

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 7, 1975

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ANZAC HIGHWAY

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Does the Highways Department intend to resurface Anzac Highway between Brighton Road and Colley Terrace during December this year and, if so:

- (a) when is the work scheduled for completion;
- (b) why was it decided to undertake this work during the busiest period of the year for traffic movement to the beach and associated sporting activities; and
- (c) why is it considered necessary to resurface this section of Anzac Highway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

- (a) December 12, 1975.
- (b) The work will take only about five days, and there will be no significant traffic disruption.
- (c) To preserve it.

FURTHER EDUCATION

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What is the reason for the large increase in the item in the Budget under Further Education—Purchase of office machines and equipment—which shows payments of \$952 in 1974-75 and \$80 000 proposed for 1975-76, and what is the nature of the office equipment to be purchased?

2. Have tenders been called for the supply of office furniture and equipment and, if so, who was the successful tenderer and where will the furniture and equipment be manufactured?

3. If tenders have been called, were all South Australian firms invited to tender and, if not, why not?

4. If only a limited number of firms was invited to tender, on what basis was the invitation made and on what basis was the final decision made?

5. Is it the policy of the Education Department and the Government generally to use South Australian manufactured goods and, if not why not?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. In the 1974-75 financial year the office equipment expenditure of \$952 only covered the head office requirements, and the office equipment for the field institutions was allowed for in the capital equipment expenditure of the department. A separate contingency line of \$80 000 this year covers all office equipment requirements of the department which operates from 31 major institutions and a large number of administrative branch classes set up throughout the State. The office machines are required to provide adequate facilities at each of these locations servicing the needs of over 90 000 students. One major item of expenditure is on the provision of microfilm equipment in library resource centres. Other equipment includes offset printing units, repromaster lithographic printers, photo-copying machines, plate makers, electronic composers, process cameras and electric typewriters.

2. All office furniture is supplied by the Public Buildings Department and is either manufactured in their own

workshops or let out on contract. The office equipment required is purchased in the normal way through the State Supply Department.

3. Vide 1.
4. Vide 2.
5. Yes.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. For what purposes are officers of the Further Education Department to travel overseas?
2. How many officers will be involved?
3. What will be the specific subjects of their study?
4. When will a report on their activities be available to Parliament?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. To make investigations and attend conferences relating to educational matters.

2. On present expectations the only officer to travel overseas on the business of the department will be the Director, Mr. M. H. Bone, who will visit New Zealand for three weeks, beginning September 24, 1975, and the State of Penang in Malaysia from November 27 to December 11.

3. The Director of Further Education is in New Zealand to hold discussions with the New Zealand Director of Technical Education on accreditation of Certificate and Diploma courses and other matters of mutual interest. He will also investigate teacher education in technical and further education and attend the annual conference of the Technical Institute Association.

The Director of Further Education will also go to Penang to represent the Department of Further Education during Adelaide Week.

4. Any reports arising out of these visits would be internal.

LIBRARIES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Does the near 100 per cent increase in subsidies to local government libraries proposed in the 1975-76 Budget indicate:

- (a) an expansion of local government library activity; or
- (b) that new libraries will be established; or
- (c) a general increase in the cost of providing books?

2. What proportion of the proposed expenditure is attributable, respectively, to each of these or other factors?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The increase in subsidies under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act proposed by the Government for 1975-76 is because of—

- (a) An expansion of local government activity in the provision of additional and extended library buildings and in provision of new services, such as cassettes and disc recordings for loan and home delivery of books to housebound readers and old folks' homes. Three councils already providing library services will complete and open new buildings, and two other councils will complete major extensions to their existing library buildings during the year.
- (b) The first provision of a public library by one council during the year.
- (c) An increase in the price paid by the Libraries Board for subsidised books supplied to local government public libraries.
- (d) An increase approved by the Government in the maximum amounts on which \$1 for \$1 subsidy may be paid.

2. Of the increase proposed (amounting to \$469 000) for payment under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act the proportion attributable to each of the foregoing factors is—

- (a) expansion of local government activity \$199 000, or 42.4 per cent.
- (b) new libraries being established \$42 000, or 8.9 per cent.
- (c) increase in price of books \$18 000, or 3.7 per cent.
- (d) increased maximum subsidies \$210 000, or 45 per cent.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has the Library Promotion Committee of South Australia ceased its activities and, if so, why?

2. If it has not ceased its activities, why is there no proposed allocation of funds for the year 1975-76?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. The Committee did not require a grant this financial year.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): What is the reason for the reduction in real value of the grant to the Aboriginal Education Foundation for 1975-76 by maintaining it at the same level as the amount spent in 1974-75, namely, \$6 000?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The grant to the Aboriginal Educational Foundation is provided to transport Aboriginal children to pre-schools. A sum of nearly \$1 000 out of last year's grant was not spent for this purpose, and therefore this year's grant was left at the same figure as last year.

TEACHER REGISTRATION

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. For what reason is the allocation for 1975-76 for the Teachers Registration Board reduced by \$32 853 to \$14 000, compared to the payments made in 1974-75?

2. What is the estimated amount which will be forthcoming during this financial year and in subsequent financial years from sums payable for teachers' registrations?

3. What amount is it estimated will be available to be paid into general revenue after all expenses for the Teachers Registration Board have been met for this and the next financial year, respectively?

4. Is it proposed to change the registration fee in any way?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The reduction is due to the fact that registration fees are now being received.

2. The Teachers Registration Board estimates that about 17 000 teachers will register in this financial year at \$12 each for a three-year registration giving a total of \$204 000. The estimate for 1976-77 is 1 500 teachers for a total of \$18 000 in registration fees.

3. No moneys from registration fees are paid to State revenue. The \$12 triennial registration fee is calculated to meet the board's recurrent expenses. In the event of a surplus the money would be held in a trust account.

4. The board will review the fee towards the end of the initial three-year registration period which expires on January 31, 1979.

ASSISTANCE TO CHILDREN

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What is the reason for the reduction in the grant to be paid to St. Patrick's School for Handicapped Children in 1975-76?

2. What is the reason for the reduction in the grant payable to the Sunedin Retarded Children's Welfare Association in 1975-76?

3. In what way are the activities of these organisations likely to be adversely affected by the reduction in grants?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. An error has been made in the sums placed on the Estimates. Amounts available from the Australian Government under the States Grants (Schools) Act, 1973-74 should also have been included in the published grants proposed. This applies not only to St. Patrick's school and Suneden but also the Autistic Children's Association and South Australian Oral School. The additional sums available are—

	\$
St. Patrick's school.....	12 030
Suneden.....	6 600
Autistic Children's Association.....	11 800
S.A. Oral school.....	15 570

Funding arrangements are now in hand to remedy the error.

3. There will be no adverse effect on these organisations now that the matter has been rectified.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to honour the undertaking given on September 17, 1974, during the 1974-75 Budget debate that it aims "to reach 20 per cent of the cost of running a Government school by 1976" in its aid to independent schools and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes.

CHILDHOOD SERVICES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What are the proposed activities for 1975-76 of the childhood services programme which will require a budgeted \$10 000 000 for the coming year as opposed to an expenditure of nearly \$5 500 000 in the last financial year?

2. Have Commonwealth Government funds been made available for this programme in the current financial year and if so, are these funds as much as originally expected?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Childhood Services Council budget for 1975-76 provides for an expenditure of \$2 174 000 on capital projects and \$7 743 000 for on-going recurrent items, leaving the relatively modest sum of \$83 000 to support new initiatives to be approved once developed by programme sponsors.

2. The Australian Government will wholly fund all 1975-76 capital commitments. Existing on-going recurrent programmes will be wholly funded from Federal resources until December 31, 1975, but the State will be required to continue its support of certain Kindergarten Union recurrent expenditure until that date; thereafter the Commonwealth will fund recurrent expenditure for the pre-school element of programmes on a 75:25 basis—including all Kindergarten Union field workers salaries not previously met. Under the terms of the new funding arrangements, expenditures deemed to be of an administrative nature are to be met by the State; however, the Australian Government will fully fund the costs of teacher training courses and research programmes whilst vacation programmes are of such a nature that they do not attract any State commitment. In so far as administration costs are concerned, representations have been made to the

Commonwealth for a contribution towards this expense and a decision is awaited from the Federal authorities on this point.

On the matter of whether Australian Government funds are as much as originally expected, the Commonwealth is currently assessing the extent of its funding commitment on existing on-going recurrent and capital expenditures throughout Australia. Once this is known, the uncommitted funds from the Commonwealth appropriation of \$74 000 000 can be determined and the Children's Commission will then consider applications for new initiatives from all States. Under the circumstances, it is not possible to be more specific on this aspect of the question at present.

INDUSTRIAL TRAINING COUNCIL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has the Industrial Training Council now become a statutory body as was foreshadowed by the Minister of Labour and Industry during the Budget consideration on September 18, 1974, and if not, why not?

2. If it is now a statutory body, when will a report of its activities be presented to this Parliament?

The Hon. I. D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. No, because the Bill is not yet finalised.

2. *Vide* 1.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

Dr TONKIN (on notice):

1. Will the Minister bring down a full report of the activities of the Manpower Development Branch for the last financial year?

2. To what extent has the branch been affected by the current unemployment situation?

3. Have the activities of the branch in any way affected the operation of the Apprenticeship Commission and if so, in what way?

The Hon. I. D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. A report of the activities of the Manpower Development Branch of the Labour and Industry Department is printed each year in the departmental annual report.

2. Not appreciably.

3. No.

SAFETY REGULATIONS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): When will regulations covering safety, health and welfare for all people employed in industry throughout the State now be introduced in view of the Minister's expectation expressed last year that they would be available within 12 months?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: As explained during the debate on the Bill that led to the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972, regulations are to be made on an industry by industry basis concerning the safety, health and welfare for all employed persons within the State. So far regulations have been made concerning the building and construction industries, industrial premises, rural industry, shops and offices and a first draft of regulations for the timber industry has been prepared.

CALLAGHAN REPORT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): What progress has been made on the implementation of the recommendations of the Callaghan report on the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Dr. Callaghan's recommendations for the restructuring of the Department of Agriculture are under consideration by a working party of senior officers of the department and the Public Service

Board. The proposals require detailed examination before any specific programme of implementation can be recommended and there is no Australian experience in the re-organisation of services of the magnitude proposed in the report. However, the Acting Director of Agriculture, Mr. H. P. C. Trumble, who is a member of the working party is presently overseas to investigate, *inter alia*, the structure of regionalised agricultural services. Final plans for the implementation of Dr. Callaghan's report will also be influenced by the Government's reaction to the Corbett Report and the report of the Committee for Uniform Regional Boundaries for Government Departments.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has there been any significant change in the number of casualty attendances at Lyell McEwin Hospital during the last three months and if so, what is the nature of the change?

2. Have casualty services been fully staffed by resident medical officers during that period and if not, what has been the cause of any lack of staff?

3. Have the casualty services provided during that period been adequate and if not, in what way have they been deficient?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. There has been no significant change in the total number of casualty attendances during the last three months when compared with the preceding three months.

2. Due to the shortage of available Resident Medical Officers to be rostered by Queen Elizabeth Hospital to the Casualty Department of Lyell McEwin Hospital, there have been a limited number of nights when the department had to be closed at midnight until 8 a.m. the next morning. During the month of September this occurred on three occasions despite attempts to recruit itinerant locums from the metropolitan area.

3. During the time that the department has been open the casualty service provided has been adequate having regard to the medical staff available.

DOCTOR RECRUITMENT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have attempts been made, or will they be made, to recruit medical officers from Asian countries, and in particular from India, Sri Lanka, Singapore and Hong Kong, for service in South Australia and if so, why?

2. How many doctors, and from which countries, is it proposed to recruit?

3. What will be their qualifications and will these be registrable in South Australia?

4. What will be their terms of employment?

5. When and where is it proposed they will begin their duties?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Recruitment of medical staff from overseas countries is an on-going process to fill vacant or established positions, e.g. recruitment for Flinders Medical Centre. Apart from this no special attempts have been made to date to recruit medical officers from Asian or any other countries. Any recruitment of overseas doctors which might be made in the future, depending on need, would not be limited to Asia but would include all countries having reciprocity of registration with South Australia. This does not apply to two of the countries mentioned in the question, namely, India and Sri Lanka.

2. See answer to 1.
3. See answer to 1. Those with additional specialist qualifications are normally sought.
4. Normal hospital conditions.
5. Dependent upon vacancies arising.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Are attempts being made by a senior South Australian doctor at the request of the Director-General of Medical Services to recruit Italian medical officers during his overseas visit and if so, why?

2. How many doctors is it proposed to recruit?

3. What will be their qualifications and will these be registrable in South Australia?

4. What will be their terms of employment?

5. When and where is it proposed they will begin their duties?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2, 3, 4 and 5. See answer to 1.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has the Medical Superintendent of Lyell McEwin Hospital been authorised to recruit five additional medical officers for the hospital during his present visit overseas and if so, why?

2. Where will they be recruited?

3. What will be their qualifications and terms of employment?

4. When is it proposed they will begin their duties?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The Medical Superintendent of the Lyell McEwin Hospital has been authorised to recruit five additional medical officers in the grading of Senior Resident Medical Officer because of the shortage anticipated of resident medical officers from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in 1976.

2. Advertisements have been placed in the United Kingdom for these Senior Resident Medical Officers and interviews are planned at the Agent General's Office in London.

3. The minimum qualification acceptable for a general medical practitioner by the South Australian Medical Board would be a pre-requisite to appointment and their terms of employment would be similar to a second year or third-year resident medical officer under the State Public Service.

4. As soon as arrangements can be made for assisted passage nomination under the Commonwealth immigration programme.

PETROL TAX

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Which company failed to pay duty levied under the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act, as set out on page 9 of the 1975-76 Financial Statement of the Premier and Treasurer, and does this company retain the money collected from the public from sales on which duty has been charged?

2. Has any action been taken against the company to ensure that the duty is paid?

3. Should the legislation imposing this duty be proved invalid, what will happen to money:

(a) held in dispute by the company which has retained the duty collected; and

(b) collected and paid to the Treasury by companies which have complied with the Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The secrecy provisions of the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act preclude me from naming, in this place, the oil company which has failed to make payment in accordance with the Act. A challenge to the validity of both the South Australian and New South Wales legislation in respect to Section 92 of the Constitution has been made and that challenge is a matter for determination by the High Court of Australia. Moneys retained by the oil company relate to the tax it has collected on the sales it has made to non-licensees. Moneys due and payable by the oil company's licensed retail outlets are being paid to the Government.

2. Assessments have been issued and served on the oil company in respect to their liability under the Act. The oil company has given a written undertaking to the Acting Commissioner of Stamps that it will meet all its obligations under the Act in the event of the challenge being unsuccessful.

3. (a) The oil company will retain the money.

(b) That matter will need to be considered if and when the legislation is proved to be invalid.

MARGARINE QUOTAS

Mr. GUNN (on notice): In view of the serious effects on local producers and the dairy industry of the production of table margarine, will the Government defer its decision to lift table margarine quotas in South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government does not accept the postulation that the abolition of table margarine quotas in South Australia will have "serious effects" on producers and the dairy industry; and it does not intend to ask Parliament to amend legislation which removes quotas on (table) margarine in this State as from January 1, 1976.

EYRE PENINSULA HOUSING

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many houses will the Housing Trust build on Eyre Peninsula this financial year for purchase and rental, respectively?

2. How many houses were completed in this area in 1974-75?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Anticipated completions and sales 1975-76:

Eyre Peninsula (Region 5—D.U.R.D.)

57 dwellings—approximately 20 of these will be for sale.

Whyalla

200 dwellings—approximately 60 of these will be for sale.

2. Completions and sales 1974-75:

Eyre Peninsula (Region 5—D.U.R.D.)

33 single-unit houses including 17 sales; 14 double-unit houses.

Whyalla

202 dwellings including 55 sales.

Note: Port Augusta is not included in the above figures.

GOVERNMENT PRODUCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it anticipated that Samcor will take over the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When the necessary enabling legislation is passed by Parliament and brought into operation—probably in mid-1976.

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. What is the number of sheep delivered to the Produce Department at Port Lincoln under the 75c scheme to September 30, 1975, and what is the number slaughtered by the department under the scheme during the same period, respectively?

2. What are the reasons for any discrepancy between the number delivered and the number slaughtered?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The total number of sheep received at the Port Lincoln works under the 75c scheme to September 30 was 16 242. The number slaughtered over the same period was 15 075.

2. The discrepancy of 1 167 represents the number of sheep dead on arrival, or which died in paddocks or lairages before they could be slaughtered.

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. What is the expected total number of sheep to be slaughtered under the 75c scheme at port Lincoln?

2. How many sheep have been booked in for October and November, 1975, respectively, and is it expected that the Port Lincoln abattoir will be able to cater for the demand?

3. Has a rationalisation scheme been introduced to enable all producers an equal opportunity to take advantage of disposing of stock under this scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Subject to the conditions described in No. 2, the number of sheep slaughtered could reach 45 000 by mid-November.

2. No firm bookings have been made for October or November as regular lamb and sheep slaughterings are expected to fill most of the available killing capacity. "Potter" sheep will be called in only when killing space appears to be available. From mid-November onwards, the space available for "potter" sheep would steadily increase if the scheme was still in operation.

3. A rationalisation scheme has not been introduced, as this would involve an intensive survey of properties on Eyre Peninsula, which could not be undertaken by the Government Produce Department.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What is the reason for the reduction in the amounts payable in 1975-76 to the General Manager of the Produce Department, and in respect of other staff?

2. What is the reason for the increase in the amount allocated for 1975-76 under contingencies for the same department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The reduced provisions result from the retirement on November 4 of the General Manager, the transfer of grain inspection staff to the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries Department and the impending transfer of remaining staff to the State Supply Department.

2. Contingency estimates were based on a full 12-month period for the operation of the Light Square and Port Lincoln divisions irrespective of any change of control. The increase over the previous year is brought about by anticipated additional costs of administration, equipment and operating expenses due to inflationary trends.

MEDIBANK

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Government intend to relieve local government bodies of their compulsory contributions to hospitals now that the Government has signed the Medibank agreement and, if so, when?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Because the State Government, under Medibank, is committed to financing capital expenditure of Government and other approved hospitals in addition to providing for one-half of the annual deficit of the cost of operating these hospitals, local government bodies will be required to continue rating contributions for hospital purposes.

KARCULTABY SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When will work start on the Karcultaby school?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If present plans are maintained, it is possible that tenders will be called in the latter part of the 1975-76 financial year. The letting of contracts for this school had to be deferred because of inadequate Loan funds.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Mr. GUNN (on notice): How many people are currently employed in the Agriculture Department and, of these, how many work in the Gawler Place office and at Northfield, respectively?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The number of officers, including weekly paid personnel, employed by the Departments of Agriculture and Fisheries is 1 020. Of these, 254 are located at Agriculture Building, 133-135 Gawler Place, and 44 in the Fisheries office at 183 Gawler Place; 129 officers are stationed at the Northfield complex.

EYRE HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it expected that the sealing of the Eyre Highway will be completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The latter half of 1976.

EDUCATION PLANNING

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is the Minister satisfied with the progress made by the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research?

2. What are the reasons for the large increase in allocation of money for the year 1975-76?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. A grant of \$250 000 was provided in 1974-75 of which \$58 000 was not spent chiefly because of the late appointment of professional staff following the passage of the Act. The \$192 000 expended covered the initial planning and organisational operations. The 1975-76 provision of \$325 000 will cover salaries and wages of staff for a full year, the employment of the additional staff that has been approved, the commissioning of expert reports by specialists who will not be employed on a full-time basis, the publication of reports, accommodation and general office expenses, the costs of seminars arranged to discuss matters of forward policy, and miscellaneous contingencies, including council and committee expenses. The council was assembled in June of this year and is now undertaking the full scale of the operations contained in the powers and functions conferred on it in the Act.

HOUSING TRUST

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Were applications for the position of Chairman of the Housing Trust called for publicly and, if so, what form did the advertisements take?

2. If applications were not called, how many people were invited to consider taking the position and on what basis was the decision to extend each invitation made?

3. Were any other persons invited to consider the position and, if so, who were they?
4. Where is the normal place of residence of the present Chairman of the Housing Trust and if it is not Adelaide:
 - (a) how often does he travel to Adelaide in the course of his duties and at whose expense;
 - (b) what is the cost of travel in respect of each visit to Adelaide and is a travelling allowance paid in respect of these visits; and
 - (c) what were the various positions in employment held by the Chairman when last he was permanently resident in South Australia?
5. What experience has the Chairman had to qualify him for his present position?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. The same process was followed as under Liberal Governments.
3. No.
4. The Chairman is resident in Sydney, but for many years has had a residence in Adelaide also. He was previously resident in Adelaide and intends to move to Adelaide again permanently.
 - (a) He spends two weeks a month in Adelaide at his own expense.
 - (b) See (a).
 - (c) A housing consultant with Liberman & Associates.
5. Wide experience in building and development.

MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many branch offices of the Motor Registration Division are to be established, and where have they been or where will they be located?
2. Has an official opening been held in each established branch, and what official openings are planned for other branches?
3. What has been the total cost, respectively, of each official opening and what are the details of expenditure in each case?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. 17. Eight of these are in operation, namely Mount Gambier, Whyalla, Port Pirie, Berri, Elizabeth, Tranmere, Marion and Port Lincoln. The remaining branches are envisaged at Morphett Vale, Murray Bridge, Kadina, Barossa Valley, Port Adelaide, Modbury-Tea Tree Gully, near-northern suburbs, western suburbs and south-eastern suburbs.
2. Yes.
3. Costs have been:
 - Mount Gambier \$549—hall hire, catering, invitations, fares.
 - Whyalla \$284—invitations, fares, half cost of catering (combined opening with S.G.I.C.).
 - Berri \$229—invitations, catering.
 - Port Pirie \$1 563—railcar, catering, P.A. system, bus, invitations.
 - Elizabeth \$305—invitations, catering.
 - Tranmere \$260—invitations, catering.
 - Marion \$277—invitations, catering.
 - Port Lincoln \$462—invitations, catering, fares.

NARACOORTE CAVES

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. What area of land was purchased from Messrs. Schuster and Pavy respectively, and included in the Caves Reserve at Naracoorte?

2. What was the price per hectare of each parcel of land respectively?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Mr. Schuster—123.08 hectares.
Mr. Pavy—55.87 hectares.
2. Mr. Schuster—\$162.50 per hectare.
Mr. Pavy—\$129.68 per hectare.

MUNDULLA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. RODDA (on notice): When will a reticulated water scheme be provided at Mundulla and has a survey of water availability of suitable quality been made in the town area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Consideration was given to the source of supply for Mundulla on the basis of a salinity survey of various bores in the general area of the town. A possible supply basin was selected and the Department of Mines has drilled a production bore and an observation bore.

It is not possible to indicate at this stage when a reticulated supply can be made available as the above two bores gave rise to increasing salinity figures with higher pumping rates. Long term pumping tests are being arranged to see whether the basin can provide an assured supply at an acceptable pumping rate with a satisfactory level of salinity.

BIMBADEEN DEVELOPMENT PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many contracts to construct houses in South Australia were entered into by Bimbadeen Development Proprietary Limited?
2. How many houses were completed?
3. What was the total value of the contracts let and the houses completed, respectively?
4. Who are the directors of this company?
5. When did the company go into liquidation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. 440 approximately, less 65 which were cancelled (includes contracts for supply of kits only).
2. 203 approximately (includes kits only).
3. Total value of contracts let . . . \$4 268 157
Less contracts cancelled . . . \$625 951
\$3 642 206 (approx.)

Total value of houses completed \$2 485 185 (approx.)

4. The present directors of the company are:—
Carr, Malcolm Leon, 1 Frobisher Avenue, Flinders Park, appointed October 21, 1969.
Carr, Ethel Isla, 1 Frobisher Avenue, Flinders Park, appointed October 21, 1969.

Former directors of the company were:—

- Carr, Lionel Howard, 36 Tumby Terrace, Tumby Bay, appointed October 21, 1969, resigned May 17, 1973.
- Carr, Laurel Dawn, 36 Tumby Terrace, Tumby Bay, appointed October 21, 1969, resigned May 17, 1973.
- Salmon, John Bernard, 15 Mayflower Crescent, Hallett Cove, appointed May 14, 1973, resigned March 26, 1974.
- 5. April 26, 1974.

MODBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): Did the Education Department or any other Government department subsidise the final cost of work undertaken on the car park to serve Modbury Primary School and, if so, to what extent?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The car park was constructed outside the Modbury Primary School boundary by the Tea Tree Gully council on council property. It is understood that funds were made available through the Regional Employment Development scheme.

ADELAIDE-MANNUM ROAD

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. What stage has planning reached for construction of a new Adelaide to Mannum road via Chain of Ponds, Gumeracha and Birdwood?

2. When is it expected that work will commence on this new road construction?

3. When is it expected that this work will be completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Consultants prepared a preliminary report some years ago, but since then environmental considerations on certain aspects have aroused some doubts. Consequently, a review of the proposals commenced recently. A new aerial survey will be undertaken shortly.

2. Subject to availability of funds, work will commence on:

Palmer-Mannum section.....	1977
Tungkillo-Birdwood section.....	1978
Gumeracha Bridge.....	1978
Remainder of Birdwood-Chain of Ponds section.....	1980
Tea Tree Gully-Chain of Ponds section.....	— Not programmed at present.

3. 1982, subject of course to the availability of funds.

CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Why did neither the Premier nor the Deputy Premier attend the second session of the Constitution Convention held in Melbourne between September 24 and September 26, 1975?

2. Do they intend to attend future sessions and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Because other duties required their attention.

2. Yes.

CONSTITUTION ALTERATIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Will the Government support the proposal contained in the draft Federal Bill entitled "Constitution Alteration (Inter-change of Powers) 1975" and, if so, what action, if any, does it intend to take to make manifest that support?

2. If it does not support the proposal, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. See I.

RAPE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it intended to introduce legislation to alter the law concerning rape and, if so, what alteration is proposed and when will such legislation be introduced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia has submitted three reports on the criminal law in force in this State and is now considering its fourth and final report, that relating to the substantive criminal law. The Committee will deal with the law concerning rape in its final report and will no doubt consider recent cases in the South Australian Supreme Court (*R. v Brown*) and the House of Lords (*B.P.P. v Morgan*) where the question of

consent was considered. The committee dealt with the matters of corroboration and cross-examination of witnesses in committal proceedings in sexual cases in its third report. The Government is considering the recommendations made by the committee in these areas. I would expect the committee to also consider in its final report the question of cross-examination of the prosecutrix concerning her prior sexual experience. The Criminologist in the Attorney-General's Department has recently reported to me the results of a study he made on rape in this State. I shall be considering this report together with any recommendations of the Mitchell committee in deciding whether any legislative alteration should be made to the law concerning rape.

BEE-LINE BUS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the annual cost of the Bee-line bus?

2. Is it proposed, in the future, to make any charge to passengers and, if so:

(a) why;

(b) when; and

(c) how much?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. \$99 400.

2. At present, no.

PARK LANDS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is any part of the park lands required for the purposes of the new Crystal Brook to Adelaide railway and, if so,

(a) how much;

(b) where; and

(c) when will it be required?

2. Does the Government propose to add an equivalent area to the park lands to make up for that required for this purpose and, if so, where and what action is to be taken to add it to the park lands?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

(a) About 2.4 hectares.

(b) This is generally contained in a strip parallel to the existing western railway boundary within the area known as Bonython Park. There is also a small portion in the roughly triangular area between the Outer Harbor and north main lines which is of insignificant size.

(c) Mid-1976.

2. About .7 ha of railway land would be available for return to park lands.

POLICE PARKING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What action, if any, does the Government propose to take the better to provide for the parking of the motor vehicles belonging to police officers on duty at Adelaide Police Station?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The question of providing parking space for private vehicles of police officers on duty at Police Headquarters is one which has received a great deal of consideration over the years. The major factor inhibiting progress in this matter has been the scarcity of suitable sites within the vicinity of the Police Headquarters. Nevertheless, investigations are still in progress to locate a suitable site.

PORT LINCOLN HOUSING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Are there at present houses under construction at Port Lincoln for the Housing Trust and, if so, how many?

2. In respect of each of them:
 - (a) when was construction begun;
 - (b) when is completion expected; and
 - (c) who is the main contractor?
3. Are any of such houses for occupation by officers of the Agriculture Department and, if so, when are they required for such occupation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Yes.
(b) 38.
2. (a) Varying periods.
(b) Approximately three a month are completed.
(c) There are eight different contractors.
3. There are three houses for occupation by officers of the Agriculture Department which will be completed and handed over by Christmas coinciding with services becoming available.

OVERLAND EXPRESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What arrangements have in the past been made to protect passengers on the Overland express from annoyance by other passengers?
2. What happened on the Overland to Melbourne on the night of Sunday, September 7 last, and what action, if any, has since been taken to prevent repetition of such an incident?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The train staff, which averages 18, is available for passengers' welfare and they call for police intervention if considered necessary. In addition, senior traffic staff and security personnel are present from time to time particularly when large groups are known to be travelling.
2. Two male passengers travelling from Perth to Brisbane approached a train porter and demanded to be supplied with a torch in order to search for a lost ring. When the train porter replied that he did not have a torch, he was threatened and assaulted. When the train arrived at Keith, the police were called, but prior to their arrival another member of the train staff who attempted to quieten the men was also assaulted. The two troublesome passengers were removed from the train and held at the police station overnight. On Monday, September 8, 1975, at 10 a.m. they appeared in the Keith Court of Summary Jurisdiction. One of the men pleaded guilty to the charge of common assault and was fined \$20 with \$3 costs, while the other pleaded guilty to the charge of being drunk and was fined \$5 with \$3 costs.

FENCES ACT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the Fences Act, 1975, been proclaimed and the regulations gazetted and, if not, why not?
2. When will the regulations be gazetted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Fences Act, 1975, has not been proclaimed pending the preparation of rules of court which are expected to be completed this month.
2. Not applicable.

INTERPRETERS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the State Government or the Public Service Board employed any persons to act as interpreters within the Public Service and, if so:
 - (a) how many;
 - (b) in which departments are they employed; and
 - (c) when did their employment commence?

2. If not, when does the Government intend to employ interpreters, how many will be employed, and in which departments?

3. Has the Government previously promised to employ interpreters, and, if it has, when were those promises made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. It is expected that a senior interpreter will be appointed during week ending October 10, 1975. An appointment of a second full-time position of interpreter is expected shortly. These two full-time appointments will be made in the Attorney-General's Department. In addition to the full-time positions, applications are to be invited from suitably experienced Public Service officers who are interested in performing part-time interpreting. A register of those officers will be maintained by the Interpreting and Translating Service. Contract interpreters will supplement the full-time interpreters for court interpreting and complex written translations.
3. Yes. January 28, 1975.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. On what date does the contract for the employment of Mr. Linden Prowse terminate?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to offer Mr. Prowse a new employment contract when the current contract has terminated and, if not, why not?
3. What official position does Mr. Prowse hold within the Unit for Industrial Democracy?
4. Is the Minister aware if Mr. Prowse has made public statements indicating he does not believe:
 - (a) that legislation should be introduced to compel companies to adopt worker participation schemes and, if so, what were the views he expressed; and
 - (b) that placing workers on the boards of companies will improve the working environment and, if so, what were the views he expressed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. February 18, 1976.
2. This will be considered at the appropriate time.
3. Executive Officer.
4. Mr. Prowse's views concerning these and other relevant matters have been the subject of normal official discussions and communications. It is not my intention to collate the reported public statements made by Mr. Prowse. One would hope that the honourable member was quite capable of doing this himself.

DAIRY SPREAD

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Have any companies within South Australia sought approval to manufacture the product, dairy spread, which was developed by the Agriculture Department?
2. Has this product been sold commercially within South Australia and if not, why not?
3. Has the Agriculture Department had problems with this product infringing possible patent rights and if it has, what are the details of these problems?
4. Has the Agriculture Department been asked to pay money for the patent rights for this product and, if so, what amount of finance was involved?
5. Does it appear possible for dairy spread to be manufactured commercially within South Australia, and, if so, when is manufacture expected to commence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. No, because no manufacturer has been licensed by the Australian Dairy Corporation.
3. There is some conjecture over this matter. The patent attorney handling the patent taken out in the joint names of the South Australian and Australian Governments is of the opinion that the patent for dairy spread will stand in its own right. On the other hand, the Australian Dairy Corporation, the licensing authority for dairy products, has been advised that the patent could infringe that of the Swedish product "Breggot". It is understood that the problem has been discussed by officers of the appropriate Australian and Swedish authorities; and the Minister of Agriculture has asked the Australian Minister of Agriculture to take up the matter at diplomatic level.
4. No.
5. Dairy spread has been manufactured on a semi-commercial scale and commercial manufacture will commence as soon as licences are granted by the Australian Dairy Corporation.

MORPHETT'S BUS SERVICE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is Morphett's Bus Service Proprietary Limited currently owned by the Municipal Tramways Trust?
2. Have owners of buses belonging to this company been prosecuted since January 1, 1975, for contravening the legal weight and measure limits for vehicles?
3. If the company has been prosecuted, on how many occasions has it occurred, what fines were imposed, and what were the circumstances which led to each offence?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Not applicable.

PRAWN AND LOBSTER FISHING

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. On whose recommendation are prawn licences and rock lobster licences granted or allocated in South Australia?
2. Who are, and what qualifications have, the Chairman and members of the Prawn Fishing Industry Advisory Committee and the Rock Lobster Industry Advisory Committee, respectively?
3. How many times does each committee meet each year, and what have been the major recommendations of each committee in each year since they were established?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows: Because of the absence last week of the Acting Director of Fisheries and his administrative assistant at a meeting of the Australian Fisheries Council in Canberra, it is regretted that a reply to the above question will not be available by the prescribed time. An answer is expected by Friday, October 10.

GOVERNMENT GAZETTE

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (September 16).

The Hon R. G. PAYNE: Copies of the *Government Gazette* are supplied free to only Parliamentary libraries and other selected organisations as shown in the attached schedule. The cost of supplying copies of *Government Gazettes* to Government departments is charged to the Estimates line Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous—Government Gazette Cost of Printing, Publishing and Paper. The cost of supplying copies of the *Government Gazette* to the 47 district offices would amount to approximately \$2 200 a year.

"GOVERNMENT GAZETTE" FREE LIST *Public Bodies and Private Individuals*

Advisory Committee, University and R.A.H.....	1
Australian Broadcasting Commission.....	1
Australian Mineral Development Laboratories . . .	2
Professor L. W. Cox, University of Adelaide . . .	1
Dr. J. M. Bonnin.....	1
Dr. R. A. Burston.....	1
Dr. A. G. Campbell.....	1
Dr. J. R. Magarey.....	1
The Editor, <i>Whyalla News</i>	1
S.A. Employers Federation.....	2
S.A. Institute of Technology.....	1
The Mayor of Adelaide.....	1
Mr. C. J. T. Paddick, Adelaide Road, Murray Bridge	1
The Private Secretary, Government House.....	2
Royal Association of Justices, S.A.....	1
Royal Swedish Consul.....	1
Mr. M. L. Smith, 178' North Terrace.....	1
Union Trades and Labour Council.....	1

Total 21

Interstate and Oversea Governments and Libraries

Interstate

Statistician, Austn. Bureau of Statistics, Canberra . .	1
Department of Labour and Industry, Sydney.....	1
Library, Australian Parliament, Canberra.....	1
Library Board of Western Australia.....	1
Parliamentary Library, Sydney.....	1
Parliamentary Library, Victoria.....	1
Parliamentary Library, Queensland.....	1
Parliamentary Library, Tasmania.....	1
The Prime Minister, Canberra.....	1
Public Library, Sydney.....	1
Public Library, Victoria.....	1
The Manager, Tourist Bureau, Victoria.....	1
University of Melbourne.....	1
University of Queensland.....	1

Oversea

Board of Trade Library, London.....	1
British Museum, London.....	1
Department of Commerce, U.S.A.....	1
F.A.O. Library, Rome, Italy.....	1
Foreign and Commonwealth Officers (Library), London.....	3
General Assembly Library, Wellington, N.Z.....	1
International Labour Office, Geneva, Switzerland . .	1
Library of Congress, Washington D.C., U.S.A.....	1
New York Public Library.....	1
Public Library, Manchester, London.....	1
Rhodes House Library, London.....	1
Royal Empire Secretary, London.....	1

Total 28

LOWER NORTH-EAST ROAD

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (September 9).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Following recent investigation, the Highways Department considers that at present there is no justification for varying the existing programme for reconstruction and widening of the Lower North-East Main Road 93 between the Torrens River at Dernancourt and Anstey Hill. The position as set out in my letter of June 23 still applies.

STRAY DOGS

In reply to Mr. WELLS (August 13).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Under the Registration of Dogs Act, action can be taken by a local council to remove dogs from schoolgrounds provided the council has prior authorisation from the Education Department. By means of a notice in the *Education Gazette*, it is proposed to give Principals of schools the power to authorise a district council to remove stray dogs from school property as the occasion arises. Principals will be asked to advise students at the same time of the action to be taken because it has been found on a number of occasions that some of the dogs involved belong to students and have followed them to the school where they have been joined by strays.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING DEPARTMENT

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The total value of printing work received by the Government Printer during 1974-75 from Government and semi-government sources which might have previously been processed by private printers was about \$10 000.

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: During May of this year, to avoid retrenchments because of a down-turn in the volume of work being received from client departments by the Government Printer, the Chief Secretary directed that additional work be obtained if possible, from the Australian Government, Government and semi-government instrumentalities. From the approaches made to semi-government instrumentalities, only a minimal amount of work which normally perhaps would be processed by the private sector was directed to the Government Printer. The Government Printing Department has not expanded its operations in the printing field in relation to previous years and still prints work for Government and semi-government instrumentalities only, never for private enterprise. The new machinery on order is to replace old and obsolete plant used for processing exercise books for the State Supply Department and a phototype-setting system to process type-setting now being contracted out.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S STAFF

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: During 1974-75 there were four retirements and four resignations from the department. During that year two auditors were appointed from outside the Public Service, each of whom had worked for firms of chartered accountants in Adelaide as accountants and auditors. The names of the individuals and firms can be supplied in confidence if necessary. Also, during the year 13 temporary officers were recruited by the Public Service Board on the automatic salary range, and five officers transferred from other Government departments, and five officers transferred from the Auditor-General's Department to other departments, making an increase of seven in total staff. Consideration has already been given to increasing the number of staff and approval obtained for an increase in the establishment of eight during 1975-76.

In reply to the inquiry concerning computers, departmental officers are aware of the possibility of fraudulent manipulation of computers by programmers or operators. A review of the cases reported has indicated that there was either a considerable lack of internal control or collusion by responsible officers. In evaluating computer systems, audit staff look for a proper division of the duties and responsibilities of officers involved in computer applications, and the carrying out of proper internal controls as well as examining programmes in detail.

In reply to Mr. BECKER (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The number and classification of staff in the Auditor-General's Department this financial year, compared to each of the past three financial years, is as follows:

	30/6/73	30/6/74	30/6/75
Assistant Auditor-General	1	1	1
Directors of Audit	—	3	3
Senior Auditors	7	8	8
Auditors Grades I-IV . .	31	29	33
Steno.-Secretary	1	1	1
Examiners	13	13	14
Calculating machinists .	7	7	7
Clerks and office assistants	14	16	18
	74	78	85

Approval has been given for eight additional positions to be created in 1975-76, but to date none of these positions have been filled.

GLADSTONE PRISON

In reply to Mr. VENNING (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: When the Estimates were being prepared, it was possible that Gladstone prison could continue in operation until December, 1975. However, in July, 1975, it became appropriate to close the prison as at July 30, and under these circumstances it is possible that most of the contingency expenses provided will remain unspent or be distributed under approval to the prisons that have absorbed the former Gladstone prisoners and staff. Regarding the equipment at Gladstone prison, no action has been taken regarding the kitchen equipment as it is possible that the prison could be used for some purpose and retention of a kitchen could be considered desirable. With regard to the laundry equipment, this has been inspected by the Manager, Group Laundry, and has been allocated to the various Government departments as stand-by equipment. Therefore, no laundry equipment will be available for purchase by the public.

In reply to Mr. VENNING (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: When the Estimates were being prepared, it was expected that Gladstone prison could continue in operation perhaps until December, 1975. However, in mid-July it became appropriate to close the prison, but at this stage everyone has not yet moved away. Two officers are still in residence, engaged in transfer of equipment and goods, and they are also providing a service by showing around people from bodies who are considering making application for use of the premises. It is expected that these officers could be there for another two to three weeks before transferring to their new positions at Port Lincoln. Therefore, some of the allocation to Gladstone prison will be spent, some will remain unspent, and some may ultimately have to be transferred to the prisons housing former Gladstone inmates or employing former Gladstone staff.

GAOLS

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: 1. The prospect of violence in prison is always present and is one of the areas in which officers are trained and must be particularly vigilant. Prison Superintendents and the Classification Committee are also aware of the potential problem, and there have been a number of instances where prisoners have been kept apart by placing them in special prisons, or where, at the prisoner's own request, he or she has been placed in separate confinement during a time of particular anxiety. There have also been times when prisoners have been placed in separate confinement by the administration for their own protection. It would be unrealistic to state that there are no offensive weapons in prisons, bearing in mind tools, culinary utensils, or in fact almost any movable object can come within this classification in the hands of a desperate and determined person. Therefore, it can only be stated that every precaution is taken to see that violence against individuals or groups is kept to a minimum, and this is one of the principal reasons why security prisons, in particular, restrict groups to as small a number of individuals as is possible, bearing in mind the particular circumstances that exist at any one time.

2. The reason why only \$67 was spent of the \$80 allocated for purchase of chickens for Mount Gambier Gaol was that that amount of money purchased the number required. It is expected that the same amount of chickens this year will probably cost \$80.

TERMINAL LEAVE PAYMENTS

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Terminal leave payments are made to officers who leave the service without taking all their annual or long service leave. Their accrued leave entitlements are calculated and the appropriate lump sums determined in accordance with their salary classifications.

CADELL TRAINING CENTRE

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The gross return from produce sold by Cadell Training Centre during the 1974-75 financial year was \$51 609.61.

CIVIL DEFENCE

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The provision of \$9 000 for 1974-75 and the estimated requirement of \$12 000 for 1975-76 are to provide assistance to councils in the administration of their local organisations of the State Emergency Service previously known as Civil Defence units. The subsidy is on a \$1 for \$1 basis of actual council expenditure on administrative costs, insurance and maintenance of equipment and vehicles, and on the provision of headquarter facilities for the local organisations. At present the subsidy is limited to \$500 in any one year to a single local government authority, although in some instances in larger councils, expenditure has exceeded \$2 000 a year. In most instances, particularly for district councils, expenditure does not exceed \$1 000 and therefore does not attract a full subsidy. Claims were submitted by 42 councils for 1974-75. The present basis for the subsidy is due for review. However, together with equipment provided by the Australian Government it provides a tangible encouragement to local government to sponsor and develop local volunteer organisations of the State Emergency Service.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As a result of negotiations held between the Public Actuary and the Police Association, Cabinet has given approval for the drafting of a Bill to provide for a new pension scheme for police officers to bring the benefits broadly into line with those applicable to public servants. Under the new scheme full benefits are available to any police officer who joins the force prior to age 30, and the normal retiring age is 60, with some provision for earlier retirement. Any person who was under 30 years at the time of the last review of the Police Pension Fund, that is, December 16, 1971, will receive upon retirement at age 60 a lump sum of 150 per cent of his final average salary and a pension of 50 per cent, with further benefits for any widow he may subsequently leave. Transitional arrangements have been made for all persons who were aged over 30 at that time, and in the case of a person who is aged 33, and thus with 27 years to go until retirement in 1971, the lump sum would be 146.85 per cent of final average salary and the pension 48.8 per cent. A full schedule of the benefits provided under the transitional arrangements has been provided to the Police Association.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The sum of \$5 000 was allocated to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals under "III Chief Secretary 151 Miscellaneous 40/38 Sundry Grants" as approved.

PRISONER ALLOWANCES

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (September 16).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Prisoner allowances do apply to women prisoners at the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, Port Augusta, and in other prisons at which women may be held. Vaughan House is not an institution administered by the Correctional Services Department. Regarding the Women's Rehabilitation Centre, this was a new institution at Northfield, commissioned in 1964, and was purposely built for women only.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (September 16).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Officers of the Community Welfare Department who are injured in the course of their employment at homes established for the reception, detention, correction, maintenance or training of children, are entitled to workmen's compensation under the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1971-1974. Depending upon the particular circumstances of any given case, they may also be entitled to a sum, not exceeding \$2 000, by way of compensation for injury or loss sustained as a result of the commission of an offence, pursuant to the provisions of either sections 4, 6 and 7, of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1969-1974, or section 52 of the Juvenile Courts Act, 1971-1974.

DISABLED SOLDIERS ASSOCIATION

In reply to Mr. EVANS (September 11).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Chief Secretary has informed me that the application from the Totally and Permanently Disabled Soldiers Association of Australia for financial assistance is being considered. The Auditor-General has been requested to examine the financial position of the association and, on his findings, to recommend whether their situation warrants financial assistance from the South Australian Government and, if so, to recommend the level of this assistance.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

In reply to Mr. ALLISON (September 30).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I refer the honourable member to page 369 of the Auditor-General's Report which contains an analysis of the 1974-75 results of the State Government Insurance Commission. He will note that of a total loss of \$1 526 000 incurred by the commission in that year, \$1 115 000, or 73 per cent, was in respect of compulsory third party insurance. It is the Government's policy that, in the long term, the commission shall operate profitably and it is not our intention to make the achievement of this aim more difficult by requiring the commission to give concessional rates to pensioners. A far more sensible approach to the question of concessions to pensioners who own motor vehicles would be for the Government, to exempt pensioners from the stamp duty on third party policies and to grant them concessional registration fees. I point out that the South Australian Government does both these things.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

In reply to Mr. WOTTON (September 18).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The construction of an underpass under the South-Eastern Freeway at Childs Road was thoroughly investigated in the planning and design stages of the project and found to be unwarranted. Subsequent further and later re-examination at the request of the District Council of Mount Barker did not reveal any reason for alteration of the original decision. The closure was

ultimately proclaimed in the *Government Gazette* of September 18, 1975. No evidence to justify further study has been now advanced. The alternative access via the interchange bridge will be opened on October 1, 1975, and Childs Road will be physically barricaded off at the same time. The chances of the bridge over the freeway at the interchange being closed as a result of some emergency are extremely minor, and in such an event, and under such conditions, there are reasonably close alternative crossings.

HEYSEN TRAIL

In reply to Mr. WOTTON (September 16).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Long Distance Trails Committee of the State Planning Authority is responsible for the planning and supervising of the construction of the first section of the Heyesen trail and is acutely aware of fire hazards that would result from careless use or misuse of the trail. The committee is prepared to accept that sections of the trail might have to remain closed during portions or all of the official fire season or as proclaimed by the Minister of Agriculture or local government bodies. Route selection is being guided by an avoidance, wherever possible, of wooded ridges and ravines which have a history of bushfires. Emergency Fire Service field officers are consulted, regarding the safest routes in their respective districts. Trail information signboards at access points will call attention to the user the regulations which will include a prohibition of smoking in certain seasons. Further, camp fires and overnight camping will be restricted to special areas safely constructed and, of course, camp or cooking fires will be permitted only during certain seasons.

Prior to the first section of the trail being opened to the public, briefings on bushwalking, scouting and other potential trail using organisations will be undertaken in order to acquaint the public with the nature of the trail, its purpose, and the regulations governing its use. Until such time as off-road vehicles (whose exhausts are fire hazards) are regulated by special legislation, the Long Distance Trails Committee will consider the use of trail bike barriers placed at regular intervals to discourage such vehicles from using the Heyesen Trail. Experience has shown that trail walkers and bush walkers are, by and large, responsible individuals with high regard for the environment. The committee has enjoyed their co-operation in Heyesen trail research projects. Their alertness on the trail can contribute to the early warning system of fire reporting, and in this regard contribute to a reduction of the seasonable bush fire hazard in South Australia.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Dr. TONKIN: Does the Premier expect that Commonwealth funds will be available to support his proposed scheme to reduce unemployment in South Australia and, if not, for how long, at what cost, and for how many people will jobs be made available by the State Government? The Commonwealth Minister for Labor (Senator McClelland) has confirmed that the RED scheme will not be revived, and the Premier announced yesterday that he intended to support a State scheme to help reduce unemployment in South Australia. This is already at an alarmingly high level and, with school leavers entering the work force at the end of the year, it will be even worse. The Premier has said that, if the RED scheme is not to be reintroduced, the Commonwealth Government should compensate South Australia for the equivalent sum it spends on providing unemployment relief. During his talks with the Commonwealth Treasurer last week, the Premier must have been given some indication whether the Com-

monwealth Government would advance money to South Australia for this purpose. The Premier should press the Commonwealth Government to give the States their own funds to administer in their own way, so that South Australia could use the money to its best advantage to meet the local needs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not been given any assurance by the Commonwealth Government on this matter. I certainly made submissions, as I have publicly stated, to the Commonwealth Government asking for its assistance. I believe that some form of the RED scheme should be reinstituted. I have previously made submissions concerning State unemployment relief schemes, and I have sought from the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer undertakings that, if we expanded the work that we had undertaken in providing State unemployment relief, we would at least get the equivalent of what the Commonwealth would be saved. At this stage I have no answers on this. I have nothing more than an undertaking that the submissions would be examined. The Commonwealth Treasurer last week was unable to give me an immediate reply to the submissions which I made to him and which I had sent in correspondence previously to the Prime Minister. I cannot say what precise form the State unemployment relief programme will take, because it is still being investigated. We have had several submissions from our officers involved in this area and have asked that more work be done on preparing proposals relating to this matter. As soon as a decision has been reached by the State Government it will be announced.

BREAD INDUSTRY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what is the Government's intention regarding the bread industry? I presented deputations to the Minister's predecessor (Mr. McKee) in connection with this matter, especially as to the effect of any changes the Government might make involving country bakers. I had a good hearing from Mr. McKee, who was sympathetic to the problems of country bakers. Recent press reports have indicated that matters concerning the zoning of bread deliveries, stopping weekend baking, and so on, are before the Government. It is a matter of vital concern to country bakers to know what the Government intends to do. A committee of inquiry was formed to look into this matter, and it brought down a report. Recent press reports indicate that the Government is contemplating action. I see a quick Cabinet meeting is now taking place to ascertain the reply to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to ask his question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier is teasy, but country bakers are concerned about—

An honourable member: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" has been called. The Hon Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There has been an inquiry into the bread industry, and I have received a report, although I do not know whether that report has been made available to the public.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The report hasn't been made available.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It has been made available to me, and I have examined it. As a consequence of that report, it was recommended that an authority be established permanently to inquire into all aspects of the bread industry, except in relation to wages. Obviously, that inquiry will take into account baking hours, bread deliveries, bread prices, and country baking: all

matters that are affected by the baking industry. It is obvious that this action has been taken on the basis of escalating costs that occur continuously not only in this State but throughout the Commonwealth. The Government, which is trying to reduce the continuing escalation in the price of this commodity, believes that the establishment of such an authority, headed by Judge Murray (who I believe is an able person and will competently conduct the affairs of the authority) is a step in the right direction. Her Honor is privileged to have been given the opportunity to head the authority, and no doubt when she establishes the principles under which the authority will work we will see a change in bread prices and in the distribution of bread.

BUILDER'S LICENCE

Mr. EVANS: Is the Minister of Housing aware of any problem being experienced in the housing industry as a result of the functioning, or malfunctioning, of the Builders' Licensing Board? I refer, first, to a problem being experienced by builders who did not renew their licences at the appropriate time earlier this year. A person I know, who had a general builder's licence in the name of his company and in his own name, decided to go overseas and not to have any building operations in progress while he was away. He arrived back on Monday of this week and applied to the Builders' Licensing Board to renew his licence, only to be told that he must make a fresh application and start from the beginning, supplying all the information that has to be supplied when a person applies for such a licence. If that is the case, is the Minister willing to have the Act amended to change that aspect of it? In the *Advertiser* of Saturday, October 4, the Housing Industry Association (S. A. Branch) made strong allegations against the Builders Licensing Board, claiming that many builders had had to wait months to receive their renewed licences and that the association hoped that the Builders Licensing Act could be administered in a manner which was fair, equitable and businesslike, and known to be so by the community. The association also alleged that the Builders Licensing Board had caused increased costs to the housing industry. The report that the Minister has laid on the table today states that the number of licences that expired on April 30, 1975, was 10 373, and at the end of June only 7 962 had been renewed, representing a reduction of almost 25 per cent in the number of people holding licences in South Australia, in 1973-74, the board paid \$46 304 in salaries, whereas in 1974-75 it paid \$102 413. The number of staff was increased from 10 at June 30, 1974, to 14 at June 30, 1975, an increase of 40 per cent. The board's staff has been increased by 40 per cent, yet the building industry finds it difficult to operate within the board's requirements. On Friday last the Minister said he had no information to substantiate the claims of the Housing Industry Association. Is he now aware of any problems? Has he any comment about the case of applications for licences that have lapsed because the builder concerned has been overseas or has not been interested for some other reason in renewing his licence at the relevant time?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The statement I made to the *Advertiser* was that I was not aware of any criticisms made by the Housing Industry Association because no submission had been made to me regarding the operations of the Builders Licensing Board, and that is still the position. The Housing Industry Association has chosen not to make any submission of any kind

to me as Minister; it has not asked me to do anything; and it has not sought to meet with me to discuss in any way any difficulties it claims arise out of the operations of the Builders Licensing Board.

Mr. Millhouse: Why should it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not saying that it should or should not; I am just saying what has happened.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you'd better get—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member were willing to wait for the rest of the answer, he might be in a position to make a more intelligent comment, and that would be helpful. Since Friday I have seen in the latest newsletter of the Housing Industry Association many statements, some of which are inaccurate. I think it is true to say that, largely as a result of the actions of the association, the relationship between the association and the board is deteriorating. I would welcome an opportunity to discuss with it the complaints that the association has in an effort to deal with those matters, but it is difficult to find out exactly what can or should be done in circumstances where one or two legitimate grievances may well be mixed up with many inaccuracies. The association has chosen to act in this way, and I believe its methods are the main cause of any deterioration in relationship that might exist. The circular issued by the Builders Licensing Board relating to drainage of sites and footing practices was intended to be not directory but to provide helpful information for builders. However, it has caused the Housing Industry Association to describe the board as impertinent and as attempting to direct and control builders excessively, yet nothing of the sort was intended. That is one example of the kind of deteriorating relationship that exists and, until the association is willing to provide me with evidence to the contrary, I believe that is a consequence of the deliberate actions of the association.

The present position regarding the reissue of licences is that there are 9 690 current licences compared to 10 373 at the end of April, so that there has been a reduction of 683 licences since the end of April. No doubt some people who were licensed at that time may have moved out of the industry, although it is interesting to note that the recent figures of approvals for new houses in the private sector show substantial increases in the first quarter of this financial year compared to the position last year. The total for the three months to the end of August for housing approvals in the private sector in South Australia shows approvals at 3 581, compared to 2 942 for the period June to August, 1974. Generally, there are no delays in licence renewals, nor should there be any confusion in that respect. Most renewals were completed at the end of May, 1975. Renewals of licences that expired on April 30, 1975, were not accepted by the board if they were lodged out of time, and the applicant had to lodge a fresh application for a licence. This resulted from an opinion obtained from the Crown Solicitor. That opinion led to action by the board that, if someone did not renew his licence at the appropriate time (such as the person illustrated by the honourable member), and it lapsed, a fresh application then had to be made; the board acted in terms of that opinion. The remaining renewals were withheld by the board pending investigation of complaints against the builder, and some others pending restructure of company finance to meet board requirements. The board is concerned that a body corporate that is the holder of a licence can meet its

everyday liabilities, and the board has the responsibility to the community to see that that is in fact the case. Of the 8 000 renewals, only 60 were held by the board, for the two reasons that I have stated, at June 30, 1975, and the number held at present is 26.

The point that I should like to make (and this is a matter on which the Housing Industry Association does not give publicity), is that the board investigates numerous complaints, and I have many letters, which honourable members may wish to see, indicating the thanks of ordinary members of the public who have been assisted by the board promptly and successfully when they have been dissatisfied and have had complaints about the standard of building. In that respect there is plenty of evidence to suggest that the board has worked satisfactorily. If the Housing Industry Association has specific complaints I hope it will be willing to take up the matter directly with me or the board, and discuss these complaints. If, however, it persists in making public statements and not attempting to make any kind of submission whatever, one is tempted to draw the conclusion that it is more interested in creating a public argument about the matter than in getting the complaints dealt with.

CATERING SERVICE

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs investigate the activities of Mr. R. Elliott, a caterer trading as Maju Home Made Cake Shop, whose last known address was 216 Days Road, Ferryden Park? A constituent has sought my assistance following Mr. Elliott's failure to keep a contractual arrangement to cater at the wedding reception of my constituent's daughter. When I received this complaint, I inquired into the matter and found that Mr. Elliott makes a practice of failing to arrive at wedding receptions at the arranged time. What happened in this case was that an arrangement was made on the day of the wedding that the caterer would attend at mid-day at the appointed place to make the necessary arrangements, the wedding being planned for 5 p.m. Mr. Elliott arrived at 4.45 p.m., his late arrival causing great consternation to my constituents. At about 3 p.m., in an emotional state, they made other arrangements for the catering. When Mr. Elliott arrived, the constituents had made these other arrangements and had another caterer on the premises busily making preparations. Mr. Elliott had taken the precaution of arranging payment in advance, my constituents having paid him \$541. When Mr. Elliott arrived, they explained to him that they had another caterer now on the job. Mr. Elliott said, "Well, that lets me out. I'll see you later," and he left with their money. As a result, they have suffered a considerable loss; they are now trying to recover that sum, but they are having considerable difficulty in doing so. From my various inquiries I found that two other people had suffered in a similar fashion at the hands of Mr. Elliott, trading as Maju Home Made Cake Shop. I think it was a despicable act that this caterer committed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member that he is commenting.

Mr. DUNCAN: Very good, Sir. The only other matter I raise is that my constituents were under the impression that part of the sum paid to Mr. Elliott was to be used to obtain a permit for the function from the Licensing Court, whereas a check at the court has shown that the permit was not obtained. So, this money at least appears to have been obtained by false pretences. I should be grateful if the Minister would investigate the matter with a view to having some check made on this caterer's activities.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I must confess that, on the facts as given by the honourable member, I am not sure whether the matter would come under my portfolio, or under that of the Attorney-General. However, on the facts, there is no doubt in my mind that this was a lousy practice, to say the least. Most members (as I am) are married and know that the wedding day is an emotional time for all concerned, and that this is an unnecessary hardship to suffer at that time. I will have the matter investigated.

RED GUMS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Community Welfare have notices placed throughout the countryside where large red gums offer shade (and I speak particularly of the high rainfall areas) warning the public of the ever-present danger that exists to those in the immediate surroundings of these trees? About two or three weeks ago, two boys in Victoria, who were camping with two of their friends, were killed when branches fell from a large spreading red gum under which they were occupying sleeping bags. It is common place to see in the South-East during holiday time scores of families enjoying the shade of and picnicking under these trees, which are notorious for dropping many tonnes of timber without warning. The danger is increasing as more and more people have leisure time on their hands and as we have increased use of the motor car: a serious hazard awaits the unsuspecting picnicker.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for his perspicacity in directing the question to me. As a matter of interest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to other members of the House, I can say that a branch of a red gum did fall on me some years ago, so I have personal knowledge of the danger from these trees. I know that there is no need to hasten to add that I suffered no ill effects from the accident, because this would be apparent to all members in the contacts that we normally have with one another. The honourable member certainly has given me a fairly tall order, but I understand his concern in the matter. He has raised circumstances in which the lives of people could be in jeopardy, but he has also given me a large contract. I think he has asked me to put notices on all red gums in areas that people use, or may use, as picnic spots. I imagine that there would be many such trees. The matter may better come within the portfolio of the Minister for the Environment. All I can undertake now is that we will examine the matter for the honourable member.

LIBRARY BOOKS

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Education take action to ensure that, in the selection of books for public libraries, the reading preferences of the people are considered fully? Recently a shop-front library display was conducted in the district of Semaphore with much success, and it would be appreciated if an assurance could be given that the preferences of people would be fully considered.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The answer, of course, is that I will try to ensure that, at all times, the reading preferences of people are considered, and, if the honourable member can give me any information about readers' preferences, as expressed by people who have taken part in the shop-front experiment, I shall be pleased to receive it, because it would be useful raw material in connection with any policy that would be directed towards discharging the obligations that I now undertake in response to the question. I was present at the opening of the shop-front library, and I congratulate all the people who showed initiative in

getting it off the ground. I hope it will be possible, with the co-operation of the local government people in the area, to establish a completely free public library. The Libraries Board tries to keep tab on the reading preferences of people and, in the board's report, which I tabled earlier today, there are short lists of the books that have been most read in the past 12 months. I will quote some books from these lists so that members may know the reading preferences of people, as expressed in requests to reserve books at the State Library. The list included in the report covering the adult section includes:

Bach, R.: *Jonathon Livingstone Seagull*.

Bronowski, J.: *Ascent of Man*.

Caserta, P.: *Going Down with Janis*.

The word "Janis" is spelt as is the name of the rock star, and not as is the Roman God's name. The list continues:

Dalton, D.: *Rolling Stones*.

Gibbons, S.: *British Commonwealth Stamp Catalogue*, 1974.

Solzhenitsyn, A.: *The Gulag Archipelago*.

Watson, L.: *Supernatural: The Supernatural History of the Supernatural*.

The list dealing with children's services includes:

Ghost stories in general.

Goscinnny, R.: Asterix series (all titles).

Hitchcock, A.: *Monster Museum*.

Thiele, C.: *Magpie Island*.

Thiele, C.: *The Fire in the Stone*.

Wilder, L.: All titles.

Finally, in the youth section, the following books are listed:

Goscinnny, R.: Asterix series (all titles).

Peyton, K. M.: *Pennington's Seventeenth Summer*.

Zinder, P.: *My Darling, my Hamburger*.

In the cassette section, obviously to the delight of my offspring, the following are included:

Beach Boys,
Beatles,
David Bowie,
Deep Purple,
Elton John,
John Denver,
Leo Sayer,
Suzi Quatro,
Sweet.

Louis Armstrong did not make it, and all I can do is repeat that it is a shame that so much youth is wasted on the young.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Education say what is happening about teacher recruitment and placement for 1976? When I asked the Minister a question a few weeks ago about the same topic, that caused controversy in the ranks of the teaching profession in this State. To paraphrase the member for Tea Tree Gully (whose usual introduction to a question this is), the Minister will be aware of a news report yesterday which is headed "Teachers demand action over staff employment" and which refers to the urgency motion moved by Mr. Talbot at the meeting of the Institute of Teachers held at the weekend and to the subsequent comments of Mr. Hunkin. It is obvious from that report that there is not only confusion amongst teachers generally, but also much consternation, worry and annoyance with the Government over the situation. Finally, I tell the Minister what he probably also knows, namely, that Mr. Mildred, Principal of the Murray Park College of Advanced Education, has, I understand, just returned from overseas, where he was interviewing people who already had been recruited to come soon to South Australia as teachers. That seems to be an extraordinary

situation when already we have what I can broadly describe as more than enough, yet that is the information which I have and which I think has not been made public so far. I base the question on the reply that the Minister gave me some time ago, the obvious concern of the Institute of Teachers, and the fact that apparently recruiting is still going on overseas, as evidenced by Mr. Mildred's trip.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: For the benefit of the member for Tea Tree Gully, I point out that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery; for the benefit of the member for Mitcham, I say that he boosts himself a little, because the debate that has gone on in education circles about the Government's policies on the recruitment of teachers stems not from his question in the House but from my letter to Mr. Hunkin. At his request, to which I readily acceded, the letter was published in a recent issue of the *Teachers Journal*. The situation has not changed. I thought it only fair that I should make known to students, particularly to people who may be seeking re-employment as teachers and also to people who are employed in the over-age category, what may be the situation next year regarding employment. That situation was that it was most unlikely that the Government would be able to employ all those people who would be approaching us for employment in the teaching area. It was therefore necessary to establish some list of priorities for the way in which we would engage people. That list of priorities was made known to the Institute of Teachers and, indeed, to the public generally, in my letter to Mr. Hunkin, as I understand it was made known in the House, possibly during the Budget debate (I forget when the honourable member asked me that question). Moreover, as I mentioned at the time both in the House and in the letter to Mr. Hunkin, I have a guarantee from my colleagues that, if the Education Department is not sufficiently funded to be able to employ all the people in the first four categories (that is, down to the unbonded students), I would be given additional finance to enable those people to be so employed. Until accurate figures are available to me about the number of persons who will be resigning from the department at the end of this year and about the number of people who will be seeking employment, it is difficult for me to make a definite statement. I will simply say that anyone who wishes to have employment with the department in the coming calendar year should notify the department immediately so that at least that aspect of the situation is clarified for us. A statutory time is laid down in the regulations regarding when persons should resign, if they are to resign under the regulations: that is not until some time in November. With the best will in the world, I will not have those figures available to me until then.

Mr. Millhouse: What about oversea recruiting?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not aware of any recruitment going on overseas. Indeed, in the list of categories set out in the statement to this House and in the letter to the institute, oversea teachers receive a very low priority.

Mr. Millhouse: Then why did Mr. Mildred go overseas?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am prepared to take up that matter. I do not know what is behind that aspect of the honourable member's question, but I can get a report for him. In general terms, I will resist making any further public statement on the situation until I know exactly where we are, particularly in relation to resignations.

GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for me a report on the Highways Department's current planning in respect of the reconstruction and widening of the Grand Junction Road between North-East Road, Holden Hill, and Anstey Hill?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain up-to-date information for the honourable member.

PRINCES HIGHWAY

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Transport say whether there has been any change in the completion date of the Princes Highway freeway to the points of egress at Callington and White Hill? I am wondering whether the Highways Department has received the funds, or whether it has the necessary funds in hand, to complete what has become known to us as the old programme. Perhaps the Minister will state in his reply what are the expected dates of completion at both Callington and White Hill.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have the specific dates at my disposal at the moment, but I will obtain them. Generally speaking, the South-Eastern Freeway is progressing according to plan, and one of the major reasons for this is that the current Commonwealth legislation provides a specific allocation for national highways that actually conforms to the policy, which we were pursuing, of giving top priority to the Princes Highway as far as Swanport. I will get specific information for the honourable member.

MEAT INDUSTRY BILL

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works discuss with the Minister of Agriculture the review of the proposed meat legislation, which has attracted so much criticism from producers and country butchers? During the weekend, many butchers on Eyre Peninsula expressed grave concern to me about the likely effects of the legislation if it was proceeded with in its present form. They were concerned that the cost of upgrading slaughterhouses would be prohibitive and would mean that nearly all country slaughterhouses would have to be closed down. This would increase costs to consumers, creating unemployment, because butchers would have to put off slaughtermen, and deny local producers a valuable outlet for their stock. These people consider that the regulations should be made available for scrutiny and comment before any legislation is passed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to comply with the honourable member's request. The matter was before Cabinet not yesterday but last Monday or the Monday before, and the Cabinet has referred it back to the Minister for further examination. I shall be pleased to pass on the honourable member's comments.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

Mr. VANDEPEER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare examine the system used by the Community Welfare Department under which money which is given out for emergency assistance and which is considered a returnable loan can, when returned, be kept with the local office of the department so that it is immediately available for further emergency assistance? Local branches in small country towns and, I presume, in Adelaide suburbs have a certain amount of money in petty cash to contribute to anybody requiring absolute emergency assistance. Some of this money at times is returned, but I admit that it is not a considerable amount. When it is returned it is passed back into Government revenue and lost to the branch. I think that, if the money that was returned could be put into petty cash so that it was immediately available to give

out in further assistance, it would greatly assist the work of the branches in the small country towns and Adelaide suburbs.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I should imagine that Mr. Byrne would have something to say about that sort of accounting, where cash that is returned is put back in the kitty in case it is needed again. Without dismissing the question in too perfunctory a fashion, I will look at the facts outlined. Something about which the department as a whole can be proud is the complete decentralisation of its operations. The financial assistance referred to has been made available through the Community Welfare Department at the point where it is needed, that is, amongst the community, and much autonomy and responsibility have been delegated down the line, particularly under the jurisdiction and auspices of my predecessor in office, to enable effective financial assistance to be granted. I can understand the thinking behind the question, that there may be some place where, financial assistance having been granted on a fairly reasonable scale and some return having been made, a further emergency may arise, but it is not necessary to operate in that way. The fluidity and flexibility of the community welfare operation and the financial assistance would, as I understand it, allow for such a possibility, but I will consider the matter the honourable member has raised.

MAIZE ISLAND

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister for the Environment say whether a proposal to purchase a property owned by Mr. Lenke on Maize Island, near Waikerie, has ever been placed before the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council for consideration? The Lands Department is in the process of building a new irrigation distribution system in the Waikerie area, and it decided in its wisdom and with the agreement of the seven fruitgrower lessees on that island to purchase their properties rather than extend the irrigation and distribution system down to the island. This has been done, and it has left one freehold landowner on the island. On numerous occasions I have suggested to the Minister that the National Parks and Wildlife Service should purchase the property from Mr. Lenke, because if it did the total land on the island would become available to the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The island is of no value to the Lands Department, even though it has purchased the other properties on the island. If Mr. Lenke's property was purchased, the National Parks and Wildlife Service would own and have full access to all the island, which I consider would make a suitable game reserve or national park of one type or another. As there is in excess of \$100 000 in the Wildlife Conservation Fund that has been collected precisely for this purpose, I ask the Minister whether this proposal has ever been considered by the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know well the area to which the honourable member refers. As he points out, he has on many occasions discussed this matter with me, and the point he makes is valid. If the remaining single property on the island was purchased by the Government, the National Parks and Wildlife Service would have available to it an area that might be of value to it. The real problem is the difference of opinion in my department about the value of this piece of land, as it is held that it is of no significant environmental value. I believe the honourable member would agree with that. Accordingly, the view that National Parks and Wildlife Service officers have taken on this matter is that, because of the scarcity of funds needed to buy all areas of environmental significance,

although the island would be a useful purchase, it cannot be rated as an area that should get priority. Accordingly, because that view has prevailed, no action has been taken to purchase the property.

Mr. Arnold: Has it been considered by the council?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I believe that the views of the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council, whose views are normally sought on this type of matter, have been canvassed, but I am not certain. The council's views should be sought if that has not already been done, so I will undertake to ascertain whether the council has already considered the matter and let the honourable member know the council's view or, if it has not considered the matter, I am certainly willing to refer the matter to it.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether it is true that a male and a female officer are in charge of up to 20 boys in the high security unit at McNally Training Centre? It has been reported to me that staff at the centre are concerned about dealing with so many young men up to 18 years of age who are experienced inmates. I am sure that the Minister would agree that two male officers should be in charge of the number of boys to which I refer. As the situation at McNally is deteriorating (and there are certainly problems) I ask the Minister whether my information is correct and, if it is, what action he will take to alleviate the problems faced at the centre.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: First, I refute the statement that the situation at McNally has deteriorated. There is no reason for the honourable member to make that statement, which can certainly be disproved. The procedure operating at the McNally Training Centre has been arrived at over several years, and it is the result of much expertise having been applied to the treatment of boys in custody. I will not go further than that. I am not an expert on these matters, and I am sure the honourable member would agree that he is neither trained nor skilled in that area either. People are employed in these positions whose job it is to assess the requirements of the centre, to take care of a situation of this kind, and to make assessments. To the best of my knowledge, and from what I have observed, those assessments are satisfactory.

Mr. Mathwin: Have you been there?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have been to McNally more than once since becoming a Minister, and I have tried to visit all South Australian training centres, cottage homes, family care centres, and so on that are within the portfolio of the Minister of Community Welfare. I have not had time to visit all centres. For the honourable member's information, I have been to Port Augusta, Whyalla, and other areas immediately to the North. I am going to the South-East soon. I have spent much time trying to familiarise myself with the operations of the Community Welfare Department so that, in discharging my responsibility as a Minister, I can give to the House reasonable confidence that I am doing the job.

Mr. Mathwin: But McNally has got problems, hasn't it?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: There is no point in the honourable member's yammering away about McNally Training Centre, because it has a proud record of rehabilitating many young people of this State. That is a fact. There can always be arguments about methods used. In

fact, agreement has not been reached throughout the world about methods that should be used in these matters. Various methods have been put forward about what are the best methods to use. It is my belief, and the Government's belief, that the methods being used at McNally are the best that can be used.

Mr. Chapman: But not quite enough stick is used.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: For the information of the honourable member who has just interjected, a new officer was recently appointed at McNally to carry out further improvements in the treatment of inmates. In some quarters at least there is a popular view that all one has to do to handle young people who have gone astray is wield a big stick in an authoritarian manner and all will be cured. Most clear-thinking people will agree that that is a load of rubbish. That view, which is put forward on occasions (and I believe it is deplorable that any member in the House, even by interjection, should suggest that this is the way young people in South Australia or in any treatment institution should be treated), is wrong. The methods used at McNally are those that were decided by competent people appointed to deal with these matters. That does not mean that the methods cannot be changed or that improvements might not be considered necessary. The methods are not hard and fast. It may well be that 20 boys with a certain assessment could easily be handled by two people. Equally, it could be that no more than eight boys with a different assessment should be handled by two people. Finally, the honourable member made some point about the fact that we had male and female officers in the training and treatment centres. Records show that, since the introduction of female residential care workers on an equal basis with males (and I am sure he is not suggesting that it should not be on an equal basis), there has been an improvement in behaviour, which can be borne out by records. I believe I have replied more than adequately to the honourable member's question.

SHEEP TREATMENT

Mr. BLACKER: My question is supplementary to the question I asked the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, last week and is also supplementary to a reply I received today to a Question on Notice. Because of the number of inquiries I have had, will the Minister, in line with the request I made last week, investigate the manner in which stock for the 75c scheme are being received at the Port Lincoln abattoir? Since the Minister's explanation last week, seven other producers have contacted me regarding this matter. They have not lost as many sheep as have Mr. and Mrs. Fiegert, but, out of a total of 1 226 sheep delivered, 336 have not been accounted for. These other producers have come to me not so much in desperation but as a matter of principle, because sheep have not disappeared in this way before. No account has been rendered for the removal of any of the 336 animals that have died in the stockyards. Normally, if stock die in the yard, an account is rendered. My constituents want to know what has happened to the stock. Has the department used them for any purpose, and what means were used to get rid of the carcasses? The producers would like this matter clarified, because it seems that there has been mismanagement. It is unusual to have so many people contacting me about so many missing sheep.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague and will bring down a report as soon as possible.

PRE-MIXED CONCRETE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether a clause will be written into the regulations under the Pre-Mixed Concrete Carters Bill or an endorsement will be put on licences of pre-mixed concrete truck owner-drivers to prevent licensed metropolitan operators accepting business outside the metropolitan area? On page 1025 of *Hansard* of October 1 the Minister is reported as having acknowledged the existence of an anomaly in this regard. He said he had taken up the matter with the owner-drivers in the metropolitan area, who had already recognised the anomaly in the Bill. The Minister said that the operators had told him they were willing to have a provision written into the certificates of registration and the licences to restrict them to operation within the boundaries of the metropolitan area. All I really require is an assurance from the Minister that he will see that the matter is "cemented" by having it written into the Act or the regulations, or on the licence itself.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have no disagreement with the honourable member on this point. My stand on this matter is printed on page 1025 of *Hansard*. In reply to a question from the honourable member, I agreed that an anomaly existed. I had already discussed it with the people who will enjoy the benefits of registration if the Bill is passed by the Legislative Council, as I hope it will be, because it is important legislation. This seems to be the only objection that can be raised to the provisions of the Bill. I believe that a protection ought to be extended to country operators. It is no use having legislation that protects people in the metropolitan area but does not protect people working outside the metropolitan area. It could be said that the legislation should cover the whole State. When the question was directed to me in the Committee stage of the Bill, I made clear that an anomaly did exist. I expected that an amendment would be moved from the opposite side, but it was not. But that does not matter: I have said that I intend by one means or another to ensure that the matter referred to will be corrected by an endorsement on the certificate of registration itself, or by a provision in the regulations. I do not think the honourable member cares about how it is done as long as he gets an unequivocal guarantee that it will operate. What I have said is the Government's attitude on the matter.

LOAN ESTIMATES

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Treasurer say which of the capital works outlined in the 1975-76 Loan Estimates, particularly those associated with school buildings, sewerage and water reticulation, will be cancelled or deferred? In reply to a question from the member for Goyder, the Minister of Mines and Energy confirmed that the plans for the establishment of a school at Two Wells had been cancelled because finance had not been available from the Australian Government. This places in doubt plans for other schools expected to be built in 1975-76. I should like to know which of these, if any, will receive the axe or be deferred. Secondly, in a report dated October 2, 1974, the Clerk of the Corporation of Kadina stated:

The office of the Minister of Local Government rang Thursday, October 2, 1975, to advise that certain moneys allocated to them for common effluent drain purposes had been cancelled and no more schemes would be able to start this year. There may be a review in March next.

Concern was expressed the following morning, when an article appeared in the *Advertiser* stating that the Port Pirie

sewerage scheme would be extended to serve the whole of the closely settled area. The report stated:

The Speaker in the House of Assembly and member for Pirie (Mr. Connelly) said yesterday he had been advised by the Minister of Works (Mr. Corcoran) that the Cabinet had approved \$4 500 000 for the work.

As some works are being extended and other works cancelled because of lack of finance, there seems to be an inequality throughout the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been no inequality in this matter. The Government's plans for the extension of the sewerage works at Port Pirie were announced a considerable time ago; in fact before the election. The announcement by the Speaker related to the specific commitment of funds, but the work had been promised years ago. The honourable member has asked me whether I will get him a list of works originally intended under the Loan Estimates this year which could conceivably be deferred. I will try to get such a list for him if we are able to provide one, but as at present advised we are not expecting any substantial deferrals of what this House has already approved under the Loan Estimates.

At 3.10 p.m. the bells having been rung:

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT
AMENDMENT BILL (REGULATIONS)**

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

**RETURNED SERVICEMEN'S BADGES ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT (R.S.L.) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

**CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(COMMISSION)**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 927.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): At the outset I say that there are features of this Bill of which we thoroughly approve. There is no doubt that it is high time that there should be a redistribution in this State, and this fact was well recognised in the policy speech of the Liberal Party before the recent election. Under the heading "Electoral Reform", the speech states:

There is a need for electoral redistribution in this State because of the increase in population and the lowering of the voting age to 18 years.

The speech further states:

We will establish a permanent independent commission to review House of Assembly boundaries immediately and thereafter to conduct regular reviews. Such commission will be so constituted as to be divorced from political influence—the Liberal Party will not entertain any possibility of gerrymander. We believe that every citizen of the State should have equal access to Parliamentary representation.

That policy was set out quite clearly in the election speech of the Liberal Party at the election held in July, and one has only to look at the various population growth areas in the metropolitan area to see how vital this matter has become, particularly in Tea Tree Gully and Mawson, where

the population is growing rapidly. Obviously, there should be at least two seats where there is now one in each area, and these changes are long overdue. As I say, there are many aspects of the Government's Bill of which we approve. The setting up of a permanent electoral commission is something that has been introduced into this House from this side as a proposition. It was referred to in the policy speech, and we believe that it should be set up, that it should meet automatically and regularly at set intervals, and that it should report. Our proposal was that the commission should report only to Parliament, and I am pleased to see that the Premier and members opposite have at least changed to the extent where they will have the commission bring down an order, which will be implemented without further reference to Parliament. That matter was brought up about 12 months ago in another place but was not regarded in any favour at all by the Government at that stage.

It was because of that that the proposition that was brought before this House previously did not allow for an automatic implementation without reference back to the Parliament. Nevertheless, I have no objection (and I believe that Opposition members generally have no objection) to the electoral commission coming down with an order, which order shall be implemented without further reference to Parliament. In fact, I am pleased that it does not have to come back to Parliament, because there will be no question of any political influence once that order has been made. It is necessary to have a commission of such vital importance completely free of political influence: for that reason I wonder whether it is better to have, as is proposed in this Bill, an *ex officio* style of commission or whether the House could be given the ability to pass judgment on the proposed nominees before they are appointed to the commission. The only way that this could be done would be by using the system that applies, for example, in the New Zealand Parliament, which has only one House and in which there is a convention that appointments of this nature are made by the approval of the majority of members on each side of the House. That, it seems, is not a practical proposition.

Perhaps we should include a provision that such members should be approved of by a three-quarters majority. It is unlikely that such a majority would ever be a Party majority (I sincerely hope not, anyway), and for that reason it would be necessary to get the approval of the Opposition, of whatever political complexion, to those nominees. Be that as it may, we are not unhappy with the *ex officio* appointments that have been suggested, and I believe that this should be a sufficient safeguard. In relation to the automatic implementation of the order brought down by the commission after it had been subject to an appeal, and in reply to a comment that was made some time ago, I say that the weight of public opinion would require certainly a Liberal Government to act on a report of an electoral commission if it came into the House, although possibly a Labor Government would not feel the need to act in response to public opinion. Generally, we are in accord with the matters to which I have referred.

Matters causing concern to members of this Party and to members of the community come under two headings. First, the Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition and as a member of the Parliamentary Labor Party for many years, said that it was totally wrong that a Party achieving a majority of the vote should not govern. I totally and absolutely agree. I can recall that in 1968, after the general election in this State, there was a march, a

demonstration, and a public meeting that was addressed by the Premier and others in Light Square. There is no question that gerrymanders have occurred and have operated in this State, and I believe that that is not a record of which either Party can be proud; certainly it was not a record of which the then Liberal and Country League could really be proud. The Liberal Party—and I state this unequivocally—certainly does not believe that there should be a gerrymander in this State for any political Party, and I am quite sure that in that sentiment I have the support of everyone in this Chamber.

We do not believe that this situation should arise: we do believe that no Party or Parties should govern without receiving a majority of the preferred votes. As I have said, this matter has been promoted by the Premier in the past and was promoted only last week again in relation to a similar matter, and yet, in the proposal for mathematically equal numbers in districts (that is, the one vote one value redistribution), I believe that there is no guarantee whatever that discrepancies will not arise, discrepancies of such a nature and magnitude that they could come into the category of gerrymanders. It is possible, having regard to the figures from the last election from the subdivisions and districts generally, that, on one drawing of the boundaries, the Labor Party could win 27 of the seats and the anti-socialist Parties 20 of the seats on what was an overall evenly balanced vote, virtually a 50/50 vote. I will put it another way: it is possible that, on the boundaries, the Labor Party could win Government with as little as 45 per cent of the vote. That is easy to understand when one considers the wastage of votes for one Party that occurs wherever there is a blue ribbon seat, whether for the Labor Party, Liberal Party, Liberal Movement, or Country Party. Undoubtedly, a Party could, in three adjoining seats of equal population, win two seats narrowly and lose the other seat in a blue ribbon situation to a massive vote from the other Party, having obtained a minority of the overall vote for the three districts. This could easily happen, and it would depend entirely on population distribution and pockets of voting support in each of those districts. The commission can act only on the terms of reference that have been given to it (on nothing more and nothing less), and that is the whole point of giving terms of reference to any electoral commission, and it is of little value establishing that commission on a permanent basis, and writing one vote one value legislation, even with a tolerance of 10 per cent, into the Constitution and entrenching it there if that system could lead to a gerrymander of any sort.

It is the more reprehensible that a potential gerrymander could be written and entrenched into the Constitution of this State. I believe that, as a term of reference, the commission should be asked (and it could do no more than this) to keep in mind, with all the other factors that have been outlined in the terms of reference, the need to ensure that as far as possible in drawing boundaries the representation in the House of Assembly should reflect the total overall voting pattern as expressed at the election last held. If it is the purpose of the Bill (and we understand from the Premier that it is) to avoid a gerrymander and to ensure that a Party gaining a majority of the vote will be the Government, why not write it in the terms of reference for the commission to consider as one of the factors that it should examine? I see no objection to that or no reason why the Premier should in any way oppose such a suggestion, because he has said that that is the aim of the legislation. If that is the aim, it should be spelled out in the Bill.

A second matter causing me concern is the difficulties that will arise if country districts are enlarged. I refer to the practical difficulties of representation. These problems have been commented on here many times before, and I will not go into them in detail: suffice to say that the Premier is on record as having said that there are peculiar difficulties in representing country areas that ought to be taken into account. The Hon. Mr. Casey, from another place, is on record as saying much the same thing, and the Hon. Mr. Cameron, also from another place, in an interview published in the *News* last July, stated that he was not in favour of and would not support a Bill that allowed for equal numbers of voters in every seat. The member for Port Pirie, also in an interview in the *News*, has been quoted as expressing the same kind of opinion. He was asked what, if redistribution legislation was considered, his reaction to it would be and whether he would oppose it as a redistribution measure. The report states:

A. I realise our boundary has to be increased. We took in only Port Pirie at one time but it has been gradually increased. You have to give special considerations to places like the country. I would not like to see, although you could argue it on the basis of numbers, that the majority of people come from Adelaide so that the country would have a minimum number of seats. But while that might be a logical argument on figures I do not know that is how it ought to be. The country ought to have a reasonable representation.

Q. So you do not approve of equal numbers of people in every electorate across the State?

A. Not as a statement like that. I feel you have got to consider the geographic areas within the country. I think we cannot go too far on that. I can see that the country electorates will have to grow but I think that will have to be looked at. Country people should not be automatically disadvantaged by being swamped out by the city. This is what could happen because 70 per cent of the people live in the city. There may have to be a tolerance. A lower number of votes for country seats.

All of those comments are pertinent to the present situation. Many country members have extreme difficulty in serving their electorates at present. I refer, for instance, to the matter of electorate offices and the tremendous difficulties that have existed, particularly in the Districts of Eyre, Frome, Mallee, and Alexandra, where it has not been possible to establish (until recently in the case of Alexandra, and even then not in the best possible way) a suitable electorate office. Despite modern developments in transport, the travelling times associated with representing our further-flung country areas are immense. Many of our members spend many hours every week travelling between Parliament and the centre of their districts. There are difficulties in some districts, particularly, for instance, in Mallee, where there is no major centre of population but simply several centres and where the member can find no home base from which to work conveniently.

I believe that these country members do a remarkable job in servicing and providing that service to their electorates now, and that any increase in the size of country districts must result in a reduction of the standard of representation. Certainly, I think, as do other people, that it will put people in the country at a growing disadvantage. I am on record as saying that I would be sorry to see any reduction in the number of country districts, because any reduction would result in a reduction of the quality of service provided by individual members to their areas, and this is not desirable. Consideration should be given to increasing the number of members of the House to allow for more seats in the metropolitan area if this will help to maintain country representation at a high standard.

Generally, as I have said, I support certain aspects of the legislation, although other aspects of it cause me grave concern. Obviously, the legislation will be passed; that has been made clear, so let us be practical about it. The Labor Party has put it forward; the L.M. has made clear that it will support it, and we will have no chance to clarify those aspects of the Bill which are causing us concern. Therefore, I support the Bill to the second reading.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Ravel): The Bill is an obvious attempt (unfortunately, a successful attempt) by the Labor Party to entrench itself in office even though in the future it may enjoy only minority support from the electorates throughout South Australia. The one argument that has been consistently used by the Premier over the years to justify the travesty we are debating now has been that his Party has enjoyed majority support throughout the whole of South Australia. On many occasions he has quoted percentages to justify his stance in regard to this so-called one vote one value. When talking about the Upper House, the argument he advanced time and time again was, "We have polled more than 50 per cent of the votes in this State: therefore, we have a right to control this Chamber." He has used the same argument on many occasions in relation to electoral redistribution of the Assembly. The basis of his argument has been the percentage of votes cast for his Party. The Prime Minister, the erstwhile friend of the Premier (we are not sure how firm the friendship is now, because some cracks appear to be developing), sought to introduce, in the Commonwealth Parliament, a Bill that in some ways would not be dissimilar from this Bill. The Prime Minister has quoted, in the Commonwealth Parliament, percentages of votes gained by the A.L.P., but these arguments will not stand up.

The Premier was talking about this in 1962. In his second reading explanation of the Bill before us, he went back to the 1800's to quote the founding fathers and what was supposed to have been written into the Constitution, but obviously he and his Party have had a big change of heart. They have made strangely conflicting statements in the past few years. In 1962, when a Constitution Act Amendment Bill was before this House, the present Premier stated:

We have had arguments from time to time from members opposite who say, "Oh well, you know it's not true. The Labor Party did not get a majority. We had a majority, so it is all right". Although their arithmetic was very bad on those occasions it would be even worse if they tried on this occasion, and perhaps it is not surprising that the Premier—

referring to Sir Thomas Playford—

did not say what he is reported to have said in the newspapers immediately after the elections. He said, "Taking the seats contested by both major Parties in this State, Labor polled 48 per cent and the Liberal Party polled 46 per cent. The Labor Party got one more representative than the Liberal Party, so everything in the garden is rosy and you cannot expect a better reason for Labor than that." Of course, he ignored 19 seats, which is nearly half the number of members in this House. If we take the House of Representatives votes we find that the Labor Party would have polled in those 19 seats not contested by both major Parties in the election 59.2 per cent of the votes and the Liberal Party 33.3 per cent.

He went on at some length to argue his case in terms of votes cast for the A.L.P., and he stated;

When those figures are added to the other figures the Labor Party comes up with 54 per cent and the Liberal and Country League with 40 per cent. However, even that is wrong because it was shown that as between the Commonwealth and the State elections in the seats that both major Parties contested there was an overall significant swing to Labor in most areas.

So the argument goes on. I could quote other paragraphs from the present Premier's speech where he advanced the argument about percentages of votes cast for the A.L.P. at elections, claiming that they gave that Party an undeniable right to govern. However, if we examine the results of the recent election in South Australia, we reach the inescapable conclusion that, in regard to the votes cast over the whole State, the election was a line ball. Not only has the Premier used this argument: as I have said, "his" Prime Minister has used the same sort of argument. Referring to the South Australian scene, the Hon. Gough Whitlam stated:

The electorates are so drawn that a Government in theory could be elected by as little as 40.1 per cent of the votes.

Again we get the percentage argument thrown up. The Premier is quoted in the press, in connection with the Upper House franchise, as follows:

The voters endorsed it and showed their feelings by increasing our membership of the Council by two and giving the A.L.P. 53 per cent of the overall Legislative Council vote.

The argument there is that the A.L.P. got 53 per cent of the votes and therefore had the right to govern. However, that argument is conveniently forgotten now. If we analyse the result of the recent election as dispassionately as we can, we find it was indeed a line ball, and that is reflected in the membership of this House. In the metropolitan area of Adelaide, the A.L.P. received 258 363 first preference votes, or 52.3 per cent of the votes. However, the A.L.P. won 75 per cent of the districts in the metropolitan area.

In the extra-metropolitan area, that Party got only 31.6 per cent of the votes. If we allocate preferences as accurately as we can (and that has been done by an examination of results where preferences were allocated and on a scrutiny of all information available), we see that the Liberal Movement preferences would go 15 per cent to the A.L.P. and 85 per cent to the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party preferences would go 10 per cent to the A.L.P. and 90 per cent to the Liberal Movement. The Country Party preferences would go 10 per cent to the A.L.P. and 90 per cent to the Liberal Party, and the A.L.P. preferences would go Liberal Party 10 per cent and L.M. 90 per cent.

If we analyse these figures further on the basis of a two-Party preferred vote for the State and add the total of votes cast for the A.L.P., we see that that Party's first preference vote was 46.3 per cent overall. We add on the 15 per cent and allocate this as a percentage of the Liberal Movement total vote. This gives a total vote throughout the State of 2.7 per cent. If we add on the 10 per cent of Country Party preferences and allocate this over the whole State, it works out at .3 per cent.

If we add 60 per cent of the preferences of all other candidates and allocate them on a State basis to the A.L.P., we see that the A.L.P. got, as nearly as we can get the figure to one decimal point, 50.0 per cent of the total preferred vote cast in South Australia, which means that the non-A.L.P. total vote was 50 per cent. I suggest that the membership of this House reflects that percentage accurately. This is the argument that the Premier has advanced over the years to justify electoral redistribution. Such distributions have varied markedly over the years. The Premier has gone back to the year dot and he has talked about the Constitution, but the argument that has been put forward here consistently has been, "We have gained more than half the number of votes in this State and we have a democratic right to govern."

There are in the House 23 A.L.P. members and 23 non-A.L.P. Opposition members, in addition to one Independent with whom suitable arrangements have been made in the intervening period so that the A.L.P. can govern. If we are to give any credence to the arguments that the Premier has used over the years, this would seem to be a scrupulously fair distribution. However, if we are hooked up by some emotive catchcry about one vote one value, we must discount the argument that the Premier has used over the years to justify it. That has been shown clearly in the results of the recent election.

There is a pressing need to do something about the electoral districts if the Labor Party is to entrench itself in office in this State, and the way is to do something about the 52.3 per cent in the metropolitan area, which returns 73 per cent of the A.L.P. districts. The way is to put weight of electoral advantage there and diminish the electoral impact of the country or non-metropolitan areas. That is what impels the Government, not the argument that it has advanced over the years about getting 50 per cent of the votes (which justifies changes being made in the Legislative Council), not the argument that, "We have more than 50 per cent of the votes in the Assembly and therefore we must change the system." We must conveniently forget that argument!

Because the A.L.P. has had a resounding vote of no-confidence in certain areas, we must disfranchise those areas in some way! That is what the Bill seeks to do. No-one denies that there is a pressing need as far as the Labor Party is concerned. It has justified its argument of one vote one value in terms of the percentage of the vote cast for it, but now it must forget that argument because it just does not line up with what has happened electorally in South Australia as a result of the most recent redistribution.

No-one denies that there is a need to make some changes. Obviously, there are, in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, growth centres that must be accommodated, but in my view they do not have to be accommodated by the radical surgery that has been promoted in this Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you supporting the second reading or not?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will support the second reading reluctantly. Changes may be made to the Bill, but one must be politically aware of the situation. Come hell or high water, the Labor Party, with support from one quarter will bulldoze the Bill through as smartly as possible to fix up the situation to which I have been alluding, because it is likely to lose majority support in this State. I have quoted before (but unfortunately it does not seem to have hit the press) and I will quote again statements the former Premier has made to this House when electoral matters have been discussed, also what the former Premier, the late Frank Walsh, said and statements made by the only member from the Labor Party who in living memory has had experience in representing one of the larger rural seats, Mr. Casey. Let us compare what these great democrats opposite had to say to what they are now saying. In relation to electoral redistribution this statement of the late Frank Walsh appeared in *Hansard* on October 24, 1962, when an electoral redistribution Bill was before the House:

The Bill proposes to reduce the number of country representatives from 26 to 20. Why should country people be denied adequate representation in this Parliament? I challenge the Government to deny that country areas will be deprived of some representation. I could not find sufficient words within the limits of Parliamentary language to describe my feelings on this aspect.

Later he said:

A district must have a reasonable shape with reasonable means of access between the main population centres therein. I have heard members, including the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), complain about the difficulties of travelling from one country town to another. For instance, in the Frome District the member would have to travel 150 miles from Peterborough to reach the boundary of his district. The Government should supply him with a helicopter or some other fast means of transportation. I oppose the clause because if it is difficult for a country member to adequately service his district now, it will be impossible if the country representation is reduced by six.

That was a proposal to reduce the numbers in the House to 20 members. What will this Bill do when it reduces country representation from 19 to 13 or 14? It will decimate country representation and make a complete farce of what the Labor Party was saying at that time. What does the Premier have to say on the matter? This is what the Premier, as member for Norwood, said on February 25, 1964, as reported in *Hansard*.

The Premier says it is difficult to represent country districts because of the long distances that have to be travelled to keep in touch with the electors. We agree with him. We have every reason to agree with him because the Labor Party in this Parliament represents not only the overwhelming majority of the people of this State. We represent far more electors here than honourable members do on the other side, but we also represent the majority of the area of the State as well. The vast majority of the area of South Australia is represented in this House by Labor members. The honourable members for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and Frome (Mr. Casey) both have electoral districts larger than the British Isles in area.

This lines up, does it not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the stuff that had been churned out last week! The *Hansard* report continued:

Why, they comprise the major portion of the Commonwealth district of Grey, which in itself comprises some two-thirds of this State. We do not believe that the present number of members representing country districts can be properly decreased, because thereby it will make country representation less efficient.

It will not be possible for members to travel the vast distances that now have to be travelled by the honourable members for Frome and Whyalla and then go further. The Premier, having said that it was not possible to decrease country representation (and he has said it here, as the member for Whyalla has pointed out, time and time again), now intends to reduce country representation, and particularly in the sparsely settled areas of this State. It will make the task of the members for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) and Frome almost impossible.

The member for Frome would have to represent an area from Coober Pedy to Cockburn and from just north of Quorn to the Northern Territory and Queensland borders.

How does that line up with what the Premier has been spouting recently? The Premier was either telling lies then or he is now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw the word "lies".

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not say he was a liar. I referred to lies. I did not know that was unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw that word.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the Deputy Speaker has asked for a withdrawal, I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will withdraw it, and rephrase the statement by saying that his statements are incompatible; whether they are called lies or incompatibilities, I have made my point. What did the now Hon. Mr. Casey say then?

Mr. Evans: What Party does he belong to?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think the honourable member did a switch early in life, as did the Premier, from statements I have read. Be that as it may, it is not germane to the question. This is what the Hon. Mr. Casey said when he represented one of the far-flung districts:

I believe in the principle of one vote one value, for I think that is the basis of all democratic thinking. However, there are times when that policy could not possibly be put into effect, and I think that is the position in this State because of the vast areas in the north of the State which are so sparsely populated.

He continued:

I represent what is known as a rural area, and I am proud to do so; it is sparsely populated and extends over great distances, and under the proposed legislation that area will be increased. I say emphatically that if those areas in the north, such as the districts of the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and myself, are increased, it will not be possible for us to do the job we wish to do and what we set out to do, for such a task would kill us and the members who come after us.

The Minister of Mines and Energy was upset last week when I referred to the fact that the Deputy Premier had decided to leave the District of Millicent and seek a city seat. The Minister (the democratic member for Brighton) suggested I was using gutter tactics. If honourable members are not prepared to stand by public utterances, it is a poor state of affairs. It is obvious that the Deputy Premier did leave Millicent for the publicly stated reasons, which are common knowledge. If the Minister of Mines and Energy objects to that, I am afraid he will just have to object. I sympathise with the Deputy Premier in his sickness, but that is not the point. The Deputy Premier left Millicent for two reasons: family and health, and he is on record as publicly stating that they are the reasons for his leaving Millicent.

It has been said that, because he is a Minister, it is more difficult for him, but I submit that the duties of members and the difficulties that obtain in country districts are similar for Ministers and back-benchers alike. Country members have to come to the city and also move around their districts, and a back-bencher does not have a chauffeur-driven vehicle in which to move around. Back-benchers have families, and those from the country are absent from their homes most of the time, as I am. One has only to consider the number of miles that members travel in country districts to realise how much is involved. The Deputy Premier bailed out because it was easier for him to represent a city district than it was to represent a country district because of the two grounds of family and health. Do not the same problems face any country member?

Mr. Evans: The member for Flinders was in hospital.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he was. If the Minister of Mines and Energy gets uptight about my advancing these sorts of argument, too bad, because it is a fact of life. The demands made on the time of members representing country districts are, for travel alone and being absent from home, far in excess of the majority of city members. I challenge anyone to refute that. In support of my argument I advance the case of the former member for Millicent. If there was another reason for his bailing out—perhaps the seat was too shaky for him—let him say so, but the publicly stated reasons were family and health.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you think were the reasons?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: A combination of all three, but it would not do for a politician to say he bailed out because the ship was sinking. That does not destroy my point.

Mr. Millhouse: It rather weakens it though.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think so. These were the stated reasons, and I agree with him. I know the demands that are made on country members. I know the time it takes to get to a function. A member spends more time on the road travelling to a function than he spends at the function. If members are interested they could ask the younger members of my family how much they see me. What is good enough for the Deputy Premier, and Labor Party members who represent country districts, is good enough for Liberal Party members who represent country districts. The Minister of Mines and Energy is trying to interject. The Labor Party imported him from New South Wales to fix up matters here, and he is well on the way to fixing them according to his socialist, Keynesian economic theory. The Labor Party made great play of what it has done for country members. The Premier said last week, "We have given you district offices." What have members of the Government done for themselves? They have given themselves district offices, too. They could walk to them, or even ride a bike to them in 10 minutes. What about the member for Alexandra who has a district office at Victor Harbor, lives at Kangaroo Island, and commutes to the city. He is at a tremendous advantage! Consider the member for Frome, who could not even set up an office in his district. In my own district office in Nuriootpa most of my business is done by trunk telephone calls. The Labor Government provided offices for its members, only at greater convenience.

Mr. Duncan: What would you say if they were taken away?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If they are taken away from the Liberal Party they must be taken away from the Labor Party, too. The Government makes a big deal about what it has done for the Opposition, but it has done so much more for itself. All Ministers were given press secretaries. The Premier talks about the big deal and what he has done for the Opposition. However, the Government has given its members much more, so that argument falls flat on its face and there is no worth in it at all. There is a pressing necessity for the Labor Party to bulldoze through this Bill for reasons of electoral expediency. Where are the under-privileged people in this State? Everyone assumes that under-privileged people live in the metropolitan area, but the Henderson report does not state that. Where are the real pockets of poverty; where are the costs highest in this State; where do people have to travel farthest for services; where are educational opportunities most easily and readily accessible? I submit that services are certainly not accessible in country areas, and the more remote the area the less accessible they are. People from country areas are put to great inconvenience and need to board away from home when they come to the city for medical or dental attention. Now we intend to spread these disadvantages into the electoral distribution of the State.

The Labor Party has introduced a Bill that will entrench it in office with a minority vote. On the voting pattern existing at present, only 45 per cent of all votes cast will secure government for the Labor Party. The Premier's argument about percentage support falls to the ground when State electoral results at the past two elections are considered. Let me now consider the Bill. There is to be a tolerance of 10 per cent. How on earth will that work? How is it to be applied?

Mr. Millhouse: How is tolerance ever applied?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have had conflicting legal views expressed about that matter, one of which is that the

10 per cent tolerance will act in favour of country seats because of the provisions of new section 83, which refers to community of interest, and the desirability of leaving undisturbed existing boundaries, which is nonsense, because there is major surgery to be performed in country areas. It further refers to topography and feasibility of communication. That would work in favour of a tolerance being applied, to under-quota seats in rural areas. That view has been expressed to me by a person who has had much to do with drafting the Bill. The other factor, relating to the population of each district, including children and migrants, will react the other way. That is likely to occur in some metropolitan districts. The final matter in new section 83 relates to demographic changes. The Premier made great play about how clear and explicit should be the instructions to the commission. What weight must the commissioner give to considering those factors? The matter of communication applies overwhelmingly to rural areas. The references to population and demographic changes would apply more strongly to some metropolitan districts. I certainly hope that, if the 10 per cent tolerance is applied consistently in terms of the major disadvantages which I have outlined and which the Premier outlined in years gone by, that will ameliorate the situation slightly. Of course, leaving undisturbed the electoral boundaries in terms of the metropolitan area makes some sense. When we are facing the loss in one sweep of the knife six country seats, obviously placitum (c) does not have much meaning, certainly not in respect of the six seats that will disappear.

There are all sorts of matters to which I could refer, but time precludes me from doing so. Attention has been drawn to what you, Mr. Speaker, said. I have read with interest the editorials that have appeared in our daily newspapers, but they took a somewhat different stance. The editorial that appeared in the *Advertiser* some time ago seemed to be reasonable, but the editorial in the *News* was a little contradictory. The *News* said the concept appeared reasonable but stated:

The changes would enhance Labor's prospects of retaining power, but that assumes the A.L.P. is able to capture a majority vote.

That statement contains an error. The Bill certainly does enhance Labor's prospects of retaining power, but Labor can and will (if the voting patterns that were evident in the recent election are maintained) retain power with as little as 44 per cent of the vote. There is an error, because the assumption is that the A.L.P. must capture a majority vote. It will not have to capture a majority vote to govern. The need for the Government to introduce this measure is pressing. It got exactly half the vote at the recent election; it got half the seats and the support of the independent Speaker. The Government must change the situation, so this is the way it is going about it. The Government does not give a hoot about what it said in 1964 about there being adequate, reasonable and fair representation in country areas.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I do not wish to say much in this debate, because I have stated my views on electoral reform on several occasions in this place. However, I should make clear to the member for Kavel, if he believes his remarks about the Deputy Premier last Wednesday did not sound like a personal attack on the Deputy Premier and that they should not have been objected to on that score, I

suspect he would be one of the few members in this House who believe that. There is no doubt in the minds of members on this side (and there is certainly no doubt in the mind of the Deputy Premier) that what the member for Kavel said amounted to a personal attack on the Deputy Premier. Whether the member for Kavel intended it that way or not, I do not know, but he might care to perhaps cool the brow of the Deputy Premier on the matter. The Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy have stated that a one vote one value system may result in a Party with less than 50 per cent of the vote being able to govern because it has a majority of seats. That is always a possibility under a one vote one value system. It arises from what the experts describe as the differential concentration of majorities, the extent to which specific Parties have wasted votes in having had majorities in specific areas.

Traditionally it has always been held to apply as a disadvantage to the Labor Party in South Australia. The traditional view before this decade was that the Labor vote was somewhat wasted because of the heavy concentration of Labor majorities in the north and north-western suburbs of Adelaide, and the expert psephologists have commented on that many times. It was certainly a factor that operated in the 1962, 1965 and, perhaps, the 1968 elections. It probably applies less today; I think that over a period of time a differential change in voting patterns occurs. For example, the voting pattern in my district is much the same today as it was 10 years ago.

Mr. Becker: What rubbish! You've put in nothing but Housing Trust houses to build up the Labor vote.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Becker: You bought votes.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The arrangements for any Housing Trust building in my district were made under a Liberal Government. No arrangements have been made under a Labor Government for Housing Trust accommodation in my district. The use of the railway land by the Housing Trust was arranged by Sir Glen Pearson when he was Minister of Housing in 1968. No Housing Trust accommodation of any significance has been built in my district since 1962, except for additional housing put on the railway land after 1968 as a result of the transfer of that land agreed to by Sir Glen Pearson. In the period I have been a member the only Housing Trust changes that have occurred did so under a Liberal Government, and even taking that into account the voting patterns in my district have been relatively stable during the past 10 years, as they have been in the District of Torrens. However, the voting patterns in other parts of the State have changed. In the 1962 election the Labor Party nearly won the then seats of Victoria and Flinders.

Mr. Rodda: What was the real reason for that?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Many reasons applied at that time. To some extent the quality of the local member applied to the case of Victoria, although it did not in the case of Flinders. In another respect I think the long period of rule by Sir Thomas Playford had started to tell against him in the country areas of the State. However, 10 years ago the Labor vote in Port Lincoln was much higher than it is today. There has been a change in that period in the overall pattern of voting that has tended to be associated with larger Liberal majorities than used to occur in years gone by.

Mr. Mathwin: You can't say that about Dover Gardens.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The voting pattern in Dover Gardens has been relatively stable during the whole period. Some variation has occurred from election to election, but the situation in 1962 and 1965 was about the same as it is now. There has not been the large change there has been in areas like Murray Bridge, parts of the South-East, and other country areas of the State. Voting patterns can change differentially again, and it may well be that in the future the Labor Party will suffer once again the disadvantage that arises under a single-member district system from a differential concentration of majorities. Once a single-member district system is accepted with one vote one value, the consequences of that system must be accepted. I have always said that in terms of the interests of the Parties the current distribution, despite the apparent anomalies, is relatively fair, and I have never said anything other than that about the current distribution.

When looking to the future, however, I believe we should consider the principles to be established on a permanent basis, with these principles being implemented by people independent of the Parliament, because what Parliament has demonstrated over the years is an inability to keep sticky political fingers out of the distribution to be made. That has been demonstrated not only in this Parliament but in other States and in other countries. No-one would contemplate that the member for Kavel, if he had the power to implement a redistribution, would agree to implement a redistribution that went against his own interests. His complaints about the current Bill demonstrate clearly he would not do that. If we are to establish principles that are to apply permanently, the only principles we can establish are those of the kind set out in this Bill. If it is argued that there ought to be a condition that no Party can govern unless it has 50 per cent of the vote, it should really be argued that there should not be single-member districts but there should be multi-member districts, and some kind of proportional representation.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you deny that was the argument used in the past by your Party to advance its principle?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think my colleagues and my Party have developed in the attitude we have expressed on this question.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You don't deny it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am aware of the quotations given by the honourable member and I am aware of the policies my Party has adopted in previous years.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You are aware of the argument you used to justify it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am prouder of my Party's present policies than I was of the policies 10 years ago, but I think that the concentration the honourable member has on the past is particularly arid. It is all one-sided. He does not care to detail the dreadful history of his Party in this matter, and the dreadful way in which a minority of the State has been able to exercise political power and control during a considerable part of our history.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You want to pay us back by doing the same thing in your own way.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member assumes that because he would gerrymander that anything anyone else puts up must have something crook about it. We must recognise that not everyone has the same motives as the member for Kavel has. As a general principle, however, I find these regurgitations of past statements to be

an arid performance and they have certainly done nothing to contribute to the general quality and tenor of the debate.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You haven't said anything yet.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member would not listen even if I did. If he thinks he is listening, he certainly has not heard, because what is said does not get through that cranium, or whatever is the process of intellectual absorption, of the honourable member, and it is a peculiar one, to say the least. If the honourable member and the Leader wish to ensure that no Party can govern other than with 50 per cent of the vote, they are really committing themselves to a straight proportional representation system as the appropriate method of election. We have had this argument before about the determination of membership of this House, and the arguments against proportional representation in the popular House are substantial.

I do not want to rehash those arguments; suffice to say that this Bill does not contemplate that proportional representation should be ruled out of account, because amendments to the Bill can take place without a referendum, provided that the Chief Justice's certificate is given that the changes proposed do not alter the principle of equal-sized districts or the principle of districts containing the same number of members. It would be possible for members of some future Government to introduce a system under this Bill, without it having to go to a referendum, by which the State was divided into five electorates of 11 members each, with a system of proportional representation applying. Basically, what the Leader and the Deputy Leader are saying is that the principle that should apply is the proportional representation principle. A single-member district system tends normally not to produce an evenly balanced House such as we have at present, but tends to exaggerate the effect of political swings. A swing of any given percentage will normally produce a greater percentage change of seats under a single-member district system than will be the case under a proportional representation system. There are other arguments against this.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You wouldn't win.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is obsessed with how to organise boundaries so as to win, whether that means winning Government or keeping his seat. I cannot agree that the law of this State should be determined to fit in with the obsessions of the honourable member. That is simply not good enough. The advantage of the single-member district system is that a swing within a community will produce a sufficient changeover of seats so that the Government changes, normally with the previous Government having a working majority and with the new Government still having a working majority. That has been the normal experience under a single-member system, and the situation in which there is an evenly balanced House is fairly rare.

It is easier to swing seals under a single-member system than it is under a proportional representation system, and there are many other advantages of a single-member district system compared to a proportional representation system that I do not intend to detail, because we are not arguing about them. If the honourable member and his colleagues wished to be consistent in the matter, they would say, "Okay, it is never going to be possible, because of the problem of differential concentration of the majorities and the way in which those differential concentrations alter

over the years, to ensure with absolute certainty that about 50 per cent of the vote produces a change of Government under a single-member system."

Mr. Goldsworthy: The only argument you've ever advanced to justify it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has never seen a Labor Government elected in this State with less than 50 per cent of the preferred votes. The honourable member has seen year after year in the history of this State conservative Governments elected with a minority of votes, and yet he has the gall to say that this is the Government that is gerrymandering. The honourable member is a member of the Party that gerrymanders. This is the basic, fundamental, democratic principle in this Bill, which has been acknowledged by the reform group within the Liberal Party over the years and supported by them. It was supported by a pamphlet that the honourable member for Mitcham helped to write some years ago along with, I think, a gentleman by the name of Mr. Reid. I am not sure of the actual history of that pamphlet, but I remember it. It was a good pamphlet and to the credit of the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He didn't put his name on it, though.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member for Mitcham, who represents a Liberal interest somewhat different to that of the Leader and Deputy Leader, does not believe this legislation involves gerrymandering. For the first time in the history of this State we have the prospect of establishing a system whereby redistributions have to be done on a regular basis; where they have to be done by people independent of political control; where the decisions of the electoral commission automatically have the force of law; where those decisions have to be determined on the basis of clear-cut principles and applied fearlessly without favour to either side; where protection is provided in the legislation for appeals to the Full Court should there be any apparent miscarriage of justice.

In the application of these principles this is a historical occasion in the annals of democracy in this country and in this State: the very first time in the history of this country that action has been taken, not only to implement a democratic system, but to ensure its continuity. And, what do we get from that section of the Opposition the honourable member for Kavel and the Leader are associated with? What is crook about this? They do not see the principles; they never have seen the principles of this particular matter because they have been associated with the implementation and justification of poor policies and because they have been elected, always, under an unfair electoral system.

That is the reason many of them are here today, and they recognise the only way they can stay as members of this House is to give an extra weight to the country vote. And, in order to stay, they are prepared to give the extra weight to the country vote and put forward all sorts of rationalisations to justify their position. The gerrymanders are over so far as this State is concerned, and all the meagre opposition that we are getting from the Leader and the Deputy Leader arises simply, in large measure, because some personal interests among the Opposition are going to be adversely affected by this Bill.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Yes, the interests of country people.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There will be more Liberal members in the city. The principle of this Bill is that a person's vote has the same weight no matter where he lives, or resides, and that people are what count so far as the value of votes are concerned. That is the basic

principle of the Bill, a democratic principle. It is the first time that it is to be applied in a permanent form in this State, in a way which cannot be undone effectively by future politicians who want to indulge in gerrymanders. The thing that really gripes the honourable member for Kavel is not so much the nature of the redistribution that is proposed, but the fact that it is going to be so difficult to alter the principles on which future redistributions are going to be taken in this State. No doubt the member for Kavel may, when the political pendulum swings in the future and his Party is more popular with the people, find himself saying, "It wasn't as bad as all that", but for the time being it is a pity we do have to put up with arguments that are no more than rationalisations that the honourable member feels about his own political future.

I support this Bill. I am proud to support it. I think it is a credit to this State and this Parliament, and I think it will ensure the continuation of a truly democratic system for the election of Governments in this State for a very long time indeed. I am proud that that basic principle is implemented in the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The debate on this Bill so far has been what one can only term an anticlimax, and that is often the way, I have found in my experience in this House, on measures that are crucial. I must say that the Minister of Mines and Energy put a bit of vim and vigour into what he said but, apart from that, we have had speeches from the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition which have been puzzling to me and which have left me bewildered as to where the Liberal Party really stands on this matter. It may well be that the member for Victoria, who is to speak after me, and other members will be rather more forthright, certainly more than their Leader was, in saying what they really think about the Bill. I have said before in discussing this topic (I probably said it last Wednesday in debate on the Bill introduced by the Leader of the Opposition and I have said it publicly) that the attitude of Liberal Party members on this matter is absolutely crucial to any question of reconciliation between the Liberal Movement and the Liberal Party in South Australia.

Despite my experience, I had hoped that the Leader of the Opposition would spell out plainly, when he spoke leading for his Party, just what his Party believes in this matter. But what did we get from him instead? We had two proposals for amendment, both of which were entirely vague. One is some kind of proposal that the commission must make what is tantamount to a political decision, that is, that it should ensure that the Party with the most votes should win the most seats. The Minister has dealt with this argument. The answer to it is that if we want to get an exact mirror of opinion in the community (not just for and against a Party, but a mirror divided into a number of segments) we go to some system of proportional representation. That will give the best reflection of opinion in the community but, as the Minister said, there are several disadvantages about that, such as the question of instability of government, because of the lack often of clear-cut majorities, the question of members in a multi-member district really working against each other rather than in the interests of their constituents, etc.

When I first came here there were members who had been elected here on the basis of multi-member districts and they said that it was not a good idea. I do not think that any honourable member would advocate, certainly not publicly,

multi-member districts; yet, that is the only practicable way in which the Liberal Party can get what it wants. From what I know of it at present, the Leader's proposal on that matter is of no point whatever. The other question he raised was that of country representation. The Deputy Leader, who called the Bill a travesty and who obviously hated every line of it (although he said that he would vote for the second reading: one can only imagine the kind of discussions that must have gone on in their Party room about it)—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I wasn't going to say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. The Deputy Leader was far more forthright in discussing this matter but, if this is what the Liberal Party is working up to and it proposes some measure that will increase the size of the House of Assembly, I would not support that. I believe that the South Australian Parliament is large enough already and that there is no justification for another increase in its size. It is only about seven or eight years since we increased the numbers from 39 to 47 and, just for the sake of preserving some of the seats of present members of this Parliament, I would not in any circumstances be willing to accept an increase in the size of the House. It would be a waste of public money, for no benefit at all.

Mr. Rodda: Would you like to tell us whom you'd like us to get rid of?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, that is not a matter for me at all. I bear no ill will toward any individual member of any Party in this Parliament, especially the member for Victoria, who is one of my oldest friends—

Mr. Mathwin: That's the kiss of death.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think that the Opposition Liberal Party is in trouble over this Bill.

Mr. Rodda: We're in trouble over it, all right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am pleased that the member for Victoria is being rather franker about this than his Leader and even the Deputy were, although the Deputy's reluctance to use his words showed through clearly. The fact is (and they know it) that this Bill is within four corners of the policy of their Party as it stands, on both a Commonwealth and a State level. I quoted them last week, and I will quote them again, because there can be no doubt whatever that the policy of their Party is in line with the principles in the Bill. The following is what the Liberal Party says in its Federal platform:

An electoral system should be maintained which guarantees substantial equality of voting powers, with regular redistributions based on numbers of electors.

If that is not one vote one value, to use the normal description of the system, I do not know what is. In its State platform the Liberal Party says:

Democratic and responsible Government based on an electoral system which guarantees as nearly as possible:

- (i) the right to equality of representation for each elector in the State irrespective of where he lives;
- (ii) that each vote shall have an equal electoral value in determining government.

That is precisely what the Bill sets out to do. I know that all of us are inclined to suspect the motives of our opponents, especially our political opponents, and we look carefully at any measure that is brought in by them, particularly if it goes to something as fundamental as this. I have looked at this Bill, I have studied it over a period, and I can see nothing in it which could be regarded as a trap or which gives the Labor Party or any other Party an inbuilt advantage (certainly not in the long run, but if we look at the present voting patterns perhaps we can make

out some kind of argument). The reason for that is obvious: a system of one vote one value, that is, dividing the total number of electors by the number of seats and allowing a tolerance, must, of necessity, be the fairest system we can imagine. We support the Bill, and I am proud to think that it has been introduced and that it will go through because of the support of L.M. members. Of course, it will be passed in the House, anyway, but it will not be passed in another place without L.M. support.

I am pleased indeed to be the member of a Party that is willing to support this proposal. It is something I have advocated, as members know, for well over 20 years now, and the proposal to which the Minister of Mines and Energy referred in his speech contains precisely what is in the Bill. The member for Victoria may be interested to know that I regret that my name was never put on that pamphlet; certainly, I supported it then and I support it now. My Party's declaration of aims says the same things in other words, namely:

The Liberal Movement believes that all should have an equal voice in the choice of those who govern.

That is only putting in another way what the Liberals themselves say in their policy and what the Government has put in this Bill. I say to the Liberal Party (I have said this before, but I believe it bears repeating) that I have sufficient faith in my political philosophy to believe that, given a fair electoral system, we can win a majority of the votes in this State and form a Government. That is a fundamental belief that I have. We are good enough to do it and we can do it. I can only believe that the Liberals themselves have so little faith in whatever they believe in that they do not think they can attract majority support in South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: We did at the last election.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not quite know what the honourable member means by that: I understand his Party got about 30 per cent of the vote; but certainly, if any of us likes to think a little ahead (and we are all thinking about the next Commonwealth election), is there any member on this side of the House who does not think that between the Liberal Movement and the Liberal Party, and maybe even the Country Party, there will not be a majority of votes in South Australia? Of course there will be. If that can happen in a Commonwealth election, why can it not happen in a State election as well? It can, if we have faith in what we believe in and are prepared to go out and work to present a good image to the electors of this State—not the sort of negative, defensive, “hang on to what we have” image that the Liberal Party has been projecting for so long but a positive one that is prepared to give the Government a go and beat it fairly. That is the greatest ambition I have in politics today because, if we can fight the Government fairly and squarely, we can beat it and give this State a good Government, something which we have not now. That is all I need to say at this stage of the debate; it may well warm up later and we may get the real feelings of members of the Liberal Party as the debate continues; but the Liberal Party must look at the terms of the Bill. Neither of its speakers so far has looked at the Bill, but it seems to me not to have any traps in it. It certainly entrenches these principles in the Constitution, and that is right. We set up the fairest Electoral Commission that I can think of—comprising, in all probability, the senior puisne judge (or a senior puisne judge), the Electoral Commissioner, and the Surveyor-General. That is the traditional Electoral Commission that we have used in this State.

Mr. Evans: Two of them are, in effect, subject to Party appointment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but, if we look at the Bill, we see that all decisions must be concurred in by the Chairman of the commission, who is a judge and who is subject finally to appointment by the Government as well. However, it ill becomes the member for Fisher to make a comment of that nature, because the Bill which he supported in 1968 set up a commission.

Mr. Evans: I was one who gave some trouble and did not wish to support the Bill. I supported it only because of your pressure.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, the honourable member did support the Bill. He did not make these complaints then or, if he did not, he does now. What fairer composition does he suggest? It is difficult to think of anything fairer than the composition of the Electoral Commission we have here. The terms of reference are conventional, and we all know that it is impossible to tell whether a commission has stuck rigidly to them or not, because they are all vague on all matters of opinion. Certainly, with regard to one, the matter of the numerical size of the electorate, the principle of one vote one value, there is an opportunity of appeal to the Full Court. However, we shall have more opportunity perhaps later in the debate to consider these matters in detail. In the meantime, I indicate again the strong support of my Party and me for the principles of this Bill, and I am looking forward to hearing the real views of members of the Liberal Party.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The member for Mitcham finished on a challenging note, that he is looking forward to hearing the real views of the Liberal Party. I thought the Leader (I did not hear all that he had to say) spelled out fairly what he thought of the Bill. I take the point that the member for Mitcham is perhaps chiding us. It seems to me to be a practice in this place that, if we do not like someone, we should upstage him. I do not say that the member for Mitcham does not like the Leader, but he has made the point that he is not fully on the side of what the Leader had to say. The member for Mitcham further said that the Liberals have so little faith in themselves or their policies that they are frightened of this Bill. The Minister of Mines and Energy said that many or most of us, if it were not for the results of a gerrymander that this Party had been noted for over the years, would not be here. We are looking forwards, not backwards, as there are no marks for looking back.

Not long after 1965, when the member for Tea Tree Gully and I first came to this place, we were treated to a Bill introduced by the late Mr. Frank Walsh, which recognised country representation. I think his Bill provided for 26 country and 30 metropolitan seats but, for some reason, that Bill did not see the light of day. The Minister of Mines and Energy said that most of us are here as a result of a gerrymander. That falls heavily on the ears of country people. I do not apologise for speaking on behalf of country people, for I represent them. They have no greater rights than anyone else has, but this Bill is a savage blow to country people. By way of interjection, I made the point that as many as eight country members could find themselves without seats after the commission had done its job. That would not be the fault of the commission or the country members: it would be the task set in this Bill. The Minister may smile, but someone has done a good job of work in spelling out this piece of democracy, which has pulled the wool over the eyes of the member for Mitcham—and that is something.

Rural people are witnessing a cruel taking away of the privileges of representation they have had in this House for a long time. I have heard used the expression "second rate citizens"; and that is what they will become, because they are scattered far and wide over the State, one of the driest States in the Commonwealth, because of its geography and (I notice the Bill mentions) topography. They will be denied representation. I received a look of surprise from the Minister when I said we could lose eight seats. My mathematics tell me there are between 210 000 and 220 000 electors in the country areas; we will not argue about that. At present, the State enrolment is about 780 000 and, by the time the commission is established and issues its orders as prescribed in the Bill, a quota will be about 17 000. With the 10 per cent tolerance, there will be an upper limit of about 19 000 and a lower limit of about 15 500. In having due regard to stability and degenerating population because young people must leave country areas, it does not take much imagination to see that the upper limits could be in the country areas, thereby aggravating the problem of access to the member.

It is all very well for the member for Mitcham to pull out the Liberal Party platform and say that what is in this Bill is in the platform: the platform that he has quoted sets out to recognise access to members, and one vote one value can be interpreted in many ways. The member for Mitcham is doing what he has done for his own convenience. Country people are extremely angry about this Bill that the Government is foisting on them. The Bill makes a shrewd assessment. My attention was drawn to this when the Minister on the front bench was smiling. New section 83 sets out the matters to be taken into account by the commission. Paragraph (a) provides for:

the desirability of making the electoral redistribution in such a manner that there will exist, as far as reasonably possible, amongst the population of each electoral district, a community of interests (of an economic, social, regional or other kind);

The commission is also to take into account the population of each proposed electoral district. Some country areas are spread so far and wide that one end of the State will not know what the other end is doing. The next matter to be taken into account is:

the desirability of leaving undisturbed as far as practicable and consistent with the principles on which the redistribution is to be made, the boundaries of existing electoral districts;

I find that an extreme paradox, because if we put 19 000 where 11 000 exist now, that will not be on. We cannot put 4 litres of water into a 3-litre bucket. There must be an overflow. The commission has a headache in regard to that provision. Then the commission is to take into account the topography of areas within which new electoral boundaries will be drawn. Other matters to be considered are:

the feasibility of communication between electors affected by the redistribution and their Parliamentary representatives in the House of Assembly and;

the nature of substantial demographic changes that the commission considers likely to take place in proposed electoral districts between the conclusion of its present proceedings and the time when proceedings are likely to be taken for the purpose of making an electoral redistribution.

The sting is in the tail. That provision leads me to believe that the redistribution must make for large country districts. Because of the nature of our every-day life, in those areas this matter must be considered as having most weight. The commission also may have regard to any other matters that it thinks relevant. I find that provision confusing, and it is the gravamen of the Bill that concerns country people.

We were not impressed by the Premier when he introduced the Bill, stating that the matter had been in the Party's policy for a long time; we had arrived at this great day of decision and so would smoke from the House of Assembly, on a broad base, the representatives of country people. Those people in the country will be disadvantaged by this. We find that the redistribution will be based on 47 electoral districts; the growth has taken place in the city; and there is a case for an increase in the number of electoral districts.

I think it can be fairly stated that there is a case for six districts, and it may be taken as a rule of thumb that six will come from the country, with 13 remaining there, on a one vote one value basis. We oppose this taking place at the expense of country people. This matter is recognised in all other States of Australia, and I will refer soon to what happened in Victoria.

I would support an increase in the number of electoral districts in the House of Assembly by six, and the argument can be advanced that perhaps we are over-governed, but the cheapest thing that the people of this State get is their government. We see from the Parliamentary Papers with which we have dealt recently that there has been an increase in the cost, and this has been taken up by Parliamentary offices, but I think that it was shown in the 1974-75 Budget that the cost of government per head of population in this State was about \$1.10. Fancy people getting the member for Stuart for \$1.10! That is the cheapest thing the people of Port Augusta will ever get their hands on. What is wrong with having six more people like him, although not from his side of the House?

I do not mind going out as the member for Mitcham suggested and telling the story, but the cost of representation is not the most expensive thing for which this Parliament appropriates money, and the argument that we are over-governed tends to fall to the ground. We may find that three-quarters of the number of people in the State will be under-represented when this Bill goes on the Statute Book, and unless someone has a change of heart it will go on the Statute Book. The Liberal Movement has indicated that it supports the measure, but I hope that amendments will be moved from this side which will deal with the matters that I am talking about. Members have spoken of their own areas, and in the South-East only two electoral districts could remain, on the basis of the larger upper limit quota, namely, Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge. I suppose it matters nought to the individual, but the people concerned should not suffer. If this is to be my last session in Parliament, so be it, but it should not happen at the expense of country people.

Some people have expressed surprise about a matter of concern that has manifested itself. I refer to the people who have stated that they would secede. On the *This Day Tonight* programme last evening and on radio, it has been stated that there are some silly people in the community and that some people are crackers. No-one has said that those people were doing the right thing, and I think it would be well for someone in the North, say, in Wilmington, to say, "Good luck to them. I am pleased they have had sufficient guts to stand up." We can appreciate the position in which people who have spoken of secession have found themselves. They are crying in the wilderness, and they know that, because of section 123 of the Constitution, it will not be easy to set up a new State.

Mr. Keneally: At one time you complain about how much money is spent in those northern cities, and now you say that the people there are in the wilderness! You should be consistent.

Mr. RODDA: I am not saying that at all. I am merely saying that these people, with their frustrated outlooks, should be commended for the stand they are taking. It may well be that the member for Stuart will find himself Prime Minister of a new State. I know that with his ego he will not take too long to catch on to that. Let us say "Good luck" to those people who have had the intestinal fortitude to stand up, say what they believe in, and bring it to the Government's attention. The people of the South-East are not at all pleased with the Government.

Mr. Keneally: Or their representation.

Mr. RODDA: One may think what one likes about that. However, those people did not seem to reflect that point of view at the recent election. I was interested to look at the library. Arising out of some of the rumblings last Sunday (and I did not know then what was happening in the Stuart District), I refer back to 1902 and to a book entitled *Shall We Hold the South-East?*, written by D. J. Gordon. There was a time when certain people in the South-East talked about moving into the State of Victoria.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How far back do you have to go?

Mr. RODDA: The Minister is not backward in going back when it suits him, especially if it relates to giving one of his horses a smart nosebag. When things are different, they are not the same! Under the heading "Appendices" in the book to which I have referred, the following appears:

The question, which has been put in a series of nine forceful articles by Wuronga in *The Register*, has excited the liveliest interest throughout the whole of South Australia. The discussion on it is also, of course, being closely watched in Victoria. The title selected is one which exactly expresses the problem now set before the people of this State—

that is, South Australia—

Shall we hold what we already have, or let it pass into the hands of others? In other words, shall the trade of the South-East be retained by South Australia, which has for more than 60 years been responsible for its public works, including railways, extensive drainage reticulation, harbour facilities, schools and postal arrangements; or shall it be to a large extent quietly absorbed by Victoria, and become a perquisite of Melbourne merchants?

I was interested in a limerick which is referred to in this book and which is described by Wordsworth over Rob Roy's grave, as follows:

Because the good old rule
Sufficeth them, the simple plan—
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.

We find ourselves in the same position as Rob Roy: the Government is taking it away, and we are trying to stop this happening. The Premier has said many times that State boundaries are illogical. That may well be. Along with our friends from the North, and despite all the ramifications of section 123 of the Commonwealth Constitution, if we are to be denied this representation (I know that the Deputy Premier, who is a friend of mine, did not leave us for this reason), we may have to look to Mr. Dick Hamer and his Victorian Parliament.

Mr. Keneally: Is that a threat?

Mr. RODDA: No, it is not. It may be that we will be far better off. We could adopt the Murray River as a State boundary. Then, all you people can sit here in the city of Adelaide, the abortion city, with its gay activists. If that is what the Minister thinks about country people, and the Government does not want us, we do not want to stay here. One vote one value sounds so theoretical, and has the support of the Liberal Movement. The member for

Mitcham has already said that this will be a condition of any reconciliation of our attitudes. However, if members of the Liberal Party must sell out their people for such a reconciliation, I know that I will certainly stick to my people. I was interested in the Liberal Movement's position: it won a seat in the Legislative Council. It gained 140 631, which gave it 2.466 of a quota. The Liberal Party obtained 211 467 votes, which gave it 3.7 per cent of a quota.

I was interested to see that, in the country seats (as they soon will have been), they polled 24 860 votes on the Saturday night. I believe that that figure rose to about 28 000 votes. Unfortunately, however, I have not been able to obtain the other figures. Because they liked Mr. Martin Cameron (although there was this divergence of voting), he obtained 40 000 votes, and the votes that gave the Liberal Movement the second seat obviously came from country people.

It is all very well for this new-found Party to base itself on the city. However, it is also enjoying the privilege in another place of having had 40 000 country people support it. But those country people got scant consideration when they met at Bordertown to discuss the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill. They got a big raspberry from the Liberal Movement members of the Upper House! Those members are not, therefore, held in the highest of esteem by the country people to whom I have spoken. The Opposition will support the second reading of the Bill, although its members intend to move certain amendments in Committee.

Mr. Keneally: Are you going to—

Mr. RODDA: I am not arguing with the principle of setting up the commission. However, I am concerned that the Government, with the population increase that has occurred, has not had the courage to examine the matter. This redistribution is being made at the expense of country people. Despite the Minister's statement (it could not be called an assurance) that eight seats would be involved, when one looks at the matter mathematically and at the contents of this Bill, one would not be surprised—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You admit your mathematics are crook, though?

Mr. RODDA: I do not admit that: only the Bill is crook, when it does this sort of thing to country people. We have here a 47-seat House. It is interesting to look at the Victorian Bill. Last year, that State set out to divide its metropolitan area into 49 seats. Indeed, they set out a quota of 28 000 electors for each district, the remainder of the State to be divided into 32 seats, giving an increase of eight seats in the new Parliament. It based this on a country quota of 24 500 electors on a closely-knit seat. If this continued, I would not mind becoming a part of that State.

Mr. Keneally: A 10 per cent tolerance on 28 000 would be 25 200, and that's not much different from the 24 600 that you're talking about.

Mr. RODDA: I am referring to the sparsely-populated areas of Victoria, the districts of which have a 15 per cent tolerance.

Mr. Keneally: I see.

Mr. RODDA: The tail is going with the hide in this situation. If this Bill passes, I say to the member for—

Mr. Keneally: The new State of Stuart!

Mr. RODDA: Yes—that he should start learning to ride those camels. I hope he will do so and not neglect his constituents. However, it will not be possible for people like me and my colleagues, who have been charged

with the responsibility of representing people, to carry out the extra-curricula activities that attach to representation in this day and age. The duties of a member of Parliament far exceed just sitting in Parliament and examining Bills. There are people from my side of politics who will argue that our duty is to make laws and to look at Statutes. My experience is that the member who does that is not long in Parliament. This Bill brings about a grave democratic denial to people in far-flung areas of the State. I support the second reading but am greatly concerned about what it metes out to people who are not living in built-up areas.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I speak to the Bill with many doubts about many aspects of it. I agree with certain of its provisions and support them wholeheartedly; however, even in the clauses I support, the provisions could have been more positive. My study of the Bill shows that it is rather vague in many respects. It is vague about who shall be members of the commission to the point where I do not believe that the Chairman must necessarily be a top judge but can be any Supreme Court judge. That clause could have been stronger. Other minor aspects of the Bill could have been expressed more positively, but I will not spend much time on that aspect, because I do not believe I am qualified to argue those points.

Setting up an independent commission is a step forward. I have always been appalled by the interference of politics in electoral redistributions; however, I am open minded about this matter. Setting up the commission will solve many of the problems that exist in this direction. Because the commission will operate on a full-time basis it will be expensive to operate, but it is a good and correct step forward. The clauses that set up the commission could be expressed somewhat more strongly. It will oversee, examine, and report on the distribution of districts. Boundaries will change as time goes on, and a full-time, properly conducted commission watching over boundaries is a good concept. Many of the aspects of how the commission is to operate concern me. New section 83 (a) provides:

(a) the desirability of making the electoral redistribution in such a manner that there will exist, as far as reasonably possible amongst the population of each electoral district, a community of interest (of an economic, social, regional or other kind);

Under the one vote one value system, it will be difficult to adhere to that principle. How far do we go with "community of interest" in country areas? When considering towns such as Mount Gambier we must also consider the surrounding countryside, so how are we to consider community of interest in that larger area? It will be a difficult decision for the commission to make. Will the commissioners be able to decide between the interests of the people of a city the size of Mount Gambier and the interests of fishermen in the small town of Cape Northumberland? Should both areas be incorporated? I therefore have severe doubts about this aspect of the Bill, and believe that the commission will have to give the matter considerable thought. Those of us in country areas who believe we are losing representation in Parliament will have to push this council to the fore before the commission in an attempt to gain recognition and to have our story heard. Paragraph (b) of new section 83 provides:

the population of each proposed electoral district;

I suppose, in some respects, the population of the electoral district must be considered, even though people are giving the right to vote to a separate section of the district. To consider the population can be extremely dangerous, because the percentage of population that can-

not vote varies from time to time. Young people grow up and become voters. In other areas young people have many children who cannot vote, so the population percentage is high compared to the number of voters. However, the situation changes over a period of 10 or 15 years, and electoral redistributions will be made purely and simply because of such changes.

In our community are a considerable number of migrants who need representation. I do not deny the necessity of these people's being represented, but I feel rather strongly against giving them voting power when they are aliens in our community and are unwilling to become part of it. I feel rather strongly about this subject and do not detract from the statement that I do not believe aliens should be able to elect people to Parliament. If aliens want the right to vote or to be represented directly in Parliament, they should become true members of our community. People who have not been here long enough to qualify in that regard do not come into this category. With Australia's immigration programme at a low ebb, there will not be many people in this category (people who have not yet exceeded the time limit for becoming Australian citizens). My objection is directed mainly against migrants who have been here for several years and have exceeded the time allotted for recognition but still have not done anything about it. These people come from many countries and seek freedom in Australia and the right of free choice to work as they please, where they please, how they please, and to set up in business and to partake of all the freedoms for which the young men of our country have fought for many years. If such people want to come to Australia and enjoy these luxuries they have a responsibility to become a true part of our society and should become naturalised, thereby gaining the right to vote at our elections. New section 83 (c) provides:

the desirability of leaving undisturbed as far as practicable and consistent with the principles on which the redistribution is to be made, the boundaries of existing electoral districts;

Those of us in the country who have studied this measure and know what its effect will be must surely believe that paragraph (c) is something of a joke. It refers to the question of the desirability of leaving undisturbed the boundaries of existing electoral districts, but later in the Bill we find that we will lose about six country seats. So, paragraph (c) is nothing but a joke. I honestly do not know how the Commissioners will be able to take into account that paragraph while at the same time dispensing with six electoral districts. New section 83 continues:

(d) the topography of areas within which new electoral boundaries will be drawn;

(e) the feasibility of communication between electors affected by the redistribution and their Parliamentary representatives in the House of Assembly;

This is another provision in connection with which country people will have to make strong representations to the Commissioners, because it allows consideration to be given to the wide open spaces of country areas. Virtual consideration to a certain amount of weighting for country people is written into the Bill. Surely the term "feasibility of communication between electors" suggests that consideration must be given to a certain amount of weighting for country areas, because of the difficulty of communication. Strong representations will be made to the Commissioners in connection with that paragraph. The member for Brighton—

Mr. Gunn: He was telling half-truths and untruths.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The correct title is "the Minister of Mines and Energy".

Mr. Gunn: The Minister for hot air.

Mr. VANDEPEER: The Minister made some outstanding statements. He proved to me that the system being introduced would create a situation where a Government gaining less than 50 per cent of the total vote would be able to govern, and he also approved of that. He seemed to think that that was the right thing but at the same time he proved that the difficulty of communication between country electors should be considered when boundaries are drawn. Paragraph (f) provides:

the nature of substantial demographic changes that the Commission considers likely to take place in proposed electoral districts.

I presume that this is to be considered with the 10 per cent tolerance above or below the quota. The Minister of Mines and Energy spent much time in dealing with the differential concentration of majorities and the effect that it had on elections. This factor is of prime importance when drawing up a redistribution Bill and when deciding how the redistribution should be made. It is a very complex problem. In this connection, I have been appalled at the skulduggery which has gone on in the past and which is being perpetrated in this Bill. Let us not deceive ourselves; we know that the differential concentration of majorities is a problem, and we also know that in the metropolitan area the size of an electoral district has a big effect on what the total result from that district will be. The proportion of Labor seats and the proportion of Liberal seats will be different in a 45-seat House from what they will be in a 55-seat House. This is the problem that the Minister of Mines and Energy called the differential concentration of majorities.

A situation where we have areas of Labor votes and areas of Liberal votes is the complete opposite of a situation where we have spread throughout the community one right-wing voter for one left-wing voter. If the total population was evenly distributed as between voters of the different types and if one Party gained more than 50 per cent of the vote in an election, that Party would hold 100 per cent of the seats. We would all agree that that would not be a fair go. The 49 per cent of the population requires representation. So, under this theory, in all cases we do not have fair representation just because there are electoral districts of equal size. The Minister of Mines and Energy virtually said this when he said that, due to the differential concentration of majorities, it was not necessarily certain that one vote one value would enable a Government gaining more than 50 per cent of the votes to govern. His outstanding statement should be well remembered, and I was surprised to hear it.

Many people do not understand the skulduggery that has gone on in the past in deciding electoral redistributions. After Edwin Gibbon Wakefield conceived the idea of commencing a colony here, the control of the colony was in the hands of very few people; it was a situation somewhat similar to that of a large company today, and it could not have been otherwise. As the colony grew, it could not have been otherwise than that those in charge of business and providing the major part of investment in the new colony naturally should also have the major part of the say in the government of the colony; very few people would dispute this. This feeling grew in the colony throughout its history, and today I would be willing to admit that the feeling stayed in the colony somewhat too long, but there were reasons for it.

Mr. Chapman: Do you mean "colony" or "Connelly"?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I mean "colony". At present we have another situation developing. It is being said that this type of operation will work. Under the Government's approach to so-called industrial democracy, we will have a board constituted of two groups totally opposed to one another. There would have been a similar situation in the early colony if those providing the money and the business enterprise had not had the power to govern. This Bill provides for the number of seats to remain at 47.

Mr. Chapman: That is what they say.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Let us hope, for the sake of the man in the country, that they do not win this time. What will happen to country representation under this system? It looks as if we will lose six of our members. The removal of such a large proportion of country representation will be a cruel operation. How can this Government continue in such a way? We require a redistribution of seats in the metropolitan area—

Mr. Wotton: We do not need a massacre.

Mr. VANDEPEER: That is what this Bill will do to the quality of representation in country areas.

Mr. Chapman: You are almost doing it Margaret Whitlam style.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, almost. Several seats in the metropolitan area have about 30 000 electors as against 12 000 in my own district, which is too much of an inequality.

Mr. Jennings: A little bit of inequality is all right?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, I will concede you that.

Mr. Chapman: In other respects they are of equal value?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes. We have a 50-50 House, equally divided on a total vote. I support my Deputy Leader in his remarks: what more equitable situation could we have than that? Will it be anywhere near that situation when the redistribution is completed? The country people are disturbed, though they recognise the need for more representation in the city. The member for Victoria has spoken about a larger House, and he has said that South-Eastern people will have to consider looking to Victoria. Secession in the northern areas has been talked about, and why not? If they disapprove in a free country why should the people concerned not talk of secession? Our original settlers came here for similar reasons. They wished to secede but they did not actually do so; they sailed across the waters and settled a new colony to find new freedoms, the freedoms they had lost and believed they could never regain in their own country.

Mr. Chapman: It is time we had a reshuffle.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I think it is high time. I think the South-Easterners could easily get the people living south of the Murray to join with them in secession—

Mr. Chapman: Donnie is stacking the deck at this stage.

Mr. VANDEPEER: That is right. People living in the area south of the Murray are free of the pollution that is rife in the metropolitan area. The people living in the metropolitan area who choose to live there make the pollution they complain about. I think people in the metropolitan area are jealous of people living in the country because the people in the country have the type of living that everyone would like.

Mr. Chapman: We have freedom of speech all right.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, and we also have the type of living that I think the hippies are looking for, but I do not think they have realised it is there in the country. We

have clean living, the open air and freedom, but we do not have the squalor found in some hippie colonies today. I think the Premier said this idea of secession was absurd, but what is absurd about it? I do not think it is illegal. I do not even consider that the secession of the Rhodesian State from the Commonwealth was illegal. What is illegal about it, provided that the people made a decision that that was what they wanted; there was no majority objection, and there was no revolution? Any control over them by any other Government can surely be severed. They are not tied to any other great power and no more are we tied necessarily to the great power of the metropolitan area of Adelaide. If we wish to secede I say we should secede, and no power in the metropolitan area can stop us. If we decide to secede we shall do so, and there is nothing the metropolitan area can do about it. That is the talk being considered in the country areas.

The cruel amputation of country representation being perpetrated by this Government will destroy our representation and it will make it impossible for Parliamentary members to service their electors and give true representation to their constituents. This Government talks of democratic rights, but I do not think it cares two hoots for democratic rights provided it gets its own way, and that it provides the power in the metropolitan area, which has so many problems of urban sprawl, pollution and traffic brought about by its own functioning. In return it is going to destroy the representation of the country people. I stand up for the rights of the country people to retain their present representation.

When we say that the boundaries of the existing districts should remain as much as possible as they are I believe that that representation will have to be maintained if the electoral commission is to consider how the provisions of the Bill will work. At the present time my district is about 160 kilometres long and if it is increased to about 240 km how will I be able to service the electorate? My district will contain more country towns and I will have more people to assist at a time of high unemployment. With problems in assistance to the dairy and beef industries, as well as community welfare, coming into Parliamentary offices in such a rash there will be even more difficulty in doing anything about them because there is no money.

How are we to handle this work in the country if the districts are enlarged? I believe I must stand up and speak for my people to maintain the representation that is being so cruelly taken from us with complete disregard for the feelings of the people in the country, with complete disregard for community welfare, complete disregard for the unity of the people of South Australia and the freedoms and democratic rights the people of this State have always considered to be the basis of the life and society we have developed over the years.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): It is said of some that they come in like a lion and go out like a lamb, but I found that the previous speaker did just the opposite; having started in an extremely moderate tone, he finished up sounding very much like Robert E. Lee. One could imagine, shall we say, "Vandepeer's Confederates" rowing across the Murray River with muffled oars some time in the not far distant future. Who is to be General Grant or General Sherman, and who to provide the dashing Yankee boys, I am not sure. However, I fail to see how germane the talk of secession really, is to the whole matter of this debate.

Getting back to fundamentals, it seems to me that, when we are talking of electoral reform, we must be concerned for two types of elector who might be significantly discriminated against. First, there is that type of elector who is distinguished by his Party preference, and his rights should be respected. Where his Party has obtained a majority of votes and yet not a majority of seats, there is something wrong with the electoral system. I heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (rather more mathematically precise than I have found him in the past; he seems to be learning in these electoral matters) suggest that, on the results of the previous State election, there is no significant penalty to either Party so far as the existing distribution is concerned. Whatever the truth of that matter (and I am not here to contend with his mathematics), it is true that one possible component in electoral disability is where a person's Party suffers a significant electoral disability.

However, that is not the only component of electoral disability. People are electors not only by virtue of their support of a certain Party, but also by virtue of where they happen to live. Therefore, it is possible that a person could be discriminated against as an elector if his say in the ultimate decision-making process (which is a State election) is less than that of a person living in another district. This will occur if the enrolment in his district is significantly above the enrolment in another person's district, and the member for Millicent in fact made reference to the disparity between enrolments in his district and in districts such as mine or that of the member for Tea Tree Gully, and so on.

When one comes to rectify these two problems, one finds that the matter of rectifying the disability resting upon an elector as a result of being in a swollen district (a district significantly above that of the average) is rather easier to tackle formally by way of legislative amendment than is the other. In fact, this matter has received a good deal of attention in the United States of America over the past 15 years or so, resulting from the historic *Baker v. Carr* case in, I think, 1962. Until that time, particularly in State Legislatures (less so in the Federal Legislature, the House of Representatives), there were quite significant rural gerrymanders in many of the States. Louisiana was always notorious for it; in fact, the infamous Governor Hughie Long was able to maintain his power-base because of the weighting of the vote in the Parish electorates in the northern regions of the State. Hawaii was another case where I understand that at one stage 7 per cent of the electors could have theoretically controlled the Legislature because of the way in which the boundaries were drawn.

In the historic case of *Baker v. Carr*, the United States Supreme Court ruled that electors could not be discriminated against in this way, and in fact it has been demonstrated in the American system since that time that, where a State refuses to reapportion its districts in accordance with a Supreme Court order, the Supreme Court can rule invalid any legislation carried by the Legislature so elected by a weighted electoral system. The justification for this whole procedure is the simple common democratic procedure that all electors should be equal when they go to the ballot box, when they undergo their participation in the fundamental decision-making process. This is something which has been carried out in a very thorough way in the United States, without any consideration as to the electoral advantage or disadvantage of the major Parties.

It is generally conceded, of course, that an electoral weighting would favour the Republicans as against the

Democrats, but that would not necessarily be the case in the South. Long, for example, was a Democrat. So this has proceeded not as a response to the first of the two matters I have referred to, the penalty which can rest upon an elector because he happens to vote for a certain Party which in turn is discriminated against by the electoral system, but rather the penalty which can rest upon an elector because he happens to live in, say, Morphett Vale instead of at Nora Creina Bay, in the District of Millicent. Basically, that problem is the one this legislation seeks to correct for all time in South Australia. It has my support because, quite apart from Party advantage, it seems to be a basic democratic right that my vote should count for no more and no less than that of the vote of anyone else when we go to the ballot box.

That will not be the case, however, if I am enrolled in a district which has four, three, two, or even 1.1 times the enrolment of another district. We could never get mathematical accuracy in these things, but this is the ideal for which all Legislatures should strive in making redistribution. This is the ideal which, under this legislation, the commission would strive for in carrying out this redistribution. In relation to the first of the two matters, the matter of whether, quite apart from any weighting of the vote of the city or the country, there is an additional penalty because a person votes for a particular Party, that very much depends on the stroke of the pen of the Electoral Commissioners. If anyone can point to anything in this legislation where this Government has been able to work something in such a way that the commission would be biased towards any Government of the future (whether Labor, Liberal, or of any other political complexion), I wish they would say so.

Mr. Chapman: What about the clause that requires, without any flexibility, 47 seats? That in itself is biased in favour of the Government.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is not.

Mr. Chapman: Of course it is.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course it is not. I hope the honourable member has not yet spoken and that he will explain his philosophy when he speaks in this debate. There are two ways in which voters can be discriminated against: one is in terms of weighting certain districts, making them bigger or smaller than others (which is something this legislation will correct); the other is simply the stroke of the Electoral Commissioners' pen, which can, I agree, gerrymander if it is done in certain ways. The original gerrymander was not based on a rural weighting of the vote: it was the peculiar shape of a district drawn for a particular reason. The Peake gerrymander in 1913 was criticised not because of rural weighting but because the Government was so injudicious to draw the boundaries rather than having them drawn by an independent commission.

Within this legislation we could draw boundaries deliberately to give an advantage to a Party, but would members consider seriously that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court selected by the provisions of this legislation, or the Surveyor-General or a replacement selected by the Chief Justice, or the Electoral Commissioner or his replacement, would be biased toward one Party or the other? The reason for the legislation being complicated is to try to avoid any Government at any time in future being able to stack the electoral commission. If there are loopholes in this legislation in that regard, I should be pleased to hear about them. If there are ways in which the member for Alexandra or any other member can think it is possible

to get at the electoral commission or at the judge of the Supreme Court or the Surveyor-General, please let him say so. I refer to the basic concern of this legislation.

Mr. Vandeppeer: Your vote, with easy access to your Parliamentarian, would have greater value than my vote with difficult access.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Not at all. We are considering decision making in a democracy, and that has nothing to do with access to Parliamentarians. It has to do with what happens on the day the elector is king.

Mr. Vandeppeer: They cast a vote for the Parliamentarian they have easy access to.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That has nothing to do with it. The honourable member and I are subject only to the control of our electors on a particular day when they cast their vote in order to determine whether we continue to represent them or not. Between those times we may listen to representations, but we decide. However, on one day at least every three years (it seems to be happening more often recently) the electors decide, and that is what democracy and the electoral system is all about. This measure is designed to overcome a situation in which a significant penalty is placed on a person because he lives in a specific area. It is a fundamental principle that has been enshrined in decisions of the United States Supreme Court, and it has my wholehearted support.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Having heard the member for Millicent's stirring address and having read and heard the news item today, I suggest the country motto could well be "If at first you don't secede, try, try again." That sort of situation has been mooted in the South-East several times, and perhaps we have not heard the last of it. I believe there is a need for city representation to be strengthened, as some members have acknowledged, but as a country representative I believe that it should not be done at the expense of a substantial part of country representation. I appreciate the problems of the member for Mawson and the member for Tea Tree Gully, both of whom have districts with 30 000 electors. I appreciate their problems of representation, but I believe, too, that a member representing a large area has equally important problems that may vary in their natures.

I agree with the morality of one vote one value, an issue that has been pushed by the Government and Liberal Movement members, but I should be pleased if someone could show me how the value of one vote one value can equate with the value of the vote and the value of representation. I cannot equate them no matter how much I try under the system being introduced by this Bill. People are to be denied access to their member, either because they are too remote or because a district has far too many electors. I believe electors in any district are entitled not only to the vote but also to the value of representation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You don't think much of the Millicent representation now?

Mr. ALLISON: I think much of what members on this side say, and I like to think they are individuals, which is more than I can say for some members.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think that if the member for Millicent had more electors the value of that representation would deteriorate significantly?

Mr. ALLISON: I value the honourable member highly, because he is a good companion in the South-East, and the former member was respected, too. An increase in the number of city electors and a slight reduction in those in country areas would meet the electoral needs of the State more adequately than is being done by this Bill. Because

of the static nature of the country population compared to the city districts, it is more than possible that country seats would be given a higher tolerance and city seats be given a lower tolerance, a situation that would diminish country representation.

After consulting a year ago with the Manpower Division in Adelaide, I found sufficient evidence was available in embryo form (and I am sure the Government could obtain it) to show that electors in a city seat could increase by 1 000 to 5 000, not within the six-year term of revision but within one or two years, with substantial movement across the city from one area to another that would throw this idealistic Bill completely out of kilter.

I am surprised that counter proposals suggested by the Leader of the Opposition were attacked with some hilarity by Government members, despite the fact that the principles involved in his Bill and those involved in this Bill would be remarkably similar, except that this Bill goes much further. I believe it is a move toward entrenching more than is stated in the Bill, because it will also entrench the Labor Party in this State. I shall not discuss the morals of previous Governments because, although I was a member of the electorate then, I am not sufficiently politically aware of circumstances to be able to debate those issues at length.

In my district the proposed reduction will affect the population in about a 50-50 way. Mine is a marginal seat and the Labor Party, Liberal Party, Liberal Movement, and National Country Party supporters will be affected in about equal proportions. They will all suffer, particularly if the district is enlarged, and they will have less effective representation than they have now. I say that because my time in the South-East is absorbed entirely in interviewing people about their problems, dealing with those problems in this House, and engaging in debate.

I have no spare time, and I sympathise with city members who have a population of between 20 000 and 30 000 living in their districts. That is the point at which the problem should first be tackled. I do not see any possibility of being able to increase my personal service should boundaries for country districts be substantially increased and the number of members reduced accordingly. I make a slight issue of the inference in the comments of the member for Kavel concerning the former member for Millicent.

I am sure that the member for Kavel wished to make the point about the member for Millicent that he was a person who fully appreciated the problems of a country district. There is no question in any of our minds on this side that the former member for Millicent was an esteemed man in his district, and served it extremely well. Equally so, there must be the recognition that, by his own words, he acknowledged the problems he had experienced. They were twofold, as I saw it and as I have experienced them in my short time in Parliament, namely, isolation from home, friends and family when serving in a remote electorate. I am here in Adelaide in Parliament for at least three days a week, and isolation from friends and family means isolation from people in the electorate.

I have to be in contact daily with my electorate to deal with the business which comes in each day, and to attempt to solve the problems. I find that day by day and week by week I am falling behind in the important issue of electoral matters, and that is where the work and the people are, and that is where I owe my first allegiance. I, for one, by the honourable member for Kavel's words, did not construe any ulterior motives when he referred to

the former member for Millicent. I think it was a question of respecting his point of view, and we all respect it, because it is relevant to country representation.

The member for Mitcham seemed to me to be a little too smug and too ready to criticise the seeming variance of Liberal speakers on this Bill. I liked the point he made, and I take it as a compliment. The Liberal Party is not bound by Caucus in making its decisions, and if different members of the Liberal Party on this side are seemingly at variance in their approach to this issue, I regard it personally as an indication that this Party is representative and continues to be representative of both city and country electorates. Make no mistake, we are a group of individuals, however much we may be loyal to our own Party and, on an issue as contentious as this one is, I feel bound to represent the people in my electorate who are partly city and partly country people, and one can imagine the problems there.

If the city and country principles on electoral issues are at variance, it is no fault of the members. It is simply the fact that one is representing the whole spectrum of the South Australian community, and doing it well. I will quote the words of the honourable member for Mitcham in the document from which he quoted last Wednesday. The document does not carry his name but three other names, and it was published in July, 1955.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who are the authors of the document?

Mr. ALLISON: Messrs. Jim Bettison, Brian Cox, and Ian Marshman, and I do not know whether they are connected with the Party now. The member for Mitcham went to great pains to claim authorship of the document, because he said that it reported his then and his current point of view. The authority, which was written for circulation only, is a private publication, not a formal publication, so it cannot be considered to be a Party document. The publication states:

The Parliament is not a body which is the master of the people, but a collection of men who are the servants of the people, and the votes which the people cast to elect their members of Parliament are not privileges given to them by the Government, but their democratic right by which they choose their "proxies" . . .

"Proxies" particularly refers to the statement I made that we represent a broad spectrum of people, and the member for Mitcham has said that this is the kind of thing the people expect of their member. I find it humorous that he should criticise people for doing exactly what he claims is the people's right. The document continues:

There is no justification for believing that we should always be in power and our opponents always be denied the legitimate chance of every Party in opposition—a chance to work the machinery of government if they can persuade a majority of electors to support them.

In isolation, it sounds good, and it is dead on line with the Bill. The publication continues:

The results, then, of a Labor victory at the next election would be that we should find ourselves not only saddled with a system of proportional representation which we dislike, but also at a grave disadvantage electorally, because of the system which Labor would almost certainly introduce. Then it might well be impossible for the L.C.L. ever to regain power in this State.

That is entrenched in the 1955 document. Like Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, I think the honourable member is condemned to everlasting perdition by his own words by supporting the Bill today.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I think he would claim those were not words of which he was the author.

Mr. ALLISON: He obviously recognises the power of the Australian Labor Party and the wish of the A.L.P. to attempt some gerrymander, whatever the Minister may have said about the impossibility of that. By supporting the Bill without question and amendment, he is obviously cutting his own throat, as it were, by his own words and by his own prior wishes. He may be a little naive in hindsight to have said that and to have spoken as he has done over the last few days. He said that he had faith in his philosophy today and he said that he had faith in his philosophy of that day, so there would seem to be some variance in his aims. Now he says that he aims to move in; then he was moving out.

I agree with his remarks, however, about a good candidate with a positive approach and good backing (the sort of campaign that he envisaged for any Party that was attacking the Government, wherever it might be). The member for Mitcham says that he subscribes to such a view, so obviously he has had a considerable change of heart since 1955. As one who objects in part but not wholly to the legislation before us, I agree that there is no need for absolute pessimism should the Bill be passed. It is up to anyone who campaigns for any election to set his stool upright and to fight like the devil all the way to the hustings.

As many of us have campaigned in the city and the country, I do not think that we need single out any particular electorate because, obviously, there were some close winners and close losers. Peculiarly to the South Australian situation, I am a little trepidant because, looking at the electoral distribution, I see that there are several areas of heavy concentration of Government voters and of Opposition voters, and not an evenly balanced distribution. The problems facing the commission are very real, and no amount of idealism will be able to convince me that the matter will be easily resolved when these three eminent, reliable, independent, impartial people get together. They have great problems in the redistribution.

My reservations on the legislation are less for what the Bill contains than for the fact that one vote one value is an ideal. I believe that it is an ideal which is impossible to realise, certainly under the terms of the legislation. I do not like the alternative of proportional representation any more than the member for Mitcham did or any more than did the Minister of Mines and Energy earlier in the day when he said that there were many reasons why we should not envisage putting that into operation.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery distinguished visitors in the persons of Mr. G. A. T. Bagier, M.P.; Mr. E. W. Griffiths, M.P.; Mr. J. Garrett, M.P.; Mr. S. Le Marchant, M.P.; and Mr. A. Woodall, M.P., members of a visiting delegation from the United Kindom Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I invite Mr. Bagier, as leader of the delegation, to take a seat on the floor of the House, and I ask the honourable Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition to conduct our distinguished visitor to the Chair and introduce him.

Mr. Bagier was escorted by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Dr. Tonkin to a seat on the floor of the House.

Mr. ALLISON: In continuing the debate on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, I point out that, whatever my personal views on this matter are, I view it with somewhat mixed feelings. I have spent 25 years of my life in a large metropolis of some 700 000 people and another 20

years in what is a relatively isolated country area, Mount Gambier, with three years in typical Australian outback country. So I am in as good a position as any member here to assess the relative merits of representation in various areas, and what it means to those people. But, wherever I lived, whether in a metropolis, in the country, or in remote bush areas, I believed that my member of Parliament should represent me. I was selfish enough to think that he was mine and that he was representing me, as a person. I live in a country area and, of course, I represent a country area, and I am putting the countryman's points of view because, after all, I am their member of Parliament. The country metropolis has some privileges that the more remote areas do not enjoy. I find, in comparison with the city dwellers, that their fellow country dwellers are slightly slower in their mode of life. Certainly, as a group we are less familiar with Government forms and have far less access to Government departments. This is reflected in my own local district office, where residents of the neighbouring Millicent District, who live adjacent to my relatively compact district, flock in regularly for advice and assistance in completing forms and other things that they would otherwise be deprived of.

Heaven only knows that much of the legislation that goes through Parliament contains a tremendous amount of control. Boards of control are being established for the good of the population, some of them questionable, but this places an added burden on the country people, who are somewhat less sophisticated and, the more remote they are from an urban city, as Mount Gambier is, the less chance they have of understanding and compiling the various forms. The need for access to a member of Parliament is certainly there. In the city, anyone can come along to any Government department and obtain first-hand knowledge and, in my own district office, many of the problems could have been answered had people been able to get into a Government department and get a sympathetic hearing. One does not always get that, because young people are not always sympathetic to older people. That is one of the problems of life.

As I have already said, Mount Gambier is a relatively privileged area and for that reason many country people come in expecting immediate assistance, which we are trying to give. However, even so, in my city, I recently pleaded, for example, the case for improved dental services for the aged, and was informed that they were available at local school clinics. But we have been told that Mount Gambier is one of the privileged areas and the remoter areas do not have these school clinics. It is a long-term plan yet to be fulfilled. I have pleaded for a better optical services: the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals have pensioner services, but we do not in Mount Gambier have that testing and prescription service. Similarly, the hearing aid service for testing is not available. I was recently corrected in print in the *Border Watch* by a former member of Parliament for Mount Gambier, who said that I was misinformed, that a hearing aid service was available from the National Acoustics Laboratory, so I immediately wondered why so many patients were coming to me when aid was available elsewhere. I do not need a hearing aid, so I had not inquired.

I have found out, on inquiry, that the next visit to Mount Gambier will not be this week or next week but is tentatively proposed for the second week in December; and that has yet to be finalised. So it could be early in the new year. Therefore, obviously country people are handicapped; they need access to members of Parliament. I have said already

in this debate that people in my district keep me permanently busy from morning to night with a constant flow of inquiries, one after the other. I do not have time for dealing with correspondence (I do that by tape, and I assume that members in other country areas are just as heavily loaded with work as I am. I am not an exception. I also assume that city members with electoral districts of, say, 29 000 electors have a greater problem than I have. I should like to think that their people have access to Government departments and get their problems solved, because they are more sophisticated or because Government departments are more readily available. When I am in town, I find it easier to take my problems to the Government department concerned without pushing them across the House as embarrassing questions. The answer is on the doorstep; the problems do not have to be negotiated in this place. Apropos the hearing aid system, in spite of the excellent service that is provided to the country, I find that I am running a hearing aid service. Indeed, I take hearing aids to the National Acoustics Laboratory, leave them there, get new batteries, have them repaired, and send them to Mount Gambier. This is part of a personalised service for aged pensioners. However, I give just as good a service to a person with a \$2 000 000 or a \$5 000 000 problem. It is important that one is readily available to one's constituents.

If country people are urged to visit the metropolis to have their medical problems solved, I also remind members that a \$20 rail fare, a \$61 air fare, or a \$16 bus fare (for the return journey), plus overnight accommodation, is such that it precludes most pensioners from even contemplating taking advantage of this metropolis-based service. I know the problem of providing medical services to country areas. Obviously, Mount Gambier would have to be one of the favoured areas, because it is a city. However, my sympathy lies not necessarily with Mount Gambier, which is a compact district that does not have the problems that other areas have. This makes me feel freer to defend the cases of my fellow members who represent far more remote areas. Having lived in a bush area, I know how difficult it is to get in touch with the local member of Parliament. I sympathise not only with members but also, and more particularly, with the people who live there. I have said in my concluding remarks that my reservations on this Bill are less to do with the legislation and what it contains than they are to do with its implications and the fact that one vote one value is one of those possibly unattainable ideals.

There are gentlemen's agreements in that Mother of Parliaments in Great Britain. This is one of the more pleasant things about Parliament: there are conventions that we *think should be* abided by. One of the nicer ones is in the United Kingdom, where the Ulstermen's votes are considered not to be the correct thing, and where the university conservative votes were considered not to be the correct thing, either. Should a university vote have been lodged in the House, there was a convention by Conservative members of Parliament that this was not to be accepted. Similarly, if the Ulstermen's votes are lodged in the House an equivalent number of Conservative members of Parliament abstains from voting. Rules do not necessarily have to be included in legislation in order to be abided by.

The question of single-member representation and proportional representation has been dealt with by other members from both sides of the House far more able than I. Single-member representation, I think most of us conclude, is far more acceptable, whereas proportional representation

is fraught with problems. The Minister of Development and Mines referred to this earlier today. It has been stated by my Leader and Deputy Leader that the Bill would certainly bear amendment. However, the member for Mitcham has said that his Party will support the Bill. Lengthy debate on the issue would therefore seem to be relatively unnecessary. However, if country people do not have their point of view stated, and if we are not seen to be observing their wishes and speaking for them, there is something wrong with country representation, whoever the country member may be and from whichever side of the House he may come. I suppose that, when all is said and done, the Bill will pass.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): As the member for Mount Gambier has said, one vote one value is an ideal impossible of attainment. I share that opinion. In all matters in which a decision must be made, the decision rests mainly on the experience that the person involved has had during his life. Therefore, it results in a difference of opinion according to the different experiences of those involved. A matter of principle is involved in relation to this Bill. One person may think that the principle stands on one basis; another person may think that it stands on a different basis. I should like to refer as a basis of comparison (and I think this is a true comparison) to the manner in which the A.L.P. selects its candidates for the House of Assembly in this State. I recall, when I was first a candidate for this House in 1968, a gentleman who was a union member said to me, "I was in a preselection once, but the secretary (or whoever the officer may have been) went to the preselection meeting and laid before it the entire vote of my union, and my union vote was cast against me. As long as I have a breath in my body, I will vote for you in March," and I have no reason to believe that he did not do so.

This is a principle on preselection and the casting of a vote. Is this true one vote one value, when thousands of votes can be cast by one person in one direction? Might I also say, with respect, that you, Mr. Speaker, have become a member of this House in a way that is relevant. I should like to recall an interview with you which was conducted by a journalist and which was reported in the *News* of July 24. You were asked:

Do you feel disappointed that you are not an A.L.P. member?

In reply you said:

I would not say that. I feel this desire which I have had for more than 14 years: to change the Party selection for the local candidate is important. I have spoken with the Premier about this. It is a decision for the State convention, but Mr. Dunstan has said he will personally support me.

If the Premier is to support you, Sir, he must consider that the method being used and the principle involved are wrong. You, Sir, were then asked, "Do you feel a traitor to the A.L.P.?", in reply to which you said, "No, not at all."

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot see the relevance to the Bill of the comments that the honourable member is now making. The House is debating the Bill, and these are personal points of view which the honourable member chooses to express. I cannot see the connection between the honourable member's comments and the Bill.

Mr. RUSSACK: I will connect my remarks with the Bill. As I said at the outset, I am comparing principles of selection and voting—

The SPEAKER: But the principles by which a Party makes its selection have nothing to do with this Bill. That is my point.

Mr. RODDA: I rise on a point of order. You, Sir, are a member of this House, having been elected by the people of Port Pirie, who were concerned about the—

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the honourable member's point of order? The honourable member should come to the point.

Mr. RODDA: I will come to the point quickly. You, Sir, were elected a member of this House on July 12 because the people of Port Pirie agreed that you should be their rightful—

The SPEAKER: I cannot see the point of order. Will the honourable member resume his seat? The honourable member for Gouger.

Mr. RUSSACK: Suffice to say that I consider that a principle was involved in a preselection, where a person's vote was cast in a certain way, with disregard for the people involved, so I say that there is involved with one vote one value a principle that I feel cannot be attained or put into practice. It seems to me that one principle is involved in one situation and another in another situation.

People are of more value than any material assets. People should be considered, not material assets, but I suggest that other factors are involved in the matter of one vote one value. I know that the Premier associates the value with the vote as far as the elected representative is concerned, but I also feel that other matters must be considered. What about the concentration of population in the city? The food for that population is produced in country areas, where there must be a more sparsely populated area, and this must be considered. There is not only the primary producer in a country area to whom consideration should be given in this way. What about the ancillary industries that provide the necessary services, etc., for these people who are involved in producing food? There is difficulty in communication for country areas and, in the main, many of the producers and other people in country areas possibly pay more in taxation on a population basis than do many of their counterparts in the city areas. As I have said, this is not suggesting that people should take second place to material things, but these matters must be considered.

In a debate in this House one evening recently, the Minister of Transport suggested to me that, if I had any control over finance, I would like to have a say in what happened to that finance, in the same way as Government departments wanted to have a say in regard to what happened to finance. Therefore, I say that the taxpayer should have some say, commensurate with the tax that he pays to Government revenue. There are two aspects regarding the value of representation. The first is the representation and service that the member of Parliament can give to his district.

In a country area, this is more difficult and more onerous. The elector in the country is not as closely associated with his member as is the elector in the city regarding distance and telephone communication. In the city, an elector can contact his member by a local call, but in the country it could cost many dollars for a constituent to have a similar conversation with his member. A report in the *News* of July 29 states:

Mr. Dunstan said today the Assembly would still have 47 seats under the Labor proposals. The scheme would mean a sharp drop in the number of country seats in the Assembly.

We take it that there will be less country representation. The report also states:

The Premier went on: "There are country seats at present with about 9 500 voters and city seats with 30 000 voters.

If you bring them to equality in vote value, then there will inevitably be a reduction in the number of country seats." Mr. Dunstan said he was confident the Liberal Movement would support the Government's measures and they would be approved.

I know that the Premier's wishes and hopes there are both realised. The report also quotes the Premier as saying:

He added: "In Parliament, representatives represent electors. All electors should have equal and effective representation within their electorate in the law that governs them." There was no longer any great problem in servicing large electorates. They could be easily travelled, and electors could easily contact country members and get service. In addition assistance to country members from the Government had been improved with electorate offices, travel assistance, free intra-State plane travel and electoral allowances.

I will refer now to some matters concerning my district in support of what I am saying about the difficulty of a country member of Parliament and his contacts with his constituents. In the years that I have been a member of Parliament, I have driven an average of 50 000 kilometres a year. At an average speed of 100 km/h, it would take 10 hours to traverse 1 000 km.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You'd be breaking the law. You would not average 100 km/h, or you would be breaking the law.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am pleased that the Minister has interjected, because it will support my argument: it will take me longer to get over these roads now. The maximum speed is 110 km/h.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's outside a town, and it is 60 within it.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am saying that the major part of my car travel is on country roads, where the maximum speed is 110 km/h, and for the purpose of my argument I am saying that I travel at 100 km/h, taking 10 hours to travel 1 000 km. To travel 50 000 km would take 500 hours, and, on a 40-hour working week basis, I spend 12½ working weeks a year behind the wheel of a car on Parliamentary business in my district.

Mr. Vandeppeer: You must be a member of a union!

Mr. RUSSACK: I am not.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You ought to be. You ought to be ashamed for not being a member of a union.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am a member of an association involved in my business activities, and that is the equivalent of any association in any other area of industry. Every member has the right to belong to an association. Most of my travelling time is spent after hours when people with set working conditions would not be working. My district is comparatively close to the city, but what about other members such as the members for Frome and Eyre? The District of Eyre covers 48 per cent of the geographical area of South Australia. I have had the privilege of travelling with the member for Eyre and other members of Parliament in a light aircraft all one Sunday and Monday, visiting certain areas and arriving back in Adelaide on the Monday at 11 p.m. We had been in the Eyre District and part of the Frome District for two days while travelling in that aircraft. Country members face difficulties in servicing their districts. What about members who represent a country provincial city?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which ones?

Mr. RUSSACK: Port Pirie, Port Augusta—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They're well represented.

Mr. RUSSACK: —and Whyalla.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Also well represented.

Mr. RUSSACK: We now have an excellent member for Mount Gambier, which is an extremely progressive provincial city. The difference between the Districts of Port Pirie, Whyalla, and Port Augusta and Mount Gambier is that members representing the first three districts travel their major distance in going from Adelaide to their district.

Mr. Keneally: What about—

Mr. RUSSACK: I know the member for Stuart has a country area around his district but, on reaching his district, he has to travel the same sort of distance that is travelled by a city member. Therefore, country members face a more onerous task. I should like to relate my experience last weekend. I left here on Thursday evening and arrived back here this morning after having travelled more than 1 100 km over the weekend. That is an example of what a country member does. One vote one value is an ideal that cannot be attained, because it is a theory.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why is it a theory that cannot be attained?

Mr. RUSSACK: If the Minister is patient, I will explain the reason to him. New section 88 (2) (a) provides:

The Bill does not provide for, or effect, the repeal, suspension or amendment of a provision of this section and the Chief Justice has certified in writing that the Bill does not:

- (i) offend against the principle that the State is to be divided into electoral districts each returning the same number of members to the House of Assembly;
- (ii) offend against the principle expressed in section 77 of this Act by which the number of electors to be comprised in each electoral district upon an electoral redistribution is to be ascertained.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: New section 77 is what you are looking for.

Mr. RUSSACK: Anyway, the Bill provides that there shall be an equal number of electors in each district.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's right.

Mr. RUSSACK: This can be determined at the time of redistribution. I venture to say that that is the only time there would be an equal number of voters in each district because, by the time the first election came about, there would be an inequality in the number of voters.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: By how much?

Mr. RUSSACK: By a considerable number. If this measure passes the commission sits, there is a redistribution next year, and Parliament continues its normal course of three years, I venture to say that, in some districts, the number of voters would differ by thousands.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How many?

Mr. RUSSACK: Let us consider the Districts of Mawson and Tea Tree Gully, which have both doubled in size in, say, 7 years. If the number of 15 000 voters is divided by seven, the result is 2 000 plus. If a redistribution takes place it is possible for a district in two years to have a difference in voters of 4 000 plus. Therefore, at the next election an inequality would exist. That is one reason why it is impossible for the ideal behind this Bill to be realised. I, with everyone else, accept that there must be a redistribution in city seats. I have referred to two of those districts, and Playford is another, as it has about 25 000 voters.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How would you solve the problem you just referred to?

Mr. RUSSACK: The same formula that applies now could be used; the boundaries could be redistributed and

perhaps two new seats created in the metropolitan area. As has been pointed out, the percentage vote in the recent election was fairly even: each major Party received about 50 per cent of the votes cast. I suggest that the legislation we now have would bring about a satisfactory result. Earlier in my remarks I tried to point out that, in the country, representation should be considered because of the difficulties experienced.

Mr. Jennings: In other words, the districts should be loaded.

Mr. RUSSACK: The Bill provides a tolerance, so the Government acknowledges this need. As an example (and admittedly it is on the basis of first past the post), if there were three districts with 15 000 voters in each district and two Parties (Party A and Party B) contested the election—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: This is taken from Ren DeGaris's speech of about two years ago, and he was disgraced.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSSACK: —and if in one district Party A received 7 000 votes and Party B received 8 000 votes—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's Ren's speech.

Mr. RUSSACK: It does not matter if it is.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're admitting it is.

Mr. RUSSACK: No, I am not. In the example I have given, Party B would win the seat. In another district, if Party A received 6 000 votes and Party B received 9 000 votes, Party B would win the seat. If, in another district, Party A received 12 000 votes and Party B received 3 000 votes, Party A would win the seat. Party A therefore has won one seat with 25 000 votes, and Party B has won two seats with 20 000 votes. Just because we start off with equal districts with the same number of voters in each district is not to say that it will produce the result that the exponents of the one vote one value system would lead us to believe. If this Bill passes, it will be possible for a Government to be elected with 45 per cent of the votes. A few weeks ago I spoke with the Speaker of the House of the provincial Parliament of Alberta about redistribution of electoral districts, told him what was intended here, and he said, "Man, you cannot do that. That is not done anywhere in the western world."

Mr. Jennings: That is very indecent of you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Jennings: You had a private discussion with a man and you publicly disclose it. That's indecent.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSSACK: I apologise if I have violated any confidentiality. I spoke also with another Canadian Parliamentarian, and he said that a redistribution had taken place recently in Quebec. He represented a rural seat of 28 000 people and he said it was an impossible task. The distribution was made there with a tolerance of 4 000 either way.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: People or electors?

Mr. RUSSACK: Electors, but I notice the Bill refers to population.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is one of the criteria for the commission.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am expressing opinions of not only country members of this House but of people in other western countries. Clause 83 (c) provides:

the desirability of leaving undisturbed as far as practicable and consistent with the principles on which the redistribution is to be made, the boundaries of existing electoral districts;

I believe that such a clause is usual in a measure of this kind but that clause—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You agreed to it in the Upper House.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am saying that the provisions of that clause can be carried out in the city much more easily than in the country, and that the boundaries in the country will be much different from what they are now: some could be twice as large. I consider that the catch phrase of one vote one value is an ideal impossible of attainment. There will be a bias to the city voter, and I consider it an ideal that cannot be carried out in principle.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the second reading of this Bill but only for the purpose of endeavouring to move that it be referred to a Select Committee. I say that because of the way in which the Government has introduced this Bill on the pretext of one vote one value and has then tried to push it through, knowing full well that the true effects of a one vote one value system cannot be implemented with any degree of certainty. I believe there should be a redistribution because the inequality of the number of electors in the districts throughout South Australia are such that it would be unfair and unreasonable to oppose redistribution. It is unreasonable to have one district with a population of 9 500 and another with 34 000.

I believe we should have an electoral commission, which should be charged with the responsibility of drawing up electoral boundaries. I believe that that electoral commission should be free from political interference. However, I disagree with the criteria set for this electoral redistribution to take place, in other words, the criteria on which the electoral commission will have to act. At the beginning of the debate, I think the member for Mitcham quoted the Liberal Party policy, and T. should like to quote now the policy of the National Country Party, which I believe puts across the message of country members. It states:

The Party is committed to the principle that all Australians should have equal access to Parliamentary representation ensuring their fundamental right to put before Parliament their special problems.

That is the platform on which I, as a National Country Party member, operate, and I believe it is necessary in the interests of the country people of South Australia. When discussing this problem, we should analyse the job of a member of Parliament. Is he someone who votes the right way when his Leader tells him to do so, or is he a representative of the people? I believe he is elected by the people to serve the people and to present the people's problems to the proper authorities. In other words, he is the people's representative, and the people expect their representative to be able to present to Parliament and to the relevant authorities the special problems of their areas. Because the areas themselves differ, so do the responsibilities and obligations of the respective members.

We are obliged, because of the differences within the respective communities, to have some latitude or tolerance to allow for the different problems within those areas. Electoral equality means nothing if we do not have equality in the community. We can have true electoral equality only if we have true equality within all sections of the community and within all areas of the State. To claim equal numbers merely on the basis of numerical strength is not feasible. If we had equal services and equal educational and medical opportunities, if all facets within society were equal, there would be a just and right claim for equal Parliamentary representation based on numbers.

To many people, Parliamentary representation is a means to an end and, if some people are denied that means to an end, they will believe they are being denied proper Parliamentary representation.

Country representation within the confines of State Government has been progressively undermined for a long time, and the latest blow is in this Bill. With the Government's proposal of 47 electorates with an equal number of constituents, the true position of centralised Government will be demonstrated to the people in a most obvious manner. It is feasible that we will have 13 country seats and 34 metropolitan seats, and even that could vary depending on the opinion of and the criteria set down for the commission. Although it is appreciated that government is determined not by the number of trees, cows, sheds, or hectares but by people, the difficulties country members have in providing proper Parliamentary representation for their constituents should be appreciated. In the past, a tolerance has been allowed, with consideration for community of interest, relative difficulty of communication and travel, extended area, and physical factors, such as density, sparsity, and boundaries of electorates and subdivisions in the area, and it is necessary that consideration be given to these adversities of country representation in order that all people may be represented equally.

If such consideration is not given, proper representation will not be possible, and equality of representation will be a hollow claim rather than a reality. I was interested to note the pamphlet which was distributed by the member for Mitcham entitled "*Electoral Reform*". I will quote from it, because I believe that is relevant to the problem we are facing. The pamphlet states:

There is one other supremely important thing which must be remembered in connection with this "area" argument. We must remember that the work of a member of Parliament is to represent people. People and their problems make the work of an M.P., and consequently the more people in his electorate the more work there is for the member to do . . .

When all constituents in a district are given an equal opportunity to have representation, the criteria "the more constituents the greater the work" readily applies, but the work of the country member to service his constituents on a numerical basis is greater than that of a member in the metropolitan area. Many metropolitan members can ride around their district on a push cycle before breakfast, but many members on this side and some on the Government side could not fly around their district in a day (in some cases, it would take several days). That illustration shows the differences of Parliamentary representation. The pamphlet continues:

Of course, a member with a large electorate will still have to do more travelling than one with a small one, and he ought to be helped by an extra travelling allowance, postage allowance, etc.

The inference from that pamphlet is that a member of Parliament can sit in his office and do all of his representative work by telephone or letter. However, such is not the case, and I challenge any member to suggest that it is. I think I could readily answer him by saying that they have not had the experience of country representation or of trying to be a country member. I do 600 hours of travel a year at the wheel of a motor vehicle, or by flying. That 600 hours represent 15 weeks of totally unproductive time during which I cannot serve my constituents, and that time must be made up invariably in my own time. How dearly I should love another 15 40-hour weeks to be able to serve my district. I think that that is the real crux of the problem, because that

15 weeks of Parliamentary representation is denied to my constituents and me in not being able to provide the service I should like to be able to provide.

This debate has brought with it two facets: first, the Bill is being introduced to take away the country loading that has applied in the past. Although it can be appreciated that if one vote one value is to eliminate that country representation, we must draw to the attention of the public of South Australia that it does not stop there, because the next facet that comes in under a one vote one value system is that it is possible for the Government to operate with a minority vote. This is a fault within the system in that, under the Bill, we are retaining the single member electorates. I think it fair to say that, as long as we maintain them within the 47 seat House under the so-called principle of one vote one value or an equal number of districts, there is always a fear that one Party, either the left or right, could form a Government on a minority vote. Under present political trends, perhaps the Labor Party has an advantage but, with changing population trends, it could go the other way. No matter which way it goes, it is wrong that any Party can govern with a minority vote.

Mr. Keneally: Are you promoting proportional representation?

Mr. BLACKER: I intend to say something about proportional representation, and I appreciate the problems within it. If we are trying to get one vote one value in its true sense, we must look at it as a means of getting that numerical equality for all people and of providing for the people of South Australia the political mandate, which the Premier claims, of one vote one value and equal representation for the people. In the Bill, the Premier is demonstrating once again his concern for electoral justice, a concept which we all undoubtedly support and which cannot better be defined than in his own words when he was the Leader of the Opposition and he was debating an electoral districts redistribution Bill in 1968. He claimed that every citizen in the country should have an equal and effective voice in his own Government. That is putting up the next stage of the debate: not only country representation with one vote one value or equality of representation. I fear that the Government is using the privilege under the political claim of using one vote one value.

The question must be asked of the Premier whether the definition, which is an explanation of the simple phrase one vote one value, can be equated with the Bill and whether the proposal for single electorates with as nearly as practicable an equal number of voters in each district conforms to the principle of one vote one value clearly and indisputably, but it does not. The division of the State into single member electorates, even if distributions were carried out with absolute precision and no tolerance, so that each district contained precisely the same number of voters, cannot guarantee that the wishes of the people as demonstrated in the ballot box will be translated into the Parliament and the Government. It is possible to demonstrate how this distortion can come about. The Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council has provided these examples in the past, and the Minister of Transport has referred to these documents earlier in the debate, so I do not think there is any need for me to repeat them. The inability of the single member electorate system to reflect the opinion of the electorate by ensuring that the majority of the seats is won by the Party which has received the majority of the votes has been demonstrated in the actual

results of many State and Commonwealth elections, without any influence from the weighting of electorates.

It is just not on to say that the system proposed in the Bill will effectively bring about and guarantee a one vote one value principle. The simple fact is that, however skilfully, conscientiously and precisely the electoral boundaries may have been drawn, it is impossible to ensure that the Government will be won by the Party receiving the greatest number of votes. I am looking now at only one function of an election, namely, determining which Party shall govern in the Parliament, the function which the Leader of the Opposition appears to regard as paramount and which he has attempted to ensure by the Bill he has introduced.

The inability to guarantee the return to power of the Party that has the support of the majority of the voters is not the only weakness of single member districts. The electoral axiom "It is the right of majorities to govern; it is the right of all men to be represented" is merely an older, and, may I say without intending any flattery, an inferior version of the Premier's credo to which I have already referred: "Every citizen in this country should have an equal and effective voice in his own, Government". It is regarding this other function, perhaps even more important, and certainly of greater antiquity (that is, the appointing of the elector's Parliamentary representative) that the system of single member electorates also fails to perform with any acceptable degree of satisfaction.

A vote cast for a defeated candidate has no value. That vote is wasted just as surely as if the voter had not even attended the poll, and although a candidate has been elected by the votes of the majority of his fellow electors (at least where a preferential voting system is used—even this is not sure under a "first past the post system") that voter has, in his own eyes at least, and possibly in actuality also, been deprived of effective and sympathetic representation in Parliament, and consequently of participation in Government. That voter (and he and his fellows were many in the recent election as well as all other State elections) has been denied the "equal and effective voice in his own Government" which the Premier claims he should have.

No change in the number of districts, no increase in the uniformity of districts and no reduction in the tolerance on the size of districts can remedy this defect in the system with which the State is now encumbered. Yet there is available a system which will, with a very high degree of accuracy, not only provide that (to use the Premier's words once again, because they do contain the distillation of electoral justice) "every citizen should have an equal and effective voice in his own Government" but will also provide the answer to the Premier's other requirement for electoral justice which followed that statement in his 1968 speech, the ability to "ensure that the majority would be able to select the Government it wanted". It was the American humorist Josh Billings who said, "It is better to know nothing than to know what ain't so", and I would regard the Premier as knowing what ain't so in electoral matters if it were not that, perhaps unwittingly (though I doubt that he ever says anything unwittingly), he has already referred to this superior system, namely, multiple member electorates returning members by the quota preferential system known by the name Hare-Clark.

The Premier said in his second reading explanation, "The Government has stood for and voted for electoral reform on the basis of one vote one value ever since the Labor Party was founded." I hardly need to remind him that the early principle to which he adverted, as contained in the platform of the Australian Labor Party, was then termed

"proportional representation", which is, as he well knows, the description popularly applied to the Hare-Clark system. He is, therefore, to be commended for providing that the application of this reform is possible under the Bill. He did, in fact, refer to it when he explained that a future House of Assembly could decide on multiple member districts.

I believe that this reform should not be left to a future House of Assembly; I believe that it should be instituted during the passage of this Bill. I cannot be sure that the intentions of the Leader of the Opposition, and the views of the Leader of the Liberal Movement, and the opinions of their colleagues in another place, will so far correspond with my belief as to ensure that such a change could be made at this time. In other words, there is a difference of opinion here. Instead I intend that the subject should be examined by a Select Committee, notice of which I have previously given.

If we are to strive for the one vote one value principle, we must consider seriously the Hare-Clark system as a means of getting equality of voting representation. This system is the method known variously as proportional representation, the quota preferential system, the single transferable vote, or the Hare-Clark system. It has been used in Tasmania since 1907 and, in a modified form, for the Commonwealth Senate elections since 1944.

With this system the State is divided into electorates larger than those used at present, with each electorate returning a number of members, and it is generally considered that an odd number of members is to be preferred, so that five or seven is often cited as being the most satisfactory, although there is an element of self-delusion in this belief that detracts from the mathematical principles on which the system is based.

Voters mark the ballot-papers (which, because several members are to be elected, carry the names of a larger number of candidates) in the order of their preference, in the same way as they do for the system now used for State Parliament, but the difference lies in the way the counting is carried out. In this system a candidate is declared elected as soon as he has received enough votes to ensure his election, and votes in excess of this, being no longer necessary for his election, are counted in favour of the electors' second preference. Thus the surplus votes cast in favour of a popular candidate are not wasted, but serve to elect another member and, in the same way, votes cast for candidates who are not adequately supported are, as soon as their hopeless position is confirmed, transferred to their supporters' second choices.

The count proceeds by the successive transfer of surplus votes until as many candidates as there are seats to be filled have received a quota and been elected, and every elector will be represented by someone of his choosing, not necessarily his first choice, but rarely beyond his third. Every vote will have had a value and, unlike the present system when almost half the voters may consider themselves unrepresented, every elector will have a representative of sympathetic outlook, to whose election he has directly contributed.

But the system provides much more than satisfactory representation for each individual elector, important though that is. It provides also a high degree of mathematical correlation between the opinions held by the electors, as demonstrated by the proportion of votes cast in favour of candidates holding those opinions, and the number of seats actually gained by those candidates. It is for this reason that the system is referred to as proportional

representation, and not because each shade of opinion in the electorate is reflected in the composition of the Chamber in proportion to the amount of support that is given to it by the electors.

Because of this feature, the system can play an important part in destroying the pernicious political corruption of "mandate": that means by which a Party offers to the electorate a platform covering a greater range of promises than Mr. Heinz's celebrated 57 varieties, and which, after being voted into power by an electorate which supports one, two, or even 10 of these items, claims that it has a "mandate from the people" to introduce every one or, even worse, to introduce those for which there is little support from the public, but much support from the Party. That is the broad outline of the workings of that system, and, whilst it has been acknowledged by the Minister of Mines and Energy that it contains anomalies, if the Government is seriously claiming the use of a one vote one value principle it must in all fairness consider seriously this system.

Early in the debate the question of country representation was raised, and the Deputy Premier's situation was mentioned. I believe that I am probably the only other member who would have had similar health problems. I have had my share of hospitalisation, and I can fully understand and appreciate the difficulties of country members. I raise this point merely because it highlights the very reason why country members should have some consideration. The member for Millicent, in his wisdom and because of his consideration for his family and his health, chose to leave a country district and move to the metropolitan area. I sympathise with him, but his action highlights and shows to me, Opposition members, and the people of South Australia why there should be some extra consideration for country representation. After all, the decision of the Deputy Premier has virtually pointed the finger and said that, if a member wishes to hold a Ministerial portfolio or any other high office in Government, he cannot have the extra burden of country representation. It creates the situation where a potential Minister in a country district is denied the privilege of being a Minister, because of location and extra responsibilities. It is an added work load that cannot be tolerated, and the Government has given us this perfect example. After all, why should a country representative be denied the same advantage and opportunities to be Premier, if he likes, as are available to a metropolitan member?

The Government has given the example, saying, "If you are going to hold a Ministerial position, it is to your advantage to operate from within a metropolitan district." I think this has been borne out adequately in the past. I repeat that I do not intend in any way to harbour any thought of the Deputy Premier's health position, but I fully and readily appreciate the difficulties under which he laboured and carried out his position, and there is no doubt that he carried it out admirably. It was his choice and that of his Party that he should move. Consequently, by that action, we have the very reason why country members should be given that extra consideration.

I should like to comment now on one aspect that the member for Mitcham has dealt with, and I think I can answer that, in as much as he denies that country representation should receive any consideration. Probably, if he worked in a country district and had to have that 15 weeks work taken out of his itinerary, he would have a different attitude. Members on the Government side are in a similar position. For example, the member for Stuart has a large district now, and it could be even larger after the

redistribution, assuming that the district stays in one piece. Members living outside the metropolitan area will have to provide more of their own time to service their people. If they do not do that, the people will not get the Parliamentary representation which they deserve and which country members, anyway, like to give.

I think that I have adequately shown my concern about the matter and have pointed out that there should be provision for country representation. The Bill provides for a 10 per cent tolerance, but I should like country districts and metropolitan districts to be defined. Probably, with the 10 per cent tolerance above and below, if the country districts were confined to the lower end of the spectrum and the metropolitan districts to the higher, I would not have any argument, but the commission could say that the population of the country districts was declining, so those districts would be put in the higher bracket, and the metropolitan districts, with an increasing number of voters, would be put into the lower bracket and built up. We could conceivably have 10 country districts and 37 metropolitan districts if that criterion were used. I support the second reading and the progress of the Bill to the stage of being referred to a Select Committee, hoping that the Government will analyse the true effects of one vote one value so that it can equitably honour its promise to the people.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): It is fundamental in a democracy that the people should have not only the opportunity to be represented but also a representative available to serve them, but this Bill deliberately sets out to deny country people proper representation. Detailed examination of the measure shows that the Labor Party is intent on punishing country people because they will not support that Party. Country people have been given a shabby deal not only by this Government but also by its Commonwealth colleagues, who have set out to treat the country people in a similar way.

When one is looking objectively at a measure of this kind, one considers not one's personal situation but the overall situation and the effects the measure will have on the people. One must ask just what will be the end result if this measure is passed and the so-called independent commission is established. The member for Peake is smiling. Obviously, he and the Minister of Education were the architects of this Bill. I know that the Minister of Mines and Energy, "the Minister of Hot Air", had much to do with drafting it. He was cunning and shrewd enough to know that, if the Government got this measure on the Statute Book and got it entrenched in the Constitution, it would be possible to have a gerrymander that no-one would be able to do anything about. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you, as a fair-minded citizen who was able to buck the Labor Party—I am sorry, the Deputy Speaker is in the Chair. The Speaker was able to buck the Labor Party.

Mr. Max Brown: Rephrase that.

Mr. GUNN: The Labor Party is cunning enough to know that it will be able to govern in this State with about 45 per cent of the vote. Obviously, the Minister has done his homework, looked at the map, and drawn the lines. I think the 10 per cent tolerance will be not in the country but in those areas where increased population is expected. The member for Whyalla probably will have a district comprising 10 per cent below the quota, not above it.

Mr. Max Brown: Do you want to come in there?

Mr. GUNN: I do not desire to go to Whyalla, but I think the Labor Party would argue the proposition that I

have mentioned. We know that the member for Whyalla does not often take part in debates, and he has, by interjection, made his longest speech. The *Hansard* index shows the people how interested Government members are in the welfare of the people of this State. The member for Albert Park is his silent self. He rarely gets to his feet, and the member for Salisbury and other back-bench members are not concerned about the welfare—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that what honourable members do in their district is related to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I am just saying that the Labor Party members are here only to be part of the voting machine. The aspirations, thoughts and welfare of the people of South Australia do not come into it. Members opposite believe they have an inherent right to govern and to inflict a gerrymander on the people. Government members want the people to swallow this, under the guise of one vote one value. I am not opposed to electoral justice and a fair go for the people, nor are my colleagues. We want to ensure that South Australians are aware that they are being sold a pig in a poke. I have never seen the Premier look so pleased as when he introduced this Bill. He believes it will entrench him in power for ever and a day. The people of this State will not be able to remove him, because he will be entrenched by an electoral gerrymander. That is the aim of this measure, but I hope it is thwarted. I recognise, as do my colleagues, the need for a redistribution in this State. We stated that at the recent election. What we have said, and what I have said on several occasions, is that we should not deny country people the opportunity of adequate and proper representation. Under this measure a number of seats will be removed from the country area and put in the metropolitan area. If we are to have electoral justice in this State, the number of members in the House should be increased so that the imbalances that now exist in metropolitan seats such as Mawson and Tea Tree Gully can be corrected. That would be fair, proper and just. I was recently in Western Australia, where four new seats have been created in the metropolitan area, as I am suggesting new seats should be created here. In Victoria, under the leadership of Mr. Hamer, the size of the Legislative Assembly has been increased by eight members. In my opinion that is a proper course of action.

Mr. Harrison: Tell us about Queensland.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Albert Park should be the last to talk about Queensland because of the sort of electoral system which his colleagues inflicted on the people of that State and which is the type of system this Government would like to inflict on South Australians. His colleagues in Queensland governed with 41 per cent of the vote, under one of the most disgraceful electoral systems that has been designed in any Westminster system of Government. That is the record in Queensland, and the honourable member should say nothing more about it. If he is so enlightened about electoral matters, he should make one of his rare contributions in this debate. It would be interesting to hear what he has to say, because he has made only about two speeches in the past five years. However, I will not be sidetracked by the likes of the member for Albert Park, who is merely a voting machine; the welfare of the people of this State does not count at all.

Mr. Harrison: If you had been a member in Playford's days you wouldn't have—

Mr. GUNN: We are not talking about the Playford days; we are talking about the welfare of South Australians

and how this measure will affect their rights and privileges as voters. I do not wish to deny the right of any elector. In making that statement, I believe that the Government does not have the right to deny country people the opportunity of fair and just representation. Under this measure that will happen.

Mr. Millhouse: What is fair and just representation?

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member is patient, I will tell him.

Mr. Millhouse: What you have now, is that what you mean?

Mr. GUNN: I did not say that; that might be the honourable member's opinion.

Mr. Millhouse: It was what the member for Mount Gambier said by way of interjection in reply to my interjection.

Mr. GUNN: I was asked by way of interjection what I would consider to be fair and just. Earlier I indicated (and if the member for Mitcham had not been out playing soldiers or doing something else he would have heard it) that the size of the House of Assembly should be increased.

Mr. Millhouse: By how many?

Mr. GUNN: That is a matter of judgment.

Mr. Millhouse: Tell us about it.

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member had taken the trouble to read *Hansard* and to look at country newspapers, he would have seen what are my views. I believe the number of members in the House should be increased by up to six members.

Mr. Millhouse: By six members!

Mr. GUNN: Yes, up to six members, and I make no apology for that statement, because each section of the community would then have the opportunity of being represented properly. We would then have a situation in which the inequalities that the member for Mitcham and other members have shown such concern about would be ironed out. People argue that tremendous costs would be involved, but one of the cheapest commodities in this State is Parliamentary representation, if members do their job properly and look after the welfare of the people of this State. We have had much talk about inequality in the size of specific districts.

This evening all of us had an opportunity to meet members from the United Kingdom Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I took the opportunity to speak to one of the visiting members and to ascertain what are the variations in size of districts in the United Kingdom. The smallest district has 23 000 voters, there are numerous districts with 30 000 voters, and the largest district has 90 000 voters. Districts range between 50 000 voters and 70 000 voters. A redistribution is carried out every 10 years by an independent body. Does anyone say a gerrymander exists in the United Kingdom? Do the Premier, his colleagues, and the Minister of Mines and Energy, say that? I understand that a similar position applies in the Canadian provinces. Does anyone say a gerrymander exists there or that the system is undemocratic, and that the people living there do not have the opportunity to express their will at elections?

It is obvious from the attitude adopted by the Liberal Movement that it has no regard whatever for country people. In the recent election I understand that, especially in the election for the Legislative Council, the Liberal Movement received about 40 000 votes in country areas. The L.M. received more votes in the Legislative Council than it received in the House of Assembly.

Mr. Vandepeer: In how many seats did L.M. candidates lose their deposit?

Mr. GUNN: I did not go into that matter, but it would have happened in numerous cases. However, judging by the attitude the L.M. has displayed publicly in country areas, since the recent election it is obvious that the L.M. will not in future get the support it got at the recent election, because it has treated with contempt people in country areas. Mr. Martin Cameron has been quoted as saying that people in country areas do not count. If that is what he believes, those people will show him that they do count. If I can rely on the United Farmers and Graziers publication the L.M. did not receive a good reception recently in the South-East. I assure L.M. members that they will receive a similar reception throughout the length and breadth of country areas.

The member for Goyder was elected to this House on the preferences of the National Country Party. He and his colleagues will say "thank you" to the Country Party for that support when the vote is taken in this Chamber and in another place on this measure. The L.M. has, I understand, always supported the right of country people to have adequate representation. The first time the member for Goyder was elected to this House he received the support of the Country Party. It will be interesting to see how country people will judge the member for Goyder on the next occasion he faces the electors.

As a member who has had experience representing a district covering about half the land mass of South Australia (about 492 100 square kilometres), I should like to make a few comments about this matter. The sterling services of the Deputy Premier given to the Millicent District have been referred to. That district is now held by Mr. Vandepeer, a man who will give sterling service to the people of that part of the South-East. If one is a realist and looks at the electoral map it is obvious that the member for Stuart, if he contests the next election, will have to travel around the northern part of South Australia and cover some of the area now covered by the member for Frome and me.

Mr. Simmons: Is he going to take over your district?

Mr. GUNN: Being a realist and looking at the electoral map, I think that is more than a possibility. That is how the boundaries will be drawn. The member for Whyalla will have a fairly cosy little area to look after because he will have as his district the part of Whyalla Stuart and the district he now has, plus perhaps a small extension. Those people living in the farming districts will not see the member for Whyalla, so they will not have representation.

Mr. Max Brown: I'll still go to the Kimba Show.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member knows what sort of reception his colleague got the last time he was at the Kimba Show. People in the northern parts of the State are just as entitled to see their member of Parliament as is any person living in metropolitan Adelaide, but it is difficult for a member to get around a large district. I have travelled 80 000 km by car in more than one year, with an average of 72 000 km. The problems I experience in that type of activity are far greater than those encountered by the average member of the Labor Party. It does not only deny the member the opportunity of spending a reasonable amount of time doing research and acting on the requests and demands of his constituents but it virtually ensures the member has little free time to spend with his wife and family or to engage in any other activity. That is the system that the Labor Party wants to inflict not only on one or two members but on members representing

all country districts and that policy is being supported by its junior partner, the L.M. I think, it is a sad day for democracy when people are denied the opportunity of proper representation.

It appears as though the member for Mitcham is now going to leave us because he thinks the Bill will not be voted upon tonight but he will be called back when it is voted on and he will play into the hands of the Labor Party. I think the attitude of many South Australians is summed up in the editorial in the *Port Lincoln Times* of October 2. I do not always agree with the editorials appearing in that paper but on this occasion I commend the editor for his realistic approach to this matter. The editorial states:

The complete city orientation of our present State Government has never been more highlighted than in the present electoral boundaries proposals. Only people who have either a blind Party interest or complete ignorance of the open spaces of this State could possibly endorse an inflexible plan designed to create a few huge country electorates.

That is what will occur if this Bill is passed. I believe this Bill incorporates the long-term aim of the Labor Party, particularly the left wing, to create a situation in which there is little representation in this country at all. It wants to rid the people of the opportunity to protest against and highlight the inadequacies of its policies. It wants to get rid of representation first by destroying the rights of country people, then by getting rid of the Upper House, destroying State Parliaments, and having one Parliament in Canberra without any knowledge of the real beliefs of the people of Australia. If one reads the documents and policy statements of the Labor Party one can see that its ultimate aim is to have only one Party and then the people will be denied democracy altogether. Throughout the world socialist Parties set out to undermine representation and then they inflict the one-Party system on people. That is what will happen eventually if the Labor Party is allowed to run its full term. We have been used to hearing the Labor Party say that if the Government is unpopular it ought to draw boundaries that will put it out of office. This Government is going to draw boundaries—

Mr. Simmons: We aren't drawing any boundaries at all, you clot.

Mr. GUNN: I must be getting close to the point because the member for Peake is getting upset. By way of interjection he has said that the Government is not going to draw the boundaries, but it has given the commission narrow guidelines to follow. There will be a tolerance of 10 per cent, and the situation applying during the last State election will be altered. At that election the Labor Party received about 50 per cent of the vote and it won 50 per cent of the seats. Is that unfair? I challenge Government members to say that the last State election did not reflect the views of the people of South Australia. The Minister of Mines and Energy did not say that; he admitted that under this mythical system of one vote one value it is possible for a Government to be elected that did not have the support of 50 per cent of the people of South Australia. That clearly shows that the fears of members on this side of the House could be realised.

Mr. VENNING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I call your attention to the state of the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a quorum present.

Mr. GUNN: It does not particularly matter about the terms of reference set out, because the commission has a narrow path to follow. A 10 per cent tolerance each way

will ensure that the things members on this side are complaining about will eventuate. I hope that before this Bill is passed the Government and members of the other place look at it closely to ensure the system that evolves gives the people of South Australia an opportunity to elect the Government it really wants. The rights of the minority must not only be protected but must also be considered. The result of an election should not only be fair but it should also appear to be fair. For years the Labor Party has extolled the virtues of one vote one value, but in practice what would eventuate under the Bill is an electoral system which is not only unfair but which will appear to be unfair when the aggregate number of votes are tabled that each political Party has received.

I do not believe in electoral malpractice; I believe that the views of the people should be reflected by the members who are sent to this House. I hope that the Government will have another look at the measure. I agree on this occasion with the member for Flinders that it would not be a bad idea if the Bill were referred to a Select Committee. I do not reject out of hand the proposal that perhaps we ought to have a look at the possibility of proportional representation. I know that some members do not like that proposal but, if we are to have one vote one value, the only way it can be implemented is by a proportional representation system; there is no other way for it. Even the Minister of Mines and Energy admitted that in his speech. With reservations, I support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Keneally: Think of all the people in Eyre who will get good representation in the next year or so.

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member thinks that he will enlighten all those people in northern South Australia, he has a rude awakening coming to him, because he will have to do more than he has been doing during the past five or six years to gain their support. Even though it has been hard work and it has meant considerable driving and being away from home for long periods, I have enjoyed representing those people. I look forward to representing the new district, which will be created on Eyre Peninsula, for a long time in the future, because I believe that the people are entitled to have good representation, not the kind the Labor Party has in store for them. With reservations, I support the second reading.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): In supporting the Bill, I say that I have always been in accord with the general principles contained therein. My interest in this matter has no relationship to the Labor Party and the proposals it has brought before the House on this occasion, because I have long believed that there should be a permanent commission that is remote from political influence. I believe that the relevant provisions in the Bill are adequate and come as near as possible to justice, as far as justice can be achieved. No-one can argue that there is not a need for a redistribution at present because why should, for example, a policeman in Minlaton have three times the voting value of his brother policeman in the Mawson District? I support the principle of nearly equal districts consistent with the terms of reference in the Bill that have been given to the commission, with the 10 per cent tolerance that is provided either way. The terms of reference are all that any fair-minded elector could ask for. I, for one, will be glad when these changes are made and when the commission is established permanently.

Mr. Keneally: And you can go back to the farm.

Mr. BOUNDY: Members may think that, and the point is taken, but I remind them that there have

already been two occasions when it has been considered that I would be there. I shall be pleased when the commission is established on a permanent basis and it will no longer be necessary to apologise for electoral inequality. Regarding the ability to serve, I have heard some heart-rending arguments put forward about how difficult our lot is, but I remind members that no-one forced us to offer ourselves for political duty. We came into this place well knowing the difficulties and disabilities. I am just as reluctant as any other member to be parted from my family, but I believe that, if we wish to serve in this way, we take on the job with the disabilities inherent therein. Believing as I do in electoral equality, I accept the extra duties that a larger district would impose on me. Regarding a country member's ability to serve, we must all agree that the provision of district offices has certainly eased the burden on all of us. In this case, not only country members but also other members who were here before district offices were provided for them would recognise that the provision of the office in their own district had been a great boon. Naturally, this will also assist in a larger district, if it comes about.

I refer particularly to the position of the members for Eyre, Frome, Alexandra, and Mallee. All these members would make the most effective use of their offices if they were established in the metropolitan area. I think the member for Gouger said that the member for Mallee did not have a centre of population in which to establish his district office. I believe that the member for Mallee rightly deserves one in Adelaide. I think that the right place for the member for Frome, together with the member for Eyre, to have offices is here in the House, because the city of Adelaide is the business centre for the people of the outback and that vast 48 per cent of the State that has been referred to.

Mr. Allen: Would you like to operate 160 kilometres from your district office?

Mr. BOUNDY: There are difficulties, I agree, but I remind the honourable member that a district office in Adelaide would be the least of all the evils he could put before the House. It would be far from home.

Mr. Allen: You believe that people should pay \$5 for a phone call?

Mr. BOUNDY: I think that the honourable member's constituents do not expect him to chase up every mallee track to see them. They know the difficulties he has. They accept the difficulties and problems, and there is no way that the honourable member could serve his district on the basis of a local call; he would need to be an extremely mobile representative. Another point regarding the serving of a country district is that there is a greater sense of community in such districts. People help one another and, if it is known that a member is moving about the district, word gets around and people forgather. I well remember the example of two Commonwealth members. The member for Wakefield (Mr. Kelly) used to insert an advertisement in the local paper saying, "I will be in front of the Minlaton Post Office on Monday morning."

Mr. Venning: He's a good member, too.

Mr. BOUNDY: I will not reflect on his ability as a member, but he used that method to meet his constituents. If the members for Eyre and Frome did the same thing, that would be a practical solution to a real problem in the matter of serving the districts. Although I appreciate all the difficulties and believe that as nearly as possible an equality of electors must be achieved, these disabilities

must be dealt with. For the comfort of the member for Frome, I remind him that I hope that he has all the benefit of the loading the Commissioners can give him to lessen his problems. I am not entirely unsympathetic to his needs.

If a member visits a social function, he is spoken to by his electors, and many members rue the day when they have their ear chewed instead of being able to dance the light fantastic with their wife or an acceptable young lady. However, an urban member has difficulties, too, because when he door knocks and visits a house in his district this is not known to the people living on either side, because there is no sense of community interest. No doubt he visits social functions, but these may interest only a small part of his constituency, and his chance to meet the electors is not as good as that available to those who serve country districts. Another situation that helps a country member is the local show, and I am sure the member for Gouger would visit every country show that he possibly could. No doubt he would have his ears pinned back by concerned constituents, but we accept that as part of our duty.

To me that is the difference brought about by the sense of community interest that exists in country areas, whose members are assisted by their constituents. The member for Tea Tree Gully would have much difficulty in servicing her 33 000 electors, and they need roads, footpaths and sewers. I have heard the honourable member referred to as the potential Minister for Sewerage, because she is always concerned about drainage. That is a difficulty of a metropolitan member in a developing area, and perhaps we have too many developing areas. Many country members have fairly stable problems, and new developments are not as pronounced as in metropolitan districts.

Mr. Keneally: I have both.

Mr. BOUNDY: I do not consider that the honourable member is a rural member: he is industrial or something, and his problems are generally confined to an urban situation.

Mr. Rodda: Are you a rural member?

Mr. BOUNDY: I am a rural man. In his lucid speech the member for Mount Gambier referred to the difficulties of servicing his district, and the lamentable plight of pensioners who had faulty hearing aids. What the honourable member needs are more social workers and not more members of Parliament. I believe that our present population is adequately served by 47 members of Parliament: that is all we should pay for, because we are a costly bunch.

Mr. Nankivell: Speak for yourself.

Mr. BOUNDY: I remind the honourable member that he costs the State as much as I do. An argument seems to have been suggested in this debate that country representation can be maintained by increasing the number of metropolitan seats. I think the member for Kavel suggested splitting the Tea Tree Gully and Mawson Districts, so that we would have four Labor members in those areas instead of two.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I didn't say that.

Mr. BOUNDY: Members have suggested that the number of seats could be increased so that in some way country representation would be maintained. It is not admitted that an increase in metropolitan seats with a retention of country seats would still reduce the percentage representation of country people, a situation that would be continued in any subsequent redistribution. The Liberal Movement represents all the State, whether city or country, and would represent those people with

equal vigour in any redistribution. The suggestion that government is unwinnable in the pending redistribution for our side of politics is an admission that people never change their political options and that our policies will always be irrelevant to most people. I welcome the chance to face the electors on a morally right ground. I cannot be accused of self-interest in this legislation, which could be called an S.O.S. Bill, meaning "Save our seats", having regard to some of the things said. Perhaps, as a result of this redistribution, I may have to compete with my friend the member for Gouger. I think I could win, but, if not, so be it. I think the redistribution that will result from this Bill will be a fair one. The member for Eyre said that I won my seat only with Country Party preferences and that I have let down my friend the member for Flinders by my stand on this matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation, and I am having trouble hearing the honourable member. I, like other honourable members, would like to hear what he is saying.

Mr. BOUNDY: I remind the member for Eyre and other members that, in the recent election, I had neither Country Party nor Liberal Party preferences offered to me. Whilst I have a high regard for the member for Flinders and hope that he will remain a member following any redistribution, I do not believe I have let him down in any way in my attitude to this Bill. I believe the electors of Goyder have accepted the principles I have espoused. Twice in the past 12 months I have faced them on the basis of supporting this Bill, and have been accepted and re-endorsed. I do not expect to suffer from their ire in future, and support the Bill.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): South Australia is one of the most urbanised regions in the western world, with the population centred mainly in one major city. That one major centre is densely populated. However, when we consider Great Britain and the voting system there, we do not find a system of one vote one value as espoused by the Premier and the Government. There is a large variation between city districts and country districts. The Playford era and the distribution at that time have been mentioned, but we must compare the communications available then to those available today. During that era there was a bigger loading than there has been in past five or six years, and rightly so. In this Bill, we are dealing with equality of representation. It is not feasible to say that equality is one vote one value and that every district in a State such as this must have, for all intents and purposes, an identical number of voters. Such a system would never work.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Oh?

Mr. ARNOLD: The Minister may carry on, but the logic is not there. We are talking about people and their rights, but obviously the Minister considers that only people living in the metropolitan area have special rights.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: No.

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes, he does. We have only to look around the metropolitan area and see the facilities that have been provided there. As soon as a member asks that a similar facility be provided in a distant country area, various Ministers say that it is not possible to provide it and that, if country people want those facilities, they must move to the metropolitan area.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Will you cite a specific example?

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes. Last week I asked the Minister of Transport to provide transport facilities for the public, especially aged people, in country regional centres to a similar standard provided in the metropolitan area of Adelaide.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who would pay for them? The metropolitan people would, wouldn't they?

Mr. ARNOLD: All taxpayers in South Australia are paying for the system operating in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who pays for the loss on country water supplies? The people who live in the metropolitan area do, don't they?

Mr. ARNOLD: The Minister asked for an example, and I gave him one.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It was very poor, though.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is not Question Time, and I ask the member for Chaffey to stick to the Bill.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is a poor example, as the Government does not believe that people living in the country should have the same facilities as are provided in the city. Let us consider the far-flung country areas. When I asked the question, I was referring to country regional centres which are more densely populated, and I used as an example the Riverland, or the District of Chaffey, with a population density of about 30 000, where there is no public transport and no assistance is given by the Government to enable people to commute from one town to the next. This comes back to equality, and that is what the Bill is about. The people in country areas have not the same facilities available to them as have people in the metropolitan area, yet the Government has made no allowance for those disadvantages.

Let us forget about how difficult it is for some country members to represent their district. I am fortunate in having one of the more densely populated country districts, but I refer honourable members to the District of Frome and the District of Eyre. Excluding the difficulties that those members have in providing representation, let us consider the difficulty that people have in making representations to their member. Let us consider the cost to an elector who is 400 or 500 kilometres from his member in contacting his member or calling to see him.

Mr. Keneally: He can make a reverse charge telephone call.

Mr. ARNOLD: That comment is not worth answering, as the allowance given to a country member for a scheme such as the member for Stuart has mentioned is little different from that given to a city member. It would cost members thousands of dollars a year to operate such a system, as the member for Stuart knows. He may find that out one of these days if later his district covers a vast area of the North. I pity the people living in that area, because they will receive virtually no representation. It is well and good for people living in a regional centre such as Port Augusta, but the people living beyond there will be of no real account as far as the member is concerned. That is how the honourable member operates. This Government is not concerned about people living in country areas, primarily because those people do not support it. That is another reason for the introduction of this Bill, to reduce the number of districts in country areas as much as possible.

I still believe that the most important factor is the availability of a member to his constituents. As I have said, I am fortunate in being a country member with a

compact district, and my constituents do not have extreme difficulty travelling to the district office. The furthest distance in my district from a centre of population to my office is about 40 km, which is a short distance compared with what is involved in the District of Eyre or the District of Frome. Therefore, it is wrong to expect a constituent to travel about 400 or 500 km to visit his member at his district office, even if that office is in the district. It has been pointed out that it is impracticable for the members for Frome and Eyre to have offices in their districts. Consequently, their district offices are in Parliament House. It is an unsatisfactory arrangement for the member or the voters. However, the Government, in its wisdom, has determined that it will make the situation a little more difficult for people living in country areas. If the Government was genuine, it would have examined Parliamentary systems in other countries in the Western World and made a decision after investigating a cross-section of opinion and experience gained in other parts of the world. Obviously, the Government will forge ahead with this measure, merely because it knows its voting strength is in the metropolitan area and also because it knows it can entrench itself in Government for a long time.

The most important matter has been overlooked completely, the matter of people. While this Government is interested purely in winning sufficient seats to remain in Government, it has completely thrown overboard the rights of people to be represented adequately. In theory, one vote one value sounds democratic, until we try to put it into effect. When we see the disadvantages faced by certain people in the community, we then see that it is not feasible for the people of this State to be represented adequately. As the member for Eyre said, an increase in the size of the House would provide additional seats and reduce the number of voters in districts such as Tea Tree Gully and Mawson. No-one denies that both those districts have much more than a reasonable quota, but trying to solve the problem by reducing country representation to about 13 or 14 districts gives enormous Parliamentary representation to the metropolitan area, an area where people have ready access to their members of Parliament, and denies people living in country areas, especially those in far-flung areas, the right to similar representation.

I believe that that is what Parliamentary representation is all about. It is there to give everyone in South Australia, whether living in the metropolitan area or in far-flung country areas, a similar chance to have their point of view placed before Parliament and acted on. This Bill will in no way achieve that end.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the second reading of the Bill in the hope that it will be amended in Committee. I, like many other members, agree that a redistribution of boundaries is necessary. There has been a build-up in the number of people in the metropolitan area. For the Government's information, I point out that there has been a build-up of people in country areas, too, but not to the same extent as has occurred in the metropolitan area. I do not know of any country district in which the numbers have not increased in the past four years. No doubt this has been brought about by the number of 18-year-olds now eligible to vote. Of course, the same applies to the metropolitan area where the number of voters has increased considerably more than the number in country areas. When introducing this measure, the Premier stated:

The Government has stood for and voted for electoral reform on the basis of one vote one value ever since the Labor Party was founded.

What happened in 1964, when the then Liberal Government introduced a Bill for the redistribution of boundaries and the Labor Opposition, because of political expediency, opposed the Bill? In fact, there was spirited opposition from the Premier (who was then a member of the Opposition) when he said:

... it is difficult to represent country districts because of the long distances that have to be travelled, to keep in touch with the electors. We agree with him. We have every reason to agree with him because the Labor Party in this Parliament represents not only the overwhelming majority of the people of this State. We represent far more electors here than honourable members do on the other side, but we also represent the majority of the area of the State as well. The vast majority of the area of South Australia is represented in this House by Labor members.

That is not the situation today. The Government is well aware that its country members represent only the small districts of Whyalla and Stuart. All other country districts are represented by the Liberal Party, National Country Party, or the Liberal Movement. The Premier continued:

The honourable members for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and Frome (Mr. Casey) both have electoral districts larger than the British Isles in area. Why, they comprise the major portion of the Commonwealth district of Grey, which in itself comprises some two-thirds of this State. We do not believe that the present number of members representing country districts can be properly decreased, because thereby it will make country representation less efficient.

It is ironical to think that the Labor Opposition at that time opposed the reduction of the number of country members in State Parliament. At that time the member for Frome represented an area only two-thirds of the size of the district as it is today, yet there were protests from the Opposition of the day about the size of the area the member had to represent. Today, the number of voters in the district has doubled, and the district is one-third as large again as it was in 1964. The Premier continued:

It will not be possible for members to travel the vast distances that now have to be travelled by the honourable members for Frome and Whyalla and then go further. The Premier, having said that it was not possible to decrease country representation (and he has said it here, as the member for Whyalla has pointed out, time and time again), now intends to reduce country representation, and particularly in the sparsely settled areas of this State. It will make the task of the members for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) and Frome almost impossible.

If it was almost impossible then, what is it like today, with double the number of voters and an area that is one-third larger? The Premier continued:

The member for Frome would have to represent an area from Coober Pedy to Cockburn—

He was not correct, because the member for Frome did not represent Coober Pedy. That area has always been represented by the member for Eyre—

and from just north of Quorn to the Northern Territory and Queensland borders—

again, he had not done his homework, because the boundary of the Frome District was south of Quorn, not north of Quorn—

The sparsely settled areas of this State will, under the Premier's proposal, have less representation than now, and he says he is doing this because we cannot justify one vote one value.

There we have a case of the Government's preaching one vote one value, yet when there was a suggestion of less representation in the country it totally opposed it. I imagine Labor members had their tongues in their cheek during the whole of the debate. He continued:

If we had one vote one value upon the basis of the Labor Party's proposals to this House, there would be no reduction in the representation in those areas at all,

How the Party opposite worked that one out I will never know. So much for the statements made by the Premier on that occasion. It is interesting to read what the member for Frome had to say at that time. He said:

I represent what is known as a rural area, and I am proud to do so. It is sparsely populated and extends over great distances, and under the proposed legislation that area will be increased. I say emphatically that if those areas in the North such as the districts represented by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and myself are increased it will not be possible for us to do the job we wish to do and what we set out to do for such a task would kill us and the members who come after us.

The then member for Frome is still with us, and the present member for Frome is still with us, despite the fact that he has a much larger area. What the member for Frome said then about killing the members was not accurate. Recently, the Minister of Mines and Energy made a statement in relation to the member for Frome and the way he looked after his area. I wonder whether it may have been part of a softening up process.

Mr. Evans: Sarcasm, perhaps.

Mr. ALLEN: No; it was a warning that under this Bill the District of Frome must become larger. I am aware of that, as are all members. I think the Minister of Mines and Energy is aware of it. He said that he enjoyed the trip North with the member for Frome, and I can reciprocate and say I, too, enjoyed the trip. He said that he thought on one occasion he had lost the member for Frome when crossing a stream. We had crossed that watercourse about eight times, and the Minister suggested I go first because I knew the road. He said the other day he thought he had lost me on one occasion, but little did the Minister know I was trying to lose him. However, he survived the ordeal and we finished up having a pleasant two days together. I think that trip was an eye-opener to the Minister. I do not think he realised the nature of the terrain a member is expected to negotiate in trips of that kind, the difficulties associated with visiting schools, and the difficulties under which those schools operate. I think the Minister then realised the difficulties associated with representation by country members.

When the House is not in session I use the excellent train service to the city that leaves my home town at 6 a.m. and returns at 10.15 p.m. That gives me nine hours in the city and enables me to return home the same day. I use this service because my electoral allowance is insufficient to cover expenses for the whole year, and it is necessary that I use the train in preference to the car in order to come to Adelaide for a day's work in the office. As the member for Goyder has said, my electoral office is in the city and it is necessary for me to do a 320 kilometre round trip to attend my electoral office. I think anyone will admit that 18 hours a day is a long day. If I was a member of a union, I think there would be a strike immediately, and I would not be permitted to work those hours. Does this Government expect a country member to work 18 hours a day? During the 51 years in which I have represented Frome, I have averaged three hours a day travelling in every 24 hours, seven days a week, and that is a lot of travelling for one member. No metropolitan member would do as much travelling, and they could use those three hours a day in servicing their electorate and possibly for entertainment and additional sleep. Often I have had two hours sleep a night. It is also interesting to note that in my district are 55 hotels.

Mr. Mathwin: You have a drink in every one of them, I suppose.

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, I have a good excuse to call in and let the people know I am in the district. My biggest problem is that the ownership of a country hotel does not last long, and every time I call it is necessary to get to know the new proprietor. There were 33 schools in my district, but three have closed. My district covers 233 000 square kilometres, which is 30 per cent larger than the British Isles. When I visited Europe last year, I visited Spain, which is the third largest country in Europe. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I take this opportunity to grieve on a matter brought to my attention by constituents concerned about the type of film available during matinees in picture theatres, particularly Saturday afternoon matinees. I hope that the Government will conduct an inquiry into this matter, and I hope that the Minister in charge of the House will listen and see that I am attacking not for the sake of attacking but to show that there is real concern about the films available to theatre managers for Saturday afternoon matinees. I have received several letters from church groups and individuals in my area about the type of film that has been shown recently. In the past few weeks the following films have been shown at Saturday matinees: *Caravan to Cavarres* (M); *Carry on Girls* (NRC); *Barry McKenzie Holds His Own* (M); *Fireball 500* (G); *Airport 75* (NRC); *Follow Me* (NRC); *Madam Sin* (NRC); *Chinese Comedian* (M); *The Best of Benny Hill* (NRC); *Holiday on the Buses* (no rating); *Lost in the Desert* (G); and *For Pete's Sake* (NRC). I see another Minister in the House, and I hope he will note what I am saying. I ask for an inquiry by the Government into the kinds of film available because, after receiving the letters, I decided that it would be wrong to stir without going to management. I went to the management of the theatres, and was informed that few general exhibition films were available and that, if the theatres wanted to show decent films for children, they were not available. The Government, particularly the Premier, has encouraged the restricted type of film and has said that individuals should be able to read, see, and do what they like. With that concept being promoted by the Government, and the Premier as Leader, we find that the film distributors and the importers are not importing general exhibition films.

If a theatre management hires, from the companies that distribute the films, the older general exhibition films they are so old that the management has to unwind them, and repair them if they are damaged, because the film distributor no longer carries out the repairs. The films must then be rewound ready for showing in the afternoon, and the theatre hopes that they do not break. Further, the film distributors specify in many cases that the film must be shown in the afternoon and the evening; it cannot be shown only at a single viewing. That, again, restricts the manager to showing these films in the afternoon to a junior audience, and that is wrong. In addition, I believe there is some need to look at the method of charging for the hire of films. The minimum hire is about \$20; that is the lowest charge, but the distributors charge a percentage if the door takings are higher than \$20. The percentage varies from 20 per cent to 60 per cent of the door takings: if it is a good film, the hirer asks for up to 60 per cent of the takings.

One would think that, with a sort of native cunning, the manager would be able to avoid paying for the total audience attending, but the distributor employs people to go around regularly and count the audience to ascertain whether the management is cheating. If the management is found to be cheating, it will no longer be allowed to hire films; so there is no benefit in cheating. I am not debating whether people want to see R films, but I have no real desire to do so. They are for adult audiences but, surely, at a Saturday matinee parents could expect, if their children are going to see a film (and I know it could be argued that a parent should take an interest in what films are shown), that the type of film shown would be suitable for children. If the Film Classification Board stipulates that a film is not recommended for children, that means that it is not suitable for children. If the board recommends that a film be shown only to a mature audience, that means that it should be seen only by mature people. If one goes back to the argument that parents should take a keener interest and ascertain what films are available, I believe that many parents do just that.

Possibly, management loses some patronage, but it still does not alter the fact that no suitable films for children are available, because the trend in our society seems to be to go for something that is gruesome, is a bit sex oriented, or has nudity in it. The Premier and some of his Party advocate strongly that individuals should have the right to see, hear and read what they wish, but that right is being denied now, because no general exhibition films are available for those people who want to view them. These films are not available to managements wishing to show them. There should be a Government inquiry, preferably by the Premier's Department, into the availability of suitable films for general exhibition. The Labor Party has advocated the trend that has resulted in a path of sexiness and goriness in books and films available today. Surely, that Party should accept the responsibility to make available films for general exhibition. Some members of our society (and you may be one of them, Mr. Speaker) prefer general exhibition films to massive gun fights or nudity that is shown in films restricted to mature audiences.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It sounds like a good case for the Film Corporation.

Mr. EVANS: I have never attacked the corporation's ability and expertise. Perhaps the Minister may be one who has led us down the wrong path. If the Government does the right thing, it will gain much respect from the community by ensuring that general exhibition films are available for those who wish to see them. At present they are not available.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I refer to the need to install traffic lights at the corner of North-East Road and Hancock Road, Tea Tree Gully. I have raised this matter many times over the years. On March 26, 1974, when I asked a Question on Notice, in reply I received some statistics about accidents that had occurred at this intersection. The reply stated that additional safety measures were to be carried out at the intersection and that the work would be undertaken. On March 27, I asked a question, and received a written reply on April 18. I next brought this matter to the attention of the Minister and his department on March 25 of this year, when I asked a Question on Notice about the latest details of accidents at this intersection. In reply I was also told that 90 similar works had a higher priority.

Later, on June 12 this year, I asked a question and received a written reply on July 3, stating that there were now 59 intersections in the metropolitan area with a

higher priority for installing traffic lights than the intersection to which I had referred, and that, on the present rate of installing lights, it could be four years before lights were installed at this intersection. I was disappointed at this reply, although pleased that the priority had been reduced from 90 to 59. The reply stated:

The priority assessment is based upon a thorough investigation of accident histories and traffic volumes. Whilst it is recognised that statistics alone are not an entirely satisfactory basis for assessment of priorities, they do enable an objective assessment of the individual situation, which can then be modified subjectively. Relative priorities are re-examined at frequent intervals to ensure that the limited available resources are utilised in the most effective manner. The priority assessment of this particular intersection has recently been reviewed, but the review did not reveal any factors which would justify any alteration of its existing priority rating.

I am pleased that, in the intervening period, this intersection has been improved. Nevertheless, the only real solution to the traffic hazard is the installation of traffic signals. The intersection is adjacent to a well-patronised shopping centre, traffic being extremely heavy on certain days. Naturally, traffic is heavy at peak periods on every day. Many people in the district, realising the hazard, try to avoid the corner if they can use another road. I was pleased to notice the Minister's statement in his letter that relative priorities were re-examined at frequent intervals, and I ask that this intersection continue to be kept under review.

In my opinion, accident histories, etc., do not necessarily prove the potential danger of an intersection. A few years ago a roundabout was installed on the corner of North-East Road and Grand Junction Road, Holden Hill, before traffic lights were installed. I do not place myself above the experts in the Highways Department but I ask that the department assess whether it would be in the interests of reducing the danger at the intersection to which I have referred to install a similar roundabout in the interim until traffic lights are installed.

I refer now to two roads in my district about which I have received representations from time to time in connection with the need for reconstruction and widening. I refer first to the Lower North-East Road, a matter I have raised previously. The most recent occasion was on September 9, and today I received a reply stating that the position set out in the previous letter from the Minister, dated June 23, still applied. Naturally, I was disappointed with that reply, because this road is too narrow for present-day traffic and is a hazard. I know that priorities regarding work on roads of this nature are kept under review, and I trust that this road will be kept under review and that, even at this stage, it will be given a higher priority; because of the general condition of the road, this is justified.

I refer now to that section of the Grand Junction Road between the North-East Road at Holden Hill and Anstey Hill. This road, which has been there for many years, needs reconstructing and widening. I realise that work on both these roads, especially the Lower North-East Road, will be costly. With the increasing population in the Grand Junction Road and Lower North-East Road areas, both these roads carry a greater volume of traffic now than they have carried previously and, with the continual increase in population, the volume of traffic on them is increasing daily. I therefore bring these matters to the attention of the Minister and the Highways Department, and trust that both these roads will be kept under review, with the aim of work being commenced on them as soon as possible.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I rise to grieve this evening on a matter that concerns my district particularly and the

State of South Australia generally. I object to the Big Brother tactic which is now being used freely by the Commonwealth Government in relation to the kindergartens of this State and which is in line with what we are used to seeing lately. The Commonwealth Government, when it is ever in a position to fund any organisation or council, wants to direct how the money is to be spent. I draw the attention of the House to a recent address entitled "New horizons for kindergartens", given by Judge Olsson to the Kindergarten Union on July 26, on page 11 of which the following appears:

The Australian Government is committed to providing care for as many children as possible, especially where it is most needed, and in the way that people want it.

On the next page the following appears:

The Australian Government will pay 75 per cent of salaries of agreed staff, including advisers, from January 1 next year. All appropriate State Ministers and officials have been advised of the new arrangements.

He went on to stress that the assistance for salaries would only be paid where services had been extended or integrated with other services, so that maximum use was being made of available facilities. This could be done by the extended use of pre-school buildings which are often closed when there are no sessions in operation. It might, for instance, be possible to allow play groups to use pre-school facilities during vacant times, and to provide some full-day care and after-school activities (I suppose this relates to latch-key children, for whom some sort of baby-sitting service would be provided) and where people who used their own homes to mind a small number of children could come together. As well, they could provide a centre from which to operate a toy library for other children's services.

We therefore have the situation in which equipment is provided for kindergartens by the voluntary efforts of the people associated with them. This equipment is supplied for toddlers, but older children are to be included within the kindergarten system and will be using this equipment. We have a situation where children will be breaking equipment that has been provided by committees and organisations that have worked hard for many years to provide facilities for small children.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Did you know that Mr. Bowen has modified that statement since?

Mr. MATHWIN: No. Nevertheless, the address continued:

Mr. Bowen said that where there were no available physical facilities, and some basic capital support was needed to start a service for children, there would still have to be a limit on funds for new building projects.

The Minister is laying down the law. It continued:

Capital funds might also be provided to enable existing facilities to be extended to broaden their operations to integrate with other services. These funds would be allocated on a priority of needs basis.

Again, we are dealing with a needs basis. The situation as I see it is a problem especially to people who have given so much of their time and effort to kindergartens and in making them what they are today. At page 14 of the address it is stated:

Projects will be developed in two ways. Any person, group or organisation will remain at liberty to submit proposals for funding to the council. These will be sent to its operations committee for consideration and recommendation, after consultation with regional committees. . . . I should warn, however, that—due to likely cuts in Government spending—1975-76 will probably be a year of consolidation and forward planning rather than of significant expansion.

The Commonwealth Government wants to include these people. The South Australian Government among other Governments has given this policy its blessing. This involves people who are looking after children in their own

homes, homes that are not inspected to see what type of food is provided, what charges are made and what the conditions of these premises are, yet we see the situation in South Australia where these centres are in dire trouble. I am talking especially about child-minding centres that are open all hours of the day. On page 15 we see the punch line, when it is stated:

Actual implementation of integration and diversification is a mandatory prerequisite to funding for each kindergarten. The Minister has stipulated what must be done and has painted a picture about how good the concept will be for the general community. The address then refers to all people involved in kindergarten activities, kindergarten unions and to the families and people who have worked so hard for these organisations. It refers also to the director and staff and sets out all the problems to be faced. After all is said and done, if it does not work out as far as those people are concerned, they are obliged to do what is suggested by the Commonwealth because it is mandatory to do so if they are to survive. If the Commonwealth Government is to assist in paying the salaries of the director and staff then, unless they follow the directions laid down by the Commonwealth Government, not the State Government, finance will be withdrawn from kindergartens and they will end up as day-care centres have ended up throughout the State. The address continued:

They will be required to participate in the total local network of childhood services on a co-ordinated co-operative basis, and allow multi-purpose use of their facilities. Full-time staff will have to be capable of acting as advisers on a range of childhood services, interact freely with the other agencies interested in such services and work in aid of them. Young girls who want to make a career of teaching in kindergartens go to the Kindergarten Union training centres where they are trained for this purpose. If they continue their studies they can become directors and control their own kindergartens. What is their future if they have taken on the job because they wish to work with small children and because they like doing so? They want to be part of their kindergartens. As far as the Commonwealth Government is concerned, these people will become social workers. The directors will be so busy filling in and sending forms to the State Government and the Commonwealth Government that they will no longer be in close touch with the kindergarten children. They will be stuck in their offices doing office work. If they had wanted careers in office work they would have trained for such work when they left school, instead of training to be kindergarten teachers. They are being prevented from following the career of their choice—that of kindergarten teachers or directors. The address continues:

In general, it will be expected that most pre-schools be prepared to provide at least limited emergency and occasional child care, and foster public health operations. So, these people are asked to do all these things in their kindergartens. They have been told that, unless they start with some scheme this year, they will be in trouble at the end of this year.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You are behind the times.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am not behind the times. It is the Minister who is behind the times. First thing tomorrow he should get in touch with the Kindergarten Union: he should not leave it to his backroom boys. He himself should wrestle with the problem and find out from kindergartens in his own district. He should get time off from the Caucus meeting to do so.

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 8, at 2 p.m.