HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 8, 1958.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

EXPORTS TO NEW ZEALAND.

Mr. KING—Has the Premier seen an announcement in this morning's *Advertiser* that New Zealand has placed a total prohibition on imports for 1959 of canned fruit other than pineapple, with reduced quantities of dried fruits? In view of accusations that New Zealand is dumping cardboard in Australia and flooding our market with peas in competition with South Australian products, will the Premier take up this matter with the Federal Government with a view to correcting the position and protecting our markets on which South Australian fruitgrowers, including soldier settlers, depend?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I saw this report, which I believe arose out of the inequality of trade between Australia and New Zealand. At present Australia is exporting to New Zealand very much more than it is purchasing from that country, and in consequence the New Zealand Government is in a difficult financial position. I will have this matter investigated to see whether there is any way in which I can assist the industry.

BOOLEROO CENTRE WOODWORK CENTRE.

Mr. HEASLIP—I understand that some time ago approval was given for the construction of a woodwork centre at Booleroo Centre, and that at one stage a contract was let. In view of the urgent necessity for this building, will the Minister of Education ascertain the reason for the delay?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be very pleased to do so and let the honourable member know, either tomorrow or next Tuesday.

STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. DUNNAGE—The other evening I heard a broadcasting station, I think 5KA, notifying the public of the registered numbers of cars that had been stolen, and ask people to notify police headquarters if they had seen these cars. During the evening a lady rang and reported having seen one of the cars. Is it possible, once or twice a week or month, to issue a list of registered numbers of stolen cars? I am sure many lie unobserved in streets, parks and country areas, and if the people knew from the broadcast numbers that they had been stolen they would notify police headquarters.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter investigated, and advise the honourable member after the Commissioner of Police has reported on it.

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 559.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—As far as I can see without analysing it closely, this Bill is practically similar in all respects to a measure introduced last session, and as it has been before members for a considerable time it is not necessary now to deal precisely with its provisions. I am somewhat intrigued about this Bill. It was introduced early this session, but was then relegated for a long time to a very obscure position on the Notice Paper. Now at this late stage it has been resurrected and placed at the top of the Notice Paper for private members' business. It was not introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, but by another Labor member. I made inquiries about it because it seemed to me that it was not running exactly according to plan. It seemed strange to obliterate a measure introduced so early by putting other business ahead of it; it was only a fortnight ago that any action was taken to see that it came before this House after its mover had given his second reading speech.

I found that this was a somewhat similar course to that taken by legislation introduced for, I think, precisely the same purpose in another State. When I made further inquiries from another State, I found there was great divergence of opinion among Labor members there on whether the legislation was desirable or not. For that reason, it had not been introduced by the Leader of the Party, but by a back-bencher, and it had not been pushed very hard to get it passed. I wondered whether that was the position here, because this Bill was not introduced by the Leader of the Opposition and it has been before the House for a long period without any active steps to promote it to the top of the Notice Paper—and of course the Notice Paper on Wednesday afternoons is entirely at the disposal of members opposite. I wondered whether there might not be some misgivings about this legislation on

the part of members opposite, although undoubtedly it is requested by the bank industry. I use that term in the fullest sense, because I think from my own observation that Mr. Dunstan's statement that it not only receives the support of bank employees, but is benignly regarded by at least some bank managements is correct. Under those circumstances, I was wondering what was the reason for the apparent back pedalling on this Bill by members opposite. I made some observations upon this legislation last year, and, as far as I can see, they are fundamentally sound today. There is no doubt that a large volume of banking business is done on Saturday mornings. I was informed by one bank that 90 per cent more business was done on Saturday mornings than in the corresponding time on other mornings.

Mr. Dunstan—What bank was that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Savings Bank.

Mr. Dunstan—What is the position in the State Bank?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no information from that bank on the basis of percentages, but I was informed by the State Bank that a large volume of business was done on Saturday mornings, particularly regarding housing. I asked one trading bank why it was not possible to roster the staff on Saturday mornings so that at least a considerable number would not have to report for duty, and I was informed that it was not possible to do so because it was the busiest time of the week for the branch concerned and the whole staff was fully employed. I have no doubt that banking services are required at the weekend. The member for Norwood said that bank managements in general did not oppose the Bill, and I accept that statement. In general, bank managements would prefer Parliament to settle the issue instead of having to settle it themselves.

Mr. Dunstan—They can't settle it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—They told me that, and produced an opinion along those lines, but having looked at the opinion I think it would be possible to pass legislation that would enable bank managements to settle the issue themselves. However, I am not running away from the issue on that account. It has been brought before Parliament and I think Parliament should express its views. In considering this legislation members should keep two or three facts well in mind. In the first place, I do not think this Bill would impose much hardship, if any, upon the normal type of customer of a trading bank, for if he wanted to make a purchase he could pay by cheque. However, persons who could be greatly inconvenienced are those with savings bank accounts only. Except for district councils or certain approved societies enumerated in the Act, they are not able to draw cheques; so they, or someone for them, have to go to the bank to make a withdrawal. Of course, the depositor can write out and endorse the necessary document and hand his passbook over to someone else to make a withdrawal, but the fact remains that it is a transaction involving a personal attendance.

Many new Australians do banking at weekends. The dependants of many of these people are still overseas and they are obliged to make fairly regular remittances for their maintenance, and many banks do a large volume of this class of work on Saturday mornings. I have found that Saturday morning is one of the busiest shopping periods of the week. Families often undertake shopping transactions of more than ordinary moment on Saturdays. I have found from a number of large stores that when transactions involve something other than a normal purchase the husband and wife often shop together. I do not think any member opposite would deny that a large volume of transactions is undertaken on Saturday mornings, and in many instances that business necessitates the attendance of the person who desires to do banking business. The member for Norwood soft-pedalled this point this year, but last year he said it was all right, so far as the Savings Bank was concerned, for the agencies to do it.

Mr. Shannon—I think the spokesmen for the bank officers are still saying it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am not concerned with the comments appearing in the daily press, but that view was expressed here in support of this legislation. I have made inquiries and ascertained that many agencies already object to being called upon to do a large volume of banking business on Saturday mornings. They are normally established in shops, and if staff has to be devoted to banking business that interferes with the primary purpose of the shop, namely to sell goods. Consider also the position of postal workers. Every post office is, I believe, an agency of the Commonwealth Bank. I think postal workers would resent being taken from their postal duties to do banking work on Saturday mornings when the banks were

closed, particularly as banks at present do not give as many hours of service to the public as postal officers.

This subject requires great consideration. It is not an easy problem to solve because it does affect the public. It has been argued that the Public Service closes on Saturday mornings. That is substantially true of the Public Service proper, but not of Government employees, many of whom work not only on Saturdays but on Sundays as well.

Mr. Stephens—You don't want the banks to work on Sundays, do you?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I was not suggesting that. The interjection is futile. If services are to be maintained in a modern society it is necessary to provide for their operations over the weekend. No country in the world has been able to escape that obligation and I suggest that that is one reason why members opposite have soft-pedalled on this legislation. They realize that while one section of the community will benefit the public may, in some instances, be detrimentally affected and it will only emphasize the good conditions enjoyed by bank officials.

I can understand the desire of bank officers to have Saturdays off. That is a normal desire. In the Government services, wherever possible, we have made a long weekend—if we may call it that—available to employees. Later today I propose to table an amendment to this Bill and if it is acceptable and the bank officers advise me in writing to that effect I will support the second reading and assist the passage of the Bill.

Mr. Jennings—And get it knocked out up top.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—We do not indulge in those devious practices. I will support the Bill to the limit of my ability and I may have some influence even in another place. I regret that I have not the actual amendment before me, but it will take the form of a proviso attached to the Bill stating, in effect, "This Bill will not come into operation until steps have been taken to open banks and to keep them open to the public until 5 o'clock on Friday afternoons." In other words, while the public will lose some banking time on Saturday mornings they will gain additional time on Fridays to enable them to carry out their weekend transactions.

Mr. Riches—Suppose some banks agree and some do not?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have referred this question to some bank managements who have intimated that it is practicable. The public interest must be considered and my proposed amendment will meet some of the objections bank officers have at present to coming in on Saturday mornings for a relatively small period of public business when other sections of the community are not required to work. I believe it has the support of my colleagues. If I get written agreement from an authoritative source representing the bank officers for 5 o'clock Friday afternoon closure I will facilitate the passage of the Bill here and, I hope, in the Legislative Council. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. O'Halloran—

That in the opinion of this House a Royal Commission should be appointed—

(*a*) to recommend to the House during the current session new boundaries for electoral districts for the House of Assembly to give substantial effect to the principle of one-vote-one-value; and

(*b*) to consider in the preparation of such electoral boundaries the advisability of providing for multiple member districts.

(Continued from October 1. Page 1024.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—Last Wednesday I indicated my support of the motion and said that I had favoured the proposal prior to the last State election, and that therefore voters in my district had agreed with it. I believe they still agree. Although this debate has been approached in the right way by members on this side, Government members have referred to almost everything except the subject matter of the motion. Labor's policy on socialization has been frequently mentioned. Government members referred to the time when Mr. Ward of the Commonwealth Parliament was alleged to have supported in a television interview the socialization of land. These remarks were made merely to delay matters. I want to point out just what happened in that television interview, and the following is an extract from the *Adelaide Truth*:—

Last Sunday in a television interview Mr. E. J. Ward, M.H.R. (Labor, New South Wales) was asked questions about nationalization of farms. Mr. Ward said that probably—but not in his political lifetime, and subject to the approval of the people—land would be nationalized. Here is a verbatim report of the relevant part of the interview:—

Question: Now, would you, for example, nationalize land, grazing land, wheat-producing land, primary-producing land of all kinds?

Mr. Ward: Well, that obviously would be a long-distance programme and I should imagine it would be well down the steps to be taken.

Question: But it would be among the steps to be taken?

Mr. Ward: Well, I wouldn't care to say. I would say that probably, eventually, yes. But if you ask in the immediate future—in my time in politics—probably no, but again I say that these great changes would be affected as a result of getting the approval of the people themselves.

Mr. Ward's remarks naturally have been seized upon by the Opposition Parties as useful election ammunition. It has been reported that they have embarrassed Dr. Evatt, now busy preparing Labor's 1958 Federal election policy speech.

Mr. Ward's remarks have not embarrassed the Labor Party, Dr. Evatt, or anyone else. Government members here have drawn this red herring across the trail in an attempt to gain political capital, in view of the forthcoming Commonwealth election, and the press has tried to mislead the people about statements made by Mr. Ward. The article in the *Truth* gives the lie direct to the statements made by them. Opposition members support the motion purely for the sake of justice. Government members say we suggested the proposal in order to get a Labor majority in this House, but that is not so. All we want is justice for the people. Educated people coming to South Australia have frequently referred to the political gerrymander: it is the first thing the casual observer notices. It is obvious that things are upside down when we have 26 country seats and only 13 metropolitan.

We seek electoral justice and wish to give the people the opportunity to elect the Government they want. We want the Government to realize that in South Australia there is an unjust political set-up, and it is time the Government was honest enough to appoint a Royal Commission without any strings attached to it, as there were when the last Royal Commission was appointed to consider this matter. The whole question could be reviewed and a Royal Commission could make recommendations on electoral boundaries. Surely we have competent men in South Australia for appointment to such a commission. We have been told that in the metropolitan area there are pocket-handkerchief-sized electorates, whilst some country districts are very large. I am happy with the people and the district I represent. Why should electors in my constituency have a vote equal in value to 3½ times the vote of the people in the metropolitan area? People in my district realize that is not right and they wholeheartedly support the appointment of a Royal Commission.

Mr. Hambour—That is a broad statement to make.

Mr. BYWATERS—Yes, but the people were told at the last State elections that Labor favoured electoral reform. They accepted me on that occasion, and they will accept me when I tell them this from a public platform before the next election.

We were told that people in the metropolitan area could approach their members without difficulty, but the same applies in the country. The people in my district know that they have only to write or telephone me to obtain my services. What members opposite have conveniently overlooked is that we have not said that Parliament should be the same size as it is now. That is something that would have to be considered by the Royal Commission. The Commission would say whether or not Parliament is big enough, and I am sure it would say that it is not because, although population has increased, the number of members in Parliament has not. The country has suffered from the lack of decentralization. The Government has had a majority in country areas because of its policy of non-decentralization. If, of course, we had the same city and country electoral boundaries as in the Federal sphere, there would be no reason for the Government to encourage people not to go to country areas. I think this matter is related to the decentralization problem, plus the fact that we have an electoral gerrymander. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I oppose this motion for several reasons.

Mr. Lawn—Did the master tell you?

Mr. KING—This is entirely on my own initiative. But for the mistakes made by Opposition speakers in this debate I probably would not have spoken. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters), speaking about the desire for electoral justice by the people, claimed to have placed this matter before the electors of his district before he was elected. He must be a very confident man to be able to say that he had a mandate from the electors. He obtained only a small majority of votes at the last election, so how can he feel justified in believing that he is supported by all the people in his district?

The number of members in this Chamber is not mentioned in this motion; all it seeks is the appointment of a Royal Commission to

recommend new boundaries for electoral districts to give substantial effect to the principle of one-vote-one-value, and to consider the advisability of providing for multiple member districts. The size of this House has an important bearing on this matter. It would be difficult to apply what this motion seeks if the number of members remained the same. I think it is understood by most people that what suits one State does not exactly suit another. We must be prepared to change with the times, and South Australian Parliaments in the past have endeavoured to meet the situation, for multiple electorates have been tried, and the numbers in this House have been reduced.

Mr. Shannon—It was an experience we did not like.

Mr. KING—I think that has been a common experience. The question of whether this electoral reform can be brought about in time has been raised and answered. I do not think members opposite thought this matter could be finalized this session, but merely wanted to use this motion for beating one of their drums. The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) spoke in his usual vitriolic way and, I thought, used some rather unpleasant adjectives. He sometimes reminds me of an old saying attributed to Confucius, "He who throws mud loses ground." I think a man of his obvious ability could put his vocabulary to better use. His words would be far more effective if they were less objectionable, and would tend to raise the level of debate. He compared the representation of an industrial area of 20,000 people with that of a completely rural area of 6,000 people. However, there are very few completely industrial areas. Any electoral record will show how the voting goes and one cannot regard an industrial area as one in which the voting is entirely Labor. There are very few purely rural areas, because there is a division of opinion throughout the country. It is unwise to assume that people in the same district are all of the same political opinion. Even if we drag everyone to the polling booth and give them a "How to Vote Card" we do not know how they will vote. I do not think members opposite consider they represent all the people in their electorates, although perhaps they are hypnotized into considering that, as they are put here on the card votes of unions, they are here to represent one class of people, and it is difficult for them to realize that there are other classes they have to represent as well. I think in many cases, however, they do the best they can for their constituents.

Mr. Lawn—If you lost your notes there would be a scramble.

Mr. KING—If the Labor Party ever got into office they would make a horrible scramble of the affairs of this State, because they would not try to represent anyone else's point of view. In that case, what is the value of one vote one value? When anyone here talks about one vote one value I do not think he understands what he is driving at, but it certainly does not apply in the case I have just mentioned.

I believe that Labor members opposite are out of touch with the political situation and are dominated by unions. They are dependent on the goodwill of a small number for preselection to stand for election to Parliament, which is a complete denial of the principle of one vote one value. The member for Enfield said that the Legislative Council was a Party House, but if members look at the proceedings of the Council they will see that Liberal and Country League members frequently vote with the Opposition and that their opinions are often divided. Mr. Jennings should check his facts before he makes statements. One of the points he made did not at all support the motion. He said:—

> It is absurd for members to sit still twiddling their thumbs for seven months of the year and then to have Parliamentary business rushed through in five months.

For a member of this House to practically admit that for seven months of the year he has plenty of time to sit twiddling his thumbs is a wonderful argument in favour of the representation as it now stands. Unwittingly he gave the show away, for he clearly demonstrated how little he has to do. All the country members on this side of the House are fully occupied all the year. They have no time for twiddling thumbs, and often not even time to attend to private affairs. The remarks of the member for Enfield more than justify the present electoral set-up and substantiate the opinion that most city members can ride from one side of their electorates to the other in a few moments. South Australia can get more value from an active country member representing 6,000 electors than from a thumb-twiddling metropolitan member misrepresenting perhaps 20,000 electors. The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) praised the record of the Government, and the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) also had some kind words to say about it. Their speeches indicated that the progress made

under the present system is a credit to the Government. The principle of one vote one value is a meaningless catch cry which I do not think members opposite really believe in, subscribe to, or fully understand. If they were sincere they would throw out the iniquitous card voting system under which they receive support. I hope, and they probably hope, that the unions will pay their affiliation fees on the same basis as they claim their voting rights.

I understand that the principle of one vote one value can only be implemented under a system of proportional representation, which necessitates multiple electorates. However, from the experience of this State and other places, we know that multiple electorates do not work well in practice. In many countries proportional representation has resulted in instability of Government because the Government cannot get a sufficient majority to carry out its policy, so it is a negation of government. We have an excellent example of this in the rigidity of membership of Parliament in the Senate. Members of both sides of the Federal Parliament are concerned about this problem and are trying to find a solution. That is a typical illustration of the problems of proportional representation. In multiple electorates, when the fifth member elected gets only one-fifth of the votes cast the principle of one vote one value falls down. I have been told by people in favour of proportional representation that under our present system of compulsory voting proportional representation has not been given a fair trial, but I do not intend debating that point today.

The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) astonished me with some extraordinary reasoning when he supplied some information attributed to Mr. Reid, of the University's Department of Political Science. I think the member for Norwood must do some thumb twiddling too because Mr. Reid told me today that neither he nor Professor Duncan had any knowledge of the figures allegedly compiled by them.

Mr. Dunstan—Mr. Sainsbury, of the Political Science Department, gave those figures to me, and Mr. Reid acknowledged them.

Mr. KING—At any rate, I have repeated what Mr. Reid told me. The honourable member made a big mistake when he compiled a table of figures he had incorporated in *Hansard*. He endeavoured to prove there had been a swing to Labor and endeavoured to relate certain figures to the Senate, but I do not think anyone understood what he was driving at, and I do not think he did either. He selected a number of results of the elections held in 1956 that suited him, and brought in the recent by-elections, but he omitted to bring in anything that did not suit his case. For instance, the Speaker was opposed in Angas by a Labor opponent.

Mr. Dunstan—Nonsense! He was not a Labor candidate.

Mr. KING—The biggest mistake the honourable member made was in regard to the figures for the Torrens election. He included the votes of Mr. Coumbe in the Labor total, and put the Labor votes in the Liberal figure. The difference in the voting was 2,219, and as he had the votes reversed his figures were out by 4,438. Therefore, the case built up by the member for Norwood was fallacious. An examination of the electoral report confirms my statement that Mr. Dunstan reversed the figures for Torrens. I do not think he did so deliberately, but if one bases arguments on statistical evidence he should ensure that that evidence is correctly prepared, particularly when he states, "Statistically, that system of analysis is completely irrefutable." Behind this motion is a desire that the present ratio be reversed so that the metropolitan area will have 26 members and the country 13. The city representation would be doubled and the country representation halved. I do not think country members of the Labor Party would like to be compelled to give up their seats to allow someone in the metropolitan area to take over. I do not think they would support that proposal.

Mr. Jennings—They are all supporting it.

Mr. KING—I do not think when they are on the hustings they will bring it to the forefront. It will be like nationalization: one day they support it and the next they don't. I am sure country people will have their own views on this subject. I think it can be fairly claimed that the gerrymander so glibly referred to by members opposite has been proved a myth. It has been used as a red herring and for political capital. Mr. Jennings revealed the futility of splitting up country electorates because he has admitted that for seven months of the year he cannot find anything to do but twiddle his thumbs. If the representation in this House were reversed the question of decentralization would arise. The Labor Party gives lip service to decentralization, but its policy has exactly the opposite effect. In this instance it wants to centralize power so that it can have its fingers on the pulse of industry and

can exercise control over manpower and services. It wants to be in a position to put us in a straight-jacket out of which we will never get. I do not think members opposite understand the proposal of one vote one value. It has been thrown in for good measure. It sounds good but is quite meaningless. Proportional representation, which is connected with multiple electorates, has been mentioned. The disadvantages of proportional representation would far outweigh any theoretical advantages. It has an intellectual appeal for some who do not have regard for those factors which have made it an outmoded theory.

The record of the South Australian Government reveals the wisdom of the present system. South Australia has become a good example for other States and is the envy of most people. I pay a tribute to the Opposition because it has contributed considerably. Members opposite have regarded themselves as South Australians rather than as members of the Labor Party in aiding the State's progress. Notwithstanding the present electoral system members opposite have stated that they can win the next election. If they are prepared to state their policy without reservation, and if it is good enough, they will have the opportunity, particularly if they are as game in their campaign as they have been during this debate. People will vote for the policy they prefer and in that respect Labor will have an equal opportunity. I do not think there is any need for a Royal Commission because South Australia is well served with the present boundaries.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—The member for Chaffey (Mr. King) has followed the course normally followed by Government members when speaking to this debate. They impute certain motives to the Labor Party for moving such a motion and they misrepresent the Opposition, particularly in respect of proportional representation, which is not mentioned in the motion. Mr. King said that there could not be multiple electorates without proportional representation.

Mr. Shannon—He did not say that.

Mr. FRED WALSH—He did, whether he meant to or not.

Mr. Shannon—But that isn't right.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Of course it isn't, but it shows that he didn't know what he was talking about.

Mr. O'Halloran—He demonstrated that forcibly during his speech.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes. During this debate the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), to whom we usually look for an intelligent contribution, did not apply commonsense, and his normal picturesque speech was sadly missing. He tried to treat the whole matter as a joke, but the Opposition did not intend it as a joke. We have repeatedly endeavoured to have the electoral boundaries revised and not, as suggested by members opposite—particularly the Premier—with the object of creating a system to guarantee our Party a return to office.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—I went further than that.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Quite possibly, and I may come to that.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—I also said, "Without the necessity of producing a good policy."

Mr. FRED WALSH—All Government members followed the same course.

Mr. Jennings—They were yes men.

Mr. FRED WALSH—They are not only yes men; they are professional claquers. If the Premier makes a remark and they do not support him by voice they support him by vote because they are compelled to do so. If they don't, the Premier says, "Why did you boys get off the beam?" I have heard the Premier say, "I will get my boys and see what we can do about this." We know the Premier has a big influence on his "boys," as he indicated today in another debate.

Mr. Hambour—There is a big difference between having respect for a person's opinions and taking orders from him.

Mr. Jennings—We don't have to laugh at our Leader's jokes.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I enjoy a good laugh, particularly when the member for Light speaks, because he is most humorous. Mr. King said that country districts were misrepresented by members who are representing country districts.

Mr. King—Not all of them.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I did not think you were referring to country members of the Liberal Party. I guarantee that no Liberal member represents his district more efficiently and conscientiously than members on this side. When we are elected we do not consider ourselves merely Labor Party representatives. It is true that we give effect to Labor's policy, but we tell the people prior to the elections what our policy is. It is true that we discuss matters in caucus and reach agreement, and it is only natural that as far as possible we

should give effect to caucus decisions within this House provided they do not conflict with the interests of the people we represent.

As usual, when the Premier has no material to work on, he was most facetious. He tried to ridicule the motion. The Premier is quite capable of advancing sound arguments to support his views, but on this occasion he had nothing to work on and he resorted to ridicule. When he does that he makes himself look ridiculous, particularly if unbiased outsiders are listening. They do not expect such statements from the Leader of the State. I regret that he adopted that attitude and hope that he will not consider any proposal coming from the Opposition as merely for political purposes. We want a just and fair electoral system that will give everybody proper representation in Parliament. If, as the Premier suggests, our policy is not acceptable, then we shall have no complaint and will accept the decision of the people. We want a fair vote, not with the odds laid against our Party as they are today. Mr. King said the motion suggested an increase in the number of members. What is wrong with that? At one time we had 56 or 60 members when the population was only 300,000 or 400,000. Today the population is more than 700,000 but the membership is only 39, so the people cannot be adequately represented. Labor members represent their districts as efficiently and conscientiously as any other members, but we must remember that it is most difficult to represent a district of about 25,000. Metropolitan members know of the work that comes from people seeking assistance in many ways. If for no other reason the districts should be altered to provide more equal representation. When the Premier got away from his facetious remarks he said that even if the motion were carried there would not be time for a Royal Commission to take and consider evidence and present a report, to have it considered by Parliament, to revise the districts and to have new rolls printed. That is probably a sounder argument today than when he spoke. Opposition members would have been happy to expedite the debate in order that action could be taken this session. The Premier did not say that even if returned to office next March he would move for an alteration of electoral boundaries. He should say whether he is prepared to do so.

Although electoral boundaries were reviewed three years ago the number of electors in some metropolitan districts has since increased up to 6,000. In my district there has been an increase of over 5,000. If there is no revision of boundaries within the next three years some metropolitan seats will have between 25,000 and 30,000 voters on the roll. There will not be the same change in country districts, and the position will be so confused that boundaries will have to be reviewed. Mention has been made of broad acres but legislation is not passed in their interests, but in the interests of the electors. Reference has been made to the quota in some districts. Gawler includes the town of Elizabeth. How long this will be allowed to continue rests, of course, with the Government, but notice should be taken of the position. Before long the population of Elizabeth will be about 30,000, which will be an addition to the voting strength of Gawler. We would have liked an intimation from the Premier on where he will stand on electoral boundaries in the future. Labor was charged with accepting the recommendations of the last Royal Commission. All Opposition members spoke against the setting up of the commission, not because they were opposed to its revising the boundaries, but because of the terms of reference, which said that the commission had to retain the existing two to one ratio between country and metropolitan seats, and in its recommendations the Royal Commission retained that ratio.

The commission was also asked to bear in mind community of interests. I do not know whether I am right in criticizing the work of that commission because at the time I represent one of the districts vitally concerned—West Torrens. I do not know much about community of interests that exists between the people of Glenelg, Henley Beach and Grange and the people of Keswick and nearby places. There seems to have been no attempt on the part of that commission to follow the boundaries laid down by the Commonwealth Commission. Instead of keeping as far as possible to the subdivisions within the Commonwealth division in my district it included a subdivision of the Kingston division, so my district covers parts of two Federal divisions. One member says that he has parts of three in his district, which is even worse. I have four municipal areas—Woodville, Henley and Grange, West Torrens, and Glenelg—in my constituency. The Royal Commission should have considered these things and as far as possible made electoral boundaries conform to municipal boundaries. In Labor circles I have expressed the view that the boundaries suggested by the last Royal Commission were not in the interests of the Party.

Mr. Jenkins—Many of your Party members said they were acceptable.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I have no doubt that they were sincere in their view and that they thought that what was recommended was better than what they had had previously. Certainly it brought Mr. Loveday, representing Whyalla, into this House, and another member opposite would not be sitting here so smugly but for the alteration of boundaries.

Mr. O'Halloran—I got the big end of the stick.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, and it involves much travelling. Metropolitan members do not have time to travel because people are always seeking help concerning water supplies, sewerage, homes and other things, but that is why we are here. Mr. Geoffrey Clarke stated that Mr. Jennings said he would abolish State Parliaments. If he did express that opinion, possibly by interjection, it was only his personal opinion and not the policy of the Labor Party. It is like the statement allegedly made by Mr. Ward of the Commonwealth Parliament. An incorrect interpretation was placed on his remarks in a television interview and the same applies to Mr. Clarke's statement about the remark by Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Can you explain the denial by the member for Norwood that he said Australia should be divided into 20 parts?

Mr. FRED WALSH—I am talking about Mr. Jennings. I may be soft and dumb but I do not think Mr. Geoffrey Clarke can draw me away from the references I am making about Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—I do not mind, but I wish you would put equal force into explaining the denial of the member for Norwood.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I am sometimes charged with being plausible, like the chairman of the Betting Control Board, who said the secretary of the board was unnecessarily courteous to me. The Premier says that if this motion succeeds it will have a bad effect on the community and will not facilitate the development of this State. That, coming from the Premier, is not very intelligent. The State has been developed under the existing boundaries, or those which existed prior to the present boundaries, and any changes could not alter the position at all. I believe the passing of this motion would facilitate and expedite the State's development, and this is something we are just as keen about as members opposite. We want South Australia to be one of the best States in the Commonwealth, and despite what has been said about our Party, I assure the Premier and Government members that if we are successful in the next elections it will not be our fault if our State does not develop further. I now wish to refer to an article which appeared in the *News* of August 5, 1957, and which makes very interesting reading today. The writer was dealing with the election of the Nicklin Government in Queensland last year, and under the heading of "Fair vote values," said:—

Rigged electorates do not appeal to Australians. Mr. Nicklin and his majority have a chance to rectify long standing abuses. They will not do so if they show the same lack of principle as their opponents and load the new electoral distribution just as unfairly the other way. The new Government's re-allocation of electorates, not expected until next year, will have peculiar interest to South Australia. If Mr. Nicklin's Party makes a fair division between country and city without trying to shepherd Opposition strength into a few electorates, South Australia will be left with the invidious distinction of being the only Australian State with a blatant electoral gerrymander.

That did not come from the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), who frequently uses the word "gerrymander" and is an authority on it, but from the *News* leader writer. The article continues:—

On the other hand, if Mr. Nicklin chooses revenge and rigs the electorates against the Opposition many in South Australia will take it as supporting evidence that if the Opposition here came to power an equally unfair and disproportionate electoral system might be set up.

This article, to which I draw the attention of members opposite, was not written by a Labor supporter; we do not think the *News* or the *Advertiser* supports us politically, particularly at election time. If the writer of the article was sincere, he would come out in support of this motion, but as he has remained quiet, it is obvious that the paper is not so interested as it claimed to be when the article was written.

Reference has been made to our prospects in the next elections. To win an election in this State the Labor Party has as many obstacles as it is possible for any Party to contend with. First, it has to contend with rigged electoral boundaries, a matter that has been discussed here not only this session but in many previous sessions. We are not blaming the present Government for setting up the 39

electorates in 1937, although we can blame it for hanging on. It takes all Labor's resources, which are very limited, to put our policy before the people, because we have not the power of finance or of the press—and it is a mighty power—to put our case before them. I could enumerate other difficulties, but I have set out the principal ones. If we were able to let the people know our policy, we would get a better vote than we do, despite the present electoral set-up.

The Premier referred to the Federal Parliament, saying, "That is the case in other States and in the Federal Parliament, particularly in the Senate." We know that the principle of one vote one value does not apply to the Senate in Australia, the United States of America, or any other country with a similar political set-up. Who would suggest that we should have equal representation on a State basis in the House of Representatives? We know one vote one value does not apply fully to the House of Representatives, but it is almost that. Victoria, I think, has two State members to each Federal district, and we could have two or three to each Federal district to establish a well balanced State Parliament. The Premier went on to say:—

> In these circumstances how can he say it is necessary for us to change completely the whole course of history and the procedure that has been accepted in, I was going to say, every country in the world—certainly in the United States of America, one of the greatest democracies?

Although I do not think many do not know this, it might be well for me to point out that the Commonwealth Parliament was more or less patterned on the Parliament of the U.S.A. True, each State in the U.S.A. has two representatives in the Senate, but that principle does not obtain in the Congress. To show how they get over the problem in the Parliament of California regarding the bigger towns, I will now give some figures relating to that State. It has an Assembly and a Senate, the Assembly having 80 members. Los Angeles, with a population of 2,783,643, returns 32 members; San Francisco, population 634,536, eight members; Alameda, population 513,011, six members; San Diego, population 289,348, three members. The districts are based on 68 counties, which are grouped in some instances for representation in the State Assembly. The sixth seat is representative of 10 counties, with the populations shown in the following table:—

County.	Population.
Nevada	19,283
Placer	28,108
El Dorado	13,229
Amador	8,221
Calaveras	2,299
Alpine	323
Juolumne	10,887
Mariposa	5,605
Inyo	7,625
Mono	2,299
Total	97,679

These counties together return one member to the Californian Assembly and that is how they get over the position—by grouping the counties in order to get somewhere near the quota. It varies, of course, but it is usually somewhere between 70,000 and 80,000.

Mr. Quirke—And about 97,000 square miles.

Mr. FRED WALSH—No, the area is not very large; these are counties.

Mr. Quirke—What is the average size of a county?

Mr. FRED WALSH—No particular size.

Mr. Quirke—Our counties are fairly big.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Some Californian counties, such as Inyo and San Bernadotte, are big, but without a big population.

Mr. Quirke—That one member would be a long time getting around his constituency, wouldn't he?

Mr. FRED WALSH—That may be so, but the 32 who represent Los Angeles would not take long in getting around their district. I do not know how the system works, for Parliaments in America are run differently from our Parliaments. On one occasion I was the guest of the Governor of California and visited its Parliament. For most of the time the speaker was smoking a cigar. When a vote is taken the members do not call "Aye" or "No," but press a button and an indicator shows how they vote. When I was in the House the voting was equal, and one member was told by the Speaker, "Go on Reg, you can support this," and Reg switched his vote so as to give a majority.

I have quoted something of the practice in the United States to show that the Premier was wrong when he referred to that country. He referred only to the United States Senate, just as he only picked out the Senate in Australia. The position is entirely different in the United States. Each State has its own system, though I have quoted California only because I know something about it. I spent 10 weeks there, and I thought the handbook I have would provide good material for this debate. It shows that what can be done in

the United States in regard to grouping, or having more than one member representing each district, can be applied here. Even if we had more than one member for some districts, we could still have only one representing another district. Perhaps the member for Whyalla could be the sole representative of Whyalla, but in the metropolitan area there could be several members for one district. That would be a question for the commission to determine, and I stress that we are not suggesting any particular method in the motion. The commission would have to take evidence and make the necessary inquiries before bringing down recommendations. If it were not restricted in its terms of reference, as the last commission was, its recommendations would be accepted by the great majority here.

Some members opposite made unfair remarks about Labor members and the card vote system. If they can tell me any fairer method I will advocate it before my Party. Under the card vote system a vote is recorded for every individual who is a member of the Party. It is true that the representation of the different affiliates is limited, for it would not be possible to get 50,000 or 60,000 people at one assembly to discuss matters adequately, much less record a vote. Each representative of an affiliate has an equal proportion of the voting strength of that affiliate, and he records the votes in accordance with the directions of his union or sub-branch. What is wrong with that? I do not subscribe to any ganging up for the purpose of carrying a motion or supporting a candidate, and I do not think anyone on this side of the House does. We do not concern ourselves with currying favour with those who may have a great mass of votes. We are not afraid to express our views, and I challenge anyone opposite to say I have not expressed my views according to my beliefs.

Members on this side of the House would be happy to have something similar to the card vote system in this Chamber. Sometimes we express personal views that do not fit the arguments we are trying to advance. That occurs because we drift away from the subject, or sometimes I express personal views that are not those of some of my colleagues. However, I hope that members opposite will not persist in viewing every Bill or motion put forward from this side of the House as having some ulterior motive. We are just as desirous as they are to legislate in the best interests of the people of this State, and I hope they will not continue to utter untruths about us. They should confirm their facts and figures before they speak, and by doing so they would gain the admiration of members on this side of the House.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—As a country member I feel impelled to say a few words in opposition to the motion, which could not give proper representation to country people. It would destroy the whole electoral system as we know it, and in the past it has been the country, not the metropolitan area, that has made South Australia prosperous and enabled the State to make the progress it has made. The wealth produced in the country, and exports of goods produced in the country, have made the State prosperous, but the motion will take away the representation to which the country people are entitled. I was astounded to hear the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters), who is a country member, advocating one vote one value.

Mr. Jennings—He is a democrat.

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not know what he is. If the motion is carried there will be no electorate of Murray, and the people there will have no representation in Parliament.

Mr. John Clark—Do you think they would be disfranchised?

Mr. HEASLIP—They would be to a large extent under one vote one value, and most country people would be. If the motion is carried it will bring about further centralization, and I was astounded to hear a Party that allegedly advocates decentralization trying to bring about centralization. How can we expect people to move away from the built-up areas if they do not have adequate political representation? People naturally flock to the metropolitan area with all its amenities, facilities and transport services, and centralization would be aggravated if the motion were carried. At present we have 26 members from country areas. I admit that they represent fewer people than the 13 metropolitan members, but many country electorates are too big already. The Leader of the Opposition has admitted that his district is too large. Mine is too big for me to represent my constituents adequately.

Mr. Jennings—No one has advocated a reduction in the number of country members.

Mr. HEASLIP—That is just what the honourable member has advocated, and so has the member for Murray. If we are to have the system of one vote one value there must be a reduction in the number of country members unless we have a Parliament of double

the present number. What would happen to the northern areas of the State if the motion were carried? The districts of Eyre, Flinders, Whyalla, Stuart, Port Pirie, Wallaroo, Yorke Peninsula, Rocky River, Burra and Frome would be placed in one of the multiple districts.

Mr. John Clark—How do you know?

Mr. HEASLIP—That must follow on the basis of population. That is what the motion advocates. The Leader said that there would be nine multiple electorates with five members each.

Mr. O'Halloran—When?

Mr. HEASLIP—On the previous motion; I think last year.

Mr. John Clark—Oh, you are discussing a different motion from the rest of us!

Mr. HEASLIP—I am discussing what the Opposition supports. The whole area I mentioned would become one district represented by five members. Think of the area each member would have to cover. It would be utterly impossible to provide adequate representation to the people, most of whom would be disfranchised.

Mr. John Clark—I have 12,000 people in a country district now.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, in a few square miles. The Leader's district covers the major portion of northern South Australia and he appreciates how difficult it is to represent.

Mr. Jennings—He will still vote for this motion.

Mr. HEASLIP—He knows how difficult it is for him to communicate with his constituents and for them to communicate with him. Under this motion they would have less representation.

Mr. Corcoran—They would have more.

Mr. HEASLIP—I cannot see how, unless we have an extremely large Parliament. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) said that there was no mention of proportional representation in this motion but in introducing it the Leader said:—

This resolution is, after all, very simple. It proposes that a Royal Commission should recommend during the current session new boundaries for electoral districts for the House of Assembly to give substantial effect to the principle of one vote one value and I challenge any member to say that that is not a just principle in a community that claims to be democratic. . . .Multiple electorates would solve that problem and would also permit the introduction of proportional representation which, after all, is the only means whereby each substantial body of political opinion in the community can get the representation in Parliament to which it is entitled.

Mr. John Clark—That is all very true.

Mr. HEASLIP—But the member for West Torrens said that proportional representation was not mentioned.

Mr. John Clark—You realize, of course, that the Royal Commission would have to decide on the advisability of it.

Mr. HEASLIP—It would have to decide within its terms of reference. The member for West Torerns complained about the terms of reference of the last Commission, but members then agreed to letting the Commission fix the boundaries. He also complained that he had five councils in his area. The member for Eyre has 10 and I have seven. The member for West Torrens has no cause for complaint about the number in his comparatively small area. Under this motion Mr. Bockelberg would have 20 district councils and I would probably have 14. Under proportional representation there cannot be a stable Government. It is only because South Australia has had stable Government in the last 20 years that it has made such progress. Take away stability and we get chaos. France is an illustration. Under proportional representation no Party can get a sufficient majority to give effect to its policy.

Mr. John Clark—You realize they haven't proportional representation in France.

Mr. HEASLIP—They have its equivalent.

Mr. John Clark—It is a hybrid type of system.

Mr. HEASLIP—Proportional representation still brings about the same thing. We will never have stable Government under it. The best Government is one with sufficient weight to enable it to give effect to its policy whether it is right or wrong, good or bad.

Mr. John Clark—Do you contend that the end justifies the means?

Mr. HEASLIP—No, but a Government must be able to enforce its policy. It is no good giving effect to part of it and being compelled by pressure groups to do something it does not believe in.

Mr. John Clark—Don't you believe the people should have the right to dismiss a Government it doesn't want.

Mr. HEASLIP—The people of South Australia have always had that right. Members of the Labor Party felt, with the last alteration of boundaries, quite confident that it would be elected to office. I believe it would have been had it possessed a policy the people wanted. It is only because the present Government has a policy and is stable that the people have retained it. I do not intend to

speak at length on this because if a person has a good argument he can express it briefly. If he has to labour a point, then it must be weak. The member for West Torrens said that because members delayed in speaking on this motion its chance of being accepted this session had diminished. He spoke at great length and delayed its chance of being passed. Let us have a vote on it and decide it. I oppose it.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I oppose the motion. The member for West Torrens said that he thought that one of the fairest means of voting at elections would be by the card system. I disagree because members of a union, who vote on the card system, may have no concern for the area involved and may be miles away. In our plebiscites the only people who vote are those residing within the boundaries of the electorates concerned. It has amazed me to hear three of my friends opposite—the members for Wallaroo, Murray and Millicent—by interjection supporting this motion. I should not think for one moment that their constituents would be happy about this proposition.

I oppose it mainly because I know my constituents would not have a bar of it at any price and also because of the phrase "to recommend to the House during the current session" contained in the motion. I doubt whether any member opposite has considered what is entailed in the work of a Royal Commission before it can bring in a report. Our elections are usually held in March. The last four elections have been held in March. In 1944 the election was held on April 29 in order to give the troops in Japan an opportunity of voting, but the preceding election was also held in March. That seems to be the general practice with State elections. I cannot see how it would be possible, if the motion were accepted, for it to be implemented between now and next March. We must remember that a Federal election is proposed for November. That alone will entail much work in the Electoral Department without the additional work that would be involved in the re-compilation of State electoral rolls.

The first matter to be considered, if the motion were accepted, would be the appointment of a Royal Commission. The terms of reference to the committee would require study by the Commission which would then have to set about taking evidence, investigating community interests, deciding the number of people in each electorate, and determining the new boundaries. It would have to consider whether the existing subdivisions should be maintained. New maps would have to be drawn. None of these things could be done within a short time. When it had compiled its report it would have to be submitted to and be passed by this Chamber and the Legislative Council, after which it would have to receive Royal Assent because it involves an alteration of the Constitution. Much time would be required.

The re-compilation of the electoral rolls for this House and for the Legislative Council is a big job. There would also be the colossal task of printing and we all appreciate the constant pressure that is on the Government Printer. Considering all these things, it would be impossible this session to do what is proposed.

Mr. Riches—You could still vote for the motion.

Mr. JENKINS—I shall oppose it because there is no possible chance of getting things done before the next State election, and it is not acceptable to my electors. Much humbug has been talked on this motion by members opposite, who have taken the opportunity to propagate their political views. I will not speak at length because the proposal cannot be carried out this session.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I oppose the motion, but not because I do not think there is a need for a drastic revision of our electoral set-up. I also oppose it because the inquiry may result in multiple electorates. In earlier years I supported them but through experience I have grown wise and I now regard them as unsatisfactory for State Parliaments. Only Tasmania and Victoria have them, and those States get into much trouble over Parliamentary representation. Any suggestion to have multiple electorates here will not be supported by me. Earlier I believed that minorities should be represented in Parliament, and that we should have proportional representation, but so far no-one has suggested anything other than a hybrid system to suit personal needs. The best way to work multiple electorates would be to have a minimum of three members in each, and probably they would work better with six, but I will not dwell on that matter.

It was interesting to hear the remarks of some members in this debate, but others did not deal much with the motion. As one member suggested, in a debate like this there is often some heat, but that does not excuse intemperate language. Those who make innuendoes and give smart replies often

hurt other people. Frequently they are intended to hurt and apparently the more steam that can be put in the better, but all that is wrong. It cannot be appreciated by people outside and it does not reflect credit on the members who do it. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, can take no action because it comes within the bounds of our Standing Orders, but there has been too much of it in this debate.

South Australia has 13 metropolitan and 26 country seats. It is said that in consequence decentralization of industry is impossible. Queensland has 75 districts, 24 metropolitan and 51 country, but that State is not a fair comparison because the rivers and ports in the north lead to decentralization. New South Wales has 94 electorates, of which 48 are in the metropolitan area and 46 in the country. The 48 are jammed into a small area from Wollongong to Newcastle, and the country districts are spread over the vast hinterland. This has not led to decentralization of industry but to a closely knit centralization that is a menace to the safety and security of Australia. Victoria has 66 districts, 34 in the metropolitan area and 32 in the country. That State has more decentralization than any other. Western Australia has 50 districts, of which 21 are in the metropolitan area and 29 in the country. Tasmania has 30 members; six come from around Hobart and 24 from elsewhere. Again this is not a fair comparison. South Australia has not brought about decentralization of industry, which does not come from the political set-up but from decisions of people wanting to establish industries. I sometimes wonder why the Labor Party wants to change the present distribution of seats. I feel that if the present position continues for a time it will mean the deathknell of the Liberal Party. At our State elections we had a number of uncontested seats, Liberal and Labor. At least 100,000 people in the city are disenfranchised because of uncontested seats and they are getting tired of it. I know this from actual observation and close investigation. Although I do not support the motion it is vitally necessary to change the electoral boundaries and to have more members. Apart from Tasmania we have by far the lowest number in the Lower House. If more seats are created in the metropolitan area there will be more Liberal members in this House because at present a vast Liberal vote is completely ineffective. In country districts uncontested by Liberals there is a big Labor vote. The seats of country members are far too large. I disagree entirely with Mr. Fred Walsh about representing only the people, for it is physically impossible in large districts to contact all the electors, so how can they be adequately represented? A metropolitan member can ride a bicycle across his district in about 15 minutes. The position is different in my district. About six months ago I bought a car that has now travelled 10,000 miles. In 12 months it will have done over 20,000 miles. Compare that with a metropolitan district. How do Mr. O'Halloran and Mr. Heaslip get on? Those 20,000 miles at 6d. a mile will cost me £500. Then there is the time factor. I spend many hours on the roads travelling to parts of my electorate. I often travel 120 miles to attend a function. It is not possible to adequately represent a district in this way. I would like to visit regularly all the towns in my area but the time factor makes that impossible. Because of increased population in South Australia we should have more members in this House. Fifty years ago we had more than we have today.

I now want to refer to remarks by Mr. Fred Walsh, and in this House there is no fairer debater. I wonder how he can swallow the illusion that the card vote in the Labor Party is fair. How does one get into the frame of mind even to think that it is fair and equitable? It only turns human beings into ciphers. How can it be anything else when a delegate represents a section with 2,000 votes representing 2,000 people? They have no voice; it is his opinion or the opinion of his organization. That cannot be right or fair. I am the elected representative for my district.

Mr. John Clark—And so are they.

Mr. QUIRKE—Don't give me that one; they are not. There are thousands of people who pay union affiliation fees and vote Liberal—and you know it, too.

Mr. Lawn—Would the people in your district vote Labor?

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes. And individually they can vote against me.

Mr. Lawn—You said the union delegates were not elected.

Mr. QUIRKE—Electors can vote against me every three years, but 2,000 people on a card vote are 2,000 ciphers, not 2,000 human beings. Another thing is that, if it was not for the fact that the card vote itself is used to keep the card vote there, it would not exist.

Mr. John Clark—Every unionist has a vote.

Mr. QUIRKE—Is he concerned with voting a Labor member to contest his district? I am not antagonistic about these things in any way. I am speaking factually. That is one thing that does not do any more good in a democracy than the present set-up, with insufficient members in this House trying to do a job over vast expanses of country. If this is persisted in, if the members of the Labor Party want the final dissolution of the Liberal Government, they should say nothing about the existing set-up because it will bring about the downfall of the Liberal Party unless it does something about it quickly. That is not nonsense—it is the result of considered opinion. It is the upsurge today.

There is a growing recognition of the political rights of people throughout the country. That is more particularized when prosperity is on the wane. When everybody has plenty and everything is flush, people do not think about politics, but they will think about it today. It is noticeable in the country districts. Here in the city I have gathered more by hearsay than from actual representation or direct contact, but it is representation and direct contact in the country today. So, in the interests of political equilibrium in this country, we must see to it that the people are adequately represented in this House, which is definitely not the case at the moment. I oppose the motion because it is futile and I am afraid that a Royal Commission might recommend multiple seats, which would be too bad. So I will not have anything to do with that.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—I take it that the welfare of the State as a whole is ever our first consideration. If there were any factors adverse to our State arising from the electoral boundaries and the system generally through the State's history, they surely would have shown themselves by now. Under the present system, South Australia has developed more rapidly than any other State. It is now going ahead at a remarkably high tempo. There is no suggestion of lack of confidence in the State. There is perhaps the highest degree of confidence amongst the people ever in their history. I see no reason now for any revolutionary changes in the system or boundaries of our various districts.

Anyone who believes that substantial effect should be given to the principle of one vote one value must be prepared to see proportionately less representation of country areas in this Assembly. It would follow that the preponderance of numbers in this place would be representing metropolitan interests. That would certainly be achieving centralization of government quickly but, I am certain, not in the interests of the State. I abhor the idea of there not being intimate representation of any area of the State.

Assessing the value of the country areas to the State, we look to the country for the major portion of our ability to progress and ensure higher and better living standards. Eighty per cent of our export income comes from the country, and the thought of less representation of that vitally important section is anathema to me. Our trading balances for last year reveal a favourably balance of £50,000,000 for the 11 months to the end of May. In the previous year we had a £70,000,000 favourable balance. Seeking the causes of the decrease, we find that wool exports were £34,000,000 for the 11 months, compared with £45,000,000 in the previous year. In the case of grain, it was £17,000,000, and £20,000,000 the previous year, while with metal exports it was £17,000,000, and £23,000,000 in the previous year. The point is that our exports, which are so important to us, are referred to in terms of country produce in every instance, not of secondary products. Whilst I appreciate the desirability of a balanced economy as between primary and secondary industry, and that secondary industry naturally is situated in the most favourable areas with natural advantages, it tends to find its best locations in the more densely populated areas of the State. I am looking forward to the time when we shall be able to export our secondary products and when that day comes we shall indeed have achieved a stronger economy.

As to the question of the basis for electoral boundaries, I recall that in 1949 a similar debate in the House of Commons led to the establishment of five points. The first point related to the size of electorates. In spite of our rather large electorates they can still be properly represented. This is true even of the districts of Frome and Eyre, which are particularly large. The second point concerned the shape of the electorates. Broadly speaking, our electorates have a reasonable block shape. The third point concerned the accessibility of the electorates. I should say that our electorates are accessible, although there are moans at times regarding some of the roads leading to portions of certain electorates. The fourth point concerned production and the fifth related to population.

The Leader of the Opposition suggests that, if appointed, the Royal Commission should give substantial effect to the principle of one vote one value. That is essentially population, which was the fifth point in the ideas of members of the Mother Parliament as to what should be the basis for determining electoral boundaries. Considering the growth of the eastern seaboard of Australia and the representation in the Federal Parliament since Federation from those very densely populated areas it is true to say that for many years there has been a holding up of development because of the preponderance of representation of metropolitan interests as against country representation. It is only in recent years that we have seen decentralization arising from what has been a pretty close preserve of strong representation in numbers from those densely populated areas to the detriment of the less populous portions.

The second part of the motion suggests that the Royal Commission consider, when revising boundaries, the advisability of providing for multiple-member districts. I am very inexperienced in these things, but I should like to feel that I am completely responsible for a given area and that there is no-one to whom to pass the buck, or *vice versa*. I should like to feel that the electorate was entirely my responsibility, and I should not favour more than one member for each district.

Mr. Jennings—You could give evidence before the Royal Commission.

Mr. LAUCKE—Though a Royal Commission is costly, if the terms of reference could lead to some major good I would not oppose its appointment; but when I consider this proposal I can see no possible good emanating from expenditure on a Royal Commission, and therefore I oppose the motion.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I have listened very intently to the debate provoked by my motion moved on September 3, and have sought, mainly in vain, for some real reasons why it should not be carried. I am prepared to admit there has been a multiplicity of excuses. Some members have wandered from Dan to Beersheba and back again, and some have got lost in transit, in their search for excuses to justify opposing the motion.

Mr. John Clark—One always gets lost when one has a faulty compass.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Precisely, and most of the members opposite had no compass at all and no proper idea of their bearings.

Mr. John Clark—They had a falling star to guide them.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—They had no idea of any fixed principle which could even pin point a falling star. As the mover of the motion and as Leader of the Opposition, I feel it is my duty to answer some of the points that have arisen out of the debate. Those to which I shall refer first are in chronological order. The Premier produced excuses to try to defeat the motion. He said the only reason I had moved it was that I wanted to get the Labor Party in office. I can very properly retort that the only reason he opposed it was that he and his Party wanted to stay in office. The present system put them in power 20 years ago and has kept them in power ever since. The Premier added as an afterthought that what my Party needed was a policy and not an electoral redistribution, or a Royal Commission to bring about that redistribution.

I have noticed down the years that the Premier has not been averse to accepting much of Labor's policy. When one looks at what has happened in this State during the last decade and sees the things for which great credit is taken by the Government, and particularly by the Premier, especially those great developmental moves that were supposed to put South Australia so much ahead of the other States, one finds that they were not Liberal policy at all, but pure and undiluted Labor policy. To begin with, let us consider the nationalization of the electricity supply by the taking over of the Electric Supply Company and the establishment of the Electricity Trust. I remind honourable members opposite, particularly the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins), that it was Labor votes in the Legislative Council that carried the Bill the second time it was presented in that House, and during a special session at that. We had to guarantee that all our members would be present and, with the vote of the member who had previously defaulted and who, because of some particular influence, was persuaded to change his vote, it was carried by one vote.

We find today a network of power lines and the boon of electric power has been taken far and wide throughout South Australia, not as a result of Liberal policy, but of Labor policy. I thought I understood Liberal policy at one

time, because there was a time when they believed in the sacred rights of private property and private enterprise. However, there was nothing sacrosanct about the assets of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company when the Premier decided that that company should be nationalized, or socialized (if I may use that term). As I said, these benefits sprang not from Liberal policy, as we used to understand it in days gone by, but from Labor policy.

Then came the development of the Leigh Creek coalfield, which has some relationship to the Electricity Trust. In fact, I think the desire to nationalize the electricity company sprang from the fact that that company would not play along with the Premier to help him develop a socialistic enterprise at Leigh Creek. That was another very successful example of Socialism, but again, I repeat, not Liberal policy. Then we had the uranium mine in my electorate and its associated treatment plant at Port Pirie. Are those examples of Liberal policy? The honourable gentlemen opposite, who have been seeking excuses to vote against this motion, laughed at the Premier's joke when he referred to the fact that what we needed was a policy and then turned and silently encouraged his followers: "Laugh, boys, laugh." The point about it is that they had to laugh. The leader of the band had made a joke, and the whistle tooters and the claquers had to do something about it. I will not refer to sawmills and the timber industry except to say that they too, are the result of Labor policy, not Liberal policy.

Members attempted to make a few other points. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) took us on a Fitzpatrick tour of the eastern States of Australia. He started with Queensland and he admitted that considerable decentralization had taken place there. He said that was due to the existence of great rivers along the coastline, particularly in the northern areas which had lent themselves to the decentralization of industry, but he did not tell the House that Toowoomba, the largest city in Queensland, is a long way from a major river and 130 miles from the seaboard.

Mr. Hambour—It is the largest city outside of the capital.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes. Many other large cities, a long way from big rivers, have been developed as the result of a proper land policy in Queensland, which has been administered mainly by a Labor Government since 1916. Turning to New South Wales, we are told that one half the population, or more, of that great State is centred along the coastline between Wollongong and Newcastle. The member for Burra said that that is a menace to the security of Australia and while I admit that it is a menace, I maintain that it is not as great a menace as the concentration of population in our metropolitan area which has occurred under the regime of the Liberal Party, placed in power and kept there by this iniquitous electoral system. The industrial expansion and growth between Wollongong and Newcastle is due to the wonderfully rich coalfields over the whole of that vast belt, and industrial growth in that area had to follow naturally the industrial growth of Australia generally. However, even there, thanks to the Cahill Labor Government, the trend of population flow has been arrested, and the percentage of country population now bears favourable comparison with the metropolitan population.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—Have you any figures to support that?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, I have. Speaking from memory, there has been a trend of nearly two per cent.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman—I think you are wrong.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Statisticians can be wrong.

Mr. Hambour—So can the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Statistics which I read a few months ago show that the trend of population has swung in the last five or six years. Those figures appear in a previous *Hansard*, and if the Minister cares to look them up he will find that I am right. Meatworks in New South Wales have been established by a corporation under an agreement between the Government and the local authorities. The Government advances sums of money to the local authorities, interest free for 10 years, and the result is that meatworks have been established in many country centres and stock are killed as near as possible to the point of production. The meat is then taken to Sydney to be sold in dead meat markets through the abattoirs organization. Recently, when I tried to get meatworks established at Peterborough I received no sympathy or support from the Premier or this Government. People in other parts of the State have received no encouragement, and the South-East certainly received no sympathy or support from the Government in that respect.

The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) in the course of a nice, polite speech, not desiring to hurt anybody, much less his erstwhile friend, the Leader of the Opposition, drew on his imagination as to what my resolution really meant. He said that all electors in Flinders, Eyre, Whyalla, Frome, Stuart, Rocky River, Burra, Wallaroo, and Yorke Peninsula would be placed in one electorate under the terms of my motion, but my motion contains no such suggestion. The Labor Party has a policy in this regard, and if a Royal Commission is appointed I shall be very happy to present our policy to that Commission so that it may receive mature consideration. This is what the Labor Party policy is:

A State Parliament consisting of a single Chamber with 55 members, elected under the system of proportional representation, with each Commonwealth electorate as a five-member seat, and with compulsory voting.

That is our policy—55 members of Parliament, five members to each House of Representatives district. The reason why we would hitch our electoral system to that of the Commonwealth is that it would avoid the possibility of a gerrymander in the future, because the Commonwealth system is, as far as possible, a fair system. In the area Mr. Heaslip mentioned there are two Federal electorates, Grey and Wakefield, so instead of having five members, there would be 10.

Mr. John Clark—More representation than they have now.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—And more effective representation. We would have one vote one value as provided in the Federal Constitution, and this is a fair system although not mathematically correct; it is not possible to have a system that is mathematically correct, although it is possible to have one that is fair to the electors. As has been said over and over again during this debate, the people would have the right to have the Parliament they wanted and dismiss one they did not want.

Mr. Lawn—That is democracy.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Precisely.

Mr. Lawn—That is what the master does not want.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is what the Government does not want, because it knows that if the people were granted electoral rights it would be dismissed.

Mr. Lawn—It would walk the plank.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—An apt expression, for which I thank the honourable member. We have heard much about centralization and decentralization during this debate. Even the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) in fear and trembling moved into this rather competitive arena. Let us look at what the present electoral system has done to centralize population in this State! The number of electors in the respective areas and in the respective electorates is, I think, a fair criterion. The first election under this system was held in 1938, when the average number of electors enrolled for each metropolitan district was 16,300, and the total metropolitan enrolment was 58 per cent of the State's total. In 1958 the average number for each electorate in the metropolitan area is 23,200, and metropolitan electorates have 62.95 per cent of the total State enrolment. In 1938 the average enrolment for each country electorate was 5,900, and total country enrolment was 42 per cent of the State's total; now each country member represents 6,800 electors, and the country total is 37.05 per cent of the State's total. Under this so-called policy of decentralization that was referred to so often by members opposite during this debate, the average number in each country district has increased by 900 while the average number in each metropolitan district has increased by 6,900. There is a difference of only 6,000—just a mere bagatelle!

I said earlier that there were no real arguments but there were a number of excuses, and one excuse, of course, has been the time factor. We have been told that time would not permit the Royal Commission to conduct its inquiry and to have its report adopted by Parliament in order to make the system available for the next elections, but of course no evidence has been submitted in support of that. What are the facts? After this resolution is carried this afternoon there is no reason why the Royal Commission should not be appointed this week or why it could not proceed with its inquiries and furnish a report within four weeks.

Mr. John Clark—If it so desired?

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, if it so desired. Of course, the Government would be the body to appoint the Royal Commission and if it wished it could instruct the Commission to prepare a report. Someone said electoral rolls could not be printed in time, but according to my understanding of the Constitution this Parliament could run until April next, so there would be ample time and opportunity to have the new districts delineated and the new rolls printed.

Mr. Jenkins—Not according to a high electoral authority I spoke to today.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I would not cast any doubts on a high electoral authority but I would be very doubtful about the brief the member for Stirling submitted to him.

Mr. Jennings—You could be doubtful about his interpretation, too.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is another matter on which there could be a slight doubt. There has been a complete misunderstanding by members opposite, and I hesitate to say it was deliberate, although that is the kindest thing I could say about them because, if it was not deliberate, they have shown a poor sense of perception as to what the motion means and what led up to it. The Premier, the member for Light (Mr. Hambour) and others claimed that we accepted the 1954 redistribution. Some members opposite went so far as to say that we even welcomed it but, when challenged o produce an authoritative statement from me or any other member of my Party, they failed to do so. As was pointed out by the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark), we accepted the 1954 report of the Electoral Commission because it was microscopically better than the system that prevailed prior to 1954. What members opposite did not point out, however, and what it is important that the world should know, is that we did not accept the terms of reference the Government insisted on providing for the Royal Commission by special Act of Parliament, put through this House by force of numbers. We fought the 1954 Bill at every stage.

Mr. John Clark—We even spoke on the third reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—We spoke and voted against the second reading. We tried to amend it, but failed. We spoke and voted against the third reading. Could any Party do more than that to defeat what we considered was a travesty? I do not cast any reflections on the members of that Royal Commission, for they were shackled by the terms of reference. It was impossible for them, therefore, to make a fair report on a just electoral system, yet we have been accused after having fought tooth and nail to amend the terms of reference so as to enable the members to do what they considered right, of accepting the recommendations, which were only microscopically better than what preceded them. I have dealt only with the excuses that have been put forward by members opposite, for they put forward no reasons.

The Premier said the Opposition wanted the motion carried so that it could become the Government. He put it the wrong way: he wants the motion defeated, and his Party wants the present system maintained in order to retain the government. No member opposite has endeavoured to analyse the motion properly. I stress that it states:—

. . . to give substantial effect to the principle of one-vote-one-value . . .

We admit that it is impossible to give actual effect to the principle of one-vote-one-value, but the mother of Parliaments and other Australian Parliaments have given practical effect to the principle. I also stress that the motion does not instruct the Royal Commission to do certain things. It would be left free and unfettered to determine the issues on the evidence placed before it. Great play has been made about the alleged large districts that we could have under a new system, but no one has suggested we should retain a House of Assembly with 39 members. When there was little more than one quarter of the present number of people in South Australia we had a House of Assembly of 56 members. The present number is too small, and as the population increases the situation will worsen. We should face up to the position now and give the people a representative Parliament where members can speak and vote effectively. If we do not, what defence will we have in the future when a new generation may have a totalitarian ideology? If they say that democracy in this State does not work some form of totalitarian government may be established to take its place. No-one hates totalitarianism more than I do, whether it be totalitarianism of the Right or of the Left. The only effective bulwark against any form of totalitarianism is a democratic electoral system. We believe that such a system can be evolved as a result of agreeing to the motion, and I urge the House to vote for it.

The House divided on the motion:—

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bywaters, John Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, O'Halloran (teller), Ralston, Riches, Stephens, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Geoffrey Clarke, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hambour, Harding, Heaslip, Hincks, Jenkins, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Pattinson, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Shannon, and Stott.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Davis and Tapping. Noes—Sir Malcolm McIntosh and Mr. Goldney.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

HIRE PURCHASE AGREEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 767.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—As far as I can see this Bill, and I have not checked it clause for clause, is almost precisely the same as the one introduced by the Leader of the Opposition last year. Its principal terms are undoubtedly the same and if I followed the Leader's speech accurately, its objects are the same. The conclusions I have come to are almost precisely the same. In other words I think this House might be well disposed not to pass it. The Acts Interpretation Act states that all legislation should be remedial, but I do not think this Bill remedies anything: I think it could do much harm. We frequently hear criticism of hire-purchase, and invariably from the Opposition. I am certain that but for hire-purchase we would not have nearly as good a standard of living or standard of employment as we have and I believe we would have more industrial unrest. For electoral reasons the Opposition will not admit that we have high standards of employment and of living. This does not apply only to the South Australian Parliament because if we listen to national broadcasts we hear members of the Federal Opposition crying stinking fish. The reason is obvious. A Party cannot change the Government unless it creates dissatisfaction. It cannot change the Government whilst everybody is doing well, is prosperous and has a high standard of living.

The Opposition may not realize it, but much of its opposition to hire-purchase arises from the fact that undoubtedly it has provided the working man with standards he would never have enjoyed under other circumstances. It has also provided him with a means of credit he would not otherwise have had. It has assisted in maintaining employment and has been conducive to industrial peace. If there are any wrongs or unfair practices arising from hire-purchase we should take steps to ensure their elimination.

Mr. Lawn—That is what we are trying to do.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Opposition is trying to do one thing, but the Bill would achieve something entirely different. It would completely disrupt hire-purchase in South Australia. To indicate this Government's attitude, when Mr. Cahill wrote asking if we would attend a conference on hire-purchase we replied that we would be pleased to do so and examine any propositions that would in any way help to make hire-purchase operate more smoothly. When Mr. Cahill was unable to secure Commonwealth support for the conference he wrote asking whether we would be prepared to attend notwithstanding Commonwealth non-participation, and our reply again was that we would be pleased to attend. I am not sure whether a date has been fixed for the conference, but this State will be represented. So, if there are any undesirable implications in hire-purchase, we shall be happy to consider them.

Viewing the Bill not technically but generally, we observe that its biggest weakness is that it tries to deal with all types of hire-purchase in the one Bill and under one set of conditions. Not very long ago, when there was undoubtedly a dearth of money available for hire-purchase transactions, the type of hire-purchase that most affected the working man was the least popular, and it was curtailed. The most popular type of hire-purchase from the point of view of the hire-purchase companies is undoubtedly that of a motor car: the least popular is that of household goods. In the case of a motor car, a substantial transaction, usually involving about £700, takes place. It is a big transaction with only one customer, good security and good resale value. From the point of view of the living standard of the people, and particularly young couples starting out in life, the most necessary type of hire-purchase involves the provision of household goods.

My first criticism of the provisions of the Bill is that they would undoubtedly militate against the hire-purchase of household goods, which most affects the average working man's standard of living. The honourable member sets out to have a standard rate, but his formula even to an expert is obscure.

Mr. O'Halloran—Have you a report from an expert on it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are you going to produce it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I may but, even if I do not, I am certain it will be produced because it has been circulated through the House. There are so many objections to this Bill that I fear that, were I to state all of them, honourable members might tire of my eloquence and feel that I was endeavouring to stonewall the Bill. I have had several explanations of the formula in the Bill. The trouble is that in no case do

they appear to arrive at the same conclusion. Certainly the average purchaser would not be able to understand them because I cannot follow the basis of the honourable member's formula, and I have given it considerable attention. However, I want now to deal, not with the technicalities, but with the general principles of hire-purchase.

The big criticism so frequently heard about hire-purchase is the spread of its volume, but is that really a criticism of hire-purchase? Surely the fact that the public are demanding it and that it is increasing in extent shows that there is a public necessity for it—which is just the opposite from what honourable members would have us believe. I have heard it said that this is stopping us from getting money from the Loan Council, but I do not believe that. I have been told that it has unduly raised the rates of interest as far as the State's borrowing is concerned, but I can find no evidence of it. Again, I have heard that the agreements the public are asked to sign do not clearly set out the conditions and that the public sign all sorts of commitments they do not understand.

I have taken the trouble to obtain some forms concerning, I think, every hire-purchase company operating in South Australia. They set out what the public will be paying in terms that are understood by the consumer much more clearly than anything that will be effected by the Bill, because I doubt very much whether anybody would ever know where he was in the transactions involved there. Generally, I believe that the opposition to hire-purchase created by members opposite is completely unjustified; it is not in the interests of the people they are here to serve. It is not conducive to maintaining or improving our standard of living. I am sure that, if this Bill comes into operation, it will disrupt what is today a useful public service and will lead to unemployment in some of our factories. Those are positive statements, but they are, to the best of my belief, absolutely true.

All the things mentioned by honourable members, including the odd exaggerated case here and there, I have tried sincerely to investigate. I have taken the trouble to analyse the position of the purchaser in South Australia and compare it with that of the purchaser in New South Wales, where the Government has brought in not precisely the same legislation as this, but legislation to cover this problem. I find that, in fact, the rates of interest charged in South Australia are below the permissible rates provided for in the Act and applied in New South Wales. That shows how ineffectual the New South Wales legislation is but, more than that, the honourable member's legislation is full of ambiguities. I observe the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) smiling.

Let me refer to some of the notes prepared for me by a responsible authority. I do not propose to make it available publicly but, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to know the authority, I am prepared to show him the documents. The authority who has made this available has no financial interest whatever in the success or otherwise of hire-purchase, but he is a person who can speak with knowledge, not only of this State, but of the whole Commonwealth.

Mr. Corcoran—With the information available to you, are you convinced no excessive rates of interest are charged by the hire-purchase people?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Many considerations are involved in the hire-purchase rates of interest. If honourable members will look at the standard agreement they will see that what are so frequently termed interest rates are in point of fact not interest rates at all. They involve a considerable number of other charges associated with hire-purchase. They are not interest rates, but accommodation charges, and the firms provide all kinds of services, in some instances the service of insuring the hire-purchaser under the agreement. Whatever the interest charges, those provided by the Leader of the Opposition in his Bill can not be worked out because they are based upon a rate of interest which he says is declared, but in point of fact it is not declared. It is based upon a rate of interest that has no validity whatsoever. He talked about the rate of interest declared under the Banking Act, but no rate of interest is declared under that Act. The anomalous thing is that under certain conditions in the honourable member's formula actually a person engaged in hire-purchase takes all kinds of risks providing commodities for a purchaser.

In the circumstances, if the Bill were brought into operation I am certain that it would disrupt hire-purchase to a great extent. It would not control hire-purchase, but disrupt it. I am certain that the measure would achieve no good purpose from the point of view of the purchaser of goods and I am also sure hire-purchase is something that the purchaser wants. I revert to what I said

earlier, namely, that the Bill falls down on the first instruction under the Acts Interpretation Act, that all legislation shall be deemed to be remedial. This Bill is not remedial because it does not remedy anything but adds only confusion to what after all is a fairly technical problem.

Last year when I referred to his formula the Leader of the Opposition considered that what I said was somewhat disparaging and that I was unnecessarily severe. Having looked at the formula again, given it much consideration and got the best advice upon it, I would say that any stricture I made on the formula last year was not exaggerated but was an extreme understatement of the case because the formula is a ridiculous one and could not be put into operation under any circumstances, nor are the procedures proposed by the honourable member possible of being used. I do not intend to go into technicalities because I am sure other honourable members will do so, and I ask the House not to support the measure.

Mr. Lawn—We will go into technicalities.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If the honourable member wants some technicalities on the Bill I will give them to him. Under clause 4 (*a*) provision is made for a hirer to acknowledge in writing the receipt of a copy of a hire-purchase agreement. In the second schedule of the Bill the example suggests that the copy of the agreement can be acknowledged as having been received by the hirer signing a receipt on the original agreement. This is generally impracticable as at that stage the agreement has not been accepted by the finance house. Difficulty is being experienced in having hirers mail separate receipts.

In clause 4 (*c*) provision is made for a maximum accommodation charge rate. This clause stipulates that the maximum overdraft rate under the Commonwealth Banking Act, 1945-1953—a simple interest rate—may be increased by two to obtain a maximum flat rate accommodation charge. It is pointed out that no overdraft rate has been fixed under the provisions of the said Banking Act. The rates are merely the subject of agreement between the Central Bank and the trading banks. Under clause 4 (*d*) provision is made for repayments of equal amounts at weekly, fortnightly, monthly or quarterly intervals. No consideration has been given to the particular requirements of primary producers whose income is irregular and often may be received only on a yearly basis. I am informed that primary producers use hire-purchase extensively upon a yearly basis, and have always done so, and I believe they desire to continue to do so, notwithstanding the Bill. Provision is made in clause 4 (*e*) for a refund of the accommodation charge upon prepayment of any instalment. The time element, namely, how long before due date the prepayment is made, has not been mentioned. In the example given in the second schedule, if a hirer paid his instalment one day early as each instalment fell due the accommodation charge of £5 4s. would be reduced by £2 6s. 8d. to £2 17s. 4d., although the hiring period would in effect be shortened by one day.

In clause 4 (*f*) provision is made for the agreement to be signed by the hirer and hirer's spouse. This provision would seem to apply more properly to domestic goods. It is an odd provision to apply where machinery is being acquired for business purposes. In clause 4 (*g*) provision is made for a hirer to have the right to nominate his own insurer if he desires to do so. In this regard the following points may be very relevant: The finance house is the legal owner of the goods and as such should be able to elect where the insurance should be placed. Finance houses arrange with their insurers to provide a "back-stop" protection to cover instances where a hirer may, by active omission or commission, debar himself from making a claim under the relative insurance policy, for example, the driving of a motor vehicle whilst under the influence of liquor. Such protection would not be available if the insurance was allowed to be placed with individual companies. An insurance company affiliated with a finance house accepts the risks involved for all hirers. Individual insurance companies could be prone to accept only first class insurance risks, leaving the doubtful risks for the insurance company affiliated with the particular finance house. This would be a totally unacceptable proposition. Under present insurance arrangements the finance house would be covered after the expiry of the original term of the hiring when arrears of rental exist. Such an arrangement provides an important protection for hirers, and it might not be possible similarly to arrange for individual insurance.

Under present insurance arrangements the cover applies immediately the finance company becomes an interested party. This is a protection for the hirer, and probably could not be

automatic with individual insurance arrangements. The whole matter of insurance is highly complicated in its technical aspects, and if such legislation were to be introduced many difficulties would have to be faced in making detailed arrangements with a great number of insurers. Handling costs would be greatly increased and possibly new accounting systems would be necesssary. Because of increased costs an increase in the rate of hiring charge may have to be considered. This shows the technicalities that are involved even in the simple matter of effecting an insurance. The insurances are of a special nature and are, as far as motor vehicles, for instance, are concerned, more numerous than comprehensive insurances, which are generally costly.

Mr. O'Halloran—They are very much more costly.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have gone into the question of costs, and I can find no evidence that hire-purchase companies get an advantage in the way of rebates or commissions on this insurance.

Mr. Lawn—Usually their own insurance companies are involved.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I can ascertain, the rates are reasonable. I believe that as a result of bulk insurance the purchaser does not get a worse deal, but a very much better deal than he would under other circumstances. For hire-purchase companies I am sure the cover is much more adequate, and it is a general cover to meet the exigencies of the circumstances. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the Bill. The Opposition does not dislike hire-purchase in a general way, as the Premier would have the House believe. The Leader of the Opposition said that it was desirable because it allowed people to obtain goods they would not otherwise be able to get. In spite of what the Premier said, the whole matter of hire-purchase has been of great concern to many people who are not members of the Labor Party. We have seen articles in the press by economists and other people competent to speak on matters of finance, and they have expressed great concern about hire-puruchase.

Hire-purchase in this country has reached large proportions. The Leader quoted some enlightening figures to show that the hire-purchase debt in the Commonwealth is about £300,000,000. However, the Premier says there is no need to control it. He said that hire-purchase business is strong, but obviously where something is strong there is a need for control. When a river is flowing strongly there is a need to control it. I have the greatest respect for a number of people known to me who are engaged in the hire-purchase business, and I believe they are doing only what the law permits. I sincerely believe that some people prominently engaged in hire-purchase would agree to some control, with the unscrupulous people coming under it. For the good of hire-purchase and for its continuance we need control. It is needed to give the business an air of respectability. That is all we wish to do. Some of us are interested in the hire-purchase business, and we want it to be respectable. The Premier said that hire-purchase is a boost to industrial development and peace. I want to examine some of his remarks, and I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted and debate adjourned.

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

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act relating to the Stabilization of the Wheat Industry.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is South Australia's contribution to the legislation required for the continuance of the Australian Wheat Board and the wheat price stabilization scheme. The scheme which has been in force for 10 years does not, in accordance with the terms of the present Act, apply to any wheat harvested after September 30 last. For some time discussions have taken place between Commonwealth and State Ministers in the Australian Agricultural Council and with representatives of the Australian

Wheatgrowers Federation with regard to the continuance of the scheme, and decisions on this subject have now been made which are acceptable to the Governments concerned and to wheatgrowers generally. It is proposed to extend the scheme for a further five years with only slight modifications.

The principles of the wheat marketing scheme are well known to Parliament and I need not explain them in detail. For the purpose of marketing the Australian wheat harvest, both locally and overseas, there is a Wheat Board established by Commonwealth law. By virtue of the powers conferred by the Commonwealth and State Acts the board takes control of substantially the whole of the Australian wheat harvest. It markets the wheat and pays the grower. The price stabilization scheme is carried out by means of legislative and administrative arrangements under which a price equal at least to the cost of production is guaranteed for 160,000,000 bushels of wheat a year. Commonwealth laws ensure that the guaranteed price will be received on up to 100,000,000 bushels of wheat exported, and the legislation of the States provides that wheat sold for consumption within the Commonwealth will realize not less than the guaranteed price. Local sales are about 60,000,000 bushels a year.

In order to continue the scheme it has been decided that a new Commonwealth Act will be passed concurrently with uniform State Acts. This course has been considered preferable to dealing with the matter by amendments of existing Acts. Amendments are more difficult to understand and make it more difficult to secure uniformity. I will mention the main matters dealt with in the Bill.

The Australian Wheat Board.—The Bill will be administered by the Australian Wheat Board which will continue in existence and be constituted in substantially the same way as previously. The only alteration proposed in the membership of the board is that Queensland, instead of having one member, will have two members, either of whom can sit upon the board as an alternative to the other. This arrangement will not give Queensland an additional vote. The provisions as to the duties of growers to deliver wheat to the board through the medium of licensed receivers have not been altered.

The home consumption price.—The Bill provides that the board must sell wheat for home consumption or stock feed in Australia at the guaranteed price as fixed under the Commonwealth Act. For the coming season 1958-1959 this price is declared by the Commonwealth Act to be 14s. 6d. a bushel for bulk wheat free on rails at ports of export. This price was agreed upon by the Australian Agricultural Council and is recommended in the report of the Wheat Index Committee. This committee in its investigation considered the recent survey of the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The guarantee.—The guaranteed price for wheat sold overseas has also been fixed at 14s. 6d. Commonwealth legislation ensures a return of this amount on up to 100,000,000 bushels of wheat exported from the crop of 1958-1959. The guaranteed price in future years will be reconsidered from time to time in accordance with movements in the cost of production. In order to provide money for meeting obligations under the guarantee the Commonwealth legislation provides for the establishment of a Wheat Stabilization Fund consisting of the proceeds of a tax on exported wheat. The rate of this tax is the amount by which the return per bushel from wheat sold overseas exceeds the guaranteed price, but at no time will the rate be more than 1s. 6d. a bushel. The balance in the old fund, which on May 31 was £9,100,000, is to be carried forward for a nucleus of the new stabilization fund. The Commonwealth law also contains provisions for ensuring that the Stabilization Fund will be kept down to approximately £20,000,000. If payments into the fund at any time should bring it above £20,000,000 the excess will be returned to the growers, those who paid into the fund earliest receiving the first distribution of the excess. If it should be necessary to find money in order to bring the export returns up to the guaranteed price, money will be drawn from the fund for this purpose. If there is not sufficient money in the fund, the Commonwealth Government will find the balance.

Freight to Tasmania.—The Bill contains a clause similar to that in the present Act under which the home consumption price of wheat is loaded to provide money for meeting the cost of transporting wheat from the mainland to Tasmania. This cost is at present a little over 4s. a bushel. Tasmania uses about 2,000,000 bushels of wheat a year, most of which is received from the mainland. If the price of wheat in Tasmania included the full transport costs it would be a serious burden and handicap to that State. In order to prevent this and to give Tasmania some benefit

from the wheat marketing scheme, the principle was accepted in 1953 that the price of wheat sold for local consumption throughout the Commonwealth should be loaded so as to meet the cost of shipping wheat to Tasmania. The loading is at present 2d. a bushel.

Premium on Western Australian wheat.—The provisions by which Western Australian growers receive a premium of 3d. a bushel on the amount of wheat exported from that State are included in the Bill. This premium is paid out of a deduction from the total amounts realized by the Wheat Board for all wheat sold by it. The reason for the Western Australian premium is, of course, that Western Australia is nearer the principal overseas markets for wheat and has always enjoyed a better return, owing to the lower freight.

From what I have said it will be apparent that the Bill contains very little that is not already in the existing scheme. Its main object is to extend the scheme so that it will apply to the next five harvests. The Government believes that both the marketing arrangements and the price stabilization scheme have the approval of an overwhelming majority of the growers and has therefore no hesitation in asking Parliament to authorize their continuance.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:—

That the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1955.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Government has brought down this Bill because of a recent decision by Mr. Justice Mayo that section 127a of the Road Traffic Act, which prescribes the short right turn, does not apply to riders of motor cycles. That section has been in force for eight years. It has been generally accepted that it applies to motor cyclists, and there is no doubt that on the whole motor cyclists have conformed to the rule laid down in it. It would be a most unsatisfactory position if the law were as laid down by His Honor. There would be one rule for right hand turns by motor cyclists and a different rule for drivers of other vehicles. Thus considerable confusion might arise at intersections in a stream of traffic consisting of both motor cars and motor cycles. Motor cyclists have become accustomed to the short right turn, and this method has decided advantages over the old one. It is not necessary in connection with this Bill to discuss the question whether the decision of Mr. Justice Mayo is correct in law or not. It is sufficient for the purpose of justifying this Bill that the judgment raises doubts on a matter of everyday conduct, and that His Honor's interpretation of section 127a is contrary to the intention of the Government when it introduced the 1950 Bill, and the intention of Parliament when it passed that Bill.

The Judge's view of section 127a was arrived at by implications based on a comparison between that section and some other sections of the Act. Subsection (1) of section 127a lays it down that every driver of a vehicle must, when turning to the right, make the short turn and a separate subsection says that the same method must also be followed by riders of animals. The section does not say expressly that it applies to the rider of a motor cycle. There are, however, definitions in section 119 saying that the word "driver" means a person driving or riding a vehicle or animal, and the word "vehicle" includes a motor cycle. Some of the other sections in the Act which apply both to vehicles and animals refer to drivers and riders. His Honor thought that there was an inference to be drawn that section 127a did not apply to riders of motor cycles but only to riders of animals. If this reasoning is correct it is possible that a number of other sections in part VI of the Road Traffic Act which refer to drivers or driving vehicles and do not expressly mention riders will be held to be limited in the same way. This would be a highly inconvenient result, because some important traffic rules would not apply to motor cycles.

Having regard to Mr. Justice Mayo's decision, and also the possibility that doubts may be raised in future about the application of other parts of the Act, it is desirable to deal with the matter by legislation. In the first place it provides that references to drivers and driving will be deemed to include references to riders and riding unless the

express language of a particular provision indicates that that provision does not apply to riders and riding. If this amendment is passed it will not be open to the Court to limit the operation of a particular provision of the Act by implications drawn from the language of other provisions. Thus, for example, a provision applying generally to drivers of vehicles and which does not expressly state that motor cycles are excluded will apply to motor cycles.

Secondly, the Bill declares that the principal Act will have effect as if the amendments made by the Bill had been in the principal Act at the time when it was passed. This will ensure that motor cyclists who have followed the accepted interpretation of the Act in the past will not thereby be liable to be held guilty of any offence or of negligence. It is a retrospective provision but is necessary and harmless and will not disturb any established rights.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill ratifies the amending River Murray Waters Agreement by which the claim of this State to a share of the Snowy Mountains water is accepted by the other parties to the agreement. The agreement was signed on the 11th of last month and was the result of nearly three years' difficult and complicated negotiations between South Australia on the one hand and the Commonwealth, Victoria and New South Wales on the other. It was early in 1956 that the Government first learned that New South Wales and Victoria proposed to share between themselves the water which would be diverted into the Murray from the Snowy River by the Snowy Mountain Authority, and that South Australia was to be excluded from any share in this water.

The Government immediately took the matter up with the Commonwealth. On February 27, 1956, we wrote to the Prime Minister pointing out that the Snowy Mountains project had been financed from revenue and that South Australia as a contributor would expect to receive a fair share of the water. We asked to be allowed to see the draft agreement before it was signed. This request, though re-iterated from time to time, was consistently refused. It was not until the Snowy Mountains agreement was signed more than 18 months later that South Australia received a copy of it. The agreement confirmed the information which the Government had previously received. It provided that the Snowy Mountains waters were to be shared equally between New South Wales and Victoria. It also provided that the River Tooma, one of the tributaries above the Hume reservoir whose waters had to be taken into account in working out South Australia's share in a time of restriction, was to be diverted from the river by the Snowy Mountains Authority without any provision for compensating South Australia for loss of its share of this water.

From the outset of the negotiations South Australia has claimed that if Snowy Mountains water is diverted into the Murray above Albury it will become part of the Murray and must be taken into account in working out South Australia's allocation of water in a time of restriction. The Crown Solicitor, Mr. Chamberlain, strongly held this view and he was supported by Mr. D. I. Menzies, Q.C., recently appointed as a Justice of the High Court. The Parliamentary Draftsman also advised the Government to the same effect. Sir Garfield Barwick, however, who was retained by the Commonwealth, took the opposite view. He advised that New South Wales or Victoria could put water into the Murray River anywhere and take it out lower down. They could, as it were, use the Murray River as an instrument for storing, transporting and delivering an independently owned volume of water not really forming part of the river.

It is not necessary for me now to tell again the long story of the correspondence, inspections and conferences which took place in an endeavour by the parties to the Snowy Mountains scheme to satisfy the South Australian Government that it was not prejudicially affected by the Snowy Mountains Agreement. All that I need say is that two years elapsed without any satisfactory proposals being made for assuring to us a share of the Snowy River water; and the Government finally decided that it had no alternative but to commence an action in the High Court. Instructions were given to the Crown Solicitor and on April 17 of this year a writ was issued. We claimed a declaration of South Australia's right to a share of the Snowy River water and other remedies, the decision of which would raise the issue whether the Snowy Mountains scheme was constitutional.

After the issue of the writ negotiations and conferences continued and finally New South

Wales and Victoria conceded the justice of the claims made by South Australia, and agreed to define our rights by the only effective method, that is, by an amendment of the River Murray Waters Agreement. They asked, however, that when the agreement was being amended the existing provisions dealing with the allocation of the Murray waters in periods of restriction should be rescinded by mutual consent and that a new code of rules on this subject should be agreed to for the purpose of removing legal doubts and clarifying the rights of the parties. The South Australian Government had no objection to this. It was, indeed, a modest price to pay for the recognition and declaration of the rights which we were seeking to establish.

The agreement, therefore, which is in the schedule to the Bill is a fairly long document because it re-writes the whole of clause 51 of the River Murray Waters Agreement, *i.e.*, the clause dealing with periods of restriction. The principal new matters in the clause can, however, be shortly stated.

The definition of "Murray water" in subclause (5) makes it clear that any waters coming into the River Murray and its tributaries above Albury by means of the permanent works of the Snowy Mountains Authority will be taken into account in working out the allocations of all the States, including South Australia, in a period of restriction.

It provides that until the works of the Snowy Mountains Authority enable water diverted from the Tooma River to be replaced by Snowy River water, the amount of water diverted from the Tooma by the Snowy Mountains works will be debited against New South Wales and Victoria and will be taken into account as Murray River waters for the purpose of working out South Australia's allotment in a period of restriction.

The definition of "Murray water" makes clear a point about which there was previously some doubt, namely:—That all the tributaries of the Murray River above Albury have to be taken into account in working out South Australia's allocation in a period of restriction.

The clause contains a complete redraft of the provisions of the River Murray Waters Agreement which deal with the allocation of water in a time of restriction. An important benefit to South Australia in this clause is that our right to a definite allocation of water for losses by evaporation, percolation, lockages and dilution between Lake Victoria and the Murray mouth is recognized. It is provided that in times of restriction the allowance for such losses will be separately computed and will be allowed to pass to South Australia in addition to the water allocated for use.

At the request of New South Wales and Victoria their rights in respect of tributaries below Albury are set out in the amending agreement in greater detail than previously. Under the principal agreement both of these States retain their right to the waters of their tributaries below Albury during a period of restriction, and if either State permits a tributary to run into the Murray, it is entitled to take out the amount so contributed in addition to its normal share. It may be that in future this right will be more important to New South Wales and Victoria than it has been in the past because of works being done for storing water in the tributaries, and they are anxious that the provision dealing with tributaries should be stated again in a form more acceptable to them. I do not think that the re-statement makes any difference to the substance of the provision which merely says that if a State puts into the River Murray water which it need not have contributed, it can take out a corresponding amount at any point.

The formula by which the amount of Murray River water available for use is divided among the States is not altered. It will still be in the proportion of approximately 5, 5, 3, but, as a result of including the Snowy Mountains water in the amount to which the formula is applied, South Australia will, of course, receive a much larger quantity in a period of restriction. In normal years also the Snowy River waters will greatly increase the volume of water flowing into South Australia and thus assist in flushing the river without adding materially to the flood danger.

It is, however, in a period of restriction that the greatest benefits will accrue, and on this subject I will quote some paragraphs from a report made by the Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Dridan, who is the representative of this State on the River Murray Waters Commission:—

South Australia would receive approximately the following quantities of water for use during a year similar to 1914-15:—

(*a*) Without Snowy water, 337,000 acre feet.

(*b*) With Snowy water, 453,000 acre feet.

These figures assume that there would be no restrictions from May to September inclusive and that restrictions would apply from October to April inclusive. The figures indicate a benefit to South Australia of 116,000 acre feet and this represents the actual benefit during the irrigation season, *i.e.*, October to April inclusive.

Considering the irrigation season only, the position would be:—

(*a*) Without Snowy water, 203,000 acre feet.

(*b*) With Snowy water, 319,000 acre feet.

Therefore, the Snowy River would have the effect of increasing the quantity available for use by South Australia during the irrigation season (which is also the season of maximum demand for other purposes) from 203,000 acre feet to 319,000 acre feet—an increase of 116,000 acre feet or 57%. South Australia's present usage of water from the Murray during the irrigation period in a drought year is approximately 190,000 acre feet. If we are assured of 319,000 acre feet in a drought year (irrigation season), I am of the opinion that development could be placed somewhat in excess of this amount on the assumption that a 10% cut could be made in a drought year if necessary. This would mean that South Australia's use of Murray water during the October-April period could be placed on the basis of 354,000 acre feet in a normal year.

Speaking in broad terms an assurance of a share of Snowy River water would mean that South Australia could double its present usage of River Murray water without running any risk of serious shortages during a year of drought.

Further local reservoirs could be developed to add to the supply to Adelaide and nearby localities, these being the raising of Mt. Bold, a new reservoir on the Onkaparinga and a new reservoir on the Torrens. Between them these new sources should add about 6,000 million gallons a year to the assured annual water resources, *i.e.*, sufficient to meet the needs of a population of 150,000 people. This does not include Soutn Para (completed) or Myponga (under construction). In addition to meeting the needs of the new oil refinery these reservoirs will meet the needs of 120,000 people.

From what I have said it will be clear that, when this agreement is ratified by all the Parliaments concerned, the claims which South Australia has made and insisted on continuously for nearly three years will be effectively granted, to the substantial benefit of the State.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MAINTENANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second Reading.

The Hon. Sir. THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill makes a number of amendments to the Maintenance Act, all of which have been recommended by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board.

Clause 3 amends section 122a of the Act which empowers the Governor on the recommendation of the Children's Welfare Board 46, 47, 62, 64, 66 and 73 to be enforced against to transfer an unruly child from an institution to the custody of the Comptroller of Prisons. "Child" as defined means any boy or girl under the age of 18 years. The effect of this definition is that the board may recommend the transfer to gaol of an unruly child under the age of 18 years but not one over the age of 18 years. The amendment will allow the section to operate in respect of any "State child." The expression "State child" is not limited by definition to those under 18 years of age but includes "any person whether under or over 18 years of age who, pursuant to this Act, is being detained in an institution or is subject to an order for such detention or is under the custody and control of the board."

Clauses 4 and 5 are brought forward to deal with a problem which has caused some accounting difficulties within the department. Section 132 authorizes the department to receive and deposit in the Treasury any moneys due to a child who has been placed out as an apprentice or in some other suitable employment. From time to time the board is asked to receive and hold other moneys due to State children and the new section 132a will enable the department to deal with such moneys by depositing them in the Treasury in the name of the board and on the child's account. The amendment to section 133 is consequential.

Clause 6 enacts a new section 152a for the purpose of altering the name of the institution formerly known as the "Industrial School, Edwardstown" and more recently as the "Industrial School, Glandore." The department is of the opinion that the use of the word "Industrial" in the name conveys an erroneous impression as to the function of the institution, many persons being under the impression that it is a kind of boys' reformatory, whereas in fact it is a home for boys between the ages of six and 14 who have been classified as "destitute and neglected" through no fault of their own. Usually the boys remain there for a short period during which they receive medical attention and other necessary treatment, preparatory to being "boarded out" by the department. It is proposed that in future the institution will be called the Glandore Children's Home. The amendment will operate to correct the name of the institution whenever it appears in legislation, rules, proclamations or other documents.

Clause 7 enacts a new section 177a to enable the obligations created by sections 24, 43, 44, defendants residing out of the State. Briefly, the sections deal with the following matters—

Section 24—Recovery of the cost of past relief from relatives.

Section 43—Summons by wife to husband who leaves her without adequate means of support.

Section 43a—Summons by husband to wife who leaves him without adequate means of support.

Section 44—Variation or discharge of maintenance orders.

Section 46—The obligations of near relatives to contribute to the cost of maintenance of a State child.

Section 47—Enforcement of obligations of near relatives of a State child.

Sections 62 and 64—Variation of maintenance order against near relative of State child.

Section 66—Summary relief to married women.

Section 73—Variation or discharge of order for summary protection.

The need for the amendment arises out of a recent decision of the Full Court of the Supreme Court of this State in the case of *Hunter v. Hunter* where it was held that sections 46 and 47 of the Act did not operate to impose an obligation upon persons at all material times resident out of this State. The Government considers the defendants to proceedings under these sections should not be able to avoid their responsibilities merely by residing in another State and that the obligations created by the sections should be enforceable in all cases where the summons can be served under the provisions of section 15 of the Commonwealth Service and Execution of Process Act.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIBRARIES (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Debate adjourned on September 17. Page 777.)

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

MARINE STORES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 780.)

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—The Bill provides that the council of the area, in addition to the Commissioner of Police, shall be given notice of an application for a marine store dealer's licence, and should have power to show cause to the court against the granting of the application. It also increases the licence fee. The firstnamed alteration is long overdue. Council authorities are well versed in every aspect of marine store collecting and it is they who determine where a marine store will be located. When I was a member for the old district of Thebarton considerable objection was taken by residents of an area on South Road to the establishment of a marine store nearby, but the council did not agree to their objection and the store was established. I consider that in such circumstances the council should be given the authority to license marine stores. It is many years since the fee of £1 was fixed and under the Bill it is increased to £3 3s. In view of the time that has elapsed since the fee was last fixed there can be no objection to the increase. As there is nothing in the Bill to which there can be objection, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

SECONDHAND DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 781.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—This is a simple Bill, but it is nevertheless of some importance. Clause 3 amends section 6 (1) and provides that a person who is well known to the applicant for a licence may give a certificate of character. In the past it has been necessary for an applicant to obtain a certificate of character from someone resident in the area where he intends to carry on his business. With the development of secondhand dealing in motor vehicles, many people are operating in areas in which they are not known, and this Bill will improve the position by permitting the dealer to obtain a certificate of character from a person living in the area where the applicant is known or where he resides.

Clause 4 amends section 21 (1) and makes it necessary for a secondhand dealer to enter in a book all goods bought or received by him. The Minister in his second reading speech explained that some secondhand dealers had done this voluntarily for their own protection and to assist the police in searching for any goods that might be wrongly sold after having been stolen or received. I believe this amendment is necessary in order to give full protection to the dealer and to the public. We on this side of the House have no objection to the Bill, and I therefore support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October, 9, at 2 p.m.