of people close to Mount Gambier belonged.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I can understand that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have spoken on this matter to the present member for Millicent and I think he agrees with me about it. There is no suggestion of any select group being singled out in this matter. No matter what the political persuasion of any people was, if the evidence showed that they

were not logically entitled to be on the Millicent roll the information was supplied to the Returning Officer by means of a letter saying that it appeared that these people were enrolled for the wrong district. As happens in many of these things, a person can move from, say, Kingston to Mount Gambier and still be in the Millicent District, although to all intents and purposes he is living in Mount Gambier. I give this Council the assurance that there was nothing underhand in what was done. In fact, it was done not specifically for a by-election but over a long period. Honourable members will find that quite a number of people have been transferred from Mount Gambier to Millicent and *vice versa* and from Millicent to Victoria and *vice versa*. I give the assurance that at no stage was this done for any political advantage.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about Mr. and Mrs. Lewis?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not know exactly to what the honourable member is referring.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You knew they had gone to Tasmania.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I turn now to the question of the enrolment of my wife and myself in the district. I can tell the Council that I raised this matter verbally with the Returning Officer and he told me that at all times members of Parliament, if in an official capacity they are temporarily residing in Adelaide and if their house is maintained in their own district, are left on the roll for their own district. This applied not only during the term of office of the previous Government but during the terms of office of Governments before that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Isn't it compulsory to notify the Electoral Office within one month of any change of residence?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I discussed this matter with the Returning Officer. I think the Council will see that even during the time of the last Government there were members who moved from their districts to Adelaide in their official capacities and who were left on the roll for their districts. The information given to me was that this had been the policy of all Governments for many years, and I think honourable members would accept that position as being reasonable. It applied in relation to members of the previous Government, as it did with members of Governments prior to that. I hope that clears up the matter raised by the Hon. Mr. Banfield. I do

not wish to say much more except to mention electoral reform, and I do not want to get into an argument or to rehash the matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is plenty of time for that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: All right. No member of Parliament will support the present wide disparity between the numbers in existing electoral districts in South Australia. The Hon. Mr. Banfield said he wholeheartedly agreed with the Opposition's attitude during the last Government's term of office. I appreciate that; perhaps he would wholeheartedly agree with the attitude expressed in this Chamber by my Party for the last three years towards a 56-seat House of Assembly.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What was I referring to when I said that I agreed with it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No Party agrees with a 56-seat House of Assembly. Therefore, the decision of this Chamber to reject such a measure is now completely agreed upon by both Parties in another place. Much has been said about this in relation to the existence of a gerrymander in South Australia. I give the lie direct to the statement that an actual gerrymander exists in South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Who are you convincing now?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: From the attitude of the honourable member, I do not think I am convincing anyone. The word "gerrymander" has a distinct meaning: it means that one deliberately draws a boundary of a physical area to connect one section to another by a narrow corridor so that one can obtain the seat for a particular political Party. But there is no such gerrymander in South Australia. We have worked on a principle that has been agreed to by both Parties over many years in South Australia; nobody could deny that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That does not mean that it is right.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If one looked at this one would see that Select Committees and Royal Commission after Royal Commission have investigated this question. This was before the development of political Parties, and every such body agreed that there must be some heavy loading in favour of country areas if there was to be reasonable Government in South Australia. From 1900 to 1956 there have been 15 separate Administrations in South Australia, seven of which were Australian Labor Party Administrations and eight

of which were Liberal. During that period no effort was made by either Party to alter the system giving some reasonable and adequate country loading, and that has been the principle up to the present. While that principle has been followed, there has not been a gerrymander in South Australia, and the sooner we get over this particular challenge the better it will be.

We have been sold in the Eastern States as a State that should be ashamed of its electoral system, yet the Eastern States' newspapers blast South Australia without having had a look at their own systems.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But two wrongs don't make a right.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, but the United States Supreme Court has adopted the principle of one vote one value, yet it has agreed to loadings of four to one as being reasonable under the one vote one value principle in an area such as Texas, which is only one-third of the size of South Australia's Northern District.

The United States Supreme Court admits that these loadings are required in such an area, yet we have this pressure at the moment which, if it comes to equal population in each district, can only lead this State to the position where many people will not be adequately represented in Parliament. Every member of this Chamber would agree with that. I do not think any member would agree with the present system, however, because over the years, due to nobody's fault, the system has become completely out of order, and people are attempting to make political capital out of a situation that they have made no reasonable attempt to alter.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Rubbish! The Bill was thrown out at the second reading stage in this Chamber.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, but for a very good reason, and no attempt was made after it was defeated here to do anything about it. It was not accepted because it contained many unacceptable provisions.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And you made no attempt to amend them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I believe it was introduced so that it would be rejected, and no attempt was made to introduce another Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Why didn't you try to amend it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think I have already answered that question. To attempt to amend a Bill of such complexity altering our Constitution would have been completely impossible for this Chamber, as honourable members know.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You could have done it if you had wanted to.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I pay my respects to the three previous Ministers (the Hons. A. J. Shard, S. C. Bevan and A. F. Kneebone). When those three gentlemen became Ministers of the Crown in this Chamber every member agreed that the choice was a good one, and that Cabinet would be well served by them. They have always maintained the respect of this Chamber. Having had experience in this Chamber I know how fiercely the back-bench members of this Chamber guard their independence. I have had much personal experience in this matter, and I know it is a worthy thing for all back-benchers to guard. If the three present Ministers in this Chamber receive the same attention to the legislation they will introduce as the back-bench members gave to the legislation of the previous Government, I believe Ministers will have to be on their mettle in presenting legislation. I have no doubt that that will be the position.

I pay a tribute to the three previous Ministers, and to the other members of this Chamber for their complete independence. I hope that that independence of attitude will be preserved. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform honourable members that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor will be pleased to receive the Council for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.30 p.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.9 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 1, at 2.15 p.m.