

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, October 19, 1960.

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

**QUESTIONS.****ANZAC HIGHWAY.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—An article appearing in the press earlier this week dealt with suggested improvements to Anzac Highway and its footpaths in view of the increasing amount of traffic. If a Bill now before another place does not embrace this matter, has the Government considered widening Anzac Highway generally, and particularly at Keswick Bridge?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Road Traffic Board Bill sets up a board empowered to make recommendations regarding parking on highways and, as Anzac Highway is a highway, the board would thus have power to make recommendations regarding parking on it. I personally believe that, before much money is spent on widening Anzac Highway, steps should be taken to stop the present promiscuous parking. Many South Australian roads need bituminizing and, as much money has been spent on Anzac Highway, it would be reasonable to assume that it would be used for the purpose for which it was constructed, as a highway and not as a parking station.

**DRIED FIGS.**

Mr. KING—This morning's *Advertiser* refers to the Minister for Trade's statement that the quantity of figs still remaining to be sold in Australia was small. My information, however, is that 11 tons of 1959 figs remains unsold while, of the 1960 pack of 71 tons received, 50 tons of South Australian figs is still unsold. As our fig industry is somewhat unique in that it was initiated by Government action and as it forms a major part of the income of some war service land settlers can the Premier do anything to prevent the dumping of Turkish figs in Australia? These are landed at half the cost of Australian figs and distributors take them in preference to Australian figs.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Last night I heard a question asked in the House of Representatives by the Honourable Mr. Makin on this matter and I was surprised to hear the Minister answer, in effect, that following on representations made to him an officer had communicated with the packing houses concerned and only a small tonnage of figs was available for sale in South Australia. I do

not know which officer communicated with the packing houses, or which packing houses were involved, but obviously the Minister was completely misinformed as to the seriousness of the position. I thank the honourable member for supplying me with precise figures, which I will forward immediately to the Commonwealth Minister. I will ask him to carry out the assurance he gave in the House that if there were tonnages of unsold figs he would take action to see that they were protected.

**TELEVISION SALES.**

Mr. HUTCHENS—Just prior to the ringing of the bells today I received a telephone call from a person who alleged that in my electorate a retail firm selling television sets had been advertising that it would make them available for free viewing for an unspecified period. People accepted the offer and after a time decided to sign hire-purchase contracts for the sets. Subsequently, they were amazed when told that they were in arrears in payments covering the period of free viewing. Some could not meet the commitments and the sets were re-possessed and sold at ridiculously low prices by the company which then claimed that under the agreement the hirer was responsible for the total amount stated therein. I regret that I will be absent from the city next week, but if I supply the Premier with particulars and documents will he have this matter investigated to see whether fraud has been committed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—At present there is a Bill before the House that the Government has been trying to get passed for two years. It deals with precisely this type of offence which it would completely cure if it were accepted by this House and another place. It covers the question of selling sets below value and other matters and was designed to prevent the type of practice mentioned by the honourable member. It sets out a code under which hire-purchase would be properly conducted. I am happy to have this matter investigated, but I point out that while there is no legislation on our Statute Book to control this situation any investigation I can make will not be nearly so effective as if I were in a position to put it in the hands of a competent officer who could enforce proper provisions. I feel that the proper procedure would be for us to deal with the Bill before the House which will prevent this type of business activity.

**HAWTHORNDENE PRIMARY SCHOOL.**

Mr. MILLHOUSE—On November 24 last year I asked the Minister of Education a

question about the site for a primary school at Hawthorndene, and the Minister said that the matter was in the course of negotiation. Since then I have heard nothing further. Will the Minister say whether a site has been purchased for this school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am pleased to inform the honourable member that a site comprising eight acres of land at Hawthorndene has been selected and purchased, and the matter is now in the hands of the Crown Solicitor to effect settlement.

#### MATRICULATION STANDARD.

Mr. CLARK—I received a number of telephone calls showing that much interest was aroused about a reply given by the Minister of Education yesterday regarding Leaving Honours classes. The Minister mentioned that he was having a conference on October 28 to discuss the whole problem of whether Leaving Honours classes should be discontinued and a higher standard Leaving class for matriculation purposes substituted. Will the Minister say whether this means that a higher standard Leaving examination is to be held for matriculation purposes at the end of the fourth year or at the end of the fifth year?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—All the discussions and the proposals have been purely exploratory. No decisions have been made, but the Premier and I share the view that the present system is unsatisfactory because the standard of the present matriculation examination is too low; but on the other hand the Leaving Honours standard is unnecessarily high for many persons merely to go to the University. We consider (and our opinion is shared by responsible people at the University) that some change should be made. My personal view is that we should continue the Leaving year but add a further year for matriculation, and that the standard of the proposed extra year for matriculation should be higher than the present Leaving, but lower than Leaving Honours. As I said yesterday, I have had discussions with the Vice-Chancellor of the Adelaide University and several other leading educationists. I intend to confer with the Association of Independent Headmasters and Headmistresses, of which I think there are 16 to 18 members. I do not know that they will be in favour; they will probably be opposed, I think, but the purpose of having the discussion is to find out the general consensus of opinion: whether the view held by the Premier and myself is good or bad, or whether we can effect a compromise between the different shades of opinion.

#### RESCUE WORK.

Mr. JENKINS—From time to time search and rescue operations are necessary to save lives in cases of motoring, fire and shipping accidents. The Police Department has developed a good cliff rescue squad and a technique for lifesaving. The first time this was used was at Waitpinga cliffs to recover the bodies of the Sheridan brothers after their plane had crashed. However, this cannot always be effective. In view of that, has the Premier ever considered the use of a helicopter with a well-trained crew kept on stand-by to take part in rescue operations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I shall have the matter examined and advise the honourable member on the decision reached by the Government. For many years the Government has been contributing to lifesaving organizations, and I shall see whether it is possible to take this further.

#### SEYMOUR, ETTRICK AND BURDETT WATER SCHEME.

Mr. BYWATERS—The Public Works Committee approved of a scheme to supply water to the hundreds of Seymour, Ettrick and Burdett some time ago. The last time I asked a question about this scheme the Minister of Works said that plans were being looked at to decide whether to supply water from the Murray Bridge scheme or from another pumping plant at Tailem Bend. As the summer is approaching and the people in this district are keen to have a water supply for stock and domestic purposes, will the Minister say whether there have been any further developments towards the implementation of this scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I assure the honourable member that this matter has not escaped the notice of the department. As is usual in the early part of the year, the department has been busy and unable to provide final plans, but I shall bring the matter to the notice of the Engineer-in-Chief again and endeavour to have a reply next week.

#### BEAUMONT SEWERAGE.

Mrs. STEELE—In view of the continued development in the Beaumont area in my electorate, could the Minister of Works say whether the department could consider providing sewerage connections to the properties of residents in this district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—This matter has been brought forward on several occasions by the honourable member, and some time ago

the department formulated a proposal which it forwarded to the Corporation of Burnside with a view to the corporation's conducting a survey in the area as to the people who were agreeable to a sewerage scheme under certain conditions. In the meantime, further applications were received from residents in the area, and one correspondent said that the local council had apparently taken no interest in the matter. I wish to correct that impression; the Corporation of Burnside went to much trouble to further the project and to obtain the information that the department and the honourable member desired in order to assist the department in coming to some conclusions. From a brief examination of the file a few moments ago I found that I had a further letter from the Corporation of Burnside giving up-to-date information on development in the area, which information has been supported by the honourable member herself in communications and discussions with me. The department is always anxious to keep up with development in any given area as closely as possible. As development is obviously rapid in this particular area, I would be agreeable to asking the department to examine the position again in the light of circumstances now existing so that the project may be further considered. I should think that if the development that now appears to be occurring is likely to continue in the immediate future, the project might be considered favourably. I do not want to make a promise now, but I shall ask the department to consider the matter and see if it can come to a favourable decision.

#### PORT PIRIE WEST PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE—Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked last week regarding the erection of toilet blocks at the Port Pirie West primary school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have a reply, but it does not advance the position any further than my reply last week. I received advice from the Director of the Public Buildings Department yesterday that it was intended to call for tenders during October. That is what I told the honourable member last week, and it is all the information I can supply.

#### WEEK-END PETROL SALES.

Mr. HEASLIP—Early in the session I asked a question of the Premier regarding the difficulty of country people in particular, but also people from other States, arriving in Adelaide on a Saturday night or Sunday night and being unable to get petrol over the week-end, par-

ticularly when a holiday followed on the Monday. The Premier said he would confer with the Chamber of Automotive Industries and that he would see if some arrangements could be made whereby these difficulties could be overcome. Has the Premier yet had that conference, and can he say whether anything has emerged that will ensure that the needs of these people will be catered for?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I believe the Attorney-General had some discussions but that they did not lead to any direct conclusions. As far as I know, the Attorney-General was not able to get any agreement with the persons concerned. The matter is being further examined, and will no doubt be further considered by this place in due course.

#### WHYALLA TO IRON KNOB ROAD.

Mr. LOVEDAY—A few months ago I drew the attention of the House to the need for bituminizing the Whyalla to Iron Knob road. I suggested that because much of the traffic thereon was Broken Hill Proprietary Company business traffic between its works at Whyalla and its quarry at Iron Knob, an arrangement might be come to between the Government and the company regarding sharing the cost of bituminizing that road. Recently, when the Lincoln Highway was opened, the press reported that the Minister of Roads had stated that bituminizing of the road was being considered. Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, ascertain whether my suggestion has been noted and what is being considered regarding the bituminizing of that road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I am sure the remarks the honourable member refers to as having been made by him in the House have not escaped the notice of my colleague, the Minister of Roads. However, this matter is somewhat complicated by certain discussions at present occurring as to what should be the programme for the Eyre Highway, in particular, regarding its route from Kimba to the existing Lincoln Highway at some point; whether it might go to Whyalla, to Lincoln Gap, or *via* Iron Knob to Whyalla and link up in that way. I think the honourable member is probably aware that these matters are all being considered, and that the Minister naturally does not want to make a decision on these matters until the interests of the district have been fully canvassed and some conclusions arrived at by those interests. I think the Whyalla Town Commission suggested

that it would be willing to maintain the road between Whyalla and Iron Knob in order to employ the plant which it must necessarily have for its own purposes: that it would be willing to consider taking over the maintenance of this road from the Engineering and Water Supply Department which up to the present has had that responsibility. All these things, therefore, have to be considered in coming to the decision the honourable member desires. As he has put forward a specific proposal, I will ask my colleague to examine the matter and report in due course.

#### BANK ADVANCES.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yesterday, in reply to my question regarding bank advances and their restriction in country areas, the Treasurer said:—

I have been given to understand that the difficulty has arisen because the Reserve Bank has asked trading banks to maintain a certain degree of liquidity; in other words, they are not to lend more than a certain percentage of their deposits, but must retain a certain percentage as a reserve against withdrawals.

I do not know who gave the Treasurer that information, but it borders on the realms of fantasy. The Commonwealth Bank itself has said, "A bank is able to create credit—"

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member must not debate the question.

Mr. QUIRKE—I am not debating the question: I am explaining the question which will immediately follow. The Commonwealth Bank has said:—

A bank is able to create credit because, when the funds it lends are spent, they return to it or to other banks in the form of new deposits.

I think the reason for the hardening of the attitude to bank advances is that loans increase deposits and the volume of money. However, this restriction applies throughout Australia.

The SPEAKER—Order! The member is debating the question.

Mr. QUIRKE—The Treasurer promised yesterday that he would take this matter up with the Commonwealth Treasurer. Will he do so as a matter of urgency, and bring down the reply to this House? It is necessary that this restriction be removed as far as possible from primary production in this State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I was privileged to hear over the air last night that this was the subject of a question in the House of Representatives, and the Commonwealth Treasurer made a statement concerning it. What he said was substantially what I told the honourable member, namely, that the

Reserve Bank for the purpose of defeating inflation had made certain demands upon the private banks. He also said that income earned overseas was somewhat lower now and that in turn had an effect upon the liquidity of the private banks in any event. I will forward the honourable member's remarks to the Commonwealth Treasurer so that he can supply me with a report in due course.

#### MOUNT BURR COMMUNITY HALL.

Mr. CORCORAN—A week or two ago I read in the *South-Eastern Times* that building operations at the Mount Burr community hall were held up because the contractor was awaiting certain timber which apparently was unavailable. Can the Minister of Forests say whether that problem has been overcome, and whether building operations are proceeding according to plan?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I shall obtain a full report for the honourable member as soon as possible, perhaps tomorrow.

#### HEADMASTERS' PROMOTIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The headmaster of the Largs Bay primary school has been provisionally appointed headmaster of the Hectorville primary school, and the present headmaster at Hectorville is due for promotion to a Class I school. I understand that the headmaster at Hectorville has claimed that he should advance with the school to Class I status. He had an interview two or three weeks ago with the Director of Education about his claim. Can the Minister of Education say whether these appointments have been finalized, whether the headmaster at Largs Bay is to be appointed to Hectorville, or whether the Hectorville headmaster is to be retained there?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I remember the Director of Education discussing this matter with me informally amongst a variety of other matters. He then said that it was a difficult problem and that he had had discussions with each of the two headmasters concerned, the Acting Superintendent of Primary Schools and some other principal officers of the department. I am sure that the Leader favours the new policy recently adopted: to try to counter the multiplicity and frequency of transfers of senior members of the teaching profession, and particularly transfers during the course of the school year. After many discussions that I had with the principal officers of the Education Department and of the Teachers Institute, we arrived at a substantial measure of agreement whereby

the transfers of senior staff, during the year at any rate, would be reduced to a minimum. Apparently, this case has arisen in the meantime, where one headmaster is seeking a transfer almost immediately because of a vacancy, while the other opinion is that the headmaster should advance with the school. I do not know what the final recommendation by the Director is. It has not yet come before me. If he has not made a recommendation, an appointment cannot have been made. I shall endeavour to make myself familiar tomorrow with the exact position and ask the Director if he can make a final recommendation.

#### VOLUNTEER FIRE FIGHTERS' FUND.

Mr. HARDING—Can the Minister of Forests tell the House the approximate amount at present in the Volunteer Fire Fighters' Fund and who contributes to the fund when it becomes depleted?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Under the Act, the Government contributes 50 per cent of the fund and the insurance companies 50 per cent. It builds up at the rate of about £1,000 a year maximum from the Government and about £1,000 a year maximum from the insurance companies until it reaches £10,000, at which stage no further contributions are made. That is all in the Act. The credit balance standing in the fund at the moment is £9,705 16s. 2d.

#### LYRUP SCHOOL FENCE.

Mr. STOTT—In July this year, the Lyrup school committee approached the Education Department for approval for the erection of a Cyclone fence around the school. An inspector called and apparently approved the idea, which was passed on to the Public Buildings Department, an officer of which visited the locality and approved the erection of the fence. In August the committee went again to the Education Department asking for the matter to be expedited. It received a reply from the Director of Education stating that the matter had been forwarded to the Director of Public Buildings. That was in August and the committee has heard nothing since. I understand that, although the project was approved, insufficient money was available at the time. The money is now available and, in view of the delay, will the Minister of Education inquire of the Education Department and the Director of Public Buildings to see whether the matter can be expedited?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes; I shall be pleased to do so. It is one of several matters with which I do not ordinarily deal, but I cannot conceive that the honourable member has the correct reply and that the money was not available. However, I will ascertain the true position and let him have a reply, probably tomorrow.

#### MOORLANDS COAL.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Premier any report on the Moorlands brown coal deposits, about which I asked a question recently?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Director of Mines reports:—

A detailed investigation of the Moorlands brown coal deposits was carried out from 1946-1951. It was found that approximately 32,000,000 tons of coal occurred in six separate deposits. The depth of overburden ranges from 60ft. to a maximum of 160ft. Combustion tests were also carried out. The coal is inferior in quality to the brown coal used in Victoria, being higher in ash and sulphur content though lower in moisture. It is not an attractive fuel. The limited quantity and the depth of overburden combine to preclude its economic development at the moment. However, from time to time the situation is re-examined in the light of changing economic factors and new mining techniques. As yet there appears to be no prospect of economic development.

#### EXPORT WEEK.

Mr. HARDING—Yesterday, when I asked the Premier some questions about the proposed export drive, I believe that he misunderstood me. Can he say whether each State will be granted a quota of goods to be displayed for export on the suggested boat trip, and whether the boat, during its four-day stay in South Australia, will be open to members of Parliament and to the public for inspection?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have no specific knowledge of these matters, but I should think the answer to the first question would be "No". Obviously it would be desirable to send overseas the best goods, irrespective of the State producing them. I should think that the boat would be open for public inspection.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following final reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:—

Angle Park Girls Technical High School.

Elizabeth Downs and Stradbroke Primary Schools.

Hendon (Seaton) Boys Technical High School.

New Norwood High School.

Whyalla (Hincks Avenue) Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr. H. L. TAPPING.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide) moved—

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Semaphore (Mr. H. L. Tapping) on account of ill-health.

Motion carried.

#### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(No. 2).

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1959. Read a first time.

#### ASSEMBLY ELECTORATES.

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

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take steps to readjust the House of Assembly electoral zones and the boundaries of electorates to provide a more just system for electing the House, which the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after the word "House" first appearing, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any reduction in country Parliamentary representation must correspondingly increase the tendency towards centralization of population and industry."

(Continued from October 12. Page 1323.)

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—When I was last speaking I was dealing with the Premier's approach to the motion and the misrepresentations he engaged in. Every Government member who has since spoken has followed explicitly his lead. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) said that Labor wants centralization of Government, and he referred to the decentralization of industry. He is so unsophisticated and so lacking in knowledge that he does not know his own Party's policy, let alone the policy of the Australian Labor Party. He would be quite content during his political life (which at present would seem to be long) to continue under the conditions that apply at present without any change. That attitude is rather strange for a young man, because one would expect a young man to suggest reforms, whereas older men, in many instances, prefer to remain in the same old groove. One is appalled to hear a young man sticking to something that is retrograde in all respects and that reveals no evidence of

advancement or reform. He wants this State to maintain a proportion of over three to one in favour of country representation in Parliament.

The member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) followed similar lines, but devoted most of his time to eulogizing the Government's actions in his own electorate. He introduced totally irrelevant questions, so much so that you, Mr. Speaker, had to call him to order. He sought to have what he had before him put into *Hansard*, but you, Sir, did not agree. He must have a most vivid imagination to have read into the motion what he suggested it contained. He went so far as to introduce into his arguments the decision of the last Australian Labor Party State Convention. He said that we had changed our policy and had dropped proportional representation, which was part of our policy for more than 40 years. I have always opposed it and was not displeased when it was removed. That was an indication that my Party is prepared to change its views and policies to meet changing circumstances. Because we have adopted a proposal for almost 50 years does not necessarily mean that we will continue with it, because changed circumstances cause us to change and improve our views.

I presume that the honourable member is familiar with the boundaries system in England. We would be satisfied with the English system for the redistribution of boundaries, if we maintained preferential and compulsory voting. The English system for electing the House of Commons would be reasonably fair here then. Although decentralization is not part of this motion, it has been introduced unfairly into this debate by most speakers from the Government side. Members of the Labor Party have as much interest as members opposite in country people. We have country members and, although some do not represent farming districts, they are nevertheless country representatives and have a job to do to look after the interests of their electors and the country generally. Unfortunately, Government members persist, not only in this debate but in practically every debate that permits of its introduction, in bringing in the argument of the country against the city, and I think that is bad. The following letter was written to the *News* last week:—

The Education Minister, Mr. Baden Pattinson, is to be complimented for his outspoken address to students of the Urrbrae Agricultural High School (*The News*, 7/10/60). He said he was saddened by bitter controversies

in Parliament and elsewhere on the vexed question of country *versus* city. Mr. Pattinson urged the students to set an example to their elders by breaking down the barrier of suspicion, distrust, discord and jealousy which now divided country and metropolitan residents in this State.

I think every member on this side of the House would agree with those sentiments. The letter continued:—

However, he seems to have overlooked the fact that the chief bone of contention is the electoral set-up in this State, by which one-third of the electors (the country voters) elect two-thirds of the Parliament. It is an arrangement for which there is not the slightest justification. It is also an arrangement, however, which meets with the approval of the present Government.

The person who wrote that letter was not a member of the Labor Party. Setting up this argument of the country against the city is the stock-in-trade of some members opposite, who introduce it whenever possible. They try to give the impression that they are the only people concerned with the interests of the country irrespective of what effect this might have on their arguments from time to time against the interests of the State generally. We endeavour to look at the matter from a different angle—the effect on the whole of the State, not on only one part of the State. It is a line all members of Parliament and the Government should follow. I now refer to a member opposite who, although he does not often enter into debates, is one of the “big guns” opposite and, when he does enter into a debate, he is either pressed into it or has a contribution to make.

Mr. Lawn—The member for Mitcham?

Mr. FRED WALSH—No, the member for Onkaparinga, who is one of the reserve battalions which, when the debate is not going too well, are brought into it.

Mr. Stott—You are not referring to him as a “big gun”, are you?

Mr. FRED WALSH—I have had a lot of experience of him and I appreciate his ability. As he made certain statements, I think we must take notice of them and reply to them. He went further than most members opposite when he said:—

I now want to refer to another matter that is inherent in the motion without its being specifically mentioned, namely, the abolition of the second Chamber. Members know that that is the ultimate goal. This is only the first bite of the cherry and the idea is that we should first wipe out the Upper House in South Australia and then wipe out the House of Assembly, leaving the whole of the power in Canberra. That is not denied and the Labor Party makes no bones about it.

That is its policy. The Party is all in favour of uniform taxation, and this is a lead along the line to a unified system of government under which the unfortunate people living as far apart as from Broome to Cape York will have to go to Canberra for redress. This is the first step—wipe out the Upper House.

It is unusual for the honourable member to indulge in that sort of talk.

Mr. Stott—It is very extravagant.

Mr. FRED WALSH—It is. This was not suggested by anyone who spoke on this side. There was no intention to introduce it into the wording of the motion, yet the honourable member saw fit not only to speak about the abolition of the Legislative Council but to say that we intended later to get rid of this House. He should have gone a step further and said that we intended to get rid of the Senate! What would happen after that is problematical. The honourable member knows that no matter what happened in this House we could not possibly get rid of the Legislative Council. Although my legal knowledge is limited, I think that the only legal way we could possibly bring that about would be for the Legislative Council to pass a Bill, introduced either in this Chamber or in the Legislative Council, abolishing that Chamber. I cannot imagine certain members of the Legislative Council voting for its abolition, however.

Mr. Stott—It would have to be carried by two-thirds, at any rate.

Mr. FRED WALSH—That is so. If we want to deal with the Legislative Council I suggest that we adopt the method proposed in New South Wales: a referendum. Who can possibly object to a referendum? Let the people themselves, not the Parliament, determine the question. I shall refer later to a country that adopts that course. The referendum, or course, is being held up in New South Wales because of certain legal objections, about which I shall not express an opinion in case I am called to order. The honourable member went on to say that the Legislative Council had been abolished in Queensland and in New Zealand, but he stated that he failed to see where they had benefited in any way by this abolition. He said:—

The bicameral system of Government has stood the test of the British way of life. There are examples where the system has been discarded in the British Commonwealth. It has been discarded in Queensland and in New Zealand, but I do not think the people there have gained anything by abolishing the system.

He does not mention that the power of the House of Lords has been considerably

restricted in recent years, with the result that it does not have the last say in the passage of legislation that has been approved by the House of Commons. If the honourable member went part of the way he should have gone the whole way, because, when all is said and done, the House of Lords today is really just something in name only as far as effectiveness is concerned. To an extent it is a sort of barnacle on the body politic, and I believe that applies generally to all second Chambers, although there may be exceptions in certain countries.

I have made a study of the position in Switzerland, which I have visited on a number of occasions. On attaining his twentieth birthday every Swiss citizen obtains his right to vote in all Communal, Cantonal and Federal affairs, and is himself eligible for election. The Commune is equivalent to a town council, and the Canton is equivalent to our State. The 22 States of Switzerland make up the Federal Constitution. The Swiss citizen has the last word everywhere, and his right to direct participation in the life of the State goes far beyond the right to elect the members of the Legislature and Executive Council and, in many Cantons, the Judiciary. In these Cantons the Cantonal Constitution is the final authority. For instance, in the Basle County, every law enacted by the Cantonal Council has to be submitted to the people for approval. In other Cantons the referendum may be brought into action. That means that if a sufficient number of signatures is collected by the citizens among themselves they have the right to demand that any law passed by the Legislature be submitted to the vote of the people.

The referendum and the initiative, features of Swiss democracy which are typical of its democratic nature, are retained even in their Federal Constitution. A Bill approved by the Federal Assembly must, according to the Constitution, be submitted to the referendum; it comes into force only if no petition is made against it after 90 days, but if a referendum is desired and a petition is submitted bearing the signatures of not less than 30,000 citizens, the final decision as to whether it becomes law rests with the people. The Swiss citizen has yet another means by which he can exercise his right to take a direct part in the affairs of his country, and that is the initiative. By this means the people, given the support of 50,000 signatures, can demand that the Federal Constitution be amended or totally or partially revised. In the Cantons the public can, with

a smaller proportion of signatures, propose amendments to the Constitution as well as the adoption of new laws.

Under a system like that, one could not object to the Second Chamber, which resembles our Senate, but has smaller numbers. There are 22 Cantons (equivalent to our States) each returning two members to the National Council. Where there is strong public objection to any law carried by either the Cantonal Government or the National Government, a petition, in certain instances, can force the matter to be submitted to the people for approval. To my way of thinking, the position in South Australia resembles the position in South Africa, which has very nearly the same proportion of country representation compared with the city, and we know the mess they are making of things in South Africa.

Mr. Loveday—They believe in second-rate citizens.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes; they have second-rate and even third-rate citizens in the Government in South Africa, if their actions in recent years are any criterion. It has been the same ever since the present Government took office there, and it is a Government that should not be permitted, in any sense of justice, to continue in office. Imagine the position if a referendum were held in South Africa on these issues! If every citizen—I do not mean only those restricted by virtue of the existing laws—were given a vote, we can imagine what would be the position of the South African Government.

Concerning the question of Upper Houses, I think it is always good to introduce another opinion as distinct from any particular Party beliefs. A few years ago, at the time when the question of the property qualification of the Legislative Council was being discussed, a leading article in the *News*, headed "Odd Arguments on Upper House", stated:—

In declaring the purpose of the property qualification for Legislative Council electors was "to allow for a more thoughtful vote", a Liberal and Country League member yesterday was not making a thoughtful statement. Property and wealth may be inherited, but intelligence is not necessarily passed on. Almost daily we read of the senseless acts performed by the progeny of rich and propertied people. It is also odd to suggest that men between 25 and 30 are "unlikely to have opinions on such widely different subjects as public finance, foot-rot in sheep, and the school-leaving age." How many mature men are well informed experts on every subject in the Statute Book? Indeed, it might be preferable to have more men in Parliament with fresh, inquiring minds than those with inflexible opinions and prejudices. A Council elected by



property owners cannot help but tend to serve sectional interests. Argument used yesterday suggested nostalgia for the days of feudal privilege. Can the will of all the people be properly served when an Upper House elected by a minority has the power to veto anything passed by the Assembly elected by the majority?

Those were the views expressed by the *News* at that time. True, since then there has been a change in the editorship of that newspaper. I believe that it will not be long, whether it likes it or not, before the Government will be compelled to have a Commission set up or a Select Committee appointed for the purpose of re-drawing the existing boundaries. I suggest that the member for Gouger might find himself on less safe and hallowed ground than he is on today, and it could well be that perhaps half, if not more, of the town of Elizabeth may come into his electorate. I know that if I were on the Commission that would be done, and I would still consider I was being just. However, I do not suppose the member for Gouger would consider I was being just.

Mr. Clark—After all, the last redistribution made Gouger safe.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes. The last Commission was hamstrung, because it was under direction: it was told to re-draw the boundaries but the same ratio of seats had to be maintained, namely, two for the country and one for the metropolitan area. Had the Commission been left to its own devices to determine how many members there should be and to make recommendations, we might have got something close to what the Labor Party seeks today. However, the net result was that certain Liberal seats were made safer and certain Labor seats were made marginal seats. I suggest the two worst sufferers were the late Leader (in the Frome electorate) and myself. Whereas we had formerly enjoyed a certain immunity from the possibility of defeat, we had to fight every inch of the way, and possibly the Party's candidate will have to continue to do so until such time as a fairer redistribution takes place.

Mr. Quirke—All that is wanted is a fair fight.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I agree with that. I do not think I could quote from a more appropriate article than the leader in last Thursday's *News*. Compare this article with the Premier's mis-statements that were so plainly and unthinkingly taken up by members on the other side of the House! The article, under the heading "Electoral Stayputs" states:—

There is a great deal of justification for the Labor motion now before the House of Assembly, calling for a readjustment of State

electoral zones. Measures of decentralization of industry have resulted in big shifts in population and changed the balance of several country electorates. The pressures of expansion have made drastic changes in the composition of a number of city zones. Some differences in the numbers of electors are fantastically wide. For instance, the metropolitan electorate of Glenelg has some 29,000 voters, while Frome, the country electorate to be contested in a by-election on November 5, has fewer than 6,000. The tremendous growth of Elizabeth, in the Gawler electorate, has produced a ludicrous disparity, even among country districts. Gawler now contains some 20,000 voters against Frome's 6,000. Metropolitan zones range from Glenelg's 29,000 to Unley's 21,000. The last inquiry into the electorates was made in 1955. Since then, South Australia has expanded more rapidly—on a percentage basis—than any other State in the Commonwealth. Another examination could now be made of the position—but this time by an unfettered commission. It is reasonable to have some degree of tolerance in the distribution of numbers in electorates; Labor's "one vote, one value" policy can never be achieved, and no-one really expects it. But if another electoral commission is appointed it should not be forced to confine its adjustments to mere numbers. If it should feel that the State would be better served by, say, 22 country and 17 metropolitan seats—the present proportion is 26 to 13—then it should have the right to recommend the change.

I referred to the last Commission and believe that the country people, with no interference with their rights, are entitled to a just representation. We would not deny them that; they should not have an unjust representation. Community of interest has to be considered. While that point was laid down in the terms of reference to the Commission on the last occasion, the Commission did not follow that out, because many of its findings had no regard to community of interest. It is not the first time that this question has come before this House, and we can rest assured it will not be the last. Extraneous matters should not be introduced into a debate of this kind, for that is taking an unfair advantage of the position: it is not debating the motion on its merits. Earlier this session, on a motion moved by our late Leader, the Premier accepted the inevitability of decentralization and agreed to the motion, with certain amendments. This time he endeavours to defeat the intention of the motion altogether by inserting certain words. If any other suggestion could be made to improve the motion, we should be happy to consider it, if not to accept it entirely. But we ask that notice should not be taken of the Premier's amendment, that it should be

rejected, that the motion of the Leader together with any reasonable suggestions forthcoming should be adopted and that the Government should then decide in its own way without any suggestion from us what steps should be taken. I support the motion.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I have listened with interest to the various viewpoints put forward. As a country member I feel that I have some justification for putting my case before the House. I do not wish to quibble about the meanings that can be imputed to words in the motion. I support the amendment moved by the Premier. In all the arguments so far, the main point seems to revolve round the number of persons who may elect a member: that is the principal point of dispute. The question is: should the number be equal in all cases, or should we achieve as near equality as possible? That depends entirely on the circumstances of the particular election, having regard to the betterment of the body corporate (be it a State, union or company) and whether the objects of the country and the welfare of its citizens or members can best be achieved in a certain way. Viewed historically, many differences re apparent in electoral matters, even in our own country. Taking the Senate as an example, we find that each State has 10 Senators but, whereas in New South Wales there is one Senator for every 379,000 persons, in South Australia there is one Senator for every 93,000-odd persons, and in Tasmania the figure drops away to one Senator to every 35,000-odd electors.

Mr. Jennings—The most original idea I have ever heard!

Mr. KING—I bet it is! I will deal with the question of democracy later, for definitions of "democracy" vary from country to country, from time to time, and from organization to organization. Turning to local government and the number of people for each elected person, the same applies as the numbers of persons in the various wards do not necessarily have to agree for the purpose of electing a councillor, a mayor or any other elected member of a council or corporation. Looking at the Federal system, which has been held up as an example, as regards the House of Representatives and the people in the Northern Territory, again there is a difference because of the special requirements of the Northern Territory. In South Australia the work of a country member may be spread so thinly that he is unable to cover the area of his electorate

because of the vast distances. Therefore, he becomes quite ineffective and is not able to place before the other members of Parliament the special requirements of his district.

I am pleased that the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) raised the question of country *versus* city. I agree that there should be no difference in this regard. The real question is the ultimate benefit of the whole State, and the means by which we achieve it. Representation must allow for the fact that there are differences in the requirements of members representing the various electorates. Let us, for instance, remember the value of primary produce to the economy of this State, and of Australia as a whole. It is nothing new to be told that all our exports earned £937,000,000 last year. The primary producer was responsible for £750,000,000 of this. Those exports are the only things we have to pay for our imports. For a moment I should like to draw the attention of the House to what would happen to the whole economy of Australia if this flow of money from the sale of our export goods were to fall away. Obviously, we should not be able to buy as many of the things that we operate and use to produce the wealth flowing into Australia today. For instance, we have to import all our petrol and oil, which has to be paid for.

Mr. McKee—It is being over-paid for.

Mr. KING—But the money would still have to be found for it from the income from primary produce. The income producing the wherewithal for industry to prosper in this country in the main comes from the country, not from the city electorates. The costs of the primary producers today have reached the stage where they are beginning to wonder whether it is worthwhile trying to carry on, in many instances. I am well aware of the position of wool and canned fruits.

Let me take wheat as an example. In 1950, wheat cost 7s. a bushel to produce, and sold abroad for 17s. a bushel. Today, costs of production average 15s., and on export markets wheat is bringing only 13s. So it is only a matter of time before a decision will have to be made whether Australia is prepared to subsidize the wheatgrower to keep him in business, the alternative being to lose the export income upon which our prosperity is based. In 1949-50, the wool clip averaged 63d. per lb. and cost a little over 30d. per lb. to produce. The average selling price was 58d. per lb., and average costs of production were probably not much less. The 1960-61 selling season has

opened with prices under 50d. per lb. The point is that the wool is not produced in the cities: it is only pulled over our eyes in the cities!

Mr. Jennings—What is the publication the honourable member is reading from?

Mr. KING—The *Review of the Institute of Public Affairs, Victoria*. The real point is that this income is responsible for about half our export income. If country people say, "We are not going to continue producing wool at a loss", and the wool rates fall because the woolpack starts to subside, the people of the State will find that the money is not there to pay for the things they require. The wheels of industry will start to slow down, work will not be quite so plentiful, and city interests will start wondering what is going to happen to them.

Mr. Corcoran—Can we do anything about it? The State cannot.

Mr. KING—I agree that the State cannot, but the State is involved in what happens. Therefore, the State should be represented by people who know and who can tell the city people what is happening in the economic trends, because none of us wants a situation arising where we cannot finance what we are doing. That position could easily arise in South Australia. The position today in the canned fruit industry, where 80 per cent of the fruit has to be exported, is that we are struggling hard to meet costs of production. The prices received by the growers today, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, are not equal to the costs of production. The same can be said about the dried fruit industry. Even today I had to refer to the fig industry. It is anomalous for the country to be asked to continue its exports to earn export income when the very industries producing that export income can be put out of business by imports which are being dumped on the Australian market from other countries.

Mr. Corcoran—According to the Acting Prime Minister, South Australia is not doing very well.

Mr. KING—Obviously he has been grossly misinformed about the position of the dried fig industry. Our vast country areas must be adequately represented. If country electorates are too big, members will not be able to effectively represent them. Our economy is so balanced today that, if there were any interference with the representation whereby city interests would benefit, the country would not prosper and our present living standards would go over-

board. A country member must be in close touch with his constituents and must fully understand the needs of his electorate. A country district of 6,000 square miles has far greater problems, quite apart from transportation, than a small electorate of three to four square miles. If the electorates of Chaffey and Ridley, for example, were combined the area would be about 70 by 100 miles, or about 7,000 square miles, and it would be virtually impossible for one man to adequately serve all the interests of the area and to bring its needs before Parliament. He would also have to depend on the co-operation of city members.

Mr. Riches—The Legislative Council districts are a bit of a farce, then?

Mr. Shannon—There are four members to each.

Mr. KING—There would not be that number if some proposals I have heard in this House were accepted. No city person can claim to have suffered because of the way the Government's policy has been implemented in the country. Statistics prove that. While that may be unpleasant hearing for some members, nevertheless it is a fact. Millions of pounds have been invested from private and Government capital in country districts. In my electorate there is a big cannery as well as co-operative packing sheds and distilleries. These have been aided by Government policy, as has private enterprise through the Housing Trust and the Industries Development Committee. The requirements of these industries have been brought to the Government's notice by members on the spot. We need a strong country representation to bring before city industries the high interest rates being charged by their agencies to the detriment of primary producers.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What worthwhile industries have been established in your district since you have been a member?

Mr. KING—I do not know that I have sufficient time to mention them all. However, for a start, I could refer to a cannery worth £600,000, two fruit canning industries worth £250,000 each, and an engineering works worth about £10,000.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What would be the total number of permanent employees?

Mr. KING—In one concern where I was formerly employed, and which used to close down just before Christmas, there were once only about 30 employees, but today that company has 200 permanently on the payroll. That indicates what can be done.

Mr. Loveday—Would you say that members on this side have ever opposed industries going to the country?

Mr. KING—No. The point I am making is that an active country member can induce industries to his electorate. I compliment the member for Whyalla who, with the assistance of the Premier, has been most active in ensuring that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company has extended its activities in his district.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—The honourable member was going to take it over.

Mr. KING—That may be so. However, it is good policy for a country member to get industries to his district. If members opposite want to nationalize the industries when they are established, that is their business. This Government has acted wisely in providing throughout the country the arteries of power, transport, water and finance upon which private enterprise feeds. If we tried to do the lot the dead hand of bureaucracy would stifle what we are endeavouring to foster.

Mr. Loveday—Where does that dead hand live at present?

Mr. KING—Apparently it was conceived in the London School of Economics and was still-born. I hope it will always remain still-born. This Government is noted for the way it has developed the State's resources. Tremendous assistance has been given to enable industries to establish in country districts, particularly in the South-East. If one or two members had to represent the entire South-East they would have extreme difficulty in adequately attending to the needs of all the people. It has been suggested that our electorates have been rigged, but I am reminded of what happened during the 1956 flood. The people at Buronga in New South Wales discovered that their representation in the New South Wales Parliament was insufficient to enable them to get the assistance that our people received from this Government. On inquiry I discovered that in order to keep the people at Wentworth and in the pastoral districts quiet, an impartial electoral commission drew the line through Broken Hill so that Broken Hill had two members, one of whom was to represent the entire district of Wentworth almost 200 miles away. Consequently, the people of Wentworth had little or no voice in Parliament. When that type of thing happens in another State one realizes

the necessity of providing adequate representation for country districts.

The prosperity of South Australia is linked with the effectiveness of our electoral system under which our vast country areas are adequately represented. I do not claim that Victoria and New South Wales need a similar system because Victoria, for instance, has many large country towns and is better served with rivers, whereas most of South Australia is arid, apart from a narrow coastal strip. If the control of Parliament were vested in city interests there would be a tendency to overlook country interests and eventually city and country residents would find themselves in a deplorable state. We have achieved a wonderful record under our present system and the Premier's amendment to this motion adequately states the position. Any reduction in the number of country members would tend to centralize power. I support the amendment.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I listened with much interest to the member for Chaffey, but did not hear much about the motion. I realize that he is able and is capable of presenting a first-class case to support his contention, but today he was so bankrupt of arguments that he had to deal with the Senate, local government, and import and export licences. I am indebted to him for his effective condemnation of the present Commonwealth Government and assure him that his remarks will not go unheeded at the next Commonwealth elections. I tried to determine from his remarks his approach to the subject matter of the motion, but I finally concluded that any approach he may have had was still-born. After listening to the honourable member and others opposite, I think the time is due for the House to be reminded of the wording of the original motion, which is:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take steps to readjust the House of Assembly electoral zones and the boundaries of electorates to provide a more just system for electing the House.

Mr. Corcoran—That is all that was in it.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, that is all. I support the motion and, if I had any desire to alter it, I would delete the word "more" so that it would indicate that we were seeking a just system. I would do this because I believe that by no stretch of imagination could anyone say that we had a just system in keeping with

the principles of democracy. Our system is the most unjust outside the Iron Curtain, and probably as unjust as any behind it. The difference between the system behind the Iron Curtain and that operating in this State is that behind the Iron Curtain there is no pretence that it is a democracy.

Mr. Jenkins—How long has the honourable member been behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. HUTCHENS—I often think I am behind it when I see the dictatorial attitude of the Government operating under this corrupt system.

Mr. Nankivell—If it were a corrupt system you would not be allowed to speak here.

Mr. HUTCHENS—All corrupt authorities make the system appear just, and that is the only reason why I am permitted to speak here this afternoon. The member for Chaffey tried to draw morals from corruption, but that is not easy. I agree with the member for Burra, who says that this system breeds political stagnation: we have political stagnation now.

Mr. Lawn—Mr. Seaman said that in the court recently.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I shall deal later with some of the remarks made by that distinguished and able gentleman who possessed facts and figures and made correct deductions in certain places. "Corrupt" means something that is foul, unwholesome and provides a stillness; there is a political stillness in South Australia, as the people are being rocked into such a state of affairs that there is a feeling of—

Mr. Jenkins—Satisfaction!

Mr. HUTCHENS—Hopelessness in regard to the desire to have a democratic electoral system. The member for Chaffey on three occasions said he was going to tell us what democracy meant, but he refrained from doing so because he could not explain it and still justify the present system.

Mr. Lawn—Do you think he will support the Prices Bill of the member for Mitcham?

Mr. HUTCHENS—No, the price would be too great. Members opposite have not tried to define democracy or to establish that the electoral system is in keeping with it, and I commend them for not trying. That shows wisdom on their part, but it also shows that they are cowards. They refrain from saying anything about democracy because they do not practise it and have no right to talk about it. "Democracy" is defined in the dictionary as:—

Government by the people, and with a form of Government in which sovereign power resides in the people as a whole and is exercised either directly by them or by officers elected by them. This type of system is undemocratic, cowardly and dictatorial. It is a type of system that denies people their rights—and nobody can claim that I cannot establish that. It operates with a complete disregard for the will of the people. Let us see how the system has weakened the rights of the people. In 1938, when the system came into being, there were 13 metropolitan electorates with an enrolment of 212,000 electors. Then, 58 per cent of the population resided in the metropolitan area. Members opposite will say that under this system the country has progressed to the same extent as the metropolitan area. We on this side of the House are not playing the country against the metropolitan area. We realize that for the development of this State every section must have an equal opportunity to progress and that we can remain economically sound only if rural areas progress. This has been said many times, but members opposite try to lead us to believe something different.

In 1938 there were 26 country electorates with an enrolment of 153,000, or 42 per cent of the total. The average enrolment for the metropolitan area was 16,300, and of country electorates 5,900. In 1959, under this system, the injustice was even more pronounced, as we had 13 metropolitan electorates representing 313,000, or 63 per cent, and 26 country electorates representing 185,000, or 37 per cent. If this system is doing so much for the country why is there not a greater percentage residing in the country? The answer is obvious. People of this State are being denied the right to an expression of opinion in this Parliament or to express their ideas about the type of Government they want. That is patently clear when one studies the figures of previous elections.

In 1953 the Australian Labor Party secured 167,000 votes and the Liberal Party secured 119,000. The Labor Party gained 48,000 more primary votes than the Liberal Party, yet it remained in opposition. Is it not patently clear that in 1953 the people wanted a Labor Government but were denied this under this system? In 1956 the discrepancy was not so evident, but the Labor Party gained 129,000 votes and the Liberal Party 100,000. Although 29,000 more votes were cast for the Labor Party, it still remained in opposition.

In 1959 Labor candidates received 192,000 votes and Liberal candidates 150,000—a majority of 42,000 for the Labor Party, yet it is still in opposition! Despite this, members opposite say this is a democracy, that it is just, and that the will of the people is heeded by the Government. However, this Government opposes a more just system of election. In three consecutive elections the Labor Party has had a big majority, yet it is still in opposition. This system has been operating for 21 years. It is now of age; it has been tried, but it has been found wanting in respect of the principles of democracy. It is a disadvantage, and not an advantage to the country.

Mr. Lawn—The Premier says the country gets less of everything; that is an admission that you are right.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I think that is true. The remarks of a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, who has done as much as anyone in fighting for democracy and who was one of the most distinguished men ever to grace the shores of Australia, were reported in the *Advertiser* of November 3, 1959. When speaking to members of Parliament, he said:—

Parliamentarians have only themselves to blame when attack from within succeeds in sweeping aside the Parliamentary system. They have fallen into two cardinal errors. Firstly, they allow themselves to become cynical in their hearts and to develop a secret contempt for those they represent, which freely undermines all proper human relationships and is the attitude of a dictator.

Let those words sink home! I feel we could not have a more cynical attitude towards our people than that shown by the present electoral system. Although I did not intend to speak about the Legislative Council, this matter was raised by members opposite and I shall reply briefly. Under our system of electing the Legislative Council, five-sixths of the women residing in this State are denied a voice in the law. That is because a Bill must pass both Houses of Parliament in the same form, and five-sixths of our women have no say in elections for the Upper House. There is no system of prostitution that is more cynical or shows more neglect of women, yet we are told that we are wrong when we ask for something more just.

We should take warning. Political humbug is often spoken by people who wish to retain this electoral system. Those people say it is doing a better job for the country. I shall not select any part of the country by way

of comparison. The Premier opposed this motion and used the district of Eyre to support his argument. The Opposition does not suggest any particular system, but is willing to leave it to the Government to take steps to bring about a more just system. With all due respect to those members who represent the West Coast in this House and another place, let us see who those people are—because I suppose some people do not know—and where they reside.

Firstly, the member for Eyre is Mr. Bockelberg, whose address is 14 Portrush Road, Marryatville; the member for Flinders (the Hon. G. G. Pearson) lives at Cockaleechee. Representing the Northern district in the Legislative Council we have the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, whose address is 109 Main North East Road, Walkerville; the Honourable Mr. Edmonds, 12 Allen Avenue, Brooklyn Park; the Honourable Mr. Wilson, 14 California Street, Nailsworth; and the Honourable Mr. Robinson, 17 Holden Street, Kensington Park. I shall not criticize these men or reflect in any way on the service they are giving, but shall leave it to the imagination of the people. The Premier said it was necessary to retain these men in office so that they could be continually available to their constituents in the country, but I point out that, inconveniently enough, five of the six reside in the metropolitan area. In fact, the country is served by residents of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Dunstan—Until recently four of those six resided in the best represented district in the State.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I have no right to dispute the member for Norwood's claim in that respect. The fact remains that those men are absentee landlords.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—The honourable member knows that is not correct: most of them have their interests in the district.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Of course they have: the people who pay their wages.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—The honourable member would be well advised to be fair and state the facts.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I shall state the facts. Government members talk about this country representation and what the present system has done and is doing for the country. I have a list showing the population of 25 country towns in 1954, compared with 1933.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—You said you would state the facts regarding members representing the West Coast. Will you do so?

Mr. HUTCHENS—If the Minister is patient I shall do so presently. The information concerning these country towns is part of my reply to the Minister. The towns (and the figures showing the drift in population) are:—

Town.	Population.		Decrease.
	1933.	1954.	
Blyth . . . . .	659	503	156
Booborowie . . . . .	675	446	229
Boooleroo . . . . .	852	617	235
Burra . . . . .	1,951	1,599	352
Bute . . . . .	849	693	156
Caltowie . . . . .	651	366	285
Edithburgh . . . . .	800	610	190
Hamley Bridge . . . . .	870	725	145
Hawker . . . . .	688	495	193
Jamestown . . . . .	2,134	1,877	257
Kapunda . . . . .	2,027	1,614	413
Kimba . . . . .	950	815	135
Melrose . . . . .	606	463	143
Minnipa . . . . .	516	376	140
Morgan . . . . .	777	575	202
Orroroo . . . . .	1,047	846	201
Pinnaroo . . . . .	1,528	1,153	375
Port Broughton . . . . .	819	598	221
Quorn . . . . .	1,946	1,813	133
Saddleworth . . . . .	622	565	57
Snowtown . . . . .	950	854	96
Warooka . . . . .	575	419	156
Wasleys . . . . .	534	386	148
Wirrabara . . . . .	981	670	311
Yongala . . . . .	626	243	383

That list shows how the population has decreased under the present system.

Mr. Jenkins—The honourable member did not mention any of the towns with increases.

Mr. HUTCHENS—There is no question that some towns have increased in population, and I shall deal with that question presently. The member for Chaffey (Mr. King) supported my argument when he said that the primary producer is wondering whether it is worth carrying on, yet honourable members opposite tell us they are doing so much for the country people under the present system. Four of the towns I have quoted (Edithburgh, Kimba, Minnipa, and Warooka) are towns that have followed the example set by their representatives, for in a period of 21 years the population of those four towns has decreased by 621. We hear about how the welfare of the State is being cared for by the present system. However, I am reminded by my colleague the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) that Mr. Seaman, when giving evidence before the Arbitration Court, said that the facts as so often stated in this place were not correct, as South Australia was not advancing to the degree claimed, and the only State where there was a real percentage advantage was Victoria, which bases its electoral system on the Commonwealth system and has a Legislative Council elected on adult franchise.

The Premier seeks to amend the motion by inserting the words "any reduction in country Parliamentary representation must correspondingly increase the tendency towards centralization of population and industry". Opposition members have not suggested a reduction of country representation, and such a suggestion exists only in the imagination of the people who wish to build up a fictitious argument against the motion. When we look at the country electorates we can see that a very definite injustice is taking place. In the 1959 elections the district of Albert had 7,253 electors; the districts of Alexandra, Angas, Barossa, Burra, Chaffey, Eyre and Flinders varied between 6,000 and 7,000; Frome, Gouger, Gumeracha, Light, and Millicent varied between 5,800 and 6,600; Mount Gambier had 8,388; Murray, 7,438; Onkaparinga, 6,743; Ridley, Rocky River, Stirling, Stuart, Victoria, and Whyalla varied between 6,000 and 7,000 odd; and Yorke Peninsula had 6,671. The district of Gawler, for very definite political reasons, had 13,183 electors in 1959.

Mr. Dunstan—And it has about 20,000 now.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, yet nothing is done about it. Why? Simply to deny justice to the people who think along the same lines as the Labor Party—the reform Party. Nothing is done about Gawler for political reasons. I am not saying that country members do not do a good job; a certain class of country member does a good job, and a certain class does not. The latter class opposes any development in his area, for political reasons, a fact which is proved conclusively in figures given to this House recently. I refer to the figures regarding houses completed during 1959-60. Of the total of 962 houses completed in the country 696 were in areas which have non-Government representation. Of the total of 631 houses under construction at June 30, 1960, 530 are in areas which have non-Government representatives. Of the total of 864 houses to be commenced in 1960-61, 626 are in areas represented by non-Government members. This motion does not seek a reduction in the number of country members; all it desires is that the people will have the democratic right to express their views through the members in this Chamber. The present system denies that right. I support the motion and hope it will be carried in its original form.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie)—In expressing my views on the motion I shall not do what the member for Chaffey (Mr. King) did but shall keep closely to the motion. I was at a loss

to know what economics taught at London University had to do with this motion. The member for Chaffey (Mr. King) more or less stonewalled on the whole issue. Naturally, I support the motion as it is the express wish of the majority of people in South Australia that something be done to bring about a more just voting system. We on this side of the House are in a much better position than members opposite to know exactly what the people of South Australia require, because we are supported by the majority of them.

We hear much talk in this House from time to time about the freedoms and privileges enjoyed by the people but under the present voting system it is obvious that these privileges are only for a particular section of the community. A Government should use its power to serve and not dominate the people. The privileges of the few should be transformed into rights available to every citizen. It is much easier for a Government to suppress the rights of a section of the community under a dictatorship than under a democracy, where it has to face the people and can be dismissed by the people.

It has been proved that the Playford Government has won only one election in the past eight, yet it has never been put out of office. This is an astounding state of affairs, and it amazes me that the people of this State have stood for this as long as they have; but the time is fast approaching when the Government will have to listen to the voices of the people, who are becoming alive to the fact that they are not getting a fair deal. Today, there is criticism everywhere of the Government's gerrymandered electoral system.

The trade union movement bitterly opposes the action of the Government in this motion. I have previously stated here that the trade union movement plays a major role in controlling our destiny: Trade unionists all over the State today are being told more so than ever before (and they are realizing it) about the Government's high-handed action in gerrymandering the electoral boundaries to control the powers and rights of the people, and we of the Australian Labor Party believe that the only political framework within which a free society that can flourish is a Parliamentary democracy with full rights for the Opposition and for the people. One reason why we oppose Communism is that it rejects this method, or accepts it only when it suits its own purposes. The reason why the Government is rejecting this motion is that it does not suit its own purposes. We also believe that the State is

made for man, not that man is made for the State. Under the present system the Government exercises great control over its citizens. When the people are denied the Government of their choice, that simply means that their freedom is being controlled and, with the continued growth of our population, the Government will find it much more difficult to maintain this gerrymandered system. In other words, you can fool some of the people some of the time but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. The authority of a Government should be to extend freedom in a real sense. There is no greater extension of personal freedom than to allow the people to elect the Government of their choice.

The present system of voting in this State has been tailor-made to support monopoly-capitalism, the bloodstream of the Liberal Government. Under the system it is permitted to grow rich by exploiting the essential needs of the average working people. The existence of a privilege based on class is a set-up similar to that of the early days when the squatters and mine-owners, and later the manufacturers, held the power and controlled those who made the laws, to suit their own purposes. Under the present set-up in the House, the Government claims that it gives more attention to the country people's needs than would a one vote one value system. It certainly gives them more attention but there is no coverage for rural workers, and members opposite claim fully to represent the country people. They have people working in the country who are not covered even by awards. Some of them work for £1 a week and tucker.

Mr. Nankivell—Whereabouts?

Mr. McKEE—In several places about the country. The honourable member may know some of them. They are people not fully qualified for various jobs, with no other calling, and they finish up working for someone in the country for a mere existence. I know of such cases. I know because I happened to be a trade union organizer and had occasion to call on various places in the country where this was happening. We have taken up cases to recover money for these people.

Mr. Jenkins—In most cases, the employers are paying much above the award rates.

Mr. McKEE—Maybe, but that sort of thing is happening today. However, the existence of a privilege based on class prevents the growth of a really free society—we are all agreed on that. This so-called free voting



system permits Governments to be returned to Parliament by a minority of the electors, the majority having no free choice (which nobody can deny because the majority has not a free choice in this State; that has been proved in the last eight elections). I do not know just how long the people will stand for it. It has me concerned. I do not think it will last much longer. We on this side believe that the people should be allowed to have confidence in themselves and select their own Governments through their properly, democratically elected representatives. I support the motion.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—My contribution to this debate will be brief. I do not propose to cover ground already so adequately and eloquently covered, but one or two points have not yet been canvassed. I will address myself to those. In the first place, I am reminded that it was the late Leader of the Opposition who introduced this motion calling upon the Government to take the necessary steps to bring about a more just system of electing this House. Members who have been here for any length of time will recall that once in every Parliament the late Leader introduced a measure to provide for electoral reform. I can remember the occasion in the Labor Party room when the late Mr. O'Halloran was elected Leader. In acknowledging the vote of confidence of the members who had elected him to that position, he gave this pledge. He said that the fair name of South Australia was blemished by the unjust electoral system under which so many of our citizens were denied the full expression of their will through our Parliamentary system, and that his advocacy would first and foremost be for electoral reform. He believed that to be important. Indeed, the Labor movement has always stood for the highest that we can achieve in giving full expression to the people and in seeing that the will of the people prevails. So it was that the late Leader in the name and on behalf of Labor introduced measures to provide for electoral reform in every Parliament of which he was a member.

Those measures took several forms, and in each instance the Government, unable to justify the system that exists today, has existed since 1938, and has kept the Government in office for all those years, tried to justify its vote against the measures introduced by the late Leader by finding some detail in the proposals that had been submitted as an excuse

for voting against them. Never was the Government successful in justifying the present set-up. It is not even attempting to justify it today but, in all the arguments introduced into this debate, it seeks first of all to draw conclusions reading into the motion inferences that are not there, and then knocking over the Aunt Sallies it has erected. So many tire of putting up alternatives and having the Government throw them out because some detail did not meet with its wishes. Proportional representation was suggested, and some members who had pledged themselves to proportional representation in their electorates voted against it because it was not the brand of proportional representation that they had supported. On this occasion, the Leader has virtually given the Government a blank sheet of paper and said to the Government, "You write out what you consider to be a just system of election." All we are asking for is an expression of the opinion of the members that the Government should introduce a just system of election of members to this place and, instead of the Labor Party proposing a system this time, we have asked the Government itself. We have given it a blank sheet of paper and said, "You draw up your own proposals." That also has not been answered, because there is no answer.

The Premier has sought to give his members an excuse for voting against it by introducing an amendment. I caution members to carefully examine the vote that they have to cast. At any other meeting the Premier's amendment would not be accepted as an amendment because it would be competent to vote for both the motion and the amendment. I support the amendment and the motion. The Premier's amendment is that any reduction in country Parliamentary representation must correspondingly increase the tendency towards centralization of population and industry. I believe that that could be so.

Mr. McKee—We are all of that opinion.

Mr. RICHES—I would be happy to give expression to that opinion, but the Premier will not permit that. The first part of his amendment is that all the words of the motion be struck out and the first vote that will be taken on this matter will be on the striking out the words of the motion. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) made a thoughtful contribution to the debate and indicated that he would support the motion. However, he will have to carefully examine how he votes otherwise he will be tricked into the situation

whereby he will vote against the motion he supported.

Mr. Loveday—Do you think the Premier would put his amendment up as a separate motion?

Mr. RICHES—No, I think he moved it so that the members following him could avoid the responsibility of making a proper decision on the motion. The motion need not and does not necessarily mean a reduction in country members or country representation. When I first came into this House in 1933 there were 46 members in this Chamber as compared with 39 today, and 27 years ago the State's population was only half of what it is today. I think a good case could be made out for an increase in the number of members of this House. All this twaddle about larger districts and smaller country representation is beside the point. Members opposite are anticipating what their own Government would do. It is an obsession with them that any system that would carry a greater element of justice than that obtaining today must necessarily favour the Opposition or impair country representation. We believe that a just system can be devised by independent members.

Mr. Quirke—You are so right!

Mr. RICHES—I mean independent in thought and not members who are unable to make up their minds on political issues. Men who have no personal interests, other than the interests of the State, would be able to determine and advise the Government on what would be a just system for the election of members to this House. I can understand members opposite being content with the present situation, because that has always been the attitude of Liberalism. So long as it suits the Party they are content to let that system remain. I can remember when there was only one Labor representative from South Australia in the Commonwealth Parliament—when Mr. Norman Makin represented Hindmarsh. Every other South Australian district was represented by a member of the Liberal Party. No-one would suggest that that was a fair representation of South Australia's thought, but that situation obtained and while it continued the Liberal Party was happy and did nothing about it although it had a majority in both Houses. I can remember the pendulum swinging and the reverse applying: there was only one Liberal member in the Commonwealth Parliament from South Australia. Labor was not prepared to sit back and say, "This is good for us so we will not do anything about it."

It obviously was not fair. Because just over 50 per cent of the people had voted Labor in all districts but one it did not mean that Labor should have almost 100 per cent of the State's representation in the Commonwealth Parliament and Labor said that the proper thing was for Parliament to represent the people in accordance with the vote they had cast. If 60 per cent of the people had voted Labor then 60 per cent of the Parliament should be Labor. Labor introduced a measure to bring that about. Labor has been in the forefront of genuine electoral reform as distinct from gerrymandering the districts.

It has been the practice of our opponents over the years that if a system suits them they will retain it. We have not asked the House to adopt Labor's policy. We have given the Premier a blank piece of paper and asked him to appoint an independent tribunal if he so desires. We have asked the Government to take the responsibility of devising a just system of electing members to this House. Surely there can be no argument against that? The Premier's amendment has no relation to the original motion, but under our peculiar Standing Orders it cannot be ruled out of order as being a separate motion. It could well be the subject of a separate motion and members will have to watch carefully how they vote lest they fall into the Premier's trap and be tricked into voting against their own convictions. If it is possible I propose to support both the amendment and the motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood).—I support the motion and, like the member for Stuart, cannot see how Government members can oppose it. No argument has been addressed to this House from members opposite against the motion. A number of strange statements have been made by them and I propose shortly (because most of them have been dealt with so far as they deserve to be dealt with) to advert to some of them. It sickens anybody who believes in justice for the people of South Australia to see members opposite rise with cynical smiles on their faces and address statements to this House which they know have no bearing upon the matter under discussion and no bearing and relation to the matter of justice, but which are simply advanced by them in cynical contempt for the rights of the people of this community and in cynical demands for the maintenance to them of the rights of office against the wishes of the majority of our people. The motion states:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should take steps to readjust the

House of Assembly electoral zones and the boundaries of electorates to provide a more just system for electing the House.

Certain members opposite arose with all the air of professors of semantics and addressed lectures to the House on how absurd it was to propose motions in the language the late Leader had used because the English language simply did not postulate the idea of having a comparative sense of justice; that is to say, they said something could be "just" or "unjust" but could not be "more just"; something could be "true" or "untrue" but not "more true"; something could be "equal" or "unequal" but not "more equal". Their argument was as crassly ignorant in its conception as it was factitious in its production. Let me turn for a moment to some authorities on the English language (and I hope that members opposite will admit that the authorities I quote have some standing). It was Alexander Pope in his *Odyssey* who said, "Some juster prince perhaps had entertained." It was Tindal in his *History of the British Race* who said, "Another person has a juster title than she to the Crown." It was Oliver Goldsmith who said, "A single glance of a good plate or picture imprints a juster idea than a volume could convey." I could give many more examples of that type from English literature. If members opposite are interested they can read Murray. Authorities on the English language would deride their statements as being those that even school children would not be expected, in fairly ignorant stages of their development, to address to an audience. They used that argument simply as an excuse for saying they could not vote for the motion because it was not in pure English and lacked satisfactory logic. I think I have disposed of that argument.

Let me turn for a moment to the second matter raised by members opposite as a reason for opposing the motion. They said, "Members of the Labor Party believe in an alteration of the electoral system in that they believe in having one House of Parliament with 56 members elected on the basis of one vote one value, and that, therefore, means there is going to be some reduction in country members in this House." It does not mean that, but that is what they said. They said, "Therefore, we must vote against this motion." What nonsense! Nowhere in the motion is there contained any such policy as that of the Labor Party to which they have adverted. The motion gives the Government a blank cheque to write a new system of electoral boundaries

to give greater justice to the people of South Australia than they at present have and nobody could suggest, for a moment, that the present system of electing this House gives anything like equality to the people where year after year, election after election, most people vote to turn out the dictatorship which we have in South Australia, but which remains in office. This afternoon I heard the member for Chaffey say, "Country people, since they have a majority in this House (though they are the minority of the people in this State) have done well by the city people." Certain country members do their duty by the city people. There is no doubt about that, and I would not deride them, but certain other country members—certainly those who support this Government—do not. To say that the people in the city areas have had a fair deal from this Government is to show the most complete ignorance of their conditions or contempt for their privations on the part of those who make such statements.

I have the most closely settled district in the whole of this State: there are more poor and old people in my district than in most other districts. The misery to which some of these people are reduced by the policies of this Government is appalling. Ask a few of them how they like this Government and the treatment it has meted out to them! Just ask them what they are faced with when they need public assistance! Just go around to some of the poor families living in the slums of Norwood and see the conditions under which they and their children are forced to live! When these people go to ask the Public Relief Department for assistance when they have nothing to eat, they are told that, according to the policy of this Government, they are not entitled to anything, and they do not get anything. They sometimes go to their member or to the Salvation Army for assistance, and occasionally get a hand-out to keep body and soul together. If their electricity or gas supply is cut off they get no assistance from the Government, which spends less than any State of the Commonwealth on the care of children and the aged, less on hospitals and charities, which has the worst education system in the Commonwealth and which spends less on each child and less per capita than any State other than Queensland. These are the people who demand something from the Government of this State and who vote for it, but whose votes were denied by members opposite.

I am not the only member who has such people in his electorate. People of this kind live in the districts of Torrens and Unley. These people have voted to get something for themselves, but this Government has denied them. The members for those districts are forced to go to their constituents and say, "You know, that is all right. You want those things, but we say there is no reason why you should have an equal say in this House with other people who live in the city. We say that you deserve only one-fourth in the say of this State compared with anyone living at Norton Summit." They are really saying to their own constituents, "You are fourth-class citizens, and that is how we are going to keep you."

Let me turn again to what this motion is doing. It gives the Government a blank cheque to introduce a more just system of electoral boundaries. Even on the Government's own admission, and even on the speech made by the Premier on the occasion of the last redistribution, obvious inequalities under this electoral system have been cited, but the Premier refuses to do anything about them. According to this electoral system there should be a quota for Gawler of 6,500 people, yet why is it that it has 20,000 people? Why doesn't the Premier do anything about it or have a redistribution? He will not, because he knows that if there is a redistribution some people in Gawler (who vote overwhelmingly for Labor) will go into a neighbouring electorate and he will lose either the member for Gouger or the member for Barossa.

Mr. Lawn—What a loss!

Mr. DUNSTAN—I shall not comment further on that. Of course, when they advanced those arguments members opposite were not concerned with the contents of the motion. They simply wanted to find some means of talking against the motion, whether their remarks were relevant or not. Then some country members did a bit of arithmetic and said, "Nevertheless, the Labor Party's policy means that if this were put into effect there would be a reduction in the number of country members in this House—the number of members representing country areas." It would not. The Labor Party's electoral policy was specifically designed to see that there would not be a reduction in the present number of country members in this House. It was calculated mathematically and with great care. Admittedly, on any redivision we would suggest that the present completely artificial boundaries of the metropolitan area be not

maintained, and that there should be the same sort of thing as exists in Commonwealth electorates. Several Commonwealth members represent partly country and partly city areas. There is not the slightest reason why the member for Gumeracha could not take in part of Magill, why the member for Barossa could not take in a little of Klemzig, or why the member for Alexandra should not take in some of Glenelg. The latter will get some metropolitan development at Noarlunga and Christies Beach as it is.

Why is it that these completely artificial boundaries exist to give the absurd arithmetical result alleged by members opposite? The reason is that political advantage makes them draw this artificial line, without any basis of reason whatever. The Labor Party believes it is wise to maintain the present number of country members. We do not want country members to have a harder task covering their areas than they have now. Of course, some of them do not have a hard time now; when referring to this matter members opposite always refer to the extremes, such as Frome. They do not refer to small districts close to the metropolitan area in which the members do not have too hard a time representing their districts, as they can get around with reasonable expedition. These members do not have anything like the calls on their time or the variety of requests from constituents as in a busy metropolitan constituency, where electors are on a member's doorstep at all times and he is extremely lucky to get an evening meal, even if he is home.

Let me turn to the principles behind this motion. This fight originally came at the time of the Levellers in the British civil war, but it has gone on year after year in the development of British Parliamentary institutions. I have cited some historical examples in this House before, but now turn to another motion that was similar to the present motion. In 1776 John Wilkes moved a motion before the House of Commons for a more equal representation in that House. Apparently, according to members opposite, Mr. Wilkes did not know anything about English either. He said:—

According to the first formation of this excellent Constitution, so long and so justly our greatest boast and best inheritance, we find that the people thus took care no laws should be enacted, no taxes levied, but by their consent, expressed by their representatives in the great council of the nation. The mode of representation in ancient times being tolerably adequate and proportionate, the sense of the people was known by that of parliament, their share of

power in the legislature being preserved, and founded in equal justice. At present it is become insufficient, partial, and unjust.

Later, he said:—

I wish, Sir, an English parliament to speak the free, unbiased sense of the body of the English people, and of every man among us, of each individual, who may justly be supposed to be comprehended in a fair majority. The meanest mechanic, the poorest peasant and day-labourer, has important rights respecting his personal liberty, that of his wife and children, his property, however inconsiderable, his wages, his earnings, the very price and value of each day's hard labour, which are in many trades and manufactures regulated by the power of parliament. Every law relative to marriage, to the protection of a wife, sister, or daughter, against violence and brutal lust, to every contract or agreement with a rapacious or unjust master, is of importance to the manufacturer, the cottager, the servant, as well as to the rich subjects of the state. Some share, therefore, in the power of making those laws, which deeply interest them, and to which they are expected to pay obedience, should be reserved even to this inferior, but most useful, set of men in the community. We ought always to remember this important truth, acknowledged by every free state, that all government is instituted for the good of the mass of the people to be governed; that they are the original fountain of power, and even of revenue, and in all events the last resource.

He then moved that leave be given to bring in a Bill for a just and equal representation of the people of England in Parliament. It is reported that Lord North was very jocular. There was reform as the fight went on year after year, and eventually the principle of one vote one value was written into the Representation of the People Bill in the Parliament of Great Britain. Although the Premier of this State has year after year said that there was no such principle that he could discover in any electoral system, the greatest masters of the English Parliament have supported that system, as indicated in that Bill.

Let me now come closer to home. Not only in England was this done, nor only by Labor Governments: not so long ago in Victoria a section of the Liberal Party, which was as vocal as were certain members of the Liberal Party here some time ago, took stock of their consciences publicly, whereas Liberal Party members in South Australia who advanced objections to the present electoral system fell strangely silent, although invited so often to comment on what they believed to be correct. In 1953, in the Victorian Parliament, Mr. Hollway said:—

My regret is that this measure has been introduced by a Labor Party Government, whereas it could have been brought forward by a Government representative of the official

Liberal and Country Party, which previously had the opportunity to do so. In my opinion, this Bill is the best piece of democratic legislation that I have seen in my 20 years of Parliamentary life. Victoria has frequently led the way in democratic reform.

In the old days members of Parliament were elected publicly. Voters had to show for whom they intended to vote. . . . I am not a supporter of any undemocratic method of electing members of Parliament, and I disagree with the South Australian system as I also disagree with the Queensland system. I consider that both systems are wrong. In discussing this question, the fundamental point is: Whom do we represent? The answer is that we represent the people; we represent their problems, their ambitions and their aspirations. We represent humanity. We do not represent vested interests and we do not represent acres or square miles. I reiterate that we represent people. I have no quarrel with members of the Country Party, who on this occasion have adopted, as they did last year, the very practical and possibly the somewhat cynical viewpoint that they have an electoral advantage which they are reluctant to give up. I can understand that point of view; it is perfectly clear to me, and I have no doubt that it is as easily understood by any other person. My quarrel has always been with the members of the Liberal and Country Party who, I believe, fumbled the opportunity of introducing this splendid piece of legislation.

Finally, he said:—

In my opinion the Bill comes down to this very simple question: are we a democracy? Do we represent people? Do we represent humanity or do we represent vested interests of some sort? If we represent people, then the question of square miles or acres does not matter at all. If any person studies the electoral history of this State, it will be seen that from the early fifties the tendency in Victoria has been gradually to introduce to Parliament more and more measures of democracy. I believe that for the first time there will be operating in the future the perfect democratic system, under which all votes will be of approximately equal value.

The speaker was Mr. Hollway, the Leader of the Victorian Liberal Party. At the time when Mr. Hollway had been Leader of the Victorian Liberal Party, one vote one value was in its platform, and he proceeded to try to introduce it. In his own words, he said that he went marching down the street that had been laid out by the Liberal Party's platform, and the Party suddenly turned the corner and went off on some sideline of its own. They tried, for their own cynical advantage, to do what this Party here has done: to maintain the electoral gerrymander which would deny the people of the State a fair electoral system. They were defeated, as eventually the Government of this State will be defeated on this matter.

Let me turn to the subterfuge which has been put before the House by the Premier. The Premier decided he did not wish to have to vote, apparently, or did not want his members to have to vote on a motion that was before the House, so (as members on this side have pointed out) he introduced an amendment which bore no relationship at all to the substance of the motion: he went on to say that that amendment was designed to say that any reduction in country members would be undesirable, and that those words would cut out the contents of the motion. The idea, of course, was to get members on this side, who wished to retain the substance of the motion, to vote against something which they were not opposed to. It was cunningly contrived. I do not intend that this House should be put in the position that it has to do that. I believe that members on this side should have the right to say clearly that they believe there should be a more just electoral system, and that they do not believe that that more just electoral system should mean a reduction in the present number of country members in this House. To that end I move—

To insert after "that" the words "while a reduction in the present numbers of members of this House representing country areas is undesirable".

I support the motion.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—My speech will conclude the debate. The motion provides that the Government should take steps to readjust the House of Assembly electoral zones and the boundaries of electorates to provide a more just system for electing the House. The late Leader gave a very fair explanation of this matter. He was concerned that the people of the State should be given a reasonable opportunity to retain or reject the Government of the day by means of the ballot box. I entirely agree with his comment that the system of having alleged quotas on a two to one basis fails on every count. He went on to say that in 1938 the enrolments for the metropolitan area represented 58 per cent of the total State enrolments, but that in 1959 they represented 63 per cent of the total enrolments. He desired a just system. Prior to 1938, election to the House of Assembly was under what is known as the multiple electorate system, and the general complaint was that people did not very often see certain members in the district and they did not always know who their members

were. Then Parliament introduced the single electorate system that we have today.

The Premier introduced extraneous arguments into the debate. He said that the Northern district had four Legislative Council representatives in addition to the House of Assembly members, and he dealt at length with the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council. That argument is not worth considering. I shall not reiterate what has been said. I oppose the Premier's amendment, and trust that the motion will be carried in the form as amended by the member for Norwood.

The SPEAKER—The member for Norwood has moved an amendment that the motion be amended by inserting after the word "that" the words "while a reduction in the present numbers of members of this House representing country areas is undesirable". I have to rule that that amendment is out of order. According to Erskine May, no amendment can be made in the first part of the question after the latter part has been amended or a question has been proposed from the Chair for such an amendment. There is already a proposal to amend the motion, and as the amendment of the member for Norwood is in the first part of the question it therefore appears to me to be out of order.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am concerned with the amendment moved by the member for Norwood. I do not challenge your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but the member for Norwood seeks to amend the motion, and I submit that he should be entitled to do so. Had it been a Government motion, we on this side of the House would have had to accept your ruling, but is the Opposition not in order in amending its own motion?

The SPEAKER—Unless the mover of the first amendment is prepared to withdraw it, the subsequent amendment is out of order.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The amendment moved by the member for Norwood is an amendment of the motion, and that is what the Opposition is asking for.

The SPEAKER—I am afraid that the Opposition is too late in moving that amendment. The Treasurer has moved an amendment striking out certain words and inserting other words after the word "House". A member cannot move an amendment to the first part of the question after an amendment has been proposed to the latter part of the question as has been done by the Treasurer.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The ruling that you gave, Sir, cited these words from Erskine May:—

No amendment can be made in the first part of a question, after the latter part has been amended, or has been proposed to be amended, if a question has been proposed from the chair upon such amendment.

No question has been proposed from this Chair upon this amendment. Indeed, the paragraph goes on to make it clear, as do our Standing Orders, that amendments are to be taken in the order in which they stand in the motion. There has been no question proposed and, until such time as a question is proposed, an amendment to an earlier part of the motion is not out of order, and the amendments should stand in the order in which they stand in the motion. That is perfectly clear by our own Standing Orders. If I may look at Standing Orders for a moment—

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—On a point of order, am I to understand that we are now debating the ruling that you have given, Sir? If we are debating your ruling, to regularize the position somebody should move that your ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER—The question before the House is on the Notice Paper and has been there for some weeks. The question is “That the words proposed to be left out—stand”. We have reached a stage where under Standing Orders the amendment has been proposed, and the amendment proposed shall not be put to the House until the debate is closed. The question will be put as proposed to the House and as it appears on the Notice Paper as having been proposed. My ruling is that the proposed amendment of the member for Norwood is out of order.

Mr. STOTT—You have just ruled, Sir, that this amendment is out of order by quoting Erskine May. I draw your attention to Standing Order 208, which deals with amendments. There is no need to quote Standing Orders 203 or 204. Standing Order 208 provides:—

Amendments proposed shall not be put to the House until the debate is closed and each amendment shall be then at once put and determined singly in the order in which, if agreed to, it would stand in the amended question. A proposed amendment to words which the House has already resolved shall stand part of the question shall not be put, except it be to add other words thereto. If amendments be made, the main question, as amended, shall be put forthwith.

The SPEAKER—Order! If the honourable member is debating my ruling, I referred to that Standing Order just now and I think the

honourable member is confusing the proposing and the putting of an amendment.

Mr. STOTT—If I may continue—

The SPEAKER—Order! I have given a ruling on the matter. I think the honourable member is debating the ruling. If my ruling is disagreed to, there is another safety valve as far as the House is concerned.

Mr. STOTT—I am not debating it; I am seeking another ruling from you, Sir.

The SPEAKER—I have given my ruling and have referred to Standing Order 208.

Mr. STOTT—But you have not given a ruling on what I am going to raise because you do not know what I am going to raise.

The SPEAKER—I thought the honourable member had sat down.

Mr. STOTT—I do insist on making this point for you to give a further ruling on. The point I raise is: as Standing Order 208 reads, by what procedure can a private member of this House move a further amendment to an amendment already moved?

The SPEAKER—I do not think the question arises; it is hypothetical.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—At this stage I do not desire to dispute your ruling, Sir. As this amendment amends a motion originating from this side, is it not in order?

The SPEAKER—According to my interpretation of Erskine May, as read by me, the proposed amendment of the member for Norwood is out of order.

Mr. LAWN—I desire to ask a question arising from your ruling, Mr. Speaker. It is in accordance with your ruling.

The SPEAKER—On a point of order?

Mr. LAWN—Yes, on a point of order. You earlier said in giving your ruling that the amendment of the member for Norwood could not be put to the House unless the mover of the first amendment withdrew his amendment. I am asking, through you, whether the Premier is prepared to withdraw his amendment.

The SPEAKER—That is out of order. I cannot direct the Treasurer.

Mr. LAWN—No, but you said if he would withdraw his amendment. I am asking him through you.

The SPEAKER—It is not a matter of a point of order.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On a further point of order, the question is not resolved and I disagree with your ruling. I move—

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I second the motion. You, Mr. Speaker, have just ruled that, according to a paragraph in Erskine May that has been

quoted by you and by me to this House, it is not proper for me to move an amendment to the first part of the motion when there is already an amendment before the Chair in the latter part of the motion. With very great respect, the rules and proceedings of the House of Commons may be imported into this House only where they are inconsistent with the proceedings of this House and the provisions of its Standing Orders.

Mr. Jennings—Where they do not conflict with our Standing Orders.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, but here our Standing Orders are clear and make application of the provisions of Erskine May impossible.

Mr. Jennings—And irrelevant.

Mr. DUNSTAN—And irrelevant. True, in a Committee of the Whole House, when this House is sitting as a Committee on Bills, our provisions specifically advert to that provision. I refer to Standing Order 422, but that is inconsistent with the provisions of Standing Order 208, which says specifically:—

Amendments proposed shall not be put to the House until the debate is closed and each amendment shall be then at once put and determined singly in the order in which, if agreed to, it would stand in the amended Question.

The position is not that amendments have to be moved after an amendment has been made to the motion. Members may, under Standing Order 208, move any number of amendments to a motion before the House at the conclusion of the debate, but they are to be put in the order in which they stand in the motion. That has been the rule of this House, I am advised by honourable members who have been here for many years. It has been the practice of this House for many years to allow a series of amendments to various parts of a motion and, at the end of the debate, to vote on them in the order in which they stand in the motion. If they are to be voted on not in the order of their being moved but in the order in which they stand in the motion, then I must be allowed to move this amendment because otherwise these words in Standing Order 208 are meaningless.

There is no point in saying that they must be put in the order in which they stand in the motion if one cannot move an amendment to an earlier part of the motion, so that one's amendment is in the earlier part of the motion rather than the latter part of the motion. Otherwise, the provision would be that the amendments shall be put "in the

order in which they are moved", not "in the order in which they stand in the motion". It would be impossible. It is completely contrary to the provision in Erskine May that you, Sir, have read out. In these circumstances, the rules and proceedings of the House of Commons do not apply in this House. What apply are our own Standing Orders, which maintain the right of every member of this House to move amendments to motions before the whole House, while the House is sitting as a House and not in Committee; those amendments shall then be put at the end of the debate in the order in which they stand in the motion.

If that is denied to members of this House, it will be impossible for them in this case to vote on the questions really before the House; members may be prevented by any such proposal as outlined from voting on a matter of merit before the House. The Standing Order has carefully provided for that, that every issue before the House can be voted on in turn, so that members' voices may be heard. Therefore, with very great respect and with due deference to your position, Sir, I must support the motion that your ruling be disagreed to.

Mr. SHANNON—It is obvious that the honourable member supporting the motion that your ruling be disagreed to, Sir, made a hasty judgment himself, first of all in questioning Erskine May, as he did when he spoke.

Mr. Dunstan—I did not question May: I questioned the validity of the ruling.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member has forgotten what he said, but I have not; I remember clearly what he said. He questioned your interpretation, Sir, of May.

Mr. Dunstan—That's all right.

Mr. SHANNON—It is all right for me, too. The honourable member had obviously omitted to read his Notice Paper and observe that there was a question printed here. It has been printed for some weeks, standing on our Notice Paper ready to be put as soon as this debate had concluded. The honourable member obviously overlooked that. His legal technicalities led him into a trap. Regarding your ruling, Sir, it is obvious that, if May is right—and as a rule this House agrees that he is a very good authority to follow in these matters—then all that the Opposition has done is to outsmart itself by coming in too late in the day with another subterfuge (if I may use a term that has been used by members opposite).



Mr. RICHES—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHANNON—I am explaining where I think your ruling, Mr. Speaker—

*Members interjecting.*

Mr. RICHES—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member's remarks have nothing to do with your ruling and are out of order.

The SPEAKER—I understand that the honourable member is referring to certain statements of the honourable member for Norwood, and I ask him to continue.

Mr. SHANNON—I only seek to clarify the position. Obviously, to anyone with a practical knowledge of the working of this Chamber the Opposition had the opportunity to frame this motion in a manner acceptable to it. Members opposite have had weeks in which to amend the wording if they thought the debate was getting off the rails. However, they have left it to the last minute. I think your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is best interpreted by May and to question it is to question the highest authority that we have to guide us in the conduct of this Chamber.

Mr. RICHES—I support the motion. The practice of this House in past years would be contrary to your present ruling, Mr. Speaker. I have tried to look up the debate that took place some years ago when a motion that was submitted to this House finally contained only the words "We believe that", because of the numerous amendments to it. There were at least half a dozen amendments to that motion at once. I am certain that that could not have happened if the House had adopted a practice in accordance with your present ruling. I ask members to disagree with your ruling because the practices of the House of Assembly, when they are not specifically covered by Standing Orders, take precedence over May.

The member for Onkaparinga said that avenues had been open to the Opposition, but in a motion of this nature a member cannot move anything until he gets a call from the Chair, and I submit that if your ruling is upheld members will be precluded from submitting amendments in their own right. It would be competent for a member early in a debate to give notice, as the Premier did on this occasion, of an amendment which would have the effect of precluding any other member from submitting any other amendment. I think your ruling is untenable and definitely unacceptable to the House.

Mr. LAWN—Mr. Speaker, I well remember on another occasion your ruling that where our Standing Orders are silent the practices of the House of Commons must be applied. On that occasion you said that the House of Commons would not permit matters that were *sub judice* to be discussed. You commenced your ruling then by saying, "Where our Standing Orders are silent". It is obvious to every member now that Standing Order No. 208 is not silent. The House should be consistent. Where our Standing Orders are silent we apply the procedure of the House of Commons, but where our Standing Orders are not silent we have your previous ruling. It is clear that the amendments to this motion must be put in order, and I ask members to disagree with your ruling.

Mr. STOTT—I must confess that I am confused as to how to vote on this motion. I believe in preserving the rights of private members. I have always been under the impression that the rules of debate provide that if an amendment has been moved no further amendment can be spoken to until the first amendment has been disposed of. The member for Stuart referred to a resolution some years ago that, because of numerous amendments, contained the one word, "That". If I remember correctly, on that occasion the amendments were considered individually as they came. I am concerned lest your present ruling, Mr. Speaker, create a dangerous precedent, because it will not preserve the rights of private members who seek to amend a motion.

Many bodies have constitutions containing a provision that the rules of Parliament shall prevail at meetings. What will be the effect of your ruling if it is upheld? A man may move to amend a controversial motion and after the debate on it, and its disallowance, someone may give notice of another amendment, but your ruling would preclude its consideration if it related to an earlier part of the motion. I am seeking a way out of the present impasse. I am anxious to preserve the rights of members, not because this ruling affects the member for Norwood or because I approve of his amendment. Once a member is elected to represent his constituents he should have the right to be heard, and we must preserve that right. If your ruling stands, Sir, I believe that only one amendment can be moved if it deals with a later part of a motion. If your ruling is upheld Mr. Dunstan's amendment will be out of order and if the Premier's amendment is defeated members will be precluded from

moving further amendments. No member would have the right to amend the original motion. Erskine May states:—

No amendment can be made in the first part of a question, after the latter part has been amended, or has been proposed to be amended, if a question has been proposed from the Chair upon such amendment; but if an amendment to a question be withdrawn, by leave of the House, the fact of that amendment having been proposed will not preclude the proposal of another amendment, affecting an earlier part of the question.

I take it that your ruling, Mr. Speaker, would preclude the proposal of a further amendment.

Mr. Shannon—That's not right.

Mr STOTT—The honourable member can put me right if I am wrong. I am prepared to listen to other members. Your ruling, Sir, is that no amendment can be made to an earlier part of the motion. That would preclude further amendments and would create the most dangerous precedent I have known of in my 28 years in Parliament. I believe in preserving the undeniable rights of private members to be heard.

Mr. Dunstan—Erskine May only applies where we have no rule, but we have a rule here.

Mr. STOTT—I want the position clarified. If your ruling is accepted, Sir, will it preclude the House from considering any further amendments? That is a dangerous situation. Unless it is clarified, to preserve the rights of private members I shall have to support the motion, not because it is moved by the Leader but because it is the only way to safeguard the rights of a member after being elected by the people.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I ask the House to support the Speaker's ruling. I have been here probably as long as any member of the House and I point out that the ruling of the Speaker enables private members to have considered matters they want placed before the House. That is the opposite of the conclusion of the member for Ridley. If, at a late stage of a debate, after everyone has spoken and without any forecast of a new matter coming into a debate, we accept what is proposed here today, we can completely forget consideration of an amendment moved early in the debate. That is the position that Erskine May and Standing Orders seek to protect.

I could cite hundreds of cases where a member has moved an amendment in Committee and another member has come in with a new idea that he wants to be considered.

What does he do? He gets up and says that he would like to move an amendment, but he cannot do so until, by leave of the House, the previous amendment has been withdrawn. That is the position that is sought to be protected here. No leave of the House was asked regarding this, and no consultation was sought. As a matter of courtesy I have never refused to withdraw an amendment if I have had notice from a member that he has desired to have something properly considered. However, in this case there has been gross discourtesy to this House. If the honourable member wanted to move an amendment the proper time to do that was fairly early in the debate, when he should have said what he wanted to do and asked if I would temporarily withdraw my amendment so that his amendment could be considered.

Mr. Riches—Would that mean that the last or next to last speaker would be unable to move an amendment?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It would not mean that at all because, even if a member were not speaking, he could extend to the House and the mover of the amendment the courtesy of saying that he wanted to move an amendment and ask that the other amendment be withdrawn. This is not, as was claimed by another speaker, part of the original idea: the original idea reduced country representation by five people.

Mr. LOVEDAY—A point is now being made that has nothing to do with the points of order or the motion we are discussing. What is more, it is not correct with regard to the original motion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am just as jealous as any member to see that the proper forms of Parliament are observed. I believe that when a ruling is given every member should examine it, as it could have a bearing on the future conduct of the House. However, I have studied the references and have concluded that they support the Speaker's ruling entirely. I have taken advantage of such legal advice as has been available to me and have found that it supports the Speaker's ruling. The consequences of any other thing would ultimately be not to deal with the matters before us but for the matter to be changed at any time by the last speaker without any opportunity for members to debate the issue raised. In fact, the honourable member's amendment is not abhorrent to me; I have always said that there should be no reduction in country membership. I am glad that the

by-election in Frome has awakened the honourable member to that necessity. I am pleased that this is the position, but I believe the Speaker's ruling is correct and I ask the House to support it.

Mr. QUIRKE—It has always been my attitude that I should support the Speaker's ruling and without exception in these cases there has been no doubt that the ruling was right, but I have some serious doubts this time. Our Standing Orders provide:—

Amendments proposed shall not be put to the House until the debate is closed and each amendment shall be then at once put and determined singly in the order in which, if agreed to, it would stand in the amended question.

If Erskine May can overcome what is provided in our Standing Orders, we should take his interpretation and leave out that Standing Order. This has arisen because of an amendment moved by the Premier, and I applaud his political canniness in doing that.

Mr. Jennings—He was trying to be smart.

Mr. QUIRKE—No, he is a member of one Party in opposition to another. One Party put up an amendment with a proposition that had nothing to do with reducing country members and the Premier, as a member of the opposing Party, this time was the Opposition. He had a perfect right to move the amendment. It was a cunning thrust, as it was designed to leave me out on a limb. I would never be left out on a limb, however, as I know what I shall do. However, it is no use arguing about the courtesy due to this House, to the Government or anyone else. The Opposition did not have any prior knowledge of the Premier's amendment. When he moved it his intention was clearly to destroy the purpose of the original proposal, and he was entitled to do that. It was his counter-thrust, and he was fully entitled to do it.

The Standing Orders that I have just read out clearly indicate that this can be done. If we are going to use Erskine May to upset the clear-cut wording and direction of our Standing Orders, I suggest that we scrap them and follow Erskine May. I have been in this House when there have been many disagreements with the Speaker's ruling, and I have not supported such disagreements; however, with the greatest sorrow I shall have to be on the side of those disagreeing with the ruling. I do not do this lightly but, when I have decided that a thing is right, I feel that I should support what I think is right. I think it is clear-cut that the Opposition,

under our Standing Orders, has the right to move this amendment. After all, this is only a counter-thrust to a shrewd thrust made in opposition to the motion. I can see nothing wrong with the proposal of the Opposition in making this counter-thrust to the Premier's thrust.

The House divided on the motion:—

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Quirke, Riches, Ryan, Stott, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall, Harding and Heaslip, Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. Jenkins, King, Laucke, Nankivell, Pattinson and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Steele.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Ralston and Tapping. Noes—Messrs. Millhouse and Nicholson.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Mr. Speaker, would it be possible for me to withdraw my amendment at this stage to allow the member for Norwood's amendment to be put first, still reserving to me the right to put my amendment later? I think that would be desirable.

The SPEAKER—I do not think the Treasurer is in order, as the debate on this matter has been completed.

Mr. STOTT—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what is the vote before the House? Do I understand that the Premier's amendment is now withdrawn?

The SPEAKER—The position is that the motion on the Notice Paper is the motion of the late Leader of the Opposition. An amendment has been moved in respect thereof, and the question that must be put by the Chair relates to the words to be left out. The Treasurer has moved to amend the motion by leaving out all the words after the word "House" first occurring, and inserting other words.

The House divided on the Treasurer's amendment:—

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Dunnage, Hall, Harding, and Heaslip, Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. Jenkins, King, Laucke, Nankivell, Pattinson, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Mr. Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Quirke, Riches, Ryan, Stott, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Millhouse and Nicholson. Noes—Messrs. Ralston and Tapping.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

THE SPEAKER—The question is that the motion as amended be agreed to.

Mr. STOTT—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would I be in order in moving an amendment to the motion now?

The SPEAKER—No, the honourable member would be out of order.

Mr. STOTT—I asked merely so that it could be recorded in *Hansard*.

Motion as amended carried.

#### HAWKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Hawkets Act, 1934-1948. Read a first time.

#### MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and

introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health Act, 1935-1959. Read a first time.

#### POLICE PENSIONS 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 Police Pensions Act, 1954-1959.

Motion carried.

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

#### WATER FRONTAGES REPEAL BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal certain Acts relating to the water frontages at Port Adelaide. Read a first time.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 6.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 20, at 2 p.m.