

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 12, 1977

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

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS** presented a petition from 374 electors and residents of South Australia alleging that pornographic publications were becoming available to children through various avenues and praying that the Council would take whatever action was deemed fit to prevent such publications from reaching young children. Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General, on the matter of land brokers' charges.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R. C. DeGARIS**: Following the question directed yesterday by the Hon. Mr. Burdett, it has come to my notice that regulations that govern the fees that any solicitor or licensed land broker is permitted to charge are such that the solicitor or land broker is unable to pass on any costs that may be levied against him for search fees, particularly search fees which the profession must pay or is expected to pay but which are not controlled by legislation. I refer to search fees in regard to local government, where a variety of charges is made from council to council for this service to be conducted, and I believe that it is quite unfair that land brokers or solicitors should have their fees fixed by regulation, yet they are not allowed to vary their charges for services rendered. I ask the Government whether it will examine this matter, with the idea of altering the regulations to allow the search fees to be recovered by the land broker or solicitor concerned.

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: I will refer the question to my colleague.

URANIUM

The **Hon. R. A. GEDDES**: I direct a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, and I ask leave to make a short statement. The question is regarding uranium enrichment.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. R. A. GEDDES**: Representatives from the United Kingdom Uranium Enrichment Company, named URENCO, are now having discussions in Canberra regarding the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant in Australia, using the centrifuge method. The Mines Department in 1964 produced an excellent feasibility study that indicated that a uranium enrichment plant could be built in South Australia, and it was indicated at that time that such a plant would be of much benefit to the State.

I am told that the URENCO representatives will be visiting various States of the Commonwealth to ascertain the feasibility of sites for an enrichment plant. Will the Government be in a position to have discussions with these representatives, bearing in mind that such a plant will not

be operational before the mid or late 1980's, when the technological knowledge of waste disposal will be further advanced, and the Roxby Downs mining venture could be coming on stream?

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

STUART HIGHWAY

The **Hon. A. M. WHYTE**: I seek leave to make a short statement regarding the impact study on the Stuart Highway before directing a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. A. M. WHYTE**: An advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser* stating:

The South Australian Highways Department proposes to construct the Stuart Highway on a new alignment between Port Augusta and the Northern Territory border. The environmental impact statement, which has been released in accordance with the provisions of the Commonwealth Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act, 1974-75, will be available for public perusal at the following locations:

It then gives a list of the places where that document can be perused. Any comment arising from that study must be made to the Environment Department by October 31, 1977. Will the Minister ascertain from his colleague whether copies of this environmental impact study can be made available to members of this Council as soon as possible?

The **Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD**: I shall take up the matter with my colleague.

TELEPHONE BOOKS

The **Hon. M. B. DAWKINS**: I wish to direct a question to you, Mr. President. I have noticed that the new metropolitan telephone books have been distributed for several days on the House of Assembly side, and I wonder whether there is any reason why the new telephone books have not been made available on this side. If there is no reason for this, will they be made available to members of the Legislative Council?

The **PRESIDENT**: I assure the honourable member that I will look into the matter. The information he has just given to the Council is news to me.

AVIARY BIRDS

The **Hon. C. M. HILL**: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture concerning Newcastle disease in aviary birds and poultry.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. C. M. HILL**: The Commonwealth Director-General of Health, Dr. Gwyn Howells, has issued a news release in which he advises that 1 150 aviary birds were recently imported illegally from Indonesia to Queensland and New South Wales, and that Newcastle disease has been found on at least one of these birds, and that all of them have been destroyed.

The Director-General pointed out that there was a real possibility of this disease spreading amongst poultry, and he emphasised that this could have a disastrous effect on the poultry industry throughout the Commonwealth. He also said in the news release that all State authorities were

concerned and were carrying out intensive surveillance to check against any possible further outbreaks. Can the Minister give an assurance to this Council that all possible is being done by Agriculture Department officers in this State to ensure that this disease will not occur in South Australia?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The outbreak of Newcastle disease in Queensland and New South Wales has been of much concern to us in South Australia. This is a serious disease affecting poultry. It is a crippling cost to the poultry industry in many other countries. We are taking every possible step to ensure that the disease is kept out of South Australia and that, if an outbreak occurs here, it is tackled as quickly as possible. We are monitoring the situation very closely. Veterinary officers in my department are in close contact with the Commonwealth and interstate authorities.

HEARING TESTS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Will the Minister of Health ascertain whether the Minister of Labour and Industry intends to make hearing tests, in conformity with the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act and regulations, compulsory for persons employed in the Public Service, in workshops, and in similar positions; if so, when does the Government intend to do this? Further, does the Government intend to enforce similar hearing tests in private industry; if so, when does the Government intend to do this?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

WATER RATIONING

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Works say whether, if there is insufficient run-off of water into the metropolitan reservoirs this summer, there will be sufficient water available for the huge area serviced by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in rural and urban areas without some form of rationing during the coming summer months?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I understand that the Minister of Works has made a statement on this matter. He does not expect that water rationing will be necessary this year. However, I will take up the honourable member's question with my colleague.

CLASSIFIED PUBLICATIONS

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Health about classified publications.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: On July 26 I asked a question of the Minister about classified publications. Before he could get a reply from his colleague, Parliament was prorogued and an election was held. We are now in a new session. For that reason, I shall repeat my question of July 26, as follows:

In the public notices in last Thursday's *Advertiser* a notice inserted by the Classification of Publications Board states that the board has classified certain publications. Then follows a list of prohibitions that apply to the publications. The books which are the subject of my question all carry the classification A. Classification A is defined as follows:

A condition prohibiting the sale, delivery, exhibition or

display of the publication to a minor (other than by a parent or guardian or a person acting with the authority of a parent or guardian) or the exhibition or display of the publication in circumstances in which it is likely to be perused by minors.

The books which are the subject of my question are as follows *The Australian Weed, Drug Manufacturing for Fun and Profit, A Guide to Growing Cannabis under Fluorescents, The Complete Cannabis Cultivator, Herbal Highs, The Marijuana Consumer's and Dealer's Guide, and The Super Grass*. With one exception, all of these publications are published by a publishing house calling itself the Flash Post Express Company. It is well known that the possession and growing of *cannabis* is illegal in South Australia. From the titles of at least some of these books, it appears that they advise how to grow *cannabis* and, in one case at least, it goes a little further and purports to be a guide for dealers in *cannabis*. As honourable members know, this Parliament only last year greatly increased the penalties for dealing in drugs. How is it that publications designed to help people to carry out illegal activities are allowed to be sold in South Australia, and will the Minister take steps to remove these books from sale?

Does the Minister now have a reply to my question?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There is no power to remove books from sale in South Australia, and the Government has no intention of introducing legislation to empower the banning of books. The right to disseminate information is fundamental to democracy.

If indecent or obscene material is sold, the vendor is liable to be prosecuted under section 33 of the Police Offences Act if, in fact, the board has not considered the publication or has refused to classify it. Books and magazines of this nature are not banned, but their sale may result in prosecutions. If he has not observed any conditions of sale that might have been imposed by the Classification of Publications Board, he may be prosecuted under section 18 of the Classification of Publications Act.

The Classification of Publications Board also has jurisdiction in regard to publications dealing with matters other than sex, namely, drug addiction, crime, cruelty, violence or revolting or abhorrent phenomena. Sale of such publications without reference to the board, however, does not render the vendor liable to prosecution under section 33 of the Police Offences Act unless indecency is also involved.

The position is, therefore, that the board has either to restrict the sale of publications dealing with drugs or see them sold in the same manner as ordinary magazines. In the past, some magazines advocating the use of drugs of various kinds have been restricted more severely than those complained about by the honourable member. The latter publications, however, deal with the cultivation of marijuana and, as such, the board formed the opinion that a restriction on sales to minors was appropriate.

True, the cultivation of *cannabis* is illegal in South Australia. Material on *cannabis* is, however, widely available in library and scientific publications and in other works. It would be as impossible to suppress all such publications, as it would be to suppress publications dealing with the cultivation of opium and mescaline. I presume that the honourable member does not suggest we ban the works of DeQuincey or Aldous Huxley.

MAGISTRACY

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My question is directed to the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General agree with the

statement by Mr. Wilson, S.S.M., in his letter tabled in the House of Assembly recently, that the Attorney's statement was an assertion that in the exercise of his judicial duties—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Here it is—the whole bloody lot.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster is out of order.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I realise about order. Thank you for informing me.

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member realises this, he should not start these conversations.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Good things in life are prohibited.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will repeat my question: does the Attorney-General agree with the statement by Mr. Wilson, S.S.M., in his letter tabled in the House of Assembly, that the Attorney's statement was an assertion that in the exercise of his judicial duties he had been guilty of partiality and a lack of integrity and had violated his judicial oath?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall seek the Attorney-General's views on this matter.

However, the Government had no obligation to accept the committee's recommendations.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Dictatorial.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is what Sir Thomas Playford said. Are members opposite saying that that is dictatorial? If they are, they should refer the matter to Sir Thomas Playford, because I was merely telling the Hon. Mr. Dawkins what Sir Thomas did on more than one occasion.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Why don't you stand on your own two feet?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is exactly what I am doing: I am not sitting on my bottom like the honourable member is. I am telling the Council what Sir Thomas Playford said from time to time, and the Government does not disagree with that. Further, regarding the other aspect of the question, as I do not want the Hon. Mr. Dawkins to lose any sleep about the legality of the matter, I will refer it to my colleague.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think that subject has been exhausted.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Works, about the Public Works Standing Committee.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear what the Hon. Mr. Dawkins is saying. There is so much conversation emanating from the Government benches.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If I can speak over the top of the honourable gentleman in the corner, I wish to draw the attention of the Council to a statement referred to by the Auditor-General in his report with reference to the Paringa Park School and the comments in the *Advertiser* on Monday last. The editorial in the *Advertiser* of that date stated:

Once again, in his annual report to Parliament the Auditor-General is critical of some Government accounting and financial management practices. Specifically, this year, he has questioned the expenditure of nearly \$700 000 on redevelopment plans for the Paringa Park Primary School despite two recommendations by a top Parliamentary committee that the project be scrapped.

Later, it continued:

Even more importantly, he—that is, the Auditor-General—has identified "poor financial management" in many Government departments.

I should like the Minister to ask his colleague why the Government has chosen to ignore the findings of the Public Works Standing Committee on these two occasions and, if this is so, whether this is not contrary to the Public Works Standing Committee Act and, therefore, unlawful? Also, in that event, how does the Minister justify such action?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague. However, so that the honourable member will not lose any sleep regarding the legality of this action, I repeat what I said yesterday regarding reports made by the Public Works Committee. I refer to the attitude adopted by Sir Thomas Playford, who said (and the Government agrees with his statement) that the Government had to refer matters to the Public Works Committee when it wanted to undertake projects costing more than a certain stipulated sum.

HOSPITAL LEVY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Health a question regarding the local government hospital levy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Earlier this week, the Secretary of the Local Government Association, Mr. J. M. Hullick, called on the Government, through the press, to scrap the local government hospital levy. He stated clearly the intense feeling that exists within local government throughout the State in opposition to the levy. This gentleman went so far as to name one council (the Stirling District Council) and one local government association (the South-Eastern Local Government Association) as being specific bodies that oppose the levy strongly. In view of such an authoritative call from local government to the State Government to take some action in this matter, I ask the Minister of Health whether the Government is considering further the abolition of this local government hospital levy.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: All levies and charges are constantly under consideration by the Government, so we are reviewing these charges. I understand that, at the time of the election campaign, members opposite, when they were out on the hustings, made this one of their planks. We have seen the result of the election, and can we assume that we have a mandate for this levy, which has been in existence for more than 30 years? The honourable member mentioned the South-East local government system, and it is interesting that in the South-East a petition was sent to ratepayers by local government in the area asking people to protest against this 3 per cent levy, without there being a starter for this petition. Local government advertised again. Therefore, there has been no reaction from the people. The association has made representations to the Government from time to time and we have told it in the past that we will keep this matter under review and, if and when we are able to remove the levy, which, as I have said, has been operating for more than 30 years, the Government will do so.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I direct a question to the Chief Secretary.

The PRESIDENT: He is not in this Council any longer. Do you mean the Minister of Health?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Have you all finished? My

question, which is directed to the Minister of Health, with the leave of the Council, is: can the Minister ascertain how many councils are members of the Local Government Association, as against those that are not? Secondly, can the Minister tell the Council, in respect of a local government area which is proclaimed within the meaning of the Act and in which there are large towns, the number of councillors that are elected by the principal towns in those local government areas, as against the number elected by the rural parts of those local government areas?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will try to get the information for the honourable member.

MAGISTRATE'S TRANSFER

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General, relating to recent publicity in the *Advertiser*, concerning a magistrate.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It appears from the letters which were tabled in the House of Assembly recently and which were referred to in the *Advertiser* this morning—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: What was the name of the man?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Mr. Wilson, S.S.M., repeatedly sought an interview with the Premier. The Premier is the head of the department and Mr. Wilson is a senior officer employed by that department. The matter is also obviously of considerable gravity. From the letters tabled, it appears that Mr. Wilson was merely stating the obvious in saying that there were several courses open to him, and he went on to say that he did not wish to choose a course that might embarrass the Government. Will the Premier grant an interview to Mr. Wilson? If not, what are his reasons for not doing so?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the question to my colleague. There have been further discussions in another place, and the honourable member may wish to read the newspaper this evening.

FARM TAXATION

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding farm taxation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: According to a recent newspaper report, the Minister made a comment on these lines:

New farm tax averaging measures announced recently by the Federal Government would not benefit the farmer with an average taxable farm income of under \$16 000, it was stated yesterday. The South Australian Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Chatterton) said such farmers would pay more under the new tax system because they would attract an overall higher rate than before.

The Secretary of the Australian Taxpayers Association said that Mr. Chatterton was wrong, and he went on to say:

On any year a farmer's income was above his average, he would pay tax on that amount at his average income tax rate. However, if his income falls below the average he will only pay tax on the income he makes. This means the farmer is getting the best of both worlds.

As I understand the latter statement, primary producers will be able to opt out of or into the five-year averaging

scheme under this new taxing arrangement. Will the Minister clarify the statement?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: At the time I made the statement, the question of opting in or opting out had not been clarified by the Federal Treasurer. To my knowledge, it still has not been clarified by him. What will happen still has not been explained. What happens when a farmer chooses to opt out because his tax under the averaging scheme would be higher than the tax paid under the normal system? Is the income for that year still included in his averaging provisions? If it is not, the whole benefits of averaging, whilst they may be of some benefit in the short term, will rapidly taper off as the average comes up over the years. The Federal Treasurer has not cleared up that point, so there is still considerable doubt about the benefits that may accrue. As I have said, the matter of opting in and opting out had not been explained in any detail, and it still has not been completely explained.

PORT AUGUSTA TO WHYALLA HIGHWAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport. Can the Minister tell me the total amount that has been spent to date on reconstruction of the Port Augusta to Whyalla highway, which reconstruction I understand to have been going on for about four years? Secondly, what is the estimate of the cost of completing the work? Thirdly, have any tenders been let to date to private contractors for completion of any of the work?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the question to my colleague.

TELEPHONE BOOKS

The PRESIDENT: On the subject of telephone directories, I can now inform the Council that a quantity of the new directories has been delivered to Parliament House. The number is insufficient to satisfy the requirements of the House of Assembly, so no new telephone directories have come to the Council or members of it so far. The balance of the consignment, the printing and dispatch thereof, is held up by the Victorian power strike.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Saying that will give you some pleasure. Seriously, I ask you what was your source of information in regard to this matter. Many people blame everything on the power strike. From Fraser to the craziest coons, everything is blamed on the power strike. What is the source of your information?

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member does not accept my source of information, he can check up for himself.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Good God!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I asked a question.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I warn the honourable member that, if he wants to persist with this juvenile behaviour, I will have to deal with him.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of members of the committee.

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE
LEGISLATION**

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of members of the committee.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its primary object is to reduce the existing levels of land tax. The Bill is to be retrospective to ensure that these reductions will apply to the present financial year. In 1975 and 1976 the rates of tax were reviewed in view of the movement in the levels of land values resulting from operation of the equalisation scheme established by the Act, and from the revaluations made by the Valuer-General. These reductions in rates were additional to the exemption from tax granted in respect of land used for primary production.

The taxable values of land for the 1977-78 financial year show a continuance of the upward trend previously existing. However, this trend has not been uniform throughout the State and increases in the equalisation factors for the metropolitan area range from 5 per cent to 30 per cent. Within areas revalued by the Valuer-General there have also been, in some cases, some sharp increases in taxable values.

The new tax scale proposed in the Bill effects reductions in each range, except the lowest (which comprises property with an unimproved value of up to \$10 000) in which the low rate of 1 cent in each \$10 remains unchanged. The maximum rate of 27 cents in each \$10 applying previously to taxable values in excess of \$150 000 has been reduced to 24 cents in each \$10 for taxable values in excess of \$170 000.

These reductions will give significant relief where increases in taxable values attract higher rates of tax because of the progressive tax scale. However, some marked increases in tax may be expected in areas where there has been considerable upward movement in land values. On the other hand, there will be some reduction of tax on holdings valued in excess of \$10 000, where the land has not appreciated significantly in value during the past year.

The reduction in revenue resulting from the new scale is expected to be about \$2 600 000. The receipts from land tax are expected to be about \$20 500 000 during 1977-1978 compared with revenue of \$23 100 000, which would result from an application of the present scale.

The Bill also proposes other minor changes to the Act. It is proposed to bring certain of its provisions up to date following changes in other legislation. It is also proposed to exempt from tax organisations such as Aboriginal Hostels Limited which provide hostels and other facilities for the welfare or benefit of Aboriginal people.

When introducing the Bill last year to exempt land used for primary production from land tax, I stated that land tax would not be payable on declared rural land in future years although the differential tax outstanding in respect of past years would become payable if land ceased to be "declared rural land" under the existing provisions of the Act. Out of an abundance of caution, amendments are made to section 12c to ensure that, although the land may have become exempt from tax from the commencement of the 1976-77 financial year as land used for primary

production, differential tax in respect of previous years will continue to be payable until the expiration of the five-year period prescribed by section 12c.

It is also proposed that the existing provision of the principal Act dealing with conveyances with intent to evade land tax be replaced by a provision similar to that appearing in some other taxing legislation. Recently some companies and individuals who deal or speculate in land have adopted the practice of transferring small fractional interests in land for the purposes of avoiding the aggregation provisions of the Act. They thus effect a significant reduction in the total amount of land tax payable by them. The Crown Solicitor has advised that the existing provisions of the principal Act are not altogether adequate to deal with this method of tax avoidance. The Bill enables taxpayers to appeal against decisions of the Commissioner in relation to this new provision and also in cases in which there may be some dispute as to whether land is or is not used for primary production.

Clause 1 is formal and clause 2 makes the new Act retrospective to the commencement of the present financial year. This will ensure that the reduced land tax scale will apply for the present financial year. Clause 3 makes a number of drafting amendments and provides for the exemption of land used for the benefit of Aboriginal people. Clause 4 enacts the new scale of land tax, and clause 5 ensures that differential tax in respect of a period prior to the 1976-77 financial year will, subject to the provisions of section 12c, continue to be recoverable upon sale of the land or cessation of its use for the purpose of primary production.

Clause 6 provides that the Commissioner may disregard transactions entered into with a view to avoiding land tax, and clause 7 establishes a right of appeal to the Treasurer in respect of decisions of the Commissioner under the previous clause, and in respect of decisions as to whether land is or is not land used for primary production.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

**CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1976. Read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from October 11. Page 65.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Head of this Parliament, and join with all those who have extended congratulations to her on this the jubilee year of her reign. I also support the mover and the seconder of the motion in congratulating His Excellency the Governor, Mr. Keith Seaman, on his assumption of office. His Excellency has had a long career in social welfare work in the Methodist Church, and is well known in most church circles. I also add my congratulations for the work done in this State by the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Walter Crocker, and wish him well.

I have already commented on the short Speech made by His Excellency in opening Parliament, a Speech drafted by the Government. More information could have been given to the Chamber on the many matters of concern to the State. However, it is the Government's prerogative to provide the Governor with the Speech with which to open Parliament.

No-one will be surprised by the topic on which I am going to speak. According to many politicians, academics, feature writers and press reporters, the recent electoral redistribution for the House of Assembly, together with major amendments to the franchise for the Legislative Council, constitute the eventual achievement of electoral justice in South Australia. We have finally achieved, we are told, one vote one value; the gerrymander devised and maintained by Playford, to keep his Government in power against the express wishes of a majority of electors, has at last been destroyed.

Such rhetorical comments as these are more easily stated than proved. They are the catchcry of two distinct political classes; one is the democrats who really believe that the claims are true, and they genuinely seek electoral reform which, regardless of its particular form, provides for majority government. This class of person is strong in belief but weak in mathematics. It is composed of those who cannot, or are not, prepared to examine critically the claims of the reformers. The other class, far fewer in number than the former group, consists of those who know that the claims are insupportable, that generalisations about Playford's gerrymander are not verified by fact and, far worse, that the recent reforms are no more likely to produce votes of equal value than were the earlier provisions. But, despite their knowledge, these people continue to utter the old clichés, because their interests will be served by general acceptance of the recent reforms.

The recent redistribution will not guarantee majority government in South Australia, and the claim made that Playford governed with minority support for most of his 27 years falls to the ground when that claim is closely inspected. This speech is being made, therefore, to assist that first class of voter, who desires electoral democracy (that is, the election to government of the group supported by a majority of electors) and to register one reasoned protest against that other class of voter who is content with hollow clichés. I turn now to a statement made by Dr. Jaensch in the *Australian Quarterly*; from memory, I think it was the edition of the *Australian Quarterly* published in August, 1970. This statement, which is the basis of the complaints raised in regard to the Playford distribution, is as follows:

A new term is required to describe the method of winning a majority of seats with a minority of votes at a large proportion of a series of elections. Sir Thomas Playford played a major role in the original formulation and continuity of the system and he gained most from it. It is fitting, therefore, to refer to the South Australian "Playmander".

Hansard is studded with comments claiming that, in the nine elections fought by Playford, only once did the L.C.L. gain a majority of votes in South Australia. I have heard honourable members of this Council say exactly the same thing. To merely add up the total votes cast for the L.C.L. and the A.L.P. does not portray a true assessment of the overall support for the L.C.L. and A.L.P. in those elections because of three factors: (1) the large number of uncontested electorates; (2) the number of electorates in which an election took place but there was no direct confrontation between the two major Parties—the L.C.L. and A.L.P.; and (3) the relatively large Independent vote in the early years of the Playford era.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It would have been worse for you if they had done all those things.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. That is the important point.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: There were 40 000 electors in the Enfield District and only 6 000 or 7 000 in some country districts.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: When the honourable

member gets into his head that the number of people in each electoral district has nothing to do with the question of a gerrymander factor, we will be able to have a sensible discussion. Also, in analysing the election results from 1938 to 1962, it must be borne in mind that two of those elections were conducted under voluntary voting.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What is the point you are trying to make when you refer to voluntary voting?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In analysing this question, I ask the Council to bear in mind that the 1938 election and the 1941 election were conducted under a voluntary voting system which, on the figures, certainly assisted the Independent vote and also possibly assisted the Liberal vote. The Independent vote in 1938 was more than 30 per cent of the vote cast in South Australia, with a voluntary voting system.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That makes the gerrymander even worse.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. One of the first attempts to assess the relative strengths in South Australia of overall L.C.L. and A.L.P. support in elections from 1938 onwards was made by Dr. A. J. Forbes in an article in the *Australian Quarterly*, June, 1956, an article written before Dr. Forbes entered politics. In that article Dr. Forbes, in referring to the Playford Government, said:

The proposition that the present Government has an interest in retaining the Treasury benches is undoubtedly true. Is it necessarily true that it has therefore an interest in retaining the present electoral system? The Labor Party obviously assumes this to be so, and equally obviously, an answer can only be given after an examination of election statistics. South Australian electoral statistics must be treated with extreme reserve because of the large number of uncontested electorates at every election except the first in 1938. This should be borne in mind when examining the figures set out below. The figures have been compiled by using the results obtained at the Federal election nearest in time to the State election concerned in the uncontested districts and in those where one of the major Parties did not stand, e.g., where an A.L.P. and a Communist were the only candidates.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Is Dr. Forbes the former member for Barker?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. He compiled these statistics in 1938, when at the university as Lecturer in History:

Aggregate Party Vote			
Year	L.C.L.	A.L.P.	Others
1938.....	83 413	76 093	65 780
1941.....	81 116	70 244	57 742
1944.....	144 317	157 115	57 383
1947.....	180 595	159 421	61 419
1950.....	193 962	162 318	55 470
1953.....	182 279	181 447	59 843
1956.....	185 502	188 730	32 712

Dr. Forbes stated:

It should be noted that in the compilation of the above figures doubtful cases have been resolved in favour of the A.L.P. Moreover, no attempt has been made to allow for the undoubted fact that the Liberal-Country Party Government has proved more popular in the State than in the Federal sphere: for example, in 1956 the Liberal-Country Party improved its position by an average of 3.5 per cent from the Federal election three months earlier. If, in addition, it is remembered that most of the Independents have in practice

supported the L.C.L., and that in urban areas conservative Parties in terms of seats for votes tend to be at an advantage compared with their Labor opponents, it is likely that an electoral system approximating more closely to "one vote, one value" would have produced the Treasury benches for the Labor Party except in 1944. It is unlikely, therefore, that the reluctance of the L.C.L. to change the present electoral system is due only, or even mainly, to a Machiavellian desire to retain office at all costs. Their arguments, even if mistaken, must in most cases be assumed to be sincerely held.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Have you the figures for every election since 1962?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, if the honourable member will only wait.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Will they be actual figures or some that you think might have happened?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Honourable members can have any figures they like if they will let me make this point. Dr. Dean Jaensch, also in an article in the *Australian Quarterly* (volume 42, December, 1970) attempts to solve the problem of whether or not Playford enjoyed majority support in South Australia during his uninterrupted Premiership from 1938 to 1965. To explain the method used by Dr. Jaensch, I quote from his *Australian Quarterly* article:

Prior to the 1944 election compulsory voting was introduced, and it was from this point that the advantages of the 1936 electoral geometry became most obvious and can be analysed accurately. To overcome the difficulties of uncontested seats on these elections, and to provide the most meaningful results of the analysis the voting patterns at each of the elections have been converted to the "ideal"; to a situation where every district was contested by both major Parties only. This conversion was carried out by:

- (a) using Federal election results on the subdivision concerned in the case of an uncontested district, or one contested by only one major Party;
- (b) transferring minor Party voting support to the major Parties.

	Percentage To L.C.L.
Minor Party	
D.L.P.	66 $\frac{2}{3}$
Communist	10
Independent	90
S.C.L.	40
Ind. Labor	10
Ind. Liberal	90
C.P.	80

The footnote to this section states:

The recent Commonwealth election formed the basis, and subdivisional results produced the figures used. South Australian voters have consistently shown similar behaviour for Commonwealth and State elections. Labor deviations from the Federal results in districts contested by major Parties, 1943-44 and 1964-65 produce a mean of less than 3 per cent. Considering only a minority of safe seats were concerned in this conversion, the final results are justified.

Both Dr. Forbes and Dr. Jaensch used exactly the same system to compute the overall vote for the L.C.L. and the Labor Party vote for those years. On this basis, Dr. Jaensch produced the following table (table II, *Australian Quarterly*, December, 1970, page 99) showing L.C.L. support:

Table II: Party effects of the electoral apportionment, South Australian House of Assembly, 1944-1970; basis, L.C.L. support

Election	Overall Per Cent
1944	46.2
1947	48.9
1950	51.6
1953	47.1
1956	50.4
1959	49.5
1962	45.1
1965	45.6
1968	46.1
1970	44.6

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: That is a two Party referred vote; in 1962 and 1968 you got little better than 45 per cent.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is what Dr. Jaensch says but, on the basis of that Dr. Jaensch says:

On the basis of these figures, the L.C.L. could claim government at 1950 and 1956 only.

The methods used by Dr. Forbes and Dr. Jaensch to produce figures that allow a comparison to be made between the L.C.L. and A.L.P. support are practically the same, except that Dr. Forbes did not attempt to distribute preferences from the minor Party groups. Yet the conclusions reached are almost diametrically opposed. Dr. Forbes comes to the conclusion that only in 1944 could the A.L.P. lay claim to majority support in South Australia, while Dr. Jaensch says that only in 1950 and 1956 could Playford claim government. Both Dr. Forbes and Dr. Jaensch have academic backgrounds, both enjoy high reputations as political analysts, both use the same technique to solve the problem facing us, yet both come to different, almost totally different, conclusions. One must admit that that is an interesting problem, and one may wonder who is right.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I reckon it would be a fair assumption that the Liberal politician's conclusion was suspect.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member has not checked the figures, whereas I have. The claim by Dr. Jaensch that Playford governed in this State for seven out of nine elections with minority support is rubbish, as will be seen in a moment.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: In your opinion.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My papers have gone to all universities in Australia, and not one person has been able to say that the figures I presented are not accurate. However, the figures given by Dr. Jaensch are illogical. Dr. Jaensch set out in his article the overall votes for the L.C.L. and A.L.P. from 1944 to 1970, and I seek leave to have the relevant figures inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

	L.C.L. overall vote percentage	A.L.P. overall vote percentage
1944	46.2	53.8
1947	48.9	51.1
1950	51.6	48.4
1953	47.1	52.9
1956	50.4	49.6
1959	49.5	50.5
1962	45.1	54.9
1965	45.6	54.4
1968	46.1	53.9
1970	44.6	55.4

He came to this conclusion:

On the basis of these figures, the L.C.L. could claim Government at 1950 and 1956 only.

To test the figures of Dr. Jaensch, an original examination was made of his figures given for the 1970 election, namely, L.C.L., 44.6 per cent; A.L.P., 55.4 per cent. Using Dr. Jaensch's system of preference allocation and also my own system, the following tables were prepared showing the Jaensch system producing an overall vote for the A.L.P. of 53.22 per cent and my own system 53.19 per cent—a minor difference of 0.03 per cent. Whichever figure is taken, there is a 2.2 per cent error in the figure given in Dr. Jaensch's *Australian Quarterly* article.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: How did you arrive at your figure?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I used certain variations in relation to the allocation of preferences, where I had more knowledge than Dr. Jaensch had.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Tell us. It's no good your telling us that it is all in your head.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If the honourable member would hold his horses for a minute, he would find that Dr. Jaensch and I basically agree.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: He can't do his sums?

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

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: No, I am suggesting that that is what you are saying.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is right. In evidence before the Electoral Commission, Dr. Jaensch corrected his figure for overall A.L.P. support in 1970 (given in his *Australian Quarterly* article). I quote from the transcript of evidence, as follows:

Mr. Hudson—I refer you to an article which was written by you in the *Australian Quarterly*, vol. 42, No. 4, of December, 1970; the article is entitled "A Functional Gerrymander, South Australia 1944 to 1970". There are calculations given in that article of the overall vote for the Labor Party in the 1970 State election. I think on page 100, for example, the overall vote for the A.L.P. in 1970 is shown as 55.4 per cent. That figure is incorrect?

Dr. Jaensch—Yes. This is one of the embarrassing situations where an analyst has to declare to a Commission publicly that he has made an arithmetical error . . .

Mr. Hudson—The correct figure you would now support would be 53.1 per cent.

Dr. Jaensch—Rather than 55.4 per cent for the 1970 Labor Party two-Party vote.

There is an admission that my work was accurate and that Dr. Jaensch's work was inaccurate. I think the honourable member must agree.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: There's a clear majority.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will come to that. The Hon. Mr. Cornwall should take it easy. The question now arises whether other arithmetical errors have been made by Dr. Jaensch in assessing the overall vote for the A.L.P. in the other elections from 1944 to 1970. I think the Council will agree that Dr. Jaensch has made an error of between 2 per cent and 3 per cent in comparing the two-Party preferred vote in 1970. It is conceivable that he may have made a similar error right through the work. The next election thoroughly examined was that held in 1947; it was chosen for close study at random. Dr. Jaensch's figures showed that, of the overall vote, the L.C.L. gained 48.97 per cent and the A.L.P. 51.03 per cent. I have the actual results of that election before me, and I ask that the details thereof be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them. Leave granted.

Results of 1947 Election

	A.L.P.	Ind. A.L.P.	Ind.	Com.	L.C.L.	Comment
Adelaide	6 556	4 963		1 425		No L.C.L. candidate informal—1 490
Albert						No contest L.C.L. unopposed
Alexandra	1 442		887		4 502	
Angas			1 672		3 960	No A.L.P. candidate
Burnside						No contest L.C.L. unopposed
Burra	1 819				2 566	
Chaffey	2 603		3 795			No L.C.L. candidate
Eyre						No contest L.C.L. unopposed
Flinders	1 925				4 205	
Frome						No contest A.L.P. unopposed
Gawler	3 054				2 637	
Glenelg	6 832		768		11 696	
Goodwood	8 720				8 388	
Gouger	1 991				3 537	
Gumeracha						No contest L.C.L. unopposed
Hindmarsh	16 719			2 306		No L.C.L. candidate
Light	1 623		161		3 595	
Mitcham	5 700				11 650	
Mt. Gambier	2 396		4 742			No L.C.L. candidate
Murray	3 386				2 731	
Newcastle						Not contested
Norwood	8 352				8 839	L.C.L. unopposed

Results of 1947 Election—continued

	A.L.P.	Ind. A.L.P.	Ind.	Com.	L.C.L.	Comment
Onkaparinga	2 349		1 082		3 528	
Pt. Adelaide	16 222			3 418		No L.C.L. candidate 1 613 informal
Pt. Pirie						Not contested A.L.P. unopposed
Prospect	8 433				10 001	
Ridley	1 313		3 976			No L.C.L. candidate
Rocky River						Not contested L.C.L. unopposed
Semaphore						Not contested A.L.P. unopposed
Stanley	2 444				2 435	2 endorsed L.C.L. candidates
Stuart	7 227			1 029		No L.C.L. candidate 328 informal
Thebarton						Not contested A.L.P. unopposed
Torrens	8 317				10 185	
Unley	7 401				10 680	
Victoria	4 167				4 193	
Wallaroo	2 968				18 888	
Yorke Peninsula						Not contested L.C.L. unopposed
Young						Not contested L.C.L. unopposed
Stirling						Not contested L.C.L. unopposed
Total primary votes	133 959	4 963	1 783	8 178	111 216	
Total minor party vote			30 224			

However, in only 18 of those seats was there a contest between the A.L.P. and the L.C.L. Both Dr. Jaensch and Dr. Forbes approached this problem of determining a hypothetical L.C.L./A.L.P. figure for these seats by applying the results obtained by each Party in the nearest Federal election. The first step, however, is to list the 18 seats where there was a contest between the two major Parties and produce a two-Party preferred vote in those seats. If that is done, it will be seen that the A.L.P. in the contested seats polled 82 372 votes, and the L.C.L. 108 704 votes. I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard* also.

Leave granted.

Seats that Two Major Parties Contested

	A.L.P.	L.C.L.	
Alexandra ..	1 886	4 945	887 Independent votes 50/50
Burra	1 819	2 566	—
Flinders	1 925	4 204	—
Gawler	3 054	2 637	—
Glenelg	7 216	12 080	768 Independent votes 50/50
Goodwood ..	8 720	8 388	—
Gouger	1 991	3 537	—
Light	1 703	3 675	161 Independent votes 50/50
Mitcham	5 700	11 650	—
Murray	3 386	2 731	—
Norwood ...	8 352	8 839	—
Onkaparinga	2 890	4 069	1 082 Independent votes 50/50
Prospect	8 433	10 001	—
Stanley	2 444	2 435	Two endorsed L.C.L. candidates

Torrens	8 317	10 185	—
Unley	7 401	10 680	—
Victoria	4 167	4 193	—
Wallaroo ...	2 968	1 888	—
	82 372	108 704	

We are now left with the 21 remaining seats to determine a two-Party preferred vote. The next table computes a hypothetical A.L.P. vote in those 21 electorates that were either uncontested or contested by candidates other than A.L.P. or L.C.L. by transposing Federal results for the 1949 Federal election.

The final figures are arrived at by taking 93.36 per cent of electors on the roll with a 3.62 per cent informal vote (which were the State average figures for the 1947 election) and the Federal figures adjusted to that formal vote. Objection may be taken to using the average State figures to assess the formal vote, because the figures are inflated in certain seats where there was no contest between the L.C.L. and A.L.P. For example, in Adelaide only 89.49 per cent of the electors voted, with a 10.32 per cent informal vote, and with two A.L.P. candidates standing (one endorsed), and one Communist.

However, a check was done adjusting the figures to an average 95 per cent of electors voting with an average 3 per cent informal vote, but the difference in these figures is minimal and can be discounted. So, for the purpose of this exercise, the State average for the number of electors voting, and the State average for informal votes in the 1947 election are used to find the total hypothetical vote cast in the State seats, where Federal figures are converted to State seats.

If that exercise is done (and it is exactly the same

exercise done by Dr. Jaensch), it will be found that the A.L.P. in 1947 polled 49.35 per cent of the vote and the L.C.L. 50.65 per cent. If one examines the two analyses, one finds that in 1947 Dr. Jaensch says that the L.C.L. polled 180 139 votes, or 48.97 per cent of the formal vote, and the A.L.P. polled 187 751 votes, or 51.03 per cent of the formal vote.

My figures show that the L.C.L. polled 192 535 votes, or 50.65 per cent of the formal vote, whereas the A.L.P. polled 187 605 votes, or 49.35 per cent of the formal vote. The difference is that I transposed the 1949 figures and Dr. Jaensch transposed the 1946 figures. That may be a clue where we disagree.

Before examining the transposition of 1946 Federal figures to produce hypothetical State figures for the 21 uncontested seats in the 1947 State election, a check should be applied to test the accuracy of the transposed 1949 Federal figures.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Are these your figures, or do they come from the Parliamentary Library?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I prepared them, and they have been checked by the Parliamentary Library.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: They actually got them all out for you? No wonder they're flat out.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I prepared the whole paper. I gave it to the Parliamentary Library for checking, and the paper is available in the Library for anyone who wishes to read it. In the transposition of the 1949 figures, it can be seen that Sir Thomas Playford was doing better in 1947 than the Federal Government was doing in 1949.

Dr. Jaensch transferred the 1946 figures and, if one compares the State result in the seats that were contested in 1947 with the results of the 1946 Federal election, one will find that the Playford Government was doing 10 per cent to 12 per cent better in 1947 than those in the Federal sphere were doing in 1946.

That means that Dr. Jaensch's figures, in transposition, would give a 10 per cent to 12 per cent advantage in more than half the districts and so produce a figure to which no accuracy could be attributed.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: This was 30 years ago.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am debating the question that some members of this Council and Dr. Jaensch have claimed that Playford governed for seven out of nine elections without majority support, and I am saying that the conclusion reached by Dr. Jaensch is largely fallacious and that the figures given by Dr. Forbes and my figures can be relied on.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: When was Dr. Forbes elected to the Parliament?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In 1959—no, it was 1956. If one examines this position, one sees that in this exercise Dr. Jaensch has made an error in assessing the A.L.P. vote in 1947 at about 3 per cent to 4 per cent in favour of the A.L.P., in exactly the same way as he made an error regarding the 1970 figures and admitted that he was wrong. Yet, the statement was made by Dr. Jaensch that Playford had governed for seven out of nine elections without majority support, and a new word had to be coined for a case where a minority of votes gained a majority of seats. This word was "Playmander" and this produced for Playford an image of his being no more than a gerrymanderer.

I think that two conclusions can be drawn from these facts. The first is that, if any conversion is to be made to produce a hypothetical two-Party preferred vote in the 21 seats uncontested or not contested by either A.L.P. or L.C.L. candidates, the 1949 Federal elections provide a more reliable guide for the State election of 1947. The second conclusion is that the statement made in a footnote

to this article in the *Australian Quarterly* (vol. 42, No. 4, December, 1970) that South Australian voters have consistently shown similar behaviour for Commonwealth and State elections cannot be sustained if the 1944, 1947 and 1950 State figures are compared with the 1946 and 1949 Federal figures. Dr. Forbes commented in the *Australian Quarterly* of June, 1956, at page 50, as follows:

The Liberal-Country Party Government has proved more popular in the State than in the Federal sphere. For example, in 1956 the Liberal-Country Party improved their position by an average of 3.5 per cent from the Federal election three months earlier.

It appears that the State support for the Playford Government in 1947 was higher than the support for the Federal Party in 1949, even though the results of the 1949 Federal election, following the bank nationalisation issue, were described as a landslide vote for the Federal Liberal Party. This fact illustrates the dangers in transposing figures from Federal results to State seats, especially where, in 1947, 21 of the 39 State seats were virtually uncontested.

But any examination of the 1944, 1947 and 1950 State results in those seats contested by both the A.L.P. and the L.C.L. shows that the State L.C.L., under Playford, enjoyed much stronger electoral support than the Federal Party. The Federal results of 1949, following the major decline in A.L.P. popularity federally (approximately 11 per cent) over bank nationalisation, were still below the support Playford enjoyed in 1947 and 1950, although the 1949 Federal results for the Liberal Party were better than Playford's 1944 support in those seats contested by approximately 6 per cent. This may show that in the 1944 State election, Playford did not enjoy majority support, but once again a closer examination would be required to determine that question.

It is clear, on an examination of these figures, that the conclusion reached by Dr. Forbes that only in 1944 could the Labor Party claim that there was a case for Playford to answer has been proved correct. There is no case for Playford to answer in regard to his governing with a minority of votes for seven out of his nine elections.

To detail the way in which the support on a two-Party preferred basis has been arrived at for all the elections from 1944 to 1962 would produce a book of statistics that would deter the reader from continuing beyond a few pages. It was necessary, though, to demonstrate the method and the logic used in refuting the claims made that Playford governed for most of his time as Premier with minority support in South Australia.

On my analyses of the elections from 1944 to 1962, it is clear that no case can be made to deny Playford his right to govern in seven out of the nine elections he fought as Leader. Those elections were 1938, 1941, 1947, 1950, 1953, 1956 and 1959. Possibly he governed in 1944 with minority support, and certainly in 1962.

Yet, 1959 should not be passed over without it being pointed out that in that election the results were so close to 50 per cent of the preferred vote to each Party that it is impossible to determine which Party had the right to govern, although if one allows a .5 per cent advantage to the L.C.L. for postal votes and absent votes, which one cannot take into account when transposing Federal to State, the L.C.L. certainly gained support in 1959, and this is held by Hetherington and Reid in their book on the 1959 election.

However, the most important point to observe is that comparing the seats in which a direct contest took place between the L.C.L. and the A.L.P. and the Federal results, transposed to those seats, the Federal Liberal Party performed marginally the better. Therefore, the

correcting factor as applied in other elections, in 1959 turns to a minus factor to the L.C.L. The year 1959 was the turning of the tide against Playford. No longer was he performing electorally better than the Federal Liberal Party. In the next election, in 1962, Playford's overall support fell below 50 per cent, but he remained in government with the support of the Independent Speaker, Stott.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That was his downfall. Had he given up office at that time, he would have been back in office after the first meeting of Parliament. That is when the people woke up. Do not let us use the word "gerrymander", because you have said there is not such a thing.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have not said that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You said that there was no gerrymander under Playford. I have said that, if he gave away office in 1962, he need only have done so until the first session of Parliament, and the people would have returned him in 1965. He was too greedy.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There is no case for Playford to answer if the only challenge to his political integrity is based solely on the claim that he governed for practically the whole of his 27 years in South Australia with minority support, yet that claim, made by a prominent Government member, did more harm to the L.C.L. image than anything else over the past 10 years. It is a claim that cannot be sustained on logical examination.

The questions to be answered now are, first, what percentage of the overall preferred vote did the A.L.P. poll in 1962 and, secondly, what percentage of the overall preferred vote would the A.L.P. have had to poll to ensure an even chance of victory? The percentage that the A.L.P. would have to poll over 50 per cent would then show a degree of advantage, which will be called the gerrymander factor.

A reliable answer can be provided to the first question using the same logical approach as was used in determining a two-Party preferred vote for the A.L.P. and L.C.L. in the elections 1944 to 1970. That examination shows that the A.L.P. was preferred by 53.53 per cent of the South Australian electors and should have been in government in 1962.

Question two poses a more difficult problem, but there is available a measuring stick and, in applying this method to State and Federal elections in Australia, it can be shown to be more than reasonably accurate.

If the same measuring stick is used for a number of elections in the same State, the variation from the prediction and the actual results can be compared and an assessment can be made as to its accuracy. The measuring stick is used this way: first, determine the overall vote for each Party, and then look at the seats nearest to the losing Party in percentage vote that the losing Party must win to achieve government. Take the percentage over 50 per cent that the winning Party achieved in the seat furthest away from the losing Party that must be won and add that percentage to the losing Party's overall vote. If the addition comes to 50 per cent then the distribution can be said to be absolutely fair. If it is over 50 per cent the amount exceeding that can be called the gerrymander factor.

For example, in the 1975 State election the A.L.P. polled 49.2 per cent of the two-Party preferred vote and the Liberal Party 50.8 per cent. Yet the A.L.P. won the election by one seat. Therefore, the seat closest to the Liberal Party is the "median seat", which happened to be Gilles. The A.L.P. polled 52.8 per cent of the preferred vote in Gilles.

Therefore, add 2.8 per cent to the 50.8 per cent already polled, and the gerrymander figure is 53.6 per cent, less 50 per cent, which equals 3.6 per cent. This means in 1975, the Liberal Party would have been required to poll 53.6 per cent of the overall vote to have an even chance of winning government.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You needed only 200 votes to win in Gilles.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is incorrect. If the Council would like a dissertation on this matter, I refer to the work done by Edgeworth in 1898. He was an English statistician who made a remarkable discovery.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I know that the Government is worried about this matter.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As Leader of the Government, I rise on a point of order. The Leader says that the Government is worried, but I make it clear that the Government is not worried: it has not been worried about what the Leader has been saying for many years. It is the old story: it is a lot of baloney.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R. A. Geddes): The Minister knows that there is no point of order and that he will have the opportunity to reply, if he so desires.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The second point is that, if one wants a means of measuring the gerrymander, one has to examine the number of blue ribbon seats or seats of 70 per cent or over held by each Party to determine from Dr. Jaensch's work in this distribution that there are 12 blue ribbon Liberal seats and two blue ribbon Labor seats which is a *prima facie* case for consideration of the gerrymander factor.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: From where did you get those figures?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: From Dr. Jaensch.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What about his 1973 figures?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have used the pendulum figures provided in relation to the 1975 results, as they are the only results with which comparison can be made. I know that the honourable member supports Dr. Jaensch, because his work is inaccurate and favours the A.L.P. Regarding the assessment of the gerrymander factor, as I stated, in 1898 Edgeworth made a remarkable discovery.

It is argued by some that the measuring stick is illogical because the Liberal Party required only 2.8 per cent in Gilles, not over the whole State but, if an examination is made of all elections, the method has a reasonable reliability. Also, it can be logically argued that the Liberal Party could gain 2.8 per cent in each of the other 46 seats, but not in Gilles, and still have lost the election.

In 1898, Edgeworth, an English statistician made quite a remarkable discovery. In studying the results of elections in Great Britain he found that the percentage of seats won by Parties in a single-member electoral system was approximately the relationship between the cubes of the percentages of the votes polled. For example, in a correctly balanced distribution, if both major Parties polled 50 per cent each of the vote, then they should each win 50 per cent of the seats.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What percentage of the people voted?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am coming to that. If, however, Party A wins 52 per cent of the vote and Party B

48 per cent, then the relationship of seats won would be in the ratio of 52³ to 48³. In a House of 100 members this would mean that Party A should win 56 seats to Party B's 44.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Everyone knows that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is what I have been talking about for the last half hour. If this system has a reasonable accuracy rating in prediction, in Great Britain where voluntary and first past the post voting is still used, would it not be reasonable to expect that the measuring stick should be more accurate in Australia, where for many years the electorate has been compelled to vote and vote preferentially? The answer to that question is "Yes", despite the uncanny predictions by Edgeworth in 1898 in Britain. However, it is even more accurate when applied in Australia because of compulsory voting and compulsory preferential voting.

The discovery of the law of cubic proportions, its application and the degree of its accuracy, particularly where the vote is compulsory, led to the next step. If the law of cubic proportions is reasonably accurate, then there must be, in all elections, a uniform swing that takes place, even though in some districts the swing may be large and in others no swing at all, and yet in others, a swing in the opposite direction. If the uniform swing concept did not produce reasonably accurate predictions, the law of cubic proportions could not have been noticed in the first place by Edgeworth in 1898.

That is the point I have been arguing, and the Hon. Mr. Cornwall agrees. The accuracy of the measuring stick is enhanced also by the use of compulsory and preferential voting. In 1965 and 1968, by applying exactly these principles one finds that in 1965 there was a gerrymander factor favouring the L.C.L. of 3.2 per cent, and in 1968 the gerrymander factor favouring the Liberals was 3.34 per cent. In both those elections the gerrymander factor remained the same in that distribution, and that is another remarkable aspect; once a gerrymander factor has been established it will remain during the term of that distribution.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Those figures are wrong.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: They are accurate.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: With 56 per cent of the vote on the cube system, what percentage of the two Party preferred vote should be won?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cannot give those figures now.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: It would be about 70 per cent of the seats.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It would be 65 per cent, anyway. Again, the honourable member has missed the point. I am saying that the 3 per cent gerrymander factor means that there would have had to have been an overall swing to the A.L.P. under the Playford distribution. The A.L.P. would have had to poll in 1965 and 1968 at least 53.5 per cent of the vote to have had an even chance of winning the election.

It shows that in those two elections the gerrymander factor favouring the L.C.L. was about 3.5 per cent.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: When did you come to this conclusion?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My most recent work was done about 12 months ago. I turn now to the 1969 redistribution. In the policy speech for the 1968 election, the L.C.L. advocated the division of the State into 45 seats (an increase of six) with 25 seats in the metropolitan area and 20 in the country. However, the Bill finally introduced

by the L.C.L. was for a House of 47 (an increase of eight) with 28 metropolitan seats and 19 country seats.

The proposal for a House of 45 seats with a 25/20 city/country relationship showed that both Parties would have had an even chance of winning with 50 per cent of the preferred vote, making reasonable assumptions as to where the boundaries would be drawn. The policy alteration to 47 seats with a 28/19 city/country distribution tipped the balance in favour of the A.L.P.

On figures produced, it was demonstrated on a reasonable assumption on the probable boundaries that the L.C.L. would have to poll 54 per cent of the preferred vote to have an even chance of winning. The predictable gerrymander factor following the actual drawing of the new boundaries was about 3 per cent favouring the A.L.P. The actual gerrymander factor favouring the A.L.P., examining the results of the 1970, 1973 and 1975 elections, was (and these are Dr. Jaensch's figures as well as mine):

Election	Gerrymander Factor	
	Favouring A.L.P.	
	Per Cent	
1970.....	2.2	
1973.....	4.8	
1975.....	3.6	

If one checks this gerrymander factor in any redistribution, the maximum variation between the predictable gerrymander factor and the actual gerrymander factor is 1.8 per cent. I do not care whether honourable members check the Queensland figures or the Western Australian figures: 1.8 per cent is the largest variation that I can discover in studying 50 years of Australian election results. The gerrymander factor will remain constant in any distribution within certain tolerances. There must be a variation, but it is not a violent fluctuation. The figure of 1.8 per cent means that the factor remains constant—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Within certain tolerances.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Perhaps I should seek leave of the honourable member to include the qualification "within certain tolerances". In *Playford to Dunstan*, page 184, the authors say of the 1969 redistribution:

The result was a relatively generous measure of electoral reform, which, if still falling short of equity, would never have been contemplated by his predecessor.

How do the authors define equity? With a predictable gerrymander factor of about 3 per cent favouring the A.L.P., the authors claim that the 47-seat distribution did not provide equity! Perhaps on reflection the authors of that book are right. It certainly did not provide equity for the L.C.L.!

Finally, I refer to the 1976 redistribution, which the Premier claims provides the first democratic boundaries in South Australia (this State's first democratic election—one man one vote one value), but, on rational examination, it provides one of the fiercest gerrymander factors seen in Australian electoral history, together with a complete denial of representational equity.

Honourable members will recall that I pointed out this fact to the Council when the original terms of reference were provided for what the Premier calls the "Independent Commission". "Independent", my eye! The commission is controlled by terms of reference which substantially governed the final boundaries.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Where did the terms of reference come from?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: The member for Torrens in another place said that he thought the electoral system was fair.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If anyone wants any knowledge on electoral mathematics, I can assure you, Mr. Acting President, that I have as much knowledge as

anyone else and a good deal more than most. Honourable members will recall my opposition to the boundaries when they were presented. The predictions made at that time have been shown to be accurate within reasonable tolerances following the election.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Did you vote against the terms of reference?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I tried to alter them. Page 6 of Dr. Jaensch's paper, under the sub-heading "Interpretation", states:

The application of past election results to the 1976 redistribution begs many questions. The political environments in 1973 and 1975 were significantly different, and the 1976 environment is different again. In 1973, the Dunstan Labor Government contested against the Eastick L.C.L. opposition with the Liberal Movement as a Party within a Party and the Federal Labor Government relatively popular.

In 1975, the Dunstan Labor Government contested against the Eastick L.C.L. and the Millhouse L.M., with the Federal Labor Government notably unpopular. In 1976, the Dunstan Labor Government faces a "re-unified" Tonkin Liberal Party (with a "rump" of the L.M. in the Millhouse L.M.P.) with a Federal Liberal Government in power.

I do not agree that the application of both logical mathematics and the history of voting patterns to the 1976 redistribution "begs many questions". Nor can I understand Dr. Jaensch's reluctance to pursue the exercise to its logical conclusion. Even a superficial examination of his previous work reveals a regular application of this method, against which his present avoidance is curiously inconsistent.

To argue that political environments in 1973, 1975 and 1976 are significantly different is to state the obvious; every month produces a different political environment, to some degree. But the fact remains that since 1944 the maximum variation of the two-Party preferred vote, in State elections, has been plus or minus 4.5 per cent from 50 per cent. That is in contrast to our voting habits in Federal elections. South Australians display little variation in voting at State elections. Yet, despite Dr. Jaensch's earlier use of the same predictive techniques, and the relative consistency in State voting patterns which is an aid to prediction, he concludes at page 6 of his article that:

Hence any attempt to extrapolate results of any future election from either 1973 or 1975 is fraught with problems; it is a task which the Electoral Commission correctly placed as an "inexact science" with "a measure of oneiromancy".

In evidence before the commission, Dr. Jaensch said that one could only gauge the gerrymander factor in any proposed distribution, in hindsight. Yet in an article published in the *Australian Quarterly* (December, 1970) Dr. Jaensch said:

Prior to the 1944 election, compulsory voting was introduced and it was from this point that the advantages of the 1936 electoral geometry became most obvious, and can be analysed accurately.

In other words, although Dr. Jaensch said in 1976 that a gerrymander factor could only be measured after the election next following a distribution he was prepared in 1970 to impute to Sir Thomas Playford the ability to foresee and engineer a gerrymander factor that became evident nine years after a distribution. In August, 1976, I produced a prediction chart as follows:

Based on a two-Party preferred vote, the following result is the best result the Liberal Party can expect. This prediction is based upon the correctly assessed gerrymander factor of 5.4 per cent favouring the A.L.P. in the distribution and allowing a 2 per cent tolerance for possible aberrations and differential swings:

A.L.P. per cent	No. of members	Lib. per cent	No. of members
55	30	45	17
54	29	46	18
53	26	47	21
52	26	48	21
51	26	49	21
50	26	50	21
49	26	51	21
48	25	52	22
47	25	53	22
46	23	54	24

I said at the time that this prediction was the best result that the Liberal Party could reasonably expect. How does this prediction chart, made in August, 1976, compare with the actual results at this last election. It is absolutely spot on!

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It is only for the actual result; you cannot draw any other conclusion.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I say that this chart will remain quite accurate during the life of this distribution. Make no mistake about that. In other words, the A.L.P. two-Party preferred vote will have to fall to 46 per cent in this State before the Liberal Party has an even chance of winning an election. Every honourable member in this Council knows that statement to be true.

In her speech yesterday, the Hon. Anne Levy referred to the gerrymander against the A.L.P. in Queensland. The honourable member is quite correct in saying that a gerrymander factor exists in Queensland that places the A.L.P. at a disadvantage, but the disadvantage to the A.L.P. in Queensland is not as great as the advantage the A.L.P. has in South Australia; nor is the disadvantage suffered by the A.L.P. in South Australia in 1965 to 1968 as great as the advantage enjoyed by the A.L.P. in the present distribution. The gerrymander factor in this distribution is greater than that existing against the A.L.P. in Queensland and greater than the gerrymander factor in the 1965 and the 1968 elections of the Playford era. If the Hon. Anne Levy wishes to criticise the Playford and Queensland distributions, then her criticism, to be fair, must also be directed against her own Government and her own Premier! Dunstan and his A.L.P. machine—his battery of academic and professional out-riggers—now take their place as the most skilled gerrymanders in contemporary Australian history!

Dr. Jaensch, in the Flinders University publication, *On Campus*, said, "I see nothing on the horizon to suggest there won't be two Dunstan decades for South Australia." Based on the available evidence, that statement must be a fair one, because while this distribution remains, the chances of the A.L.P. losing Government with a vote significantly less than 50 per cent is minimal. To enable all honourable members finally to nail their colours to the mast on the question of each vote having an equal value, during this session I will introduce to the Parliament a private member's Bill to ensure that the State will not be able to be governed by a Government with minority support. That principle surely must be the central theme to any one vote one value controversy.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Are you going to change the single member, one vote one value system?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member will see in the introduction of the Bill that it will be one having the effect of removing a Government with minority support. In all this one vote one value question, that principle must be the central theme in any such controversy. We also have in the system of counting for the Legislative Council, a system which allows votes not to have as close as possible an equal value. Already Bills

have been introduced by the Hon. Arthur Whyte to correct this anomaly, only to find that the Government has rejected those Bills or refused to deal with them. I hope this speech will be a watershed for electoral justice in South Australia.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Was not that what the split was all about in 1972? Was not that because Mr. Carnie did not think you were being fair about electoral justice?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have just made a statement, if the Hon. Mr. Sumner would not interject for a moment. I feel free, in this session, to speak my mind on this subject, in the hope that those people who believe in each vote having the same value as any other vote may understand a little more about the question. In the Bills that will follow in this session, both for the Legislative Council and for the House of Assembly, the principles of equal value will be followed implicitly. If those principles are adopted by the Parliament, the prediction of Dr. Jaensch of two Dunstan decades will not eventuate. If, however, the Parliament supports the fiercest gerrymander in any contemporary distribution in Australia, that which is now existing in the House of Assembly, together with the mathematical gerrymander in the Legislative Council voting system, then I would say that the Jaensch prediction is an underestimation. In conclusion, I would like to quote some passages from a speech I made in the Council some five years ago:

As pointed out by many political commentators in the U.S.A., it is becoming critically important to move from the narrow concern of the obvious malapportionment existing prior to the *Baker v. Carr* case, to a concern for malrepresentation of interests.

All electorate systems of electing legislators, including equal population systems, may yield distorted representation. Electorate boundaries, particularly if the basis is mathematical equality, can submerge identifiable interests.

There are interests which can quite easily become a "locked in" interest, which will get no effective representation on policy matters, and no representation at all to participate in the Legislature. There is a need to talk more of political equity than of the mathematical equality of voters in each electorate.

The theory that equal numbers guarantees equal representation is the greatest fallacy of all. The analyses I have given to the Council of the position from 1938 until now are accurate and correct, and I will stand by my figures. There is no question that the present distribution contains the fiercest gerrymander factor favouring the A.L.P.

Before I leave politics, my point will be understood by a much wider section of people than understand it now. Before this session is over, the advocates of each vote having an equal value will have another chance finally to show their true colours on this important matter. Unless the point is accepted, the Premier of this State must take his place in Australian electoral history alongside those whom he has so effectively lashed for perpetrating electoral distributions that give significant electoral advantages to a Government. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Do you support what Mr. DeGaris has said?

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I congratulate His Excellency the Governor, Mr. Keith Seaman, on his appointment and the manner in which he opened Parliament last week. I also take this opportunity to congratulate all the new members who have been elected to this Parliament.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What about the five Labor members?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I said "all new members". I also congratulate those—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Did you congratulate Mr. Wilson, the new member for Torrens?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That gentleman is included among the new members. Not only do I congratulate those new members who have been elected but also I commend all candidates who stood for Parliament but were unsuccessful at the election.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Mr. Worth, in particular.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is so. He was one of those who offered his services for Parliament. He and all those who were not successful deserve appreciation for offering to serve the public. I also join with His Excellency in expressing appreciation to Mr. Walter Crocker for the splendid manner in which he has carried out his duties as Lieutenant-Governor.

Like other Opposition members, I regret that the Government did not detail its full programme in the Speech which it prepared for the Governor and which was delivered by him in this Council on opening day.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Would you like a copy of the policy speech?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have one in front of me, which I borrowed from the Parliamentary Library and which I will return to it as soon as possible. The Government has a responsibility to uphold the tradition of informing the assembled members of the whole Parliament of its proposed programme. That, to my knowledge, has always been done. I believe that carrying out the practice, as the Government did, of omitting its programme from that Speech showed disrespect for the Parliament.

It is well to remember that Parliament is supreme over the Executive. The correct procedure in my view is that a concise resume of the Government's legislative programme should be reported by the Executive to the Parliament. Also, of course, other issues important to the State (the Hon. Mr. DeGaris referred to the unfortunate drought now being experienced) should also be commented on by the Government on such an occasion.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Through the Government.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes. One can only assume from the information that was given that, as this session proceeds, the issues that have been referred to in the Government's policy speech will be brought before the Council. I hope that in future the Government will return to the traditional procedure of informing the Parliament of its programme. That practice would be welcomed not only by Parliament generally but also by those members of the public who take an interest in these matters.

The Hon. Anne Levy referred to the Premier's policy speech, which I borrowed from the library and a copy of which I have in front of me. That is the only course of action I can take to check the Government's programme for this session. It is well to remember that not necessarily every detail of this policy speech has been approved by all people who voted for the A.L.P. at the recent election.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Tell us which ones you think are all right!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr. Dunford has asked me to tell him which ones the people have some doubts about.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No, which ones are all right.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think they voted for some of them.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Which ones? Tell us!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think basically the people voted in the way they did because of the popularity of the

Party Leader rather than because of what was contained in the policy speech. I hope the Minister of Health agrees with me that there is some doubt that people who voted for the A.L.P. did not necessarily agree with everything that is contained in that Party's policy speech.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Tell us which ones you think are all right.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I would find some difficulty in answering the honourable member. However, I will tell him that there are some matters in the speech with which I believe the public does not agree. Those matters can be found on page 7 of the speech. I refer to those paragraphs dealing with the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That's a real winner.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Minister can say that. However, I think that, when this State is ultimately put to the test (the Labor Party has deliberately set upon this course to put these things to a test by a referendum—and I am referring to the Labor Party's ultimate aim to abolish the Council), the people of South Australia will vote for the retention of the Council, and that they will give the A.L.P. a resounding message that it is wrong.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: You wouldn't oppose a referendum Bill now?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I will oppose a referendum Bill, whether it be now or later. The truth is that the Labor Party is frightened to introduce it now. It is launching upon a softening-up process and a programme to belittle this place and show disrespect for it. Ultimately, the Government has in mind the abolition of the Council.

The measures concerning this House that are mentioned in the policy speech are that the Government intends to seek simultaneous elections, that it wishes to abolish the six-year minimum term, and that it ultimately wishes to hold a referendum concerning the power of the Legislative Council to refuse Supply. The objectives in bringing these measures down and the reasons for the enthusiasm one can sense from interjections from members opposite are not honourable: they are political.

The Government continues its attack on this Council and is doing everything possible to discredit it. The Government is making unending attacks on the Council, and it is the Government's goal on this occasion, by introducing changes in this session, to make this Council ineffective as a House of Review. The Government is trying to influence public opinion by this process, but I believe that the people are taking much more interest in this subject than Government members think.

The Hon. Anne Levy: How do you know that?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I mix with people generally and, from the feed-back I get, I believe that people are beginning to take much more interest in the question of abolition and much more interest in the attacks that have been made than in the past. I think that the more discussion that we can generate on the subject the better, because the people should be informed of the other side of the whole question. I am getting tired of hearing the Labor Party attack this Council year in and year out.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Why don't you go out amongst the people?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I go out amongst them as much as the honourable member does.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: The people want to get rid of this place.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They do not.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Why not have a referendum?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Let the overall issue be perfectly clear. The two major Parties in this State are completely apart on this question. The A.L.P. stands for abolition. It is in the Party platform and we know that they are bound

hand and foot to everything in that platform. If they act against it, they are automatically expelled from the Party.

The other side of the question, which is worlds apart from that, is that the Liberal Party stands for retention of the Legislative Council, and will do so at all times. My personal view is that the bicameral system, the two-House system incorporated as one Parliament in this State, is far better than what the Labor Party wants, namely, one House reigning supreme. When one looks at the value and usefulness of the present system—

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Give an example.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I will as I proceed. The Hon. Mr. Foster is ashamed to take his place in the Council. He is perched in the public gallery.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: The honourable member must not refer to the gallery.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: This ultimate question really should devolve about the issue of which of these two systems provides the best possible laws in this State. That should be the ultimate yardstick. Is this State going to be served by the best possible laws by having a one-House system, or by having a two-House system? That may seem to be somewhat simplistic.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What does Bjelke-Petersen think about that?

The Hon. Anne Levy: What does Bill Knox think about it?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: When this subject is raised, members opposite always bring forward the matter of Queensland and they ask why the Liberal Party and the National Party do not reintroduce the second Chamber in the Queensland Parliament. The simple answer is that we all know that Lower Houses do not altogether enjoy the checks and controls that a second Chamber can place on them. We all know that those in a one-House system, such as those who govern in Queensland, do not relish the possibility of a second Chamber being introduced. To say that is being frank and honest. If one is realistic, one must disregard interjections about Queensland.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Your argument is based on the principle that what you have not got you do not miss.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: No. It is based on the fact that Queensland has in no way benefited by the fact that it changed to a one-House system in 1922. Indeed, during the long Labor regime in Queensland, that State was in some economic stagnation, whilst South Australia made tremendous progress. One can well ask whether that position in Queensland was not due to the fact that the Government was not as good as it might have been had there been a two-House system. The people of this State must consider whether they are governed by the best possible laws under a two-House system.

Further, I intend to deal briefly with some of the functions of this Council because, in explaining those functions, one can obtain a proper assessment of this Chamber's worth. The first function of a second Chamber is to review and examine Bills. This function is important in a two-Party system when debate is somewhat limited in the Lower House.

That situation applies in this Parliament, where members in another place are limited regarding the time in which they can debate measures. There is no doubt about that and, if honourable members were honest with themselves about this, they would accept that.

If review of legislation is carried out adequately, improvement to that legislation must result. The Hon. Mr. Dunford asked me to give examples, and we have had examples time and again, as sessions have proceeded, of amendments being moved to Bills which have been passed in another place. The amendments are accepted by the

Government in another place.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: We've no option.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is not so. The Government has the option of carrying its opposition to such amendments much further than it does. On many past occasions amendments moved in this Council have been accepted by the Government in another place. It stands to reason that the Government must accept that those amendments improve the legislation. If there was not a House of Review, those amendments would not be put forward, and it must apply that legislation passed by a single-House system must become law in a form not as good as it would be when passed by a two-House system.

Further, not only are all those amendments moved and advanced in this process of review by Opposition members, but constantly during the past session the Government, when a Bill passed by another place was being debated here, introduced its own amendments. That indicates that a Bill can pass through one House in a form not as good as that when it passes through a two-House system.

I have given examples of where the Government, in this Council, has brought forward amendments, and where this Council has accepted those amendments. If there were only one Chamber, the Government would have to bring back the legislation for amendment, or it would have to defer its proclamation.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: What did you do about workmen's compensation?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Never mind about that. The honourable member should let me make my speech, as he will have an opportunity to make his own. On the occasions when the Government has introduced amendments in this Council, it must indicate to everyone, including Government members, that a Parliament in which there exists a House of Review does provide the opportunity for the best possible laws to be made within that two-House system.

Secondly, this Council provides the opportunity for Bills to be initiated. From my experience here this assists the machinery of Parliament. Bills can be introduced in both Chambers, the two Chambers working at the same time, both having the right to initiate Bills. Certainly, this adds to efficiency and cuts down the time of Parliament, and in many cases it makes—

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: A mockery of the popular House!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It does not make a mockery of another place. I am saying that, when Bills are initiated in both Houses, it expedites the smooth running of Parliament. Indeed, another place does not take so much time in debating measures that have been initiated in this Chamber, because it knows measures go to it from this Council in a well-considered manner and in relatively good shape. All honourable members would agree with that. Initiating Bills is a function of a second Chamber, which is a point that should not be overlooked in this debate.

This Chamber's third function is to provide some delay where that delay is reasonable, so that the best possible legislation can pass through Parliament. It is proper, if Bills are forced through another place quickly, that the State at large be given an opportunity to know what the legislation is about, and for the population at large to express its view on that legislation. Therefore, some delay in this Chamber is proper, and a second Chamber provides the opportunity for such delay.

There is no such opportunity in a single-House system. The Hon. Mr. Dunford asked for examples and, in respect of delay, I want to make two points. First, a Bill was introduced in the Council today to amend the Land Tax

Act. That Bill was debated in another place for one day only. However, I understand that some alterations were made to the Bill just before it was introduced in another place, and Parliament is being asked to treat this matter with extreme haste.

As the Bill came to this Council only today, I have not had a full opportunity to study it closely, but a constituent has pointed out that one clause of the Bill is entirely unrelated to the publicity given to this matter. The publicity surrounds the fact that the rate of land tax is reduced.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: How has your constituent seen the Bill, while you have not?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: He was informed by a member in another place.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Why did you not get a copy of the Bill from another place?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Because Bills coming to this Chamber are not always the same as Bills in another place, as the honourable member should know. My constituent is concerned that there is a sting in the tail of this Bill which is completely unrelated to the matters given publicity by the Government. I stress that there is a possibility that people having some interest in land but not having that interest in their name, may find that those total properties are aggregated for assessment of land tax and, as a result, those people in aggregate might pay a much greater amount in land tax than they are presently paying.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Is your constituent a member of the Real Estate Institute?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: You're not talking about yourself?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, I am not. The honourable member should not be so suspicious. The point is that, if it is true that on close perusal of a Bill honourable members find—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting President. Is it in order for the honourable member to read from someone else's notes?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have not got anyone else's notes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: It has been common practice in recent years for honourable members on both sides to quote and read from newspapers and other reports.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If there is a danger in the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill, as has been expressed to me, that Bill should be delayed. The best possible system provides for the right to delay legislation in appropriate circumstances. I can recall talking to a retired public servant from Queensland who informed me that there were occasions when his Minister in the single-House Parliament in that State deferred introducing Bills until near the end of a session in the hope that they would have a rapid passage: in effect, in the hope that they could be forced through quickly. The whole process of delay is lacking in the Queensland system. If any honourable member can tell me that the people are best served by a system where there is no possibility of delaying legislation in appropriate circumstances, I should like him to stand up and say so.

A further function of this Council which I believe considerably benefits the Parliament is that, where debates do not involve the fate of the executive Government, it is possible for a full and free discussion to be conducted by experts—and there are experts on both sides of this Council. I hope we will always see people with expert knowledge elected to this Council. The Government of the day, irrespective of its political complexion,

can take notice of opinions expressed by such members, because those opinions are expressed in the public interest. One could not have that situation in a single-House Parliament.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Would you be willing to see this Council divorced from the executive system altogether and see it play a true review role?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That is ironic, coming from an honourable gentleman whose name was in the press only last week as being a contender for a front bench honour.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: And he nearly got there, too.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I wonder how the other Government back-benchers felt. Apart from the functions I have so far referred to, the two-House system ensures greater safety and protection to many of the State's senior officers; for example, the Auditor-General and members of the Judiciary, who cannot be dismissed from office without the approval of both Houses of this Parliament. If there is a single-House system, the Government of the day has the opportunity to bring pressure to bear upon such officers through a threat of dismissal. Everything possible should be done to minimise that possible danger.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: This Council should be abolished, but it won't be.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The honourable member must be agreeing that the people would reject a referendum on the subject. Another reason why it is more likely that the best possible legislation will be enacted under a two-House system is that in this Council legislation is reviewed in a different atmosphere from that applying in another place. In the Lower House one expects strong, spirited debate in which, naturally, tempers will flare and emotions will run high. In the Lower House in such circumstances determined Governments, simply by their numbers, can force legislation through. However, when that legislation comes before this second Chamber, generally speaking a calmer and more tranquil approach should prevail. This second look at legislation can reveal areas where improvements can be made, resulting in better legislation.

Of course, in recent years the traditional approach in this Council has been difficult to achieve but that difficulty, in itself, is not sufficient reason to support the abolition of this Council; that difficulty is simply a result of the election to this Council of members who find difficulty in controlling their feelings and who become excited and provocative. These same members tend to agitate for the abolition of this Council. The people should consider the opportunity that this Council has to check any Government which, being in control of the House of Assembly, uses its powers excessively or conducts itself contradictorily to its overall promised programme. This Council can exercise its responsibility in those circumstances, irrespective of which Party is in power. This power must not be exercised irresponsibly. That is a check in the bicameral system which must not be overlooked.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Who wrote that for you?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I am quoting from notes that I have made. I summarise by saying that the people in this State are governed better with a two-House system than would be the case if this Council were abolished. The best possible laws result from a two-House system. This is a very important matter. I have endeavoured to stress briefly the functions of this Council and its value in the Parliamentary system. A measure of which the Government has given notice in its policy speech and a reference in the Governor's Speech have, as their aim, to weaken the effectiveness of this Council. They are steps along the course upon which the Labor Party is launched. That course is to abolish this Council.

Lastly, I shall quote from the *London Times* of October

6. In this issue there was a report upon the British Labour Party's conference held at Brighton where there was a debate about a week ago to abolish the second Chamber at Westminster, namely, the House of Lords. The only speaker at this conference whom I quote is the Government Chief Whip in the House of Lords, Lady Llewellyn Davies, whom I have had the pleasure of meeting and have had some discussions with her. Lady Llewellyn Davies opposed the motion to abolish the House of Lords.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Did you hear Manny Shinwell?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Yes. He is 93 years of age and a great old man. I shall read this paragraph from the *London Times* about Lady Llewellyn Davies:

There was laughter when she said that their job was to make legislation more perfect, and she retorted: "I am there. You are not. I see what goes on and that is what goes on. Bills need revising. If there is no second Chamber, with all the pressures which are on the House of Commons as at present constituted, Bills would go through imperfect and the courts and judiciary will interpret the law of the land."

I support the motion.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Before launching into my speech I want to make some comment on the contributions by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Hill to this debate. I do not want to do this in detail. I know that honourable members will have *Hansard* copies tomorrow and will be busy all weekend replying in detail to some of the rubbish that both those gentlemen spoke. I am surprised at the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's late conversion to democracy. We all know that converts are usually the most obsessed, the most bigoted, the biggest zealots of all. This is certainly true in the case of Mr. DeGaris. He is all those things I have mentioned, as is a true convert, and his was a very late conversion.

Even in this conversion, what he has not been able to do is to convince one member of his own Party, let alone anybody on the other side of the Council, that anything he is saying is correct, that this State is gerrymandered and that the Labor Party has some advantage under the electoral boundaries. It is absolute nonsense and all his own people agree that it is nonsense, that his opposition is out of step with his own Party. He is chasing headlines. He is in opposition to every responsible commentator in this State and indeed throughout Australia.

He presents his material in a very dishonest manner. He picks out of articles and statistics things that suit him. This was clearly shown by his use of the Dean Jaensch pendulum that was published in a monograph that is available in the Library. It was also available in the *Sunday Mail* on August 21. There was not only one pendulum; there were two side by side. I find it difficult to believe that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris failed to see the other one which was there an eighth of an inch away. The point that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is trying to prove with the 1975 pendulum that Dean Jaensch put out was that the redistribution was a gerrymander because the Labor Party had only two safe seats and the Liberal Party had 12.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is not true at all. You cannot even quote what I said.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: I will have a look. It is in the *Advertiser* of October 3, 1977. Mr. DeGaris said:

Since beginning the argument that the 1976 redistribution was a gerrymander of quite dramatic proportions favouring the Australian Labor Party many people have asked me how a gerrymander can be recognised when all the electorates have equal numbers, Mr. DeGaris says.

There are many ways this can be done, but the simplest way to recognise a boundary fiddle is to compare the number of seats for each Party that may be classified as blue ribbon.

That is, those seats which would require a 20 per cent swing or more to change.

If one examines the pendulum chart prepared by the senior lecturer in politics at Flinders University (Dr. Dean Jaensch), it will be readily seen that the Liberal or Country Parties have 12 seats in this category and the Australian Labor Party has two seats based on 1975 figures.

This illustrates the gerrymander's basic art—the locking up of the opponents, votes in as many blue ribbon seats as possible.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is quite true.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: When you have a look at the other pendulum which was published in the *Sunday Mail* and which was about a quarter of an inch away from the one that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is quoting—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Do you think he might have missed it?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I know he is one-eyed, but the two things are side by side. It has been accepted by all responsible commentators that the 1973 election result was the best result to compare relative voting strength patterns.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Name two commentators who have said that. Only one said that.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Leader should wait just a minute. They were all responsible commentators. I am making the statement and, if he is able to do so, the Leader can prove me wrong. The 1973 vote was a better indication than was the 1975 vote of the normal voting pattern in this State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How can you say that? It's absolute nonsense.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Dr. Jaensch recognises this. He produced a pendulum based on the 1975 result, as well as one based on the 1973 result, which was a more representative basis on which to work.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are they first past the post votes?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Leader used the pendulum. They are the same figures that he used. If one looks at the 1973 figures, one sees that eight seats belonged to the Labor Party that required a swing of—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Was this first past the post voting or not? Answer the question!

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Leader used the 1975 pendulum. It showed two A.L.P. seats that required more than a 20 per cent swing, and 12 that were held by the Liberal Party. The Leader must have used this pendulum, which is based on the 1975 A.L.P. primary vote. Was that the one that he used?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I don't know.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Go on! Of course the Leader knows what he used. This is the chart which shows that two A.L.P. seats required a 20 per cent swing, and that 12 seats were held by the Liberal Party.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: On primary votes in 1975?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: That is the one that the Leader used. It is here.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you go back to 1973?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Dr. Jaensch does.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What does that say?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: That the A.L.P. has eight safe seats and the Liberal Party seven. I am certain that the Leader reads the *Sunday Mail* and that he saw this. If he was putting honestly any sort of case, he would have used both sets of figures. But, of course, he did not do so. That is why Government members have such fun knocking down what he says.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You are dealing with primary votes?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I am dealing with a chart that was drawn up on a basis identical to the one that the Leader used.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What gerrymander is stated there?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: It does not say.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Come on!

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I have no intention of talking about the gerrymander factor. I am merely pointing out the dishonest way in which the Leader misrepresents facts. It was very poorly done and, indeed, transparent. Government members have much fun in destroying the rubbish that the Leader puts up, because it is so easy to do so.

The other interesting thing about the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's complaints regarding the redistribution is that one can use a test on it. However, is it supported by both sides? In this case, the redistribution was supported by both sides. In fact, we went even further, because the Federal Liberal Government is now introducing a redistribution based on virtually identical terms of reference to that which has been applied here. Although there is a difference in relation to large seats, it is of no real significance. Basically, it has a 10 per cent tolerance. The Federal Liberal Government has an enormous majority in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and it can introduce any system that it likes. However, it is introducing the same system which we have here and which is supported by both sides here. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris is the only one out. The Federal Liberal Government is introducing the same system.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Not with the same terms of reference.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: With the same tolerance.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You're being dishonest.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: No, I am not. The essential part of that redistribution, which was an essential part of our redistribution, was the 10 per cent tolerance.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That was not the central point.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: What is the Country Party moaning about? It is the 10 per cent tolerance.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is not.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Aren't the terms of reference similar?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: They are exactly the same on the tolerance, and the Leader knows it. He is merely arguing for himself: he is not arguing for his colleagues here or for his Federal colleagues. The Leader is on his own.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: Rubbish!

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I am sorry. The Leader may have the support of the Hon. Mrs. Cooper, the Hon. Mr. Burdett and the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, support to which he is welcome.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: They won't be here for much longer, Frank.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Of course they will not. In a way, what is happening is sad, because the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is destroying his own Party. He is telling every candidate when he stands at an election, "We cannot win. It is not possible for us to do so." Mr. Tonkin is going blue in the face telling every candidate, "We want to win with your seat." However, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is saying that the Liberal Party cannot win.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I have never said that.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: That is, in effect, what the Leader is saying.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No, it isn't.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I do not know why the

Leader's Party does not do something about it. As I said recently, next to Don Dunstan the Leader is the greatest thing that the A.L.P. has got going for it. I am sure that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's contribution will be dealt with more fully by my colleagues next week.

I know that in these Address in Reply debates one is at times scratching to find something to say. However, the Hon. Mr. Hill's contribution was really appalling.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: He'll never make the leadership on that speech.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Every time the Hon. Mr. DeGaris sits down, everyone thinks, "That is it. He will have to win on the face of Mr. DeGaris's speech." However, the Hon. Mr. Hill then gets up and wrecks everything. He does it every time! He gets right back down to the field and, yet again, we must suffer the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. That honourable gentleman is smiling, but he knows that the greatest thing he has going for him is the Hon. Mr. Hill.

The Hon. Mr. Hill said, in reply to an interjection from the Hon. Mr. Dunford, that one thing about which he was sure was that the A.L.P. did not have a mandate to tamper with this Council, or words to that effect. I think honourable members opposite will agree that that is what he said.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I said that everyone who supported you at the last election did not necessarily agree with the proposals in your policy speech regarding the Council.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: I said you hadn't been out amongst the people.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And I said you hadn't been, either.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: If you thought that this Council was worth defending, why did you not defend it during the election campaign against the Labor Party proposals regarding blocking of Supply and simultaneous elections? You were not game to do that. I apologise: the Hon. Mr. DeGaris may have been in Naracoorte and he may have done it there. Of course, I exclude him from the Liberal Party. The Hon. Mr. Hill also said that this Council was very good with checks and balances, that it was a good system, and that the legislation from the House of Assembly should be delayed, amended or tossed out.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I did not mention tossing out.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: All right, you will never toss out? Regarding delaying and amending, you think that is fine. You agree with checks and balances. If the Liberal Party is in Government in the Lower House and the Labor Party has a majority in this Council, will you still agree that the Labor Party has the right to amend Liberal Party legislation or to delay it, or to toss legislation out as you repeatedly do?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Provided it is acting responsibly.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Who judges what is responsible? I want to get this clear. I will be here for a long time, but I do not think it will happen in my time, but in the time of future generations there could be a Liberal Government in the Lower House and a Labor Party majority here. I think it is on the record now and when I leave this place (and I have forgotten when that will be) I will leave on my desk a copy of *Hansard* of this debate so that my successors will know that they have your full permission to do what you have been doing for 100 years.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I will send you a framed copy of it.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: When I was sidetracked by the two members who had spoken in the debate before me, I wanted to congratulate the Governor, Mr. Seaman, on attaining his office. I am sure he will fill the role with distinction as have his two predecessors, Sir Douglas Nicholls and Sir Mark Oliphant. I did not have the

opportunity to meet the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Crocker, but I agree with what other members have said about him. In the six months for which he was in office, he served well. From what my colleagues have said, he was a delightful and affable man and did a good job for the State.

There has been some criticism of the brevity of the Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament. Claims that the Speech gave no indication of what the Government's programme was and that this was contrary to tradition have been made. I think, Mr. President, that the contrary situation applies to the Governor's Speech on this occasion. It was very comprehensive. It stated quite clearly that the Government intended to legislate to give effect to the programme put before the people prior to the election on September 17. At that election the people of this State voted quite clearly for the Dunstan Labor Government's policies and proposals, and the Government through the Governor's Speech said that it intends to carry out the wishes of the people. Just in case some members of the Opposition are not clear on what the Government's proposals were during the election campaign I have a copy of the Premier's policy speech and seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Policy Speech given by the Premier

The Labor Government is united in achievement and purpose. Our achievements have been to ensure democracy in South Australia—and this is the first fully democratic election in this State—and to bring the services of housing, health, welfare, education, consumer protection and public utilities to among the best in the world. It is our purpose to maintain those standards and to build security and diversity of employment, and an effective way for all in their own future. The adverse national economic climate has slowed the pace of improvement, and now, unhappily, we find South Australia needs to fight to defend what we have already achieved. The policy of the Federal Liberal Government, supported with constant enthusiasm by the Opposition in this State, has been to cut public services, reduce public employment, reduce the money supply and to reduce construction and housing activity in both the public and private sectors. We view that policy as wrong. It has achieved no reduction in inflation. It has reduced and will further markedly reduce employment. It will lead us further and further into economic depression. In its headlong course to economic ruin the Fraser Government has tried to make the States its instrument. So far from the new Federalism they preached—under which the States were to have more say in allotting their own priorities, they have reduced our resources.

The money paid to this state over the past two years has increased only slightly and by nowhere near enough to take account of rising costs. As a result we have had, in practical terms, a 7 per cent cut in funds. And this at a time when the Commonwealth has withdrawn from a wide range of programmes it previously ran and which it now expects the States to pick up and administer from our reduced resources. Fortunately, as a result of the Railways Agreement which the Liberals fought at the last State election, we have been in a position to do much to offset Federal Policy locally. We have abolished the petrol tax, abolished rural land tax and abolished succession duty between spouses. We have reduced succession duty rates and land tax rates for many. We have absorbed cost increases particularly in public transport in order to counteract inflation. We have refused to cut our public services, and we have kept construction expenditure high both in public buildings and in housing.

We have brought new industries and new technology to

our State. We have provided job creation schemes which have ensured employment for thousands whom Mr. Fraser (who condemns such schemes) and Mr. Tonkin (who says they are a waste of money) would have left unemployed. It will take all our resources of reserves and other funds to maintain that policy this year. We ask you to give us a mandate for the policy of using our resources to the full to maintain services, construction and employment and to give a mild controlled stimulus to the economy. That policy is endorsed by the Premiers of all States—regardless of political party—in contrast to the Fraser policy of reductions in services, employment and construction. Mr. Fraser's policy is the policy of our opponents in this State. To maintain the right course—the course supported by the six state Premiers—will take all our reserves. We will use some of these towards maintaining public works programmes otherwise endangered by the Fraser Government's slashing of the real value of loan funds, and the rest to maintain the unemployment relief scheme. But we will use resources the Commonwealth cannot get at to give a boost to the economy through the building industry.

The greatest success story of the insurance industry in the history of Australia is the State Government Insurance Commission against which our opponents fought bitterly. It has generated more than \$130 million in investment income for this State in less than five years. It will now not only build its own multi-million dollar prestige building in Victoria Square—in accordance with the Winston plan for development of the Square—it will also add to the housing finance by which it has already assisted 2 500 South Australian families into their own new homes. The State Government Insurance Commission will take over the second mortgages on Housing Trust homes, thereby releasing an extra \$4 million to \$5 million of Housing Trust's funds each year in the next three years. With that extra money the trust will be able to build more houses.

Within a fortnight tenders will be let for a new tower building financed by the Superannuation Fund, for public service offices. The new building will be on the corner of Wakefield Street and Gawler Place, and will also be designed in accordance with the Winston plan. There is another way in which we can get limited access to additional Loan funds. Statutory authorities can borrow up to one million dollars a year each without the permission of loan council. Each million dollars borrowed costs one hundred thousand dollars a year to the State budget to service, and so does not create a heavy burden on revenue as compared with the immediate benefit of capital expenditure.

New authorities will be created and some additional borrowing powers for existing ones will be provided. As an example—library services in the State are not adequate and urgent action needs to be taken. By tight budgeting measures we can provide one million dollars beyond normal funding to ensure the provision of shop front and mobile library services this year, particularly in the deprived western suburbs. The board will be able to borrow one million dollars to get warehousing, mobile libraries and cataloguing space in the suburbs to relieve the congestion at North Terrace.

The Government has received and adopted the report of the working party on the establishment of a Government Clothing Factory. A Government Clothing Factory manufacturing clothing and flat ware, other than tailored clothing, for Government purposes will be established in Whyalla, providing direct employment for 60 people and bringing an additional industry to the city. A Corporation will be set up to borrow semi-governmentally for the establishment costs. The factory will save the Government 15 per cent of current annual costs for clothing. I will give details tomorrow of a special statutory authority and other provisions for outback areas not within local government.

South Australia's community banking institutions—The State Bank and the Savings Bank—are of vital importance to our development. They will be protected and given every opportunity to develop full and competitive banking services. The franchise of the Savings Bank will be extended to cover the non-personal accounts of small business.

An energy authority will be established to provide the State with independent advice and information on the development and conservation of our energy resources. The Authority will establish a special inquiry into the end use of energy and the ways and means of conserving energy resources. The Government will continue its accelerated exploration programme for gas to ensure future supplies for Adelaide and South Australia. The highest priority will be given to ensure that the supply of gas to the South Australian Gas Company and Electricity Trust of South Australia is sufficient to take us well into the next century. The Government will continue research into alternative forms of energy, and in particular solar energy. The Government's policy will be to establish South Australia as a centre for this type of research and continued financial support will be given towards these objectives. The Electricity Trust of South Australia will build its next 500 megawatt power station at Port Augusta. Arrangements with the Commonwealth for freight rates for Leigh Creek coal have now been satisfactorily concluded.

The Labor Government in South Australia has a record unequalled among the Australian States in education. While the past few years have seen a great deal of attention given to the physical resources of schools, and though much remains to be done even in this State, we recognise that we have entered a new era when greater demands will be made upon students seeking places in the work force. Teachers and principals will face a new challenge for an even higher quality of education. Therefore, developments in education will be shaped to these changing demands. We will begin to phase out the zoning of secondary schools. This will provide opportunities for students to have a wider choice in selecting what and how they are taught. We will expand the numbers of teachers and teaching assistants employed in State schools and will provide 10 per cent non-contact time for primary teachers and junior primary teachers by 1979.

We believe it is vital that schools develop as effective community centres. Community-based schools—pioneering in Australia—are already being built at Angle Park and Burra. Plans are advanced for a similar development at Thebarton and are being made for Port Broughton. But we also believe that existing schools need to be adapted to more community use, available to the whole family. We will continue to finance independent schools at an overall cost per child of 20 per cent of the cost of educating children in Government schools. We will maintain the "needs" basis of funding through an advisory committee ensuring that the greatest share of funds goes to those schools with greatest need.

In 1975, the Labor Government committed itself to a universal pre-school system for four-year-olds by the end of the decade. By June, 1977, enough places to cover 92 per cent of four-year-olds had been catered for in 348 pre-school centres. New facilities will be provided in rapidly developing housing areas to the north and south of Adelaide. Secondary book allowances will be kept under review. Next year, the Government will begin construction of two new community colleges at Gilles Plains and Elizabeth and Stage 3 of the Regency Park Community College at an estimated total cost of \$19 100 000. In addition the Government proposes to build a community college at Noarlunga, to be located in the town centre and linked to a new major shopping area.

Because of the Land Commission (another great achievement of the Labor Government), developed building

blocks are much cheaper here than in the other States. As a community we now own the vast bulk of land to be developed for urban purposes in the next decade. The surpluses from the Land Commission will be used to develop community facilities both in new suburbs and in existing areas. This will ensure facilities at a much earlier date than previously achieved. We will make a radical overhaul of the planning law. This will ensure proper control of private development, quicker and less costly planning decisions and processes and the regionalisation of planning with greater local participation.

While the main Monarto project has had to be deferred in the absence of development funds from the Commonwealth, the reduced staff of the commission will continue to be engaged fully on consultancy work. The eventual development of Monarto is vital if we are to keep Adelaide the kind of place it is, and to ensure it does not deteriorate in the suburban sprawl now the curse of Sydney and Melbourne. We have already a proven policy leading Australia in redeveloping depressed urban areas. The first extension of this policy to the country will be in Port Pirie.

The South Australian Housing Trust will commence a regular programme of purchasing old houses in Port Pirie which can be upgraded, upgrading them and making them available for rental. In addition, in co-operation with the Corporation of the City of Port Pirie and the State Planning Authority, the trust will assist in the redevelopment of areas of Port Pirie where there are substandard houses not capable of being upgraded.

Under Labor, South Australia now leads the world in consumer protection. We will now legislate to provide control of insurance contracts to ensure people are not misled as to the cover they are getting, and we will enact a Consumer Product Safety Act to ban unsafe products. We have already decentralised the Consumer Affairs Branch to a number of country centres and the services from those offices will be expanded. New regional offices will be opened in Tea Tree Gully, Elizabeth, Port Adelaide and Noarlunga. We will continue to give high priority to the implementation of the Sex Discrimination Act. A project will be set up to eliminate discriminatory provisions generally from South Australian laws.

The Government seeks a specific mandate to introduce optional preferential voting for House of Assembly elections. The Government will introduce legislation to require members of Parliament to disclose their pecuniary interests to the extent necessary to ensure that no conflict of interest occurs between their private activities and their public interest.

We seek a mandate for simultaneous elections of the Legislative Council and House of Assembly, and the abolition of the six-year minimum term requirement for the Legislative Council. A referendum will put to the people the removal of the power of Legislative Council to refuse supply to a Government with majority support in the House of Assembly.

South Australia, under Labor, is a pace-setter in law reform. In the area of criminal law and sentencing, the Government has recently passed laws to increase the penalties for trafficking in hard drugs to a maximum fine of \$100 000 and 25 years imprisonment. We have introduced tighter laws governing the availability of firearms. South Australia was the first State to pass legislation reforming the law relating to sexual offences to ensure that the trauma suffered by the victim is minimised. The Government now proposes to review all penalties for criminal offences in line with the Mitchell Committee's recommendations.

We propose, in conjunction with the Police Commissioner, to seek ways of obtaining closer public co-operation in the area of law enforcement. We will introduce a new Criminal

Injuries Compensation Act to simplify procedures and to provide that the victim of a crime can obtain up to \$10 000 for injury caused by violent crime. We will extend the Act to cover claims for compensation for property damage caused by juveniles absconding from the custody of the juvenile institutions. We will implement legislation enabling the Crown to appeal against sentences in criminal matters. In relation to indecent publications the Government will amend the wording of Section 33 of the Police Offences Act to make it more effective and to increase the penalties. The Government will carry out a study to ensure that court procedures are simplified to remove unnecessary red tape and to provide for the use by courts of simple language in their forms and procedures.

As a matter of urgency the Government will implement legislation to give effect to the major recommendations made by Judge Mohr, the Royal Commissioner who investigated the Juvenile Court system. The Government will establish a Corporate Affairs Commission to exercise control over corporations and securities and we will co-operate with other States and the Commonwealth in an endeavour to have a national corporate affairs structure established. The Government is most concerned about corporate crime and will undertake a thorough review of criminal laws in this area. The Government will introduce legislation to reform laws relating to debtors to ensure that the use of imprisonment as a method of forcing a person to pay his debts is removed. We will act urgently to further develop schemes for debtor assistance and counselling. We will continue our strong backing of the Police Force in provision of modern police equipment and methods. As has already been announced, the police and Health Commission will share a special helicopter service.

The Government has established a top level inquiry into the laws relating to handicapped persons' rights and we will amend laws where they are discriminatory or unfair to handicapped persons. The South Australian Government has been pre-eminent in this country in its achievements in the promotion of the arts, not only in this Festival Centre, but in the provision of regional cultural centres, in the formation of State performing companies, in the provisions for the Art Gallery and in the enormous success of the South Australian Film Corporation. The main thrust of our arts policy in the next three years will be to develop more activity in the community arts area. We will widen participation in the artistic activities of the community, in suburban and country areas. Grants will be available for the upgrading of community performing and recreational facilities in local government areas which are not serviced immediately by a regional cultural centre. Water quality has always been a problem and never more than in this drought year when we have to rely on poor quality Murray water.

A comprehensive water treatment programme to cost \$144 million is being undertaken to upgrade the safety and physical quality of Adelaide's water supply. The first works at Hope Valley are nearing completion and will supply filtered water at 60 000 houses later this year. The second works at Anstey Hill will be completed in 1979 and will supply filtered water to 50 000 homes. It is the policy of the Government that filtered water will be supplied to all the metropolitan area. The speed will depend entirely upon whether the present Federal Government honours the agreement made in relation to this funding.

The Government is presently undertaking major sewerage extension works totalling \$23 million. These works include North-Eastern suburbs, Blackwood-Belair, Parafield Gardens-Salisbury, Christies Beach-Noarlunga, and the Lonsdale-Hallett Cove area. Work is also under way in the country in Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Balhannah and Victor Harbor. An announcement has already been made on

sewerage for Mount Gambier.

South Australia contains migrants and their descendants from many countries. We are one community, delighting in our multi-cultural heritage. A special ethnics affairs branch to ensure services to ethnic minorities is being set up. We have already announced our policy of supporting ethnic radio, increasing interpreter and translating services and language classes, and grants to ethnic festivals.

Despite the drastic cut-backs in Commonwealth funding of hospitals—\$13 million off the capital programmes and \$5 million off the recurring costs, we will continue and maintain our record of providing the best of Australia's health and hospital services. Major hospital works to proceed include Flinders Medical Centre, Modbury Hospital, Christies Beach Hospital, Home for Incurables, Adelaide Childrens Hospital.

Community welfare services have been brought from the worst to the best in Australia. A redevelopment programme of \$900 000 will be undertaken at the Magill Home for the Aged. The limit of rebate on water and sewer rates for pensioners will be raised from \$50 to \$75 and on council rates and land tax from \$100 to \$150 to ensure that increased property values do not impose additional burdens on pensioners. The Budget Advice Service is currently operating in 16 centres. Next year it will expand to Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Millicent, Modbury and Berri. The service will be taken into the schools to ensure children learn about wise money management. It will also be available to the Opposition. A new community welfare centre costing \$800 000 will be established at Marion. The Government proposes also to establish new centres at Mount Gambier and Enfield.

As a part of the Government's major drive to combat youth unemployment the budget for the Government's community youth unemployment scheme has been lifted to \$560 000 this financial year. A major expansion in the development of programmes for young unemployed throughout the State is being undertaken. The Community Improvement Through Youth project has already been announced. This work is being co-ordinated with the Youth Work Unit of the Department of Labour and Industry. The Government has under way a number of initiatives which aim to promote self-determination for South Australia's Aboriginal people. Legislation will be passed to give tribal land rights to the Pitjantjatjara people.

The Government will continue to encourage a greater use of public transport in order to reduce the damaging effects of the increasing use of cars—noise and air pollution, reduced personal safety, and the use of scarce energy resources. The Government will aim to increase the opportunities for travel by people in all parts of the metropolitan area who must use public transport because they have no cars. New buses are steadily being provided for a major expansion of bus services throughout the metropolitan area. Improved services will be provided with a service to the Flinders Medical Centre, extensions and service improvements to the North-Eastern areas, the introduction of a circular bus and introduction of a new feeder service from Brighton railway station to the Sheidow Park and Hallett Cove area. A new bus feeder service from Hackham East to Lonsdale railway station has already been introduced. As an immediate step the tertiary student concessions that presently apply will be extended to the buses and trams. The estimated cost is \$100 000 per annum. A major public involvement exercise to determine the type and location of transport for the North-East is presently being undertaken. The Government expects the report based on the people's views to be available for discussion and subsequent action.

The State Public Service has a high reputation for its managerial efficiency and its modern approach. Legislation

will be introduced to amend the Public Service Act to enable the development within the South Australian Public Service of varying forms of modern management. The Government will continue to expand areas dedicated as national and conservation parks towards a target of not less than 5 per cent of the State's total area. During its next term, the Government will complete the purchase of Deep Creek, which will become a major national park, complete the dedication of the Coorong while maintaining its Game Reserve and dedicate Coffin Bay national park. The Black Hill Native Flora Park will be developed to form a major recreation and education facility of national significance. We will complete the Mt. Lofty Botanic Gardens to make it one of the few major botanic gardens developed in Australia this century.

Legislation to protect the State's cultural heritage will be enacted. The Government will take steps to determine the location, importance and type of support necessary for all museums, with particular reference to rural museums. Legislation to provide for an environmental impact statement for use in both public and private decision-making will be introduced. The structure and functions of the Environmental Protection Council will be reviewed to enable the council more effectively to act as an independent adviser for the public in environmental matters. The Government has instituted a major programme to protect our people against the burden of unemployment. More than \$40 000 000 has been provided so far under our Unemployment Relief Scheme. The Government's policy is to continue these programmes.

A further \$7 000 000 will be provided to extend the highly successful State Unemployment Relief Scheme. The Government will legislate to protect security of employment by requiring adequate notice to employees (in accordance with length of service), of any retrenchments or close-down of business. The Long Service Leave Act will be amended to provide that pro rata long service leave is payable irrespective of the nature of the termination of employment.

The Government will renew the effort that has been frustrated by the Legislative Council to improve the Workmen's Compensation Act. We will set up a committee to examine the possibility of providing a no-fault 24-hour accident cover on a State level. The Government's efforts to provide more flexible shopping hours and service have been repeatedly frustrated by the Liberals in the Legislative Council. They have veered from demanding no change to wanting to abolish all rules so the pieces fall where they may, according to the political wind as they sniffed it. We will legislate to give effect to the report of the Royal Commission on Shopping Hours. We expect that the new provisions will operate by Christmas.

We will act in conformity with an International Labour Convention to prevent private employment agencies demanding fees from unemployed workers. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act will be amended to improve its operation and to maintain the favourable and co-operative industrial situation in this State. The Industrial Commission will be given an unfettered discretion to include in its awards the same provisions on preference to unionists as Commonwealth and other State industrial tribunals now have. The Government will legislate to ensure that all litigation on industrial disputes takes place in the Industrial Court.

The relationship between employers and employees in South Australian industry is better than in any other State. The Government intends that this should continue and be further improved. To bring this about, the Government has been pursuing a policy of industrial democracy aimed at providing employees with the opportunity and the right to influence decisions at their work place. It also involves the

further development of more efficient, effective and satisfying work provisions for the public and private sectors. The Government has established a Tripartite Industrial Democracy Committee comprising five employers, five trade unionists and two Government representatives. This committee recently came to a unanimous view regarding the philosophy, nature and scope of industrial democracy. The Government accepted and will promote the implementation of that philosophy.

The State is facing the worst drought in its history. Anticipating this problem we have set about revising the whole drought relief programme and administration, which has been transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Rapid action will be taken to deliver assistance to farmers already in difficulty. We will ensure that the State's resources are used effectively and Commonwealth back-up finance is called on as soon as necessary.

The Government doubled the Budget allocated to Fisheries for 1975/76. This has enabled a greatly enlarged research and development programme to be undertaken. We will establish a marine laboratory to complement this expanded research programme. The Government recognises that professional and amateur fishermen both have rights and we will ensure that amateur fishermen will have a continuing right of entry into the fisheries. The Government will carry out a research programme to study the resources of the Spencer Gulf region, in view of the declining catches.

The Labor Government has recognised the particular problems of horticultural industries in the Riverland. Funds have been provided for emergency pools in wine grapes and citrus juice. The loans to the Riverland Cannery have been converted to grants. We recognise the need for long-term solutions to the problems of this region, and have established the Riverland Development Fund which will provide the benefits of better returns to growers, which will occur this year. The Departments of Agriculture and Fisheries will form a regional unit in the Riverland area which will bring together all the services provided by the departments. This regional unit will provide growers with a complete advisory service. We will conduct an inquiry into citrus marketing in South Australia in order to find out the best method of ensuring that growers get the best and most stable returns.

The programme I have outlined will keep South Australia in the lead. We will continue to show the way to the rest of Australia in the development of progressive and democratic government. At the same time South Australia will maintain its pride of place as a State where quality of life, concern and compassion for people, equality of opportunity and the ability to live a full life in a social context are to the fore.

Vote Labor . . . we're showing Australia how.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: My action will save all members the difficulty of not knowing what was in the policy speech. The reception that speech received from the people of this State was extremely good, and the Government had a very significant increase in its share of the vote and was returned with an increased majority in the peoples' House. I have taken note of the Labor Party's victory and I accept the will of the people.

The people of this State can rest assured that I have heard their voice. I accept their decision and will not be using my power in this Chamber to frustrate the peoples' clear and expressed wish to have the Government's policy implemented. I hope that every other member of this House will do the same, particularly those members of the Opposition who have not been democratically elected themselves, because they appear to be the worst offenders in misusing this place for the benefit of the wealthy reactionary forces who cannot get majority support in this State.

I hope, Sir, we have seen the last of the permanent will

of the people syndrome from the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. After four consecutive House of Assembly election losses, I think it is about time Mr. DeGaris allowed the people of this State to have their wishes carried out without his dead hand holding them back.

Regarding the election campaign itself, I spent the greater part of it in the country areas of the State, and was very pleased with the result. For the A.L.P. to have received about 40 per cent of the vote shows that country people are becoming much more aware that the depression they are at present experiencing is not going to be solved by the Liberal and Country Parties. They are realising that their natural and economic allies are the ordinary working people of South Australia, not the giant corporations that are ripping off both the small farmer and the workers.

I believe this swing to the Labor Party will continue as the depression in country areas deepens. It has been a feature of previous rural depressions that country electors have moved to the extreme right of the political spectrum. At times such as country people are now experiencing, such lunatic fringe organisations as the League of Rights have received significant support from desperate country people. This has been particularly so in the areas where I spend most of my time; that is, the Assembly Districts of Eyre and Flinders. This movement to the extreme right has not taken place during this rural depression.

I was pleased and heartened by the cool and rational way in which country people discussed their problems, and they were certainly very much aware of the damage that Mr. Fraser and Mr. Anthony were doing to their way of life. I admit that the Federal Labor Government made some mistakes in its rural policies. These have been recognised and rectified. I am sure that at the next Federal election we will see a similar swing to the A.L.P. in country districts to that which we experienced in this State on September 17.

Perhaps the most personally rewarding experience I had during the election campaign was a visit I made to the North West Aboriginal reserves. I visited Indulkana, Ernabella, Amata and Fregon and, apart from seeing some of the most spectacular scenery in Australia, I felt privileged to have been welcomed into these Aboriginal communities. I must confess to having known little of the problems that Aboriginal people face in Australia, and one visit to the North West communities certainly has not made me an instant expert, but I believe every member of Parliament would benefit from visiting these areas.

The visit was certainly an education to me. The problems the communities faced ranged from the large and vexed question of land rights to the difficulties of obtaining a driving licence when the rules of the road, which the driver must know, are not printed in the Aborigine's own language. Of course, there is an enormous number of problems ranging in importance between the two points I have made.

I must say that I was impressed by some of the steps that have already been taken by various State Government agencies to assist the Aboriginal community. The Education, Public Health and Community Welfare Departments, in particular, are doing a good job in supplying services in a difficult geographic and cultural area, providing services that we take for granted in our suburban community. I suppose the first thing that struck me in talking to the people of the community was the affinity the Aborigines have with the land.

If there was one recurring theme throughout the various communities I visited, it was the Aborigine's desire to own their own traditional tribal areas. I do not want to go into the rights and wrongs of the acquisition of the tribal land

by whites in the past, not at this stage, anyway, but there can be no doubt that the return of that land to the Aboriginal people must be given top priority by any Government with a conscience.

Therefore, I was delighted to see in the Premier's policy speech a firm commitment along those lines. Steps are already being taken to have the land returned to the rightful owners. I hope that when legislation does come before this Council, it will get the non-Party political treatment it deserves.

I found during my visit that the understanding of the political system among Aborigines was patchy. It ranged from a first-class knowledge of both the Parliamentary system and the various political Parties to absolutely no understanding at all of what we were trying to explain to the people. Two things that most people have some knowledge of were land rights and Don Dunstan, so it is not surprising that the Labor Party attracted the overwhelming majority of the vote from members of the community.

Regardless of the way the Aboriginal people vote, it is important that the political process is taken to the communities for the education of both sides. Aborigines have to feel that politically they are part of Australia, that their vote does count and that their voices can be heard in the various Parliaments of Australia. Some progress has been made in making the Aboriginal people aware of their political potential. The results of the recent elections in the Northern Territory were known and discussed among the Aboriginal community, and they were proud of the fact that their people in the territory have played such a vital role in defeating many National Country Party and Liberal Party candidates.

There was also some understanding of how the voting rights of some Aborigines were stolen from them by the Liberal Party in the Kimberley areas of Western Australia. I was able to reassure the Aboriginal people that no attempt would be made by the Labor Government in this State to prevent their voting, nor did I think the Liberal Party would get up to the same sort of low tricks that it used in Western Australia in an attempt to prevent Aboriginal people from voting for whom they wished.

I am pleased to say that I have not so far had any reports of the Western Australian Liberal Party tactics being used in this State. One reason why I was sure the Liberal Party would not use similar tactics in South Australia to those used in Western Australia, was that the only member of the Liberal Party who went up there was the Hon. Mr. Whyte. No matter what one says about the honourable member in this Council, his honesty cannot be doubted outside it.

Politically he may be shonky, but when he is not being a politician, everything he says outside this Council is of the utmost propriety. The Hon. Mr. Whyte is the only member of the Liberal Party who visited the Aboriginal communities. That is the reason for my view that no political tricks were used. Perhaps I am naive.

Further, the biggest problem in race relations is the attitude that coloured people are somehow less worthy of being considered human beings than are whites. This is not an attitude reserved for some white Australians; unfortunately it is prevalent all over the world. We read about it every day in the world news in our newspapers. International racism is practised, for example, in southern Africa, and seems to find plenty of support from extremist elements in the Liberal and National Country Parties.

One example of a person with this attitude is the Western Australian Minister of Health and Community Welfare, Alan Ridge. In his Kimberley electorate, Mr. Ridge had to campaign amongst the many Aborigines in

the district. That Mr. Ridge did not enjoy his experiences is evidenced by a letter he wrote to a Mr. P. J. Quilley that has been extensively quoted in the press. Amongst other things, Mr. Ridge wrote:

It was a degrading experience to have to campaign amongst Aborigines to the extent I did. It offended me to know that, whilst I was concentrating my efforts on these simple people over the last couple of weeks, I was neglecting a more informed and intelligent section of the community.

Further in his letter, Mr. Ridge referred to the necessity to amend the Electoral Act in relation to illiterate voters. He stated:

If this wasn't done, there could be 3 000 to 4 000 Aborigines on the roles by the next election and the Liberal Party would be doomed to failure.

Mr. Ridge went on:

It is going to be difficult to get through any legislation which smacks of discrimination, but I believe we have an obligation to try.

That letter was tabled in the Court of Disputed Returns. That a person with such attitudes should be retained in a Ministerial post in a Liberal Government is a disgrace to the Western Australian Liberal Party. Also, I refer to a press report which, along with Mr. Ridge's letter, illustrates the problems Aboriginal people have with some white Australians. The report in the *News* of September 20, 1977, is as follows:

Use Aborigines on tri-shaws—plan at Alice

Alice Springs: Unemployed Aborigines should be used to pedal white visitors in tri-shaws around Alice Springs to promote tourism. Alice Springs Tourist Promotion Association member Mrs. Teddy Cairns proposed this following an Asian trip she made. Mrs. Cairns said: "It would give them some money, they would contribute something to the community and it would add a touch of local colour. It is very hard for people to walk around here in the heat. Tourists could be picked up at their hotels and taken to the many interesting spots around the Alice, she said.

Mrs. Cairns said tri-shaws similar to those used in Singapore, where she recently spent a holiday, should be manned by the "more responsible nice Aborigines between 35 and 40". The tri-shaws would have to be registered, probably with the council. "I'm sure there would be no objection from either the black or white people here," Mrs. Cairns said. But in Sydney, Aborigines protested bitterly at the proposal. They said they did not want to be treated like Asian coolies for the benefit of wealthy white people.

That suggestion was not even made in the name of protecting the world from communism as most racists' suggestions are. While some people hold the type of attitude expressed by Mr. Ridge and Mrs. Cairns, I am afraid the Aboriginal people will always be an exploited and abused minority in our society. I want to state that I did not feel it a degrading experience to campaign amongst Aborigines, as did Mr. Ridge. Indeed, I was pleased to have been allowed into their community and am grateful for the education they gave me. I repeat, I am delighted that this Government is to legislate to give back to these people the land the whites have stolen from them.

When looking at the Premier's policy speech, one is immediately struck by certain items that are going to be the subject of a great deal of debate in this Council. It is obvious from the performance of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris last Thursday, when he broke Parliamentary tradition on the election of committees, that the Liberals here have not yet realised that they have just lost an election for the fourth consecutive time.

Because of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's totally unreasonable and undemocratic attitude, all the major Government proposals will be opposed in this Council and we will see a

continuation of the DeGaris Liberal Party policy of attempting to win in this Council what they cannot win in the electorate.

A brief look at some of the items mentioned in the Premier's policy speech will illustrate what a battleground this Council will become over the next three years. Preference to unionists, all litigation on industrial disputes to take place in the Industrial Court, optional preferential voting for the House of Assembly, legislation to require members of Parliament to disclose their pecuniary interests, simultaneous elections for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council are all policies for which we have been given a specific mandate to legislate for change. They are policies that strike right at the heart of the conservative forces of this State and, despite how clearly the people have spoken, I have no doubt that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and his reactionary gang will defend to the end the special position of privilege and power of those conservative forces.

It will be interesting, for example, to see what arguments the Opposition in this place will use in opposing legislation to require members of Parliament to disclose their pecuniary interests, because I will bet here and now that the Liberal Party members will oppose the Bill or attempt to amend it so much as to make it worthless. I have no idea what the Opposition has to hide, if anything, but one thing I am sure of is that they will act as though they have something to hide in an attempt to keep their financial affairs private whilst they exercise public office.

If there is one area that wants opening up it is this area of politicians, political Parties, cash, and conflict of interest. Although the Government's proposal to require members of Parliament to disclose their pecuniary interests is a very welcome first step in cleaning up what could be a very sordid area of our political system, I still think it is only a first step and much more should be done in this area. The way in which some political Parties are funded in secret by big business both local and overseas owned is wrong and open to abuse and corruption. I would like to see all donations to political Parties made public and eventually a system where political Parties are financed by the State. Whilst I appreciate that the publication of Party donations and eventually the funding of Parties by the State is some way off yet, though I think inevitable, I applaud the Government's intention to at least require members of Parliament to show that they are honest and have no conflict of interest when considering legislation. It will be fascinating to see the Liberals' reaction to the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: I would like to see publication of the list of donations made by big business to the Labor Party.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I cannot speak on behalf of the Government but, as a rank-and-file member of the Labor Party, I think I can safely say that the Labor Party will give the honourable member a list of donations that we have received from big business when he gives us a list of donations made by big business to the Liberal Party. Would the honourable member support a Bill requiring disclosure of donations that political Parties receive?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: How can we get details of union donations to the Labor Party?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Easily. The honourable member should read today's newspaper. The Vehicle Builders Union is considering the question of giving \$10 000 to the Labor Party. The ignorance of members opposite astounds me.

One final topic I wish to mention is the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's obsession with gerrymanders. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has the unique ability not to recognise a

gerrymander when one is evident to the rest of the world, as in South Australia until this year, and conversely he sees one now, when no-one else can. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has threatened us with his presence in politics until he has seen to it that the present voting systems for this Council and the House of Assembly are changed. He made a correction in his speech, but the *Advertiser* of October 3, 1977, referred to the point he made. I suspect that, apart from the electorate wanting no part in any DeGaris-style tampering with the present systems, the Liberal Party will not want his negative, disruptive presence in its Parliamentary Party for very much longer.

I am looking forward to seeing the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's new Bill on electoral "reform". The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has the ability to produce a Bill every now and again, each one different from the last, but all with one thing in common, and that is that none of them was implemented by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and his Party when they had control of both Houses of this Parliament. I really enjoy our frequent debates in this Council on electoral matters. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has opened his mouth on the subject so much over the years that it is a pleasure to look up his record and air his rantings. It reminds us all on this side of the Council of what it was like in South Australia's dark ages, and it keeps the Opposition away from more fruitful things, such as trying to win majority support in the community.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris is entitled to his obsession and he is entitled to bring in a Bill on voting systems every week if he so wishes. That is his democratic right, but what he has no right to do is frustrate the will of a popularly elected Government. Different dictionaries give different definitions of the word "mandate". I suppose it can be legitimately argued just what a mandate is but surely, after winning four consecutive elections, a mandate is what this Government has. To any reasonable person, four consecutive election victories would be a good indication, to say the least, that the people wished the Australian Labor Party to govern this State through the House of Assembly.

The people have repeatedly shown that they do not want government by the Liberal Party, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris or this Council, and it is about time the Opposition acknowledged that fact. To conclude, I congratulate the Government on its victory and look forward to assisting it to carry out its policies during this Parliament. I support the motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: When the Hon. Mr. Blevins was making his speech, he asked leave of the Council to have inserted in *Hansard* the Governor's Speech without its being read.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: It was the Premier's policy speech, and it was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: I have been advised by the Clerks that I was wrong in allowing it to be agreed to. I understood that the Hon. Mr. Blevins was seeking leave to have inserted in *Hansard* His Excellency the Governor's Speech, which is a Parliamentary paper.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: It was the Premier's policy speech, and it was all quite in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! I am trying to finish what I was saying. If it involves Parliamentary papers, it is not in order to have them inserted in *Hansard*.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.42 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 13, at 2.15 p.m.