

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 26, 1953.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**TRAMWAYS TRUST INVESTIGATION.**

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Following upon the Premier's statement to the House yesterday that Colonel Bingham will not be available to advise the Tramways Trust on its problems, will he see that a committee composed of men who have made a success of transport problems in Adelaide are brought together to advise the trust? I feel it is futile to go overseas and bring in experts, no matter how expert they may be in their own country, when we have local men available who have proved that they can handle this problem efficiently.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The suggestion of bringing in an overseas expert was not made by the Government, but was a proposal approved by the trust without any reference to the Government. Under its legislation the trust has an obligation to do certain things. In examining its problem I have no doubt the trust will take into account the knowledge available to advise it. On a number of occasions it has asked the Government to make available particular officers to advise on certain aspects of its problems. There is no suggestion that this was a vote of no-confidence in the new trust which, I think, has set out in a very business-like way to bring the Adelaide transport system up-to-date and make it efficient. I have no doubt it will secure information from the best sources available to it.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Can the Premier say whether Colonel Bingham was invited to South Australia by the old board which was elected largely by the municipal councils, or by the new board, which was nominated by the Government. Is not the Premier of the opinion that men who have made a success of private transport businesses under existing South Australian conditions would be more suitable to advise the trust than a man from overseas, who has had an entirely different problem, knows nothing of our local conditions, and, I am given to understand, has not made a great success of solving the transport problems in the city by which he is paid?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As far as I know, the invitation to Colonel Bingham was

extended by the new board. I have heard no suggestion of his being invited by the old board, but I will make quite sure that my information is correct. I was not aware that there was anyone in South Australia, other than the Tramways Trust, actually engaged in running a tramway system. There are private bus owners running bus services and, I believe, operating them very efficiently, but they are operating them under entirely different conditions from those under which a public transport utility is operated. Two or three things provided by our public utility are not necessarily provided by a private operator. Firstly, the public utility usually provides a minimum service throughout the day under conditions which must frequently involve a loss on a particular trip. Any member who has studied the peak loading system of the tramways will realize that, if the trams were run only in the early morning when workers were going to work and in the evening when they were coming home, full trams with payable freights would probably eliminate a considerable part of the costs at present being heaped up against the trust. However, the tramway system has tried to provide a minimum service, say, every 10 or 20 minutes according to the district, and this involves an entirely different problem from that of running buses purely for profit with a purely commercial motive. Under those circumstances it is just too bad for travellers who do not happen to be travelling at that time. A public utility, however, gives a service somewhat wider than that. Many workers do not come to town during normal travelling times, for their work requires them to come at other times. I am not in any way depreciating the good work done by private bus operators. I have sympathy with the honourable member's feelings and desire that we should get the best advice possible, and will bring the honourable member's suggestion before the trust, but I am not sure that the information required by the trust would necessarily be available from within the State.

Mr. DUNKS—I understand the Premier told Mr. Macgillivray that a private bus owner had some privilege in that he could wait until he got a load before making a trip?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I did not say anything like that.

Mr. DUNKS—Then I ask the following questions: Is not the private bus owner under the control of the Tramways Trust in that,

firstly, he must supply his programme of running times? Is he not compelled to make definite charges as stipulated by the trust, and must not his bus be in a certain condition?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—These are quite new points, and I am happy to assure the honourable member that the private bus operator must secure a licence from the trust. I think he must have a vehicle which is suitable, and a schedule which he is obliged to maintain. These things were never questioned. I said he does not have to submit a schedule to the trust providing for uneconomic running. In many instances at present the trust, as a public utility, has to provide for many journeys to all parts of the metropolitan area when it is known before they start that they will be uneconomic because of the light loading at that time of the day.

BAROSSA DISTRICT WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. TEUSNER—In view of the increasing water requirements of the rapidly growing Barossa district and contiguous districts is it the Government's intention to link up the Warren water reticulation system with the Mannum pipeline and to increase or enlarge the Warren trunk main? If so, has either or both of these proposals been referred to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The original scheme submitted to the committee for taking the pipeline from Mannum to Adelaide did not include a link between the main pipeline and the Warren system. A further complementary scheme, however, has been prepared (and is now before the Public Works Committee) for the purpose of providing such a link and augmenting the supply to the Warren Reservoir and for the enlargement of the Warren trunk main to Paskeville. The total amount involved might easily run, if present costs are maintained, into £4,000,000. Consideration cannot be given to this proposal during this financial year, because the Estimates contained no provision for the work and the committee's report has not yet been received.

TRAMWAYS STRIKE.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Can the Premier say whether there is a likelihood of an early resumption of tram and bus services?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, except that I have heard unofficially, although I think authoritatively, that the tramway men this morning decided to return to work.

LAW RELATING TO STRIKES.

Mr. TRAVERS—I would like to put to the Premier some inquiries concerning the law relating to strikes in general (having in mind of course no particular strike). They are as follows:—Can the Premier say whether the Government will consider the desirability of extending the present law which creates the offence of public mischief so as to include any person who participates in a strike based upon no reasonable cause? and will the Government consider the desirability of extending the present law relating to compounding offences so as to prevent any employer who has dismissed an employee for just cause from reinstating him merely because of a show of mob rule?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member has raised two very important topics upon which I should not like to express an opinion without analysing them. If he will ask the question again next week I will give him a considered answer.

GALVANIZED IRON AND CEMENT SUPPLIES.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—I understand that Mr. Pollnitz, who was sent to the eastern States recently to obtain supplies of galvanized iron, has now returned, and I should like to know what success he had. As far as I can ascertain, the shortage is as acute as ever and many urgent works are held up. I am not suggesting that the Government is responsible for the position of the cement shortage, or can do much to correct it, but I understand that it has granted some financial assistance to at least one big cement company, and the Premier may have a knowledge of the possibilities of cement being secured. In my district many people have been waiting for 12 months for supplies and still have little or no prospects of getting any. Can the Premier throw any light on those two matters?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. Pollnitz has returned from the eastern States and supplied me with a very comprehensive report on the position of steel production there. The production of steel has risen greatly and appears to be adequate for all Australian requirements. Indeed, substantial quantities of steel products are being exported from Australia, even to the United States. The problem has been to secure the necessary ships and to get them loaded to bring the commodities to South Australia. Mr. Pollnitz discussed this matter with the shipping authorities and with the officers of the various companies concerned. He reported to me that it

is proposed to put additional ships on the run to this State and that at last additional men have been accepted for work on the wharves. While he was in the eastern States a call for 60 men to man the ships at one of the ports had a response of over 700 applicants, so there was no question of an overall shortage of men, but purely and simply the artificial restrictions placed upon the use of men to load the ships. I will be happy to bring down Mr. Pollnitz's report for perusal for any member interested. The production of cement has been stepped up sharply in South Australia, and I think the general position is somewhat easier. I realize that with the lifting of all restrictions on its use many works which had been held up over a long period were started and in some instances cement has been purchased against the commencement of work which has not yet actually taken place. If members have an urgent case where intervention is warranted, and will give me the particulars, the quantity of cement required, and the usual supplier so that the proper merchants can be acquainted with the position, I will do my utmost to see that relief is given.

WOOMERA ROCKET RANGE.

Mr. DUNNAGE—During the last week or so there has been a great deal of publicity in the press and over the air about the Woomera rocket range and about the amazing types of new weapons of destruction being tested there, and also about many prominent officials from England who are arriving to watch the tests. I understand, also from the press, that Mr. Menzies is likely to visit the range. Has any invitation been extended to the Premier to go to Woomera and, if so, when is he likely to be there?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—On a number of occasions I have received and accepted invitations to visit the Woomera rocket range in connection with various developments there. South Australia was responsible for the installation of a water supply for Woomera, and this Government has on all occasions given assistance when requested. However, this Government has no knowledge of the scientific experiments being conducted and, indeed, does not desire to have, for, being of the greatest importance, they must be kept as secret as possible, and there is no necessity for any member of this Parliament or Government to be in any way involved in those secrets. South Australia realizes the importance of the range and on the other hand has always received courtesies from

those responsible for it on any of the matters where State and Commonwealth activities overlap.

WHEAT MARKETING PLANS.

Mr. HEASLIP—An article in today's *Advertiser* headed "Crisis over Wheat Marketing" states:—

The wheat industry was facing its gravest marketing crisis since the depression years, the chairman of the Australian Wheat Board (Sir John Teasdale) said today. He was referring to the failure of the Victorian Government to agree with other States on terms of the proposed reserve wheat marketing plan. In view of the fact that wheatgrowers have been urged by responsible people to grow more wheat and that they have succeeded, we are now faced with the gravest crisis since the 1930's. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any action will be taken to get the Agricultural Council to meet to overcome the problem, since Victoria has, stupidly in my opinion, refused to co-operate with the other States?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The Agricultural Council met and formulated a plan for wheat stabilization for a period of five years and also a reserve plan, so that in the event of the stabilization plan not being agreed to by all the principal wheat-growing States, there would still be a plan in operation. Both the stabilization plan and the reserve plan envisaged 15s. a bushel as the home price of wheat for both human and stock consumption. That being so, it now rests with the Victorian Government to say what its attitude is. Neither the Agricultural Council nor anyone else, as far as I can see, can coerce the Victorian Government. However, I think that Government would be disturbed at the prospect of stabilization going out of existence, which could easily happen, if no steps were taken to overcome the deadlock. The majority of the States agreed to the stabilization plan. If Victoria agrees to it, it is possible to have a stabilization plan because all the principal wheat exporting States will be in line, but until that State agrees there must be a deadlock. The Commonwealth Minister for Commerce and Agriculture could call a further conference if he thought it possible either to get the other States which agreed to the plan to climb down or get the one State that did not agree to come into line with the others. It seems that little purpose would be served by calling the Agricultural Council together on that issue at present.

WATERSIDE WORK AT WALLAROO.

Mr. McALEES—Last week I asked the Premier to see what he could do for unemployed waterside workers at Wallaroo, and he promised to do his best and consult the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping, Senator McLeay, to see if ships could be sent there. I know this Government cannot do much in regard to shipping, but it is my duty to bring this matter before the House to let the Premier and other members know that there are no ships at Wallaroo and to see whether something can be done to provide work for the men, instead of attendance money.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have not yet had an opportunity of putting this and other matters before Senator McLeay, but I will do my utmost to do so as soon as possible.

HOMES FOR PENSIONERS AND AGED.

Mr. HEASLIP—In reply to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, the Premier said that the homes for old age pensioners to be built by the Housing Trust would be built in the city first, and that it was the trust's normal policy to build homes where the need was greatest. The need for homes for old age pensioners, whether in the city or in the country, is the same. The pensioners would be perhaps happier in a country town than in the city. The cost of building homes in the country would be no greater, probably less, than in the city. Will the Premier consider the building of homes outside the metropolitan area, where there are too many people already?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member says the cost of building is no greater in the country, but in nearly every country centre the cost is substantially greater. The matter of building homes for the aged was raised by the Pensioners' Association, which asked that these homes should be made available in the metropolitan area, so the trust is in fact giving effect to that request. If sufficient requests are made by an appropriate authority and the numbers are sufficient to warrant it for the trust to consider building such homes in other places, they will be considered.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. SHANNON—Following on conversations I have had with the member for Flinders relating to the American system of road construction in what we call outer areas using cement as a stabilizing agent with any local material which is available for roadmaking, I believe that in America they have developed a machine which does the

actual mixing of the final surfacing of the road and lays the material whilst proceeding along the roadway at a considerably greater speed than that attained in our more orthodox methods of road construction and final sealing. As the result of the matter having been raised, I believe by Mr. Pearson, can the Minister of Highways and Local Government say whether the department has given careful thought to the possibility of using such a device, particularly in the areas that Mr. Pearson knows about on Eyre Peninsula? Kangaroo Island is another place where I imagine there would be suitable material for use as a stabilizing agent. There are many places on the mainland where that form of roadway may serve the purpose for a long period. It may not be as good as present methods of construction, but it would be much cheaper.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The member for Flinders took up the matter with me, and I, in turn, had a number of conferences with the Highways Commissioner thereon. Not only has the Highways Commissioner been abroad and studied recent developments in road construction, but there is a first-class laboratory at Mile End, which I invite any honourable member to see, where every type of material is tested. Other officers have been abroad also. Prior to hearing from Mr. Pearson the suggestion to mix native earth with cement, during Mr. Fleming's time as Commissioner the mixture was utilized for some roads near Salisbury, and I saw it done. The Highways Commissioner has given cogent reasons why it would not be economical to use it in a general way. The cost of the plant would be heavy, the material would have to be such that it would mix with cement, the cost of cement is greater than that of other materials, and the cost of carting the cement would be another great factor. The net result would be that no saving could be effected or expected. We would like to use it, but the factors are adverse. I will let the honourable member have a full report from the Highways Commissioner.

RAILWAY SLEEPERS FOR EYRE PENINSULA DIVISION.

Mr. PEARSON—Following on comments I made during the Address in Reply debate about sleepers being required for the Eyre Peninsula division, last week-end a serious derailment took place close to my property. Eleven trucks of wheat were turned over and the line was out of commission for several

days. In view of the condition of the track in many parts of the division, and the urgent need of sleepers to keep the track at least open for traffic, has the Minister of Railways anything to report regarding getting supplies of sleepers for the division?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The real difficulty is getting good jarrah sleepers from Western Australia. We have had orders in for sleepers from many areas. We have gone as far as Trinidad and have got some through England. The net result is that we have insufficient sleepers to do half the work we would like to do; and therefore each case must be judged on its merits. I am sure the Acting Railways Commissioner will not allow that line to be without sleepers simply because some have been destroyed. He will see that sleepers are obtained from another place. I will bring down a report from the Acting Railways Commissioner.

STEEL WORKS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

Mr. RICHES—My question relates to the report submitted to Parliament yesterday by the Director of Mines. He recommends an expansion of the steel works programme and specifically refers to the establishment of a steel industry in South Australia. Paragraphs 10 and 11 of his summary are as follows:—

Ample supplies of high-grade iron ore are available in Australia for the proposed expansion programme, but it is vitally necessary that the export of iron ore, pig iron and scrap iron be restricted so that they can be conserved to maintain production of low cost steel for as long as possible. Little is known of the iron ore reserves of Australia. After 25 to 30 years, unless new discoveries of high-grade iron ore are made, low-grade ore will have to be relied on for continued as well as further increases in steel production. The tempo of exploration and development should be increased, with special attention being given to those areas where the economics of production are favourable. South Australia provides 99 per cent of the total iron ore production of Australia. Its known reserves of high-grade ore are not unlimited, but are adequate to support a new steel plant of 750,000 to 1,000,000 tons capacity for a period of 30 years. At the same time they are adequate to supply Port Kembla and Newcastle for a similar period. The reserves should not be depleted to an extent which will prejudice the establishment of a large scale steel works in South Australia.

In another part of the report the director points out that deposits at Iron Monarch are being depleted and that "approximately half of this magnificent deposit of iron ore has been removed." In view of his further report and strong recommendation will the Premier

take up with the Commonwealth Government the question of the desirability of imposing restrictions or exercising some control over the amount of pig iron and iron ore exported to other countries?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As regards pig iron, the Commonwealth Government has for many years controlled its export on a licence basis. It is purely Commonwealth control. The Commonwealth Constitution provides that trade and commerce between the States and overseas shall be under the control of the Commonwealth Parliament. It is a matter over which my Government has no control and upon which it has not been consulted. As regards the general recommendation the honourable member has read, I remind him that my Government has never stood for repudiation and it would not, under any circumstances, stand for the repudiation of any agreement that had ever been entered into by a South Australian Parliament or Government. The position is that certain leases have been made available to the Broken Hill Pty. Co. by an Indenture Act passed by a South Australian Parliament and as far as my Government is concerned it is not a subject for repudiation.

Mr. Riches—No one has suggested that it is.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member, by his question, has suggested it. If he will look at the Act he will see that none of the matters he has mentioned is included.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 19. Page 415.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—Mr. Speaker—

Labor members—Resign.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A cursory glance at the Bill shows that it provides for a number of matters, but to make sure that I understand correctly the intentions of the Leader of the Opposition I should like to recite them briefly to make sure that we are arguing the Bill upon common ground and debating it with all the facts clearly stated. I understand that the principal matter dealt with is an alteration of the constitution of each House: that the Legislative Council is to be altered to consist of 18 members representing three six-member constituencies and the House of Assembly is to consist of 45 members representing nine five member constituencies; also,

that these constitutional changes are a first step to the introduction of the system of proportional representation. In addition, consequential amendments are proposed following upon an alteration of the electorates. In the short time available to me I have not had an opportunity to study the full effects this would have. Another proposal is to alter the system relating to deadlocks. In lieu of a double dissolution, which is at present available, the Bill proposes that when a deadlock occurs there shall be a joint sitting of both Houses. A further amendment deals with the deletion of the requirement that members of the Legislative Council must be at least 30 years of age and substitutes the age of 21. I think that that sets out in broad terms the proposals contained in the Bill. I find that the honourable member's arguments for the amendments are based largely on the principle he advocates of one vote, one value.

Mr. O'Halloran—In that respect I agree with Sir Winston Churchill.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member has quoted all kinds of authorities. Under the Acts Interpretation Act all legislation which comes before this House should be of a remedial nature, and I take it that what the honourable member is seeking is to remedy a defect which he feels exists in that we have not in this State the system of "one vote, one value." I have studied this matter extensively and can find no mandate for even supposing that there is such a principle in electoral matters as "one vote, one value." It is something which the Leader of the Opposition has conjured out of thin air. It is certainly not a principle adopted in the Constitution of Australia or that of any of the Australian States, with perhaps one exception.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you accept the proposal in the Constitution of Australia?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will come to that shortly. I am quite happy to deal with this matter and also with a number of the honourable member's assertions which I find completely without foundation. He has drawn together a miscellaneous number of items, some of them completely unrelated and some not even consistent, and has said, "This constitutes a Bill of electoral reform." We in this House were apparently expected to swallow that statement as if it were something that could not be questioned, like the law of Moses. The very basis on which the Bill was founded, the basis of one vote, one value, which was the keynote of all the Leader of the

Opposition's contentions, is completely without any mandate as an electoral system in any part of the world, with perhaps one or two minor exceptions. It is certainly not an accepted system generally. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the United Nations, and it immediately occurred to me that we should consider the position there when discussing this Bill. That body was greatly sponsored by the Leader of the Federal Labor Party, Dr. Evatt.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—And a right of veto has been given to a minority.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and we find that countries with a population of 40,000 have the same effective representation in the United Nations organization as countries with a population of 600,000,000. There was no principle there of one vote, one value. Dr. Evatt had some personal gratification and ambition, and proceeded to organize the small nations. Australia goes forward to the United Nations with a population of 7,000,000, but our representative can talk with as much assurance as India's delegate, representing 600,000,000. I listened to the Leader of the Opposition with great patience, and I did not mention the United Nations.

Mr. O'Halloran—Nor did I.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—*Hansard* shows that he did. This so-called principle that the Leader of the Opposition has placed before us as inviolable is not a principle, but only a figment of his imagination. It does not exist in other countries. In Australia it has been realized that Governments must deal with electoral matters from a practical point of view. We must consider what the ultimate result of the system will be.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is the way you always approach this question.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Perhaps I can give the honourable member some illuminating information on this matter. Let us consider what has been done in the neighbouring State of Western Australia, where there was a redistribution of seats recently. The system operating there has been accepted by the present Labor Government, for it did not announce any intention of altering it and, in fact, has no intention of doing so. The arrangement of the Legislative Assembly electoral districts there is regulated by the Electoral Districts Act of 1947, which provides for the division of Western Australia into three areas—the metropolitan; north-west; and agricultural, mining and pastoral areas. In

Western Australia they have gone much further than we, for we have classified our districts into only country and city. The Act allots three seats to the north-west area, an area to be divided into districts at the discretion of the electoral commissioners. The remaining seats, that is the remaining 47, were to be divided between the other two areas on a quota basis, reckoning two metropolitan electors as one elector. The electoral commissioners were then required to divide each area into electoral districts on an ordinary quota basis, a margin of 10 per cent either way being permitted. The commissioners were required to give due consideration to community of interest, means of communication, distance from the capital, physical features, and the boundaries of existing electoral districts.

It will be noted that a definite advantage was given by the Act to the extra-metropolitan elector. The Act provides for a further redistribution on the passing of a resolution by the Legislative Assembly or on the report of the Chief Electoral Officer that the enrolment in not less than five districts falls short of the quota or exceeds the quota by 20 per cent. The initial redistribution was proclaimed in 1948. This electoral system in Western Australia was not formulated in the horse and buggy days, but is modern in conception. The Western Australian *Quarterly Statistical Abstract* of December, 1952, shows that at the election that took place on March 25, 1950, the maximum enrolment was 9,882 votes, and the minimum enrolment was 1,078. That gives a mean figure of 5,480. The number of electorates with enrolments of over 5,480 was 21, and the number with enrolments under 5,480 was 29. There were three electorates with less than 2,000 electors, three between 2,000 and 4,000, 24 between 4,000 and 6,000, none between 6,000 and 8,000, and 20 electorates with 8,000 and over.

Mr. O'Halloran—None with 51,000.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, nor do we, in South Australia, have any electorates with only 1,000 electors. The Western Australian Government holds office by virtue of those three small electorates. Where, then, is this wonderful principle of one vote one value which is advocated by the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Dunks—What Government was in power when that policy was implemented?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A Liberal Government, but the present Labor Government

proposes to perpetuate it. In the last South Australian Parliament the Liberal Party held seven of the large seats, the Labor Party only six, and we did not hear so much then about this aspect of the position. The arrangement of electoral districts in Queensland is regulated by the Electoral Districts Act of 1949—legislation not of the horse and buggy age, but of a recent year. It was introduced by a Labor Government, not as its first attempt at this kind of thing, but as a result of great experience and knowledge of the system. That Labor Government has gone much further in Queensland than we have gone in this State, for Queensland has been divided into four zones with a fixed number of seats in each zone—not merely metropolitan and country zones as in South Australia. The commissioners are required to find a quota for each zone by dividing the number of electors in the zone by the number of seats allotted to it. They are then required to fix electoral districts based roughly on the quota of electors for each district and are allowed a margin of one-fifth of the quota either way. The commissioners had to give due consideration to community or diversity of interests, communications, physical features, and petty sessional districts and local government areas. The Act appears to make a distinction between metropolitan and country voters, since 24 seats are allotted in the metropolitan zone.

Mr. O'Halloran—I mentioned all that in my speech last year. There is nothing new about it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, but some of these everlasting truths are sometimes overlooked. What is new is that the suggestion advanced by Mr. O'Halloran that there was involved, in Queensland, an accepted electoral principle of one vote one value is wrong. There is not one iota of truth in that suggestion, for in Queensland 24 seats have been allotted to the metropolitan zone and 51 to the remaining zones. I remind honourable members that the redistribution of seats in South Australia was not made by my Government.

Mr. Stephens—It was made by your Party, if not by your Government.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It was not made by my Government. A committee was given a direction to provide for two country seats for every metropolitan seat, and that is the basis of Mr. O'Halloran's objection, but in Queensland there are 51 seats in the country to only 24 in the metropolitan area.

Mr. O'Halloran—What are the relative metropolitan and country populations of Queensland and South Australia?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have those figures, but I propose to give figures which I consider would be more useful to honourable members. The *Brisbane Courier-Mail* of March 9, dealing with the Queensland State elections of last March, gave the following enrolments for electoral districts:—

Number of Electors.	Districts.
Under 5,000	6
5,001 to 10,000	34
10,001 to 15,000	31
15,001 to 20,000	3
Over 20,000	1

Do those figures signify an adherence to the sacred principle of one vote one value advocated by Mr. O'Halloran? By interjection members opposite have asked about the set-up under the Australian Constitution, but what is the position with regard to that Constitution?

Mr. Lawn—It is haywire.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Anything with which the honourable member disagrees is haywire. The Australian Constitution provides, firstly, that in the House of Representatives, notwithstanding the number of persons in a State, the number of representatives shall not fall below a certain number.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—That was a concession to Western Australia.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—And also to Tasmania. In fact, it was a concession to parts not fully developed and populated. Secondly, the Constitution also provides that in the Senate, the House which has equal legislative authority except in one minor sense, each State, irrespective of its size, shall have equal representation. Does that fact uphold the principle of one vote one value? It does not; in fact, when the Labor Party was recently making sweeping amendments with regard to Senate elections, it dealt with the problem not from that angle, but rather with the idea of making the Senate safe for life. They were not concerned at all that the ratio of South Australian Senate electors to the number of South Australian senators was only one-fifth of that in New South Wales, and took no action to change that situation even though they had a majority in both Houses.

Mr. Dunstan—They could not have altered it even by a majority decision in both Houses.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, they would have had to refer it to the people, who would

have turned it down because it was not acceptable. Recently a Federal Labor Government established a system of Parliamentary government for the Northern Territory. As the Northern Territory was a Federal territory, the Federal Government required no mandate from the people as to how the Parliament for the Northern Territory should be set up. All that was necessary was to pass a Bill constituting that Parliament. Although a Federal Labor Government had complete power over the Constitution of the Northern Territory Parliament, did it adopt the sacred principle of one vote one value? The member for Adelaide, who has frequently interjected in this debate, knows that the Constitution of the Northern Territory Parliament contains no reference to anything like that principle and that in no other part of the world is there a Parliament elected on a less democratic basis than that of the Northern Territory.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is not Parliament.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Up to a point the Council makes ordinances governing the territory. People in the area elect six members to the Council, and six are appointed by the Administration. The Administrator is appointed by the Minister, and is automatically the President of the Council. In case things should go wrong, it is provided that all decisions are subject to veto by the Minister, and the Council cannot deal with money matters. The principle of one vote one value was not adopted in this instance, although the Council was set up by a Labor Government. The people of Northern Territory were told that they were being given local government. The sacred principle enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition is not adopted universally throughout the world. The position varies because of local problems. I often get suggestions, some good, from Opposition members. They speak about the need for decentralization, greater amenities in the country, and the improvement of country public utilities. Members of my own Party, and Independent members, make good suggestions on these matters, but we all realize that there are inherent difficulties in tackling the problems. It is said that the country has an advantage because of the electoral set up, yet, generally speaking, the country is under-privileged. Members know that there are problems associated with country development quite apart from the number of electors in any district. Many of our undeveloped and less populated parts present the greatest problems, yet the Bill

takes from some of the districts the representation they have at present. I believe the present electoral set up has been of great benefit to them. It would be a bad thing for the State if the representation were reduced. I want members to realize that at the moment I am not speaking politically, I will do that later. If this House, instead of comprising members of two Parties and some Independent members, consisted of members of only one Party, and the important matter of State development were considered without bias, it would soon be decided to give more representation to the country.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is admitted in my proposal.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member proposes nine districts, each having five members. Four of the districts are to be in the country and five in the metropolitan area.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not say that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. The honourable member omitted to say it. There were one or two explanations of the Bill which left much to be desired. Tactfully, much was left out of them. Of the 45 members proposed 20 will come from the country.

Mr. Stephens—The Bill does not say that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Figures say it. Do members opposite know what is provided in the Bill? Mr. O'Halloran says it does not say that there will be four districts in the country and five in the city but Mr. Lawn said, "What is wrong with that?" I suggest we get some enlightenment as to what is actually proposed. We have a right to know the true position. If I understand the Bill correctly, the number of members in this House will be increased by six. I did not hear any reasons given for this increase, but there must be some. Yesterday when I introduced a Bill to increase the number of Ministers I tried at length, with some assistance from members opposite, to explain why I thought there should be two more Ministers. That matter was placed before the electors before the last State elections in a clear statement on Government policy. At the time I did not hear any suggestion by the Labor Party to increase the number of members in this House by six.

Mr. O'Halloran—It was in the policy speech.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Then it must have been said in an obscure hall, and if it was said the electors did not support it.

Mr. O'Halloran—We got a majority vote.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I did not see any great enthusiasm by electors for that particular activity. If the honourable member adopts the principle of one vote one value—

Mr. Stephens—You will lose the present Government.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think not. Under the Bill the number of country members will be lowered from 26 to 20 and I believe the number of metropolitan members will be increased from the present 13 to 25. That is the position as I understand it.

Mr. O'Halloran—You do not understand it. That is the trouble.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member made a long speech and I gave considerable attention to it, but he did not come out and frankly state how many members the country would have. He did talk about one vote one value, and I believe that the member for Adelaide agrees that that principle should be adopted. If we adopt one vote one value and bring in a system as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition then we will get a result that is significantly close to what I have stated. We will then have the position that the member for Adelaide, instead of taking 10 minutes to walk across his district, will take only five minutes.

Mr. Lawn—Some members opposite ride in motor cars through their districts.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I draw the members' attention to the big country districts of Eyre and Flinders. What chance would the member for Stuart have of adequately representing his district under the system suggested? I believe there are two things which are self-evident if one studies the position with a degree of intelligence and impartiality. The first is the suggestion that an electoral system based upon one vote one value is unsound.

Mr. Davis—What are you going to do as an alternative?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I suggest that the Bill should be rejected because it is inherently wrong. If it were applied to this State it would have not a desirable but an undesirable effect upon the health, wealth and happiness of the community. If one studies the Senate of the United States of America one will find that the little State of Nevada, a desert area away out in the west, has the same number of Senators as the wealthy and powerful State of New York.

Mr. Davis—The same position applies in Australia.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Exactly. Mr. O'Halloran's argument in point of fact boils down to a fallacy. It has been stated by the Opposition that the present system was designed to return and maintain a Liberal Government perpetually in power.

Mr. O'Halloran—And it has been a very efficient instrument.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The single electorate system applied for the first time to the 1938 election, and records will show that out of a House of 39 members nine Labor members were returned, 15 Liberal members, and 15 Independents.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The last-named did not represent anybody.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the Butler Government, which was in power when this system was approved by Parliament, set out, as we were told, to provide a system which would result in a perpetual Liberal Government, it was singularly inept in its job, because the first time it was put into operation the Liberals got only 15 members out of 39. The Liberal Party, at that time carried on the Government for one reason and one reason only—it was the only Party which had a coherent policy. At that time our friends opposite were wrangling among themselves and had two Leaders of the Opposition. The Liberal Government was able to carry on not because of the electoral system, but because it was a coherent organization with a definite policy. Many of the present members of Parliament were members at that time. Mr. Macgillivray is one of them, and he will tell members that all legislation was considered by the Independents on its merits and they voted for or against it as they liked. They had no time for the Liberal Party, and often were its frank critics. However, they were confronted with the position that the Liberal Party was the only organization which could provide a coherent Government. On the very first occasion when the present electoral system was put into operation it did not return a Liberal Government, but the Liberal Government was kept in office because the Opposition was completely disorganized and was in fact split into different sections over an economic issue.

Mr. O'Halloran—Your memory is usually pretty good, but it is wrong there. The Opposition was organized and had only one leader in 1938.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the Labor Party today held all the seats it has held at some time since 1938 it would in fact have more members than the Government Party.

The member for Murray captured his seat from Labor at the last election, a seat which Labor had held ever since the single electorate system applied. On a number of occasions my Party has held Norwood, which under normal circumstances would be considered a Labor seat, and it will hold it again; it has also held Prospect and will hold it again. It is not that the Labor Party has not had the numbers, but it has not been able to attract the electoral support. The Labor Party held Stanley, but lost it, and it has also held Torrens, but lost it.

Mr. O'Halloran—And it will hold it again.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is time enough to consider these matters after the event. The Labor Party lost Stanley because it said to the member for Stanley, "You must do so and so," but the honourable member said he was here to represent his district and would sooner get out of the Labor Party than do what it told him to then. It is not a question of the numbers having been rigged against the Labor Party, for if it had held the seats it formerly won it would constitute the Government today. During the last election campaign several visitors came from other States. We seldom see them, except at election time, and they proceeded to run the rule over the South Australian electors, but they knew nothing of our traditions. They should not tell us how to put our house in order. If they looked at their own houses they would find plenty to occupy them for a long time.

In addition to all the undesirable features about the Bill I have mentioned there is the extremely difficult matter of proportional representation. It has been tried in a number of Australian States and now applies to Senate elections, but it will cause more chaos in the Federal sphere than any other provision ever enacted. It will mean that for half the time at least the Government Party in the House of Representatives will be without a majority in the Senate. If proportional representation had applied since the Federal Parliament was constituted the elected representatives that formed the Government of the country would have been faced for at least half the time with an adverse Senate.

Mr. Macgillivray—Isn't the Senate supposed to be a non-Party house?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will deal with that point in a moment, but proportional representation for Senate elections constitutes one of the most serious problems in the country. The South Australian Parliament has no

authority over the Commonwealth Constitution, but we are certainly not unassociated with the Commonwealth Parliament. There is plenty of room for sincere differences of opinion between members on this side of the House and members opposite, but if we cannot have a Labor Government with the power to govern, at least let us have a Liberal Government with the power to govern. We cannot have a country without a Government at all.

Mr. Shannon—France is trying proportional representation, but it does not work too well.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is so, and the same applies to Italy. The lessons to be learned from those countries should be sufficient warning for us.

Mr. Riches—What would be the position in the Senate today without proportional representation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There would be a Liberal majority in that Chamber.

Mr. Riches—No, only as regards one State.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the people decide they want a Labor Government in the Federal sphere next year, there will still be a Liberal majority in the Senate, but under the old system of electing the Senate there would be a Labor majority there as well. I believe that in the future the electors will not decide who shall have the majority in the Senate, but the State Parliaments will. The two sides in the Senate will be so even that with one or two deaths the balance could be upset; and the State Houses of Parliament fill casual vacancies.

Mr. John Clark—But not under true proportional representation.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—One of the difficulties of proportional representation is that by-elections cannot be held. Some other method of filling vacancies has to be evolved. Tasmania has proportional representation, and members opposite look at that State with longing, but who runs the Tasmanian Parliament today?

Mr. John Clark—The electors.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, one Independent member.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—One vote there is of astronomical value.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When it was mooted that that Independent member had a desire to become a Senator I never saw any Government in Australia go into such a tailspin as the Tasmanian Government did, which decided it had to persuade him not to stand. When I asked why I was told, "Under

proportional representation the next member would be a Liberal." The Government used all its influence to make him stay put, for another Liberal member would have meant a change of Government. Having seen the weaknesses of proportional representation and its results I strongly advise the House to keep clear of it.

Mr. Riches—If the electors of Murray had voted differently at the last election we would be in the same position as Tasmania.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Probably, but that would have been as a result of a vote of the electors. That is the difference. No-one will deny the mathematical excellencies of proportional representation, but there are one or two fundamental difficulties associated with it that have not yet been overcome in any part of the world.

Mr. Macgillivray—What are they?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The first is the difficulty associated with a by-election.

Mr. Macgillivray—That is not very important.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—But the next member to get into Parliament may be of a different political complexion. We, in this State, follow closely the traditions of British Parliaments. The essentials of good Parliamentary government, as we know it, are twofold; the Government must have sufficient authority to enable it to carry out its functions and there must be an Opposition which will be on the job to see that the Government does not get off the rails.

Mr. Macgillivray—Have you heard of collective Ministries?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have heard of all sorts of queer and quaint things, but I am discussing the essentials of good Parliamentary government with which foreign countries are not acquainted. Parliamentary government has not worked there so well and smoothly, nor given such good results, as in British countries.

Mr. Macgillivray—That is questionable, for it has worked effectively in Switzerland for many years.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have been to Switzerland, and, although I have every regard for the hard working Swiss people, I consider even with all their moral excellence and good qualities they do not enjoy the quality of freedom that we as British people enjoy, nor do the peoples of any other countries.

Mr. Macgillivray—Is that because of Party politics as we experience them in this House?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am speaking of Parliamentary institutions, but, because he does not understand Party politics, the honourable member wants to talk about them whenever he can. Proportional representation has resulted in calamity and ruin in France. Probably more than any other factor, the fact that the French political sphere was riddled with graft and inefficiency led to Hitler's declaration of war which ultimately resulted in France's downfall, and the position will remain the same until, firstly, proportional representation is abolished in France.

Mr. John Clark—They haven't got it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Secondly, the French Parliament should be made responsible directly to the people, the same as the Australian Parliament. Only then will it emerge with a sane Government capable of carrying out the country's affairs. I oppose the Bill, for I do not believe it is in the best interests of the country, nor is it based on proper principles. To pass it would be a retrograde step, for the suggestion of proportional representation is no good and should never be mentioned in any suggestion of electoral reform.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—Following on the eloquent words of the Premier I feel a trifle bashful about adding my small voice to the discussion, but I must do my best. As I listened patiently to him, I recalled an old Zulu saying:—"I have spoken," meaning "I have said what I think and everybody else must think the same." As the Premier constantly turned to speak to his sycophants behind him, I imagined him saying "I have spoken." I had hoped that this matter would be dealt with on a non-Party basis. The Premier had an enormous amount to say about the principle of one vote one value. I maintain—and I am supported by all members on this side and, I think, some on the other side—that that principle is simply a matter of elementary justice and something which we could not possibly expect the Premier to understand. Much has been said about the Western Australian electoral system, but that system has nothing to do with us. We would not have the impertinence to dictate to Western Australia about its system. The Labor Party in Western Australia did at least succeed in beating the Liberal and Country League gerrymander in that State. The Queensland electoral system was mentioned, but that also has nothing to do with us. Even if a gerrymander exists in that State we have no right to dictate to the Queensland

people on the electoral system there. Had the same percentage of swing that we had in South Australia away from the Liberal and Country League Government at the last South Australian election occurred in Queensland away from Labor, even under the so-called gerrymander there, the Queensland Labor Government would not have retained office, so that is one gerrymander—if it can be called a gerrymander—that is hard to compare with that existing in this State.

The Premier took a long time in talking around all the points of the compass without arriving at any destination. Surely Mr. O'Halloran, in introducing this Bill, gave the answer to all the Premier's statements when he quoted the figures of the overall majority of votes recorded by Labor at the last State election. I regret the Premier did not have much to say about proportional representation. Indeed, what he did say showed his abysmal ignorance of the subject. Apparently, he does not understand it and therefore he is not interested in it. Proportional representation is one of the most important aspects of this Bill, but the Premier was prepared to dismiss it lightly. He had much to say about Tasmania where, he claimed, one Independent keeps the Government in office under proportional representation, but he forgot to mention that from 1938 to 1941 Independent members kept his Government in office.

Mr. Fred Walsh—And also between 1941 and 1944.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes. I must support the Bill, as I am sure all thoughtful members must. It is an attempt to redress the wrongs of minority Government which we have experienced in South Australia. Labor members will readily admit that, if under the system we advocate, the Liberal and Country League Government is returned, it will not be in a position of being retained in defiance of the wishes of the people as it is at present. If that happened, surely the prestige of the Liberal and Country League would be higher than it is today—and it certainly needs raising. Labor members would be disappointed at the return of a Liberal and Country League Government under the system we advocate, but at least we would have the satisfaction of knowing that the system was fair to everybody. We want a majority and not a minority to have the Government they desire.

Under the Commonwealth Electoral Act it is incumbent on the Government to cause a redistribution of seats when conditions demand

it, and that has been done. We want not only to amend the boundaries but to give electors a method of voting which will ensure that their vote has a full value. It seems odd that in this State there is no legislative provision for periodical adjustments as there is in the Commonwealth Act. It is absurd that at present the Constitution Act, and not the Electoral Act, provides for the details concerning the arrangement of the electorates. Should not such specific provisions as the rules for the determination of electoral boundaries be included in the Electoral Act, as is the case in most States? Would it not be more convenient if they were in the one Act? The Premier tried to show that electoral reform was unnecessary in this State, but in recent State elections Labor has regularly polled a greater aggregate of votes than the Liberal and Country League. Yet the majority throughout the State is negatived and treated as a minority in the Parliament. The people should be entitled to one vote each. There should not be a varying value of the vote according to where the voter lives. We have heard several specious arguments on this matter. Surely if 60 per cent of the voters support one Party and 40 per cent another Party, the number of members in the Parliament should be in the ratio of six to four. That is plain, hard fact.

Mr. Lawn—It would be representative government.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes. I want to speak about proportional representation, which was neglected by the Premier. Despite what has been said today it is a system of proved justice. I want to show some of its advantages. It should not have been regarded as a matter related to Party politics, and I regret that Party politics have been brought into the debate. It should be considered as elementary justice. In a democratic country with democratic people we should have the opportunity to elect a democratic Parliament, but at present we have not got one. I do not claim that all my thoughts are original. After all we must learn from the past. I do not want members to think that my thoughts on this matter have not come from other people. I have one or two quotations from people who have been of some worth in this world. I want to show what they think of proportional representation, even if our Premier does not like it. Some years ago Sir Winston Churchill said:—

Both therefore on the grounds of securing a truer representation of the people and the

strengthening of the House of Commons, I am in favour of electoral reform. First the application of proportional representation

I do not always agree with Sir Winston, and I do not think he cares whether or not I do, but on this occasion I do agree with him. H. G. Wells, who many people say talks a great deal of sense, went further than Sir Winston Churchill and said, "The only civilized method of democracy is proportional representation. It is the right way and all the other ways are wrong and bad." The Leader of the Opposition referred to the economist, J. S. Mill, and the other night I saw a remark by him with regard to proportional representation. He said, "It is the will of the people ascertained under the fairest system ever devised by the mind of man." Would members support a law, or even tolerate one, which provided that all votes cast for a Liberal candidate in, say, Hindmarsh should be null and void? Would they agree that all the votes cast for a Labor candidate in, say, Mitcham should be null and void? If such proposal were put forward members on both sides would rise in anger and oppose it, yet in the two districts mentioned—and there are others which could be cited—that sort of thing obtains.

After hearing the remarks today I realize that some explanation is necessary on how proportional representation works. It is the only effective answer to the gerrymander, referred to by the Leader of the Opposition as an ugly beast which raised its head in America and is not yet extinct, but is thriving. A gerrymander provides safe seats for mediocrities, or even dodderers and suchlike. Proportional representation is the only system which gives elected bodies representation in proportion to voting strength. It is obtained by what is known as the single transferable vote. It is not a difficult system to understand. It provides for three things. First, the electoral districts must be large enough to each return several members. It will not work with single electorates. Secondly, although there are several members to elect, each elector shall have only one vote, which he gives in the first instance to the candidate he prefers. Thirdly, this single vote shall in certain contingencies be transferable from one candidate to another, and the elector by the placing of his vote controls the transfer of his vote. This vote is made transferable in order that provision may be made for the representation to be proportional. The vote is transferable

when the elector's first choice has more votes than he requires to be elected, or when after all surplus votes have been transferred the elector's first choice is at the bottom of the poll.

I remember reading some years ago about something a school master at a public school in England did when he desired the boys to elect prefects. I believe it was one of the origins of proportional representation. On looking at the school roll he found that there was a larger percentage of boys in the lower than in the upper school, and he was afraid that if there were a straightout vote the upper school would be swamped by prefects from the lower school, which was not desirable. He had the idea then of taking the boys out in the school-yard arranging 10 seats, and putting the name of a candidate on each seat. Then he said to the 100 boys who had to vote, "Go and stand against the seat of the candidate you prefer." When there were enough boys standing around one seat he sent boys along to the next seat, and so on. That was a simple illustration of proportional representation.

We have heard something about Senate elections. The Premier forgot to mention that under the old electoral system for the Senate the voting at the last Senate elections would have returned five Labor candidates. It has been said that the Senate was to be a non-party House. That is a joke, but it was the original idea. Many people make the mistake of confusing the old style of Senate voting with proportional representation. Let me give an example of how preferential voting used to work for the Senate. Let us suppose three Labor and three Liberal candidates sat for three seats. Let us suppose that of the Labor candidates A got 200,000 first preferences, B 1,000, and C 1,000, and that of the Liberal candidates D got 199,000, E 1,000, and F 1,000. If they all voted the ticket, and a big percentage of the electors would, the Labor side would get 202,000 votes and the Liberal side 201,000, yet under the old style of preferential voting the three Labor candidates would be returned and no Liberal candidate. Under proportional representation the total votes cast would be 403,000. The quota to elect a candidate would be that number divided by one more than the total number of members required, plus one more vote, which would give a quota of roughly 100,000. When the first man gets 100,000 plus 1, the rest of the first preferences are transferred to the number two, if voting the ticket, and

so on. According to the figures I have given Labor would get two Senators and the Liberal Party the other one, and that would be a just proportion of the votes cast. To give a simple illustration. Supposing that 50 citizens are present at a meeting to elect a committee of five and 26 vote for one group of five and 24 for another group of five. Under our present system all five of the first group are elected and none of the second group. Supposing that 12 months later another committee has to be elected and two of the 50 members have changed their minds. We now find that 24 vote for the first group and 26 for the second and all five of the second group are elected, and those who held office the previous year are defeated. In other words, we have two people controlling the votes of 50.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Under proportional representation one man has dominated Tasmania for years. That is the only place in Australia where that system operates.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Later I shall give a long list of places where it applies. Under our present system, as in the case I have just cited where two people virtually control an election, an over-importance is given to the floating vote, and hence we find that electors are frustrated and defrauded of the value of their vote if they do vote. We maintain that one vote should have the same value throughout the State. At the beginning of his speech today the Premier said that he had had only time enough to give a cursory glance at the Bill, and when I listened to what he had to say I realized that on this occasion he was speaking the truth. Under our proposal single electorates will be grouped to form one large electorate. It is impossible for proportional representation to work in single electorates. Thus, instead of having five single electorates where only the majority-holders are elected we get one large electorate with five elected according to the proportions of their votes; and people are not disfranchised, and usually we find there is a contest in every electorate and not just winners and losers as in a football match or a boxing contest.

Let us consider an example which shows the pernicious system under which we have our so-called democratic rights. I shall take the general election in England in 1951. The Prime Minister, Mr. Atlee, disgusted by his minute majority went to the country, and under the single electorate system lost. But the results of this British election, like that of 1950, makes nonsense of the popular belief that whatever its faults their present system

of election can be relied upon to provide one Party or another with a substantial majority upon which to base strong Government. It sounds like South Australia. At this election, although Labor secured the highest vote on record by any Party in any general election in British history, for its vote of 13,949,000 it gained only 295 seats, whereas the Conservatives with 200,000 fewer votes got 321 seats. Had this election been held under proportional representation it would have resulted in a slightly different story. The result would have been as follows:—Labor 304 seats, Conservative 298, Liberals 15, and others 4. That shows the discrepancy occurring under a shopworn system of election. I should like to give a simple election for five members in one district under proportional representation to be conducted on the lines we hope to introduce under our Bill. I shall submit a simple ballot paper. It is most unlikely that the seven mentioned are ever likely to contest an election against each other in the one electorate. I am using the particular names mentioned because they are well-known in South Australian and Australian politics.

The ballot-paper is as follows:—Goldstein, A. M.; O'Halloran, M. R.; Playford, T.; Macgillivray, W.; Menzies, R.; Richards, R. S.; Schmidt, O. H. I submit the following thoughts not of a die-hard Labor voter, but one with strong Labor inclinations. He says to himself:—

I like Mick O'Halloran personally, and I like his politics. I would like to see him as Premier of S.A., I therefore give him No. 1 vote.

If O'Halloran has more votes than he requires for election, or so few that he has no hope of being elected, I want my second choice to go to Bob Richards, whom I greatly admire, and would like to see back in politics.

If my vote is not necessary for either of these because they have enough first votes to elect them I want to give it to the new, young, up and coming Labor man, Schmidt, who made a good impression on me during the election campaign.

If my vote is useless for all three of these, I like Bill Macgillivray's forthright statements, although I can't always agree with him, and I have leanings towards his theory of money. He gets my number 4.

I don't like Playford's politics, but he has my respect and there are things about him better than most Liberals. He gets my No. 5.

I'm left with Menzies and Goldstein. I don't like Menzies intruding into State politics, in fact I don't like anything about him. I don't know much about Goldstein. He's on the Liberal ticket, and I think he's a Jew, but I know many fine Jews, and only one Menzies. Anyhow, I would sooner have the worst Jew than Menzies, so I give Goldstein No. 6.

Mr. Menzies gets the last vote, and I applaud the elector's good sense for that. I could have shown how the vote is transferred, and I could have given examples from Liberal, Independent, or Communist votes, but as I know the Labor point of view better I thought I should give a Labor example. It shows how the single transferable vote works, and surely that is not hard to understand. We must remember in regard to proportional representation that in no circumstances can the elector's marking of a second preference count against his first preference. The second preference does not come into operation until the candidate with the first preference is either elected or defeated. Similarly, the third preference cannot count against the first and second, and so on. An elector can vote a Party ticket, or not. He pleases himself: it is entirely in the hands of the voter. The preferences count for the men or women he favours most, in order of preference. No Party needs to restrict its number of candidates. The Chief Electoral Officer of Tasmania should know something about proportional representation, and in 1945 he wrote:—

The single transferable vote method is a sort of special providence automatically distributing votes until at last the full fair strength of a Party is properly determined.

We have already heard—and I knew we would hear it—the excuse of unfairness to country dwellers. I am the last man to be unfair to those people, but we have heard much from members opposite about decentralization. However, it has been honoured more in the breach by this Government than in the observance. The Government is often interested in only one section of country dwellers, and a small section at that. I cannot remember much support from the other side of the House when an attempt was made to extend the provisions of the Industrial Code to country areas. Further, I remember the fate of a motion the Labor Party put forward last year seeking to speed up decentralization. I remember, also, that I had to wait weeks before I could get the opportunity to give my contribution to the debate on that matter. We did not get far, except in putting forward some excellent arguments. I maintain that we have too much city versus country electorate rubbish. The Government puts forward a false-faced bid for country support, one which the electors are not prepared to swallow. Some of them are finding it is choking them. South Australia is all one State, and the electoral boundaries are not geographical, but

purely artificial. We do not always find community of interest in them. In my district—and I do not desire the boundaries there to be altered unless as a result of this Bill—there is little community of interest. At the northern end we have Lyndoch and Rowland Flat, which are vine-growing and wine-producing areas, but they have little in common with the rest of the district, yet it works well as a whole. When our world was created Providence did not mark out the boundaries and say that certain electors shall vote for this district and others shall vote for that. The Liberal tycoons put forward the idea that the electoral districts are circumscribed by natural and inexorable boundaries. The Premier spoke this afternoon as though the boundaries were cut and dried, that we know exactly how many members there would be from the country and how many from the city. Under the Bill the Labor Party will not arrange the boundaries. We could not possibly say which districts would be town or country; indeed, when the Bill has been implemented, as it will be in time, a good many districts will be partly country and partly city, which is the ideal arrangement.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—But on a population basis it automatically follows that the metropolitan area must have 65 per cent of the representation.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—No.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—It does if one vote has one value.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—The Minister is presupposing how the boundaries will be arranged. The Ministers are supposed to represent country districts, but where do they live? The present system does not necessarily produce effective country representation. There was one stupid gibe about the Leader of the Opposition's district. One would think from it that he drew up the boundaries of Frome, but the fact that he is by accident the member for that district, and will be for life, should not mean he should not stick to it. Larger electorates do not make it harder for the elector to contact his member, especially in these days of better communications. The more electoral boundaries there are the more the union of similar interests is hindered. Anyway, most people find it easier to approach a member they know, or have helped to elect, than one they do not, but who became a member whereas the system caused the other man's failure to gain a seat. I know that members are only too happy to assist constituents approaching

them, whether they know they helped him to gain a seat or not, but many electors are reluctant to approach members with different political views from their own. It has been said that outstanding men certainly have advantages over local big shots, but why shouldn't they? It has also been said that better men will be encouraged to stand for Parliament under proportional representation, but surely the best are wanted. Again, higher salaries for members may induce better men to stand. Their salaries should at least be related to increases or decreases in the living wage.

We heard again this afternoon the argument that has been repeated down the years, the failure of proportional representation in France, but there is much ignorance on this matter. I believe statements about proportional representation there amount to wilful and deliberate misrepresentation. It has been proved over and over again that this system has never really been used in France; they use an illegitimate electoral system where lists of candidates are nominated and elected as a bloc vote. This afternoon the Premier ascribed the downfall of France completely to proportional representation. Has anything more ridiculous ever been uttered in this Chamber?

Mr. Michael—He didn't say "completely."

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I think he also said that the war had much to do with France's downfall, but France would be a hard country to govern under any electoral system, for it has many ideologies and religious and political Parties. Again, the very temperament of the people makes it hard to govern. The old red herring of too many Parties has again been raised, but this is nonsense. We heard much about Tasmania, but there is no multiplicity of Parties there. Despite what the Premier and interjectors said, proportional representation has been in operation there for 47 years, and they are still sticking to it. The Premier said majority rule cannot be obtained under this system and cited the Senate, which is supposed to be a non-Party chamber. However, it is the only system that can guarantee majority rule. For many years, until recently, the Governments in Victoria were minority Governments working with the support of another Party, but we have a different type of minority Government in South Australia. Here there is a majority against the Government outside the House, but a majority for it inside. That is our special South Australian brand of democracy. The right of decisions in the House will depend on the majority still, but all have the right

to decide who is there; the electors do not have that right under our present system. No measure should be passed in any Parliament unless it commands a majority vote from a thoroughly representative House. No Party should be entitled, as it is in South Australia, to a majority inside the legislative halls without a majority of votes outside. Proportional representation is not too hard to understand; at least, it is not hard to get an idea of how it works. Even if some find it hard to understand, I ask who fully understood the old preferential system of voting? It is not necessary to understand electoral voting systems, because trained electoral officers implement the systems. A man may travel in a plane just as fast and as comfortably without knowing how the engine works. He may tell the time without knowing just how many cogs and wheels are in his watch, or how it works. Even though he does not know these things, the watch will keep just as good time. No man stops eating because he is not quite certain how his digestive organs work, and the food tastes just as good without any such knowledge. There are always experts to fix our engines and watches, and there are experts to whom to run when our stomachs ache. It has been alleged that the system of proportional representation is too slow, but in this regard I quote Miss Norma Patterson, who says:—

All the processes of nature are slow. A government by the people will necessarily be slower than a dictatorship, just as trial by jury is slower than shooting a man down.

Lack of speed is not a major fault, because after all in our own Houses of Parliament we deliberately ensure that our processes of legislation are slow by having three readings of a Bill and requiring it to pass through two Houses; therefore, we cannot very well complain about the slowness of the system. This afternoon we have heard much about countries which have tried proportional representation. It has been tried in Ireland, Malta, Yugo-Slavia, Switzerland, Norway, Belgium, Finland, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Tasmania. I do not mention France, for it has not been used there. After exhaustive studies and many visits to Norway, Switzerland, Denmark and Sweden, Lord Symon of Wythenshawe, in his book *The Smaller Democracies*, says:—

The recent history of these small democracies is a stimulating and encouraging thing . . . In Switzerland the brilliant solution of the minorities problem . . . Probably the most striking success in history in the art of living together in peace and freedom among people

of different races, languages and religions. Sweden has gone further towards reconciling the interests of town with country, and of Capital with Labor, than any other nation, and has been the most successful democracy in avoiding the evils of booms and slumps . . . She has an exceptionally wise and able Government, and perhaps the best prospects of any country of establishing something approaching the perfect democracy during the next generation.

Could it be just an accident that, with proportional representation used to elect these Governments, we find such notable features as those mentioned in this quotation as the solution of the minority problem in Switzerland? Many so-called democracies are interested in minorities. Recently, in our Parliamentary library I came upon an article in the *Illustrated London News* of May 23 by the historian, Arthur Bryant, which stated:—

If the present trend continues for another two or three generations, the only provision left for the expression of minority opinion will be the official salary of the Leader of the Opposition. And by then the reason for this will have ceased to exist, for there will no longer be a Parliamentary minority. For the Parliamentary majority will have ceased to tolerate any such irritant to its own complacency . . . Thereafter no voice will be heard but the metallic and sycophantic mouth-piece of authority saying sycophantic things.

I hope that statement does not remind members of a state of affairs much nearer home, and I remind them that Arthur Bryant is not a Labor supporter. Lord Symon dealt with the reconciling of the interests of town and country—the very thing that we have been told here that this system will not do. The system of proportional representation would result in the avoidance of the evils of booms and slumps and enhance the prospects of a perfect democracy. Mr. O'Halloran mentioned Ireland as a notable example of the effective working of proportional representation, and in this regard I will quote a letter written to the *Irish Times* by the Rev. Canon Luce, D.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy at Trinity College, Dublin. This letter was written at a time when it had been suggested that proportional representation might be abolished in Ireland. Dr. Luce is famous in Eire as one who looks for the truth below the surface and as one who writes and preaches without bias and with authority. The letter stated:—

It would be a thousand pities if a Party in a fit of impatience were to scrap this well tested instrument of enlightened Democracy, an instrument to which we all, irrespective of creed, class and party, owe far more than we sometimes realize, and which can do for our children what it has done for us. Proportional

representation has been a healing force in our midst. Old political feuds are dying; public spirit is replacing faction. Our elections are well conducted. The voice of reason is heard, and the gun is silent. Proportional representation deserves much of the credit, for proportional representation produces contented and loyal minorities, whereas the other system breeds muzzled, sullen discontented minorities predisposed to doctrines of violence. Proportional representation has been a unifying force, and unity is strength. The other system antagonizes majority and minority, accentuates the difference between them, and therefore weakens both. How then, can some say that proportional representation fails to give strong governance? A contented minority is a strength to the majority, while a discontented minority, and a bullying majority are a weakness to the whole body politic. Surely those who accuse proportional representation of making for weak governments are confusing the strength of authority based on political consent with brute strength.

Since the establishment of the Free State, we have lived under several administrations, every one of them elected by proportional representation. Every one of them has been a strong government, judged by the true test of strength. Their legislative output has been large, yet most of the grave measures have been carried by the slenderest majorities. The scale only just turned, but there was consent behind it, and whether we approved or disapproved we all accepted the decisions loyally and cheerfully, and made them our own. For we have been able to say to ourselves, "It is the will of the people ascertained under the fairest electoral system ever devised by the wit of man." We shall not be able to say that if proportional representation goes. If proportional representation goes, the feeling of enforced submission will banish the freeman's feeling of glad consent to the law, which he through his representative has helped to make. A government with a majority of 6 is infinitely stronger than a government with a majority of 60 elected otherwise. Proportional representation bevels the sharp edge of political controversy. Its psychological basis is sound. It rests not on that artificial, childish division of men and measures into good and bad, nice and nasty, but on our true and natural judgements of our fellow men and their thoughts. We do not love and hate, we prefer; we like more or we like less. The proportional representation voting paper is the voting paper for the intelligent public spirited man.

Those words were written by an eminent divine who had no political bias and spoke only from his experience of the system in Ireland, where, I am pleased to say, wiser counsels prevailed and proportional representation continued. Surely such evidence of the work of proportional representation cannot be denied. If it has proved of so much value in a country like the Irish Free State where turbulence was rife, especially at election time, of how much

more value could it be here, where elections, although unjust, are at least comparatively peaceful. Indeed, in some districts they are peaceful and apathetic because of the hopelessness of electing a candidate. Only the fear of a fine makes people vote at all. We cannot call our system a democratic one. The matter before us should not be considered as a Party matter. I believe it is regarded as such because it has been introduced by the Opposition. It should be voted on as an issue of right or wrong. We must have multiple electorates to introduce proportional representation. If this reform is introduced it will go down in South Australian history as the greatest reform ever passed by the two Houses. I regret that the Premier has spoken, and I do hope that it does not mean that other Government members will remain silent, except to interject. I appeal to members, firm in the belief that this should not be a Party measure, to support the amendment to the Constitution Act, despite what the Premier has said. I have tried to show that this is the living application of the principles of justice. Long ago Emperor Justinian, who codified the laws, described it as "the constant and perpetual will to give every man his due." That is all we ask for in the Bill, which I support.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MENTAL DEFECTIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EMPLOYEES REGISTRY OFFICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Employees Registry Offices Act, 1915-1939. Read a first time.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved:—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining Act, 1930-1951.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

**BUILDING CONTRACTS (DEPOSITS)
BILL.**

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act for the regulation of certain building contracts and for incidental purposes. Read a first time.

**OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.**

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Offenders Probation Act, 1913-1951. Read a first time.

**PORT BROUGHTON RAILWAY
(DISCONTINUANCE) BILL.**

The Hon. M. McINTOSH, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to authorize

the discontinuance of the Port Broughton railway and for other purposes. Read a first time.

**HONEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.**

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Honey Marketing Act, 1949.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 27, at 2 p.m.