

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, July 16, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

GEPPS CROSS SALE YARDS

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of yesterday about a letter I had written to him concerning the condition of the Gepps Cross sale yards?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is routine practice for all correspondence received in my office to be acknowledged, at least formally, and if the honourable member did not receive an acknowledgment of his letter I apologize to him. I assure him, however, that his representations were not overlooked, and a report from the Director of Agriculture on this matter was received in my office yesterday; it indicated that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board had replied direct to the honourable member in response to a similar letter that apparently he had directed to the board. I am informed that the board assured him that everything would be done to correct the deficiencies of which his constituents had complained. Since then it has achieved a high degree of success in effecting the satisfactory cleansing of the receival yards, at some considerable cost to the board, and it is making every effort to overcome problems in this regard arising from irregular deliveries of stock to the yards.

MEAT STANDARDS

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Agriculture any further information in reply to my question of yesterday about the crutching of sheep prior to their sale at the Metropolitan Abattoirs?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes; this morning the Director of Agriculture gave me some further information on this important matter. As I explained yesterday, the system has been changed recently; the change took place during the time I was attending a meeting of the Agricultural Council. I was not informed until yesterday, when the honourable member asked his question, that this was so. However, this morning I was informed by the Director that an officer of the department was at Gepps Cross yesterday to see exactly how the scheme was working. Apparently there are four ways in which the

scheme will work. First, sheep that are not crutched will be rejected outright. Secondly, a warning will be given in respect of a particular line of sheep showing stains, etc. Thirdly, there will be complete rejection on the grounds of sheep not being emptied out. Apparently this was one of the main troubles noticed yesterday, namely, that farmers or graziers sending their sheep into the abattoirs were not leaving enough time for the sheep to be emptied out. This was causing the yards to become dirty. In those cases, there will be complete rejection. The last one comes under the heading of "not satisfactory". This is very similar to the warning that is given under the second category. Nevertheless, the officer informed me that only five per cent of the yarding was affected under these four categories, and he considers that the way in which the scheme will work will be beneficial to the industry generally.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I listened with considerable interest to the reply given by the Minister regarding the condition of sheep at the abattoirs, and I fully approve of most of the measures suggested. I understood him to say that the first remedy that could be applied was the complete rejection of any sheep that were not crutched. Surely this could not apply to sucker lambs in sample condition and absolutely clean. Surely it is not suggested that for export purposes these lambs would have to be crutched. Can the Minister explain that?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Whilst I did use the term "sheep" I did not use the term "lambs". I do not suppose it would ever apply to lambs in the answer I gave. Nevertheless, this matter has been brought forward by the people vitally interested in it—the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board, the Stock-owners Association, the United Farmers and Graziers, the Fat Lamb Producers, and others. In view of the question, I will get a more detailed analysis of the situation and bring down a report for the honourable member on the situation relating to all types of sheep and lambs.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: As I understand that the Minister has further information at his disposal, I shall be pleased if he would give it.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Perhaps we can clear up this matter of sheep and lambs without waiting until after the weekend before the honourable member gets a reply. The onus is definitely on the producer to ensure that sheep and lambs are crutched or shorn on the inside of each leg to the hock and on and under the tail very soon before marketing. This does not necessarily mean the day before or even a few days before sale, but the onus is on each producer to comply by marketing absolutely clean stock, and this is always difficult in winter. This has been brought about by the recent embargo on our mutton shipments to the United States of America. The Gepps Cross abattoirs management is immediately examining plans to redesign the sheep stocking pens and approaches to each chain to enable, if possible, crutching at the point of slaughter. This would take months to become operative, however, so in the meantime the producers have no option but to comply with these conditions of sale. They can be reviewed at any time, but it is absolutely vital to regain very soon the North American mutton market or sheep prices for slaughter could collapse later in the season.

CLEVE VETERINARY OFFICER

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Earlier this year the stock inspector from Cleve was shifted to Jamestown, leaving Cleve without any qualified stock officer. I understand the department intends shifting the stock inspector now resident in Port Lincoln to Cleve. These gentlemen over the years have given valuable assistance to the area, more especially in view of the fact that veterinary officers are very scarce in the country. However, their ability to assist with animal husbandry is limited. Cleve and the surrounding districts for many years have relied largely on the very good offices of Mr. Rayson and Mr. Crosby who, although not qualified veterinary officers, are licensed. These gentlemen have made an outstanding contribution to the welfare of stock on Eyre Peninsula. However, they are ageing and the demand is increasing. As there is no stock inspector at Cleve at present (although I believe he is to be replaced), will the department consider stationing a veterinary officer at Cleve in lieu of a stock inspector or, preferably, having both?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be only too happy to take up this matter with the department. I assure the honourable member that to my knowledge, anyway, veterinary people are very difficult to come by, even today, and I think it will be very difficult to comply with the honourable member's request. However, we will do all we possibly can to assist in the matter. I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

ROAD SURFACING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I was reading in a journal a few days ago that in the London metropolitan area a certain anti-skid surface is being sprayed on the roads, which has led to a decrease of up to 87 per cent in the accident rate on roads that have been sprayed. Is this chemical being used in South Australia and, if not, will the Minister make some investigations about the benefit to be gained by its use?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will pass on the question to my colleague and find out whether this chemical is being used in South Australia.

ADELAIDE HIGH SCHOOLS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education. As reports indicate that the Adelaide Boys High School and the Adelaide Girls High School will be merged in 1973 and that the amalgamation will take place at the Adelaide Boys High School, will the Minister say whether it is proposed that any further Education Department buildings will be built on the park lands?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague.

PRAWNING LICENCES

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Just before going out of office I announced that we would issue 12 more prawning licences in South Australia. Can the Minister tell me whether any action has been taken?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No. The issuing of further licences has not been done at this juncture. I issued instructions for the Director of Fisheries, Mr. Olsen, who is going to Port Lincoln tomorrow, to put a proposition before the fishermen over there for the issuing of new

licences for the prawning industry. If the fishermen are agreeable to the suggestions, I see no reason why they should not be issued. I assure the honourable member that the situation is well in hand and it should not be very long before these new licences are issued.

MINING LEASES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I wish to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Recently, a resolution came before the Australian Labor Party annual conference, originating from the Port Augusta branch, demanding an inquiry into all special mining leases issued by the Liberal and Country League Government over the past two years. This resolution was given considerable publicity in the press and, in my opinion, cast certain doubts on the policy and the integrity of the Minister and the officers of the Mines Department. Can the Chief Secretary, as the senior Minister in this Council, say whether the Government will immediately ask the Auditor-General to inquire into all special mining leases issued during that period—indeed, the period can be the past five years if the Government likes—so as to allow the inferences contained in this resolution to be inquired into and a report made to Parliament?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to refer the question to the Premier in his portfolio of Minister of Mines.

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, tell me the present situation concerning the control of flammable material used for clothing, especially that used in the manufacture of children's night attire?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be happy to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain a reply.

GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In June, the Government announced that it was setting up a secretariat comprising three young graduates from the Public Service and that the decision to establish this secretariat followed the

arrangement to appoint a press officer to each of the nine Ministers. The announcement said that these officers would receive between \$3,000 and \$8,000 a year and the Premier said that we needed a group outside particular Government departments who would study the working of particular departments, and he mentioned two departments that would be involved. I believe there have been some misgivings within the Public Service as a result of this announcement because it is not understood just what the role or powers of the secretariat will be. In order to overcome some possible misunderstandings regarding the scope of the work of the appointees, I ask: to which departments will these appointees be attached; who will be their senior officers; and what is envisaged as their exact work and responsibilities?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question, which I appreciate, is deep and important. Although I know something about the question, I think this is really a Premier's Department matter. I think it would be better for me to obtain a detailed reply to the whole question rather than my talking about it in general terms and perhaps saying something that was not correct. If the position is worrying the Public Service (and this is something nobody wants to do), I would rather obtain a considered reply and bring it down as soon as possible.

CRAYFISHING INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government has any plans to correct the continuing decline in the crayfish catch in South Australia, particularly in the South-East? If the Government has such plans, what are they?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Only one plan could correct the situation—a plan for breeding more crayfish. It has been claimed that there are hot lines to realms above, but I assure the honourable member that I do not have any. Because crayfish catches have been declining for several years, no more crayfish licences have been issued. At present there is nothing more that we can do except to hold the number of licences at its present level. If anyone wants to leave the industry he can do so. The fact is that the crayfish are just not there. Here is another example of a lack of research into fishing resources in the Commonwealth. As time goes on, we hope that the situation will be improved as a result of more research being carried out.

FATAL ACCIDENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On June 26 in Glynburn Road, Tranmere, there was an extremely unfortunate tragedy in which a schoolboy died. Press reports indicate that he may have touched an electricity pole under the control of the Electricity Trust. Naturally, this accident has caused considerable public disquiet. Is the Minister of Agriculture able to make a statement concerning this matter and, if he is not, will he obtain from the Minister of Works a report about it as soon as possible?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 15. Page 34.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): In rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as drafted, I should first like to express the regret of all honourable members that his Excellency the Governor, because of his convalescence from a recent illness, was unable to perform the opening ceremony. I think we all agree that, since assuming his high office in South Australia, His Excellency has endeared himself to all sections of the South Australian public. Both he and Lady Harrison have carried out their tasks with dignity and skill. I am sure all honourable members wish him a speedy recovery to complete health. At the same time, we were privileged to listen to the Governor's Deputy, Sir Mellis Napier, opening Parliament. One may describe Sir Mellis as the grand old man of South Australia who has carved for himself a unique position in South Australian history. I do not know how many times we have been privileged in this Council to have Parliament opened by Sir Mellis but it must be many times.

I congratulate the Government on its assumption of office, and I congratulate the three Ministers who are members of this Council on their selection for the Ministry. Both the Hon. Mr. Shard and the Hon. Mr. Kneebone have been Ministers previously; both acquitted themselves well in their portfolios. The Hon. Mr. Casey, of course, comes to this Council as a new member; as majority Leader in this Council I extend a warm welcome to him. At the same time I remind him that this Council is a good deal different from the House of Assembly in several ways, and I warn

him that the standards are also somewhat different in this Council.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You do not need to warn me: I am well aware of that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Hon. Mr. Casey will have to know his legislation thoroughly, because the major role of this Council is to expose all legislation to critical scrutiny. I am sure that the Hon. Mr. Casey will fit into the spirit of this Council. I, like some other honourable members, have read the speeches he has made in the House of Assembly, and we have noted his references to the two-House system. The only conclusion one can reach is that the Hon. Mr. Casey possesses the qualities and beliefs necessary to enable him to fulfil his role very well in this Council.

I suppose I cannot leave this part of my speech without referring to our friend, the Hon. Mr. Banfield. One can express some disappointment that the honourable member, after his service in this Council, still remains on the back benches. I remind him that he, being on the back benches with so many other honourable members, is in very good company. Of course, we all realize that there must always be disappointments in connection with selecting a Ministry. The Hon. Mr. Banfield came into this Council as something of a stormy petrel. He came with his political base firmly established in the trade union movement, and he still debates most questions with what one may term a Yarra bank brand of oratory.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: "Botanic Park" would be a better description.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is a higher standard than that, but we do detect a mellowing of attitude in the Hon. Mr. Banfield that can only make him a more effective member of this Council. In any case, we all have a very high regard for the honourable member and for his very earnest approach to his task in this Council. We look forward to a continued mellowing of his political approach.

I cannot leave this part of my speech, either, without referring to a gentleman who is no longer a member of this Council. I refer to the Hon. Stan Bevan, a member of very long standing in this Council and an ex-Minister. I do not think I can say with all honesty that the retirement of the Hon. Mr. Bevan was entirely his choice. I know I speak with the agreement of all honourable members in expressing the genuine regard we all had for him. I express regret that this Council does not now have the benefit of his experience and

his long service on the Ministerial benches in this Council.

All honourable members here have their own political views, and those views vary from member to member. However, our duty goes well beyond loyalties to Party politics. I do not look upon members of the Australian Labor Party in this Council as political enemies any more than I look on Liberal and Country League members in this place as political allies. Indeed, on looking back I can say that the Hon. Stan Bevan was in all respects a political friend, one who could be trusted absolutely to advise and help if he could, as an individual, in this Chamber. I know I express the wish of all members here when I say that I hope that the honourable member, with his good wife, will enjoy his retirement from active political life.

Whilst speaking on that question, Mr. President, I cannot let this opportunity pass without mentioning the retirement from the House of Assembly of the Honourable Tom Stott. No matter how one might feel about Tom Stott, one must agree that he was a remarkable figure on the political scene in South Australia. He held the seat of Ridley for 37 years as an Independent and, although I am not certain that I am correct in this, I assume that this is probably a record term for an Independent member in the British Commonwealth. He held this seat against all attempts to wrest it from him.

Recently, Mr. Stott made certain comments to South Australian newspapers. Although I do not entirely agree with all the statements attributed to him in the newspaper articles, I believe that some matters call for comment. Mr. Stott said that some L.C.L. members had been anxious to kill the image of Sir Thomas Playford to gain for themselves public acceptance of a public image. I believe that in saying that he was right, because not only has the Australian Labor Party over a period of years attempted to kill the image of one of the greatest South Australians of all time, but in that attempt it has been aided and abetted by certain L.C.L. members. Of course, one can understand the A.L.P. attempting to kill the image of Sir Thomas Playford. I believe that what Tom Stott said in that newspaper article was correct: certain people wished to kill the image of Sir Thomas Playford because they thought it had to be destroyed so that they themselves could acquire an image.

I could mention many examples of this two-pronged attack on the image of a person

I believe to be one of the greatest South Australians of all time. In respect of one of these attacks on Sir Thomas Playford, there seems to be almost a public acceptance of the label that has been pinned to him. I refer to this now well-worn label of "gerrymander". This tag that has been applied to Sir Thomas by the A.L.P. for political purposes (I do not blame it for that, because that is its role) has been taken up by political writers and the news media to the point where I believe the public now accepts as factual that Sir Thomas deliberately gerrymandered the political system in South Australia and clung to office year after year with a minority vote. This view has been fostered by the A.L.P., and I understand why it has fostered it; but also it has been fostered by certain L.C.L. members for the same reason, namely, the dream of gaining personal political power.

I believe this question should be examined more fully and carefully and the facts placed before the public in an unbiased fashion. I have spoken on this matter previously and put forward a correct and factual picture, and I intend to do so again today. In 1936, the then Government set up an independent commission to redistribute electoral boundaries for the House of Assembly in accordance with certain principles. The terms of reference were: first, the preservation of the then existing ratio between metropolitan and country districts; secondly, the retention in each district of a quota of voters as evenly balanced as possible in districts of a similar category; and, thirdly, the recognition of a community of interest in the drawing of those boundaries.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Sir Thomas Playford was only a back-bencher in those days, was he not?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is true. Over many years in South Australia, even from 1856, when responsible Government first came to this State, there has been a series of Royal Commissions and Select Committees that have reported, and each one has agreed that in South Australia it would be undemocratic to have equal population in each district. Over the years from 1936 to the present time, after that redistribution, electoral statistics must be treated with extreme caution because of the large number of uncontested seats in any South Australian election. Therefore, the figures that I will now give use the results obtained at the Commonwealth election closest to the State election in all uncontested districts and in those districts where one of the major Parties did not contest the election. For example, where

there was an A.L.P. candidate and a Communist candidate, one could not say the vote was a true A.L.P. or Liberal vote. The figures I shall give as a result of my research show the true picture in South Australia. In 1938, the L.C.L. polled 83,413 votes, the A.L.P. 76,093 votes, and the other Parties, including Independents, polled 65,780 votes. In other words, in 1938 the A.L.P. had a 34 per cent vote. I will not quote votes any longer: I will quote just the percentage of the A.L.P. vote, which is the important factor. In 1941 the A.L.P. once again had a 34 per cent vote; in 1944 it had a 43 per cent vote; in 1947, a 40 per cent vote; in 1950, a 40 per cent vote; in 1953, a 43 per cent vote; and, in 1956, a 46 per cent vote. Reid and Hetherington of the Politics Department of Adelaide University (and one cannot say that they would be at all biased towards the L.C.L. viewpoint) in their book *South Australian Elections 1959*, doing the same exercise, produce the following figures indicating Party support: L.C.L., 45 per cent support; A.L.P., 48 per cent support; D.L.P., 5 per cent support; Communist, .5 per cent support; and Independent, 1.3 per cent support.

So we see that right from 1938 to 1959, a period of 21 years, at no stage on a percentage vote with preferences allotted would the A.L.P. have won an election in South Australia. Yet we are constantly hearing this publicity. There has been talk about the Playford image being a loser of the election. I believe that the Playford image, if it played any part at all in the election, was a Playford image projected to the people by the A.L.P. and by certain L.C.L. members for their own personal political gain. In all the figures I have given I have resolved doubtful cases in favour of the A.L.P. and have overlooked the fact that in the period from 1938 to 1959 the Playford Government in every case did better than the Commonwealth Government. So, I have been conservative and have leaned towards the A.L.P. in presenting these figures.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Could you give us the 1965 State figures, when all seats were contested?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes; I can do that quite well. In 1965—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Running from 1962 to 1965 and 1968.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will give the 1965 figures, because they were the best figures.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What is wrong with 1962; is that getting a bit close?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No; the 1965 figures were the best figures ever put up by the A.L.P. in South Australia. The correct figures for the 1965 election are (to the nearest whole figure): L.C.L., 44 per cent; A.L.P., 52 per cent; D.L.P., 1.6 per cent; Country Party, .4 per cent; Independent, 1.1 per cent; Social Credit, .8 per cent; and Communist, .3 per cent. If we look at those figures and allot preferences as one would expect them to go, we find that it was probably a 53 per cent A.L.P. vote and a 47 per cent L.C.L. vote. If one transfers those percentages to the actual representation in the House, one sees that the A.L.P. with a 53 per cent vote returned 55 per cent of the members and the L.C.L. with a 47 per cent vote returned 45 per cent of the members, which shows this development of the killing of an image of a man.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: In what year did you have a 53 per cent vote and were not able to govern?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This has not occurred with either the A.L.P. or the L.C.L. in South Australia because—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It occurred when the A.L.P. had a 50 per cent vote.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: —the A.L.P. had never had a 53 per cent vote until the 1965 election, which gave it the best result it had ever had.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What about the percentage of the vote in 1968? We had 52 per cent, but did not govern.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is quite true, but once again—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I do not want to interject but I do not think some of your figures are correct, especially those when Mr. O'Halloran was the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I give the Chief Secretary a complete guarantee that my figures are correct, and I have leaned towards the A.L.P. to be completely fair.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You did not tell us how many uncontested seats there were.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I want to destroy this nonsense, this propaganda that has been put forward by the A.L.P. for its own political ends and by other members for their own personal political gain, that for year after year and election after election the Playford Government held office in South Australia without a majority of votes. That statement is complete and absolute nonsense. When one examines this critically, one finds that there is no case that can be made out to accuse

Playford of gerrymandering. There was 40 years of Labor rule in Queensland. If we want to see what a gerrymander looks like, let us look at what the A.L.P. did in Queensland during that period, where that Party would probably still be in office if the Q.L.P. had not broken away. That is why the A.L.P. was defeated. If we want to see what a gerrymander looks like, let us look at Queensland, which abolished the Upper House in 1921. In that State areas were connected by a corridor to gain extra seats and, if my memory serves me correctly, we find that the Government there retained office on about a 35 per cent vote. From 1936 to 1959, on the percentage of votes cast compared with members of Parliament serving in the House of Assembly, the A.L.P. should never have governed in South Australia; yet Playford has been branded with this unwarranted tag of "gerrymander". I do not mind if the argument is against the principle of some country loading: that is fair argument. I come out firmly, as every democratic country does, for some reasonable and adequate loading for country districts. No-one can convince me or the Supreme Court of the United States or the British House of Commons that this so-called one vote one value has any validity.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I do not know that you can convince us that there has not been a gerrymander.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: The honourable member said that there was a gerrymander but that it was not a Playford gerrymander.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I never had any intention of trying to convert the Hon. Mr. Banfield, but at least I hope that the correct picture will be got over to the public of South Australia and that this unwarranted tag that has been thrust upon Sir Thomas Playford will be dispensed with.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: All you are saying is that Playford did not gerrymander; you are not saying that there was not a gerrymander, are you?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am saying that there never was a gerrymander in South Australia, and the figures prove that. Let us come to the present situation. For the first time in South Australia for many years we have a Party with a little (not very much) over 50 per cent of the votes controlling almost 60 per cent of the seats in the House of Assembly. This is the biggest gap between percentage of votes received and number of members in our history since 1936.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Except for the Commonwealth voting last time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: And some people talk about a gerrymander!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There's a similar set-up in the Legislative Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: At this stage, we are not considering the Legislative Council. All I am doing is demolishing what I believe to be a dishonest impression given to the public of South Australia (created by the A.L.P. for political purposes, and adopted by some of our own L.C.L. members for their own personal political benefit) and a tag that I believe is unwarranted as far as this man is concerned. But the adoption, as in Great Britain and America, of some loading for country areas has absolutely nothing to do with the question of gerrymander. As I said, if one wishes to have a good look at what a gerrymander looks like, he should look at the Queensland system under 40 years of A.L.P. rule. Then the Hon. Mr. Banfield would understand what a gerrymander looks like.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We've been through it; we know it.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: There was an attempt in 1966, as I recall it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There was an attempt then. I recall the Hon. Mr. Dunstan saying, when the present distribution came through which has resulted in almost 60 per cent of the seats being controlled by 50 per cent of the votes, that that, once again, was a gerrymander and that this distribution was not fair: he said this was another gerrymander in favour of the L.C.L. As I pointed out, with a shade over 50 per cent of the votes, the A.L.P. is controlling about 60 per cent of the seats in the House of Assembly. I present this case for the second time in this Council, with figures I can guarantee are accurate.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: After deleting certain districts. You doctored them up.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I again refer to the statement of Reid and Hetherington. Again I point out that I do not think the honourable member would claim that their statement was biased towards the L.C.L. They said that they accepted the principle—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It was a factual statement.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I accept it as being that. They said that in South Australia merely to add up the votes cast for the A.L.P. and the L.C.L. would not give a true picture because in a number of districts there was no candidate standing for one of the Parties and

therefore the two Parties in those districts were not in conflict. The only way in which one can get a true picture of the position is to substitute in those seats the nearest Commonwealth election figures. These figures over the years favour the A.L.P. in South Australia. This is what is being done, and it is the only way that a reasonable figure can be achieved. I present this case for the second time in this Council because I believe that a man who has given outstanding and sterling service to South Australia should at least retire from politics to his apple orchard in the Adelaide Hills without a tag being stuck on him that he does not deserve.

I wish to give this assurance to the Ministry and the Ministers of South Australia: this Council will continue to act as it always has acted, with co-operation to the Government of the day to formulate legislation in the best interests of all South Australians. One still reads in the press references to a "hostile Legislative Council"; that is a term that I do not understand. Of course, the Legislative Council has been hostile over the years, irrespective of the colour of the Government in the House of Assembly, at various times. It has been hostile on many issues. If one analysed the Hon. Mr. Kneebone's speech yesterday it could be seen that he perhaps admitted that the previous A.L.P. Government in South Australia was wrong in its road transport legislation that the Legislative Council defeated in 1966. Although we took a lot of abuse in this Chamber when that Bill was defeated, now the A.L.P. is agreeing with the stand that we took at that time.

I could go on and quote Bill after Bill, not only during the A.L.P.'s Government of 1965-68 but go back for many years where exactly the same picture can be seen: the Legislative Council made amendments, defeated legislation and received criticism for being obstructive; yet the Government came to accept the Council's decision as being correct. I am not one to say that the Council is always correct (that would be foolish), because it has made mistakes in the past (so, too, has the House of Assembly) but, nevertheless, it is also true that, in regard to many amendments that have been made in this Chamber and Bills that have been defeated (and there are not many of them), the Government of the day in the House of Assembly finally acknowledged that the attitude adopted by the Council was the correct one. I assure the Government that the Legislative Council will not set itself out to be obstructive to the Government but, as in the past, will reserve the right to prevent the public of South Australia from being the victims of rushed or hasty legislation or legislation that is not in the best interests of all South Australians.

I have a document of the record of the Legislative Council over the period 1930-67 that sets out the number of Bills discussed in each year, the number that originated in the Council, the number that were amended, the number that were laid aside for further consideration, the number passed, and the number that the Council defeated. As it is a factual document, I ask that it be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

RECORD OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OVER THE PERIOD 1930-1967

Year	Bills discussed	Originated in Council	Amended	Laid aside by L.C. for further consideration	Passed	Defeated L.C.
1930	57	7	25	2	50	5
1931	81	13	35	1	71	9
1932	49	14	17	1	44	4
1933	42	9	24	1	40	1
1934	65	20	25	2	58	5
1935 (I)	7	2	3	1	6	—
1935 (II)	63	10	27	1	60	2
1936	83	6	20	1	80	2
1937	50	5	16	1	46	3
1938	55	5	29	4	48	3
1939	57	8	23	5	49	3
1940	69	9	24	2	66	1
1941	52	10	21	1	51	—
1942-3	38	3	15	—	38	—
1943	41	4	12	2	39	—
1944	40	8	15	1	39	—

RECORD OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OVER THE PERIOD 1930-1967—*continued*

Year	Bills discussed	Originated in Council	Amended	Laid aside by L.C. for further consideration	Passed	Defeated L.C.
1945	49	6	16	2	45	2
1946	59	16	15	3	53	3
1947	58	13	12	3	52	3
1948	60	9	13	—	59	1
1949	69	12	14	2	67	—
1950	62	20	18	3	58	1
1951	53	8	9	—	52	1
1952	57	14	14	—	56	1
1953	58	9	11	1	56	1
1954	70	12	13	—	69	1
1955	63	21	15	1	61	1
1956-7	62	19	8	—	60	2
1957	52	12	15	1	51	—
1958	62	17	4	1	59	1
1959	56	15	11	2	54	—
1960	74	20	11	1	72	1
1961	53	19	8	1	52	—
1962	60	18	5	3	57	—
1963	80	21	19	1	78	1
1964	54	20	17	2	52	—
1965-66	97	26	21	1	90	4
1966-67	87*	22	24	2	81*	1
1967	60	8	21	2	57	1

* Including restored L.C. Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I dare say one could go back through history and see the same pattern, but I think the 37-year period from 1930 to 1967 is enough to show the attitude of the Council; and it covers periods of both A.L.P. and L.C.L. rule in the House of Assembly. That document shows clearly that the Council's attitude has always been one of co-operation. There has not been much variation in our attitude whatever the colour of the Government in the House of Assembly.

Paragraph 45 of His Excellency's Speech states:

Legislation will be introduced to remove anomalies in the law relating to receipt duty and gift duty and to alter the incidence of succession duty to give remissions to a spouse inheriting a house, to the inheritors of small estates and primary producing property. Other special remissions will be removed, successions will be aggregated and rates on larger successions will be increased. In order to grant some relief in the rural sector of our economy, the Government will introduce legislation to increase exemptions on land tax for primary producing property.

In February of this year the State Premiers and the Prime Minister met to consider the whole question of Commonwealth-State financial arrangements. Certain agreements were reached at that meeting, but final agreement had to wait until later. The South Australian Premier at that time was reasonably happy

with the proposals made. Following the recent Premiers' Conference, South Australia gained an extra \$16,400,000, an increase of 12.9 per cent in the allocations to this State over those of the last financial year. The previous Ministry would have been very happy to have this sum to administer over the last financial year. Yet the Commonwealth Government was roundly criticized by the present Premier for its attitude to South Australia! With a \$2,900,000 surplus in the Budget, which the Government has inherited, an extra \$16,400,000 from the Commonwealth Government, plus other matters not mentioned, I believe that the Government should begin its term of office on a reasonably sound financial basis. The statement that South Australia was badly treated purely because there is a Government of a different political colour here is unwarranted.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is perfectly true though and, what is more, you know it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No; it is not perfectly true.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We will prove it before long.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It was announced that South Australia was applying to the Grants Commission. Of course, it is this State's right to apply to the Grants Commission. I recall that in 1959 we relinquished

our role as a mendicant State and stood on our own two feet.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: At that time I said we would live to regret it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We have lived to regret many things; nevertheless, the facts I have related are correct. When South Australia was under the Grants Commission (that is, before 1959) we received assistance even though at that time the South Australian Government kept the taxation level per capita here at the lowest level in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And South Australia's social services were at the lowest level in the Commonwealth, too.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: We have argued that question before: it hardly bears examination. If the Chief Secretary will bear with me for a moment I will examine it for him, too. It has been alleged that our social services were at the lowest level in the Commonwealth. We did receive special assistance from the Grants Commission, but it is now being implied that we cannot get assistance from the commission unless we increase taxation in South Australia. Sir Thomas Playford received assistance from the Grants Commission but, at the same time, South Australia's taxation level was the lowest per capita in Australia. The statement that we must now increase taxation before we can receive any assistance from the commission is simply not true. Nevertheless, we see the publicity that is being issued, and I am certain that the following policy has been planned: first, blame the Commonwealth and, secondly, blame the Legislative Council for all the sins and omissions of the Government.

I believe this policy is already established. In its statements on the Grants Commission the Government has specifically mentioned the question of succession duties and the amounts paid per capita in New South Wales and Victoria, as compared with the amounts paid in South Australia. Once again, I believe that this is an excuse being concocted to blame the Commonwealth Government for any increase in this area of taxation. We all know that a heavy increase in capital taxation is part of the ideology of the Government, part of the ideology of the Labor Party, and part of the ideology of Socialism.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Come on! The other State Governments are not Socialist Governments.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am saying that heavy increases in capital taxation are the ideology of the present Government. Planning

is proceeding so that someone else can be blamed for the introduction of this capital taxation. With the surplus accumulated in the last financial year and the increase that we knew we would receive from the Commonwealth Government, the previous Government was able to promise significant reductions in these capital taxation areas—land tax and succession duties. Paragraph 45 of His Excellency's Speech is as follows:

Legislation will be introduced to remove anomalies in the law relating to receipt duty and gift duty and to alter the incidence of succession duty to give remissions to a spouse inheriting a house, to the inheritors of small estates and primary producing property. Other special remissions will be removed, successions will be aggregated and rates on larger successions will be increased. In order to grant some relief in the rural sector of our economy, the Government will introduce legislation to increase exemptions on land tax for primary producing property.

I remind the Government of the reference to remissions to primary producing properties. We know very well that four years ago we had a succession duties Bill in this Council and that a similar promise was made. Yet when it was examined in depth we found that there were no remissions to be made at all. Indeed, on primary producing properties the increase in succession duties in that Bill ranged between 38 per cent and 60 per cent over the whole of South Australia. I want the Government to note particularly these words in His Excellency's Speech. I have no doubt that I will be reminding the Government of them in the future: it intends to give remissions to primary producing properties.

I only hope that the Bill that will come before this Council is not like the Bill that was before us previously, when promises were openly made to the public that it offered a reduction to primary producing properties. On examination, however, it involved heavy increases in succession duties in respect of primary producing properties. I draw the Government's attention to the fantastic burden carried today by the primary producing community as a result of the impact of capital taxation. Recently I saw a statement (I cannot remember where it was, and I cannot vouch for its accuracy, but I am certain that my friend the Hon. Mr. Kemp could confirm these things) that the average income of a primary producing property in New South Wales is \$2,000 a year. I know that right throughout South Australia at present there are many primary producing properties (in fact, I would say the majority) on which the income is less than the

basic wage, yet these properties have to carry and service heavy capital taxation. I personally know of properties which carry efficient farmers but which realize an income that is less than the burden of capital taxation.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Don't you think lending institutions could help?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not know whether the Minister has had anything to do with borrowing money from lending institutions to pay succession duties, but I suggest that the Government should look at the question of succession duties before worrying about lending institutions.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: But on today's economy, don't you think the lending institutions could help?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My impression is that lending institutions are doing a magnificent job carrying the present situation. However, what Governments have to realize is that they have a part to play, too, and that is in this question of relieving taxation on many of these properties. I shall have more to say on this topic in later debates. However, before leaving this question of capital taxation (I refer to local government rating, drainage rates, land tax, rentals on perpetual leases, and provisions that the primary producer must make for succession duties and probate) I wish to say that I only hope the statement in paragraph 45 of His Excellency's Speech, namely, that there will be remissions in the Succession Duties Bill for primary producing properties, is accurate. I hope that the Bill that comes before us this session will not be the same sort of Bill we saw in 1966 which, as I said, promised reductions in this level of taxation but in point of fact contained increases of between 38 per cent and 60 per cent on all primary producing properties in South Australia.

Paragraph 45 also refers to the question of introducing legislation to increase exemptions for land tax on primary producing properties. I trust that this statement is also true. I trust that it will take into account the new quinquennial assessment, and that the statement means that there will be a real reduction in the impact of land tax and not just some alteration to exemptions. I know very well that the State is limited in what it can do to alleviate the present situation in our rural economy. I also accept the fact that possibly the national Government is somewhat limited in what it can do and that possibly the problem is an international one more than a national one. As I pointed out, the State can do very little in this field. However, I believe that it must do

all in its power to reduce this killer of capital taxation in an area of the economy which at present does not have the ability to pay.

In conclusion, I reiterate that the Legislative Council has not in the past adopted a role of hostility towards the Government, nor will it do so in the future. Our role is to warn and to co-operate with the Government in passing into law legislation that will be of benefit to the community. As I have said, I have had incorporated in *Hansard* a statement of the record of this Council over the last 37 years, and I think that illustrates quite adequately the independent yet co-operative attitude always adopted by this Chamber.

Perhaps I can issue a warning on one matter at this stage. We know from His Excellency's Speech that the Government intends that the tentacles of the Party machine should reach into and control all assemblies of government in South Australia, including local government, and I express very grave fears regarding this stated intention of the Government. If, as is set out in the Speech, the Government intends to provide for adult suffrage and compulsory voting at council elections and to allow councils to enter fields of services to the aged, I believe this policy is designed to allow the Party machine to control completely all assemblies in this State; and when the Parliament and the local government bodies of this State act only as an extension of an executive of a dominant Party machine we will have achieved the exact antithesis of a democratic system. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply as drafted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PORT AUGUSTA TO WHYALLA RAILWAY AGREEMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is intended to approve the agreement between this State and the Commonwealth for the construction and operation by the Commonwealth of a standard gauge railway from Port Augusta to Whyalla. The text of the agreement appears in the schedule to the Bill. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal, and clause 3 provides for the approval of the agreement, this approval being necessary to bring the agreement into effect. The approval of the agreement by the Commonwealth has been

expressed in clause 5 of the Port Augusta to Whyalla Railway Bill, 1970, of the Commonwealth, which was assented to on June 17 last. This clause also authorizes the State to do all things required of it under the agreement. Since the railway will be maintained and operated by the Commonwealth as part of the Commonwealth Railways, such obligations as there are of this State are set out in clauses 5 and 6 of the agreement.

Clause 4 formally sets out the consent of the State to the construction of the railway. This formal consent is rendered necessary by the provisions of the Constitution of the Commonwealth, which requires the consent of the State to railway construction by the Commonwealth. I draw honourable members' attention to clause 4(2)(a) of the agreement, which deals with railway crossings, and in this regard the Minister for Shipping and Transport, when introducing the Commonwealth measure in the House of Representatives, said:

We have paid particular attention to the question of level crossings. Arrangements have been discussed with the South Australian authorities regarding the points at which the proposed route of the railway crosses the existing alignments of the Stuart Highway (to Woomera) and the Port Augusta to Whyalla road (marked Lincoln Highway on the map). As a result the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner has agreed to include a road overpass in the proposed work (at a point about five miles from Port Augusta), and the South Australian Highways Department will divert the Port Augusta to Whyalla road to enable it to use this overpass. This will eliminate all highway level crossings. There will be level crossings, however, catering for purely local traffic, at Lincoln Gap and on the Point Lowly Road near Whyalla. These crossings will be protected by flashing lights. There will, of course, be the usual access crossings provided by agreement with the holders of pastoral leases along the route of the railway. I am happy to confirm that this is the substance of our arrangement with the Commonwealth in this matter.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill and acknowledge that there is an urgency to have it passed as quickly as possible. Endeavouring to be as helpful as I possibly can in the matter and hoping that other honourable members will feel the same, there is no reason why—

The Hon. C. R. Story: Even the Chief Secretary appreciates that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I remember when the Hon. Mr. Story asked for the suspension of Standing Orders for similar machinery to be put in train, and there was strong objection

at that time from the Chief Secretary, then the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Are you saying that at no time did he co-operate?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Sometimes he did when the hour was getting late in the afternoon. It is a point well worth making, that the Opposition on this measure and at this time wishes to be extremely co-operative because it acknowledges that this is an urgent measure.

The Bill itself was drawn up during the time of the previous Government. I well recall sending it back to our Railways Commissioner and asking him to check it over and make any points if he had any objection to it. I can recall his reply, to the effect that he was quite satisfied with it.

I have read with some interest recently that Government members are in favour of the South Australian Railways being handed over to the Commonwealth. It is not a policy with which I agree but it is a policy that appeals to most people with centralist ideas in Australia. I always feel a little sorry that the State has not even some control of the northern railways at present owned and operated by the Commonwealth, because it is of course this kind of long-haul freight by which a State can achieve in its areas the farthest away from its capital cities some profit, on lines that should be profitable, such profit being offset against the inevitable metropolitan railway losses.

Here in South Australia we are in a rather unfortunate position in that some of our long-haul railways in the north are Commonwealth-owned. The particular line covered by this Bill, of course, simply joins up with and becomes an integral part of the Commonwealth Railways in South Australia, those railways radiating out as this particular line will from Port Augusta.

I was interested to hear in the Minister's second reading speech that, when a similar measure went through the Commonwealth Parliament, a map was available for honourable members there to peruse so that they could gain some impression of the route of the line, particularly where it came near to Port Augusta and Whyalla. I am sure that honourable members who serve that electoral district in this Council would have been interested to see a map here, but apparently none has been provided by the Minister of Roads and Transport.

However, a pleasing feature is the fact that an overway will be provided by the Commonwealth so that a dangerous railway crossing will not have to be constructed between the Lincoln Highway and the proposed new railway line. The highway there, together with the other northern highway from Port Pirie to Port Augusta, is, unfortunately, a part of the State in which many accidents occur, and anything that can be done to make those roads safer should be done. That is a pleasing point.

I hope that, when the Commonwealth proceeds to build the line, it will put the project to public tender, because construction of projects of this kind by private enterprise (and this is a fairly big project, the cost being about \$7,000,000) is by far the most economical way in which construction of this kind can be carried out.

I hope, too, that the Commonwealth looks closely at the possibility of using concrete sleepers in this new line. I know we produce timber sleepers in this State but, of course, we could produce concrete sleepers as well. I am mindful that our small industry that produces timber sleepers finds a ready market in the many hundreds of miles of existing track where maintenance, repairs and replacements have to take place.

From my reading of the situation, the most modern railways of the world are favouring either concrete sleepers or some form of concrete bed upon which the rails are laid. I think here in South Australia we should have nothing but the best in railway lines and other public works whenever they are built. Perhaps in the Commonwealth department that particular aspect can be borne in mind. As I mentioned a moment ago, this is an extremely

urgent measure. It is necessary to pass the Bill quickly so that the Commonwealth can proceed with this work. It simply confirms the agreement that has been reached between the two Governments.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): In closing the debate I wish to thank the Hon. Mr. Hill and other members of the Opposition for co-operating in getting this measure passed quickly, despite what might have happened previously in regard to the hurried passage of legislation. In reply to the Hon. Mr. Hill, although I have not provided a map, if he reads the first schedule of the Bill he will find that it fairly accurately defines the route of the railway line, and anyone living in the district will probably be able to ascertain where the line will go.

In response to what the honourable member said about people saying that some members of the Government might like to sell our railways to the Commonwealth Government, I have heard some members of the Government and people in the street say that when the honourable member was Minister of Transport he wanted to hand over the railways to private enterprise. That is the kind of argument one hears from people in the street who take particular interest in these matters. I should like to see the railways operated profitably. The Government provides railways as a service to the State, and this is how it should be. I thank honourable members for taking this matter as far as they have taken it.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.52 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 21, at 2.15 p.m.