

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 18, 1976

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about succession duties?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The recent announcement by the Premier and Treasurer that the Government will introduce legislation to amend the Succession Duties Act to abolish duty on successions between husbands and wives will prevent a recurrence of the problem referred to by the honourable Leader in respect of deaths occurring on or after July 1, 1976. If the Leader requires further information in respect of any specific estate, I will obtain a detailed report and advise him accordingly on the production of relevant information.

WOMMA ROAD INTERSECTION

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture, in the absence of the Minister of Lands, a reply to my recent question about the Womma Road intersection?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Womma Road and Heaslip Road are under the care and control of the District Council of Munno Para. The council has taken the following action: (1) erected over-sized symbolic "cross road" signs on all approaches to the intersection; (2) erected a "reduce speed" sign in advance of the "cross road" sign on the eastern approach of Womma Road; and (3) made provision in its 1976-77 budget for the installation of two street lights at the intersection. In addition, at the council's request, the Highways Department is investigating the need for "stop" signs at this intersection, and the feasibility of adding a right-turn lane from the southern approach from Heaslip Road into Womma Road.

MODULAR HOUSES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Forests.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the press on February 2, 1975 (about 18 months ago), a long article dealt with the Government's proposals to construct timber-frame houses of the modular kind in Mount Gambier. The article states:

The venture . . . is based on obtaining sole Australian rights to patent designs held by a New Zealand construction company, Modulock (N.Z.) Limited.

Referring to the Minister, the article also states:

He said the unprecedented move was a major breakthrough in Government efforts to make full use of State resources. . . . The units would be sold through the commercial division of the Woods and Forests Department which would build a \$1 000 000 manufacturing plant near the State sawmills at Mount Gambier.

The report mentions that the proposed houses are of about 11 to 12 squares in size and would sell for about \$16 000 each. The report further states:

The plant is expected to be fully operational in about nine months.

First, has the factory been built as was stated in the report; secondly, have any houses been built under this scheme; and, thirdly, can the Minister comment on any progress that has been made generally in the plans announced about 18 months ago?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I think the press report was not completely accurate. The intention of the scheme was not to build a \$1 000 000 factory but to lease it from the South Australian Housing Trust on the same terms and conditions as the trust leases factories to many other industrial enterprises. The scheme has not commenced operation; negotiations are still taking place between the Woods and Forests Department and the New Zealand partners in the venture, and certain legal matters have still to be cleared up. It has not been possible to launch the project at this stage. Regarding the second part of the honourable member's question, obviously no houses have been built under the intended scheme at Mount Gambier. Modular houses have been built in South Australia on an experimental basis. These houses, which have been brought in from New Zealand, are being evaluated and are proving successful.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Is it a fact that \$500 000 was to be the fee paid to the New Zealand company for the purchase of the rights to build this type of house? If that is the case, has any money been paid to the New Zealand interests?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: No. The rights for this housing system, as it is called, from Modulock (N.Z.) Limited were not at any time valued at \$500 000, nor has any money been paid.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister say whether or not, in his opinion, the whole scheme as proposed 18 months ago has now failed, or does he believe that in due course these plans will come to fruition?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I confidently believe that in due course the plans will come to fruition. It is quite a considerable venture for the Woods and Forests Department, which has obviously entered into it only after considerable investigation and care to ensure that the interests of the department are protected. This has been the reason for the delay in establishing the venture. However, I believe the scheme will make a valuable contribution towards further processing of the timber resources of the South-East. It will also provide additional houses in country areas. The units are built in the factory and are not transportable houses, and they will not be competing with the production of transportable houses. These units comprise a timber-framing system for the erection on-site of various satisfactory types of dwelling.

GAWLER HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on July 27 concerning extensions to the Gawler High School?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: My colleague the Minister of Education states that the extensions planned for the Gawler High School include a library resource centre, an eight-teacher flexible open-space unit, science accommodation, and a commerce suite. The project is on the current tender call programme, and it is expected that actual construction will begin during this financial year.

GEM FISH

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Fisheries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I understand that the Fisheries and Oceanographic Division of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation has been asked by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department in this State to do some exploratory trawling work to try to find out whether the fish called the gem fish is a commercial proposition in South Australian waters. I understand that the C.S.I.R.O. research vessel did its trawling in June and July. Has any report of the prospects of that fish being a commercial proposition for fishing in South Australia come to the Minister's notice?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yes. An approach was made recently to the C.S.I.R.O. to use its vessel, the *Courageous*, for further investigation. The C.S.I.R.O. has played its part in the Agriculture and Fisheries Department's total programme in trying to develop further fishing off the southern shores of South Australia to help those fishermen who have been adversely affected by the mercury ban on sharks. We employed fishermen to do exploratory fishing for us to prove a gem fish resource in that area, and this was part of that work. I have not received a detailed report on the results of the trawling work undertaken by the *Courageous*, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

PHOSPHATE ROCK

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to addressing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: On August 3 last, the Industries Assistance Commission issued a draft report on assistance for consumption of phosphate fertilisers, and invited public comment at a hearing on August 31. There are several inaccuracies in this report which, if accepted by the Federal Government, could result in a further increase in the cost of superphosphate. I refer particularly to the statement in the Industries Assistance Commission report that fertiliser manufacturers should pay a "world parity" price for phosphate rock from Christmas Island. At present, Australian manufacturers use a mixture of Christmas Island phosphate, which is very impure and contains up to 6 per cent of oxides of iron and aluminium. The balance is made up of rock from Nauru and Ocean Island, which has less than 1 per cent impurity. Because of the different quality, Christmas Island rock is valued much lower than that from Nauru and Ocean Island. Despite the Industries Assistance Commission statement, there is no "world parity" price for Christmas Island phosphate because nowhere else in the world do fertiliser manufacturers use rock with impurities up to 6 per cent. Australia is unique in having to blend its rock to get below the maximum acceptable level of 3½ per cent impurity. This is one reason why Australian costs of making superphosphate are higher than in many other countries. Will the Minister of Agriculture ensure that his department presents a case to the Industries Assistance Commission on August 31 to stress the fallacy of increasing the price of Christmas Island phosphate to "world parity", since it would be disastrous for the cost of superphosphate to be increased unnecessarily at the present time?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will take up the question raised by the honourable member. We, as a department, are presenting a submission to the Industries Assistance Commission on a number of inaccuracies that appear in that draft report. The honourable member has raised one of them—the question of the world parity price for Christmas Island rock. Another inaccuracy in that report that will be rebutted by the department is the statement that the subsidy should be paid on the total phosphate; this makes no allowance for the fact that water-soluble and acid-soluble phosphates are really the only forms that are of much use to a farmer, and the payment of bounty on a total phosphate basis would encourage the use of fertilisers and forms of rock phosphate that have practically no value, in those circumstances, in South Australia.

FENCING MATERIAL

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am not sure whether my question should be addressed to the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry or to the Minister representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, but I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the appropriate Minister.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It has been brought to my notice that wrought iron, which is made from second-grade ore, is much cheaper to produce for that reason. It also is much more valuable to use where part or all of it is placed in the ground. The rust factor is minimal compared to that for mild steel and, because wrought iron is much cheaper, it seems that it may be possible to use it for fencing material, which is at present manufactured from mild steel. As we are all interested in providing what facilities we can and creating what productivity we can for Whyalla at present, I ask the Minister whether the possible manufacture of wrought iron fencing material has been considered.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring down a report as soon as possible.

MEDIBANK

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I saw in yesterday's *News* a small item headed "Hunt Gets Number 1". The report was datelined Canberra and it stated:

The A.C.T.U. President (Mr. Hawke) signed up earlier with Medibank insurance, but he didn't get membership book No. 1. The Minister for Health (Mr. Hunt) signed up today, 24 hours later, and got book No. 00000001H. Mr. Hunt, his wife, two daughters and his son are now covered for a shared room in hospital, physiotherapy charges, ambulance, and theatre charges for \$37.46 a month.

I was pleased to read that Mr. Hunt realised that the best possible coverage that he could get for his family would be obtained by staying with Medibank, and I am delighted that he agrees with Mr. Hawke that it is the best value regarding medical insurance. When anyone asks me what to do in this present maze of conflict, and so on, regarding Medibank, I tell him—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must not express opinions when making his explanation.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I will ask the question. Would the Minister care to tell the people of South Australia of the arrangements that he is making for his family's health insurance, and thereby give a lead to the people in what is an extremely confused area?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Obviously, I had made up my mind before Mr. Hawke and Mr. Hunt gave that information to the people of Australia. It is pleasing that Mr. Hunt has confidence in Medibank. I am sure that he realises what the position will be once the computer has sorted out the confusion. I assure the honourable member that I also will be a member of Medibank, and I can recommend that course to everyone.

MONARTO

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in the Council.
Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: In last year's Hayden Budget very little money was allocated for work on Monarto. That was a wise decision on the part of the then Federal Labor Government which was confirmed by the Budget of the present Federal Government that was delivered last evening. Obviously, members of the South Australian Government are the only people who consider Monarto still to be a goer. Despite this, the Premier has said that South Australia will go it alone. I ask the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in the Council—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: —why the Government has this obsession with a project that is doomed to failure. Also, what is the present estimated cost of Monarto and, if the Government is foolish enough to persist in continuing with Monarto, how does it intend to pay for it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I must disagree with many of the honourable member's observations. I suppose it was contrary to Standing Orders for him to make those observations.

The PRESIDENT: I thought the honourable member was getting a little close to the bone.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President. In fact, I thought there was no bone there at all. The Hon. Mr. Carnie and other honourable members realise the discrepancies that exist in his explanation. Having said that, I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister in charge of Monarto.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No doubt the Chief Secretary is aware of the knowledgeable gentleman from Birmingham who attended a conference this week. That gentleman said that there ought not to be any great delay in achieving the Government's aim in connection with Monarto. Since that gentleman left the State, we have noticed that the projected population for Adelaide within the next 10 years is slightly greater than 1 000 000 people. Because of that projection, because of the opposition to the Monarto growth centre, and because the Federal Government last evening neglected to give any funds at all to this

necessary project, does the Chief Secretary agree that the Federal Government ought to be condemned by honourable members of this Council?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I believe that that would be the correct action for this Council to take.

PRESS CORRESPONDENT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The August 13 issue of the *Canberra Times* contains a report headed "Infamous gerrymander reversed", which was written by a person claiming to be that paper's South Australian correspondent. The report, which deals with the redistribution of electoral boundaries, is a vicious attack on a former Premier of this State, Sir Thomas Playford. Will the Chief Secretary ascertain whether the South Australian correspondent for the *Canberra Times* is in any way employed by the South Australian Government at present, or whether he has in the past been closely associated with this Government's promotions?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I wonder whether the Leader could supply me with the name of the South Australian correspondent.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cannot. I am asking you.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In those circumstances, I am afraid that I cannot get that information for the Leader.

Later:

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Chief Secretary say whether Mr. Bruce Muirden is employed in any way by the South Australian Government? Further, does Mr. Muirden act as a special South Australian correspondent for any interstate newspapers and, if he does, which newspapers?

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: This is a hardy annual.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister was asked a question, and no-one else need comment. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will endeavour to obtain the information for the Leader.

GLADSTONE HEALTH CENTRE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The citizens of Gladstone are concerned about the building of a community health centre in that town. The Minister of Health has indicated to them that, in the present financial situation, the South Australian Government will not be able to assist with a subsidy for that project this financial year. Will the Minister therefore assure the Council that the Government will be able to give some form of a subsidy for the construction of a community health centre at Gladstone next financial year?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think the Hon. Mr. Geddes has asked his question the wrong way around. He said that the South Australian Government could not come to light with a subsidy for this centre at Gladstone.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: I am quoting from a letter of yours.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think the honourable member is quoting from a letter that I wrote to the effect that, because the Commonwealth Government was not going to agree to fund any new project this year, the building of the Gladstone health centre would have to be deferred until further allocations came from Canberra. That is the position. It seems that this involves one of those great big steps being taken by the present Australian Government in its fight against inflation. Although the people of Gladstone want this project to proceed just as people in other areas want their projects to proceed, it cannot be proceeded with this financial year, because of the foolish actions of the present Federal Government. The South Australian Government does not know what funds will be made available by the Australian Government for this project next year. However, I assure the honourable member that, if the Australian Government comes forward with funds, South Australia will be able to meet its share of the subsidy.

ABORIGINES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No doubt the Minister is aware of the Liberal Party's published policy. I have the policy document containing much small print.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Is that the Federal policy?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The honourable member would not know what his Party's Federal policy was, especially with a bloke like Fraser as Prime Minister.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member sought leave to make an explanation. He is not going to take up the time of the Council in arguing with another honourable member.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You are absolutely correct, Mr. President, but you should castigate the honourable member, who caused it all. The policy, headed "The Welfare of the Individual", states:

The correction of discriminatory aspects of the social order with regard to the Australian Aboriginal people can only be achieved if the necessary assistance is given in a form which concurrently leads to recognition of the responsibilities and obligations of full citizenship.

Can the Minister tell the Council the extent to which Aborigines will be disadvantaged in this State as a result of the provisions in the Commonwealth Budget, announced by the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Lynch), to cut expenditure in this area?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: At this stage I cannot state the exact extent to which Aborigines will be disadvantaged, but I know that the action taken in the Commonwealth Budget announced last evening is contrary to the Liberal Party's policy. This is nothing new: it does not matter what is in the Liberal Party's policy any more than it matters whether that Party carries out its election promises.

WATER RESOURCES

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Minister of Agriculture, acting on behalf of the Minister of Lands, a reply to my recent question about the Water Resources Act?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Attorney-General has assumed responsibility for the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal, and he has advised as follows: (1) A Registrar has not yet been appointed; an appointment will be made within a week or two. (2) Forty appeals have been received. Copies of such appeals have been forwarded to the Minister of Works, as is required by the regulations.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My original questions included the question of whether any appeals that had been received had been notified to the Minister of Works forthwith, as required by the Act, but that question was not answered. Will the Minister obtain a reply to it?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Yes.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On behalf of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, I ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has a reply to a question asked by the Leader about water resources.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It was not the Government's intention, in introducing the water resources legislation, to affect the ownership of the drainage system in the Millicent District Council area. The ownership remains unaffected. The Government has no intention of proclaiming the surface waters in this area under Part III of the Water Resources Act, 1976, or indeed of proclaiming the surface waters of any area, unless it is clear that competition for the waters may impair the beneficial use. Nothing is known which would suggest that the surface waters in the Millicent district should be so proclaimed.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 559.)

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You will regret this.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Bill seeks to undo the work done in 1973, when the present system of election for this Chamber was introduced. In effect, it does away with the list system of voting and returns to the proportional representation system used in the Senate. It does not allow voting by groups.

The second part of the Bill requires that all preferences be counted, irrespective of the quota that is obtained by any candidate. I think that, before dealing with the merits of the Bill and answering the propositions advanced by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, it is necessary to take a short excursion into history. It is important that the Bill be placed in some sort of historical context. We must compare the current system and its democratic nature with the system that existed in this Council until 1973.

Although I realise honourable members opposite do not really like me doing this, I feel compelled to draw attention to some of the attitudes they expressed towards electoral reform during those years just to see how sincere they are in proposing a Bill such as that before the Chamber. I do not know whether the honourable Leader has the support of his Party in introducing this Bill but he and all honourable members opposite, including those who were members of that fledgling institution, the Liberal

Movement, are being less than sincere in their advocacy of this Bill.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You are—

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: As I am the second speaker in this debate I am forced to anticipate what the Hon. Mr. Cameron might say about the Bill. Clearly, this is another rearguard action by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to try to re-establish his credibility with the people of South Australia. Of course, he will be completely unsuccessful in this attempt, as he has been in most of his previous attempts in the past 10 years to retain a privileged system of franchise in this Council. My excursion into history is necessary to show what was the voting system for Legislative Council elections before 1973.

Responsible government was instituted in this State in 1857 as a result of a series of Constitution Bills accepted during 1855 and 1856. The Constitution then established laid down the basic nature of the Legislative Council that continued in all its essential forms until 1973. In 1856, the franchise provided for a property qualification. To be entitled to vote a person had to have a freehold property to a value of £50, or a leasehold property with an annual value of at least £20, with three years to run on that lease and with a right of the occupant to purchase. A third qualification concerned a person who occupied a house with an annual value of £25.

That system was changed only slightly during the ensuing 100 years. The consolidation of the Constitution Act that occurred in 1935 indicates that there were amendments in 1913 and 1918 that extended the franchise somewhat, but not materially. The qualifications regarding freehold estates at £50 and leasehold estates having an annual value of at least £20 still existed. Another section was inserted so that the proprietors of a lease from the Crown of land within South Australia on which there were improvements to the value of at least £50 were included.

Doubtless, that was designed to take into account country gentry who were leasing land from the Crown. At that stage an inhabitant/occupier, as the owner or tenant of any dwellinghouse, was also included. To some extent that was an extension of the franchise that existed in 1856. Also, provisions were introduced, I think, in 1918 extending the franchise to those members of the armed forces who had served outside Australia, or outside the United Kingdom, if the force was raised in that country.

Therefore, in 1935, as the result of the amendments of 1913 and 1918, there had been only the slightest extension of the franchise; the basic property qualifications still remained. A further amendment which was made in 1943 and which extended the rights of ex-servicemen to vote included those who had voluntarily enlisted in the armed forces or, whether they had voluntarily enlisted or not, had served in a force outside Australia. Alternatively, if they had enlisted elsewhere, if they served outside the country in which they were enlisted they were entitled to vote. That extension did not apply to conscripts who did not see active service overseas. Again, we had a slight extension of the franchise. Apparently, honourable members in this Council considered that at least someone who had volunteered for active service in the armed forces overseas and within Australia, and who had borne arms for his country, should be able to contribute to the democratic processes of the State.

The next major amendment was in 1969, when amendments were tacked on to a House of Assembly redistribution measure. That was accepted by this Council and subsequently accepted by another place, although the amendments really had nothing to do with the Bill, which dealt

with a redistribution in another place. At that stage the franchise was extended to some extent, and that situation obtained until 1973. In 1969, following the passage of that measure, at last the strict monetary considerations of the franchise were removed so that all owners of freehold land, all occupants of leasehold land, and all proprietors of Crown land under lease could vote. The cumulative effect of these changes was to enfranchise any person who had a freehold or leasehold estate in possession anywhere in the State. The franchise was also extended for the first time to the spouse of an inhabitant-occupier (that is, a tenant or owner) of a dwelling-house. The wartime qualification was extended to permit all who had served to be entitled to vote whether they had enrolled voluntarily or had been conscripted; it was also extended to those who had seen active service overseas, even though not in time of war. So that was again some increase in the franchise.

The final increase, as we all know, is the system that actually exists at present. It was introduced as a result of a compromise arrived at in June, 1973, when the Government, following the March, 1973, election, in which the Legislative Council franchise had been a major issue, presented two Bills to the Legislative Council that were eventually, in a modified form, accepted. The most important point that must be realised from this brief historical survey is that from 1857 right through until 1973 the franchise remained substantially unchanged. There were modifications in 1969 that took out the requirement of property having a certain value, although at that stage that probably was not as great a reform as it might have appeared to be on paper, because most people occupying or owning property would have had property of a greater value than £50 or £20, but the basic franchise remained in force for about 120 years as a restricted franchise that precluded a number of people in this State from voting in elections for this Chamber.

Of course, in considering this Bill, we must realise where honourable members opposite stood on this issue. It is interesting to note when they were elected to this Chamber. Fortunately, some of them, like the Hon. Mr. Carnie, the Hon. Mr. Burdett and the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw, have a clear conscience on the matter because they have come into the Chamber only in recent years; but there are others that would not have such a clear conscience. In any event, it is interesting to note—

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: —when some of the other honourable members were elected. The Hon. Martin Cameron was elected in July, 1971, so he has to bear some responsibility, albeit a small amount compared with that of some other honourable members. The Hon. Jessie Cooper was elected in March, 1959, so she had about 14 years in which to do something about the Legislative Council franchise. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins was elected in March, 1962, so he had some 11 years in which to do something about the franchise. The Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. DeGaris) was elected in December, 1962, so he had about 11 years; the Hon. Mr. Geddes was elected in March, 1965, so he had about eight years; the Hon. Mr. Hill was elected in December, 1965, so he, too, had some eight years in which to act. The Hon. Mr. Potter was elected in March, 1959, so he had about 14 years to do something about it. The Hon. Mr. Whyte was elected in October, 1966, so he had about seven years. Therefore, most of the honourable members opposite were in this Chamber for a considerable time while this restricted franchise existed.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Were they in Government at any time in that period?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. I think it is true to say that the Hon. Jessie Cooper was a member of the Government Party for about eight years, and yet she did not do anything about it. A similar situation applies to the Hon. Mr. Potter, the President. Although he made some desultory attempts to change it at various times, he was not very successful. I suspect he could not get the numbers in the Party room to support his attempts, but he seemed to change his mind at various times whether or not he really believed in an extended franchise. I will deal with that later.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Are you going to talk about this Bill?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. I told the honourable member I would put the matter into historical perspective.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: To see whether they were dinkum or not.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You are concerned more about the past than the present.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: At present, honourable members opposite do not care at all about the past; they are so ashamed that they want to forget about it.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We are forward-looking.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It is quite clear that many honourable members opposite (indeed, I venture to say that the great bulk of them) were in power and able to do something about amending the franchise during that period from 1959 to 1973 yet, with one or two exceptions, they did nothing. They preferred to retain a system that had existed since 1857.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Labor Party would not agree to a reasonable compromise.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. Burdett has obviously been talking to his Leader, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris; but I will deal with the compromises that were offered by honourable members opposite during those sad and sorry years. During that time, what was the Labor Party doing about bringing reform to this Chamber? Surprisingly, my research reveals that its attempts were very creditable! I have not gone back to before 1962, but in that year the Hon. Frank Walsh, the Leader of the Opposition in another place, introduced a Bill to provide for one vote one value, for equal constituencies in the Lower House, and for universal franchise for the Legislative Council. That Bill did not reach this Chamber, because Sir Thomas Playford was then the Premier, and the Bill lapsed after Mr. Walsh had given it its second reading explanation. So honourable members opposite did not show much enthusiasm on that occasion.

In 1964, on September 16 Mr. Walsh again introduced a Bill in another place to extend the franchise in this Chamber. Again, the matter was not debated and the Bill lapsed. In 1966, following the election of the Labor Government, some serious attempts were made, because a Bill was able to pass in another place and arrive in the Legislative Council, much, I am sure, to the consternation of honourable members opposite. Among its clauses, that 1966 Bill provided that the House of Assembly should comprise 56 members, that a permanent commission should be set up, and that redistribution should be according to the principle of one vote one value, or there should be equality between the city and the country. It is interesting to note that towards the end of last year we passed a Bill that fulfilled most of those criteria. However, there it was—a 10-year fight to get that reform adopted.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Was that Bill passed unanimously?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There was opposition there, too?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In 1975 there was a great deal of opposition. Honourable members may recall that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris wished to defeat the Bill completely by negating the tolerance. The Hon. Mr. Hill wished to extend the tolerance from 10 per cent to 15 per cent.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How did it get through? Whose vote got it through?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I think the Hon. Mr. Cameron and the Hon. Mr. Carnie voted with the Government on that occasion. We know that they might well change their minds now if a similar Bill came up.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting President. It appears to me that the matters being discussed by the honourable member are such that he has digressed right away from the Bill. In fact, the honourable member is making implications that are totally groundless and I reject them completely.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R. A. Geddes): The honourable member's point is taken but I consider it not to be a point of order.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The 1966 Bill, in addition to making that reform of the House of Assembly to which I have referred, included a provision for full adult suffrage for the Legislative Council and an amendment to the deadlock provisions to provide for deadlocks to be resolved in a way similar to that existing between the House of Commons and the House of Lords. So that was the first time a Bill of this kind came before the Council.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What has all this to do with the Bill before us?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It is an interesting historical summary.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: To whom?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: If the honourable member allows me to proceed with my speech and does not make inane interjections, I will be able to complete the history and then honourable members opposite will be taken out of the misery that they are going through. I know that relevant extracts from *Hansard* have been quoted here previously.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: And they will be quoted again.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. I will not refer to some of the more extraordinary statements that were made by Sir Lyell McEwin and the Hon. Mr. Rowe, who are now no longer in this Chamber, but I should like to refer to what some members who are still with us said on that occasion. *Hansard* of February 10, 1966, at page 3957, records what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris thought about the Bill and about democracy in general, as follows:

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You do not believe the people should have a say about who their representative should be?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think it was well stated in the Address in Reply debate that this Council should consider the permanent will of the people, and I think the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill would agree. This point was well put by the Hon. Sir Charles Kingston. This Chamber must be elected by those who represent the permanent will or thinking of the people. We can talk about this for a long time, but I believe that household suffrage is possibly more democratic than is a complete adult franchise. A household consisting of man and wife and four or five children makes a great contribution to the State and is

entitled to two votes. Another person who may have no responsibility at all and who may even be living in the sandhills somewhere has one vote.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: For the Legislative Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am talking about a complete adult franchise. It can be argued that a household vote is more democratic than is complete adult franchise. I am certain that if the present Government had accepted the Bill introduced by the Liberal Government to extend the franchise for this Chamber so as to give a vote to the spouse of an elector the permanent will of the people would have been reflected in the vote.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: As a sop to the perpetuation of a gerrymander!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not quite understand that. It is like the expression "one vote one value"—I defy anyone to define it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It is a galah cry!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is. I can say openly that I agree with one vote one value as nobody can define it.

That was what the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS said about democracy, and I know that it has been quoted previously in this Chamber. During my research on this matter, I discovered that the Hon. Mr. Cameron had quoted that extract during the debate in 1973 on the electoral reform proposals.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: How about being original?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Council needs to be reminded of some of the attitudes expressed by honourable members opposite. I know that Opposition members dislike that and I do not want to go through it again, but it is most important for us to realise who are the real driving forces behind this Bill and just what their attitudes have been in the past. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who is still with us, was elected in, I think, 1962, and doubtless he could have done much to change the system. As reported at page 4072 of *Hansard* on February 16, 1966, that honourable member stated:

Like other honourable members, I am completely opposed to the Bill. I consider that it would create the worst possible type of gerrymander ever envisaged in the free world.

This was on a proposal to introduce adult franchise.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: What has this to do with the Bill?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It is a historical resumé. I know that honourable members opposite do not wish me to go through it, but it is necessary for me to do so. The Hon. Mr. Hill changed his spots as time went by. I realise that in 1966 he was a new member of the Council.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He was ambitious, too.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Doubtless he was ambitious, but he was a new member and he was undoubtedly influenced by the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS. As reported at page 4074 of *Hansard* on February 16, 1966, the Hon. Mr. Hill said:

We cannot vote for machinery or measures of this kind unless we have some knowledge of the will of the people upon that question.

I recall that this matter was part of the Australian Labor Party platform at the 1965 election.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Do all the people consent to what is in a platform?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Perhaps the most important way to find out what people think (and the Hon. Mr. Hill may not agree with me) is to have an election.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: With about 49 per cent of the vote, it is a minority Government.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. DeGARIS has had the temerity to interject. I do not know whether *Hansard* got it down, because it was a faint cry, a cry in the wilderness, one may say, as the honourable member referred to the value of votes. In 1966, the Hon. Mr. Hill also said:

As I have listened to other speeches upon this matter, I have been convinced that, when we talk of the will, it must be a steady will, a permanent will, or an underlying will, whichever adjective one wishes to use.

That extraordinary statement was obviously the result of the influence of the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS. With attitudes of that kind being expressed in 1966, it is not surprising that the Bill was lost in this Chamber. The particulars of the division on the second reading of the Bill are worth referring to, and they are at page 4083 of *Hansard* of February 16, 1966. Those who voted "Aye" were the Hon. Mr. Banfield, now the Government Leader here, the Hon. Mr. Bevan, the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, and the Hon. Mr. Shard. Not unpredictably, those who voted "No" were the Hon. Jessie Cooper, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS, the Hon. Mr. Geddes, the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, the Hon. Mr. Hart, the Hon. Mr. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, Sir Lyell McEwin, the Hon. Mr. Octoman, the Hon. Mr. Potter, the Hon. Mr. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill and the Hon. Mr. Story. That was the fate of the 1966 attempt to reform this place. The next attempt was made by the present Premier (the Hon. D. A. Dunstan) in 1968. He introduced a private member's Bill in another place.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: In the Assembly.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, in the House of Assembly. Somewhat surprisingly, that Bill was passed by the House of Assembly on October 23, 1968, despite the fact that there was in office a Liberal Government led by Mr. Hall, now Senator Hall. Having been introduced on October 16, 1968, that Bill was passed by 26 votes to 10 votes. It should be pointed out that in Committee on that occasion Mr. Hall moved amendments to Mr. Dunstan's private member's Bill that sought to entrench in the Constitution the existence of the Legislative Council.

But what did the Hon. Mr. DeGARIS have to say about that Bill when it was introduced in the Council? He still opposed the extension of the franchise, because there was insufficient protection for the bicameral system. He then tried out the excuse that the entrenching provision was open to doubt.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It was, too.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: On that occasion, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. A. J. Shard) tried to get debate on the matter continued. However, that move was lost by 15 votes to four votes. I venture to suggest that the four honourable members voting for a continuation of the debate were the four Labor members in the Council, and that the 15 honourable members voting against it were those honourable members on the Opposition benches.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think there must have been a gerrymander in those times, for there to have been only four Labor members?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Obviously, something was not satisfactory in the system.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But not a gerrymander: just something crook?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I would not like to accuse those honourable members of being crook, merely because they continue a system of gerrymander, but something was obviously amiss. On October 9, 1968, an attempt was made by the Hon. Mr. Rowe to extend the franchise, the effect of which was to reduce the age of voting to 21 years, to remove the value of land qualifications, and to increase the rights of ex-servicemen. That Bill was supported by the Australian Labor Party in this Council on the third reading, although Labor members did not consider that the Bill went far enough. It was introduced and read a first time

in the House of Assembly in 1968, and then it lapsed. So, even that modest attempt at reform in 1968 was thwarted.

As I have said, there was a reform in 1969. The amendments, which were tacked on to the House of Assembly's redistribution Bill, were accepted by the Labor Party and by Premier Hall at the time in order to save the redistribution. The next attempt to obtain full adult franchise for the Council was, not surprisingly, made by the Labor Party in 1970. That Bill was passed in the House of Assembly but was lost on the second reading in the Council on November 3, 1970, by a vote of 13 to six. I put on record where honourable members stood on that occasion. Those honourable members voting for the amendment were Messrs. Banfield, Casey, Hill, Kneebone, Potter, and Shard. One sees that the Hon. Mr. Potter and the Hon. Mr. Hill must have had some qualms about the matter. Those honourable members voting against the second reading, many of whom are still members of this place, were Mrs. Cooper, and Messrs. Dawkins, DeGaris, Geddes, Gilfillan, Hart, Jude, Kemp, Russack, Rymill, Springett, Story, and Whyte. That therefore ended the 1970 attempt.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Was the Hon. Mr. Whyte amongst them?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Fascinating!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. Whyte was against full adult franchise at that time. It is interesting to note that on that occasion the Bill was defeated on the second reading. No attempt was made by honourable members opposite to try to compromise or to move any amendments to the Bill. It was a total and absolute rejection of the principle of full adult franchise. There were more attempts. In August, 1971, a Bill came to this place from the House of Assembly. On that occasion, the Hon. Mr. Hill supported the second reading, and intended to move amendments that he said he had foreshadowed in October, 1970. Those amendments provided that elections for both Houses ought to be held on different days, that there ought to be voluntary voting and separate rolls, and that the provisions regarding the Legislative Council ought to be entrenched. If the Hon. Mr. Hill had had the opportunity, he could no doubt have moved amendments. However, those who sat around and with him on that occasion—

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: And on him!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, even on him. Those honourable members contrived to defeat the Bill altogether, and it was lost on the second reading by 11 votes to six votes. Those honourable members who voted against the Bill were Messrs. Dawkins, DeGaris, Geddes, Gilfillan, Hart, Kemp, Russack, Rymill, Springett, Story, and Whyte. Again, the Hon. Mr. Whyte was there. The six honourable members voting for the second reading were Messrs. Banfield, Cameron, Casey, Hill Kneebone, and Shard. I can only assume that you, Mr. President, were not around at that stage.

It is interesting to note from page 783 of *Hansard* that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris tried to wriggle out of that situation, saying that he supported voluntary voting for the House of Assembly. Without giving any special commitment about that, he said that, if the House of Assembly would consider introducing voluntary voting, the Legislative Council would perhaps look at a change in its structure. That was his contribution in 1971.

I now come to the final unsuccessful attempt made by the Labor Party to reform the Legislative Council. On November 15, 1972, a Bill, in the same form as the 1971 Bill, was

introduced in the Council. On that occasion, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had yet another excuse. This time it was not that he thought households were more democratic than individuals; he said that the Legislative Council should not be a mirror image of the House of Assembly. His Party might just have accepted that Bill had some system of proportional representation been introduced, with two large districts. I understand that was then the policy of his Party—some patched-up job to accommodate, within the same ragbag, such diverse opinions as those of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and Mr. Steele Hall. The reference to voluntary voting was a red herring. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that Liberal members in the Council might have considered passing the Bill if the House of Assembly had done something about those three issues.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: What year was that?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: It was 1972.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: So there are only four years left.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: One finds that the second reading of that Bill was also lost. That last unsuccessful attempt made by the House of Assembly to reform the Council was lost by 14 votes to four votes. Those honourable members voting against the Bill (and here we have a few surprises) were Messrs. Cameron, Dawkins, DeGaris, Geddes, Gilfillan, Hart, Hill, Potter, Russack, Rymill, Springett, Story, and Whyte, and Mrs. Cooper. Those voting for the Bill were the old hardies, Messrs. Banfield, Casey, Kneebone, and Shard. We now come to June, 1973, when a compromise was finally effected. This Chamber passed a Bill implementing full adult franchise, but the Hon. Mr. DeGaris imposed two conditions, first, that the State should constitute a single electoral district and, secondly, that there ought to be a proportional representation system of election. He said that, if those two provisions were not introduced in another Bill, he would not agree to adult franchise legislation going through.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Was this after they lost Midland?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: This occurred after the March, 1973, election, when the Hon. Mr. Creedon and the Hon. Mr. Chatterton were elected. The Liberals might have been worried that, had there been a double dissolution, they would have lost. There is nothing like necessity to push the political principles along. One can always find some quotable quotes, and there is no-one more quotable than Mr. Steele Hall (now Senator Hall). The Hon. Mr. Cameron is squirming in his seat, but he should be overjoyed to hear Mr. Hall in full flight, getting stuck into the geriatrics of the Legislative Council, and Mr. Hall certainly did that on this occasion. The following is an extract from Mr. Hall's speech on June 27, 1973 (*Hansard*, page 152):

The Opposition's idea of co-operation was to put the Government in visual disgrace in the eyes of the public by taking the business of the Council out of the Government's hands.

Mr. Hall was referring to some shenanigans that went on in this Council during that debate when, contrary to precedent, the Opposition—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What precedent?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The precedent that the business of the House is in the Government's hands. It is a convention which operates in our Parliamentary system.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you mean that, if the Government wants to push a Bill through in five minutes, we cannot adjourn the debate on that Bill?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Leader always seems to get most upset when I quote Mr. Hall.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Yet they were buddies in the same Cabinet! There was not one argument between them, because they did not speak to one another!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Mr. Hall's speech continues: I have never heard so much twisting of words, so that the public of South Australia now find that black is white and white is black. All I can say is that Dr. Goebbels was an amateur!

That is what Mr. Hall said about members of his own Party. Later in his speech, Mr. Hall said:

The Council has been deceitful in this matter—

I suppose he meant the Liberal members—

and there is no doubt that it was dripping with hypocrisy yesterday and last evening when its members expressed concern for one vote one value. As recently as three months ago, the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House was on the media debating with a well-known academic the merits of restricted franchise. As far as I am concerned, these people are the creepy-crawly creatures of South Australian politics. If this type of deceit had taken place in commerce, the people concerned would be behind bars—

Mr. Hall wanted to put the Hon. Mr. DeGaris behind bars—but, because they deceive under privilege, they can get away with deceiving the South Australian public.

So, Mr. Hall is always good for a quotable quote, as is the Hon. Mr. Cameron, who made the following remarks on June 26, 1973 (*Hansard*, page 122):

I, as a right-of-centre politician (and, as was pointed out to me in the last vote in this Council, of a different Party from the normal right-of-centre groups in this Council), hope I still retain some idealism. I do not believe that members on this side of the Chamber (I am speaking of the Liberal and Country League in this matter) should reject again full franchise for any idealism, because the Government has put forward this matter time and time again.

So, the Hon. Mr. Cameron espouses idealism, but he is now back in the same Party as are all the creepy-crawly people who voted consistently for restricted franchise. The extract from *Hansard* continues:

I shall watch the passage of the Bill with interest but shall have great difficulty in moving any amendments, because I have not a seconder in the Council—through no fault of my own.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You had two on one occasion, for a while.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I did for a little while. We had what we call still-born members. We gave birth to them but the Minister should know that they did not breathe. It took us a lot of effort to get them that far, too.

He must have been referring to the Hon. Mr. Hill and the Hon. Mr. Potter, who had a brief flirtation with the Party to which the Hon. Mr. Cameron belonged.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: Are you going to refer to the Bill?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The attitude of some Liberals changed overnight.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: For many years in this Chamber, honourable members opposite could have reformed the Council, but they did nothing. The question of restricted franchise and the question of a substantial weighting of Assembly votes in favour of country areas was supported by them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Has there been a loading in favour of the Labor Party?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Leader will have to demonstrate it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It has been demonstrated.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Leader has been trying to demonstrate it since 1963, but he has not done it to the conviction of anyone here.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There are some academics with red faces at present.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Who?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You cannot refute what I have said.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will supply another quote to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris (*Hansard*, October 15, 1975, page 1328). He quoted an article from the *Australian Quarterly Review* when I was something of a beginner in this field and thought people were reasonably open, honest and said what they thought. When I put the point that the Labor Party had been substantially discriminated against by the electoral system existing from 1936 to 1969, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that that was not true and that the Labor Party did not deserve to win an election on the basis of the majority of votes at any of the elections held at that time. At page 1327 of *Hansard* in 1975, he stated:

My authority is the *Australian Quarterly Review*—

I then went on to quote *Playford to Dunstan* by Dr. Blewett and Mr. Jaensch. The *Hansard* report is as follows:

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I took all that into account; I quoted an article.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Who was the author?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not know, but I can provide the figures for you.

Do honourable members know who was the author of that article? Apparently the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had forgotten that in 1956 Dr. Forbes had written that article. Can we believe that? The Hon. Mr. DeGaris could have given me a straight answer and said it was Dr. Forbes, who now has a job working for the President of the Senate. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that he did not know who was the author. The most important point was that there was no change. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris and those who sit behind him slipped and slid all over the place to try to avoid introducing full adult franchise. This Bill seeks to do away with the list system of voting. I suppose we can have a legitimate debate about the values, or otherwise, of a list system of proportional representation, the system that operates in the Senate, the Hare-Clark system—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Hare-Clark system does not apply in the Senate.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: —the system that operates in Tasmania or the proportional representation system operating in the Senate. The fact is that the list system of voting is used in many countries in Western and Central Europe. I believe a list system operates in Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, and Finland. Variations of the list system have operated in France and Germany.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Will the honourable member, in reviewing list systems, examine the systems he has referred to in Belgium, Switzerland and other countries, to see whether they have a droop quota system attached to them? These are the points he has overlooked in dealing with this system.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I do know that there are various species of list systems.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There is none like this one.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: From my brief examination, I believe there are one or two that are similar. I do not

have the names at the moment but my recollection is that France had such a system.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Not with a droop quota.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: France has never had proportional representation. You had better get off that one.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The point is—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The system is crook, and you know it.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: The Leader would not even accept the system he is trying to pin the Hon. Mr. Sumner down to.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Sumner has the floor.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: There are various systems, and I have named several of them. The criticism that is usually made of the list system is that it does not allow an elector to vote for a specific candidate; he must vote for a Party *en bloc*. This emphasises the existence of Parties in our system. We must recognise that the Party system is a reality in western democracies. In fact, many people suggest that it is a desirable reality. What is the situation in the Senate? Candidates are still grouped by Parties and voters generally vote on the Party ticket.

It must be faced that the only reason that individual members in the group on the ticket are there is that they are endorsed by their Party. If they wish to run as Independent candidates they could do so and electors could vote for them. It is important to point out (the Hon. Mr. DeGaris might probably concede this as he has said it often himself) that there ought to be a different system for electing a Lower House from the system used to elect an Upper House in a bicameral system, and a different system of election for both Houses exists in South Australia.

Also, a list system prevents the use of large ballot-papers and the confusion inevitably resulting from them, including the large informal vote that occurs in the proportional representation system advocated by this Bill. Honourable members opposite will recall the Senate elections in 1974, when 73 candidates stood in New South Wales; the ballot-paper contained 73 names, and 73 squares had to be filled in. Certainly, that system is not designed for clarity in electoral matters: it is designed for confusion and an increase in the number of informal votes.

What honourable members opposite are really complaining about is that their vote was split by the Party led by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Party led by the Hon. Mr. Cameron. As I have previously pointed out (I refer honourable members to page 2121 of *Hansard*, 1975), if the Liberal Party had obtained an extra 1 per cent of the vote, giving it, say, 31 per cent of the vote, it would have got the largest final quota and would have obtained, with less than one third of the vote, more than one third of the seats.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That would still have been wrong.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will explain that. Unfortunately—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You are agreeing with me.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: —in any voting system one cannot get an exact proportion.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Yes, you can, as near as practicable.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: As near as practicable—

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: The Bill does that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There is no case for a minority to obtain a majority.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I will demonstrate that by reference to Senate figures shortly. The simple fact is that, if the votes of the Liberal Party and the Liberal Movement had been combined and had been of the same number (and that is debatable: if they had been combined, I suspect a large number of people who voted for the Liberal Movement would not have voted for the combined Liberal Party/Liberal Movement), the combined Party would have obtained six members and the Labor Party would have obtained only five members.

The simple fact is that the Opposition Parties were split and the Labor Party obtained the largest final quota. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris stated in his second reading explanation:

A system of voting which allows a group polling 48.5 per cent of the vote to gain 54.5 per cent of the elected members cannot be said to be a system providing for one vote one value, while the groups polling 51.5 per cent of the vote elect 45.5 per cent of the members.

Even if we take the combined vote of the Liberal Movement and the Liberal Party and give them an extra 1 per cent of the vote, they would have obtained 54.5 per cent of the members—that is, six out of the 10.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: With a majority vote—that is the point.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, but with a lower proportion than the actual vote, which is, of course, in other words, what happens. It is often not possible to get an exact proportion of seats to votes unless everyone is running as a candidate or there are as many seats as there are electors.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Don't you object to a minority getting a majority?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, generally.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Not the way you are putting it.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I think what I am saying is borne out by reference to the Senate figures. Looking at the 1974 Senate results in this State, we find that the Liberal group obtained four seats with 34.99 per cent of the vote; the Labor Party obtained five seats with 47.39 per cent (that is, half the seats), and the Liberal Movement obtained one seat with 9.84 per cent of the vote. Taking the combined Liberal and Liberal Movement vote on that occasion, they had 44.83 per cent of the vote and yet obtained 50 per cent of the seats. That is the system that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris wishes to introduce here. I do not disagree with that.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: What should have happened?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: All I am saying is that there are different systems, and it is impossible to get a strict mathematical proportion. All we can hope for is to get a system that approximates it.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: But our system would approximate more closely.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Even under the Senate system, which is substantially what this Bill wants to introduce, we can get the situation that obtained in 1974 where the combined Liberals obtained 44.83 per cent of the vote and got 50 per cent of the seats.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: But isn't the Bill fairer than the Act?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I do not think it can be said to be fairer or unfairer. The reason we got in with a minority of the votes was that the Parties opposite were split, and they refused to come to terms with that. It is true that in first past the post voting, which obtains in Britain, people get elected on a minority of the votes

because there is no preferential system, but that is accepted in Britain and the United States to be a democratic system of voting; every vote counts. There is a legitimate argument for the first past the post system, for preferences, a proportional representation system and its various forms, and the list system. Provided we get a situation that approximates what the system we have at present or the Senate system does, or what the House of Assembly system with equal electorates does, that is as far as we can take it. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris insists, now that he pretends he has come of democratic age, that he believes in one vote one value. We realise he does not.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Have you any argument against the Bill?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am putting my argument. The situation is that we cannot get an exact proportion of seats to the votes cast.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: But this is getting closer.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You tried to deny everybody and now you think you are lilywhite and pure.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I thought perhaps some people had forgotten my preamble. The present system is far more democratic than anything that has existed in this Chamber. It goes as far as it can.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You opposed it in the initial stages.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: No, I did not.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Dealing with the December, 1975, Senate results, we find that the Liberal Movement obtained 6.54 per cent of the votes and, of course, got one of the 10 seats. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Burdett can explain that.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Return to this Bill and say what is wrong with it.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am explaining that this Bill introduces a system similar to the Senate system, and I have indicated that even under the Senate system a situation of disproportion arises.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It cannot; that is rubbish.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You never have a minority electing a majority in the Senate system.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But your system does that.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: It did it last year.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes, and the reason it did it last year was that the Opposition Parties were split.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What has that to do with democracy?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Honourable members opposite want it both ways. They want to be able to throw the Hon. Mr. Cameron out of their Party and then get the benefit of his vote in any subsequent electoral system. That is a simple plain fact.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You are defending a gerrymander.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I have been here speaking for over an hour. I suppose I could recapitulate everything I have said in the first half hour, when the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was so extraordinarily silent, but I will not bother, because it is already in the record. Taking the Senate 1975 Liberal and Liberal Movement figures, they got 57.9 per cent of the vote. The Liberals got 51.4 per cent and the Liberal Movement got 6.5 per cent; yet they got 60 per cent of the seats.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about the allocation of preferences in the group that went out; are you ignoring those?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: They are the final results.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: After all preferences had been counted?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. This is in the Senate system. You have not been listening.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And that is as close as you can get it with 10 members being elected.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: You do not get a minority electing a majority, which you get under the present Act.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The only reason why you will get that is that your Parties happened to be split. It is like the relationship between the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party in the United Kingdom. If they were united, they would win more seats.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: As usual, members opposite want to have an each way bet. They wanted to get rid of the Hon. Mr. Cameron but they still wanted his electoral support in this Chamber, or the support in this Chamber of the people who had voted for him. That is why members opposite are so upset. We must also realise (but apparently this has escaped the minds of most members opposite) that this system was introduced in June, 1973. One election has been held since then, and the system was introduced as a result of a compromise.

The Labor Party introduced the Bill in the Lower House providing for a list system of proportional representation without a preferential system. Honourable members opposite amended the Bill to include provision for preferences, and that was unacceptable to the House of Assembly. The Houses went to a conference three years ago, and I am surprised that the record shows that members opposite agreed to this system then, whilst now they are complaining. They were resisting, right up to the death knell in 1973, the introduction of even adult franchise for this place, as I have shown in what I have quoted from the statement by Mr. Steele Hall, now Senator Hall. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris, the Hon. Mr. Geddes, the Hon. Jessie Cooper, and all other members opposite agreed in June, 1973, and now they are complaining. As reported at page 148 of *Hansard* of June 27, 1973, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris stated:

I pointed out, I think on many occasions, that the use of a list system, when 11 members are being elected to the Council, makes it difficult to implement a full preferential system. Nevertheless, we have achieved a situation where every vote cast in the election will have a value and will in most cases play some part in electing a member to this Chamber.

Why did the Hon. Mr. DeGaris not oppose it on that occasion?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You know as well as I do that this Council goes to a conference and reaches a compromise, although it may not finally agree with the compromise.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Ask him to repeat that!

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am indebted to the Hon. Mr. Cornwall for reminding me of what I said in the earlier part of my speech, when I said that on at least eight occasions the Council could have compromised on this matter but did not do so.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: When were they?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I have cited Bills introduced by a Labor Government and rejected out of hand in this Council on the second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: They did not go to a conference?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Council rejected them. The Hon. Mr. Cameron is in hysterics at his Leader's attempt to justify the unjustifiable. As reported at page 149 of *Hansard* of June 27, 1973, the Hon. Mr. Cameron, who also agreed to the compromise reached in 1973, stated:

Certain votes were previously excluded from the count, but it is clear from the amendment that the votes will now be considered. I believe we will now have an optional preferential voting system, so that a person may or may not indicate a preference as he wishes. I had thought that this matter could be included in the scheme, and the Party that I represent regarded it as desirable. Therefore, I support the motion.

As reported on the same page of *Hansard*, the Hon. Mr. Whyte said:

I want to congratulate those who have brought this legislation to a point where it is acceptable to all Parties. I am certain it will work to the advantage of the State. I reiterate what I said last evening, that it is to the Premier's credit that he introduced a system of proportional representation. All who took part in the debate deserve credit.

He goes on to say that, apparently in the Party room, he had propagated the idea of the proportional representation system. It is clear that members opposite showed no interest in electoral reform until they were forced into it in a double dissolution situation in 1973. They gave nothing away, and subsequently they supported the proposition that they are now trying to change. In any voting system, there are flaws, and it is not possible to get precise mathematical equality between the number of votes and the number of districts. For this reason, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do not quite know how one answers the ramblings to which this Council has just been subjected. It would be one of the worst speeches that I have ever heard here. It seems to me that the Hon. Mr. Sumner has not an original thought in his head, and he makes a speech after going to the library or somewhere else and using a photo-copying machine so that he can stand up here and bore the backside off all of us. I think it is important to examine just what the Hon. Mr. Sumner has gone through. It has been an exercise of wriggling away from the fact that probably he should not be here, because he has not been elected democratically. I can understand why he is the first speaker from the Government side on this Bill, because he was elected to this Council under an imperfect system and he has to make an excuse for his presence. The Government obviously has given him the job of proving that this Bill is not a proper one.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Mr. Cameron has accused me of taking my seat in this Chamber by, as he has almost implied, a fraud. Certainly, he has said that I have not been democratically elected. I consider that to be a reflection on me and on the most recent election, and I ask him to withdraw the statement.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Sumner has asked the Hon. Mr. Cameron to withdraw the remark because he regards it as a reflection on himself. Will the honourable member withdraw?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No, I have no intention of doing that, because that is what this Bill is all about, and that is why the honourable member is perhaps a little upset. Because he avoided speaking to the matter, he wants me to stop speaking to it, but I will not stop speaking.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I rise on a point of order. That is a further reflection. I at no time suggested that I wished the Hon. Mr. Cameron to stop speaking about the Bill. Clearly, I should like him to speak to it and I want to hear all his arguments. The implication that I do not wish him to speak and that I wish to stifle his contribution to the debate is pure nonsense and I again ask him to withdraw the remark.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is not the way you dealt with a similar one here yesterday, with all due respect.

The PRESIDENT: Surely honourable members are not as thin-skinned as all that.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That's different from what you said before.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member can ask the Hon. Mr. Cameron to give way.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I would give a short answer to that request.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Mr. President, what redress has a member got if he thinks he has been unfairly dealt with by another honourable member who is on his feet?

The PRESIDENT: Order! If an honourable member takes a point of order which I uphold, that is all right. The give-way rule was introduced to solve this problem.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: On a point of order—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member could also make a personal explanation, if he so desired.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Don't worry about that.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is the Hon. Mr. Foster raising a point of order?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes. It seems to me that a member can stand in this Chamber and make all sorts of assertions and accusations against another member, claiming that he has no right to be here. There has been a reflection not only on the member concerned but also on the Electoral Department.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must be satisfied that there is a reflection on the honourable member concerned.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I'd like to see your interpretation in writing, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I am in order.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I shall be pleased to sit down while all these matters are sorted out.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Cameron should continue with his speech.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Let me return to the point I was making. During his recounting of events (it could not possibly be called a speech), the honourable member raised anything that he could possibly dredge up out of the past. That is the action of a true conservative; he is not willing to look at the present situation, or even to the future. The honourable member tried to find where I had not supported the democratic system, but he failed. He was not able to reflect on me in any way. Now, we find the Hon. Mr. Sumner taking the sort of stand on this matter that he has criticised others for taking. He is refusing an opportunity further to democratise the system. He is saying, "Because you used to do it, I am now going to do it. I do not want the whole thing sorted out or a compromise reached in a truly democratic system." The Hon. Mr. Sumner is now assuming the very attitude that has been condemned in the past. I am surprised to find a man, who claims to represent a democratic Party in this place, stepping backwards.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He's now opposed to change.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, he is a conservative now. It is incredible that he has now jumped over the fence and landed on the other side. Let us look further into the motivations of the Hon. Mr. Sumner and the Party that he represents. His Party claims that it believes in the democratisation of this Council, although one can see from that Party's platform that it believes in one thing only: the abolition of this Council. The Labor Party is not even interested in democracy. I have known the reason for the various moves it has made in the past: to get a majority in this Council and to get rid of it.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: That's absolutely correct.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Labor Party wants not to give people a vote but to take it away from them. Members on the Government benches support the Trades and Labor Council, which has recently refused to accept the democratic decision of a union. They do not believe in democracy. They refer to it emotionally for their own purposes and now, when an attempt is made to improve the system, they throw it aside because it does not suit them. If members opposite did support the Bill, the Hon. Mr. Sumner would have to say—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Tell us what Bjelke-Petersen is doing.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What has that got to do with it?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The only thing that I could find in the Hon. Mr. Sumner's speech that had any relevance to the Bill was his implication that he was here only because Opposition members were split. What an incredible statement! Surely, it would have been better for him to support the Bill to bring about a system in which it did not matter whether the Parties were split and which ensured that the will of the people was brought to its final conclusion. If Government members do not believe in that, they believe not in preferential voting but in first past the post voting. Government members have said that this is not their policy, but it was their policy when they spoke previously. They should explain what they mean when they say that the result of the last election occurred because the Opposition Parties were split. They do not want preferential voting. That is surprising, considering what the Hon. Mr. Blevins said recently. Although I am quoting from memory, I am sure he implied, by way of interjection and in other ways, that the Labor Party no longer had first past the post voting as part of its policy.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: That's correct.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Well, the Hon. Mr. Blevins had better tell that to the Hon. Mr. Sumner.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: He made the policy.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It is a great shame that the Labor Party, which I always thought believed in true electoral reform, is slipping backwards. I implore Government members to support a system that will bring about true democracy in the Council. We could patch up the system which is operating at present and under which the last election was held. However, to bring about true democracy in the Council, support of this Bill is necessary, and I ask honourable members opposite to reconsider their attitude to it. Let us not have a vote on this matter until Government members have had an opportunity to show the people that they are not frauds and that they believe in democracy. I support the Bill.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Whyte.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Fair go!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Neither the Hon. Mr. Blevins nor the Government Whip has provided me with his name as a prospective contributor to the debate.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: That doesn't alter the fact that I was on my feet before the Hon. Mr. Whyte was. Aren't you supposed to call on the member who was on his feet first?

The PRESIDENT: No. I make the call according to the list of members provided by the Whips.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: There should be one side and then the other. They talk about democracy, but it doesn't obtain here.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Where's your Whip?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I call on the Hon. Mr. Whyte.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: But that's—

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: If it will assist the debate, I will sit down to allow the Hon. Mr. Blevins—

The PRESIDENT: I was wondering whether it might assist the debate if the Hon. Mr. Whyte sat down.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I have sat down now.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: It was in your court, Mr. President, not the member's.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It gives me much pleasure to see these provisions reintroduced in the Council, and to ask for the support of the whole Council for what is, indisputably, the most democratic system of electing members to the Council. Government members know that this Bill will achieve the same end as the amendments that were moved by me to a previous Electoral Act Amendment Bill. It will achieve a truly preferred vote; this cannot be disputed. It has been proved that this is the only system whereby every vote cast will reach its full proportionate value. It is strange that members opposite should fiercely oppose this Bill. Indeed, the Hon. Mr. Sumner went to some lengths in opposing the Bill. I do not think I have ever seen any other honourable member do such a political sewer crawl. When the honourable member started discussing the Bill, he spoke of two Bills.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. The Hon. Mr. Whyte has referred to my speech as a political sewer crawl. As you will know, my speech was historically accurate.

The PRESIDENT: What is the point of order?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Hon. Mr. Whyte's remark is clearly a reflection on me and on what I had to say. I ask that it be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: Do you object to the use of the words "sewer crawl"?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: It is a somewhat colourful expression. The Hon. Mr. Sumner has objected to the use of these words. Is the Hon. Mr. Whyte willing to withdraw them?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I went about as near as I could to describing correctly the diatribe that the honourable member gave. When the Hon. Mr. Sumner started discussing the Bill it was obvious that he had confused two electoral Bills, both introduced by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. The Bill now before the Chair does not need any clauses providing that the votes must be counted to their full extent, because that is written into the formula in the first place. The Bill previously introduced by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris dealt with a full count of preferences for an Assembly election.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I was not confusing the Bills.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The formula prescribed under the Hare-Clark system being conclusive, there can be no wastage of votes whatever.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: It is not the same as the Senate system.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: No. If members opposite prefer the Senate system, I would not object to that system, which has much to recommend it. In some circumstances it hastens the count. However, Tasmania has most satisfactorily used the method advocated here since early in the history of Tasmania (I think 1901). The Tasmanians have proved that it is not necessary for every square to be filled in, as in a Senate system, for the count to be accurate. They have developed a system under which only the number of candidates to be elected need be voted for. In this Bill, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has stipulated that, for the convenience of the voter (not for the convenience of the electoral officers), a voter shall vote for one more person than the number required to be elected. This does not make it any easier for the electoral officers. But they are satisfied that it is not a complicated way of voting, and they can arrive at the result in good time. Because South Australian electoral officers are as competent as electoral officers anywhere in Australia, the system will present no problems to them.

Much has been said about the previous franchise. Actually, the Labor Party's opposition to the restricted franchise did it more harm than good. Members opposite often talk about the previous 16-4 balance in this Council, but one of the reasons why the balance remained 16-4 was that Labor Party leaders told the people, "Here is your Labor Party candidate, but he is not really going into Parliament to represent you: his object is to abolish the Legislative Council." The Labor Party could never get its voters to the polls because they had no enthusiasm for such a candidate.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What about the fact that there were only two metropolitan districts, while there were three country districts?

The Hon. Anne Levy: What about the fact that 30 per cent of the population elected 60 per cent of the members, while 70 per cent of the population elected 40 per cent of the members?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The problem is related to the fact that Labor Party voters did not go to the polls. I compliment the Hon. Mr. DeGaris on pursuing this matter, because undoubtedly this is the means by which every vote cast will carry its democratic right fully. Because it is a proven system, honourable members should have no hesitation in accepting it.

True, I supported the list system. I did so because it was a step forward; at least it was proportional representation. Of course, had it been a true list system, it would have been even more acceptable. Actually, I have never been an advocate of the list system because I believe it emphasises two-Party politics. That is one of the sorry points in Parliamentary patterns today. Parties are constituted by people and are therefore designed to suit those people. History will show that none of these institutions ever lasts unless the people concerned by them have the democratic right to take part in them. Under our present list system, the voters are denied the right to vote for individual candidates. Given the opportunity, there would be any number of people who would divide their vote between Parties. They would appreciate the right not to adhere to the present Party numbering of candidates and would prefer to be able to place a number of their choice against a candidate.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: As the honourable member has always been helpful to me in the past, I will give way.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Surely, whether it is a list or a proportional representation system, as suggested in this Bill, the only reason why candidates are on a ticket is that they have obtained their Party's endorsement. True, as most voters follow a Party ticket anyhow, there is no real additional choice given to electors.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: That is a lot of nonsense, because that is exactly what this Bill provides. Under the present system a voter has no option but to tick the list of candidates the Party presents to him.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Has any member of the Senate been elected outside the order decided on by the Party?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: They certainly have in Tasmania.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The possibility is there. Many people would not follow the Party ticket if they had the option not to do so. Certainly, any honourable member who opposes this Bill does so for only one reason: he is frightened to show his face to his electors and is hiding behind the protection of his Party. This is what the Bill is all about: it gives electors the opportunity to choose their candidate. It seems strange that a well-educated man like the Hon. Mr. Sumner (although he probably still has much to learn), as the leading speaker for the Government has taken a stand completely opposed to that of Ben Chifley who was the most noted Labor leader in my time, and probably for a long time before that, and was the man who introduced the system operating for Senate elections.

It would be interesting for honourable members opposite to read what Ben Chifley had to say about the Senate system and the previous electoral systems used to elect Senators, and what Dr. Evatt, as the then Attorney-General, had to say when he introduced the legislation. I do not want to bore the Council by referring to all the statements made because all honourable members have access to Commonwealth *Hansard*. I know how the Hon. Mr. Sumner can research *Hansard* and, if he has any rival at all in this area, it must surely be the Hon. Mr. Blevins, who gave an example when a Bill on this subject was last considered in this Council.

There is no reason why honourable members should not go through Commonwealth *Hansard* to determine what was the true position. The comments of Mr. Chifley were similar to those of Dr. Evatt, who stated:

The great defect, from the representation aspect, of both the old "first past the post" and the more recently used "block majority" system is that at an election, generally all seats in a State are won by candidates of the one Party, leaving a minority of between 40 to 50 per cent of the electors without any representation at all in the Senate. For many years there has been a demand that the Parliament should provide a system of electing Senators which would give more equitable results and enable the electorate to be more truly represented in the Senate. The Government has given careful consideration to the matter and has closely examined alternative methods.

The following statement is of great interest:

It has decided that, in relation to the election of Senators where each State votes as one electorate, the fairest system and the one most likely to enhance the status of the Senate is that of proportional representation.

There, without any possibility of refute, is the research of the then Government and one of the leading Labor Party figures of all time. Ben Chifley instructed his

Government to investigate possible systems. There are numerous ways in which people can vote, but nowhere is the list system mentioned in this Chifley report. The list system, as it is designed in South Australia, has no parallel in any other system. Nowhere else in the world is the list system employed as it is in South Australia.

This Bill provides the opportunity to improve our present system. Although I do not know whether Government members yet to speak will criticise the Bill, I feel they will try to deny us the opportunity to improve the existing system. The system proposed differs from the Senate system inasmuch as in Senate elections it is necessary to vote for every candidate on the ballot-paper, whereas the system advanced by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is similar to that used in Tasmania, where only the vacancies plus one need be voted for. The Hobart correspondent of the Adelaide press, writing in respect of the Tasmanian elections, stated:

The more we study the results of these elections the clearer the fact becomes that Hare's system does secure correct representation, and prevents the polling of a large number of useless votes, and if true representation is what is wanted, this is the only way yet devised on which it can be surely obtained.

If it was necessary I could detail the system for honourable members opposite but, as all the calculating method is readily available to them, I will not take up the time of this Council by doing so. I merely point out to honourable members opposite that this system will result in a true and proper representation in this Council. Its results will not be questioned in any form. I reiterate that the only reason why any honourable member will vote against this Bill is that he is afraid to face the electors. I support the Bill.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I oppose the Bill, as I can see no reason to change the present system, which, when it first appeared, was agreed to by all Parties—it got rave reviews. I will read out some of the things that honourable members opposite said at the time. I am aware that these things have been read out before but they should be read again and again and again because, every time the Hon. Mr. DeGaris or any member of the Opposition starts talking about and denigrating the present system, which they are doing all the time, we have to reply using their own words. For example, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had this to say about the present system (page 148 of *Hansard*) on June 27, 1973:

Right throughout the debate on this matter, the main point of contention has been the fact that a certain undetermined number of votes cast would be lost. I pointed out, I think on many occasions, that the use of a list system, when 11 members are being elected to the Council, makes it difficult to implement a full preferential system. Nevertheless, we have achieved a situation where every vote cast in the election will have a value . . .

That is what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I did not say an equal vote; I said it had a value.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: That is exactly what you said.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Not equal value.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I cannot read your mind, but that is what you said. The fact remains that they are the Leader's exact words. He cannot change them now, although he can have a change of heart. The Hon. Mr. Cameron had something to say on the matter, too. On June 27, 1973 (page 149 of *Hansard*), he said:

Having had a brief look at the amendments agreed to at the conference, I see that they contain a provision that meets the only objection I have had about this Bill. Certain votes were previously excluded from the count,

but it is clear from the amendment that the votes will now be considered. I believe we will now have an optional preferential voting system, so that a person may or may not indicate a preference as he wishes. I had thought that this matter could be included in the scheme, and the Party I represent regarded it as desirable.

On the same page, the Hon. Mr. Whyte is reported as saying:

I want to congratulate those who have brought this legislation to a point where it is acceptable to all Parties. I am certain it will work to the advantage of the State.

That is absolutely correct. We should also look at what Dr. Eastick, the then Leader of the Opposition in another place, said on that occasion (page 162 of *Hansard*), as follows:

The Premier has said that minorities will be given the chance of representation and that those who fail to make a quota will see, subject to their vote being cast in a preferential manner, the value of their second, third, or fifth votes going to the eventual election of a person to the Upper House. I believe, and I reiterate, that all Parties can be satisfied with the end result, but the ultimate winner will undoubtedly be the community of South Australia.

I concur in what he said; it was correct. These quotes show that the present system is completely fair and should not be tampered with by members of the Liberal Party, who have proven records of electoral banditry. The Hon. Mr. Sumner has given some examples of what honourable members opposite have done in this matter, and a sorry record it is, too.

I want to give one more example of how honourable members opposite have constantly tried to rig the electoral system. I refer to the *Weekly Report, Legislative Council* of August 25, 1972. It is an anonymous document but I think every honourable member realises that the shy violet who compiles these things is the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. It does not say so here, but we know it. It appears from this document that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris at that time was trying to mislead people that this somehow was an official report of the Legislative Council. The title has been changed since then, and he has to put his name on it. There is more about that in *Hansard*. Under the heading "Constitution Act Amendment Bill", the following appears:

This Bill, which implements the policy adopted unanimously by the Special General Meeting of the L.C.L. on February 19, passed its second reading and Committee stages last Wednesday. The Chief Secretary was the only Minister to speak opposing the Bill on the grounds that the population of the proposed metropolitan district demanded greater representation than the representation from the country district. The Bill (Hon. Mr. DeGaris's Bill) provided for two districts, one metropolitan and one country, with 12 members in each district, elected on a proportional representation system of voting.

So the Hon. Mr. DeGaris introduced this Bill on August 15, 1972, for a proportional representation system. Somewhere along the line, the Hon. Mr. Whyte convinced him of the wisdom of this course. Let us look at what it would have meant to the people of this State if the Bill had been introduced then. It would have meant 12 members in each district, under the proportional representation system, and the metropolitan district would have had 267 526 electors, whereas, in the rural district, the number of electors would have been 111 527—a ratio of about 2½ to one.

According to this document put out by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, one of the objections taken to the Bill was that the voting paper would be too cumbersome and the quota for the election of a member would be too low to give an effective result. That is interesting. Many other honourable members have at times said the same

thing: if the whole of the State had been allowed to be one district, the voting paper would have been too large. If the State had been divided into two districts, one southern and one northern, half metropolitan and half country in each district, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's objection was that the metropolitan area would dominate each district. Nothing at all was said about the way the people voted—just that the metropolitan area would dominate each district. Another disadvantage was said to be that minority groups would be somewhat disadvantaged.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not doubt that.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that the minority groups were somewhat disadvantaged. He wrote this. Frankly, I do not understand it. If the Leader would like to explain it, I shall be only too pleased to give way and sit down. Another proposition was that there would be one country district and one metropolitan district, with 14 members in the city and 10 in the country. According to what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, the disadvantage would be that the quota to be elected in one district would be lower than the quota in the other. What is special about that? The Leader does not say. That gives some indication of another P.R. system that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has attempted to introduce here.

What we can see from reading that document, which I commend to all honourable members (it is available in the Parliamentary Library), is that the last thing that the Liberals and the Liberal Movement wanted at that time was a true proportional representation system. They wanted to fiddle with such a system. Every honourable member of the Opposition who was in this Council on August 15, 1972, voted with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to fiddle the system. That number included the Hon. Mr. Whyte and the Hon. Martin Cameron. Preceding me in this debate, they have made great claims for the proportional representation system, yet they supported the Hon. Mr. DeGaris when he put up a straight out fiddle. You also, Mr. President, voted to support this travesty of a P.R. system, but we know that your heart was not in it. As you told us, in the *L.M. Story*, you knew that L.C.L. members were only interested in saving their seats. They wanted to do that, above all. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

The House of Assembly transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

That whereas the Parliament of South Australia by joint resolution of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly adopted on September 26 and 27, 1972, appointed

12 members of the Parliament as delegates to take part in the deliberations of a convention to review the nature and contents and operation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose any necessary revision or amendment thereof:

And whereas by resolution of the House of Assembly of Thursday, August 28, 1975, and agreed to by the Legislative Council on the same day it was *inter alia* resolved that the Hon. J. D. Corcoran be appointed as a delegate to take part in the deliberations of the convention:

And whereas it was further resolved that each appointed delegate shall continue as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia until the House of which he is a member otherwise determines notwithstanding a dissolution or prorogation of the Parliament:

And whereas the convention has not concluded its business:

Now therefore it is hereby resolved:

1. That the appointment as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia of the Hon. J. D. Corcoran be revoked and the Hon. P. Duncan be appointed such a delegate in the place of the Hon. J. D. Corcoran; and
2. That the Premier inform the Governments of the Commonwealth and the other States of this resolution.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That the Legislative Council concur in the resolution of the House of Assembly.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills. The three persons representing the House of Assembly on such a committee would be the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Messrs. McRae and Vandepeer.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That the request contained in the message from the House of Assembly seeking the appointment of a Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills be agreed to and that the members of the Legislative Council to be members of such committee be the Minister of Lands, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris and the Minister of Health, of whom two shall form the quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee, and that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that House accordingly.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.54 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, August 19, at 2.15 p.m.