

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, October 17, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

CADETSHIPS

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to a question I asked on October 3 about cadetships in the Government service?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Chairman of the Public Service Board reports as follows:

There is no fixed number of scholarships made available in any particular year, the number being determined annually after a review of:

- (a) the likely requirements of Government departments in the next succeeding three or four years;
- (b) the number of qualified applicants likely to be available from graduates of universities, colleges of advanced education or other appropriate educational institutions.

The development of scholarship schemes by employers, as distinct from awards by Governments to assist students to obtain tertiary education, arose from a shortage of qualified persons and the need for employers to encourage suitable students to tertiary education for subsequent employment, usually under bond to serve for a specified period. However, with the growth of Commonwealth and other scholarship schemes and other assistance now available to students and with restricted entry into most courses imposed by quotas, employers' scholarships have little or no effect on increasing the numbers of qualified persons available for employment.

In 1968 there are 250 students holding scholarships awarded through Public Service departments, the largest groups being Engineering—77, Agricultural Science (and associated disciplines)—38, Veterinary Science—20, Dental Therapy—32 and Architecture—29. The approximate direct cost, excluding fees, to the Government of these scholarships is \$200,000 per annum. The number and type of scholarships to be awarded in 1969 is now under consideration. An advertisement appeared in the daily press on October 5 and a further advertisement will be run on Saturday, October 26.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

The Hon. L. R. HART: Many honourable members are looking forward to visiting Roseworthy College tomorrow to witness the opening of the new science block by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. C. R. Story). Some of us are not quite clear about the procedure to be followed tomorrow. Can the Minister of

Agriculture indicate what the programme will be?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Tomorrow is Roseworthy Farmers' Day, an annual event at the college, and it gives the opportunity for practical farmers, members of agricultural bureaux and old scholars to assess what is happening at the college. On this occasion, of course, there will be the added pleasure of witnessing the opening of the new science block, which has been financed by the Commonwealth Government. The proceedings will start at 10 a.m., when visitors may have an informal look over the grounds and dormitories. A barbecue luncheon will be provided at 12 o'clock at a cost of 50c a person. An official conducted tour of the college will commence at 1 p.m., and the official opening of the new block will be at 3 p.m. As no public transport will be provided, honourable members and others wishing to go should make their own way to the college, where they will be received at the building in the centre of the grounds.

DOG FENCE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture representing the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The dog-proof fence, which is commonly known as the "buffer fence" in the north of the State, encloses and protects the sheep population of South Australia. It is about 1,500 miles long and runs from the New South Wales border to the Great Australian Bight. Its maintenance is the responsibility of the lessees whose properties adjoin the fence. This maintenance is financed partly by them and partly by an annual grant of \$37 a mile of fence. In New South Wales this figure is \$140. The grant is financed by a dog fence rate of 35c a square mile levied on all pastoral leases throughout the State and by a Government subsidy of 20c a square mile. Until recently these contributions, amounting to \$34,655 and \$19,803 respectively, were coping with the necessary maintenance; indeed, a small reserve fund had been built up.

However, as the fence becomes older and as costs increase (I think the cost of a mile of new fence is about \$1,200 today) more money is needed to keep it dog-proof. It must be borne in mind that the present contribution to the fence is paid by lessees who own only about 2,000,000 of the 20,000,000 sheep in South

Australia. If the Government could increase its subsidy to 35c, which is the subsidy paid by the pastoral lessees, the maintenance problem could be overcome. In view of the rising costs of maintenance and in view of the depletion of the funds established to maintain it, will the Minister of Agriculture ask his colleague to take up with Cabinet the question of increasing the present Government subsidy of 20c a square mile to an amount that will match that payable by the lessees (35c a square mile)?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask the honourable member to put that question on notice.

MAIN ROAD 106

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to the main road No. 106 from Gawler to Mallala. For some years now the first portion of that road from Gawler to Kangaroo Flat has been sealed, and sealing later proceeded to Roseworthy College and on to Wasleys on a district road. A traffic count taken on the road from Kangaroo Flat through to Mallala leads me to believe that the road warrants construction and sealing. Will the Minister therefore inform me when the Highways Department intends to commence that work?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will ascertain the information for the honourable member, and, if there is a current traffic count on the road, I will obtain that information for him as well.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1914.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I join with the Hon. Mr. Kneebone in expressing regret at the death of the late William Anthony Brown who passed away last Saturday. His death was a sad blow to all of us. As the honourable member said, Mr. Brown was Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council; a member of the interstate executive of the Australian Council of Trade Unions; a member of the Housing Trust for a number of years; and he was secretary of the Metal Trades Union for over 20 years.

During his term as the leading officer of the industrial movement in South Australia, the State and workers generally benefited as a result of his hard work and the conscientious way in which he applied himself to his duties. He was not one, as some people might say, who made excessive demands: he was always fair and just and could always see the other fellow's point of view. His death was certainly a great blow to the trade union movement, and I join with the Hon. Mr. Kneebone in expressing sympathy to Mrs. Brown and her family, as well as to the trade union movement generally. I also join with the Hon. Mr. Kneebone in expressing sympathy to the family of the late Harry Eric White, who was Assistant Leader of the *Hansard* Staff in this place for 8 years.

I turn now to the Bill. I was toying with the idea of going along with other members in saying that I supported it. However, my conscience got the better of me and I found that it would forever haunt me if I were such a hypocrite as to support such a measure without there having been any warning prior to the election as to what might take place thereafter. The introduction of the Budget illustrates the agility of Government members in being able to somersault without batting an eyelid. If one attempted to do that one would realize that it was quite a feat, but Government members have done it without a blush. When members of the present Government were in Opposition they told the people how the State could be run without increasing taxation. Honourable members in this Council knocked back Labor Government measures which would have raised extra money from people who could afford to pay that extra money.

Honourable members also deplored any criticism that was levelled at the Commonwealth Government for not making more money available to the States. They said that the Government should spend more, that it should not raise taxes, and that it should not join with the other States in criticizing the Commonwealth Government. Time and time again they said that just because other States had certain types of taxation it was no reason for this State to have similar taxation measures. They also said that charges should not be in line with other States. And so they went on in this irresponsible vein until they took over the Treasury benches. I say "took over" because they were not elected.

We find that despite the things said by Government members when in Opposition,

and despite the fact that they were appointed by only 43 per cent of the people of this State, they immediately set about increasing taxation by 20 per cent. It was ludicrous to hear the Hon. Mr. Dawkins yesterday singing the praises of a Government which brings in a measure that will increase taxation by that high figure. This, Mr. President, is in addition to the other measures it has already put into operation for raising extra money. I refer especially to the charge for excess water, which has been increased by 20 per cent.

This increased excess water charge comes about at a time when the reservoirs are full. Had it come about when the pumping of water was a daily procedure and a costly undertaking, there might have been some reason for it; but without this being the position, it increased this charge by 20 per cent, and this will affect the people Government members claim to represent. They claim that they have the interests of the country people at heart, but this 20 per cent extra charge will hit country people more than anyone else.

The market gardeners, who probably use more excess water than anyone else, will have to pay this extra charge. People in the country, who have to use more water than the city people because they live in the drier parts of the State, are the ones who will be hit, yet these people are the ones whose interests this Government says it looks after. What did the Government do with regard to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited? Excess water charges do not apply to a company such as that, because the B.H.P. Company has a water supply under contract at a much cheaper rate than is applicable to the market gardeners and the country people generally.

We have been told from time to time that the L.C.L. members in this place and in another place have freedom to vote how they wish on any measure. Despite the many thousands of dollars spent by the L.C.L. to return these members to Parliament, the L.C.L. tries to tell the public that at least the members are free to vote how they like. However, what do we find? It was reported that the new member for Murray in another place asked several questions regarding increased charges for excess water, and he was not very happy when the Government told him it was not prepared to reconsider the charges. He was given an opportunity to express his disapproval of the Government for imposing these

charges to the detriment of the country people, but what did he do? Did he vote in the way his conscience dictated, or did he jump to the tune of the whip wielder? He joined in with the other members of the L.C.L.; he got his orders from the farmers on North Terrace on how he had to vote on this matter, and he finished up supporting the Government in increasing excess water rates. So much for the freedom of the L.C.L. members about which we have heard so much.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins, at some length, sang the praises of the Government, and he was loud in his praise of the Government for increasing taxation. Since the Government has been in office it has also gone about increasing prices in other ways. It has decontrolled prices of many items which, in the main, concern people in the building trade. Practically every item necessary for a person to use in erecting a home has been freed from price control. I do not think it is merely coincidental that water tanks have also been freed from price control; it would seem that this is because the Government intends introducing fluoridation of our water supplies and expects a rush of people wanting to buy water tanks. Therefore, the Government intends allowing the price of this item to soar to whatever price the manufacturer decides and will not impose any controls at all.

Turning now to the lifting of price control on footwear, I had brought to my notice this morning an instance concerning a national proprietary line of welted shoe. Since that type of footwear has been decontrolled, prices have risen by \$1.50 to \$2.50; that is only one item of something over 200 items freed from price control since this Government assumed power. That is the Government that had the audacity to tell the Labor Party that it was the instigator of increased costs! The example I have quoted of the price of a pair of shoes increasing by \$2.50 is a direct result of the lifting of price control on some articles.

The Hon. Mr. Dawkins also said yesterday that the Labor Government had increased land tax. Of course, he was far from the point because that Government reduced the rate of land tax in the 1966 Bill. It is true to say that assessments were increased in 1965 in accordance with an Act introduced by a Liberal and Country League Government, but that reassessment was necessary because it had to be reassessed every five years. To say that the Labor Government increased land tax is

just as misleading as other statements that have been made by Government members.

The Government continues to protect the wealthy and "sock" the poor. It has made no attempt to keep charges below those of other States. Charges for public hospitals in this State are even higher than in some other States. We have been told by way of a leaflet issued by the L.C.L. that it is desirable for this State to maintain the Legislative Council because, amongst other things, the leaflet claims that that Party stands against class legislation and guards against revolutionary, reactionary, or hasty legislation. Yet not one member of the Government in this debate has given any indication that he is against this particular legislation! If this is not class legislation, or aimed at one particular class, then I do not know what is. It is purely and simply aimed at the working class people in this State.

Who will have to pay the greatest amount of the receipts stamp duty of one cent in each \$10? Of course it is going to be the average working man! He will have to pay one cent for every bunch of carrots he buys from a shop, and if he forgets one item and then has to return to the shop a second time he is required to pay another cent to the Government in stamp duty.

This duty will hit everybody; it will especially hit the man renting his home because every time he pays his rent he will have to pay one cent extra for each \$10 or part thereof; it will also hit the man buying his home over an extended period. However, this duty will not hit the man who has sufficient money to purchase a block of land or a house for cash, but it will, I repeat, hit the ordinary, everyday working man who is unable to find sufficient money to pay cash for these things and so reduce his taxation as far as receipts stamp duty is concerned. The second reading explanation states:

A stamp duty of \$2 upon certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance designed to assist in public hospital operation, as fees payable in public hospitals for road accident patients cover only a portion of total costs.

It is anticipated that \$840,000 in a full year will be raised as a result of this \$2 stamp duty on compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance. However, this does not remain at \$2 per annum for everyone. Here again, it hits the small man, who cannot pay for 12 months' motor registration and 12 months' compulsory third party insurance at once: he has to pay it for six months at a time, which means that he pays \$4 stamp duty in a year. Again, the

Government is looking after the man who can pay the full amount of compulsory third party insurance but is not giving any concession to the pensioner or the man with a large family who needs to have a motor car but finds it difficult to save up to register it for 12 months at a time. That is where the Government, in effect, doubles the tax from the poor man, who has to pay \$4, not \$2, a year.

The Hon. Mr. Hill said that the Labor Party was not the only Party with an interest in the working man. Of course, we know that his Party has an interest in the working man. As long as he has a cent in his pocket, the Liberal Party will take a keen interest in him to make sure he does not get away before he hands it over to the Government. This Budget extracts practically the last cent from the working man. Then there is "an extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent to cover other forms of time payment, leasing and like transactions". At whom does this hit—the Treasurer or the Chief Secretary? It hits at neither of them, nor at the majority of the Government members, nor at the people they represent. Again, it hits the little man. This came in without any reference to the people, though only 43 per cent of the people voted in favour of this Government.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Does it not hit the finance companies?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course not. It hits the little man. The honourable member knows that as well as I do. If any tax is to be levied, who pays it? It is the man who does business with a firm. In addition to the taxation, 35 to 40 per cent is added on by the finance companies for profit, so it is a money-making affair for them. It is not the hire-purchase companies at all, and the Minister knows it. The fee for obtaining a liquor licence has been raised from 5 per cent to 6 per cent. Again, most people will have to pay more—but not the wealthy people. The price of beer has already gone up.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You can sell your conscience for new, because it has never been used.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It has been used and it was about to be used. I am not talking about my conscience. My conscience would have been abused if I had supported this measure. It would have haunted me as a hypocrite for the rest of my life. I am not prepared to go against my conscience, as the honourable member is when a measure like this is introduced.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It will be a useful trade-in on your soul.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course it will, but at least it must be more valuable than the consciences of members on the Government side, because they have no conscience whatsoever. I have a conscience here, but members opposite have no conscience. The second reading explanation states:

An increase in public hospital charges in line with charges elsewhere which, together with proposed charges in appropriate cases in mental hospitals, may increase revenues by \$600,000 in a full year and \$356,000 this year. How many times were we told that we should not have the same charges imposed upon us as those imposed in other States? Yet that is done in respect of three or four of these items, to bring them into line with what obtains in other States, in spite of the number of times that members opposite have said, "We cannot have these death duties simply because they apply in other States. Why should they apply here merely because they apply in other States?" Yet in four or five cases taxes are raised merely to bring them into line with those operating in other States. Even though we still have the highest percentage of unemployment in Australia, those people unemployed have to pay exactly the same amount of tax as those working in the other States. Even though the wages in this State are, on an average, lower than those paid in other States, the wage earners still have to pay the same charges as are levied on those people receiving more pay—and this in spite of the fact that the present Government members when in Opposition said, "We do not have to do it for the sake of following the other States." Yet they are doing it now, and not only to the same level as in other States but, in some cases, exceeding that level.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The salaries in other States are higher than they are here. Can we follow the other States in that?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, we cannot follow them, or give our employees four weeks' annual leave; but we can give them everything else in the way of taxation. We cannot give them similar working conditions because that would be too costly to the State, but we can impose on them the same high charges and taxes that apply in other States. At the same time, we are getting labour on the cheap. I do not know whether the members of this Council will stand up to the claims made in this leaflet prepared by Mr. R. Y. Wilson, Secretary of the Liberal and Country League, 175 North Terrace, Adelaide, and

printed by Mitchell Press, that it is L.C.L. policy to maintain the Legislative Council because, amongst other things, it stands in the way of any Government pursuing a taxation policy greatly exceeding its election promises.

Tell me one item of these seven in respect of which the L.C.L.'s promise was kept! Then tell me what this pamphlet is worth. It is not worth the 20c cost of printing it, let alone the delivery charges paid to the boys putting them in letter-boxes. The leaflets that appeared in the last three years were not worth the paper they were written on, in view of the promises given to the people. There was no mention of what would happen as regards increased taxation.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Do you think the leaflet influenced Clyde Cameron?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, and he knew what a hypocritical leaflet it was, because he could read between the lines and he voted against the Government. The L.C.L. convinced 43 per cent of the people, who could not read between the lines, but it could not convince the other 57 per cent of the people when it put out this lying propaganda before the last election.

It was pleasing to hear the Hon. Mr. Hart elaborate on some of the things achieved by the Labor Government during its term of office but, naturally, he omitted quite a few of the things it had done in that three-year period. Let me remind him of some of them. The Labor Government introduced measures that at least made this a civilized State. For years, under the Playford Government, we were the only uncivilized State in Australia. The action of this Council in throwing out the Labor Party's electoral reform Bill kept us the hill-billy State of the Commonwealth. I hope it will not be long before we lose that title.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The missionaries have not quite finished their work.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course, because the Government is not too sure whether or not it wants its Bill now. We have heard much ballyhoo about the fact that the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill was introduced within 100 days of the present Government's taking office and that the Labor Government took 107 days to introduce an electoral Bill. Of course, the Labor Government had a mandate from the people to remain in office for three years, during which period it planned to carry out all its promises. The present Government did not have a mandate from the people for any legislation, yet it still took 100 days to introduce the Bill, and it has still not been introduced

in this Council. Many more than 100 days have gone by, yet we do not know what form the Bill will take by the time it reaches this Council. Also, we do not know what form it will be in by the time it leaves this Council. The Commissioners cannot get on with their job, because no Commissioners have been appointed and no legislation has been passed to authorize their work. The Hon. Mr. Story should have been aware of these points before he said that the Commissioners had not come back with their report. He should not blame the Commissioners: they have not yet been appointed.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I said that the missionaries had not quite finished their work.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I accept the Minister's word, but I say that neither the Commissioners nor the Government has completed the job of getting the Bill through another place.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I was speaking about your statement that the State was fairly uncivilized.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I said it was a hillbilly State. I was referring to the way every other State refers to South Australia.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Check *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I said that I hoped it would not be long before the present Government brought this State into line with other States, as it has done in respect of other policies. In spite of what the Hon. Mr. Dawkins said yesterday about increased land tax, I point out that the Labor Government gave complete exemption from land tax to councils and it exempted properties from land tax if they were valued at less than \$1,000, compared with \$640, which was the exemption allowed by the Playford Government. In listening to the Hon. Mr. Hart one would have thought that he was saying that the Liberal Party members were the ones from whom all blessings flow. In fact, the Labor Government put into effect well over 90 per cent of its pre-election promises, and it was prevented from putting into effect the rest only through the actions of this Council, which is elected by less than 25 per cent of the people, yet its influence is greater than that of the popular House.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you sure it is the popular House?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It certainly will not be the popular House as a result of the Budget. It was popular during the three years of the Labor Government's term of office. The people of this State

are happy about the amendments to the Licensing Act, which have permitted a saner and more realistic approach to our eating and drinking habits. Although Sir Thomas Playford was only one member of a team, he had the numbers in the team to stop this State from enjoying civilized licensing laws. We had to wait for Sir Thomas to lose control before we could establish a lottery in this State. He did not even want the people to vote at a referendum on this issue. Evidently he believed that establishing a lottery would be like putting poison in the hands of children: this was the way the Liberal and Country League Government treated the State for many years, and the present Government is reverting to a similar method of treatment.

The present Government is reaping the benefits of lotteries, as the revenue from them is received into the Hospitals Fund. Consequently, I cannot see why it was necessary to impose a tax of \$2 on certificates of compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance. Of course, the revenue from this duty will not go into a special fund: it will go into general revenue. Consequently, we do not know whether it will go to hospitals. We have been told that it will be paid towards hospitals, but I doubt whether it will be used for this purpose.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The reason given was that, as motorists are having accidents, they should pay towards the hospitals.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think the Government thought that it was a good catch, and that the motorists would cheerfully pay \$4 a year to assist hospitals that they would use as a result of accidents. If the Government properly provided for roads, there might not be so many accidents. It would cost a relatively small amount to conduct an accident prevention campaign. This would be better than the Government's policy, which is to wait for accidents to occur and then to provide money for wooden legs, etc. The Government is also reaping the benefit from the Totalizer Agency Board but it has not done anything to abolish the winning bets tax. We heard the Government say that the abolition of this tax would be one of the first priorities—next to Chowilla! However, neither priority has been put into effect. There is some talk about the winning bets tax being lifted next year, but it may not be lifted until the year after that, or 1971, when the Labor Government is returned to the Treasury benches.

The Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Bill was well received in drought-stricken areas. Honourable members know that country people benefited greatly from the prompt way in which the Labor Government handled this matter. The country people were very pleased with the Labor Government's action. For many years the grapegrower and the winemaker were at loggerheads over the price of grapes, and, consequently, the winemaker jacked up to the extent that eventually the grapegrower practically had to give his grapes away rather than allow them to rot on the vines. The L.C.L. Government, which claimed that it looked after these people, was not prepared to do anything about it. It was not until the Labor Government came into power that a minimum price was established. Now, both the winemakers and the grapegrowers are reasonably satisfied. This could not have taken place under an L.C.L. Government because it affected the winemakers, who contribute more to L.C.L. funds than do the small blockers.

Amendments to the Places of Public Entertainment Act have given the people greater opportunity to enjoy themselves on the Sabbath. Some people want to go to church on Sundays, but this does not mean that all people want to do so. However, the L.C.L. Government was not prepared to see both viewpoints, so the people had to wait for a Labor Government to amend the legislation. The Hon. Mr. Bevan referred to amendments to the Public Service Act that set up a full-time Public Service Board, which the Public Service Association of South Australia had sought for 10 years from the Playford Government. Why did the Playford Government not grant the association's request? It was never prepared to say why. However, the board has now been established. Probably the Playford Government thought that a board might get out of step to some extent but, of course, such a board would have got out of step to no greater extent than did the Playford Government.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is harder for control to be exercised if there is a board, compared with the previous set-up.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, because it was a dictatorship. However, now the board has been set up public servants might be able to get a fair go. Prior to the Labor Government's term of office public servants were not entitled to pro rata recreation leave, although 99 per cent of all other awards provided for it. However, this did not apply to the Public Service, which was

under the control of a Liberal Government. No-one seems to know why they could not get pro rata recreation leave. However, public servants can now get such leave after one month's service, the same as applies in most other awards, and what under a Liberal Government were privileges are now rights.

The Public Service Association also appreciated the honouring by the Labor Government of its election promises to amend the Superannuation Act by giving increased pensions to retired persons and reducing the contributions to the fund. This prompted a statement from the Public Service Association that more had been done regarding superannuation during the Labor Government's term of office than had been done in the previous 10 years. I do not know why they did not go back 30 years, but they said that we did more in two years than the previous Government had done in 10 years. That is in line with all our progress during that period.

Many years ago the International Labor Organization recommended equal pay for equal work for the sexes. Did this Government or the Commonwealth L.C.P. Government attempt to put it into operation? Of course not: it was not until the Labor Government took office in this State that the principle of equal pay for equal work was adopted. The Labor Government introduced equal pay for teachers in progressive steps over a five-year period. It also empowered the State industrial tribunal to grant equal pay for equal work if it thought that that was necessary. However, the court had been prohibited from doing this: it had been denied the right to grant equal pay for equal work, by Bills brought in by the Liberal Government. That Government was frightened of what the court would find if it examined the matter.

The Labor Government also gave the right to women to sit on juries, something for which they had been asking for years. We recognize the worth of women, and we have attempted to give them equal standing with that of males. That Government also gave the first increase in 10 years to trainee teachers. All other people had been receiving increased allowances and salaries, but the poor trainee teachers were denied any increases. However, today that increase is being whittled away by this Government's action in taking away their travelling allowances and making them purchase their own books. Therefore, what these young people received during the term

of office of the Labor Government is being taken away by this Government, and soon we will not be able to attract the right type of trainee teacher to the Education Department. This has all been brought about by the actions of this Government, which really has no mandate from the people to do any of the things it is doing.

The Labor Government introduced the system of giving free school books to children attending primary schools, something that it had been trying for many years to have done. Here again, the Liberal Government was not prepared to assist the people or to help the education of the children of this State to that extent. The trade union movement attempted for years to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act to bring it not ahead of but into line with interstate Acts and with the Commonwealth Workmen's Compensation Act. However, it was knocked back repeatedly. Indeed, Sir Thomas Playford is on record as having said that never in his time would people receive workmen's compensation for injuries sustained while travelling to and from work, yet this applied in all other States. It was not until the Labor Party occupied the Treasury benches that the people of South Australia got this protection; they did not have a hope of getting it under the Liberal Government.

We also improved workmen's compensation so that a person who received an injury as a result of his employment other than by accident was compensated. The Liberal Government was not prepared to include that provision either. I could continue in this vein for a long time but, as I promised the Hon. Mrs. Cooper that I would not be long, I will not go on.

The people of South Australia appreciate all that the Labor Government gave them during its short term of office. We may have increased taxation, but we did not increase it in the way this Government has. We did not burden further the man who could least afford more taxation and, as a result of our actions, the people of South Australia again voted for a Labor Government at the last election, but were denied it. The present Chief Secretary when in opposition asked us how we knew we received more than a 50 per cent vote, because we did not contest each seat. He made a bad error there. His Party said, "We will fly the flag in every district", with the result that they went down at the last election compared with the previous one. Members opposite will probably not make that same fatal mistake again. Whereas we pre-

viously had to prove that we got the majority vote by reference to the Senate figures, we now have State figures to prove this. I strongly oppose the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I strongly support the Bill, and I wish to comment on some of the major matters that honourable members have raised regarding items that come within the control of my departments. The Hon. Mr. Kemp coined the phrase "the rape of the Adelaide Hills". Quite understandably, this caused much public discussion and unfair criticism of the Highways Department regarding the work it is doing in the hills. It also led to misunderstandings regarding land subdivision and the water catchment area in the hills. That phrase and the speech caused a certain amount of television publicity, and several misunderstandings have occurred.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Minister didn't come out of that too well, either.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think he came out of it very well.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Well, you could not have been watching yourself too closely.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I did not object to the second part of the programme.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was the second part that I objected to.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: You are the first one to tell me that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The others weren't game.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I turn now to land subdivision in the Mount Lofty Ranges. The Planning and Development Act establishes control over the subdivision of land into allotments, and any allotment over 20 acres is exempt. Control is exercised by the Director of Planning and the council of the area in which the land is situated. Both parties must approve a plan and, if either refuses, there is a right of appeal to the Planning and Appeal Board. The Director of Planning must consult other departments such as the Highways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department before giving his decision. The policy followed in administering the control of land subdivision in the metropolitan planning area is contained in the metropolitan development plan. This was the report and plan submitted to Parliament in 1962 and accepted by Parliament as the basis for guiding the future development of the metropolitan area when the Planning and Development Act was passed.

The metropolitan development plan defines a "country living zone", extending from Crafers to Bridgewater, in which allotments should be half an acre in area. I point out that this area of the allotments is greater than the area where subdivisions occur on the plains. Beyond the country living zone lies the "rural zone" in which allotments are created associated with normal rural and agricultural activity.

The "hills face zone" is the narrow strip of country overlooking the city and extending above the foothills to the ridge of the ranges. Subdivision is strictly controlled in this area due to the difficulty of the terrain, the expense of providing public services, and the desire to preserve the natural character of this magnificent backdrop to metropolitan Adelaide.

It has not been clear from the honourable member's speech, referring to indiscriminate subdivision in the Adelaide Hills, where this actually has been taking place. Subdivision at the present time is limited in the Adelaide Hills; there is not a great deal of that form of activity, and recently there have been only few applications for subdivision in that area. Building development in the hills today is taking place, however, and this is taking place largely on allotments created before the present controls were exercised. No doubt more people will find it pleasant and convenient to live in the hills as access by the new freeway becomes easier.

However, the main task, which the Government accepts quite willingly and quite happily, is to ensure that as more people go to live in the hills the beauty of the Mount Lofty Ranges is preserved. Controls can only go so far. Bodies such as the Mount Lofty Ranges Association can ensure that there is a greater public awareness of the need to preserve this unique asset.

There has also been a belief developing that the unfortunate embankments and cuttings which have been necessary for the Highways Department to make in the hills will be left in their present ugly state when the highways projects there are completed. Mr. President, this is not so. The department proposes to go to great lengths to try to re-beautify some of the areas which are at present affected by the construction of roads through the Adelaide Hills. It is interesting to note that up till the present date 1,875 trees have been planted between Measday's Corner and the Stirling overpass; 44 advanced trees of from 5ft. to 30ft. in height have been moved from adjacent properties to the freeway, and 1,000 ground

cover plants have already been planted. It is expected that from 10,000 to 14,000 trees and shrubs will be planted along the freeway between Measday's Corner and Verdun.

Now, there have also been rumours (and these rumours were expressed by a member of the Mount Lofty Ranges Association) that the Highways Department had made some glaring errors regarding the purchase of land, and that land has been offered back in quite appreciable areas and quantities to previous owners as a result of mistakes having been made. However, I point out that land acquisitions for the South-Eastern Freeway have not exceeded the actual areas required for freeway purposes, except in a limited number of cases when the department has been obliged to purchase relatively small areas of severed land.

No land acquired by the department in connection with the South-Eastern Freeway has been re-sold, with the exception of 25 perches (only about one-sixth of an acre), which was re-sold to the original owners at cost. At present, negotiations are proceeding towards the transfer of two portions of surplus land to adjoining owners on an exchange basis, and these two relatively small pieces are only 29 perches and 26 perches in area.

The Hon. Mr. Kemp referred to the damage done in the catchment area of the hills in regard to contamination of water there as a result of various changes that are taking place in the hills. Adelaide, in common with the very large majority of cities throughout the world, has to rely on water from catchments carrying considerable human population and practising various forms of animal husbandry. A comparison with Melbourne is scarcely justified as that city is almost unique in its present privileged position of having uninhabited catchments.

At the present time, the Engineering and Water Supply Department works with all the district councils in the catchment areas and its patrol officers co-operate with the local councils and boards of health in maintaining the best possible conditions of operation in areas contributing water to streams, and take particular interest in the stream-side lands.

The negotiations of the department with the district councils particularly cover pollution, and that is covered under certain headings. These include all forms of animal husbandry, domestic establishments, and industrial wastes involving in many cases special treatment of wastes from the factory itself or from the

factory and surrounding residential establishments. Headings also considered include those relating to recreational areas and activities such as quarrying and other work that could change the discharge characteristics of the area.

Part of the criticism of the Highways Department has been that some errors have been made in regard to the design of the main Crafrers bridge, and an accusation has been made that the bridge is too low. The maximum permitted height of a vehicle under the Road Traffic Act is 14ft., whereas the bridge in question has a clearance of 15ft. 8in. The national standard for design is 15ft., or 17ft. 6in. if there is no convenient alternative route. In this particular case there is an alternative route, but in any event 17ft. 6in. was not possible on account of the proximity of the Crafrers main street.

The Hon. Mr. Bevan referred to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, and it seemed to me that his principal or perhaps his only real criticism of the whole issue of the M.A.T.S. Report centred around its financial aspect. In fact, that was how he put his view. In regard to this financial aspect, I will just touch upon some of the facts which I think will be of interest to all who, quite understandably, have expressed in this debate some query concerning the financial aspects of the M.A.T.S. Report. The keynote of the study has been that the plan must be practical and workable and within the financial resources expected to be available. The whole study has been influenced very largely by economic considerations. The prospectus of the study which provided the basis of the work by the consultant stated, in part, that:

The broad objective of the study is to devise a workable, acceptable and adaptable plan to guide traffic and transport of metropolitan Adelaide up to the year 1986. The study must be conducted and presented in such a form that continuing surveillance, refinement and amendment is practicable both during the period up to 1986 and beyond.

To further guide the work of the consultants and local staff, planning goals were defined as follows: the plan should guide and, where necessary, direct the growth of the Adelaide metropolitan area in such a way as to preserve and enhance the social and economic welfare of the community as a whole; the plan should be within the financial capabilities of the community. Compromises may have to be made, therefore, between the ideal and the obtainable.

A further requirement set out by the Joint Steering Committee stated that the total cost to the community both in the first cost and in the continuing maintenance and operating expenses should be justified by sound economic analysis, and the plan should be refutable within the financial resources likely to be available. The estimated costs of implementing the M.A.T.S. proposals, under the various headings, are:

	\$ (in millions)
Roads—	
Freeways and expressways	299.3
Arterial roads, rail crossings, and proposed Port River crossing	137.2
	436.5
Rail—	
Rolling stock	32.0
King William Street subway	32.8
Other line improvements	14.3
	79.1
Bus—	
Rolling stock	26.9
Depots, etc.	1.5
	28.4

Adding a further \$30,000,000 as an estimated cost for parking within the city of Adelaide brings the overall total to \$574,000,000.

I now touch upon the reliability of the above cost estimates. These have been largely based on current rates, and that was the question raised earlier in the debate. As far as road projects are concerned (and road projects represent 76 per cent of the overall cost) it is not acknowledged that the unit rates will necessarily increase with the general inflationary increase in the cost structure. The point has been strongly made that it is expected that roadmaking costs will escalate tremendously, but there is sound reason to suggest, as I have pointed out, that because the unit cost has not increased in recent years, this will not happen. Larger scale road construction operations in the future will afford the opportunity to organize the works on a much larger scale, the letting of larger contracts, and the more effective use of larger plant. Also with increasing mechanization of large scale road works, the labour content represents an ever reducing proportion of the total cost. These factors will tend to reduce unit rates whereas the inflationary factors in the general cost structure will tend to increase unit rates. It remains to be seen which is the

more powerful influence in relation to future road works.

It is of interest to note that unit construction costs of the Highways and Local Government Department have not increased in recent years in keeping with the general increase in the cost structure. It is important to recognize that while cost estimates have been based on current rates, so also have estimates of the revenue expected to be available for carrying out the works.

Principal sources of funds available to the Highways and Local Government Department are State motor taxation, road maintenance contributions and Commonwealth grants to the State for road purposes. While the cost of the road proposals put forward in the M.A.T.S. plan amounts to \$436,500,000, the total funds expected to be available to the department over the next 20 years is expected to exceed \$1,000,000,000. This estimate of revenue assumes no increase whatsoever in the rates of State motor taxation or of road maintenance contributions. In respect of the Commonwealth grants it assumes merely a continuation of the increasing trend that has applied over the past 10 years.

It is not a matter of the M.A.T.S. road proposals being beyond the available financial resources. It is rather a matter of what proportion of the funds expected to be available can be directed towards the metropolitan area. It should not be assumed that all road proposals contained in the plan should be financed entirely from Highways Department funds. The city of Adelaide will be involved in some of the road proposals.

The public transport proposals are estimated to cost \$107,500,000. Of this, \$58,900,000 will be required for rail and bus rollingstock and this figure includes the cost of replacing and expanding the privately operated bus fleet in addition to that of the Municipal Tramways Trust. While funds for the improvement of public transport services are dependent on State Government allocation, the Government recognizes that failure to allow public transport to play its role in a correctly balanced transportation system would be extremely expensive in terms of the additional expenditure required on roads and in terms of the additional social cost involved.

It has been estimated that an investment of approximately \$30,000,000 will be required to carry out the proposed parking programme of the city of Adelaide which has been endorsed by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation

Study. This figure represents the total sum by both the city of Adelaide and private interests.

The substantial progress already made by the city in its five-year parking programme has been largely financed by loan funds because of the council's limited resources and its commitments in other fields. The matter of the availability of funds for future parking requirements will be the subject of further consideration by the Government.

No-one will deny that the cost of allowing traffic congestion to develop would be very high indeed. With few exceptions, arterial roads in metropolitan Adelaide are capable of handling today's traffic volumes. Estimates of future travel, however, indicate that total vehicle miles of travel in metropolitan Adelaide will more than double, increasing from 4,120,000 vehicle miles on a week day in 1965 to about 9,500,000 in 1986. It is evident that we are headed for chronic traffic congestion unless drastic action is taken and taken soon.

Direct benefits to the users of roads and public transport services recommended in the plan will result from savings of time due to higher operating speeds on freeways, and rapid transit rail services. It is estimated that by 1986, the savings on this account will benefit the community by \$28,000,000 annually. Due to improved operating conditions on roads resulting from the proposals of the study, it is estimated that by 1986 road users will save a further \$43,900,000 annually because of lower vehicle operating costs. Saving in operating costs of road vehicles attributable to those passengers diverted to public transport (who would otherwise use motor cars) is estimated at a further \$5,500,000 annually by 1986.

The diversion of travellers to public transport will reduce the demand for car parking in the central city area by 3,000 spaces representing a saving of approximately \$6,000,000. In the Adelaide metropolitan area the current fatality rate in car accidents is equivalent to 7 fatalities for each 100,000,000 vehicle miles of travel. Studies in 30 States of the U.S.A. indicate that the fatality rate on freeways averages less than 2 per 100,000,000 vehicle miles of travel. It is estimated that between now and 1986 the safer operating conditions prevailing on freeways recommended by the study will represent a saving of 350 lives.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What is the percentage on our type of road now?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is now 7 fatalities for each 100,000,000 vehicle miles of travel, and based on actual studies carried out in America it could be reduced to two fatalities for each 100,000,000 vehicle miles of travel. Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Kneebone commented upon the need for the Railways Institute and the Railways Department to be fully considered during the proposals concerning the festival hall. I assure him that the Railways Department was consulted fully by the committee that is investigating the proposal for a festival hall on the new site. It has been received and is being considered by the committee.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone also dealt with railway houses. This matter was publicized recently in the press. I assure the honourable member and other honourable members that the policy followed by the Railways Department during the last three years is being continued, in that houses that the department considers will not be required by employees are being and will be sold. At the same time, of course, some vacant houses must be kept in readiness for employees transferring either to the city or to other country areas, where it is essential that they be housed properly by the department because of a change in place of employment.

For that reason, it is necessary to keep some houses vacant at all times. The department maintains these houses in quite good condition but it is understandable that at some times of the year (and at present because of the weed growth) houses are inclined to take on an appearance of neglect, but the problem of weed growth is being tackled by the department; it is not a really serious problem.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone also mentioned the Government's proposal about the rationalization of railway services. I do not think he put forward a very convincing argument. In fact, I doubt whether he objects strenuously to the Government's present proposals that, where some lines are obviously uneconomic, it is necessary for any Government, if it approaches its job in a businesslike way, to take some action. This does not mean, of course, that lines running at a loss, passenger suburban lines that the Government deems socially necessary, come within a rationalization programme. The Government accepts that some passenger lines are now running, and will continue to run, at a loss. Because they are patronized reasonably well, the Government regards it as a necessary service to the people to provide such lines. We do not intend to

alter those services: as I have said time and time again, it is only the services that are obviously uneconomic in respect of which we have taken some action.

I was interested to observe that there was a lightning railway strike on this issue of the Government's railway plans. With railway rationalization we are cutting out services that have been proved to be completely unrealistic in an economic sense and, where necessary, are arranging for them to be replaced by more economical road services. The whole scheme was thoroughly considered by Cabinet before it received approval and is clearly in the best interests of the State. The savings are at least \$1,000,000 a year in a railway system with an average annual loss of \$10,000,000. It would be an irresponsible Government that turned its back on tackling this problem.

The lightning strike last Friday was an act of irresponsibility. Retrenchments of personnel are not involved and the welfare of employees who may be transferred is being fully considered. If this proposal had involved retrenchments, I could understand last week's action, but time and time again both the department and I have stressed that retrenchments are not involved in this matter. The Leader of the Opposition in another place and his Deputy have previously publicly commented on the need to rationalize railway services. I presume the Leader is now on the other side of the fence trying to make political capital out of this strike.

The attitude of the railway unions, to whom the previous Government gave service pay and additional annual leave at great cost to the community, is to be deplored, with the notable exceptions of more stable bodies, such as the Australian Transport Officers Federation, which divorced themselves from this action. The greatest sufferers from this irresponsible attitude are the travelling public and customers of the railways, who must tend to lose faith in the railway system when actions such as this occur.

Mention was made in this Chamber during the debate of a view held within the railway unions about a certain contract which, it was claimed, was given to private enterprise in South Australia at the expense of the Islington workshops. With one or two minor exceptions, tenders have been called for the supply of all standard gauge locomotives and rolling stock. Except for main line locomotives, the South Australian Railways has submitted tenders, and whenever its tender was the lowest the work has been undertaken at the Islington workshops.

Recently, tenders were invited for standard gauge bulk grain hopper waggons, with construction alternatively in aluminium or steel. Following the receipt of tenders, a recommendation was made to the Commonwealth authorities that the order be given to the South Australian Railways for manufacture in steel, its price being the most favourable received for construction using this material. However, the Minister for Shipping and Transport directed that tenders be recalled specifying steel construction only. Tenders have closed, but a decision has not yet been made regarding to whom the order will be given. It is incorrect to say that the South Australian Railways had been granted the contract originally but that it was subsequently awarded to another firm. I hope that those explanations will assist in clearing up some of the points raised during the debate. I thank honourable members for their consideration of these matters in their speeches. I strongly support the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I thank honourable members for the attention they have given this Bill. During the debate not many queries have been raised about the Budget itself. I have much information with me which, fortunately, I need not give because no questions have arisen on the individual lines of the Budget, so I shall be brief. First, I quote what the Leader of the Opposition said on this Bill:

The extra taxes to be raised in this year arising from this Budget and from Bills to be introduced subsequently are expected jointly to produce an amount of \$3,820,000.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is, this year.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, this year. The Leader continued:

The same imposts in 1969-70 are expected to produce the sum of \$8,300,000. It is the method proposed to raise that additional money on which I wish to speak today. I, with most other people, realize that Governments have to find money, but I think it can be taken for granted that most Governments try to spread the burden on all people to an equal extent, and according to their ability to pay.

In those comments of the Leader I entirely concur. In framing this Budget, the Government worked with the idea of achieving a balance. As the Leader rightly pointed out, there will be some difficulty in achieving it. Even after it had been worked out on paper, the Budget was difficult to balance because some things have occurred since then that will

have a big impact on the ability of this State to balance its Budget in this coming financial year. We are still certain, however, that the attempt must be made to balance our Budget for the coming year. It is not in the best interests of the State to allow this continuing drift in the Treasury finances. Every person who takes an intelligent interest in this State would disagree with the point made by the Leader of the Opposition. He said:

But when we look at the proposals this year we find that no such attempt has been made, because they are set out in a seven-prong attack upon the people of the State in an endeavour to raise extra money. In the main, such money is to be raised by each person contributing about an equal amount, irrespective of ability to pay.

This is the point where the Leader and I disagree.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We will get an adjudicator in, and I will have a little on the side.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It depends entirely on the adjudicator, and I think the people of South Australia will be the best adjudicators. This Government faced an extremely difficult problem in framing the Budget in the present circumstances. The reaction in the community has been that the Government has done a first-rate job in attempting to overcome the difficulties facing this State. I should at this stage like to correct some statements made during this debate. The Hon. Mr. Banfield said that over the last three years Liberal members of this Council had urged the previous Government to spend more money, and that they had also urged the previous Government not to raise taxes and not to criticize the Commonwealth Government. This is an incorrect simplification. Liberal members of this Council did not urge the previous Government to spend more money in an irresponsible fashion. We did draw the previous Government's attention to certain matters, but we did not urge it to spend more money *ad lib* and we did not urge it not to raise taxes.

This Council took action only in respect of the means whereby taxation was to be levied. We would not have opposed an increase in succession duties if the Government had wanted to increase them on a proper basis, but we did object to the massive change in the whole structure of succession duties. We objected to placing the emphasis upon one section of the community which in many circumstances did not have the ability to pay.

In levying succession duties, a Government is taxing a capital asset, where often there is no cash available. Liberal members of this Council entirely agreed that the States were in a difficult situation because taxation in the States was not based on any growth factor. We did, however, say that it was wrong that conditions here should be worse than those in other parts of Australia, and we said it was wrong to place all the blame on the Commonwealth for a situation in which we were involved. The aim of this Budget has been to spread taxation through all sections of the community, with the heavier impact falling on those who have the ability to pay.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: In which direction does that happen?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I turn now to the question of the means available to the States to raise taxation. Land tax is not based on ability to pay: even if a primary producer makes a loss of \$10,000 he must pay his land tax. Regarding succession duties, one may inherit an asset in the form of a farm or a house, but the succession duties are not based on ability to pay. Here is where the Leader of the Opposition and I are at variance.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Every tax in the Budget hits every person on an equal basis. Which of the seven new taxes hits the man who has got money harder than the man who has not got it?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Gift duty is based on a sliding scale. The more a person gives the higher is the duty.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is a double tax.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: What is the meaning of that?

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that the Minister address the Chair; then we will not be involved in personal discussions.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Chief Secretary is on very weak ground: we are only trying to help him.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Leader of the Opposition has asked me to point out one of the seven taxes that is based on the principle that the more wealthy section of the community should pay more. I have referred to one such tax—gift duty, where the duty increases in proportion to the value of the gift made. Regarding turnover tax, we heard the Hon. Mr. Banfield speaking today about an impost of a cent on a bunch of carrots. This is emotionalism at its worst. The turnover tax is at the rate of one cent in \$10, or \$1 in \$1,000. On the normal household bud-

get of \$50 a week, the impact will be 5c, so I do not think it will make any impact at all.

The public has accepted the Budget in a manner that Labor Party members here cannot appreciate, because the Budget has spread the taxation over the whole community. While this Budget is a difficult one because of what the present Government inherited from the Labor Government, it has been accepted by the people of South Australia as reasonable in the circumstances because it does not fall heavily on any one section of the community and because it is based on ability to pay. Let us consider what the alternative Government would have done to meet this deficit of about \$11,000,000. I agree with the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, who said that it was necessary that one should closely look at one's costs. The private sector of the community must do this when it meets a financial difficulty, and I agree with that. This Government is doing it, but is being criticized for it.

The Minister of Roads and Transport has mentioned services that need to be discontinued because they are no longer economic, and I refer to services which are running with less than one passenger a trip and which are costing the taxpayers \$1,000,000 a year. We are doing these things—

The Hon. C. R. Story: And being thoroughly criticized for it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. This is the situation, and this Budget has been accepted by the public. Most of these matters will be debated when the various Bills come into this Council. However, I want to comment on hospital charges, because much was made of them by the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Mr. Banfield. However, the record in this respect needs to be examined closely. When the last Liberal Government went out of office the charge for public beds in South Australia was \$6.50 a day; intermediate beds cost \$8; and private beds cost \$10 a day. On April 1, 1967, the cost of public beds rose to \$9 a day; intermediate beds rose to \$12.50 a day; and the cost of private beds was increased to \$16 a day.

If one examined the rise in these charges during the term of the Labor Government, one would see that the cost of public beds rose from \$6.50 to \$9 which, in a period of three years, represented a rise of 40 per cent; the cost of intermediate beds rose from \$8 to \$12.50, a rise of \$4.50 or 55 per cent; and the charge for private beds rose from \$10 to \$16, a rise of \$6 or 60 per cent. This all took

place during the three year term of office of the Labor Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And your increased charge occurred in a period of six months.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The last rise we made will operate from November 1, 1968, when the cost of public beds will rise to \$10; intermediate beds to \$13.50; and private beds to \$17, a rise overall of less than 10 per cent, while in three years under the Labor Government the average rise in hospital beds was over 50 per cent.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And yours is a 10 per cent rise in six months. Work that out on a pro rata basis!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member said that hospital charges in this State were higher than those in any other State but, of course, that is not so. In New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania public beds cost \$10 a day.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did I say "in comparison with wages"?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. The honourable member said that hospital charges in South Australia were "higher than".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I hope you give me credit for comparing them with wages.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, I give the Leader full credit for that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I did that too, but the Minister is not prepared to admit it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The cost of public beds in New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania is \$10; intermediate beds cost \$13.50 a day; and private beds range from \$16.20 in New South Wales to \$23.50 in Victoria.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Victoria woke up to the position regarding private beds.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. Victoria has some private beds that cost \$15 a day but others cost more, up to the super-deluxe accommodation which costs over \$23 a day. By and large, hospital charges at present are comparable throughout Australia. However, we increased them only recently, and I believe there are to be further rises in other States.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I thought the amount being paid into the State hospitals by the State Lotteries Commission would look after this.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It has often been argued that the lottery would solve the problem for hospitals from New South Wales down to Tasmania, but that has not been the case. It has never been the saviour for hospital finance.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It has assisted very well, but that is the best that one could say for it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Hon. Mr. Kneebone had much to say about many matters, but I do not wish to reply to them all. He said that the difficulties contained in the Budget arose from the drought we had last year. However, I point out to him that the Budget got well behind in 1965-66, when there was a deficit of \$8,000,000. That had nothing to do with the drought of 1966-67. I appreciate fully that last year's drought had a serious effect on this State's Budget, but we cannot blame the drought for all the financial difficulties that the State is in when, in the financial year 1965-66, we drifted back in total over \$9,000,000 in our Budget account. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone gave quite a dissertation on succession duties and, although I do not like using the word "rubbish", I suggest he knows nothing at all about the Bill his Party introduced into this Council.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is what you think.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I even saw an advertisement in a newspaper that did not interpret properly the Bill before the Council. At present the Labor Party is trying to prove that the Bill was magnificent and that it would have hit only that small group of businessmen in Adelaide who were getting around succession duties legislation. However, that is sheer poppycock, and the farming community realized it, because that Bill would have cut wads out of the primary producing community of this State. Indeed, a member in another place who had much to say on the Bill realized that it would do exactly that.

I have spoken at length, and I think I have answered most of the questions raised by honourable members. I fully appreciate the attention members have given the Bill. It is a difficult Budget but I sincerely believe that the people of this State have accepted it as a reasonable means of overcoming the financial difficulty with which this Government will be faced in this financial year.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary):
I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For some time now the permanent building societies in South Australia have been making representations to the Government for deposits made with them to be accorded trustee status, thus enabling the societies to gain access to funds not presently available to them for house mortgage lending. The Government is anxious to assist in any reasonable measure that will promote the application of additional funds for home financing and, in fact, it gave an undertaking at the time of the election that it would proceed to formulate legislation to give trustee status to deposits made with certain permanent building societies, subject to acceptance by those societies of conditions that would give adequate protection to the trustee and at the same time place the building societies in proper relationship with other authorized trustee investments.

This short Bill gives effect to that electoral undertaking. Clause 1 is formal, but it does, in effect, delay the operation of the Act until March 1, 1969. This delay is thought desirable to ensure that any movement in deposits from the Savings Bank of South Australia to building societies consequent upon the enactment of this Bill does not take place until after the improvement in the deposit position consequent upon the improvement in seasonal conditions is felt by that bank.

Clause 2 provides a definition of "deposit" that excludes certain share subscriptions that otherwise could be included in such a definition. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act and provides for the declaration by proclamation of certain permanent building societies with which deposits may be made by trustees. Such a proclamation can be made only after a report has been received from the Auditor-General on the financial condition of the society. In addition, the Governor has been given specific power to amend, vary or revoke all proclamations made for the purposes of section 5 of the principal Act.

It will be noted that trustee status will be given only to such building societies as are declared by proclamation by the Governor, and in giving consideration to an application from a society to be so declared the Government will in the first instance have regard to the society's financial strength so as to ensure that deposits made will have the safety and security required of a trustee investment. In the second place, the Government will require societies to give reasonable undertakings regarding their lending procedures. In particular, the societies will be required to undertake that their lending on house mortgages will be subject to the

similar restriction as would apply if they themselves were trustees, that is, that they may not lend more than an agreed proportion of the reasonable value of a property unless the repayment of the loan is insured with the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation.

Finally, the approved societies will be required to seek the approval of the Treasurer to the rate of interest that they propose to offer on deposits from time to time. In giving approval, regard will be had to the rates of interest being offered by other persons and bodies listed in section 5 of the Trustee Act, and other matters bearing upon their reasonableness. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1901.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): We have in South Australia been recently subjected to a constant stream of statements to the effect that the majority of voters, be they only 51 per cent, is entitled to have utter and complete freedom to decide what laws shall be made, with complete disregard for the requirements of the other 49 per cent.

It has been pointed out on a number of occasions that this reason is fallacious. It has been further pointed out that one of the major responsibilities of Upper Houses is to prevent class legislation and to watch the rights of minorities. Laws for the community should be matters that most of the major groups in the State should agree upon, not things that 51 per cent wish to impose undemocratically on 100 per cent.

The bicameral Parliamentary system was designed to ensure that no one pressure group in the community could grab and maintain any autocratic class-conscious power. Constant efforts to destroy the special, but different, franchises of the two Houses of Parliament are aimed at the proposition that the majority should never have to modify their wishes for the requirements of a minority.

The constant reiteration of the statement that the Legislative Council of South Australia is a House of Review only tends to obliterate the original intention, namely, that it should examine legislation from angles which could well be different from those observed in another place. One cannot repeat too frequently that the fundamental objective of a

bicameral system is to ensure that legislation will be approved by two groups of people who represent different sections of the community, the result being that if both Houses approve of a Bill it may be presumed to be worth while for the State as a whole, whereas if either House makes objection to it it may be presumed to be in some sense harmful to one or more sections of the population—and therefore it may be presumed to be bad legislation and should not be passed until further examined.

This brings me to my main point: that if we move too far in the direction of giving identical franchise to the two Houses we are destroying the fundamental intention of this Parliamentary system. However, I am in favour of this Bill because substantially it gives equal rights to husbands and wives in the election of members to this Chamber. It has been one of the quaintnesses of our past social development that not only money, property, and ownership generally, but also many legal rights have been lodged largely with the male of the species. In this more enlightened era, when it is generally recognized, except by a few of my friends, that husbands and wives have equal responsibilities in matters of family affairs, home ownership, and civic association, the mere fact that we have inherited the practice of a husband's signing his name to most documents on behalf of the pair should not deny a wife an equal right with him in selecting the people who will have authority over their joint undertaking. After all, the man in most cases has entered a church and in holy circumstances there, before a registered minister of the gospel and assorted witnesses, has avowed that with all his worldly goods he her endows—this oath must, even in our quaint legal world of today, have some official standing. It would then seem irrational for that man to turn round and say, "Yes, I did swear to share my life and worldly goods with you, but I didn't mean to go as far as sharing my Legislative Council vote with you!"

I support this Bill, but in doing so I reiterate that I do not look upon it as another step on the road to the introduction of a universal franchise, which I consider is entirely another matter and quite destructive to our present form of Government.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill, possibly to the surprise of many members. However, I have had long experience in negotiating on behalf of various people, and on this occasion I am negotiating on behalf of the people of South Australia.

I have always taken the attitude that half or even a quarter of a loaf is better than no bread, but I want to make it clear that I do not accept this Bill as the ultimate objective. In case I should be misunderstood, I want it placed on record that I totally oppose having a second House of Parliament within the State. I do not think a second House is necessary; I think it is overloading the State, and I think the will of the people should be accepted.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Is the honourable member talking about an Upper House in the State Parliament?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Not about the whole State Parliament?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. I am saying that there is no need for a second House in any State Parliament. I believe in the Queensland system.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In a sovereign Constitution it is more important to have a second House in the State Parliament than in the Commonwealth Parliament.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not speaking about sovereign rights; I am speaking of my own experience and observations. If any honourable member believes that a State second House is more important than the second House in the Commonwealth Parliament, I should like to hear him say so. I do not know how we would get on if the second Commonwealth House did not exist. I believe we should have full adult franchise as long as this Council exists. I do not think the Council is needed but, if it has to be with us, then its members should be elected on full adult franchise. I support this Bill simply because, as I said previously, a quarter loaf is better than no bread.

It would appear on the surface that the intention of the Bill is to double the number of people eligible to enrol for the Legislative Council, but it will not have that result. I do not think the numbers will be anywhere near doubled, because many single people and those eligible to register because of army service are now registered.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: In most newly developing areas houses are owned jointly.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, so I think the increase will be only about 50 per cent. I now deal with remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Geddes in this Chamber yesterday. I know I have not functioned properly this week, and I wondered whether it was time I resigned from this Parliament because perhaps I was

becoming silly. I had said that Western Australia and Victoria had full adult franchise, and somebody told me that it was different. My interpretation of "full adult franchise" is that every person over the age of 21 years is entitled to vote if he wants to.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Entitled to be enrolled.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, entitled to be enrolled. However, honourable members in this place said that Victoria and Western Australia were different. How in the name of goodness can there be a difference in full adult franchise?

I want to read an extract from yesterday's *Hansard* dealing with my comments and those of the Hon. Mr. Geddes. The honourable member was speaking about the Australian Labor Party gaining control by numbers in this Council and eliminating it. The following exchanges occurred:

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That does not necessarily follow. Western Australia did not give it away, and that is the latest example. Your argument is all "up a wattle"!

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In reply to the criticism of a difference in the method of electing members to the Upper Houses in Western Australia and Victoria, I agree, but let it be clearly understood—

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: They have full adult franchise.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I am not arguing adult franchise; I am speaking in support of the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We said that Western Australia and Victoria had adult franchise, and you said it was different.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: One wonders how one can explain clearly enough; one almost needs a blackboard and chalk.

At that stage, a Minister said, "You want a mallet to drive it home to them." I wonder who needs a blackboard and chalk, or a mallet, to know that full adult franchise means every person over 21 years of age is eligible to be enrolled. That is the position in Western Australia and Victoria. I agree that they have different boundaries, and that they are loaded. In our system, if we were to achieve full adult franchise, we would certainly have some loaded areas in country districts.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: If it were left to the Liberals they would be loaded!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, it would be at least two-to-one. I wondered yesterday whether I had become senile before my time, because I could not understand the arguments put by members opposite, who claimed that although Western Australia and Victoria had adult franchise it is different from ours.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is misrepresentation.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is typical of some of the misleading statements that have been made. I understand what adult franchise is, and I am sorry for the Hon. Mr. Geddes and the Minister of Agriculture.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Don't be: I can look after myself.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I try to be reasonable and to listen to other people's points of view, but when it is said that Western Australia and Victoria have an adult franchise different from ours, I wonder just who is silly!

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: The honourable member need not answer this but, if the voting age were reduced to 18 years, would he then be in favour of full adult franchise?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If the voting age were reduced to 18 years then I believe every person, irrespective of age, who has the right to vote for another place should have the right to vote for this Council also. I think that is clear and logical; I do not think anybody would need a chalk and blackboard to understand that.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I think I understand it!

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It is voluntary voting in Western Australia and Victoria, isn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, and I would like to see it here.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I said it was voluntary, not compulsory.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am sorry, I misheard the honourable member.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The honourable member got into the same bother yesterday.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I did not. The Minister and the Hon. Mr. Geddes said that, although Victoria and Western Australia had full adult franchise, it was different from here. That is recorded in *Hansard*. However, I do not want to debate this now. I want to make it crystal clear that I support this Bill because it is a step in the right direction, despite what the Hon. Mrs. Cooper says, towards the ultimate objective of full adult franchise for the Legislative Council. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper thinks it will never come, but I say it will. Public opinion will force it on this State ere long.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: Look at what happened in New South Wales.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The form of electing people to the Upper House in New South Wales is the worst I have ever heard.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: They do all right.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Better than an election.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The Government in power in the Lower House appoints members to the Upper House.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not want to take the matter any further. I think I have made myself clear. I do not think the State needs a Legislative Council but, if we are to have a Legislative Council, we should have adult franchise for it as we have for another place. I accept the Bill because it is a step towards what I believe will ultimately be accomplished in the State.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I congratulate the Leader on his wisdom in supporting this Bill. However, unlike him, I do not believe in a unicameral system of Government. The Hon. Mr. Shard may not have said that in so many words but he said he believed in the system operating in Queensland, a unicameral system. This Bill seeks to widen considerably the franchise for the Legislative Council. That being so, I am pleased to support it. If it is passed and becomes law, the franchise for the Legislative Council will be somewhat similar to, but not identical with, the franchise obtaining for the Upper House in Tasmania.

Each family unit in South Australia should be in a position to have a vote for the Legislative Council. This Bill sets out (in normal circumstances, at least) to provide a minimum of two votes for each family unit occupying a house or a self-contained flat—that is, where both parents are still living in their dwelling. This franchise is considerably wider than the franchise existing for local government in this State and many other areas of the world. Local government franchise has been described by people on both sides of politics; I believe, as being democratic and close to the people. The local government franchise does not give every person a vote for council elections, but it does give each ratepayer and most of the families living in the area a say in the local government system.

The franchise envisaged in this Bill is much wider than the local government franchise. The existing franchise for the Legislative Council is far wider than the local government franchise and has become progressively wider over the years, owing to the increasing value of property, to the extent that the provisions with regard to \$100 value for freehold and,

\$40 for leasehold have no longer any significant meaning or effect. Accordingly, this Bill seeks to remove the monetary restrictions and to provide for the spouses of Legislative Council voters who are already enrolled to be enrolled, too; for the broadening of the categories in respect of war service or active service; and for the enrolment of the spouses of people enrolled under the war service qualifications. The only restriction (if such it can be called) imposed by this Bill is in clause 2 (d), which amends section 20 (1) (iv) of the principal Act by restricting the dwelling to one situated in South Australia. This restriction probably should have been in the original Act, anyway.

I believe in a wide franchise for the Legislative Council. For that reason, I am pleased to support this Bill but I do not believe in an identical franchise for the two Houses of Parliament of any State or country. If we have an identical franchise, we shall tend to get the same situation in the two Houses; we shall tend to get a repetition of numbers in the two Houses and to establish one House as a "rubber stamp". Therefore, we shall not get the "second look" at legislation that we get by an Upper House not elected in that way. We are all human beings and do not, perhaps, always fully appreciate the value of a Parliament of two Houses; but a second House is needed. We need a House of Review, of second thought. To that extent, we should try to keep the Legislative Council in this State in that category. I believe sincerely that over the years we have had a considerable amount of objective thinking in this Council. Some honourable members may not agree that that has always been the case, but it has been in this Chamber to a considerable extent. I think many honourable members believe in enterprise, initiative and independence of thought. The only people who would not be really qualified to vote under these provisions would be the young people (and, possibly, those older people) who had not branched out in any way to get away from "mother's apron strings", as it were; who had not had the initiative to set themselves up in a self-contained flat or dwelling. They do not have to own the dwelling or the self-contained flat but anyone who does not own one, anyone without this qualification but who has the initiative and independence to get away from his parents' home and set himself up in a self-contained flat or dwelling, will, under the provisions of this Bill, be qualified to vote for both Houses of Parliament. I support this Bill, because I

believe it is a step in the right direction, as the Leader has said.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I was shocked by the way in which we came to deal with this Bill this afternoon, when other matters were ahead of it for discussion. It amazes me that we can rush in and deal with this measure so quickly. We have often heard in this Chamber about what goes on when legislation is rushed through. We talk about this place as being a House of Review, and say that we are here for the purpose of properly examining legislation, but this afternoon we have had a disgraceful exhibition of legislation by haste.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Didn't you alter the order of the Notice Paper when the Labor Government was in power?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We did not put Bills off to the same extent without even talking on them. This Bill is in the nature of a panic move. Its introduction has been brought about by the attitude of the ordinary people towards this Council's franchise. Even in their own Party rooms, where they have talks and conferences, prominent members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party supported the move for adult franchise, yet this Bill is being rushed along this afternoon. The fact that it extends the franchise to spouses of people enrolled is an effort to show people outside that some honourable members are prepared to go some part of the way towards appeasing those who are talking about electoral reform in this State.

Everyone knows that after the last election people took more interest in politics in this State; wherever people congregated they discussed the Constitution and this Council's franchise. I agree with what my Leader said; I will probably support this Bill because it will improve the present situation. When some Liberal members spoke on this Bill they talked about the threat of this Council's being wiped out. Isn't such talk an admission that, if the people of this State had the opportunity to vote on a fair basis, the majority of members of this Council would be Labor Party members? This is the fear of Liberal members, and this is what is behind this Bill's introduction.

The honourable members I have referred to think that, if this Council's franchise is changed to a full adult franchise, the same viewpoint will be put forward here as is put forward in another place. Let us not kid ourselves. When the L.C.L. is in power in

the Lower House and its Bills come to this Council, what happens? Some Liberal members who say they have a different viewpoint from that of the Party get up and talk that way and even go to the extent of voting against some Bills, but I notice that there are always enough honourable members voting for such Bills to ensure that they are passed.

Under the present set-up the L.C.L. will always have the numbers, irrespective of whether it is in Government in the Lower House. There is nothing to stop this Council's being a proper House of Review even if the franchise for the two Houses is similar. I am totally opposed to the type of restriction continued under the present Bill; indeed, I am totally opposed to any restriction on the voting for this Council, but I will probably vote for the Bill. I support full adult franchise.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support this Bill, which implements a promise given on the platform during the last election campaign.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It did not reach the headlines.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: It was mentioned during the election campaign by Party leaders and also by many honourable members of this Council.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Then, why didn't the Government, instead of a private member, introduce the Bill?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Contrary to what the Hon. Mr. Kneebone said a few minutes ago, this Bill's introduction was not a panic move; it has been in mind since the present Government took office.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It was in mind long before that.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The move was made to introduce it almost immediately on this Government's taking office. I support the principles of the Bill which, as the Hon. Jessie Cooper said, widens the franchise to include the spouses of those who are now eligible to vote. Because of financial and other circumstances women have to some extent been excluded from voting. There is nothing in the present franchise that excludes anyone because of sex or political Party but, because the property of a married couple is usually vested in the man, many women have been excluded. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone referred to this Council's purpose as a House of Review. He attacked this Council for passing without proper consideration Bills that had been received from another place. I

cannot remember all the Bills introduced during the Playford Government's term of office, but I can remember one particular Bill in respect of which five amendments were made, four of which were carried.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about conferences?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: In proportion to the number of Bills passed through the Houses, these have not varied very much, considering the number of Bills amended, the number rejected and the number laid aside. The Hon. Jessie Cooper gave very substantial reasons why an effective bicameral system can work only where there is some difference in the point of view between the two Houses. This Bill will give the vote to a large extent to the family unit. It removes the restriction that the minimum value of property owned must be \$100. If any honourable member checks the electoral rolls he will find that the majority of electors are householders. By extending the vote to spouses we will tend to make the franchise a household franchise. These are people who have an interest not only in the present but in the future of this State. They have the welfare of their families to consider, too. The State Parliament differs from that of the Commonwealth: the State Constitution is a fully autonomous one, whereas the Commonwealth is limited to the powers passed over by the States plus any others that it may be able to obtain through referenda. In the Commonwealth sphere the people are protected by the courts. Indeed, if the Commonwealth Government oversteps the Constitution the matter can be taken to the courts, as happened with the attempt to nationalize the banks. However, no such protection is afforded in the States. Indeed, the only protection that the people of this State are afforded as far as their rights and freedoms are concerned is that of a second House.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: And they don't all get this protection, do they?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes, they do.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Not all of them do.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I do not understand the interjection.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: They are not all represented here.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The Government is not elected through this House: it is elected in the House of Assembly on an adult franchise. The Legislative Council franchise is purely to elect a second House,

and has nothing whatever to do with the election of Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There are three Ministers here. Surely they are part of the Government.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: It has nothing to do with the election of a Government, which takes place in the Assembly, and the majority Party in the House of Assembly forms a Government. That has nothing to do with the Legislative Council franchise, and it is in the Assembly where Governments rise or fall.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Yet this Council has more power than the other House.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Further, the Constitution provides that if this Council is obstructive to legislation that is the will of the people, the Government in the Assembly can go to the people on the issue. Deadlock provisions are contained in the Constitution, and that issue is resolved again on an adult franchise: whether the people accept or reject the proposition. That is the protection they are given. If they did not have this second House, representing a different point of view, they could be forced by a dictatorial Executive to accept whatever measures it imposed on the people, and they would have no redress. It could happen that without the protection of the second House a dictatorial Executive could enforce its will and, even further, if that Executive took instructions from outside, the will of the people could not prevail.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: So you exercise your freedom and vote here in accordance with the North Terrace policy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The people don't seem to have done too badly in Queensland without a second House.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I could answer that if the Council did not mind being worried by a long and involved explanation of the circumstances. The people of Queensland did not vote for the abolition of the second House. A referendum was taken on it, and it was defeated. The Government of the day gained control of both Houses there and voted the second House out. We all know the history of Queensland since and there is no need to go into it in detail. Queensland is one of the wealthiest States in the Commonwealth as regards natural resources, but we know its position today. Much the same thing happened in New Zealand, too, and we realize its position today.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Look where England is today: stony broke!

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: New Zealand was a country mentioned by a member who interjected yesterday. He said it had abolished its Upper House. In New Zealand, in 1950, the National Government, which upon election had found itself confronted with a hostile Upper House, abolished that Chamber. Two years later, in 1952, the Constitutional Reform Committee set up by the Government reported as follows:

We are of the opinion that a second Chamber constituted in the manner recommended in this report and entrusted with the powers, duties and functions which are fully discussed herein, would give the people of the dominion a very desirable and useful institution in the political administration of a fully sovereign and united State such as New Zealand and that it would prove to be a practical and worthwhile alternative to the Legislative Council which was abolished by an Act of the New Zealand Parliament in the year 1950.

If one examines the position in the other great nations of the world, one will find that over 50 of them have used the bicameral system. Indeed, more than that number could be involved, because it is difficult to ascertain to which of the new African States this would apply, as their form of Government is inclined to vary. In addition, another 12 nations have at some time or another abolished their Upper Houses and have later reintroduced them. These include the great and progressive nations of the world, including such countries as England, France, America and Germany.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: When did England abolish its Upper House?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I have statements on that, if the honourable member wishes me to go through them. However, I do not intend to weary the Council by explaining why Oliver Cromwell and others found it necessary to reintroduce the second House.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But what have they done to the House of Lords?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: They have retained it, but that is not a fair comparison with this Council, because it is largely an hereditary House, though for political expediency, as happened recently, life peers have been appointed. The point I am making is that any attempt to weaken unduly the franchise of this Council is the first step towards its abolition, and that is admitted by the Leader.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I make no bones about that; I have said it repeatedly.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The A.L.P. intends to abolish this Council.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And 53 per cent of the people have supported us on that.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Whether it was 53 per cent, or perhaps 51 per cent, that voted for the Labor Party, wherever this matter was taken up at the last election that Party had its worst figures. Much has been said about the word "democracy" but, to be fair, I do not think it has been used by members of this Council. However, we see it used *ad nauseam* in the press when certain people refer to our Parliamentary system. I believe that the second House in South Australia is the only thing that can ensure that in the future we shall continue to have democracy.

It has been ably demonstrated by the Labor Party this afternoon (and I need go no further than those speakers) that it is its intention to abolish the second Chamber. But what other protection is left to the people with an autonomous constitution, if an autocratic Executive gains control in another place? The question of democracy has been mentioned repeatedly, particularly by one speaker, in the press, interstate, at universities and anywhere that one cares to mention. The Hon. Mr. Banfield said this afternoon that South Australia is looked on by the other States as a hillbilly State. This is true. I have knowledge of this myself. And why? Because this person has been speaking in other States on this same subject and rubbishing South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Telling people the facts.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This word "democracy" that has been used so freely is a Greek word. It goes back to a form of Government —

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Are you talking about Max Harris?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: No, I am talking about the Hon. Mr. Dunstan, who has had so much to say on this subject. The word "democracy" is a combination of two Greek words meaning "government" and "people". Ancient Greece was split up into large cities. The communication between those cities was very bad, and the people in them helped to govern the country, not through electing members but, as citizens, having a voice themselves. This was not extended to those in the country because of the lack of means of communication. Of course, we must remember that the citizens were only a proportion of the population.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It was a little in reverse to what we have here.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Certainly the country people had no say. As I was saying, this is where the word "democracy" was first used, and it has a wider meaning in these times. It is generally accepted that the word "democracy" means the widest personal freedom by which man has the liberty and equality of shaping his own career, and equality before the law. A democracy is often judged by the way in which it treats its minorities.

As I said, we have seen in the press and heard on the radio and particularly on television this word "democracy" used over and over again by Mr. Dunstan, the Leader in another place, who is the proponent of democracy. He sets himself up as the proponent and champion of democracy in this State.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That is nothing to be ashamed of.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I do not disagree with anybody setting himself up as a champion of democracy if he is sincere in what he is doing and if his reasons for making these statements are in the interests of the people and of the State. However, let us look at what Mr. Dunstan has done personally to further democracy in this State. I can remember two marches on Parliament House in an effort to use pressure tactics to alter legislation before the Legislature. It is only a matter of days ago that he was associated with a protest meeting which involved a strike to protest against the actions of the Executive.

Now is this democracy? Mr. Dunstan is also involved within the constitution of his own Party. This is not meant to be a criticism of the Australian Labor Party. However, we see Mr. Dunstan, who professes (this was in the press, and I have the article here in front of me) to believe in "government by the people of the people for the people". Mr. Dunstan, when he was the Premier of this State, took his directions on policy from the Party. We saw Trades Hall officers sitting in the President's Gallery of this Council and Ministers consulting with them on points brought up in this Council.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We saw leaders of your Party up in the gallery, too.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I was personally concerned in some of these negotiations. We saw a conference between the two Houses take place in this building when Trades Hall officers were outside in the corridor and Mr. Dunstan again consulted them. Is this government of the people for the people and by the people?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Aren't they entitled to put their views to their member?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: As far as "liberty and equality of shaping his own career" is concerned, does Mr. Dunstan believe in compulsory unionism or not, and does he deny that he believes that a man in possession of a union ticket should have preference in obtaining work? Is this equality of opportunity?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Mr. President, I think this is over the border. The honourable member is not talking to the Bill but is talking about a member of another place.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think the remarks are relevant to the Bill.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Mr. President, I come back to this matter of retaining democracy in this State. I believe that any attempt to weaken the franchise of this Council would be to the detriment of the State. I know that there are numbers of people who believe in the one-House system. There are also a number of people who have been influenced by some of these things that have been said outside, without knowing the full story. Then again we come to those who want to destroy our system for political expediency and to change the present Constitution radically in an attempt to gain absolute power.

Mr. President, if I have wandered from the subject of the Bill it is only to illustrate that at least some who are attacking this House and everything it stands for do not themselves practise the principles of democracy which they so freely discuss publicly. I support the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (4)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan (teller), A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard.

Noes (12)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, C. D. Rowe (teller), V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): Mr. President, I have no alternative now but to speak to this Bill, after witnessing this afternoon a flagrant violation of democracy, the exhibition of having a motion for an adjournment of this matter defeated in the way it has been defeated. At first, I intended to support the Bill because I think it is an improvement on the present situation but, because of the

exhibition we have just witnessed in this Chamber, even if I am the only one to do so, I shall vote against the Bill. I have heard a lot said this afternoon about democracy, but what it has to do with this Bill I do not know. In all the 17 years I have been in this Chamber, I cannot remember this procedure being adopted.

We were informed by the last speaker that this was a Government measure representing Government policy. I interjected and said, "Well, if it is, why was it left to a private member to introduce it instead of its being a Government Bill?" It is not a Government measure: it is purely and simply a private member's Bill—not that I am saying a private member has no right to introduce such a Bill. I am not complaining about the way in which it has been introduced here. However, we have seen Government business (not involving just one Bill) put off to the next sitting day, which is a day not usually provided for the consideration of private members' business, to enable this Bill to be disposed of. There seems to be much fear psychology attached to this measure. Why is it so important that the Bill should be disposed of this afternoon?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You know it and we know it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Of course. We saw a report in this morning's paper to the effect that notice had been given of a Bill dealing with the Constitution to be introduced in another place next Wednesday. That is apparently the reason for our rushing this measure through today. I object to this course, and I will vote against the measure because of the attitude of Government members in this place this afternoon. I repeat that I believe this measure is an improvement on the present situation relating to persons entitled to vote for the Legislative Council. However, because of the attitude of Government members, they have lost one supporter, anyhow, on the floor of the Council, although I know it will not make much difference to the result.

This reform has been introduced not only as a result of the advocacy of members of the Labor Party but also as a result of the advocacy of members of the Liberal Party. We know perfectly well that motions concerning this matter have been debated at L.C.L. conferences, at which the opinion has been expressed that something must be done about the present Legislative Council franchise provisions. The provisions contained in this Bill

were part and parcel of a measure introduced before Sir Thomas Playford retired from Parliament.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: In 1963-64.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It was in 1963.

That particular measure provided for a new Legislative Council district, including areas such as Modbury and Tea Tree Gully. The then Premier said that Labor would win this district, but this was merely one of the sops offered in order to perpetuate for a further 30 years the situation that had existed in this State over the past 30 years. However, there was no difference between what is contained in this Bill and the relevant provision in the Bill introduced in 1963. It seems to me that a move akin to a stampede has been made in relation to this matter. What is needed, of course, is a different set-up in the whole Parliament. I am convinced that the present Government will be defeated at the next election, whether it is held in two and a half years' time or sooner.

Many people who were notified of their eligibility for enrolment took advantage of the notification and enrolled. This practice of notification, which was carried out during the Labor Government's term of office, is in contrast to the old procedure where a person had to apply on polling day for a Legislative Council ballot paper. In some cases a person had to demand a ballot paper. However, the practice the Labor Government decided on was that, if a person was enrolled, the clerk should automatically hand him a ballot paper. In some areas the result of the last election has had a telling effect and unless something is done in connection with the boundaries there will be a chance of the L.C.L. losing the grip on this Council that it has had for many years.

This has been made plain this afternoon: this is the fear of Liberal members. They are assuming, as I am assuming, that the L.C.L. Government will be defeated at the next election. Those members want to ensure that, when the next Labor Government is in office, they will be able to do what they did during the term of office of the previous Labor Government. They want to exercise the power of veto that they previously exercised: this is what they want to hold on to. I wanted to consider the comments made in this Council this afternoon, and I therefore moved the adjournment of the debate, but this was refused. Consequently, even if I am the only member to do so, I will vote against this Bill, because of the attitude adopted by Liberal members.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I challenge the Government to tell us why it did not bring this Bill before the Council, instead of leaving it to a has-been backbencher, although I realize he has the right to introduce a Bill.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: At least he is not a "never-was".

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask for a withdrawal of that remark.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I take that remark as being offensive and I ask that the honourable member make a complete withdrawal.

The PRESIDENT: Because there was much talk across the Chamber I did not hear the remark. Will the honourable member tell me what the remark was, or will he give it to me in writing?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member said that I had never been capable of taking a part in this Council, and I ask for a withdrawal of the remark.

The PRESIDENT: I do not know that that would constitute a breach of Standing Orders and reflect on the character of the honourable member. However, if the Hon. Mr. Dawkins—

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Mr. President, the honourable member made what, to my mind, was a considerable reflection on somebody else, and he does this from time to time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are not far behind him.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I said that the honourable member was a "never-was" and, if that offends him, I will withdraw it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You called me "crook" once and never had the decency to apologize.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Then I apologize for that, too.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You will never be forgiven.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I realize that!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I might be many things, but I was never crook.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the honourable member to observe the rule of the Chair. If the Chair is to hear what is going on, there must be order.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He is like a red rag to a bull.

The PRESIDENT: I warn the honourable member.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Minister of Agriculture said that this Bill was Government policy and was mentioned in the election speech. If this was Government policy and was a promise made at the election, why was the Bill not introduced by a Minister? According to the report published the following morning, this was not mentioned in the policy speech. I now come to the question of the rush in this case. Is there some skulduggery going on about which we have not been told?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is as a result of a conference, one of the conferences that they say they do not have.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This platform which has been put up by the Party opposite states:

It is the Liberal and Country League's policy to maintain the Legislative Council because it stands against class legislation and guards against revolutionary, reactionary or hasty legislation.

The Bill was introduced into this Chamber and the second reading given on October 9. It was introduced by a private member and, according to past practice, Government business usually takes precedence of private members' business. However, today the Government gave way so that a private member's Bill could come before the Chamber.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That is not a bad effort for a has-been.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member did not bring this about: all he has done is to perpetrate the vicious scheme that was brought forward at the Liberal Party conference about which we read in the press. We did not read it in the press as a result of the press having been at the conference. The Australian Labor Party is the only political Party in Australia that opens its doors to the press. The only information we can get of what goes on at an L.C.L. conference is through a leak.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: By some of the disgruntled members.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes. However, apparently a bitter discussion took place between the Chief Secretary, who wants to retain his position in this place to the detriment of everybody having an opportunity to vote, and the Premier. The Chief Secretary knows that by retaining the present set-up he has a slight chance of retaining his position. The Premier is alleged to have said at the L.C.L. conference that he believes in an adult franchise for this Chamber. Will he dance to the tune of the people up on North Terrace

or, when this Bill goes to another place, will he be big enough to stand by what he says are his principles and vote to have the Bill amended to provide an adult franchise? It will be most interesting to see what happens.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Tell us what Mr. Cameron said at your conference.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There is no need for me to tell you, because the press was at our conference. Our conferences are open to the press and that is more than you can say in relation to your Party, because your conferences have never been open to the press other than at the mighty openings when provision is made for the photogenic people at the top. When you people open your conferences to the press you will not be—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Because the press is not admitted to L.C.L. conferences, the implication is that something suspicious has happened there. The provisions regarding the voting franchise for the Council have existed for many years. Today, within a week of the Bill's presentation here, we are asked to consider its provisions. Is that done to avoid something that may happen in the other place? Are members of the Government in this Council frightened that the people in the other place will consider the people of the State? The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan said that this place did not rubber stamp measures introduced by the Liberal Government. I challenged his statement and asked him how many conferences between the Houses took place when the L.C.L. was in Government previously, and he told me that, on an average, the number of conferences held during the term of office of the Labor Party was the same as the number held when the L.C.L. was in Government.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: I did not say that.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan said that the average number for the number of Bills would be about the same, that the average number of conferences for the number of Bills introduced by the L.C.L. was about the same as the average number of conferences on Bills introduced by the Labor Government.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: I did not—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order, and I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I asked the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan how many conferences took place, after he had said that this Council

did not rubber stamp every measure that came up from the Liberal Government in another place, and he gave that answer. Let us consider the facts. In the three years in which the Walsh-Dunstan Governments were in office, 228 Bills were passed by both Houses and seven Bills were rejected by this Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Can you name them?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: During that period 24 conferences between the two Houses were held, an average of more than one conference for every 10 Bills. Not three conferences were held during the previous three years, when the Liberal Government was in office. However, I suggest that more than 30 Bills were passed during that period.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: How many Bills were laid aside?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Interjections are not allowed, we were told.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Mr. President, the honourable member knew well when he gave that answer that he was telling an untruth, or else he knew nothing about the position.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I withdraw that statement, if the honourable member did not know the true position.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should not cast reflections on another honourable member.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan may not have known that he was telling an untruth when he gave those figures, but the figures he gave were not correct and they would have misled the Council if we did not know the correct figures, which showed that he was totally wrong about the number of conferences held over the six-year period.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: You check with *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have already checked with *Hansard*, but we do not have to do that to find out how many conferences were held. We have a capable and most competent Clerk at the Table, in whom we have full confidence, and these are the figures supplied by that officer. *Hansard* does an exceptionally good job, too, and does it equally as well as the Clerk does his job, but it is not *Hansard's* job to keep a record of the number of conferences between the two Houses. That is a matter for the Clerk, and he has done it well and has given figures that were available to the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan in the same way as they were available to me. This Bill

increases the number who will be eligible for Legislative Council enrolment but it still disfranchises many people. Some honourable members have said that, because a person's name is on the roll, he is a responsible person. Let us consider the position as it was before the last election, when the Chief Justice of this State was not eligible to vote for the election of members to this Council.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Yes, he was.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Chief Justice was not eligible to vote for the election of members to this Council, because he did not own property. Honourable members say that this is not a responsible person, that he should not have the right to vote for the election of this Council! They say he can vote when he owns a house: perhaps the Hon. Mr. Hill sold him one recently and then he became eligible. This Bill will still debar from enrolment people who are in a similar position to that of the Chief Justice. However, it opens the door to a person who may be the alcoholic husband of a woman who has struggled for years to rear her children and pay the rent. That is the effect of the Bill brought forward by the Hon. Mr. Rowe. Can that honourable member convince this Council or the people that an alcoholic is more entitled to a vote than is a person who, although he does not own property, may be a professor at a university? Is the professor less entitled to a vote than is the drunken husband? Further, is he less responsible than the drunken alcoholic to whom the Hon. Mr. Rowe wants to give a vote for the election of members to the Legislative Council?

In actual fact, this Council is no more a House of Review than is the other place. About one-third of the total number of Bills introduced in this Parliament are introduced in this Council and reviewed by another place. Are those measures being reviewed by irresponsible people? This Council cannot be claimed to be only a House of Review, because the House of Assembly reviews our Bills. Every measure passed in this Council affects every member of the community. Therefore, every member of the community should have the right to choose his representative. Honourable members of this Council have been elected by fewer than 25 per cent of the people of South Australia, and those honourable members are considering legislation that affects every person in the State, including those who have not the right to vote at Legislative Council elections. This Bill does not go far enough. If compulsory

voting is good enough for another place, why not for this place? If it is good enough to elect members of the popular House by compulsory vote, it is good enough to elect members of this Council in the same way.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think vice versa would be better.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That shows how the Chief Secretary's mind works. He wants to be elected by a minority of the people. He is not interested in how he gets here, and the Government is also in power by the will of the minority. We hear about Government members in another place having been elected by 43 per cent of the people, but members of this Council have been elected by fewer than 25 per cent of the people. Nevertheless, the Chief Secretary is quite happy to continue along that line. He was quite content to cause a donnybrook on North Terrace to ensure that his views were approved at the conference there. It is the Labor Party's policy to have full adult franchise, and I am sure that after this Bill has been debated in another place it will return to this Council with that provision included.

Why open the gate to only three-quarters of the people? Why not give the Chief Justice a vote when we allow a drunken husband to have one? This Bill should have been introduced by the Government and not by a private member. Apparently, if it is defeated the Government will only blame the private member, but nothing else will be done. If the introduction of this Bill had been included in the Government's election promises it would have been introduced in another place in the same way as the present electoral reform Bill was introduced. However, the Government did not intend to introduce this Bill, but gave the Hon. Mr. Rowe the task of putting it through.

I hope that he is late for his 5 o'clock appointment today. Government members raved on for three-quarters of an hour about the Labor Party's policy, but they were not prepared to let us speak on this Bill. They allowed the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan to get away with criticizing what the Labor Party had done for electoral reform, and hoped that the debate would then collapse. The action of the Government in not allowing us to consider this Bill fully is appalling. We have not had a proper opportunity to consider it, and this action is unprecedented in this Chamber for a private member's Bill. I hope that we will

not be subjected to this treatment in the future. Because the Bill goes part of the way towards our objective, I am prepared to support it.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I thank members for the attention they have given to this Bill and for their indication that it will be unanimously supported.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not right.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It has been indicated otherwise.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: With some decent tactics you could have had a unanimous vote.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I intended to say that, although it was not unanimously supported, only one honourable member, for reasons that he indicated, will not support it. If I am wrong, he can correct me, but I understand that he supports its principles but, for other reasons, will not support the Bill. The Bill has been debated in this Chamber for eight days and, except for the honourable member to whom I have referred, it has received unanimous support.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It can't be unanimous if there's one exception.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: It has received almost unanimous support in its content and, therefore, there is no justification for any undue delay in its passage. As a private member I realize that the time to debate private members' business is excluded as the session goes on.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It has never been excluded in the history of this Chamber.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Normally, but it is the responsibility of private members to complete their business as quickly as possible. I thank those honourable members who have contributed to the debate and I thank those who have promised support for the Bill. Principally, the effect of the Bill is to extend the franchise of people who are entitled to vote for this Council to the spouse of a person who already has the right to vote. I described this myself as converting the franchise of the Council into a family franchise; in other words, the heads of every family, almost without exception, will be entitled to vote for this Council.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Hon. Mr. Dawkins raised an interesting point to which he did not appear to know the answer: what is the position of three or four girls who rent a flat between them?

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I did not raise the point.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You said a girl only had to go to a flat.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not think I can give a categorical statement on that, and I would not want to make one that could be misleading. As I understand it, if they have a completely self-contained flat they are entitled to a vote.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What about if three or four girls share a flat and share the rent equally?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I do not know; I cannot give an exact answer on that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You introduced this Bill hastily without knowing what it meant.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: We are trying to establish that the heads of the family will be responsible for voting for this Council, which has limited powers in what it can do with regard to the Government of the State. In many areas we do accept the responsibility of the heads of the family, who have to carry a greater responsibility than other people. For my own part, I adopt the argument that once a person becomes married, he has by force of circumstances to take a more responsible view because he has a family to consider, he is more mature in his judgment, more experienced in his outlook, and he thinks about these things with a greater degree of responsibility. In these circumstances, I think we are getting a more mature judgment.

I asked the Leader during his speech whether he would indicate to me what his view would be if we reduced the voting age to 18, about which I think there is some proposal in another place at the present time. His answer to that was that if the voting age was 18 he would be agreeable for people to vote for this House when they were 18 years of age. I am one of those people who believe that a person is much more mature at 21 than at 18, and I was very interested to see the result of the Gallup poll the other day which showed that the majority of people thought that a requirement that a person should be 30 years of age before he became a member of Parliament was a wise provision.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There should be a limit at the other end, too.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am quite happy to agree to a limit at the other end.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Then you're gone.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The point I make about this is that I think the people of this State would favour the retention of a family

franchise on the basis of this Bill, and I also think that if this matter was tested at a referendum this is the answer we would get.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I disagree with you there.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The Leader is entitled to his own opinion, but I am expressing mine. I say that because of what happened in New South Wales.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Are you talking now about voting at the age of 18?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: No, I am talking about the abolition of the Council and about what the people would do if they were asked to vote on whether we should maintain the franchise as proposed by my Bill as opposed to a full adult franchise. The Upper House in New South Wales is not an elected House but a nominated House, and a nominated House must, of necessity, be a more exclusive House than this House. I use the word "exclusive" in the sense that the people nominated to it are nominated to represent particular interests. Notwithstanding that New South Wales had a nominated House, notwithstanding the terrific campaign that went on by the Government and through all the mass media to have the House abolished, and notwithstanding that this campaign went on over a period of several years, the net result was that when the question was put to the people they voted by a very large majority to retain what is a nominated House and a very much more restricted House than this one.

We tend to be sidetracked in coming to our opinions because of what is said and done through the mass media. Because we see pictures of violent demonstrations on the television screen and because we read about them, we tend to think that they represent the majority opinion. My attitude on this matter was considerably widened when I saw the situation that arose in France. Recently, there developed in France a situation where we were almost led to believe that the people had reached a point of anarchy and that the Government was in serious trouble and likely to be overthrown. However, we discovered that, when the people had a chance to express their opinions at the ballot box, the result was that the Government received an overwhelming mandate, notwithstanding that it had been in power for a considerable time.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is more than the Playford Government got.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Because we hear and see certain things said and done by people through the mass media, we get the wrong idea about these things. Over the last few years particularly, the value of this Council to the State has become more appreciated by a larger section of the community. I have no fears that if this matter was considered by a referendum—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is, the abolition of the Legislative Council?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: No—the franchise I am proposing, as opposed to a full adult franchise.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You may lose more votes the way you are going.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Be that as it may, I do not now want to go into the arguments fully. I want to establish a family franchise, which has much merit. In many other spheres there is a restriction on people having expressions of opinion on these matters, particularly in local government. For instance, in many church organizations (which are concerned not so much with material as with spiritual affairs) there is greater control and restriction. Because, with the one exception I have mentioned, there is no opposition in this Council to this Bill, I do not feel it is necessary for me to speak any longer. I thank honourable members for their support and sincerely hope that the Bill will be passed.

The PRESIDENT: It is necessary for the second reading to be carried by an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the Council. I have counted the Council as required by Standing Order No. 282, and, there being present an absolute majority, I put the question:

That this Bill be now read a second time. There being a unanimous vote, I declare the motion carried in the affirmative by an absolute majority.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.46 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 22, at 2.15 p.m.