

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 8, 1954.

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

QUESTIONS.**FERRY AVENUE-WATTLE AVENUE LEVEL CROSSING.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Minister of Works take up with his colleague the question of providing a level crossing at the junction of Ferry Avenue and Wattle Avenue, Plympton Park, to go over the existing double tramway track to Anzac Highway?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I shall be pleased to do that.

SECOND-GRADE EGGS.

Mr. DUNKS—Has the Minister of Agriculture an answer to the question I asked yesterday about the use made of second-grade hen eggs listed at 2s. 6d. a dozen?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The position is exactly as I stated yesterday, namely, that the whole of the second-grade eggs at that price are reserved for pulping because we have to meet known commitments in regard to pulping requirements by manufacturers here and also the export quota, so there are none available to the general public.

PORT PIRIE RAILWAY TRACK.

Mr. DAVIS—On August 5 a deputation waited on the Minister of Railways on the question of the removal of the railway line in Ellen Street, Port Pirie. I received a letter from the Minister stating that the request had been refused and giving reasons, amongst which was the following:—

If the proposals were practicable the advantage obtained would be far more than outweighed by the great expenditure involved. Arising out of that reply I placed two questions on the Notice Paper that were answered yesterday. The first was:—

What would be the estimated cost of removing the railway track from Ellen Street, Port Pirie, to the back of the Institute, the Town Hall, and the Barrier Hotel?

That question was not answered, though the second was. I ask the Minister representing the Minister of Railways what was the reason for not answering the first question? Was it that the Railways Commissioner had no idea of the cost, or is he not prepared to give members of this House the information they require?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I think I can answer the honourable member without reference to the Minister of Railways. The question in effect was whether it was practicable to do the work without interference with the requirements of the port. The reply was definitely that it would confound the whole of the port scheme and therefore the question of cost does not enter. However, I will get an estimate of the cost, though it will only make the question more ridiculous than ever.

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE STUDENTS.

Mr. GOLDNEY—An article in today's *Advertiser* under the heading, "S.A. Farm Experts Concerned: Need for more Students urged," states that Dr. Callaghan, Director of Agriculture, said that under the department's cadetship plan it was possible for a father to put his boy through the University for nothing. If boys are put through these courses and are financed by the department, has the Government any claim on their services after graduation?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I do not think the Government provides for the university training of such students. I know there is a Commonwealth scholarship scheme under which students of various professions can obtain degree tuition, but the agricultural science courses were discussed at the recent Agricultural Council meeting and a recommendation of the standing committee was adopted. The substance was that we should review, in the first instance, the salaries being paid to such expert personnel with a view to attracting more of them to our departments and, secondly, that the Commonwealth should be approached to provide a special scholarship for agricultural science students so that more would undertake this course. At present not enough are taking the course and we are very short of that type of trained personnel. While the matter is under discussion no firm decisions are being made, though we are not losing sight of the problem.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LAWN—Statements have appeared in the press recently indicating that the rainfall this year is below average and last night's *News* included photographs revealing the shallowness of various reservoirs. Can the Minister of Works say what will be the probable position of the metropolitan water supply in the coming summer?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Were it not for the prospects of the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline delivering water to the reservoirs this summer, the position would be parlous. It is expected that we will be able to draw from the River Murray this summer and to that extent, therefore, the position can be regarded as being well guarded. Once the water arrives at the top of the hill it will flow down the river and supplement the reservoirs before the pipeline comes to Adelaide itself. Some difficulties have arisen in relation to the delivery of pumps, but we hope that will be overcome. It is not expected they will be in a serious position as the water from the pipeline will neutralize the shallowness of the reservoirs.

HOME FOR ANGASTON SCHOOL TEACHER.

Mr. TEUSNER—Some time ago I made a request to the Minister of Education that an additional house be built at Angaston to accommodate a married school teacher. I was subsequently informed by him that tenders were called for the erection of that home. Can he say whether any tender has been accepted and when work will commence on the construction of that house?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—A contract has been let and the South Australian Housing Trust expects the foundations to be poured within the next few weeks.

TRANSPORT OF TALEM BEND SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Mr. WHITE—Some time ago I introduced to the Minister of Education a deputation representative of parents of children conveyed from Talem Bend to Murray Bridge daily to attend the high school. It pointed out that the present conveyance arrangements were most unsatisfactory and that an approach to the Minister of Railways requesting the provision of a rail car for the purpose of conveying the children had been refused. The deputation asked that a road bus be provided. Has the Minister any reply to that request?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I was impressed by the arguments advanced by the deputation and referred the request to the Transport Officer, Mr. Harris, and later discussed the matter with him. It is estimated that the cost of transporting the 57 high school students from Talem Bend by bus would be £2,000 a year, whereas the value of free railway passes is £475 a year. I referred the matter to the Minister of Railways and requested him to

inquire into the possibility of altering the afternoon departure of the Murray Bridge to Talem Bend train used by the children. I have been informed by him that he has referred the matter to the Superintendent at Murray Bridge and I am hopeful that some simple solution will be found whereby these children will be transported to and from Murray Bridge without what appears to be an excessive cost.

EIGHT-MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT ROAD.

Mr. FLETCHER—At present a road runs practically from the centre of the Eight-Mile Creek Settlement and connects with the highland known as Chomleys. During the winter it is impossible to use about a quarter of a mile at either end of that road and as a result some settlers must travel distances of 18 to 20 miles between blocks—about 8 to 10 miles extra daily. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether it is possible to re-construct or repair that road to enable the settlers to use it and save them extra travelling time?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes, I shall be glad to do that.

SITTINGS OF HOUSE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—A number of members have indicated to me that they desire to make advance arrangements for the week following the show adjournment. Can the Premier say whether it is intended that the House should sit in the evenings of that week?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is expected that the House will sit in the evening during the week following the show adjournment and also that sittings on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings will be almost continuous for the rest of the session. At present there is some urgency with regard to Loan appropriations: the authorities that existed at June 30 totalled only about £7,000,000, and they are now almost exhausted; therefore, immediately after the show adjournment, the Government would be pleased if honourable members were prepared to finalize the Loan Estimates as the first business.

MOTOR SPARE PARTS PRICES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Some time ago I drew the Premier's attention to what seemed a very excessive charge made against one of my constituents for a spare part of a motor vehicle, and the Premier said that the charge had increased by 800 per cent since the lifting of price controls in that industry. He

said he would take up the matter with the company concerned to see whether any reasonable excuse could be made for the excessive charge. Has he received a report on the matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The firm concerned was an interstate one, and it was necessary to write to another State. I have inquired but have not yet received an explanation for the high cost.

TRAMWAY TRUST POLICY.

Mr. DUNKS—In its interim report on the Municipal Tramways Trust, printed on June 25, 1952, the committee of inquiry stated the following conclusion:—

Alternatives to the present method of control appear to be . . . (d) to hand the undertaking over gradually to licensed private operators under the control of a public licensing authority to ensure a safe and adequate transport service for the public, and protection of the public moneys invested.

Further, in its final report the committee stated the following conclusion under the heading "Financing working operations":—

Such alternative or concurrent action could include . . . (b) the transfer of as many as practicable of the light traffic routes by lease or licence to private operators, who should be required to pay a reasonable levy on gross receipts in return for the franchise; such transfers to be accompanied by all possible consequential reductions in the tramway organization.

Can the Minister of Works say whether such action has been taken under the new set-up of the trust?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I cannot reply of my own knowledge, but I will get the information from the trust and let the honourable member have it.

MENTAL INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. LAWN—Yesterday in reply to my question on mental institutions the Premier said:—

At the present time I would estimate that some 300 to 400 elderly patients could be cared for, more appropriately, either at home with their relatives or in an infirmary type of hospital.

In view of that reply, does the Premier intend to write to the relatives of those unfortunate patients asking that accommodation be provided for them at home, or is the Government contemplating the construction of an infirmary for unfortunate patients who have no home or relative to go to?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government does not intend to ask the relatives to take

these people back. I did not say the Government intended to ask them, although in some cases it would be very appropriate if the relatives did look after the persons concerned. The Government has been building accommodation at Northfield and will continue, as well as its means and finances permit, to provide such accommodation. Last year, in an effort to assist in solving this problem, the Government made available to church authorities a large sum by way of subsidy of capital expenditure on old folks homes. I believe about £312,000 was voted by Parliament and has been distributed to various institutions. In the Government's view that is an excellent arrangement that will enable the churches, which have always been anxious to play a part in this charitable work, to play a bigger part than they have done in the past. Further, we believe this arrangement should be continued, and in that connection negotiations are proceeding at present with the Commonwealth Government. Recently, that Government announced a proposal similar to that adopted by this Government last year, and, when the Commonwealth proposals are to hand, further action in this State will be considered.

GREENOCK SCHOOL TRANSPORT.

Mr. TEUSNER—Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding the provision of transport for certain scholars attending the Greenock school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I discussed this matter with the Transport Officer of the Education Department and also investigated it myself. The policy of the department is not to establish a school transport service unless at least half the children listed for transport reside five or more miles from the school, and the application forwarded by the honourable member does not comply with this requirement.

COUNTRY WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION SUBSIDIES.

Mr. HAWKER—I understand that the Government provides the Women's Branch of the Agricultural Bureau with a full time secretary and also pays something towards the cost of country delegates attending annual conferences. No such grant is made to the Country Women's Association, which was established for many years prior to the establishment of the women's branch of the Bureau and which is doing similar work. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government would be willing to make similar facilities available to the Country Women's Association?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The women's branch of the Agricultural Bureau is directly associated and affiliated with the Department of Agriculture, and by virtue of that association it is entitled to certain services and grants. The Country Women's Association, of course, does not fall within that category, and, as policy is involved in this matter, I shall have to confer with my colleagues before I answer the question.

SEWERAGE REGULATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER—I have received some correspondence from a member of the advisory committee on the plumbing industry at the Adelaide Technical School with reference to the revision of the Adelaide sewer regulations. I have mentioned this matter to the Minister of Education and desire to know whether he has a reply to this request?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have a reply insofar as it affects the Apprentices Board. The honourable member referred considerable correspondence and requests to me, and I asked for a report on the two questions concerned. I have ascertained that the board consists of Mr. J. S. Walker (Superintendent of Technical Schools), who is the chairman, Mr. M. R. McColl (Chief Inspector of Factories and Steam Boilers), deputy chairman, Messrs. A. B. Thompson, R. W. Parsons, J. A. Fargher (Commissioner of Railways), A. E. Smith, M. T. Phillipps and M. D. Grealey. The chairman of the board reports as follows regarding sewerage regulations:—

At meetings of the advisory committee of the Plumbers Trade School, at which I have taken the chair, reference has been made by members of the committee to the need for the issue of revised sewerage regulations, both for the trade itself and for instruction in the school. . . . Insofar as the Apprentices Board is concerned it would be an advantage to the Trade School in the training of apprentices there if the new regulations were issued as soon as possible. I cannot take the matter further because the other part does not concern me or my department.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL SEWERAGE.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I was reported by today's *Advertiser* to have said in the House yesterday, in reply to a question by the member for Port Pirie on Port Pirie Hospital sewerage:

The new works would provide for present and known future requirements and would require a full-time staff of 800.

What I did say, and what I read, was:—

A sewage treatment works has been designed which will meet all present and known future requirements and which will handle all liquid wastes from the hospital. The present number of full-time personnel is 400 and the scheme will cater for a total of 800.

That is the reverse of what the *Advertiser* reported me as saying about the number of staff. I shall be pleased if the press will make the correction.

BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ANATOMY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 552.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I have not had an opportunity to very closely examine the Leader of the Opposition's remarks on this Bill, but I have looked at the measure and given some consideration to his observations. The Bill represents an improvement on previous Bills introduced by him in his attempts to alter our electoral system, although it is somewhat along the same lines. Previously the legislation referred to proportional representation and had as its main characteristic the principle of one vote one value. This Bill does not refer to either. It is a moderate measure. I do not agree with many of its provisions, but it is a big advance on previous proposals on this matter by the Labor Party. It shows that our friends opposite are prepared to learn if information along the right lines is supplied to them often enough. We used to hear much about the sacred principle of one vote one value, but that has now gone. Apparently some notice has been taken of our efforts to show that the principle did not exist elsewhere in the world. We pointed out that even in Australia in the States where Labor Governments were in office it did not operate. We thought that it had gone over the

heads of our Opposition friends, but apparently they now realize that it is not such a sacred principle. The Bill sets out what we on this side have always considered right—that for areas where the population is scattered, where there are many developmental problems and few amenities, there must be special provision.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I take it you are supporting the second reading?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Almost. The honourable member will hear in due course how far I am prepared to go on this matter. Earlier in the session the Leader of the Opposition asked whether the Government intended to introduce legislation on this matter, and I said it did, but that I did not want to hinder the Opposition because I did not think the Government's legislation would be the same as that proposed by the Opposition. I cheerfully withdraw some of the remarks I made then because I am impressed by some of the constructive alterations that have been made to the Labor Party proposals. I cannot understand why some districts are singled out for additional representation, whereas others are not. It may be claimed that the areas singled out are the largest in the State, but they are not the most undeveloped or the most underprivileged areas. It may be that Mr. O'Halloran singled out districts on Eyre Peninsula and in the northern and north-eastern parts of the State because they covered the most square miles, but if that is so it is something that cannot be accepted in its entirety. I believe it is impossible to separate country districts. Many members ask questions in the House, but if someone were to ask me which member had the most problems in his district I would say a member representing one of the small districts, such as Wallaroo. It is a district with a substantial population in a relatively small area, but it has lost its means of livelihood and the industries that supported it.

Mr. Shannon—Now it is one of the underprivileged.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and I should have thought that, although it is not a large area, it is one that decidedly needs priority in the consideration of questions coming before this House. I have been reading recently of steps that were taken in Great Britain in a period of unemployment when it was necessary to help underprivileged areas. It was necessary for Parliament to consider special legislation for those areas, and I think it is impossible to separate one country district in our State from another. The Leader of the

Opposition singled out the district represented by Mr. Riches for special consideration. He included Stuart in those that should get a representation ratio of 2-1 compared with the rest of the State. However, I do not know of any district which has a more assured future. The Federal Government has lavished at least £20,000,000 on it over a period of years.

Mr. Shannon—It has even got the Old Country helping it with finance.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—And at present the State Government has a programme of some £20,000,000 for the district. Why it should be chosen when it is already embarrassed with riches is difficult to understand. One has only to look at the map to realize how fallacious it would be to include it for special consideration. More than one-half the area is completely unoccupied, except for aborigines who are not even de-tribalized. Nothing but a miracle can make much of Stuart anything but unoccupied Crown lands. Some of it has a rainfall of under 4in., but an evaporation rate of 7ft. I follow the reasoning of the Leader of the Opposition when he says that there should be two electoral zones, but his selection of the zones was an artificial selection. When it is examined it is found to be completely fallacious.

I believe that the present zones that have been established over a long period are far preferable. They give substantially more justice to the population and provide for more advancement for the State than the artificial distribution proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. I cannot see why Port Augusta should have more representation than Wallaroo. Let us look at the problems in the district represented by Mr. Stott. We are spending much money at Loxton in developing soldier settlement schemes, but the industries there are now meeting marketing problems. Some of the areas singled out for favoured treatment by the Leader of the Opposition are pastoral districts, but they are probably the best off, economically, of any parts of the State. So far the pastoral industry has not met serious marketing problems, and I cannot follow why the Leader of the Opposition included some pastoral districts for special consideration. He now proposes to return to multiple electorates. He has abandoned proportional representation.

Mr. O'Halloran—Who said that?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I presumed the honourable member had abandoned it.

Mr. John Clark—He has not.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Does the Leader of the Opposition still support proportional representation?

Mr. O'Halloran—Definitely.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—On a three-member basis?

Mr. O'Halloran—Yes.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Then the honourable member has completely changed his views on that topic, for he said previously that proportional representation, in order to be effectively applied, could operate only in large areas with a large number of people. Proportional representation with three-member districts would be about as sensible as having proportional representation with one-member districts. We have been told frequently that we would have to divide the State into, not 15 districts, but 5 or 7 for proportional representation so as to give scope for minorities to be represented. Proportional representation on three-member districts is so absurd that I never even imagined that the Leader of the Opposition would consider it.

Mr. Pearson—The parties could only be returned for each district on a 2 to 1 basis.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It would be possible to have three candidates of different political views.

Mr. Shannon—I would like to hear the advocates of proportional representation on the scheme put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is not proportional representation at all, but a complete contradiction of what members opposite have always said on this question. They have said before that we on this side of the House did not understand proportional representation.

Mr. O'Halloran—You do not understand democracy.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member said before that we did not understand proportional representation because we considered it on too limited a basis, that we did not realize that big districts were needed for it. The proposition now put forward has never been applied anywhere else. If proportional representation on a 15-district basis is suggested the proposal is even worse than I thought it was. I do not believe it will lead to democratic legislation with democratic results, nor to effectiveness in Government and Parliamentary procedure. No one can deny that a redistribution of districts is necessary because one only needs to examine the metropolitan area. There has been an influx of people to

the outer suburbs, many coming from the centre of the city itself. The city is small compared with the area represented by the member for Glenelg. There are big divergences in population in the metropolitan districts and they are undesirable. The time has arrived when a commission should be appointed to examine the areas of population and to recommend to Parliament what new districts should be established. Let me make it quite clear, however, that I do not budge one inch from my belief that the present metropolitan representation is adequate as compared with the representation for country areas. An observer would appreciate that the amenities and privileges enjoyed in the metropolitan area are far greater than those in the country. The country is still lagging behind.

Mr. O'Halloran—It will always lag behind while you are Premier.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Leader of the Opposition frequently says "This is another failure," "This is another Government innovation," or "This is another of the Premier's wildcat schemes." It is interesting, however, to note that he always speaks with two voices, because whenever the Government does something which benefits the State the Leader immediately claims that it has carried Labor's policy into effect. I have frequently proposed schemes which the Labor Party had never thought of, but as soon as they have proved effective and for the good of the community, we have been told that it is Labor's policy. I do not mind that, because I like to have the support of the Opposition. The other day, when the Leader used the phrase "This is another of the Premier's wildcat schemes," I could not help reflecting on other schemes which had been so called. I will enumerate a few. The Leigh Creek coalfield was one scheme in which the Leader of the Opposition assisted. Another was the Electricity Trust. Radium Hill is in the Leader's district and the Government has had his utmost co-operation in its development. Does the Leader of the Opposition think that the establishment of a power station at Port Augusta is a bad scheme? That is a scheme on which the Leader did not have an opportunity of expressing his views, so it can be regarded as a Government wildcat scheme.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you suggest that is Liberal policy?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do. Let me explain Liberal policy, because quite frequently I fear that the Opposition is uneducated on Liberal policy. The Labor Party frequently

asserts that it represents the working class: the Liberal Party sets out to represent every class. That is the difference between the two Parties. We are not sectional in our approach and try to give a fair deal to all sections of the community. We have no privileged pets. We try to provide a fair representation for all sections and do not believe in class legislation. The Government has revealed time and again that if anyone is taking action detrimental to the welfare of the people it will introduce legislation to control the position. We do not represent vested interests and have placed upon the Statute Book much more liberal legislation than any Labor Party has done in the history of this State.

Mr. Corcoran—We have never had an opportunity.

The SPEAKER—I think the debate has widened a little.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is inevitable in a debate which introduces the question of the representation of people that it will broaden out. Let me return to the problem of the development in some areas being greater than in others. I believe that a commission should be appointed to investigate the position and legislation to that effect will be introduced this year. The commission will comprise three members and will be beyond reproach in respect of its qualifications and integrity. Parliament will give to that commission the powers of a Royal Commission and it will be given instructions by Parliament upon which to examine the position.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is very important.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Does the Leader consider that that should not be done? If he does, I point out that that is precisely what is suggested in his own Bill.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not suggest that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The type of instruction he would give the commission cannot, in my opinion, be justified upon any principle. I cannot see how one country district can be differentiated from another. I can easily see how you could differentiate in the metropolitan area, which is densely populated and fully developed, but I cannot for the life of me see why an area like Port Augusta should have a different type of representation from an area like Wallaroo nor from the large and important district of Victoria. That district is capable of development and one day will probably contain 25 per cent of the State's population. I cannot see how discrimination

can be made between country areas, and I believe that country areas should have the same ratio of population one to another.

Mr. Dunstan—Why?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Most country areas are on a fairly even basis of development at present. On these matters the proposed commission should have a fairly wide discretion. Indeed, the Leader has given a fair discretion—20 per cent. above or below the quota. The Bill is a distinct contribution to this problem, but I cannot support it because the discrimination it makes is not a proper one.

Mr. O'Halloran—It might give the people a chance to change the Government if they want to!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Whenever a person has a ballot-paper he has that chance. There are one or two enthusiastic new members in this House who make interjections without studying history. When the present single electorate system was introduced in 1938 the result of the so-called gerrymander was that 15 Liberal, 9 Labor and 15 Independent members were returned in a House of 39.

Mr. Dunstan—If you had read the report of the debate last session you would know that argument was fully answered.

The Hon. PLAYFORD—Possibly, but the honourable member did not perhaps understand the significance of my statement; an elector, if dissatisfied with the Government, can always defeat it by voting for the Opposition.

Mr. Jennings—But it takes many more electors to do that under the present system.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Sooner or later honourable members learn that the electors who sometimes give them their favours at other times withdraw them. The honourable members who are interjecting will find that out in due course. Further, there were three elections held under the existing systems before this Government had a complete majority of its own members in this House. That is the gerrymander that the commission is alleged to have introduced! The fact is that Independent members without Party affiliation—

Mr. McAlees—Where did they go?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Some went to the Labor Party.

Mr. Dunstan—Only one.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Possibly only one in number, but he was equivalent to a host; indeed, the Party lost his seat when he retired. Be that as it may, those Independent members had the alternative of subscribing to the L.C.L. Government's policy or dismissing the

Government: they chose to support the Government's policy. In due course the Government will introduce a measure providing for the appointment of a Royal Commission that will be instructed to examine the present population in the existing zones and to make recommendations to Parliament. The present Bill contains subsidiary provisions which, if I understand them rightly, could cause much administrative difficulty. For example, the Legislative Council districts, which at present contain complete Assembly districts, would be independent of the Assembly districts. That would create administrative problems, but, as I have yet to see what action the House will take on the Bill, I will not discuss the details of those provisions. I merely signify that the Government has almost completed the preparation of its Bill to provide for the appointment of a commission that will have the duty of examining the present electoral boundaries and make recommendations to Parliament on alterations that should take place.

Mr. O'Halloran—At the present ratio between country and city?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The existing ratio is highly justified, and the Government's Bill will provide for its retention. Opposition members have realized that the principle of one vote one value they previously supported cannot be justified by the state of development of country areas.

Mr. Fred Walsh—I, for one, have not said that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The present Bill provides for a different ratio in some districts, so the Opposition has departed from what we have always heard it say was the real point on which it differed with the Government. Under those circumstances I take it that, before the session is over, we shall be able to reach some conclusion in this matter. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—The Opposition has always maintained, and does now maintain, that the principle of one vote one value should be the basis of electoral justice.

The Hon. T. Playford—That is not in this Bill.

Mr. DUNSTAN—It is and if the Premier listens, he may learn even from one of the new members. The principle of giving to every person in the community an equal right in the election of his representatives is no new principle. It is a principle which has been acknowledged down the ages by the common people of Great Britain and of the countries associated with

the British peoples. In fact, as long ago as the reign of Charles I it was said by the commons:—

... every man born in England, cannot, ought not, either by the law of God nor the law of nature to be exempted from the choice of those who are to make laws for him to live under and for him, for aught I know, to lose his life under.

Colonel Rainborough said:—

The poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the greatest he.

There is in our common weal the basis of justice and it is based on equality of the rights of the people who live in our communities. During the last debate it was pointed out that the Opposition wanted one vote one value. On that occasion I quoted the following:—

What is to be adopted as a fair electoral system? It is the division of the country into constituencies sized according to convenience and equity. Convenience implies that the constituency should not be too large for the maintenance of personal contact between candidates and voters. . . . Equity implies that the constituencies shall be as nearly equal in population as possible.

In other words, the whole basis of electoral representation should be equality of votes. That has been acknowledged by all supporters of the system, Winston Churchill included, but it is not possible to carry it out with mathematical accuracy. In certain circumstances owing to the difficulty of representatives getting in contact with electors through sparsity of population or something of the kind, there may be certain departures from the mathematical basis, but that should not allow the minority to dictate to the majority. Of course, the Premier does not accept the principle of one vote one value. I find difficulty in ascertaining which principle if any does he support. He seems to agree that within the electoral zones he maintains should exist there should be equality. No-one knows how, unless it is on the basis of one vote one value. He departs from that principle immediately his own Party advantage is endangered by it. The only real exception to the principle of one vote one value is on the basis of convenience. The zone which in this Bill is given the smaller basis of electors comprises three-quarters of the State. It has been acknowledged by the Opposition that it would be difficult to construct electorates larger than those that would be constructed under this scheme and still allow representatives in this Parliament sufficient contact with their electors, because the difficulties of time and space would

be such that the electorates would be too large to be workable. In the remainder of the State there would be no electorate which would be as large as existing electorates which are acknowledged by Government members to be satisfactory.

Mr. Shannon—It would be interesting to hear your explanation of (32b) of clause 8.

Mr. DUNSTAN—That is the matter of tolerance. The 20 per cent tolerance is allowed because it is impossible to pursue the principle of one vote one value with mathematical accuracy. In consequence there has to be some tolerance in drawing electoral boundaries. There should be substantial equality between the electorates. I have already referred to this matter but I am sorry the honourable member was not listening.

Mr. Shannon—You have not explained it very clearly to me.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In all places where one vote one value has operated there has had to be a basis of tolerance. It has always been pointed out that it is not possible to do it with mathematical accuracy, but there should be substantial equality. Owing to geographical features there must be a difference sometimes, but the basis should be substantial equality of representation.

Mr. Heaslip—Then there is no such thing as one vote one value.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In substance there is. The Premier has given reasons why he does not believe in the principle, but this sort of thing has been contested down through the ages. In this House we have had attempts since 1872 to return to the basis of one vote one value, which was the first basis on which this House was established. It was only when the population changed that there was an alteration. A motion was brought before the House on this matter as long ago as 1899 and there has hardly been a Parliament since the existence of this House when there has not been a demand for more effective representation. Mr. Travers said the Labor Party was making a new demand. He can know nothing of the history of the State. It is not something new, but an age-long struggle by the people for their rights.

A member—The Labor Party.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No, by members also of the Party opposite. There are many young Liberals who abominate the principles adopted by members opposite. One member was taken to task by an executive member of the Liberal Party because he was ashamed of certain sentiments

expressed, as they seemed to savour of Communism and Fascism. In 1899, when there was a demand for more effective representation, it was said:—

They could not get away from it. They found the good-for-nothings, ne'er-do-wells, rogues, prostitutes and vagabonds, if they found them anywhere, in the big centres of population, and if they were wise in their generation they would not give them the same representation as perhaps the more wealthy and the more intelligent and honourable people who lived in the country.

The speaker was the Hon. Thomas Playford.

Mr. Macgillivray—It's hereditary!

Mr. DUNSTAN—It is. The same principles are being expressed today by the Premier, though perhaps not quite so crudely. I might say, "like grandfather, like grandson." The Premier says that areas of sparse population should be given greater representation. On what basis of justice?

Mr. Jennings—On the sheep.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Apparently saltbush, sheep and the like are to be an electoral factor. He also said that some areas were underprivileged and underdeveloped and needed greater representation. For 90 years the country areas have had greater representation than the city, yet they have not developed as they should have. Why?

Mr. O'Halloran—Because the system has prevented it.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Of course. Effective decentralization of industry cannot be carried out while maintaining a Government in office based upon the present country representation. If industry were decentralized effectively—and not merely to areas which are already returning Labor candidates, but throughout the State—the present Government would go out of office. Therefore, decentralization is not being attempted. Members opposite always vote against decentralization proposals that have come from this side of the House. The metropolitan area originally had about 20 per cent of the State's populace, but it has grown to over 60 per cent. Many rural areas have been denuded of population. It is an entirely specious argument—and I do not think it was advanced seriously, but with an obvious motive—to say that the Government could not give effect to an electoral system such as is proposed. The Premier said that electoral figures show the people can go to the ballot box and change the Government, but let us have a look at the figures for the last State election. I know that members opposite say that those figures would not give a true picture because a number

of seats were not contested by the Liberal Party and others were not contested by the Labor Party. However, I will produce some figures compiled by the Department of Political Science at the Adelaide University in conjunction with the Electoral Office. They were compiled by the lecturer and checked by the tutor in political science, who is an executive member of the Liberal and Country League, so it can be seen that these figures would hardly be adverse to the Government if they were not true. Consider first the electorates in which the two parties were opposed. A total of 83,554 votes were cast for the Liberal Party and 86,850 for Labor. For the electorates in which the parties were not directly opposed, instead of taking the State vote we can take the Senate vote corrected by the percentage swing to the Playford Government that was shown in the electorates where the parties were opposed in the State election. That is more than fair to the Government because in the staunch Labor electorates which were not contested by the Government the swing shown to the Government in borderline seats as compared with the Senate vote did not occur, or not in previous elections anyway. This gives a grand total, corrected by the swing shown in the Senate election, of 83,968 votes for the Liberal and Country League and 115,136 for the Australian Labor Party. Therefore, the very most that the Government could have got at the last State elections was 42.3 per cent of the votes, whereas Labor would have got 55.7.

Members opposite may say, "If you got 60 per cent of the votes you could get office." That is probably true, but why should the people have to record such a fantastic majority for Labor to gain office when they have already recorded for Labor the heaviest majority that any Party has ever recorded in this country? Why should Labor be kept out of office when it has polled 56 per cent of the total votes? Apparently only because of specious arguments by members opposite. Of course the Premier has not relied only upon his own arguments. Last year the member for Torrens had a good deal to say on electoral reform. His speech was resonant with that passion for accuracy and truth which is so characteristic of his contributions to this House. He referred to the position in Great Britain and to the House of Commons redistribution legislation of 1949. He had much to say about the principles laid down on that occasion. I was interested in his remarks because they seemed to be quite out of accord with what I had previously read on this matter, so I went to

some trouble to see what the position really was. When referring to the 1949 legislation in Great Britain the honourable member said:—

We find that certain criteria were laid down in the 1949 Act. They were these—firstly, the size of the electorate; secondly, the shape of the electorate; thirdly, the accessibility of the electorate—

and here he continues with the fictitious illustrations, the accuracy of which I shall comment on shortly—

fourthly, production of the electorate, and fifthly, population.

I examined what in actual fact had occurred in the Mother of Parliaments. The first Bill, as a result of the all-parties conference to design the redistribution of the House of Commons, laid down certain basic criteria for the boundary commissioners and they were these: firstly, that there should be certain numbers of electorates for the various countries to be represented; that two-member constituencies, where possible, should be split up into one-member constituencies so far as was practicable; that the electorate of any constituency returning a single member should not be greater or less than the electoral quota by more than approximately one-quarter of the electoral quota; that so far as was practicable, having regard to those rules, they must take into account county and borough areas so that they would not split them too much for the purposes of administration; and that they might depart from a strict application of the above rules if special geographic considerations, including in particular the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency, appeared to them to render a departure desirable.

In actual fact, there were about eight seats which they found they could not construct on the basis of those rules without completely dismembering certain boroughs, which would make it very difficult of administration. A further Act was passed in 1947 to allow them to depart from a strict application of the equality of electorate principle in cases where that seemed to be desirable because of the difficulties of administration. Those were the very few exceptions and for the remainder, the principles laid down in the schedule of the Representation of the People Act remained and today, after the redistribution of the seats, the boundary commissioners are charged with having a certain number of constituencies per kingdom and with, so far as is possible, not dividing up the country or borough areas,

but the constituency shall be as near the electoral quota as is practicable and they may depart from strict application if it is desirable to avoid excessive disparity between adjoining electorates and it is obvious they must maintain equality there unless special geographic considerations apply. In other words, half the matters mentioned by Mr. Travers are not in the Act at all and never were. I defy him to discover them and show them to the House. I have the Acts before me and any member can examine the schedule of the rules the boundary commissioners must maintain. They are basically these: there shall be one vote one value and the only departure from the strict application of that principle shall be where geographical considerations make it difficult to administer it. Geographical considerations have been taken into account in this Bill and there is no other basis upon which to depart from the strict application of the principles I have mentioned.

Mr. Travers also examined certain of the existing electorates, one being the district of Newcastle, which he said was an enormous area and, of course, it would be ridiculous to demand that a member in Adelaide should have the same basis of population as a man representing that area, because, he said, the electorate of Newcastle comprises 300,000 square miles. That is a bit more of the honourable member's imagination, because the total area of this State is 380,070 square miles, Newcastle is not the largest electorate, and there are 39 electorates. If Mr. Travers' calculation were correct this State would be about the size of the whole of Australia. He then referred to the Federal sphere and said, "Of course, there is not one vote one value in the House of Representatives." He took the figures which existed before the census as the basis of the House of representatives electorates and said, "Ah, well, they are not equal." He did not go back to the time when the previous redistribution had taken place and when they were substantially equal. He must have known that was the case because he is one of Her Majesty's Counsel, learned in the law, and he must know the contents of the Constitution which require that the electorates shall be determined upon a quota basis. Why is it that these things come forth from the Government benches upon a subject of this nature? Why is it that we have what we may euphemistically call exaggeration from the honourable member opposite? I think the principle is this, that to truth; logic and principle on this issue, members opposite

can say—and I misquote the poet—"I could not love thee, dear, so little, loved I not office more."

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—This topic is most interesting when one reads the speeches of 12 months ago. Reference was made to the gerrymander which had been foisted upon this State by this Government. We heard that last year from Mr. Dunstan, an up and coming young man, who has told us plainly that we have no conscience and that he is the only man who was ever a member of the Liberal Party outside the Chamber who had a conscience and because of it had left the Liberal Party to join the Labor Party. He made it quite clear that it was obvious he would have to leave public life unless he could right this terrible wrong which has been foisted on the people of South Australia. He was chided by interjection during his remarks and it was suggested that his colleagues in the Labor Party in Queensland had held office for a little longer than this Government and that in Queensland there were 18 Federal seats, of which the Labor Party only won five while the Liberal Party won 13. Mr. Dunstan blithely waved that aside and said "If I did not have a conscience I would not be a member of the Labor Party." It is difficult for those of us outside the Australian Labor Party to understand the existence of these two opposite elements, one advocating a certain method by which justice should be achieved, and the other saying that such a method is wrong. On one notable occasion was invited to debate the subject of electoral reform with the honourable member for Norwood, Mr. Dunstan. I believe that I was invited so that I might be put in my place. The audience were treated to a good demonstration of soapbox oratory by the member for Norwood.

Mr. O'Halloran—What was wrong with your effort?

Mr. SHANNON—Mine was not quite as good.

Mr. Dunstan—Apparently you did not convince the audience.

Mr. SHANNON—In my innocence I expected it would be a friendly debate among people who wanted to learn a little about the art of debating, but I found, after the meeting had been in progress for some time, that the purpose of the meeting was to put me in my box and slam the lid down tight. After the debate the meeting divided on the question, and I think the member for Norwood won by a margin of a few votes in an audience of

between 30 and 40. I did not have the opportunity of stacking the meeting—

Mr. Dunstan—Nor did I!

Mr. SHANNON—I do not think the honourable member is a fool and I am giving him credit for having a little grey matter. I did not know a vote would be taken so I did not have the opportunity to stack the meeting, but, even without taking that precaution, I lost by only a few votes.

Mr. Lawn—But you have the electorates stacked in this State!

Mr. SHANNON—No Government member is unmindful of the fact that the Labor Party in this State has been a voice crying in the wilderness, and, if it looks into its affairs, it will find why it does not occupy the Treasury benches: it has been unable to offer the electors a programme of forward movement such as this Government has given them.

Mr. Lawn—Yet our Party gets the majority of votes!

Mr. SHANNON—What the Premier said this afternoon is all too true: the Labor Party rushes to climb on the bandwagon when it sees that something the Government has done is well received by the electors. However, unfortunately for the Labor Party, it has no constructive ideas of its own.

Mr. Pearson—Doesn't that apply to Socialism generally?

Mr. SHANNON—Yes; in some cases the socialistic doctrinaires have very little common-sense approach to our problems, and this Government has been able to bring forward year by year progressive legislation, with the result that the general welfare of this State has advanced beyond imagination. When I first became a member in 1933 most South Australians were resigned to the fact that South Australia would be a primary-producing State for all time. They believed that, because of our lack of power and dependence on imported coal, we could not engage in large-scale secondary production. What the Premier has said this afternoon, however, is now history: we have become almost self-sufficient in this field and soon South Australia may be the home to which industries will come from other States because of the availability here of cheap atomic power. My Party can claim much credit for this trend. It has been said that the present electoral distribution of two country seats to one metropolitan seat has retarded the State's development. Indeed, Mr. Dunstan said that such retrogression was to be expected under the present electoral set-up.

I could not follow that argument, but then I am not a legal man able to understand such reasoning. The facts are obvious to anyone who has followed the growth of towns at the head of Spencer Gulf. Whyalla was once no more than a small fishing village with a population of a few hundred, but now it has one of over 8,000. Port Pirie again was not much more than a fishing village 20 years ago, but it is now fast growing into an important industrial centre. These are factors which our friends opposite forget to note in this matter. They do not take into account what is happening in the lower South-East in connection with afforestation development, or the development of land in the upper South-East, where there is an added income from land previously regarded as desert. These things are happening in areas where there is allegedly unjust representation, but in view of what is happening there the people should stick to the present electoral set-up and get a little more development. The specious argument used by Mr. Dunstan was only a watering down of his iron-clad support 12 months ago for the principle of one vote one value. At a University debating club meeting he said that one vote one value was the only principle to adopt and that once we got away from it some people were denied their just electoral rights. It cannot be denied that the Bill gets away from the principle of one vote one value. Mr. Dunstan said that there must be some tolerance in the matter. Last year he was the most intolerant of supporters of the principle.

Mr. Dunstan—Read what I said.

Mr. SHANNON—I have read it and I suggest that the honourable member read it again and then recant some of the things he said then. I think he has seen the light a little and has gone along the road a short distance towards commonsense, and realizes that South Australia cannot be compared with the United Kingdom which has been in course of development hundreds of years, many more years than has South Australia. The matter of representation in the two countries is so different that it is not possible to make a comparison. The honourable member has agreed now that there should be a tolerance to provide for our thinly populated northern pastoral areas. It is proposed in the Bill that these areas shall have a voting strength considerably less than the rest of the State, yet Mr. Dunstan says the Bill makes no big distinction between country districts. The Frome

district now goes from Peterborough to the borders of Queensland and Northern Territory, takes in a large slice of our pastoral areas, some of the industrial areas around Peterborough, and some of our fringe farming country. Mr. Dunstan suggests that the district has not been differently treated from any other country district, yet the River Murray areas, the farming districts inside Goyder's line and the South-East have a numerical voting strength only half that of the upper regions. Is that not a differentiation between country electorates? The Bill is an attempt on the part of the Labor Party to adroitly dodge what was obviously a weakness in its former approach to the problem of giving equal representation to all parts of the State. If one vote one value had been the only reason for the introduction of this Bill there would have been no move to exclude pastoral areas in the subdivision of districts equally. The Bill is a subterfuge to throw wool over the eyes of the people. The Party wants to get away with a distribution that will be favourable to it as a Party.

Mr. Jennings—It will be, too.

Mr. SHANNON—I thought someone would admit it. It seemed obvious to me that that would be the approach to the problem and that Party strings would override everything else. When I suggested that the South Australian branch of the great Australian Labor Party, which is so keenly conscious of this principle of one vote one value, should take it to the Labor Party Federal Convention I was told that it could not be done. I am now told that it will not be done for the very good reason that the major strength of the Party comes from the eastern shores of Australia, and that Labor people there are not favourable to the principle of one vote one value because they are keen to have Labor govern. Labor might not govern under one vote one value in those States. I give that to the member for Adelaide for what it is worth.

Mr. Lawn—It is worth nothing.

Mr. SHANNON—It may be worth something. If he thinks it is worth while he should try it at Labor Party conventions. If it is worth while in South Australia it is worth while throughout Australia.

Mr. Lawn—You don't know anything about it.

Mr. SHANNON—I have an idea I do. If this sacrosanct policy of one vote one value is discussed at any future convention held by the Labor Party I shall be pleased to hear the honourable member on it.

Mr. Lawn—It is Federal Labor policy now.

Mr. SHANNON—How strange! Let us examine the political situation in Queensland and New South Wales.

Mr. Hutchens—Did you say New South Wales?

Mr. SHANNON—Yes. The honourable member seems to imagine that the Labor Party in New South Wales has not a policy of keeping in office.

Mr. Lawn—Give us the Queensland figures.

Mr. SHANNON—I remind the honourable member that for the House of Representatives the electorates are divided into districts of about equal numerical strength. Queensland has 18 seats, 13 of which are held by the Liberal or Country parties and only five by Labor, yet the Labor Party has a comfortable majority in the State House.

Mr. Jennings—They hold separate elections.

Mr. SHANNON—I would be amazed if they didn't.

Mr. Jennings—You were trying to mislead the House.

Mr. SHANNON—I was not. I was only giving some figures. It seems that if the present Bill is passed, which is unlikely another measure will be brought before the House to provide for proportional representation with three-member districts.

The SPEAKER—Proportional representation is not mentioned in this Bill.

Mr. SHANNON—I agree, but we are entitled to consider how this Bill is affected by a proposal to introduce it.

Mr. Lawn—Why don't you speak on the Bill before the House?

The SPEAKER—I ask members not to interject.

Mr. SHANNON—The proposition put forward by the Leader of the Opposition is an entire abnegation of the principle supported by all in favour of proportional representation. The ultimate goal of this system is to give representation to minorities. The member for Flinders informs me that Mr. O'Halloran said, in his second reading speech, that he would bring down another Bill for proportional representation if this Bill were passed. Therefore, I am justified in referring to proportional representation and the great difficulty that the Labor Party would find in applying it to three-member districts. Has the Labor Party, in its innocence, introduced a Bill merely for three-member districts, thinking that proportional representation will give minorities representation in the House? I am certain that members opposite have no thought that one little rabbit would slip in.

Mr. Jennings—We would get some rabbits out.

Mr. SHANNON—We have some here.

The SPEAKER—I ask members not to reflect on the House.

Mr. SHANNON—I was certainly not reflecting on any member, but I think we would still have a good cross-section of electors represented in this House under any system. This Bill represents a great forward step by the Labor Party—a rather remarkable step in one year. It has come much further along the road than I thought it would. Proposed new section 32b impresses me in most respects. It relates to the various matters to be considered by the commissioners. They are:—

(a) community or diversity of interest; (b) means of communication; (c) physical features; and (d) existing boundaries of subdivisions.

The last-mentioned may or may not be wise, because, after all, there may be existing subdivisions at present denied one of the three former considerations. Generally speaking, however, it is a good basis upon which to make some reasonable approach to this problem. I asked Mr. Dunstan specifically to reply to the 20 per cent tolerance but apparently he did not realize what it meant. There could be 80 people in one electorate and 120 in the adjoining electorate each having a similar representation in this House. I doubt whether he appreciated that. Twelve months ago Mr. Dunstan could not speak calmly upon this problem because there was a disparity of approximately 21 per cent between certain electorates, but his own Party Bill permits a 20 per cent tolerance and he is supporting it.

I hope that when legislation is introduced by the Government relating to this problem the Opposition will approach it with an open mind. If members opposite can suggest any constructive improvements I will support them. I cannot, at the moment, see any great merit in this proposal. It will certainly not provide for decentralization which is so glibly spoken about by the Opposition but about which it has done so little. When the people of this State realize what would happen to those living in the outlying parts under this proposal they will not be happy and will probably prefer that matters remain as they are, particularly if we are to continue to develop the country to its fullest and to make the utmost use of our available resources. I hope the Labor Party will not persist in endeavouring to impose upon this State that awful abortion known as proportional representation.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—Since I have been a member of this Chamber I have been apparently labouring under a strong misapprehension. I have always understood that when a member rises to oppose or support a measure he is supposed to discuss it. So far as I could understand, except for the latter part of his speech, Mr. Shannon did everything but discuss this Bill. However, I do not want to waste the time of the House by discussing his irrelevant remarks but I shall refer to one or two of his later comments which did have some remote relationship to the matter under discussion. The main purpose of the Bill is to get rid of the objectionable and evil gerrymander which is ruining this State. Mr. Shannon referred to what is attempted under this Bill and he mentioned, in particular, how impossible it is to compare England with South Australia on account of the long established civilization in that country in comparison with the shortness of ours. Justice is the same wherever you live, whether it be in India, Borneo, Hong Kong or South Australia and this Bill is attempting to get rid of the gerrymander and to replace it with what we believe to be more just.

I do not propose to deal at length with the Premier's remarks but he attempted—as he frequently and successfully does—to damn with faint praise this measure introduced by the Leader of the Opposition. However, it will not be so easy to dam the flood of public opinion now reaching its heights against the juggling of electorates in South Australia. I will prove, if possible, a little later that juggling has taken place. I remind the Premier and his Party that such floods of public opinion as exist today against electoral injustice in South Australia have always washed away totalitarian Governments. History has a very nasty habit of repeating itself in such matters. It was rather interesting to hear the Premier sum up his remarks by saying that he could not support the discrimination in this Bill. The reason for that is obvious—it is not his particular type of discrimination. Imagine a Treasurer elected to Parliament under a system such as we have in this State, which is unquestionably the height of discrimination, refusing to be associated with a Bill because there is discrimination in it! It is almost impossible to believe, but it is what he said. I ask members not to be influenced by his remarks about possible new legislation. It is clear that it will continue the evil system that has existed since

1938, because the Premier has told us quite definitely that the present ratio will be maintained. It must not be forgotten that when we speak of this ratio we say there are 26 seats for the country and 13 for the city, and therefore fall into the error of believing that the representation is two to one. That is a gross exaggeration because, as I will show later, the ratio is well over three to the country to one in the city—possibly not in members, but certainly in votes.

I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his honest attempt to satisfy genuine objections raised by members opposite last year. One or two members attempted to take him to task but they should have known better; he is a difficult man to take to task. His attempt, however, appears to have been completely unavailing because during his speech interjections from the other side made it obvious that the objections raised last year will be brought up again in a slightly new dress. After hearing the Premier's most impressive, or should I say unimpressive, remarks, and hearing the member for Onkaparinga, we realize that although the Leader made some attempt to answer objections to his old Bill, new objections have been brought forward on this occasion. It was obvious last year that some members opposite were worried about the electoral set-up and disliked the idea of holding seats if they were not entitled to them. I know, and so do they, that thousands of their followers also dislike the idea. Although sometimes we hear the cry that politicians are not honest, to which of course I do not subscribe, any man who sits in this Chamber and helps to make the legislation of this State likes to think deep down that he is here because of the wishes of the people. For any member to have a sneaking idea at the back of his mind that but for this electoral system he would not be here is a discomfiting thought. I know that some members opposite feel that way but whether they will say so is perhaps another thing.

Mr. Dunstan—It will depend on the thickness of the hide.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is so, but I am not a good judge of animals. The member who has just resumed his seat gave us a good dissertation on them and appeared to imply that certain members were animals; however, I do not wish to continue in that strain. I congratulate the Leader on the system he has introduced of a zone for a sparsely populated area, and he should be congratulated on it because, as some members opposite have had the wisdom to see, although the real reason

seems to have entirely passed them by, I am quite sure that in one sense a certain amount of this must have gone against the Leader's grain because he knows that this Bill does not equate us quite as closely to one vote one value as last year's Bill. However, it does plan a just and equitable system as near as possible to one vote one value making due allowance for geographical difficulties. We have not changed our ideas one bit; we want to give as nearly as possible one vote one value and the fullest amount of justice. Mr. O'Halloran said:—

It is not our intention to perpetrate a gerrymander in favour of the Labor Party in South Australia.

I entirely indorse this as do all members on this side, and after all it would be a very simple thing to put a plan of that nature forward. All we would have to do is reverse the electorates and provide two city seats for every one in the country, but with a fair and just system that is not necessary because this is a Labor State, as proved over and over again by the votes cast in elections, even though they were not given their real value. The word "gerrymander" has come into the debate a good deal this afternoon and some members may wonder just what it means. I obtained what I felt to be an unbiased opinion from a reference book used by the member for Norwood last year, because it is a good source of information. It is called *Theory and Practice of Modern Government* and was written by Dr. Herman Finer of Chicago University, an authority on these matters, whose books are studied in all British-speaking countries. His definition of a gerrymander is:—

To arrange the shape of constituencies so that your own Party's majorities, however small, are spread over the largest number of constituencies and your opponents' majorities made as large as they can be in each constituency certain to be won by them, but restricted to as few constituencies as possible.

Mr. Lawn—That is exactly what is being done in South Australia.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is so. I do not know if Dr. Finer has ever visited this State but it is obvious that some reports of our system have reached him. The Premier has said on a number of occasions with the utmost earnestness that the system will continue. Although he said this afternoon that it is going to be varied, members realize that he told us that the same principle with regard to city and country electorates will continue, so we know that it is only going to be a variation on the same theme.

Mr. O'Halloran—He did not give any reason for the principle.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—The Premier has said time and time again that the principle referred to will continue until decentralization has made country amenities as good as those enjoyed in the metropolitan area. In other words, decentralization will continue until the end of time. I believe it should be named "The Playford Theory of Gerrymander." In effect the theory provides "we will not alter boundaries until South Australia's population is decentralized; we will not make any real attempt to decentralize and therefore the electoral boundaries will remain the same; we will amend the boundaries (perhaps) when the State is decentralized, but we do not really intend to try to decentralize and therefore the electoral boundaries will remain the same." This goes on *ad infinitum*; it is like a dog chasing its tail. In the meantime the Liberals rule while the State decays. That is the reason, cause and effect of the gerrymander. Dr. Finer also said:—

Now men seek to cast out the devil from themselves by pledging themselves to a constitution. And in most State constitutions it is provided that electoral districts shall be compact in form, contiguous in territory and contain the maximum possible equality of inhabitants. Yet even within these requirements the bosses and their henchmen act effectively.

They certainly do. South Australia is a living proof of just how the boss and his henchmen get to work. I believe that many of the so-called henchmen are not very happy about retaining their seats under false pretences. The important words in Dr. Finer's statement are, "the maximum possible equality of inhabitants." That obviously is one of the most important requirements in any just and equitable system of electoral boundaries. How does this compare with what the Leader of the Opposition said—

By drawing up the electorates so that the minimum of L.C.L. electors could return the maximum number of members—by cunningly arranging the district boundaries to exclude this area or include that from the point of view of which way the electors in such area would vote—the L.C.L. sought to make sure of a majority in the House of Assembly.

That quotation combined with that from Dr. Finer gives us the essence of what is becoming known as a gerrymander throughout the State. It is also the essence of what gerrymanders are throughout the world where they have been allowed to exist. In South Australia the gerrymander has been a very successful

venture. Figures show that when it was introduced it was expected to be a grand success, and from the point of view of getting the required Party a majority in this House it certainly has been a grand success, but from the point of view of the State we shall have to invent a much stronger word than "failure" to describe it. Dr. Finer advocates that to obtain democratic electorates constituencies must be sized according to convenience and equity; they must not be too large for the maintenance of personal contact between members and electors; they must be as nearly equal in population as possible. I hope most members will agree with him on that, but I doubt it. These things surely are so elementary as first principles of electoral justice that they can hardly be denied, although they are denied. That is exactly what we advocate—electoral boundaries drawn up simply and without management. Then, surely by the law of averages no undue advantage or disadvantage can accrue to any Party. Finally, and apparently innocently, Dr. Finer asks, "Are politicians so unfair as deliberately to produce or maintain inequitable election districts?" The answer of course is that some are. Finer should take a look at the electoral set-up in South Australia and then I think the answer would be obvious to him. We have heard in this House a little about electoral systems in other States. I shall not weary the House by analysing a number of State elections, but shall mention two States which have often come under fire in this regard. First, let us consider New South Wales. The member for Onkaparinga implied that it was a Labor State because no other Government could possibly get control there. I believe he is right, but he is right for the wrong reason. It is difficult for a Party other than the Labor Party to gain control in New South Wales, because the people want a Labor Government. In the last State elections held there, on February 14, 1953, the Australian Labor Party had an overall majority of 155,684, and with such a majority it needed no gerrymander to retain office. That majority meant the return of a Government in accordance with the wishes of the majority, and New South Wales electoral boundaries obviously allowed electors to show what Party must occupy the Treasury benches. It has been said that, because the New South Wales and Queensland Labor Governments are elected under a so-called gerrymander, the Liberal Party in this State is entitled to cling to its gerrymander, but Queensland has twice as many country as city seats

only because it has twice as many country as city electors. At the last Queensland election held on March 7, 1953, the Labor overall majority was 39,058, which meant the return of a Government in accordance with the wishes of the people—a Labor Government. The electoral set-up there allowed the people to choose the Government they wanted.

In the South Australian elections last year the Australian Labor Party won 10 seats with an aggregate vote of 166,526, which meant that the average number of votes required by Labor to win a seat was 16,600. Four Australian Labor Party members were elected unopposed in districts having a total enrolment of 51,485. The Liberal Party won 16 seats with an aggregate vote of 119,003, which meant that the average needed to return a Liberal member was 7,400. Five Liberal members were elected unopposed in districts having a total enrolment of 43,877. It will be seen, therefore, that more than twice as many votes were required to return one Labor candidate as were required to return one Liberal. Each Party contested 22 districts, and Labor gained an overall majority of 47,523. Despite the fact that an overall Labor majority of 39,000 was sufficient to return a Labor Government in Queensland, an overall Labor majority of more than 47,000 failed to return a Labor Government in South Australia. This large majority should have enabled the people to return the Government they desired—a Labor Government—but under South Australian rules a Liberal Government was returned. In other words you can't win the grand final even though you obtain the higher score. The South Australian electoral set-up does not allow the electors to choose their Government. This denial of rights is known as the South Australian gerrymander; there is none worse!

Last year the total enrolment of the 13 metropolitan seats was 279,000 or 62 per cent of the total State enrolments, whereas in the 26 country seats it was 170,000 or 38 per cent of the total. As one-third of the electoral districts in South Australia are in the metropolitan area and two-thirds in the country, this meant that a country vote was worth 3.29 metropolitan votes. Last year the member for Port Adelaide gave some interesting figures with regard to certain country and city seats, and I will take those figures a stage further so as to make good my point about metropolitan and country enrolments. Mr. Stephens cited five city electorates and compared their enrolments in the year 1938—the first year

of this vicious gerrymander—with their enrolments in 1953. His figures were:—

	1938.	1953.	Increase.
Port Adelaide . .	17,110	30,379	13,269
Glenelg	16,028	27,333	11,305
Burnside	15,826	20,786	4,960
Hindmarsh . . .	17,578	23,075	5,497
Semaphore . . .	15,129	24,244	9,115

Total Increase 44,146

During those years of decentralization we find a 54 per cent increase in those five districts and I submit that that is more than enough for nine country districts—probably enough for 10—and in an attempt to prove that I will quote some figures for country districts. Some members who speak so strongly about the wonderful decentralization throughout our country districts may do so in ignorance, and if they do some of these figures may be rather illuminating to them. They will notice that in the five metropolitan seats the increases totalled many thousands, and they will notice that in some country districts there have been increases as well. The figures are:—

	1938.	1953.	Increase.	Decrease.
Albert . .	5,549	6,125	576	—
Angas . .	5,814	6,391	577	—
Burra . .	5,258	4,336	—	922
Eyre . .	6,001	5,084	—	917
Light . .	6,207	5,430	—	777
Newcastle	4,822	3,989	—	833
Rocky				
River .	5,259	4,719	—	540
Young . .	4,795	4,218	—	577
Frome . .	4,140	3,660	—	480

However, everyone will know that the decrease in Frome is not the fault of the Leader of the Opposition, for he has been fighting for decentralization as genuinely as possible. We must take heed of these figures. Whereas in the city districts I mentioned there was an increase of 44,000, in these nine country seats, during this much vaunted period of decentralization, there was a decrease of 3,893, or nine per cent. If the increase of 44,146 for the city seats is added it will be seen that there is any amount of room for nine, if not 10, additional seats in the city areas I quoted. Indeed, on the figures, it would certainly be worth more than 10, because if the Leader of the Opposition were taken into account every member would recognise that he would be worth two average members. Surely this shows the absurdity of this gerrymander. The Premier has told us that this system, or some modification of it, is to continue until decentralization is in full bloom. There has been a certain amount of decentralization in some spots, but I am talking about an overall decentralization comparing metropolitan and country

districts. We find that decentralization has increased by leaps and bounds since 1938—but backwards. Indeed, during the Premier's regime in 16 years the ratio of metropolitan and country population is now 61 per cent to 39 per cent. In 1938 the country population was almost eight per cent higher than it is today, so decentralization has improved under the gerrymander or Playford regime by minus eight per cent. The purpose of this system is to bring decentralization to the country and it is to remain until it does, we are told. At this rate in another 16 years we will find 77 per cent of the population in the metropolitan area and only 23 per cent in the country, and if we are prepared to take this to its absurdly logical conclusion the time is not far distant when all South Australia will be living in the metropolitan area. I expect we will find L.C.L. gerrymanderites still bleating about decentralization and still demanding 26 seats in the country and 13 in the metropolitan area.

Mr. O'Halloran—And having difficulty in getting candidates to represent the rotten boroughs.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Yes, but a good many of the prominent supporters of the Government already represent electorates in which they do not live very often. Of course we are wrong, for it is to presuppose something that must be made impossible—that the L.C.L. Government will still be clinging to power, and this cannot be allowed to happen. If the L.C.L. Government had been elected under a true and just electoral system I would say, "Good luck to it," because the people would want it, but that is impossible under the present system. There is some consolation in giving a final quotation. Finer, in concluding his writings on gerrymanders, said "However, the system provokes retaliation and public contempt." This has already happened in South Australia. We do not have to travel very far before we find that the means by which the present Government continues in office are disgusting more and more of the people, and not only those who support the Labor Party but those who are normally known as "floaters." Many Liberal and Country League supporters feel that they are in an invidious position. They want to support a Government in whose principles they misguidedly believe, but they are not happy when the Government is returned as I have said. Public contempt is the weapon that the Government is beginning to face. I am firmly convinced that this subterfuge, commonly known as a gerrymander, would not fool

even a Russian. I believe it will eventually bring its own reward and there will be the just system, which I support. I believe it will give all people the right to elect the Government they want. There will also be a full recognition of minorities as well as major Parties under proportional representation which, despite what Mr. Shannon has said, is the fairest voting system ever devised by the mind of man. I support the Bill.

Mr. DUNKS secured the adjournment of the debate.

BELAIR PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Public Works Standing Committee on the Belair Primary School, together with minutes of evidence.

Ordered that report be printed.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 554.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I give Mr. Jennings good marks for his intentions in introducing this Bill. I will support it but it is subject to criticism on the matter of principle. It singles out one type of sport on the ground of cruelty, yet allows other sports where there is cruelty to continue. We should pass legislation on the ground of principle rather than expediency. The Bill says that we may shoot pigeons provided we do not shoot them if released from a trap, but apparently we can shoot ducks and other birds not subject to protection. The shooting of these other birds is also a sport. I have been told that there is trap-shooting of other than pigeons.

Mr. Jennings—Pigeons are not mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member said that birds cannot be shot when released from a trap, but apparently other birds can be shot.

Mr. Jennings—Not from traps.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The cruelty is not associated with the trap but with the shooting. The Bill should be given much consideration in the matter of principle. There is an old saying, "Hard cases make bad laws," and that is true. There is cruelty, no doubt, in the trap-shooting of pigeons, but in Committee the whole position should be considered. Expediency has not yet passed a good law and it will not in this case.

Mr. Stephens—Don't you think the object of the Bill will be defeated if it is overloaded?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There may be political considerations in this matter. Many animals and birds killed by shooting are vermin. In many places pigeons are becoming a serious pest, and I have even seen employees of Parliament House taking pot shots at them in the precincts of this building.

Mr. Macgillivray—But they don't trap them and then shoot.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is true, but in many sports we like animals and birds to be appropriately tame before we start shooting, which is the same thing in principle. I am prepared to support the second reading, but Mr. Jennings singled out one form of sport. To say it is over the brink on the ground of cruelty when we know there is equal cruelty in many other sports seems to be shirking the issue.

Mr. Corcoran—Cruelty comes in only when a bird is wounded and escapes.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I agree, but cruelty comes in when we wound a rabbit or duck which escapes.

Mr. Fred Walsh—When rabbits are trapped their legs are broken.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There is a slight difference there because rabbits are not caught for sport. Probably nothing is more cruel than destroying rabbits with myxomatosis. They are infected with a slow virus disease that gradually causes them to go blind and eventually die, but I will not bring in the issue of cruelty. Frankly though, the Bill is not consistent because many sporting activities will be allowed to continue, some of which are perhaps more cruel.

Mr. Macgillivray—Does that make the case of the member for Prospect any worse?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, but we should deal with legislation on principle rather than on expediency. The purpose of the Bill is clear, but I may move some amendments at the appropriate stage.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS (Stirling)—I oppose the Bill, though I agree with the Premier that it has some good points. If it is passed it will have an effect opposite to that which is intended. If trap shooting by gun clubs is abolished, ultimately many more pigeons, and other birds, will suffer cruelty than under the present conditions. I have had some first-hand experience of the activities of gun clubs, and I think it would be right in saying that a very small percentage of those who it is said have signed petitions and protested against

trap shooting know what actually takes place. I think they object to trap shooting as a sport because live pigeons are used as targets. If trap shooting is abolished and the clubs no longer purchase live birds, for which they pay 3s. or 4s. each—and they use about 30,000 birds a year in this State—with this demand gone pigeons will increase. In a few years they will become such a pest to farmers, particularly pea growers and vigneron, that some action will have to be taken for their eradication.

Mr. Macgillivray—What has all this to do with trap shooting?

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—A lot. Pigeons are a menace to many primary producers. Probably we should have to control them by poisoning; if so they would suffer a lingering death. As the Premier pointed out, myxomatosis causes great suffering to rabbits.

Mr. Corcoran—There is no cruelty when a pigeon is shot dead, but when it is wounded.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—I will come to that later. Many pea growers at Carrickalinga, near Normanville, could not grow good crops because flocks of pigeons would follow the drill, picking up the seed. The farmers would fire at them, killing eight or 10 and wounding as many more. The wounded birds were not recovered.

Mr. Corcoran—This Bill does not stop that.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—I know, but when wild pigeons in flocks are shot many get away wounded. High prices are paid by gun clubs for pigeons. I know a man who often goes to the caves near Carrickalinga. He throws a net over the caves and often snares 100 pigeons in one catch. The member for Prospect said that pigeons were not used to any extent for food, but that is because people are not prepared to pay the high prices paid for them by gun clubs. If the incentive to catch them for gun clubs is removed the birds will increase by thousands every year. Pea growing in the Carrickalinga district would then become quite unprofitable. I have read many lurid stories about pigeon shooting, and I think that much public opinion has been based on them. However, some of the stories are not true. We have heard of the wholesale slaughter of birds and their mutilation by gun dogs, but this does not often happen. Members of gun clubs—and some of them are women—have to be crack shots, for it is an expensive sport. Very few miss their birds. Possibly two or three out of every 10 released get away, and perhaps one in 10 is wounded. However, the followers of the clubs pursue them and shoot them.

Mr. Quirke—Why should they use live birds? Why not use clay pigeons thrown up mechanically?

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Clay pigeons are sent out all in the same direction.

Mr. Quirke—They are not.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—They are ejected at the same velocity every time and they take the same line of flight; therefore they are easy to shoot. I have seen shot up to 30 at a meeting, but that can't be done with live pigeons. Some of them can shoot nearly 100 clays before they miss, but 10 would be the average of pigeons. It has been said that gun dogs mutilate the birds, but if they did, they would not be allowed at any shooting club that I have attended, and I have attended several. They are well trained to recover birds quickly, and an untrained animal would not be tolerated. These dogs bring in the birds which, if wounded, are immediately dispatched. Where is the cruelty in that? Take away the demand for pigeons created by the high prices paid by the gun clubs and the birds will breed so quickly that they will become a menace to producers, desecrate city buildings and become an even greater nuisance than at present by fouling our churches and public buildings including this House. They will increase in numbers along the cliffs and banks of the River Murray and there will be a great deal more indiscriminate shooting by people out for sport shooting into a flock and getting perhaps eight or ten birds while as many will be wounded and get away. That is a great deal more cruel than organized shooting which ensures that wounded birds are recovered. Out of the 30,000 birds used by the gun clubs very few wounded birds get away. The racing of pigeons is a great deal more cruel than pigeon shooting. I read in the press a few days ago that of 1,000 birds released in a race only a dozen finished. The rest fell exhausted in the fields and became prey for hawks, foxes and shooters. In England a few weeks ago 6,000 birds were released in a race and only one finished, the rest having fallen in the Irish Sea exhausted. What is more cruel than that?

Members of gun clubs take home what they shoot and those not required by them are given to charitable institutions where they are appreciated. This Bill is only the thin end of the wedge. I was told the other day by a member of an institution that if it is passed it will be the forerunner of many more similar measures, and that the next Bill will be to ban coursing. I do not know what people in my

district will say about that, especially those in Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek, Macclesfield and Milang—the home of coursing.

Mr. Macgillivray—It is a free country isn't it?

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—It is. I think someone said in this debate that pigeon shooting had been banned in England, but I believe that pigeons were recently declared to be a nuisance there. Apart from being a pest and a nuisance to our producers, pigeons are also carriers of several kinds of diseases, including psittacosis, diphtheria and lice.

Mr. Macgillivray—Then kill them in the first place.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—But nobody will bother to go out and kill them. With a price of 3s. or 4s. created by the gun clubs' demand there is an incentive to catch them. I wonder whether perhaps this Bill has not been introduced as a matter of political expediency rather than for the welfare of the birds. In a recent edition of the *Sunday Advertiser*, under the heading of "Hot feet for New York Pigeons" the following article appeared:—

Thousands of birds have been living in the ornate stonework ever since the hall was built. The council voted 25,000 dollars today for an electric pulsating system, installed on all projections, such as hand courses, cornices, sculpture and window sills, etc. A council spokesman said, "We have to do something. You could not tell if the statue on top of the city hall was justice or the mummy's hand."

We can expect the same thing here. In his explanation of the Bill Mr. Jennings said that trap-shooting had a bad effect on young people but I prefer to see our young people undertake pigeon shooting as a sport than have them join the ranks of the bodgies and widgees, with their permanent waves and fancy pants. This is the direction such legislation is inclined to lead them, because it will take away outdoor sport. In considering this Bill we should consider the 2,200 club members, their followers, the benefit to gunsmiths and factories producing ammunition and sporting houses, the loss that will result to our primary producers and the concern that will be caused to those who love and take care of our religious and public buildings. The only way to control these pests is to allow gun clubs to continue. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I do not think very much of this Bill; it is one of those tiddlywinking things brought up by a small section that desires to create a disturbance on a subject on which they can arouse sentiment. That has been the genesis of the Bill. Quite

obviously what the Premier said was appropriate, because if we look at this problem fairly and squarely and compare it with the piscatorial art, why should we permit a band of people to fish for bream from the lower reaches of the Onkaparinga River near Port Noarlunga on a competitive basis? From the point of view of the fish, it finds little enjoyment in getting a very sharp hook in its mouth or gills and being dragged on to the bank and allowed to flap and smother until its breathing ceases. I am informed on good authority that some types of fish will live for hours out of water before giving up the ghost. I see no valid reason why the sponsor of the Bill should not have prohibited wild duck shooting, either in season or not. At the moment duck shooting is permitted only during the open season. Apparently the honourable member sees no harm in people going to the Coorong or the Lakes where ducks congregate and having a shot at them on the wing. They will even shoot at them on the water if they get a chance, but generally the ducks are too shrewd for that. We either have to apply the proposed law to all, or none at all. If we are to deal with cruelty as cruelty, the Bill must deal with every aspect. Those who go out with a sporting gun to shoot pigeons in traps, wild ducks, rabbits on the squat and kangaroos in the far north are classified as sports. Whether they are sporting people or not may be a matter of opinion. There is no difference between those people who set out in a competition to shoot pigeons in traps or to shoot wild ducks. Whether these are to be considered sporting activities or not, or whether cruelty comes into it or not, must be viewed by the House in its widest sphere, and not in a restricted sense.

I admit that the average person does not like the idea of not giving the game, whatever it may be, a sporting chance. If I am out after rabbits it gives me no pleasure to shoot one on the squat. If he is on the run and I miss I say "Good luck to you," but if I hit him I take credit for it. Sports like to think they have given their quarry a chance. When it is open shooting, whether for rabbits, hares,

pigeons or ducks there is a certain amount of cruelty associated with it which cannot be avoided. That is accepted. If it is cruelty alone that this House is concerned with, we must look at the matter in its completeness. It is for those reasons that I oppose the Bill. I do not believe it could be amended in Committee in such a way as to satisfy all parties. I know that what the member for Port Adelaide has suggested could be done and what would be the final result. We would kill the legislation by overloading it with amendments which brought in all the various matters with which cruelty is associated in sport. In effect, we would kill it by kindness.

My view is that a proper approach is to oppose the second reading, and if any honourable member feels disposed to bring forward a comprehensive measure to deal with cruelty as such in sport, let him have the courage to do so. However, do not let us pander to a small section who are seeking to insert what we might call the thin end of the wedge. Do not let members for one moment think that the enthusiasts will be satisfied to stop here. If they win this first round the next step will follow. If that assumption is correct, then the House should be prepared to face up to the full problem now and deal with it in its entirety. Since this is only a partial measure and deals only with a small and not important aspect I shall oppose the Bill. There is not nearly as much cruelty associated with trap shooting of pigeons as the shooting of wild ducks. In fact, there is probably not one per cent of the cruelty in this case that there is in duck shooting because most pigeons, being only a few yards away from the gun aimed by the expert, would not get away. Because the Bill does not deal with the broader aspect of this question, I cannot support it.

Mr. FLETCHER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 21, at 2 p.m.