

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, April 17, 1962.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from April 12, Page 17.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): When the result of the recent election became known, it was obvious that an early session of Parliament would be necessary so that certain matters could be determined. I announced that as soon as possible Parliament would be called together to enable it to decide one or two vital matters, that in the meantime the Government would act as a caretaker Government, and that it would not undertake any direct responsibility for future policy which might be considered to be not in accord with that which an alternative Government might desire to make. I believe that that was the proper constitutional course to take. Incidentally, it was not approved by many Communist ships visiting Australia. I was surprised at the number of visiting ships of Communist origin that had an interest in constitutional issues in this State. Incidentally, my action was not approved by certain members opposite. The fact still remains that it was a proper method of dealing with this matter, and it was the only constitutional procedure that could be set down.

I make this statement to explain to members why the Government so readily, last Thursday, agreed to the motion of the Leader of the Opposition that Standing Orders be suspended to enable him to move a motion without notice. The reason was the Leader had informed me that he desired to move a no-confidence motion. That statement was made in front of witnesses and it was why I so willingly and without hesitation gave the Leader the opportunity to move his motion without any suggestion of restriction. That action accords with what the Government has done over a period of years. As the Leader of the Opposition, when he introduced the Bill, did not pronounce this to be a vote of no confidence, may I say at the outset that it is to be a vote of confidence. I make that clear because the purpose of this session was to decide whether the Government had control over the House and over matters coming before it, or whether the Opposition had control over such matters.

The only one way to determine that issue is by enabling the House to decide freely.

An argument was advanced that, because honourable members opposite had 19 members elected and the Government had 18, the Government should resign forthwith, but such action would have given two districts no say as to whom should constitute the Government. Those two districts, in fact, represent the balance of power. If that is a democratic way of dealing with matters in this House I have never heard of it.

The only constitutional way of dealing with a question of confidence is on the floor of the House. If honourable members who may have said they were going to support or not going to support the Government think the Opposition, as constituted, can give this State a better form of government than it has at present then it is their duty to vote us out.

Mr. Lawn: The electors voted you out on March 3 but you won't go out.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member would stop to think more and talk less he would be much more effective. The Government considers this vote to be a vote of confidence.

Mr. Jennings: Are you supporting the Bill?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. I will soon tell honourable members what I think of the Bill. I am only telling members what I think of the way in which the Bill was introduced.

Mr. Fred Walsh: It was no worse than your approach to the Independents.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At the moment I am speaking about how the Bill was introduced: it was introduced by a subterfuge. If the Leader of the Opposition had come to me and asked me to suspend Standing Orders to enable him to introduce the Bill I would have given him the Standing Orders permission because, as I said before, if the Government does not have the confidence of this House then it is time the Government vacated the benches. However, if the Government has the confidence of the House, then it can go ahead.

This becomes not only a vital matter, but a very urgent matter because I can tell honourable members, including honourable members opposite, that many vital decisions, some affecting honourable members' districts, have been delayed since the election. I am not trying to restrict the debate, but I suggest that honourable members remember that this is a vital vote and if the debate is prolonged I shall not be

responsible for some difficulties that may consequently arise.

Mr. Clark: That is only a bluff, isn't it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member can accept it as a bluff if he likes. That is his right. Today many important matters have been held up in accordance with the promise I gave publicly that the Government would act as a caretaker Government. On one or two minor matters that had to be dealt with urgently, I consulted the Leader of the Opposition, who concurred in what was proposed.

The second thing is that the Leader of the Opposition, while he did not say that this was a motion of no-confidence, unless my ears deceived me spoke at length and used the word "mandate"—on three occasions, I think. Anyway, he used it certainly once. He claimed that he had a mandate from the people to introduce this legislation and have it accepted, whereas he has no such mandate. On a number of occasions he is reported to have said in the country—and he did not contradict the reports so I presume they are factual; they were certainly printed in the press—that he would not lessen the representation of the country, whereas this Bill does lessen the representation of the country, as I will show honourable members. Incidentally, it does many funny things, some of which the Leader of the Opposition himself does not expect.

If I may make a suggestion, in passing, in connection with this matter, I suggest that the honourable Leader of the Opposition continue to get his political advice from his present advisers but that he go to the Parliamentary Draftsman when he wants Bills prepared. I think that, if he could do that, it would be an improvement on the present innovation. But, at present, the country representation, whether it is right or wrong (I am not arguing that point at the moment), is 66 per cent of this House. Does anybody challenge that arithmetic? When the honourable member's Bill becomes law (if it ever does) the country representation in this House will be 45 per cent.

Mr. Clark: Percentages don't mean anything.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not arguing for one moment whether it should be 66 per cent or 45 per cent. I repeat that the honourable Leader went around the country saying that he would not reduce the country representation whereas his Bill reduces the country representation from a majority to a minority. That is the position.

Mr. Clark: And that is how the Government is governing at present.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There are several other things associated with this Bill for which the honourable Leader cannot claim any mandate, because they were simply not mentioned at any time during the election campaign in his policy speech, or in any report made in connection with them. Many miscellaneous provisions are included in the Bill, and some are far-reaching. Did the Leader of the Opposition say that this Parliament in the future would be made subservient to an electoral commission? I do not remember his saying that the sovereign powers of the Parliament would be made subservient to an electoral commission. If he did say it he did not emphasize it, nor did the average voter know about it. Did he say that he intended to change the deadlock provisions and take from the people the right to vote in connection with them? The present deadlock provisions apply when a Bill from the House of Assembly is rejected by the Legislative Council, the House of Assembly is dissolved, with an election following, and that same matter is resubmitted to the Legislative Council after an absolute majority has been obtained in the House of Assembly, and is again rejected by the Legislative Council. The Leader does not propose that. Under his proposal there will be no intervening election.

Mr. Shannon: The people are not to be consulted.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The people will not be consulted because there will be no election on the issue. The Leader will get away from that. I am certain that I do not yet understand all the ramifications of the Bill. I want to discuss a number of them, but I do not want to take up too much time in doing so because members opposite are anxious for a vote on the Bill, and then to come over here and assume the office of government. They are anxious to get a vote as quickly as possible, so I shall not take up too much time. Later I shall give my own comments on the measure, but now I want to read a report from the Parliamentary Draftsman on it. I asked him to give me the report because I had to go to Canberra yesterday. He states:

I report on the Bill introduced by the Leader of the Opposition on Thursday last as follows: The provisions of the Bill, which amends the Constitution, may be summarized under three headings, namely: (1) increase in the number of members of the House of

Assembly and an alteration of electoral districts; (2) extension of the franchise for the Legislative Council to all electors enrolled for the House of Assembly; (3) complete alteration in the law governing the resolution of deadlocks between Houses. I will deal with these three matters in order. The first set of provisions is contained in clauses 3, 4, 7, 10, 11 and 13 of the Bill, which will have the effect of increasing the number of members of the House of Assembly from 39 to 56 (clauses 10 and 11a), and of removing the present fixed provisions concerning the five Council districts and 39 Assembly districts and substituting Council and Assembly districts to be gazetted from time to time on the reports and recommendations of a standing electoral commission to be appointed in accordance with the new Part V of the Act. (Clauses 3, 7, 11 (b) and 13.)

The proposed Electoral Commission is to consist of three electoral commissioners, namely, a Supreme Court judge, the Surveyor-General and the Chief Electoral Officer, who are required to inquire into the division of the State into 56 districts and five Council districts, publishing their proposals, considering any objections raised, and presenting reports to the Governor. The proposed new section 81 requires the commission to forward the first report within eight months of the passing of the Bill, making further inquiries and recommendations whenever the House of Assembly so resolves or the Chief Electoral Officer reports that the number of electors in at least five Assembly districts is more than 20 per cent above or below the electoral quota. Recommendations from the commissioners are to be immediately published in the *Gazette* and have the force of law as if enacted by Parliament. Clause 4 of the Bill provides that alterations to electoral districts are to apply only to elections held after the first dissolution or expiration of the House after the Bill is passed.

The important provisions are set out in sections 78 and 79, which lay down the principles of division of the State into electoral districts. Firstly, the number of enrolled Assembly electors is to be divided by 56 to obtain what is known as the electoral quota, and the commissioners must proceed according to the following rules:

Each electoral district must contain a number of electors equal to the electoral quota or within 10 per cent thereof;

Each electoral division or district is to be of convenient shape and have reasonable access between main population centres; and

At least 26 electoral districts must include country areas.

These provisions, I was informed by the Leader, were designed to give effect to the principle of one vote one value. This is the sacred principle that is proposed to be observed in this Bill. I notice members opposite are not objecting to that statement.

Mr. Clark: Why should we?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think members opposite accept that. However,

I point out that either the Bill breaks the assurance the Leader gave to the country electors at the last election or it does not conform to the principle of one vote one value, as I will show in a few moments. This principle is one about which I frequently hear Opposition members speak, but they certainly do not practise it. For instance, when the member for Norwood attends meetings of the interstate executive of his Party with his other friend he represents a State which has a population of only one-third or possibly only one-quarter of New South Wales, which has equal representation. I do not think the member for Norwood is particularly silent because he represents only a small population on those occasions. I got out some figures in regard to this supposed theory of one vote one value. Let me see how it works out in the other Australian Parliaments, because we so frequently hear the member for Adelaide talk of a gerrymander. I hope that he will take it one of these days to the Labor convention where, I am responsibly told, you find that three people can influence the complete vote of the conference. Let us talk about this one vote one value, because we hear a lot about it and let us consider the position in the Federal Parliament. In the Senate, the quota for a Senator from New South Wales was 297,123 at the last election; for Victoria it was 225,436; Queensland 119,314; South Australia 67,576; Western Australia 54,696; and Tasmania 26,641. So, it takes more than 10 times as many people in New South Wales to elect a representative to the Senate as it does in Tasmania.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Tell us about the House of Representatives.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is the next thing on my list. In New South Wales the largest electoral district for the House of Representatives is Mitchell, which has 75,410 voters, and the lowest is West Sydney, which, incidentally, seems to be represented by Labor, and has 35,797 voters. The respective position in the other States is as follows: in Victoria, district of Bruce, 87,000, and Scullin 34,000; in Queensland, Petrie 57,000 and Dawson 38,000; in South Australia, Kingston 60,000 and Adelaide 36,000; in Western Australia, Stirling 56,000 and Perth 33,000; in Tasmania, Franklin 39,000 and Wilmot 35,000. From the House of Representative figures for the last election it will be found that the only State where the expansion has been relatively reasonable and consistent was Tasmania. In the New South Wales State Parliament—and

New South Wales has a Labor Government—there are 29,000 electors in Eastwood and 15,000 in Sturt. In Victoria, Mulgrave, the biggest electorate numerically, has 46,000 electors, and Melbourne, strangely enough, only 15,000. In Queensland, the biggest electorate, Toowoomba West, has 14,000 and the smallest, Mulgrave, has 7,000.

Mr. Clark: Compare that with South Australia!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member will wait a moment I shall give him those figures. In South Australia, the biggest electorate numerically is Enfield, with 33,000 electors, and Enfield is well represented, if I may say so.

Mr. Jennings: That is the only sensible thing you have said this afternoon.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: From the Government's point of view we would not want it better represented. Enfield has 33,000 electors; Frome has 5,800. In Western Australia an election was held recently, but when I wrote for figures the counting was not complete in the north-west zone, so the figures for that area will be from the previous election. In Western Australia there are three zones. In the city zone Perth has 11,000 electors and Canning 9,500. In the country zone the largest electorate numerically has 6,000 electors and the lowest 4,000. The figures in the previous election revealed that in the north-west zone Kimberley had 1,384 electors, and the largest electorate, Gascoyne, had 1,774. In Western Australia, under a redistribution requested by the Labor Party, there are 16,000 electors in one district and 1,300 in another. Members know that in Tasmania, under proportional representation, districts are comparatively even numerically, and voting is much the same as for the Senate. The figures, if they are of any interest, show a variation between Franklin with 39,000 and Wilmot with 35,000. Members will see that the only State in the Commonwealth that has anything like one vote one value for the lower House is Tasmania, where there is proportional representation.

Mr. Shannon: That used to be the Labor Party's policy.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It used to be the policy of members opposite. I do not know why they changed it; some of the Senate elections may have caused it, but I am not sure. I shall now return to the Parliamentary Draftsman's report. I merely

wanted to show that the one vote one value that is so frequently mentioned is not an accepted principle throughout the Australian States and, if my information is correct (and I am assured it is), it is not the policy of the Labor Party's internal management. It is certainly not the policy of the Labor Party's federal management, and it is a policy that I do not support because it is a policy of complete and utter centralization. It is a policy that the Leader himself did not support at the election.

Mr. Dunstan: That is untrue.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Parliamentary Draftsman states:

Section 10 of the Constitution Act provides that except in relation to money Bills the Council has equal power with the Assembly in respect of all Bills. Clause 5 makes section 10 provide that the powers of both Houses shall be equal except to money Bills and deadlocks. If the new clause relating to deadlocks is passed (clause 12 of the Bill) the amendments inserted by clause 5 will be necessary in order to make it quite clear that the Council does not have equal powers with the Assembly in relation to public Bills other than money Bills or Bills to extend the duration of Parliament in cases of deadlock.

Clause 6 relates to section 14 of the Constitution Act, which provides for a periodical retirement of Legislative Councillors provided that an election to fill vacancies is to take place along with the next election for the House of Assembly, but this general requirement does not apply in cases after deadlocks, when, of course, the Governor may either dissolve both Houses, or issue writs for the election of extra Councillors. Under Mr. Walsh's Bill the deadlock provisions do not provide for either a double dissolution or the election of new Councillors, but only for the Legislative Council to be bypassed and from a drafting point of view the words "subject to the provisions of this Act as to deadlocks" in section 14 of the Constitution would be meaningless. They are therefore necessarily omitted by clause 6.

Mr. Jennings: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I said, I am setting out an explanation of the Bill; I will tell the honourable member what I think is wrong with it later. The report continues:

Clause 7—section 19 of the Constitution divides the State into five Council districts as set out in the second schedule.

Perhaps members may think I am taking too long in giving an explanation. I doubt whether they are understanding it. Perhaps a simple explanation may be better.

Mr. Fred Walsh: You should get someone else to explain it to you.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a summary here for members which states:

The provisions regarding deadlocks are contained in clauses 5, 6 and 12 of the Bill, the main provision being that of clause 12, which substitutes a completely new section for the present section 41 regarding the settling of deadlocks. The existing provisions may be shortly summarized as follows: A Bill has been passed by the Assembly and rejected by the Council, a general election of the Assembly must take place, the same Bill must then be passed by the Assembly by an absolute majority of the next Parliament, and again rejected by the Council. The Governor may then within six months after the rejection either dissolve both Houses or issue writs for the election of two additional members for each Council district.

The Opposition's Bill repeals all of these provisions and provides for the following steps—passage by the Assembly, transmission to the Council at least one month before the end of the session and rejection by the Council, passage again by the Assembly at its next session (whether the same Parliament or not) provided that a year has elapsed since the second reading on the first occasion, transmission to the Council at least one month before the end of that session and rejection for the second time. After the foregoing, unless the Assembly direct to the contrary, the Bill must be presented to the Governor and, upon receiving the Royal Assent, becomes law.

Mr. Clark: As in the United Kingdom.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As with a hereditary House. Does the honourable member want to promote the status of the Legislative Council to that of the Lords?

Mr. Clark: It is worse.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Does he want to make it a hereditary House? I do not believe in a hereditary House of the type of the House of Lords. If the honourable member wants to follow the House of Lords procedure, I am not with him.

Mr. Clark: It is much more democratic.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Let me calm members opposite. The report continues:

The principal difference between the present and proposed deadlock provisions is that while the present law provides for the settlement of deadlocks by way of an appeal to the electorate either after a double dissolution or by the addition of ten additional Council members, and there must have been an Assembly election between the passage of the Bill the first and second time by the Assembly, Mr. Walsh's Bill provides for no appeal at all to the electorate, but merely for bypassing the Legislative Council provided that a year has elapsed between the second reading of the Bill the first time and passage by the Assembly the second time. In other words, the new provisions mean that the Council can delay but not prevent

passage of a Bill. Additionally, the present law provides for passage by an absolute majority of the Assembly members—and I point this out—

Additionally, the present law provides for passage by an absolute majority of the Assembly members, while the new Bill omits this provision.

Let us see what would happen under these provisions. I assume that if there were an election and the House passed a Bill after the election, submitted it to the Council, and the Council rejected it, it would be comparatively easy for the same House next year to pass the same Bill. It would automatically become law under these provisions. In other words, there would be no earthly reason for the Legislative Council to be maintained at all.

Members interjecting: Hear, hear!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am pleased to hear members opposite agree with me. A recent Gallup poll indicated that a majority of the Australian people did not agree with them. Last year when the Labor Party of New South Wales sought to abolish the Legislative Council the people of New South Wales did not believe in its abolition. The people of Australia know that there is safety in legislation with a House of Review. I have had some legislative experience in this House, and the Legislative Council in this State has never been an obstructive House. The only reason for these provisions is that the Opposition has anticipated that some of the things required of it, if it ever became the Government, would be so far-reaching that the Legislative Council would have to tip them out.

The SPEAKER: Order! Although this Bill refers to the Legislative Council the Premier must refer to another place. I have allowed a fair amount of latitude but I ask him to respect Standing Orders.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Another place in this State has never obstructed Government Bills. I shall give examples of the type of legislation that has been enacted since I have been in the House. During that period electricity supplies have been nationalized. The Legislative Council has exercised wise oversight over Bills. It has not rejected Bills nor has it been obstructive and I would not, in any circumstances, advocate to any electorate that the Council's powers be diminished or altered. To take power away from the electorate as proposed in this clause is completely wrong in principle. Before commenting on the provisions clause by clause I have one or two observations

on the form of the Bill and its practical effects. The first concerns the effects of clauses 3, 4 and 13. Clause 3 repeals the second and third schedules of the Constitution Act at once so that if the Bill became law there would immediately be no electoral districts in existence. Although clause 4 states that the alterations to electoral districts are to apply only at elections held after the first dissolution or expiration of the Parliament after the passing of the Bill, the Bill does not make any alterations nor does it provide for the gap in the law resulting from the repeal of the schedules. All it does is to set up a commission to fill the gap, a job that will clearly take time as, indeed, the draftsman of the Bill recognizes, because proposed new section 81 of the Act gives the commission up to eight months in which to make its first report.

If, therefore, the House were dissolved within the next few months there would be no electoral districts in existence for the purpose of the necessary elections. While clause 4 relates to the alteration of districts at future elections, nowhere does the Bill provide that the increase in number of members is to apply only in the future. Of perhaps greater importance is whether the proposals for division of the State are practical. I get back to this question of one vote one value and the diminishing of the representation of the country. The basic requirement is the electoral quota.

I have been informed by the Electoral Office that the number of Assembly electors enrolled in South Australia is about 531,000 which, divided by 56, gives a quota of 9,482. This figure can be varied by 10 per cent giving a requirement that an electoral district must have at least 8,534 electors and not more than 10,430 electors. Now the total number of electors comprises 332,000 in the metropolitan area and 199,000 in the country. On those figures it seems impossible to obtain 26 districts or more to include country areas, each of which must have 8,534 electors. On the other hand 30 metropolitan districts of 10,430 each would give something less than 332,000 electors in the metropolitan area.

No doubt there could and probably would be combinations of densely and sparsely populated areas, but there might be difficulty in applying a quota of 9,000 to some remote country areas. I suppose honourable members realize that under this Bill—and this is a matter of interest—there would be more members of Parliament within 10 miles of the General Post Office than there would be for the rest

of South Australia. I do not know whether honourable members realize that that would be its effect. Centralization is not in it compared with this. This point might interest one or two country members. There would be more members within two miles of the G.P.O. than there would be in the whole of Eyre Peninsula, including districts such as Whyalla.

I now summarize one or two of the conclusions I have reached on this Bill and I think that they prove that the Bill has been somewhat hastily drafted. Some provisions of the Bill are unworkable, and I shall explain why this is so. I deal firstly with the provisions concerning the increase in the number of members and the proposals regarding the alteration of electoral districts. Clause 10 of the Bill amends section 27 of the principal Act, which provides that the House of Assembly shall consist of 39 members to be elected by the inhabitants of the State legally qualified to vote. I dealt with that matter earlier and I do not wish to say much more about it. The effect of clause 10 of the Bill is to strike out "39" and insert "56," so that section 27 would provide for the House of Assembly to consist of 56 members to be elected by the inhabitants of the State legally qualified to vote. There is no special provision regarding the commencement of the operation of the amendment, which would therefore become effective immediately the Bill received the Royal assent, and we would then have the extraordinary position that the Constitution Act required the House of Assembly to consist of 56 members while in fact there would be only 39. I do not know what the legal effect of that would be. It is something that I do not think has ever happened in a previous Parliament. The moment this Bill comes into operation, the number of members for the House of Assembly would be 56. Also, there would be no electoral districts to elect any. There would be no provision for electing any, so we would have a Constitution Act requiring the House of Assembly to have 56 members while there would be only 39. This is not imagination. This is a report from the Crown Law Office. Will the honourable member deny that this Bill, when it becomes effective, immediately increases the number to 56?

Mr. Ryan: At the next election.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member cannot deny it. It is set out in the Bill that, the moment it is assented to by Her Majesty, the legal requirement is that there be 56 members here, but there are

only 39 members here and there is no provision for filling the gap. I do not know what the legal consequences would be, whether Parliament could legally continue in those circumstances (I personally do not think it could), but those are the facts of the matter.

Clause 11 of the Bill makes a corresponding amendment to section 32 of the principal Act which provides that for the purposes of electing members of the House of Assembly the State is divided into 39 electoral districts—I want to come back to that—to be named and comprise the portions of the State as set out in the Third Schedule of the Act. Clause 11 of the Bill will substitute 56 electoral districts for 39 and will at the same time provide that those 56 districts are to be named and comprise the portions of the State as gazetted by the Governor on the report of the proposed electoral commission. There is a provision in the Bill, I think, for filling a casual vacancy—I believe that was the intention of one clause I studied—but there appears to be no provision to cover a dissolution of the House until such time as the 56 districts have been gazetted.

To get the quota that would be provided under the Act and that the electoral commission must provide under the Act, it will be necessary for the country districts (probably five or six of them) to have a substantial amount of the metropolitan area attached to them. Will honourable members opposite deny that? I repeat that the honourable member did say at the time of the election that there would be no diminution in the country representation. What honourable members are trying to do, of course, is attach to the country electorates a considerable number of metropolitan votes. There would not be any diminution of the country representation—oh, no! I said this before the election, so it is not new.

Mr. Ryan: And the public rejected it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Before the election, I was asked in the West Torrens district what my views were on electoral boundaries. True, at present there is much divergence between the figures of the various electoral districts. That arises not from the fact that there has not been a redistribution recently, because only two Parliaments ago there was a redistribution which every honourable member opposite supported. There was one honourable member who did not wish to support it—Sir George Jenkins—because his district was going out of existence, but he withdrew his call and the measure was passed unanimously. So it is

not that the Government has not been prepared to consider redistribution. In fact, the Government stated in His Excellency's Speech that it would be prepared to consider, with the Opposition, a redistribution.

I go further than that. I would be prepared to make a substantial change in the present distribution. I should not be prepared to accept the sort of thing that we have had thrust in here today, which I would not accept in any circumstances, and that was stated publicly before this Bill was ever introduced. Incidentally, that offer still stands, but it will be discussed, I hope, in the first place (if honourable members opposite are really interested) in a committee of the two Parties, if necessary. It would be brought in as a Bill which would be subject to amendment. It would be discussed frankly and openly before being introduced here and considered on its merits. It would be introduced as a Bill that every honourable member would be free to consider without it being declared a vital vote. That is the only way it can be done, because I point out that every honourable member knows that this is a constitutional amendment. I doubt whether either Party can command a constitutional majority easily in this House at present.

Be that as it may, I come back to this point: this Bill was brought in on the understanding that it was to be a no-confidence motion. If honourable members want a no-confidence motion, I am always prepared to assist them. I declare it to be a no-confidence motion and the Government will stand or fall by the passage of this Bill.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I intend to deal not with all the points raised by the Premier this afternoon but with one or two matters to which I wish to draw attention from the outset. For some unknown reason, the Premier started off by referring to the fact that Communist ships had visited this State and had a sudden interest in our Constitution. If that is so, the Liberal and Country League has only itself to thank for their interest because it has had such a gerrymandered electorate here for so long that the L.C.L. has provided them with plenty of propaganda. The Premier went on to say that, when he decided to take office after the last election and form a Government, if he had not done so two districts, which are represented by the Independents in this House, would have had no say in deciding the issue, if Labor had taken office, although we had 19 and the Liberal and Country League had 18 seats.

He said that it would not be a democratic way in which to decide which Party should govern. It is amazing to hear the Premier quoting democracy when he knows that although his Party has maintained office for a long period it has refused to introduce a democratic electoral system. The two electorates to which he refers have just over 12,000 electors between them, and he says they are to decide the issue of who shall govern in South Australia.

He went on to say that this Bill does a lot of funny things and would reduce country representation. That is a completely different attitude from the attitude adopted by him and his supporters in the past. He said that the country representation would be reduced to 45 per cent, whereas it is now 66 per cent. I can remember well that when we have introduced measures of a similar character for electoral reform members have said that they would reduce the number of country members. I think the member for Torrens said in 1959 that under our Bill the number of country members would be reduced to 15, which was the main objection to the measure. It was not a question of percentage but of the number of country members. It was said that the number would be reduced and that there would be too large an area for a member to deal with, and that it would be impossible to give adequate representation. This is an entirely new tack. We are used to the Premier adopting entirely new tacks when he finds that the old ones are no longer valid. We do not propose to reduce the number of country representatives. The Premier said that he did not remember the Leader of the Opposition saying that this Parliament would be made subservient to an electoral commission. That is an amazing statement considering that this Parliament has been subservient so long to a gerrymandered electoral system, which has never permitted the will of the people to be represented in this House. Yet, he talks about this Bill making Parliament subservient to an electoral commission. He knows that the object of making the electoral arrangements subservient, as he terms it, to a commission is simply to ensure that in the future no Party will be able to tamper with the electoral system. It is in the Bill so that in the future adjustments to the electoral boundaries will be made automatically and will be taken out of the hands of Parties. The adjustments will be made democratically in accordance with the way they should be made if the will of the people is to be represented here.

The Premier went on to say that the people were not to be consulted in the matter of deadlock provisions, and that there would be no appeal to them. Once again we have the amazing picture of the Premier quoting democracy. Even the Young Liberals, and it has been said here on a number of occasions, have complained about the policy of the Liberal Party on electoral reform. They have complained bitterly, but one of them has changed his tune since coming here, so we do not hear much about it now. In listening to the Premier one would have thought that the deadlock provisions were introduced in the first place because the people who introduced them had some democratic principles in mind. In other words, they were democratically inclined. However, the contrary was the position. They were introduced in 1857 in a House which represented the squattocracy of the State. They had no democratic principles. The provisions were introduced to prevent the will of this House from being expressed in a democratic way. That was the sole reason for their being included in the Constitution Act. It is utterly ridiculous for anyone to pretend that the existing deadlock provisions are in any way democratic, and that an alteration to them would make them less democratic. Of course, we are used to this sort of tactic. I can remember that when we introduced our Bill in 1959 the Premier said that it could easily mean 100 members being in Parliament. That, of course, took everything to ridicule in order to show that the measure was absurd, but that sort of thing does not cut any ice with the people outside. They are sick and tired of the ridicule introduced here when efforts are made to get the will of the people expressed in this undemocratic Parliament.

The Premier said that the policy of one vote one value would lead to centralization. It does not require such a policy to achieve centralization, because that has already been achieved. The Liberal Party has held power for many years in this State by means of the electoral system, which the Government gerrymandered to suit itself, and we can see what has been achieved in the way of decentralization. Any decentralization achieved has been the result of an economic attraction for an industry to go where materials were available. It has not been the result of representation by an individual country member. In fact, when we stress decentralization members opposite say "You cannot go far in this matter because it is determined by economic forces beyond our control," but when it

suits them they say, "We must have small electorates. We must have a number of country representatives because without them we shall have centralization." We already have centralization, and a policy of one vote one value would make no difference, to either centralization or decentralization. Economic factors decide the position. Admittedly, country electorates need good members, but we have good country members on this side, and no-one will say that they do not press for what is needed in their electorates as much as a Liberal member would. The nonsense put out about our electoral measure passes understanding.

I now shall deal with one aspect on which the Premier was strangely silent. It refers to the number of members. The Premier did not say that the Bill proposed too many members for the House. He said that if the Bill were passed there would be more members within 10 miles of the G.P.O. than in all the country districts. So what! Does that not prove that the centralization about which he speaks has come about despite what his Party has done? Is it not a fact that the population of the State is mostly within 10 miles of the G.P.O.?

What do we mean when we talk about democracy? Why is a vote given? It is given because a person is a human being. It is not a question of where he lives or what he owns. The Premier can see no good in the policy of one vote one value, yet it is a policy accepted almost everywhere in the world where democratic Parliaments exist. Where it has not been accepted the forms of government, which called themselves democratic, have usually passed away. I can see one of the Ministers opposite smiling broadly; he thinks that has not happened, but I advise him to look at the history of those places where democracy has been denied so long; perhaps he could learn a lesson from the experiences of people elsewhere.

Regarding the proposed enlargement of this House to 56 members, I remember that when we debated this matter in 1959 the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) admitted that he was in favour of the number of members being increased and contended that when the number of members had been reduced in 1938 from 46 to 39 a mistake had been made. Let us have a look at what has happened since 1938. The population figures show that the time has arrived when there should be a considerable change in this matter. As the Leader pointed out, in the first House of Assembly in 1857

there were 36 members; this was increased to 54 in 1890; after Federation there were 42; after the transfer of the Northern Territory there were 40; and after 1915 there were 46. The present number of 39 members dates from 1938.

The 1938 enrolments in the metropolitan area were 212,000 and in the country 153,000, whereas today the metropolitan area has 332,000 as opposed to 199,000 in the country. The electors overall in that period increased by more than 45 per cent, and, if the 46 members who were in this House in the period prior to 1938 were increased in accordance with the increase in population, we would have more than 66 members in this House today.

On the question of whether this is a moderate proposal, let me quote from a recent publication entitled *The South Australian Elections 1959* by R. Hetherington and R. L. Reid. One of those gentlemen is a senior tutor in politics at the Adelaide university and the other is a lecturer in politics at that university. I may say that their analysis of that election is regarded as being objective and impartial. On the question of the proposed increase to 56 members the publication has this to say:

Here the A.L.P. proposals for electoral reform are quite moderate. The Party proposes a 56 member House in which the country would retain its 26 seats and the metropolitan area would have 30. Such a distribution would still give country votes greater weight. But it would make it possible for the A.L.P. to win future South Australian elections yet would not make certain it would do so.

Surely that is the essence of democracy. It would mean that if the people wanted a Labor Government they could have it, and if they wanted a Liberal Government they could have it. In other words, if the people wanted to change the Government they could do so, instead of being faced, as they are today, with almost insuperable difficulties.

It is interesting to look at these deadlock provisions. The Premier claims that the Legislative Council has never been an obstructive House. Well, of course, that statement does not exactly fit in with historical facts. It is quite easy, of course, to make that statement. It has not had much occasion to be obstructive, because there have been few Labor Governments in this State. However, even when a Liberal Government wanted to nationalize the electricity undertaking, it found that it had to get Labor to assist it in getting that measure through the Upper House. Surely that could be claimed to be a major piece of obstruction. The Premier is always boasting

of what the nationalized electricity undertaking has meant to this State; he is always telling us of the great advantages that have accrued to South Australia because of his action in that regard, yet that measure only passed by one vote and had to be passed with the support of the Labor Party members. However, he says that that House has never been obstructive.

When we look back in history we find that the Legislative Council has used its power in a most obstructive way on a number of occasions. As I said, those occasions have not been numerous, for the simple reason that this State has not had Labor Governments on many occasions, for obvious reasons. I recall that both the Verran and the Crawford Vaughan Governments received the utmost hostility from another place when they endeavoured to amend the Constitution Act. Furthermore, the Verran Government was forced out of office as a result of such obstruction.

I also remember that the Hon. R. S. Richards had something to say on this point. In 1938, when speaking in this House to a Constitution Act Amendment Bill on the deadlock provisions, he referred to the occasion when a Liberal Government had a minority of pledged supporters; there were many Independents in the House at that time. The Assembly passed the three-year Parliament Bill by an overwhelming majority in opposition to the move of the Butler Government for a five-year Parliament. The Bill was thrown out by the Legislative Council, and I consider that that can be shown to be pure obstruction. The Hon. R. S. Richards went on to say:

Prior to the advent of the last Labor Government the then Butler Government imposed a super land tax to obtain extra revenue to meet its increasing financial difficulties, but immediately Labor assumed office, with the financial position much worse and facing a deficit of approximately £2,000,000 left by the Butler Government, the Legislative Council would not agree to the continuance of the surcharge and removed it, which meant that the Labor Government either had to accept the Bill or go to the country.

It is perfectly obvious that the Legislative Council can drive from office a Government elected by the people without going to the country itself. There is not the slightest reason why the present deadlock provisions should not be amended to make them more democratic. The present ones, of course, are absurd. The Premier has outlined them, and there is no need for me to go over them again. They are obviously designed not to be

democratic but simply to prevent democratic legislation passed here being carried elsewhere.

I will now refer to one more point made by the Premier. He said that under the proposals in our Bill it would be necessary to have some metropolitan voters added to the country electorates, thereby reducing country representation. Obviously, that is what is being done today by the spread of suburbia. What point he has in that, I fail to see. This is a continuing process. Obviously, he and his Government, despite their superior representation, can do nothing to stop it. An outward feature of the L.C.L. is its admiration of the forms of Parliamentary procedure and yet it fails to give the people of this State the substance of democracy. I remember when in 1957 we celebrated the centenary of this Parliament His Excellency the Governor in his speech said:

The merits of the system of responsible government are well-known to you. It is the product of the political genius of the British people developed and improved through centuries of struggle, trial and error. Its basic purpose is to secure that the Executive and legislative powers of the Crown shall be used in accordance with the popular will.

What chance is there of the popular will being expressed in this Parliament, when one knows the experience we have had in the last few months, and the experience over the past years? Let honourable members opposite answer that question. When Lord Carrington presented the Mace to this House he said:

Parliamentary democracy is much more than a phrase or an Act of Parliament or a formula; it is a living thing which, unless it is husbanded and cultivated, will wither away more quickly than it grew.

That is something that honourable members opposite should well ponder. Lord Carrington went on to say:

It means the acceptance of policies of which you may wholeheartedly disapprove, provided those policies are the express wish of the majority of the electorate.

Obviously, the majority of the electorate has no opportunity to express its wishes through this Parliament. Lord Carrington also went on to say:

It affords to men and women the opportunity to influence the conduct of their own affairs.

The L.C.L. always attaches great importance to British Parliamentary tradition. I suggest that its members place just as much importance on Parliamentary tradition along the lines I have mentioned as they do on the appearance of the Mace on the table. That Mace was placed there with great furore. It was a great

ceremony. What a pity members opposite cannot introduce a democratic electoral arrangement with equal enthusiasm. The British Parliamentary system as practised in Great Britain has preserved its continuity and its effectiveness by continually adapting itself to political and social change. Great Britain has a single uniform adult franchise with equal and uniform electorates.

Surely, if honourable members opposite are so keen on continuing Parliamentary tradition, it is time they paid a little attention to copying these aspects. The Premier made fun of the fact that the House of Lords was a hereditary body. Did we want our Upper House to be a hereditary body? After all, the House of Lords has had its veto reduced to one year and there is no question of having elections between the passing of a Bill twice in the House of Commons before it goes through the House of Lords. Under this arrangement the British people do not say it is undemocratic because there is no election if a Bill passes twice in the House of Commons and then goes to the House of Lords. The British people have found by experience that that arrangement is necessary today to meet the present needs of the people, who look toward true democratic government.

Our Constitution Act has remained virtually unchanged from 1857. In fact, the redistribution of 1936 to 1938 made the position worse than it was, because it fixed the number of members in this House at 39, lower than it had been before, in a time of increasing population, and fixed it in such a way as to ensure that the members on the other side always held office. That was the design of it; that is what it was intended for. It was not so much to protect the country areas. None of the main provisions of the Constitution Act was ever designed to do that, but designed to protect in the first place "squattocracy" and in the second place to ensure that the L.C.L., after the Liberal Federation made its pact with the Country Party, retained office in face of the wish of the people. They were the reasons, which have nothing to do with all these snide references that are made.

What has been done is contrary to the British Parliamentary system, which regards the Opposition as the second main Party, temporarily a minority, and regarded as an alternative government. That is one of the underlying principles of British Parliamentary

democracy. The measures that have been taken by the Party opposite have been to reduce that to a sham, and that policy has naturally reduced the importance of the Opposition as a check on the Executive. It has produced a deep sense of frustration and dissatisfaction with Parliament, not only here, but outside, and that is evidenced by the many letters that have appeared in the press since the last election. The people have written and said that this sort of thing is futile and have asked why we should have elections, and why not have a dictator and be done with it?

The people from Great Britain have said what a funny set-up we have here. Your vote means nothing, they say. The rise of dictatorship and one-Party governments have been the almost inevitable consequence of the ineffectiveness of our Constitution, which reproduces the outward form of the British Constitution without the spirit and the substance. Our Constitution Act has become just a petrified relic of the Victorian era and all forms of life that have been unable to adapt themselves to changing circumstances have invariably become extinct.

The L.C.L. is suffering from the same delusions as the Stuart Kings—it imagines it has the divine right to rule. It is obvious that that is the delusion from which the L.C.L. is suffering. Our proposals are truly democratic; they are moderate and are entirely in accord with the British Parliamentary system and British tradition. They are in the best interests of responsible democratic government in South Australia. Finally, the electors have said they want them, in a most decided manner. I support the Bill.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I support the Bill. This afternoon we were treated to a discourse from the Premier, which perhaps is not atypical of the kind of thing he says when an electoral distribution Bill comes before the House. On the other hand he did at the outset say something that was a little unusual for him. He talked about people in this House being gentlemen. I always thought that the attributes of gentlemen were that they should be people of honour and of principle, that they should have consciences, and that they should in fact be prepared to accept the normally accepted standards of the community of honour and of decency. In relation to some people who have recently spoken of electoral matters in this State, I do not find that that occurs. I cannot find any conscience, any honour or any decency in it whatever. Indeed,

when the words "honour", "gentlemen" or "democracy" appear on the lips of those people, I am moved to remember the words of a great Parliamentarian in the House of Commons who made the appropriate comment that when people of that type speak in that way it is about as appropriate as "love" on the lips of a whore.

The Premier said at the outset that the Leader had told the people of this State that the Labor Party's policy was not to reduce the country representation in this House. The Leader did tell the people of this State that, and that is the policy of my Party. Members on the Liberal side of this House have from time to time said, "You can't have fewer country members than you now have because if you do it will make it very difficult to represent the sparsely populated areas of this State; the distances that members will have to travel will be so great that they will not be able to service their areas." We in the Labor Party reply, "That is fair enough." We are interested in sparsely populated areas, because not only does my Party represent the overwhelming majority of the people of this State in this House, it represents the overwhelming majority of the sparsely populated areas of the State. We represent more of the area of this State as well as more of the people of this State than do members opposite. We see no reason whatever why the pocket boroughs immediately adjoining the metropolitan area should be difficult to service by the inclusion of some of the immediate suburban areas in them. Indeed, that position already exists in certain of the country districts adjoining the metropolitan area. The member for Mitcham has some country area in his district and the Minister of Agriculture has some suburban area in his district, and he is going to have more, much as he dislikes the fact.

How is it reducing country representation to put the fringe suburbs into the country areas into which they are spreading for purposes of electoral representation? It does not affect the representation at all. Those areas can still be adequately represented. We have given close and careful attention to that. If that is done there will be no difficulty about maintaining the principle of one vote one value. Let me turn to the question of one vote one value, which the Premier on numerous occasions has said is an electoral principle that he cannot find any support for anywhere in the world. The Premier gave a number of examples within Australia, and on this, of course, he was completely disingenuous. He knew perfectly

well that the picture he was painting to the House was not a true one. He knew that he was not telling this House what the situation was in the cases to which he referred, but he does not mind telling the people of South Australia what he knows not to be the case.

Let me advert to this in some detail. In the first place the Premier referred to Senate quotas. He knows perfectly well that since the Senate is supposed to be a States' House one vote one value does not obtain there. We in the Labor Party do not believe that that should operate and we believe in the abolition of the Senate. We do not think this principle should be maintained in the Senate. Let it be remembered that the Senate is supposed to be the States' House of Review. What is the position in the popularly elected House? From the outset the Constitution provided basically the principle of one vote one value for the House of Representatives. The Premier spoke about the House of Representatives and instanced certain electoral districts in various States under the House of Representatives quotas at the moment. He points out that in some States some of the Commonwealth electoral districts are at present twice as large in the number of voters as others. The Premier knows that under the Commonwealth Constitution, and under the Commonwealth Electoral Act, a redistribution of those seats must take place periodically. We are on the eve of a redistribution now because those seats are unequal. The Premier knows that this is going on and that the electoral commissioners have already made preliminary recommendations. He did not forget that; he only wanted to put over to the people of this State that this inequality is, in fact, the principle that obtains in the Constitution. He knows that that is not true.

Mr. Lawn: His comments will be published tomorrow, but yours won't be!

Mr. DUNSTAN: That may well be true. The Premier referred to various States and he said that in Victoria, for instance, they had electoral quotas and he mentioned a couple of seats where, in fact, one seat was twice as large as the other. He knows that in Victoria a redistribution was brought in and recommended by Mr. Hollway, the Leader of the Liberal Party, to provide two State seats for every Commonwealth seat and that after every Commonwealth redistribution there would be a redistribution of State seats. The reason those seats are out of accord in numbers is not because there is some principle in the

Constitution contrary to one vote one value, but because a redistribution is due. After that redistribution those seats are required by the Victorian Constitution—a provision made by the Liberal Party in that State—to be equal in numbers.

Mr. Jennings: That was so fair they got rid of Hollway!

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. The Liberals did not like it. They hated to think that they got one vote one value in that State and so they kicked Mr. Hollway out of the Party.

Mr. McKee: Do you think they will do it here?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not know. Here they have someone who tells the Party what to do and a set of noddors. The Premier tells as what happens in the Labor Party. He does not need to take notice of the Liberal Party at all. He tells that Party what its policy will be. They can go across to North Terrace and hold meetings and pass motions, but he twiddles his fingers and says what he is going to do. He says, "I listen to your advice, but don't intend to take it." It does not matter what they vote for.

The Premier admits that in Tasmania there is some approach to one vote one value because there the seats are based upon the Commonwealth electorates. He instanced two seats in Tasmania that he said were unequal in numbers, but again he knows that they are only unequal because a Commonwealth redistribution is pending. This business of the Premier saying that the principle of one vote one value has not been accepted anywhere in this country is, of course, complete nonsense, but what is more he ignores what he knows on this particular subject. He ignores the report of the Constitutional Review Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament which mentions these Commonwealth electorates to which he referred. This committee was representative not only of the Labor Party but of the Liberal Party also. It had six Liberal members on it, one of whom was the member for Angas (Mr. Downer, now Minister for Immigration). On this score the report of the committee was unanimous. This is what it said:

The committee feels constrained to say, however, that the one-fifth margin on either side of the quota for a State which the Act allows may disturb quite seriously a principle which the committee believes to be beyond question in the election of members of the national Parliament of a Federation, namely, that the votes of the electors should, as far as possible, be accorded equal value.

It is beyond question, according to these Liberal gentlemen. Continuing:

The full application of the margin each way to two divisions in a State could result in the number of electors in one division totalling 50 per cent more than the number of electors in the other division. Such a possible disparity in the value of votes is inconsistent with the full realization of democracy. Whilst appreciating that complete uniformity in numbers upon redistribution is not practicable, the committee considers that a permissible margin of one-tenth on either side of the quota for a State should allow sufficient flexibility in determining the electoral divisions for the election of members of the House of Representatives of the Federal Parliament.

And that is the principle written into this Bill. The Premier referred to Queensland, which at the moment has not got one vote one value; and that is correct. Before the election of the present Government in Queensland, the Liberal Party in that State had on its platform one vote one value, but when it gained office it consulted with the South Australian Premier.

Mr. Lawn: They sent for him.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is correct. It consulted with him on how it could bring about this dictatorship without jackboots, which we have in South Australia.

Mr. Jennings: Didn't the Young Liberals in South Australia have something to say about this?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have mentioned that in this House before. The Young Liberals in this State prepared and circulated a pamphlet that castigated the Premier as being a dictator, and said there was only one reason for the re-election in office of the Liberal Party—the electoral system. I have pointed this out so often in this House that I do not intend to bore the House with it. I feel I would be speaking *ad nauseam*; indeed, certainly so to the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Clark: Where are those Young Liberals now? Did they grow old?

Mr. DUNSTAN: They seem to have had their arms twisted. The Premier said, "Oh, well, now the Opposition intends to do something about the provision of electoral boundaries in South Australia, and Parliament is going to be subservient to an electoral commission." How dreadful! The proposal in this Bill is that any future electoral boundaries shall be drawn up by a completely independent commission on instructions to be laid down in the Constitution, and that no longer will electoral boundaries be a political football. They will be set by an independent authority.

Where is the change in principle? On previous electoral redistributions the boundaries have been drawn by independent commissions, but this Government wanted to make certain that when the reports came back it would be able to look at them and, if they did not suit it, it had no need to adopt them. Why should that be done? Is it not proper that the same principles should obtain as, in effect, obtain in Western Australia, because this provision about the electoral divisions becoming automatically law as a result of proposals of the electoral commission was taken straight from the Western Australian Act?

Isn't it proper that the commission should act rather than that the Government of the day should use its numbers to perpetuate something unfair and be able to manipulate the Constitution so that the people it represents here are not the majority of people in this State, if it does not like the report of the electoral commissioners? What harm is there to the Parliamentary institution that this Parliament should retain the right to maintain the principles on which electoral redistribution should take place and to provide that it should be automatic and independent of Parliament so that no member here might seek his own cynical advantage? There is no derogation from the rights of Parliament. There, certainly, is a taking out of the hands of the Executive of the provisions which now allow this Government cynically to manipulate electoral boundaries for its own selfish advantage.

The Premier then said, "Oh, well, here are these shocking deadlock provisions. They are going to get rid of the existing deadlock provisions which are excellent." What are all these excellent provisions for deadlocks that they stand at the moment? Let us see the process that has to be gone through. The Lower House puts up a Bill, to do which it has just been elected and has a mandate from the people by a majority. We have a majority of members here, we put up a Bill, and the Upper House throws it out. We have to go out to ask the people to endorse what they have just endorsed. We come back and put up the Bill again. If the Upper House again refuses it, the Governor can either dissolve both Houses (which means a third election for the House of Assembly) or he can do something which is even more extraordinary: he can call for the election of extra members on the existing rule for the Upper House; there they are, put into that place along the way. Nobody knows what happens

to them after that. The provisions of the Constitution are entirely silent. They apparently sit there, but whether they come up for election again, whether they retire, or what happens to them, nobody knows. A more absurd, ill-drafted or ill-conceived provision could not be imagined, but it was never intended that it should work. It was intended to provide such difficulties for executive Government and such expense for the people that there would not be effective deadlock provisions at all.

What has this Party proposed? That we should have exactly the same deadlock provisions as apply in the Mother of Parliaments—deadlock provisions introduced by the Liberal Party. However, it was a Liberal Party, not a Party that was in fact a Party of extreme conservative interests that adopted a nice name to conceal something nasty. There was talk in 1910 that Lord Balfour was making the House of Lords his poodle, but the present provisions were introduced by the Liberal Party. There were certainly slight alterations by the Labour Party when it was last in office, but the general principle has been written into the Constitution of Great Britain that the Upper House as a House of Review has only a delaying power—the right to give the Lower House (the popularly elected House) second thoughts. There cannot be the slightest argument in favour of providing a complete power of veto over the will of the people of this State to a House which, as at present constituted, is overwhelmingly representative of pelf and privilege—of a small minority of the people of this State. The Premier then said there were all sorts of hasty draftings in this Bill and considerable difficulties about its provisions, and he read some comments by the Parliamentary Draftsman and added a few of his own. Let me deal with these.

Mr. Clark: The Crown Solicitor got mixed up in it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, the Crown Law Department. I do not know who wrote this opinion for the Premier, but let me deal with what he had to say:

One of the big difficulties here is that the proposal is to alter the number of members in the House of Assembly in section 27 of the principal Act from 39 to 56.

There is no qualification on that. We are well aware of that. The Bill states we will have 56 members in the House and, in fact, we have 39 only and the Government will not be able to carry on, so what will be the situation? There really is no difficulty about this. I refer to the Bill introduced by the Butler Government, of which Sir Thomas Playford

was a member, in 1936. Do members know what it said about section 27? It stated, "Section 27 of the Constitution Act 1934 is amended by striking out '46' and inserting in lieu thereof '39'," exactly as this Bill does. The heavens didn't open. The ceiling didn't fall. They managed to carry on although there was the same alteration in the Constitution as proposed by our Bill. The Premier was falling into the same drafting difficulty as a member of the Government in those days, but none of the difficulties he expatiated to the House occurred. Of course they did not occur; it was a stupid quibble.

Mr. Loveday: He has knocked over another straw man.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. He said then that there will be a difficulty—"where are members sitting for?" Won't it be in the report of the electoral commission? If the Premier reads the Bill he will see that members will continue to sit for the district for which they were elected until the report of the commission. There are none of the difficulties in the Bill that the Premier talks about. He, or whoever briefed him, read it rather hastily. I was interested to note that the Premier did not say anything on this occasion to the effect that he had a majority of the people voting for him. Perhaps that is not surprising.

We have had arguments from time to time from members opposite who say, "Oh well, you know it's not true. The Labor Party did not get a majority. We had a majority, so it is all right." Although their arithmetic was very bad on those occasions it would be even worse if they tried on this occasion, and perhaps it is not surprising that the Premier did not say what he is reported to have said in the newspapers immediately after the elections. He said, "Taking the seats contested by both major parties in this State, Labor polled 48 per cent and the Liberal Party polled 46 per cent. The Labor Party got one more representative than the Liberal Party so everything in the garden is rosy and you cannot expect a better representation for Labor than that." Of course, he ignored 19 seats, which is nearly half the number of members in this House.

If we take the House of Representatives votes we find that the Labor Party would have polled in those 19 seats not contested by both major parties in the election 59.2 per cent of the votes and the Liberal Party 33.3 per cent. When those figures are added to

the other figures the Labor Party comes up with 54 per cent and the Liberal and Country League with 40 per cent. However, even that is wrong because it was shown that as between the Commonwealth and the State elections in the seats that both major parties contested there was an overall significant swing to Labor in most areas. If the Commonwealth figures for the 19 seats were corrected by that swing that would show an even larger percentage than 54 per cent for Labor and an even smaller percentage than 40 per cent for the Liberals. The most the Liberals could hope to get would be, in fact, 37 per cent. They have the support of little more than one in three of the voters in this State. They say, "That's all right". They intend to cling to office and they claim that this is something they can do in conscience, in honour, and in principle.

Let me, if I may, deal shortly with this question of whether, in fact, the Government ought to be in office in those circumstances. What is the basis of representation in Parliament? As the honourable member for Whyalla said, it is a man's humanity: it is his citizenship. No matter who the man is he should have equal rights as a citizen in this community. Lord Rainborowe, when speaking in the Army debates at Putney, at the time of the revolt of Parliament against arbitrary executive power, said that "the poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as the greatest he." But the poorest he in this community must live subject to the laws and be regulated by them, he must pay the taxes that the community imposes, he must fight the wars that the community decides to fight, and yet, this Party, if it can be called such, which sits on the Government benches, says to the ordinary people in this community, "It does not matter about you; you shall not have an equal say with the rest of this community in the laws that shall regulate your lives, the taxes you shall pay, the wars you shall fight, but we will tell you what is good for you because we say that a few pocket boroughs in the country areas of South Australia shall rule this State no matter what is the idea of anybody else." To further this argument, on previous occasions certain Government members said, "Well, the majority of the production in this State comes from the primary-producing areas. Therefore, the primary-producing areas must have a majority voice in this House." In other words, the criterion by which we decide a man's right to have a say in his own future is not whether

he is a citizen or not but whether, in fact, he produces primary produce.

Where do we end about the production of primary produce? Do the workers who produce electricity that is so widely used on dairy farms today, as well on other farming processes, contribute nothing? What about the workers who produce farm machinery? Do they produce nothing towards primary production? What about the workers who produce fertilizer and other things that farmers need? What about roofing iron? What about housing requisites? These, of course, contribute nothing to primary production at all! The only people who are, in fact, to be given votes are people engaged directly in producing primary products at the end of the production line. Even this principle does not do that.

Many people in the country are not engaged in primary production yet some of them are, on this strange principle, to be given four times the vote of people living in the metropolitan area. Who can say that somebody engaged in primary production in a country area or in any other occupation is worth four times more say in this State's future than a university professor, teacher, worker, or professional man living in the metropolitan area?

There is no such principle in electoral matters as election on the basis of the kind of production an elector is involved in or the amount he produces. The only principle is citizenship, the only right, humanity. The Premier then said, "You say that is your principle. It is impossible to obtain that under this Bill." It is not impossible. Before the Bill was drafted a careful schedule was prepared to ensure that the principles laid down in the Bill were practical. They are practical. It is perfectly possible to obtain districts of the kind required by the instruction to the electoral commissioners and to obtain the numbers in electoral districts which are therein contained. No electoral district in South Australia will be more difficult to manage under the new proposals than are existing districts at present. The Premier says, "It is fantastic to suggest that there have got to be more members in the metropolitan area." Why? This is where the centralization policy in this State, deliberately designed to perpetuate the gerrymander in this State, has put the people, and the people are entitled to representation—not as to where they live but from the fact that they are people.

I have seen in the newspapers suggestions that "You do not need more members in the

House. What you need is more balance." The way to get balance and maintain the present servicing of country areas is to increase the number of members in the House. It is perfectly feasible, perfectly proper and well based in the history of this State and its Parliamentary institutions and those of the other States, for, Mr. Speaker, even taking the increase in population that has occurred in South Australia, if we were to take that proportionate increase since 1938, we would have a bigger House than 56 members, to give proper representation to the increase in population. So there cannot be any denying of the right to increase the number of members in this House and, what is more, it would make it a much more workable House. Several members on the other side from time to time have talked of the necessity of increasing the number of members of this House.

Then the Premier said, "Ah, well, I don't know why honourable members opposite are dissatisfied with the present position because there was a recent redistribution for which every one of them voted." The Premier again knows that that is not true; he knows perfectly well it is not true. What happened was that in 1954 the Premier introduced into this House a Bill to set up an electoral commission and to give instructions to the members of that commission how they were to draw electoral boundaries. It was the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill, 1954. The instructions in that Bill were designed to perpetuate, and indeed to worsen, the gerrymander in this State. They were designed to provide metropolitan quotas of 23,000 as against country quotas of something less than 7,000, and every member on this side of the House bitterly fought that Bill. We fought it at every possible stage. We voted against it on the third reading and did everything to stop it. I was suspended from this House because I said it was an immoral piece of legislation, and I said certain things about the person who introduced it. How can it be said that members on this side of the House agreed to it?

What happened in 1955 was that the report of the electoral commissioners came in. The opportunity that was then given to honourable members was not whether they should vote for the system that they would like or for that system, but whether they should vote for the report of the electoral commissioners or the situation as it existed before, which also was bad. Which of two evils were we going to have? We had Paddy's choice. We said

we would accept the report of the commissioners—what else could we do? There was no other alternative report that we could adopt. This is what the Premier would have people believe is the basis of voting for the electoral system. He knows that we have never voted for the present electoral system—and we never will. We will never vote for an electoral system which denies the rights of the citizens of this State.

The Premier, in closing, said, "I have announced that I am prepared to consult honourable members about a change in the system, and that offer still stands. I am perfectly genuine about this." Members on this side of the House may be pardoned for being a little suspicious in this House, for feeling that the Premier is not perhaps telling the House all that he ought to.

Mr. Ryan: Does he ever?

Mr. DUNSTAN: On October 19, 1960, there was a vote in this House, and the vote was on a motion moved by the late Leader of the Opposition (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.

At that stage of the proceedings the electoral divisions in this State were out of concert even with the 1955 basis. For instance, the number of electors in the seat represented by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) was well over twice the quota he was supposed to have. There were a number of other districts like that. The district of Glenelg, represented by the Minister of Education (Mr. Pattinson), was another, and Enfield was another. The system of unjust electoral distribution because of shifting population, even on the Premier's own stated and peculiar basis, was already clear. What did all members opposite do? They voted it out. They did not consult with the Opposition about the basis of electoral distribution. They were being given *carte blanche* by a motion from this side of the House to undertake some more just system of electoral distribution in view of the present situation, and they refused it. They put up an amendment that made the whole thing meaningless, and it meant that nothing would be done.

Mr. Loveday: They are making an offer now only because they are frightened.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Because of the extraordinary electoral situation here, where a Government can get in with the votes of a little more than one-third of the people of

this State while the Opposition, which has polled the highest vote recorded for any majority Party in a State election for the last 20 years in this country, is to remain on the Opposition benches. It is only because of the public outcry that members opposite are now prepared to do something which 18 months ago they had the opportunity to do, but refused to do.

Mr. Jennings: It is not a sudden attack of conscience, is it?

Mr. DUNSTAN: No, because they have not any. There is only one fair basis for electoral representation in this House, and that is that the people's voice should be heard and that the rights of citizens should be equal. There is no other basis for electoral representation, which is normally recognized within anything that may call itself a democracy.

The provisions of the Bill put forward by the Opposition are clearly designed to give democracy to the people of this State—a democracy that they have been denied for over 30 years, and denied deliberately and cynically, to keep a Party in office against the will of the majority. If this House does not pass this Bill and this Government chooses to attempt to remain in office against the will of the majority of the people of this State, then I say to honourable members opposite that they do what they seem to have forgotten that they are doing. I heard comments by certain honourable members opposite that they wished members of this House would uphold the traditions of British Parliaments. Never has a set of individuals so denied the traditions of British Parliaments as have honourable members opposite. Never have they stopped denying them without conscience in this way, and I warn honourable members opposite that, by their continued actions in opposing democracy in this State and refusing to the people of this State the ordinary rights of citizens recognized in most places in the world where they talk about democracy, they are so bringing this Parliament into disrepute that they make of it a sham, a mere facade for the continuance of the dictatorship in South Australia. For the ruin which will inevitably redound upon the people of this State and upon its Parliamentary institutions members opposite must take the responsibility. On their heads be it if in fact the functioning of proper Parliamentary institutions in this State founders because of their cynical and conscienceless actions.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the Bill, and do it briefly because several members on this side have already spoken. The Leader

set out our policy on the matter, and his statements in his second reading explanations were clear. The members for Norwood and Whyalla endeavoured at some length to prove that there is a need for the Bill to be supported. The measure has come to a House that is closely divided, with 19 members on each side.

Mr. Ralston: Eighteen on the other side.

Mr. BYWATERS: I am talking about the support on each side, and that is the only conclusion to which I can come. On this side we believe that we received a mandate from the people at the last election. That was challenged by the Premier today, when he said that the Leader in his policy speech did not set out what is proposed in the Bill. I disagree with that statement, as did the member for Whyalla. We claim that the proposals were fully and concisely referred to in the Labor policy speech delivered by the Leader in the hall at Edwardstown. The Premier drew attention to percentages, whereas the Leader referred to the number of country districts. That is why he said that Labor would not reduce country representation. The country people are concerned about the representation they have had. The Premier has twisted the position to suit his case, which is something he usually does. It is apparent to me that there is only one way in which this matter can be decided, and I challenge the Premier on it. If he believes that Labor has no mandate let the matter be put to the test. Let us go back to the people to see whether or not we have a mandate.

I believe that the people want a change of Government, which is why they voted overwhelmingly in favour of the Labor Party. In leading articles in our daily newspapers the Government has been criticized for hanging on under the present gerrymander. The people in the streets are dissatisfied with the position that has existed for many years and have stated definitely that the time has come for a change. Despite all the handicaps that Labor has had to face in electoral matters, it has now more members in its Party than any other Party has in the House. Today the Premier said that our Bill would bring about greater centralization than exists now. Heaven forbid that such a thing is possible! When I was speaking at the Murray Bridge Town Hall during the last election campaign a well-known member of the Liberal Party challenged me on my attitude towards electoral reform. He framed his question something like this: "Do you think that if the Labor Party's policy of

one vote one value came in it would affect country areas to their detriment?" He also asked me whether I agreed that a policy of one vote one value would be possible at present. I said that I believed in the principle of one vote one value and that it was necessary because of the difference in the number of people in the various electorates. I do not accept the Premier's figures, but he said that under the Bill in the 56 seats there would be an average of 9,482 electors, with a minimum of 8,534 and a maximum of 10,430, and that consequently there would be fewer in the country electorates than in the city electorates, the difference being about 2,000.

This gentleman at Murray Bridge asked me whether I believed that it would be detrimental if we brought in our policy. I do not think that it would be possible because most of our population is in the city within 10 miles of the Adelaide Town Hall. Under the present gerrymandered system we have 26 country members and 13 city members, although most of the population is in the metropolitan area. It would be advantageous to the country to have a change in the ratio. The people believe that some of the population might go to the country, with the number in the individual seats becoming nearer the quota than they are today. This has not been possible because of the distinct difference between city and country seats. The Premier spoke about a maximum of 33,000 and a minimum of about 5,000. There has been the move to keep most of the population in the metropolitan area. The other day Mr. Hetherington said that the Labor vote was concentrated in two areas, and pointed out that the main concentration in the Labor vote was on the north-western side of Adelaide. He also said that in the country the preponderance of the votes was around Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Augusta. We know that that is so, and the member for Whyalla said it was because of raw deposits being available there. This concentration has reacted unfavourably to the Labor Party.

The Party in power should endeavour to decentralize population. If that were done there would not be talk about the extreme difference between metropolitan and country districts. It has been the Labor Party on every occasion that has introduced a measure for decentralization. Year after year it has moved for greater decentralization. Last year it moved for a reduction in country electricity charges. We thought that would help decentralization but again our move was rejected.

It is hypocritical when the Government talks about its policy of decentralization. Despite the fact that there have been more country members than city members there has been a concentration in the metropolitan area. The Premier was astray in his thinking on this matter.

I could speak on a number of other issues but I think that most of the ground has already been covered. I do not wish to belabour the position because I hope that a vote will be taken on this matter soon. I suggest that if the Government doubts that the Labor Party has a mandate from the people, it should allow this Bill to go through so that the people can say whether they want a change of Government.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): The master has spoken and, as usual, Government members have to remain silent. There will not be any speakers from the other side. I rise with pleasure to once again participate in a debate of this character. I have not missed a debate on electoral reform for the past 12 years. On this occasion I feel differently towards members opposite from what I have in the past, when one might say I have been a little belligerent in my attitude to the Government. Honestly—and I say this with all sincerity—I am really sorry for the Premier on this occasion.

Mr. Ryan: In what way?

Mr. LAWN: In all my sporting days, in football, boxing, basketball, cricket and everything else, I have been able to accept defeat equally as well as victory. On March 8 of this year the eyes of the people in South Australia were on the Premier—the Government—to see what he would do. Of course, the Opposition knew what he would do. I had no doubt in my mind what his attitude would be. I know many people, some of whom support the Liberal Party and in fact voted for it at the last election, who have admitted that they are now embarrassed. They stated that they were embarrassed when the Premier made his telecast on March 8. Even on March 3, when those people admitted that their Government was defeated and Labor was saying that the Government would not accept the people's will because it was arrogant and was a dictatorship, they still refused to accept what we were saying; but they have since said that when they saw the Premier come before the television screen "with that cynical smile on his face" they knew what he was going to say. They said they were embarrassed, and that they had to admit that what we had said was correct. I understand that a member on this side of the House invited Government members to speak

on this matter, but that they said they were not going to speak. Of course, that is not unusual.

Mr. Ryan: They are running true to form.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. Over the past 12 years, whenever Labor has introduced a motion or a Bill of this nature the speaker on the other side of the House, first and last, has been the Premier.

Mr. Jennings: The master has spoken!

Mr. LAWN: When the master speaks, that is the end of it; he can, and does, tell his supporters not to speak, and they have to do what they are told. There is another reason why they do not debate this matter, and that is that they cannot. Not even the Premier can debate this matter, and at no time in the past 12 years has he done so.

Mr. Ryan: He proved that today.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly, the same as in the past. I knew what he would say today, going on his past form over those years. I will quote from copies of *Hansard* which show that the statements he made today take the same form as in the past. He will talk about everything but the Bill before the House; he will tell you on one occasion there is no such thing as one vote one value, but in another year he forgets what he said the year before and tells us where it is and how it operates. Of course, he wants one vote one value in this House, and he is asking for more. He represents only about 6,500 people whereas I represent 20,000 people, but he says that the 20,000 people in my district are worth only the same vote as his 6,500 electors. He is asking for something even greater than one vote one value.

The Premier this afternoon followed his usual form and spoke about all sorts of things. The recent Festival of Arts took place shortly after the elections, and during the festival a poem was written about the greatest of all the arts—the art of skulduddery. That poem was as follows:

When the Festival was opened at the city's stony hall,
In formal dress, Sir Thomas sat, the artist of them all.
In this current feast of talent, he plays a special part,
For with skill quite incomparable he makes gerrymandering an art.
The conductor with his baton gives the orchestra direction,
But it really takes a maestro to conduct our State election.
The sculptor with his nimble hand, on his creation dotes,
But he bows before the master who can chisel people's votes.

The painter with creative zeal, wields his
brush and palette,
But Sir Thomas with a sweeping hand brushes
off a ballot.
The ballerina we admire, with form and grace
she acts,
But note the footwork of Sir Thomas as he
skirts around the facts.
The actor and his ancient craft is a joy at any
time,
But Sir Thomas as a democrat! The acting is
sublime.
The artists who have gathered and others of
their kind,
Fade into insignificance before this master
mind.
First prize then, Sir Thomas, though rejected
by electors,
You have served with artistry your undemo-
cratic directors.

The art of skulduddery, as practised by the
Premier of this State, was recognized at our
recent festival as the greatest art of all.

Mr. Jenkins: You will never make half the
man he is.

Mr. LAWN: I did not catch that inter-
jection. The honourable member should speak
up; he would see that I was not afraid of
interjections.

Mr. Jennings: It was something about bull
seals.

Mr. LAWN: He would know all about that.
The Premier this afternoon said that the claim
of the Labor Party to govern this State was
unfair and undemocratic because if our claim
was implemented it would refuse two districts
the right of determining who should govern
this State. He was referring to the districts
of Burra and Ridley. He went on to speak
about the Labor Party talking with different
voices. There was Sir Thomas Playford this
afternoon claiming the right of two small
districts to have the say as to who should
determine the Government in South Australia.
An article in the *Advertiser* of Friday, March 30
of this year, written by its staff representative
in Canberra, is headed "Move for Full Vote."
Let me explain that Mr. Calwell (Leader of
the Opposition) had introduced a Bill in the
House of Representatives to give the repre-
sentative of the Northern Territory a vote
in the Federal House. There are 20,000 electors
there, not 6,000 or 7,000 as in the State
districts to which I referred. Mr. Hasluck
(Minister for Territories) said:—

The granting of a full vote for the member
of the Northern Territory would mean that
the representative of a small electorate could
decide issues of vital importance to the whole
of Australia.

The electors in the two districts to which I
referred would not number nearly 20,000, and

yet the Premier demanded that the representa-
tives of those districts should determine which
Party should govern. He talks about the
Labor Party speaking with different voices.
We speak with one voice and are in full accord
with the Federal Constitution. I have
never heard members opposite condemn
that Constitution. The Premier then went on
to talk about subterfuge. He said he called
the House together to see whether his Govern-
ment had the confidence of the House. What
is most significant, he ignored the will of the
people that was expressed on March 3.

He then went on to threaten the Opposition
with the time factor. There has been much talk
in the press since the Labor Party launched
its move last week, and the press has
been trying to put the Labor Party on the
spot, because it is trying to tell the public that
we are interfering with the Government's intro-
ducing a Supply Bill to meet payments to the
Public Service. These statements have appeared
both in the *Advertiser* and in the *News*. It
is stated in today's *News* that the Speaker
may have to use his vote as to whether the
Labor Party's Bill shall be the first dealt
with. The article states:

He will have to decide for or against the
Government on the vital issue of electoral
reform.

Let me explain the position so that the press
can get the record straight. The usual practice
is for the Government to ask Parliament just
prior to June 30 each year to grant three
months' supply for the Public Service for its
requirements in the earlier part of the follow-
ing financial year. The Government will want
to pay Public Service salaries from the first
week of July to the end of September. We
grant the Government supply for three months
and we do this in less than one day's sitting.
This has been done in the 12 years I have been
a member here. I hope that the press will
put the record straight.

The Premier went on to speak of one vote
one value, to which I will refer later. He then
referred to the variation in the number of
electors in Commonwealth divisions, and this
was answered by Mr. Dunstan. The Premier
knows that following on a census there is a
redistribution of electors in accordance with
the Constitution. We are trying to provide in
our Constitution for a permanent redistribution
committee. As our districts get out of line
this committee will automatically operate,
without the question being left to the will of
Parliament, or, in other words, to the Govern-
ment of the day. At present, if a Govern-
ment does not want a redivision, it does not

seek it. We all saw what happened in Western Australia recently. The people there had to go to the court to force the Government to implement the redistribution committee's recommendations. The Government had not wanted to do that, but because authority was included in their Constitution, the people were able to go to the court and get an order that the Government should have a redistribution. That is to prevent the Government of the day from saying: "If redistribution will help us we will have it, and if it will harm us we will not have it." We are seeking the appointment of a permanent redistribution committee. There is nothing wrong with that.

The Premier went on to say that the Leader of the Opposition did not put before the people in his policy speech the question of electoral reform. To make it clear that we have nothing to hide and that the Premier is only pretending and practising his usual hypocrisy, I will read in full the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in his policy speech. It is headed "Constitutional and Electoral Reform," and is as follows:

The present unjust electoral system was originated by Act of Parliament in 1936 which provided for 13 metropolitan seats or electorates and 26 country, without taking any account of the respective electors in two groups of electorates. In other words, it was just laid down that there were to be two country as against one metropolitan electorate. The first election under this system occurred in 1938, when the enrolments in the metropolitan area were 212,000 as compared with 153,000 in the country. Today, enrolments in the 13 metropolitan electorates have increased to 333,000 whereas the 26 country electorates only have a total enrolment of 199,000 after excluding the district of Gawler, which has had a colossal population increase in recent years. As a matter of fact the average number of electors in country electorates is approximately 7,000 whereas the number of electors in Gawler has increased by more than 6,000 since the last election and there are now 19,000 electors in that country district. Therefore, it would appear that the present Government is not even prepared to consider a fair distribution in the country electorates. There has also been a disproportionate growth in the number of metropolitan electors as compared with the country, and over a period of a little more than 20 years the rate of increase in the enrolments in the metropolitan area has been more than twice that of the country areas.

The Labor Party believes in democracy, democratic government and in the control of Parliament by democratic methods. One fundamental principle of democracy is that people should be able to change the Government if they want to, but this is very difficult to achieve in South Australia. We had substantial overall majorities in the last three State elections, but they were not sufficient to change

the Government under the Playford rules of Parliamentary elections. However, I am convinced that even with the unjust system of electing Parliament in this State, the electors will be convinced with our sound policy and return a Labor Government to office on March 3.

Over the years, the Labor Party has attempted to remove injustices from the electoral system, but our attempts have been steadfastly rejected by the Liberal Government. The consistent attitude of the present Government in voting against any attempt to make our Parliament more democratic, thus fostering the gerrymander in South Australia, shows lack of respect for the democratically expressed wishes of the people and must, if persisted in, bring our Parliamentary institution into disrepute.

Labor's policy provides for constitutional and electoral reform to ensure equitable electoral boundaries with one roll for all Parliamentary elections and retention of compulsory enrolments and voting, and we will appoint an electoral boundaries commission on a basis similar to the Commonwealth and most other States.

That makes it clear that the Leader criticized the present gerrymandered electoral system in South Australia and said that if we were returned—and he expressed the belief that we would be—we would ensure equitable electoral boundaries. When I went to school "equitable" meant "equal". The Leader referred to one roll for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, and provision is made for that in this Bill. He mentioned also the appointment of a permanent electoral boundaries commission, to which I have already referred. Since that policy speech the Leader and all members of the Australian Labor Party have amplified the Leader's comments, as did he at election meetings.

We have told the people that the member for Enfield, representing one single electorate, represents more electors than do the Premier, the Minister of Lands, the Minister of Works, the Minister of Agriculture and the Speaker combined. Do members claim that that is not unjust? Some members say that there is no such thing as one vote one value and that we do not know what we are talking about. The Premier said that we do not know the Bill's provisions, but obviously he did not know them because he read out a speech prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman, Dr. Wynes.

Mr. Clark: Prepared with some assistance from the Crown Law Department.

Mr. LAWN: I missed hearing the Premier say that. I regard seriously the Parliamentary system as it applies in the British Commonwealth of Nations. I give several lectures each year on it. I know how the Parliamentary

system originated, the reasons for it, and how it operates everywhere but in South Australia. Each year I attend meetings arranged by various groups and talk on Parliament. Last year I brought 1,146 school children through this House and explained to them the Parliamentary system.

Mr. McKee: Did you explain the gerrymander?

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Every year since 1955 I have been bringing about 1,000 children to this House. Until this year I have explained to them the principle of the British Commonwealth of Nations as we know it: that elections are held and that if the majority of people vote for one Party, that Party with the majority of members forms the Government. I have told them of the eight Cabinet Ministers, the Government and the Executive Council. However, I have always had to explain that that system does not apply in South Australia. I stand at the Clerk's table and tell them that since 1938, with one exception, at every election the Labor Party has won the greatest number of votes but has remained in Opposition. In fact, in 1953 it polled about 4,500 votes more than the combined totals of the Liberal Party, the Communist Party and Independents. I have said that in South Australia it is not the Party that polls the greatest number of votes that forms the Government, but the Party that comes into this House with the greatest number of members. I have said that from 1955 to 1961, but this year, with the few schools I have taken through so far, I have had to say that I cannot tell them how the South Australian Parliamentary system works because now it is not the Party that comes into this House with the greatest number of members that forms the Government. At the elections on March 3 the Labor Party polled the majority of votes and it has entered this House with 19 members compared with the Liberal Party's 18 members. I cannot explain to anyone how our Parliamentary system works.

Mr. McKee: People all over the State have been asking that question.

Mr. LAWN: Since March 3 I have had more people asking me questions about our Parliamentary system and what the Premier will do and whether he will resign than I have had in the past 12 years. Great interest has been created as a result of the election. The people cannot understand why a Party with 19 members which secured 54 per cent of the votes—as compared with the Liberal Party's 34 per cent—should remain in Opposition. They have

questioned the legality of the position. They have asked about the skulduggery that is taking place. It is legal, although it is not moral.

Last Sunday morning I listened to a sermon and throughout it I wondered whether the minister in preparing it had this House in mind. During it I was constantly reminded of the situation in this House. He spoke of the days when the Lord came upon the earth and spoke to the sinners—men who had suffered, were suffering, who had no future in life and nothing to look forward to. They sinned openly, did not deny it, and were continuing their sinning, but the Lord said to them, "I have not come to condemn, but to save." However, to the hypocrites—those who outwardly were practising pretence and who inwardly were rotten—He said, "I do not know you." As the sermon progressed my thoughts were of the political set-up in South Australia. I do not know whether his sermon was based on the facts as we know them, but it could not have been more appropriate.

Mr. Quirke: But you have not sinned! Where have you sinned?

Mr. LAWN: I understood that the emphasis was on the hypocrites. The Lord did not want to know them. In fact, I liken the hypocrites to the Liberal Party. When he mentioned the gentle lamb, my mind went to the Australian Labor Party. If I gave all emphasis to that sermon, all members would agree with me. I think he mentioned the wolf, which is the same outwardly as inwardly. That sermon could well have been written as a result of the political set-up in this State.

It might not be amiss to trace the gerrymander from its inception. I do not know whether the people will be told about the debate in this House. As I said earlier, the member for Norwood will not be reported but the Premier will be, so he can get up and make all sorts of glossy statements that are as far from the truth as can be and have them published in the *Advertiser* tomorrow morning: "Government answers Opposition's challenge", the Government being Sir Thomas Playford. I have tried to get some of them up on the other side, but I still doubt whether they will get up. I doubt whether anyone but the Premier will get a mention in the *Advertiser*.

The SPEAKER: You must refer to them as "honourable members", please.

Mr. LAWN: I am sorry; I thought the last thing I said was about the Premier, and I wondered if I had said anything wrong. The Premier will be the only one referred to, and

he will be written up fully. I will now quote something that was said in 1936—not by a Labor man, either.

Mr. Ralston: The Parliamentary Draftsman?

Mr. LAWN: No, the Attorney-General in a Liberal Party Government. I think by that time it had swallowed the Country Party.

Mr. McKee: It is now swallowing the Independents.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, it will swallow anybody. At page 1096 of 1936 *Hansard* the Hon. S. W. Jeffries (North Adelaide—Attorney-General) was introducing the gerrymander Bill of which we are speaking today and which we are attempting to amend. At the outset he claimed that the Government had a mandate from the 1933 elections for its introduction. I have already referred to the recent policy speech of the Leader of the Opposition; I now say that, as a result of our Party's receiving 54 per cent of the votes on March 3 and of the Government's receiving only 34 per cent, surely we have received a mandate to implement the Bill now before the House. Speaking in support of his Bill in 1936, the Attorney-General admitted:

For some time the officials of the Electoral Department, at the request of the Government, have been engaged in preparing a redivision of the State into 39 single electorates, and in May of this year the Government was in possession of a tentative scheme prepared by the Electoral office. This scheme was referred by Cabinet to a committee consisting of His Honour Judge Paine, the Commonwealth Deputy Returning Officer for the State (Mr. N. V. Jeffreys), and the Surveyor-General (Mr. J. H. McNamara).

The first that Parliament knew about it was after the redistribution had been effected upon a request by the Government. The 1954 redistribution was carried out after the matter had been debated in this House, but in 1936 the Government did not have the decency even to get the authority of Parliament. Until 1936, districts were represented by a multiple number of members—some districts had three and some two. Unbeknown to the House, the Government requested a committee of the Electoral Office to draft a Bill dividing the State into 39 electorates (26 country and 13 metropolitan). Then, after examining that report and approving of it, it submitted it to the committee headed by Judge Paine and brought a Bill before this House on August 13, 1936. The Attorney-General continued:

The Imperial Parliament, however, after fully considering the relative advantages and disadvantages of all schemes, decided in

favour of single electorates. The recommendations of the system proposed were, in Mr. Gladstone's opinion, that it was very economical, very simple, and went a very long way towards what is roughly termed the representation of minorities.

The Liberal Party is interested in minorities when it is in the minority, but when the working people are in the minority it is not greatly interested in them. Mr. Jeffries quoted Mr. Gladstone's opinion (endorsing it, otherwise he would not have quoted it) in favour of the single electorate system, and said that it would go a long way towards the representation of minorities. Government supporters were in a minority in 1936, just as they are now. Last Thursday, when you, Sir, were elected, the Premier congratulated you and said, "I am sure you will uphold the rights of the minorities in this Parliament." He was asking you again to look after the interests of the Liberal Party, just as the Attorney-General of the Liberal Party was asking the Parliament to look after his Party in 1936. He went on to talk about the principal argument in Great Britain against the single electorate system, and said:

The principal defect alleged against it was that it exaggerated the representation of majorities. In other words, the majority in Parliament of the successful Party was greater than the number of votes cast for it warranted. In making this criticism it must be remembered that the commission was criticizing single electorates in which elections were conducted on the principle that "first past the post wins." It may be that the criticism of the "exaggerated majority" does not apply in the same degree to single electorates conducted on our present system of preferential voting and election by absolute majorities.

What the Liberal Party had in mind in 1936 was that a single member electorate with the "cross" method of voting could have an exaggerated majority, but the single electorate system with the preferential system of voting would just as much exaggerate the minority as the "cross" system would exaggerate the majority. When that Bill was passed in 1936 it was said that the Butler Government murdered democracy. The people are now saying that, when the Premier announced on March 8 of this year that he was going to continue in office, he murdered the last remaining semblance of democracy which had been left by the Butler Government. The Butler Government at least permitted the people to hold an election believing that they could change the Government if they so desired. Ever since I have been a member, and before that, I have been told by members who were

here in 1936 that Sir Richard Butler said, "This will keep Labor out of office for 20 years."

Mr. McKee: He was right, too.

Mr. LAWN: He was dead right. He kept the Labor Party out of office for 20 years although it polled 54 per cent of the votes. In the Commonwealth Parliament 51 per cent of the people voting for a Party would elect that Party to Government but under this system they could not. Earlier I referred to some remarks made to me since March 3. Many New Australians have asked me to explain the position and when I tried to do so they told me that in their country such a position would result in a revolution.

Because Labor members made a passive resistance and I carried a placard out in the passage members opposite have had the cheek to condemn me for protesting on behalf of the 20,000 people I represent. An honourable member on the other side represents 7,000 to 8,000 people but he had the cheek to say I was making a mockery of Parliament. This Parliament has no dignity while it persists in its refusal to respect the wishes of the people. That is the whole principle of the Bill. Last Thursday honourable members went into another place and heard the Governor's Speech. Don't they know what the Governor said? He asked for divine blessing on the legislation Parliament is about to pass and then members came back here to sit under the angel that watches over our deliberations, the work we are doing and the legislation we pass. Parliament House pillars are on a four-square basis for we are here to pass good laws in the interests of the people.

I have heard Sir Robert Nicholls (a former Speaker) speak on the origin of Parliament and he described what I am saying. When a Bill is introduced we do not dispose of that Bill immediately but members may have 30 to 40 Bills on their files. Each day one or two members may speak and months may pass before a Bill is passed. That is because of the principles of democracy and to enable more people to know what Parliament is doing. The proceedings are reported in the newspapers and broadcasts are made. We are here to represent the people and not to make a mockery of them by refusing to accept their decision made known at a general election. When the electors are disregarded all that members opposite are concerned with is the confidence of this House and swallowing up the Independents when it suits them. They are lowering the dignity of Parliament and have no respect for

the wishes of the people. They have no respect for Parliament or for democracy.

I will carry banners, and let me remind members opposite that when it suits them they also carry them. When the Attlee Government was passing its nationalization legislation in England the Conservative Party carried placards into the Chamber. I at least carried mine out in the passage for the benefit of television, but if necessary I will carry and display them here. However, I did not display them here. I will show honourable members what I consider to be displaying. I showed a placard to three people in the gallery with it on my knees while I was sitting down. Only a portion of it was shown but the member opposite says that I displayed it by showing it in the House. That is not displaying it. If members opposite wish me to display it then I will.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I rise on a point of order. The honourable member is exhibiting a placard.

The SPEAKER: It is out of order to display a placard in the Chamber and the honourable member is not in order.

Mr. LAWN: I know, but I am telling honourable members what I did out of the Chamber. I did not display it last Thursday as I did today. Unless Parliament accepts the wishes of the people members on this side of the House must make this passive protest or we may have to use force. When I say "we" I mean the people of South Australia. The honourable member opposite has not the courage to get up and say what he thinks or to talk about the Bill.

Mr. Nankivell: What about the I.W.W.?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member talks about the I.W.W. but he has a unity ticket with the Country Party, the Democratic Labor Party, the Communists, and even the Independents or anybody else who suits him. During the debate in 1936 the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Andy Lacey) asked why the Bill did not provide for single electorates for the Legislative Council if it was good enough for the House of Assembly, and Mr. Anthony, a member on the other side of the House, said, "When you are on a good thing you stick to it." That was his reply to the Leader of the Opposition. He meant that the Government was changing every three years in this State. In 1921 a Liberal Government was elected. In 1924 the people elected a Labor Government and in 1927 they elected a Liberal Government. In 1930 the Hill Labor Government was elected and in 1933 the Butler Liberal Government was elected.

Governments were changing every three years and the Butler Government said it would stop the people from doing that. It extended that Parliament for five years and went to the Electoral Office and arranged a scheme. Those were the words of the then Attorney-General. The committee did what the Government asked it to do and the proposal was put before the House. When the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, he said, "If single electorates are a good thing for this House, why not have them for the other House?" Mr. Hamilton, from the other side, said, "Why should it? It's only a matter of expediency." I have shown that the Attorney-General told the House that the Government went to the Electoral Office with a scheme for 26 country electorates and 13 metropolitan seats. When the Electoral Office examined it and found it was suitable, the Government appointed a committee, presided over by Judge Paine, to set this thing going, so that the Government could have a good thing and stick to it as a matter of expediency.

Mr. Clark: But it is not such a good system now, is it?

Mr. LAWN: But now the Government is very shaky. It does not think it is as good as it used to be. I think the honourable member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) referred to this. He quoted what the Premier said on the last occasion this matter was debated in this House a year or so ago. The Government did not want any alteration then, but now the Premier feels there must be an alteration.

We are putting up a Bill that is in strict accord with the principles underlying the Commonwealth Constitution and the Commonwealth electoral system. The remarks made by Government members that I have quoted from the 1936 debate show that the Bill as introduced was a sordid way of dealing with democracy. I am sure that this Government has no intention, either, of altering the electoral system to permit the people to give effect to their wishes and elect a Government of their choice. We claim that all the people of the British Commonwealth of Nations (I do not know whether our Government claims it for South Australia; we claim that we practise justice) are equal before the law. If we claim that, surely they should be equal before the law is made? The law applies to all the people when it is made by this House and the Legislative Council, so why should not all the people be consulted before the law is made? Why should not all the people have the right to vote for both the

Houses of Parliament? Then the majority of the people in a democracy reigns—in a democracy. This State cannot boast of that.

Following the 1936 debate, we find that in the 1938 elections, the first elections after that Bill was passed, 58 per cent of the electors resided in the metropolitan area and 42 per cent resided in the country. In 1962, 63 per cent of the electors in South Australia were residing in the metropolitan area while only 37 per cent resided in the country. So, although the Premier got up here this afternoon and talked about country representation, the House of Representatives and one vote one value, we have a drift to the city. Since this Act became operative in 1936, there has been a drift from the country of some 5 per cent of the electors to the metropolitan area.

In 1938 the country vote was worth 2.8 of the metropolitan vote, and in 1962 it was worth 3.3 of the metropolitan vote: in other words, one can say that in 1938 ten country voters were equal to 28 metropolitan voters and in 1962 ten country voters were equal to 33 metropolitan voters. That does not pertain to any part of the British Commonwealth of Nations except South Australia.

In his second reading speech the Leader of the Opposition referred to the votes cast in the last four elections for the Australian Labor Party and Liberal and Country League candidates. I refer to that briefly because, in addition to these figures for the Labor Party candidates and the L.C.L. candidates in those last four elections, I want to show how many members in this House those votes have obtained. In 1953 there were 167,000 votes for the A.L.P. and 119,000 votes for the L.C.L. The Labor Party had 14 members in this House, and the L.C.L. 21. In 1956 there were 129,000 votes for A.L.P. candidates and 100,000 votes for the L.C.L. candidates. The Labor Party had 15 members in this House as against 21 on the Government side. During the next three years there were two by-elections. Labor took one seat from the Government Party and one that was held by an Independent. In 1959 at the general election the Labor Party candidates polled 185,000 votes as against 136,000 votes by the L.C.L., resulting in 17 members coming into this House for the A.L.P. and 21 for the L.C.L. In 1962 the A.L.P. candidates polled 220,000 votes as against 140,000 by the L.C.L. candidates, and we came into this House with 19 each, although Labor had a majority of 80,000.

In 1953 the A.L.P. candidates had to obtain 11,928 votes to elect one member, while the L.C.L. had to obtain only 5,190 to elect a member. In 1956 the A.L.P. had to poll 8,600 votes to elect a member, and the Government Party had to poll 4,760 votes to elect a member. In 1959 the A.L.P. needed 10,882 votes to elect a member, and the Government Party required only 6,746. In 1962 the A.L.P. required 11,579 votes to elect a member while the Government Party required only 7,368. That is a most glaring example of inequality over the last four elections.

I was going to refer to some of the statements by the Premier, as recorded in *Hansard*, on each occasion we have introduced a Bill of this character. I shall not turn up the pages and read them but I will give the references to anybody who wants them. In 1953 the Premier denied that there was any such thing as the principle of one vote one value, and in 1958 he said the only place it applied was in the Commonwealth House of Representatives. In 1953 he denied there was any such principle. Today, he denies that there is any such principle, and ridicules the idea. In 1958 he said that the only place it applied was in the Commonwealth Parliament. So it does apply.

In conclusion, I say that the Bill provides for deadlock provisions similar to those existing in the United Kingdom. There is a reference here that I was going to quote where the Premier praises the British Parliamentary system as it exists in Britain and says that we follow the British Parliamentary system. He has said that in the past. He has said that our Standing Orders are based on the Standing Orders of the British House of Commons. The Premier has mentioned previously that in our Standing Orders we follow the practices, procedures, and usages of the British House of Commons. The House of Commons has passed deadlock provisions, and the Bill as introduced by our Leader provides for deadlock provisions identical to those provided in Britain for a deadlock between the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Without hesitation I say that the House should unanimously agree to the second reading of this Bill, even if members do not agree with all its provisions. In Committee we could decide whether any of them should be altered. In previous debates on this matter the Premier has always referred to section 22 of the Acts Interpretation Act, which states:

Every Act, and every provision or enactment thereof, shall be deemed to be remedial,

and shall accordingly receive such fair, large and liberal construction and interpretation as will best ensure the attainment of the object of the Act and of such provision or enactment, according to their true intent, meaning and spirit.

There is no doubt amongst fair-minded people that the facts placed before the House previously and again today prove that if any legislation in South Australia needs alteration, in a remedial way, it is the legislation dealing with electoral matters. I hope that the Bill will pass the second reading so that the various clauses may be debated in Committee.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I have listened to this debate with considerable interest. At the outset I say that the Bill does not have my support. The member for Adelaide made one extraordinary statement. He said that small districts like Burra and Ridley should not be allowed to control the destinies of the people.

Mr. Lawn: I did not say that.

Mr. QUIRKE: You asked why they should control the matter.

The SPEAKER: Say "the honourable member" and not "you."

Mr. QUIRKE: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. If what the member for Adelaide said is true, why should the member for Frome be counted as a member of the majority?

Mr. Lawn: You read *Hansard*. You will see what I was saying.

Mr. QUIRKE: The member for Adelaide quoted a verse. Let me now say something. Although it may not be word perfect, it epitomizes this debate. It is: "How the minority seeking authority and reaching majority hates the minority!" I am in the minority, but I do not go so far as to say that any member in the House hates me. Those who were in minority and are now seeking authority do not like me. All right, I accept that. I agree that there is a crying need for electoral reform in this State, and that was clearly indicated at the last elections. The undoubted apathy that has existed over the last two elections is indicative of the need for electoral reform. In the election before last in 13 halls I spoke to only 92 out of 6,000 electors. I beat that record this time by speaking to 72 people in the same number of halls. This shows the lack of interest in Parliamentary elections. That offsets any remark that if they had not come I would not have been elected.

Mr. Riches: It shows that the people voted against the Government.

Mr. QUIRKE: They voted for me, as they have voted previously. I have had Labor opponents before and defeated them. It has been said here and used as evidence that the 19 members of the Labor Party have the right to govern. It did not win the election. Because a Party received a majority of the votes cast it does not mean that it won the election. Labor members realize that now, but previously they did not realize it. There were three Parties in a Victorian Parliament, but the majority Party was overruled by the two minor Parties co-operating in a coalition. The only way to find out who is to govern is to ascertain who can command the majority of the votes on the floor of the House.

Mr. Ryan: We know that.

Mr. QUIRKE: I hope honourable members do, because it will stifle further comment along the lines that we have had today. At the last election about 531,000 electors were entitled to vote. About 245,000, or 46 per cent, had no Liberal or Labor competition. In other words, where Labor contested the seat there was no Liberal candidate, and where the Liberal Party contested the seat there was no Labor opponent. We hear comment about 54 per cent, but about 46 per cent had no vote for one side or the other.

Mr. Fred Walsh: We credited this against you in Burra.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have not included them. There were six Liberal seats not contested by Labor and two Labor seats not contested by the Liberal Party. Three seats had spurious Independent candidates to bring out the Legislative Council vote. Was that counted? Of course, Port Pirie, Whyalla and Stuart were counted in the 54 per cent. What was the alternative for people in those districts? They had to vote for Labor or the spurious Independent put up by Labor to bring out the Legislative Council vote, vote informally, or be fined £2. Look at the position in Barossa where there was no Labor candidate. Many people voted for the Communist candidate, but I swear that there are not half a dozen Communists in the district. About 500 people cast informal votes. That sort of thing should not be allowed to continue. Both Parties are culpable in this respect and it is evident that electoral reform is needed. I am prepared to support a reform Bill, but not this one.

Let me give some figures regarding what happened this year in connection with country seats. In the 26 country districts Labor contested only 12, and won seven. I am not

allowing that Port Pirie, Stuart and Whyalla were contested at all. Labor's tally in the country seats is seven out of 26.

Mr. Clark: Who did win those seats?

Mr. QUIRKE: Labor won them, without the contests that took place in all the other seats. In Chaffey, Frome, Gawler, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Murray and Wallaroo there were candidates in opposition. The others were virtually elected unopposed, and those electorates should no more be included in that 54 per cent than Semaphore and Hindmarsh. Those latter districts could be counted in just as easily and with as much justice as the three northern districts to which I referred.

Mr. Ryan: The majority could have been greater.

Mr. QUIRKE: Labor said that Semaphore and Hindmarsh were uncontested seats and therefore the Party did not count them in. If it had done so it would also have had to count in the six Liberal seats uncontested by Labor.

Mr. Ryan: It still would have shown a majority for Labor.

Mr. Dunstan: I gave figures earlier which made it perfectly clear.

Mr. QUIRKE: It is not clear at all; nothing is clear in the last election, except that the Labor Party won 19 seats, the Liberal Party 18, and the Independents 2, and on the floor of the House the Government commands a majority. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Ryan: How does it command a majority?

Mr. QUIRKE: Because I for one have said that I will support the Government on vital issues.

Mr. Ryan: Irrespective of the good of the community!

Mr. QUIRKE: The Premier has made this a vital issue and declared that it is a vote of no confidence. I would not vote for this Bill in any event, because I would not vote for a measure that provided for 30 seats within 10 miles of the General Post Office and 26 seats for the rest of the State. I would never support such a proposal. Under this Bill, with the number of electors divided by 56, the electorates would each consist of 9,000 people.

Mr. McKee: What sort of a Bill would you vote for?

Mr. QUIRKE: A better one than this.

Mr. McKee: Will you suggest an alternative one?

Mr. QUIRKE: I will not put up an alternative; this is Labor's Bill, and the Labor Party stands or falls by it. I am against it.

Mr. Ryan: Because we introduced it.

Mr. QUIRKE: No, because it attempts to introduce exactly the same set-up that exists in New South Wales today. My district today, with the three big towns of Burra, Clare, and Jamestown, as well as the other smaller towns, can command only 6,000 electors. Where am I going to get another 3,000? The district is big enough as it is. Do I take over half of the original district of Stanley? If I had to do that, how far south would I have to come in order that the districts could be equated?

Mr. Ryan: We leave that to competent people.

Mr. QUIRKE: Competent people did not draw this Bill up and its proposals would not be tolerated. I should hate to tell any country people that this measure provides for 30 city seats and 26 country seats, each with 9,000 people. It would mean that the districts would be half as big again as they are today. I agree that the Legislative Council needs to be reformed.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not agree with the present franchise, which ignores a big proportion of the women of South Australia. By no means can that be called a system which is satisfactory in the conditions that we know today.

Mr. Fred Walsh: Would you support adult franchise for the Legislative Council?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but not a compulsory vote.

Mr. Ryan: Why not?

Mr. QUIRKE: Because the people cannot be got to the polls now.

Mr. Ryan: You can get them there for the Senate elections.

Mr. QUIRKE: Any returning officer will tell you that people go along today and cast their votes because they are compelled to do so. When they are offered papers for the Legislative Council they will not take them, because they say it is not compulsory.

Mr. Ryan: They take them for the Senate.

Mr. QUIRKE: They do not take them for the Legislative Council; the figures show that. I would not compel anyone to vote, even for the House of Assembly, because I think that principle is wrong. Speaking from memory, I believe that compulsory voting was introduced only in 1942; when I was first elected to Parliament it was on a non-compulsory vote.

Mr. Fred Walsh: That was as a Labor Party candidate, wasn't it?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. I think that anyone who has to be compelled to vote is not worthy of the vote.

Mr. Riches: Do you believe in compulsory education?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, but that is entirely different. I have material here that would enable me to speak at length on this matter, but I do not propose to do so now because there will be other opportunities. I agree that a far-reaching electoral reform is necessary in South Australia. However, I could not possibly support this Bill, which would subjugate country interests to the metropolis, as is the case in New South Wales where, speaking from memory, there are 96 seats in the Lower House of which 60 are in the congested metropolitan area from Wollongong to, I think, Palm Beach. The country districts are in a minority, and I will not vote to put this State in that position. As a country member I have to look to the interests of the country electors, and their interests are not best served by having the majority of electorates in the metropolitan area that is suggested in this Bill.

Mr. McKee: You don't mean that; tell us the truth.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know those things to be true, and nobody can embarrass me. As soon as something is introduced which gives the people of the country a safe voice in the Government of this State I will look at it and vote accordingly. I do not intend to support this Bill.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I support the Bill. No doubt there will be a certain amount of repetition in this debate because of its one-sided nature. I am surprised that Government members have not seen fit to address themselves to the Bill. I presume they have taken the Premier's lead and accepted everything that he has said as being sufficient opposition.

Never in all my time in this House has public opinion been so focused on electoral reform as it has been in the last few months, particularly since the last elections. On this occasion the Premier has indulged in the same methods and practices as he has on every occasion that the Opposition has attempted to bring in amendments to the Constitution Act. He has tried to ridicule such a move on every occasion, and he proceeded to do so today.

Mr. Ryan: But he did not make a very good job of it.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I am afraid he did not. He finds himself in a bit of a jam, because on previous occasions he had been able to face this question with a feeling that everything would be all right. He was residing in a smug atmosphere, because he knew

he had an absolute majority of members. Therefore, he could afford to be a little humorous in his attempt to ridicule the Bills previously submitted by the Labor Party. But today the position was very different. No doubt members noticed the worried look on his face. He has lost that joviality, that care-free way he used to adopt when approaching this question. He now knows that sooner or later the Constitution Act has to be amended because of public clamour, and for no other reason. His Party would have been quite happy, and so would he, to continue along in its own sweet way as it has done for 23 years without any fear of possible defeat of the Government; but today it is different.

We find that indicated in public speeches and statements on television presentations (not by the Labor Party, but by others who have a disinterested attitude on this matter). They have expressed views similar to those expressed in one section of the press. I can with considerable confidence refer to the *News*, to which the South Australian public is indebted for the manner in which it has presented comments on this subject from time to time. I think its leader on March 9 gives a very clear picture of the position and the influence it must have on the Premier and his Party. It included the following:

No Party with only 34 per cent of the total votes cast in an election, to another Party's 54 per cent, has a moral right to be in office. But the net result of the L.C.L.'s. 34 per cent to Labor's 54 per cent was the loss of only two seats to make the respective numbers in the Assembly 18 and 19.

Electoral reform. It is not so morally wrong for a party to hang on to office because it is one seat down.

What is morally wrong is that an outmoded, undemocratic electoral system should be perpetuated, a system under which the real wishes of the people cannot be expressed.

It is clear beyond doubt that a big majority of people felt that Labor should be given an opportunity to govern.

In view of this, one of the first measures the Playford Government must take is to bring in legislation to grant much-needed electoral reform.

It has already been unofficially canvassed that Sir Thomas might bring in a Bill to alter the electoral system from the current two zones to three zones—metropolitan, country-industrial, and rural.

Whatever the merits or otherwise, the public will demand, and has a right to be given, a new deal on electoral boundaries under which the will of the people can be more accurately reflected through the ballot boxes.

In its editorial on March 28 the *News* had this to say:

The Playford position is by no means without precedent. There is nothing politically immoral in it. It is a hard, practical fact. The man who can muster a majority in Parliament is the man who rules.

But there is something challengeable in the system by which Sir Thomas has managed to cling to power.

Until the electoral boundaries have been redrawn to make the vote more equitable, there is bound to be deep dis-satisfaction in the minds of a great majority of voters.

I think that the *News* in those few lines expresses the opinion of the general public on the question of electoral reform. However, people have not given sufficient attention to this matter for many years, and are only doing so now because of the position we find ourselves in today with the House containing 19 Labor members and 18 L.C.L. members and two Independents, with the Government entirely dependent upon the casting vote of the Speaker to pass any legislation. I submit that that is not good. I am one who believes that, irrespective of the Party constituting the Government, it has a right to govern, and the only way it can be given that right is by being assured of its having a majority in the House, without depending upon Independents; and in the Federal sphere without the present Government's depending upon the support of members of the Democratic Labor Party. If we do not accept that view, we find ourselves in the position that one man can dominate a Parliament. I am confident that members on the other side are not happy about that position. It goes without saying that my Party is not happy and that is why we introduced the Bill.

Despite the arguments used by the Premier, our system is about the worst of any country outside the Iron Curtain. If I wanted to, I could go into the position existing in South Africa, but I do not desire to do that; and I do not want to make any reference to any of the backward countries, particularly those which only in recent years have been granted independence. It could not be expected that their system of Parliamentary Government could be of the same standard as that in this country. Because there are so many anomalies existing in the South Australian Act, it is only right and just that we should give members of the public an opportunity to express themselves per medium of the ballot box. The Premier in his speech did not make a very good job and is capable of doing much better. We know that his style was cramped. He had to depend to a large extent upon someone else. He quoted from a report by the Parliamentary Draftsman. It was suggested that

we had not gone to that officer. I do not know what the position is in that regard before he takes a seat on the floor of the Chamber. The position, of course, is unprecedented, because we took advantage of the first opportunity to show our disapproval of the Government's action in remaining in office.

The Premier presented the Parliamentary Draftsman's short explanation of the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition, however, went into it fully and competently explained its provisions. The Premier referred to the Legislative Council's non-obstructive attitude and mentioned particularly the Bill he introduced to nationalize the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. He had the full support of all members of the Opposition in the House of Assembly for that legislation, although some of his own Party, because of their interests in the company, strongly opposed it. When it came before the Legislative Council a majority could not be obtained and it was not until the Premier used his influence—and I am being as kind as I can when I use that term—on one member of the Council and persuaded him to change his mind that the Bill was passed. I give credit for the introduction of that legislation. Where would he be today if it had been left to the Adelaide Electric Supply Company to provide power throughout the State? Nowhere near the amount of development that has occurred would have taken place. The Labor Party does not deny that it is its policy to bring monopolies under State control: that is why we supported that legislation.

The Premier said that during the election campaign he went into the West Torrens electorate. The Liberal Party expected to unseat me. Indeed, one or two members were sufficiently courageous to wager that I would be beaten, and it was no fault of members of the Liberal Party that I was not beaten. The Minister of Education also went into my electorate and did his best to bring about my defeat by the Liberal candidate.

Mr. Dunstan: He almost brought about his own defeat!

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

Mr. FRED WALSH: At the adjournment I was dealing with the Premier's statement that he went into West Torrens during the recent State election campaign. It was fortunate for me that he did, as I think he helped my prospects; he certainly did not damage them. He attended one meeting at Flinders Park that was also attended by the Liberal candidate and, I think, Mr. Keith Wilson, the Commonwealth

member for Sturt. At this meeting, attended mainly by Italians, for whom an interpreter had been supplied, the Premier, in advocating certain aspects of Liberal Party policy, said (as reported to me) that he considered it was time I retired and that younger men were wanted in Parliament. I believe there are many members in this Parliament much older than I.

Mr. Dunstan: He is a sexagenarian himself.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I know he is not much younger than I. If what I was told was true, it was unbecoming of the Premier to go into an electorate and make such statements about a candidate. However, the Premier denies it, and I must accept his apology because the person who told me this (someone who attended the meeting) was an Italian. The Premier also spoke about taking away rights from the people. I fail to see where this Bill tends to do that. As a matter of fact, we go out of our way to give electors every opportunity to express their will in what we consider to be a just and democratic way. I believe that the rights of the people have been denied for a long time in this State and, so long as we continue the unjust and iniquitous system we have, they will continue to be denied.

For a long time the question of initiative, referendum and recall was on the platform of the Labor Party, which attempted many times to bring about amendments to the Constitution to provide for these things. I still believe that that is the most democratic system of the lot, as it gives to the people the right to decide whether legislation is acceptable or not. Let us look at the position in Switzerland where this obtains. In Basle, which is one of the cantons, it is mandatory that all legislation passed by the cantonal legislature (which is equivalent to our States) shall be submitted to the people before it becomes operative. In the other cantons of Switzerland it is within the rights of the people to petition for a referendum to be taken. I think 30,000 or 40,000 must sign a petition on any legislation that may be passed by the cantons or by the Federal Council, the highest authority in the Swiss Parliament. There is also the right to initiate legislation by petition. One could not imagine a more democratic system than that in Switzerland, yet I suppose there is not, from the point of view of production, a poorer country in Europe than Switzerland. Out of its 16,000 square miles about 12,000 square miles is arable, and two-fifths of the foodstuffs that the people consume must be imported, yet they carry legislation in such a democratic way.

I think it is a pity that our Party turned aside from its policy of recall, but this was done from experience in an attempt to get State and Federal Parliaments to give effect to it, so as a result it does not appear today. The Party could be charged with having changed its policy from time to time. It is a wonder the Premier did not refer to that, as he was critical of our representation on the Federal Executive of our Party and on our State conferences. However, he did not refer to it, and I was rather surprised. I now come to the honourable member for Burra, who was the last who should have spoken in the way in which he did.

The SPEAKER: You must refer to him as "the honourable member".

Mr. FRED WALSH: I thought I did.

The SPEAKER: You said "he".

Mr. FRED WALSH: I cannot keep saying "the honourable member" all the time. I referred to him as "the honourable member for Burra", and one has only to express oneself in a respectful way when referring to a member. I thought I was as respectful as I could possibly be. I may be lacking in knowledge of Parliamentary etiquette, but I attempt at all times to be respectful, and I try to behave myself in a way becoming a member of Parliament. It will be recalled that the member for Burra was elected to this Parliament as a member of the Labor Party on the policy of that Party, and that he survived three elections as a member of that Party. For reasons best known to himself he took certain action which compelled the Party to take certain action against him, but he was suspended, not expelled, from the Party, and had the right of redress if he so desired, but it was obvious from his actions at that time that he did not desire it. I shall now refer to parts of the speech he made on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill (Electoral) in 1953 when he was an Independent, not a member of the Labor Party. He said:

I hold—together with a number of members of the Liberal Party, I am glad to say—that some reform of the existing electoral system is necessary, but I cannot support the setting up of districts of the magnitude forecast in this debate. I consider a three-member district would be admirable, both as regards size and representation. I will not go into how such a system could be evolved, for it would be only so much beating the wind and would need an inquiry which I heartily support in the same way that I support the necessity for another Federal Convention to iron out the many difficulties which have arisen in Commonwealth-State relationships.

Then the honourable member went on to say:

Now I come to the principle of one vote one value, which the Premier and other members ridiculed. If it is wrong, then we should take it out of the Industrial and Provident Societies Act. In that legislation irrespective of the holding one man one vote is the order of the day. Under it the vote of one man has the value of one vote, and not a fraction of it.

That is different from the words expressed by the honourable member this afternoon and I wonder why he has changed his viewpoint on such a vitally important matter since 1953. The honourable member proceeded:

I should like to have radiating districts which would embrace not only part of the city, but part of the country.

That is contained in this Bill, taking the outer suburban areas into the fringe country areas. That is the idea behind the Labor Party's submitting the Bill. The honourable member continued:

The interests of the people in the city and the country are mutual. The city dwellers consume the products grown in the country, and should appreciate what takes place in the country from which their sustenance has its origin. More and more people of the city are becoming divorced from the realization that they live and have their being because of the work done in the country, and that is a dangerous attitude.

That creates discrimination between country and metropolitan areas.

Mr. Quirke: I did not speak against it.

Mr. FRED WALSH: No, but the honourable member questioned it today and attempted to ridicule the principle of one vote one value. That is a complete somersault from the way in which the honourable member expressed himself in 1953. It is regrettable that we should find ourselves in this position where Parliament is evenly divided and any legislation passed has to be decided on your vote, Mr. Speaker. That places the Speaker in a responsible and onerous position and members on this side of the House trust that absolute impartiality will be the governing factor when you, Sir, vote on this or any other matter coming before Parliament during its lifetime. I support the Bill and, with other members of my Party, commend it for thorough and thoughtful consideration.

Mr. MCKEE (Port Pirie): I support the Bill because it will provide equality under the electoral system for South Australia and will be a great benefit to our people. The Premier, this afternoon, said he believed a vote in favour of this Bill would be a vote of no confidence in himself. I, along with 56 per cent of

the South Australian people, support that statement. The Premier also said that he was most concerned about the number of Communist seamen who were in Adelaide at election time. The Premier had every reason to be concerned.

Mr. Dunstan: They think it is a home from home.

Mr. McKEE: If they tried to contact him it was no doubt to get a leaf out of his book to see how he conducted his dictatorship here. I have a copy of a weekly paper that is published in Adelaide and it contains an advertisement about a Communist booklet which, I understand, is being sold in a Communist bookshop in Hindley Street. I believe it is a best-seller. I understand that society people and others are rushing to buy this booklet.

Mr. Dunstan: The chief sale is at the Adelaide Club.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. It mentions at least 79 companies, which are directed by 20 South Australian families. The Premier is entitled to be worried because these 20 families are his very close friends and it is not very nice to have their names shown in the Communist social column. The Premier spoke of that this afternoon and I am concerned about his being worried about this matter. I did not intend to speak on this Bill, but since the member for Burra spoke this afternoon I think I should speak if only to quote some of the words used by him when this matter was being debated in this House in October 1959. On that occasion the honourable member said it was imperative that South Australia should have more members in this House, because we had far too few members. He also stated that the system of voting in the other place belonged to a bygone age and that it was a restricted voting system, which was entirely wrong.

Mr. Quirke: That still stands.

Mr. McKEE: He also said that it was a House of privilege that had no right to function today.

Mr. Quirke: That still stands.

Mr. McKEE: And he said that most of the States of the Commonwealth had seen the light and had discarded the Upper House. He went on to say he did not agree with the electoral set-up in South Australia.

Mr. Dunstan: He always voices some different reason each time for voting against the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: He has opposed so many Bills that he has forgotten which he has opposed and which he should support. He disagreed with the electoral set-up in this State but, no matter how much he despised this

particular set-up, on every occasion when such a Bill came before the House it came as no surprise to members on this side of the House when he said that although he openly admitted that the people of South Australia were not getting a fair deal, he was not prepared to do anything about it. He said he regretted that he could not support the Bill because it would be detrimental to the Government and to some of his colleagues, or probably one of them.

The remarks of the member for Gouger on this occasion were fitting when he said that perhaps the member for Burra supported the motion because he believed nothing would come out of it. I thought that was very good. That is indeed just what he thought, and how right he was.

Mr. Clark: He is right sometimes.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. The member for Gouger continued that the member for Burra had a good idea how the vote would go in this House. The member for Burra was rather cagey and he thought he should take no risks and he made doubly sure by voting with the Government. I believe that is undemocratic voting and a suppression of the rights of the majority of the people. It is a dangerous alternative to the democratic processes. I previously stated that the people should be allowed to have confidence in themselves. They should be allowed to elect their own Government through their own democratically elected representatives in the legislative institutions.

Mr. Quirke: The majority should prevail.

Mr. McKEE: I understand that is what a democratic Government means: it is government by the people. The authority of a good government should be to extend freedom in a real sense. There is no greater personal freedom than to allow the people to elect the government of their choice. If any honourable member in this House is of the opinion that the people he represents are not getting a fair deal, it is his duty as a member of this House to do something about it. The average Australian is a pretty reasonable sort of person who believes that fair play is bonny play, and every person entrusted with authority should understand this aspect of the human psychology. He should know what is expected of him and should give his services honestly and faithfully.

Every member of this House knows that the majority of people in this State are strongly opposed to the Government's gerrymander. They have become alive to the fact that they are not getting a fair deal and now realize

that the Playford gerrymander has never been designed to benefit everybody. They know now that it has been designed to suit the purpose of the monopoly vultures of South Australia. I firmly believe that the only political framework within which a free society 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 purpose. Under the present electoral system, the Government exercises great control over its citizens. When the people are denied the government of their choice, it simply means that their freedom is being controlled. There is no doubt whatsoever that South Australia is a Labor State. Fifty-six per cent as against 34 per cent indicates clearly what the people want. The present set-up in the South Australian Parliament is a joke while it houses the disproportion of the gerrymander instead of a fair representation of a democratic electoral procedure. Daily, the people of this State are asking: what is democracy? That is the burning question that the whole world today is asking. It is being asked by a wide variety of people, most of whom are not prepared to wait much longer for an answer before looking elsewhere for a solution. With the restricted voting of the Legislative Council and the gerrymandered electorates of this House of Assembly, I challenge any member opposite to convince me that this is a democracy. I have been led to believe that "democracy" means "government by the people". The word originated from the Greek—"by the people and for the people". I do not know why we use the word out here. It must upset the Greeks when they come here and hear us using it.

Mr. Riches: We are governed by some of the people.

Mr. McKEE: It would be entirely wrong to refer to South Australia as a democratic State while this undemocratic gerrymander remains. This undemocratic voting system has finally become clear to the people of this State and, since the election on March 3, the people and the trade union movement have been holding meetings demonstrating throughout the State their hostility to the one-man rule. We of the Australian Labor Party intend to fight and leave no stone unturned to acquire a fair and just voting system for the people. We shall never be content until all undeserved poverty is banished from this land. This can be brought about only when the people can

enjoy a full, free and satisfying life with a decent home and a secure job.

From its earliest days the Australian Labor movement has been concerned with personal freedom, and that can be brought about only by a political democracy, which I am afraid does not exist here today. I support this Bill because I believe that a Government should serve and not dominate the people, and the privileges of a few should be transformed into the 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 it is under a democracy, where it has to face the people and can be dismissed by the people. The Playford gerrymander in this State is the basis of an out-moded Industrial Code, with no proper award for rural workers, no workmen's compensation travelling to and from work and no automatic living wage adjustments. Many anomalies exist and are favoured by the gerrymander in South Australia. In fact, the people of this State for many years have voted against the Tory rule but, under this gerrymandered system, they are forced to accept a Government that makes laws only to suit the wealthy.

Finally, the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) said this afternoon that spurious Independents were put up in various electorates during the recent election.

Mr. Jennings: Who won?

Mr. McKEE: He said that in various electorates spurious Independents were put up to invite the Liberal and Country League vote. I should like to know where one would get two more spurious Independents than we have sitting in this House at this very moment.

Mr. Shannon: Is that a reflection on the Chair?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McKEE: I support this Bill because it is what most of the people of South Australia want.

The SPEAKER: The question is: "That this Bill be now read a second time." If the Leader of the Opposition speaks he closes the debate.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I am a little concerned about replying to some of the remarks made in this debate, particularly as they concern one honourable member. As I have not had the opportunity to peruse the *Hansard* pulls of this debate I crave your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to use information in today's press. I want to do that so as to clear up some points before the debate continues. Tonight's

edition of the newspaper states that an attack was made on the Opposition by Sir Thomas Playford, and that he said that his retention of office had been deemed to be a proper method of dealing with the present political situation. He was also reported as saying:

I make this explanation so I can explain to members why it was that the Government so readily agreed at the last day of sitting to the resolution of Mr. Walsh that Standing Orders be suspended to enable him to move a motion without notice.

It was also reported that the Premier said that the reason he had agreed was that the Leader of the Opposition had informed him that he desired to move a no-confidence motion. I want to make a statement on this matter and I make no apologies for making it, because I want members to know where the Opposition stands in the matter. Last Thursday at about 10.50 a.m. in the room of the Clerk of the House of Assembly, Sir Thomas Playford, the Clerk and I discussed the business of the day. I indicated at the time that after the appointment of the various committees necessary on the opening day of Parliament I would seek the suspension of Standing Orders in order to move a motion without notice, and I said that I expected to receive the permission. I am not responsible for what Sir Thomas had in his mind. I have never said that I would move a vote of no confidence, and I repeat that I said I would seek permission to suspend the Standing Orders to move a motion without notice. I cannot be held responsible for saying that this was a vote of no confidence.

Mr. Shannon: We know the position. This would not have happened under Mick O'Halloran.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: As a reference has been made by Mr. Shannon, I think it is appropriate now to mention another remark by him. According to tonight's newspaper he said, "We thought we were dealing with gentlemen."

Mr. Dunstan: He would not know what the term meant.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: We consider ourselves to be gentlemen. I make a further remark to the member for Onkaparinga by saying that I would not press the issue too far if I were in his position.

Mr. Shannon: That is a dreadful threat.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: If the honourable member wishes to carry it farther let him

keep on interrupting. He has the opportunity and if he wants to use it let him go on, but I would not press it too far. I repeat that I have never indicated that this would be a vote of no confidence in Sir Thomas and his Party. I will not be hoodwinked into believing that it is. I assure him that whilst I am the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Ryan: It will not be much longer.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: As the Leader of the Opposition I say that we shall choose our own time for moving such a motion. Mr. Speaker, the Notice Paper that we have today is the second that has been printed since last Thursday, and I thank you for the correction. The Standing Orders that were suspended were Nos. 43, 94, 226, 243, 293 and 295. Not one member of this House dissented from the motion.

Mr. Ryan: They did not wake up.

Mr. Shannon: Then it was a trick.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Not one member raised any objection.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I do not mind if interjections are made to me. I listened to the debate today without interrupting, and I expect the same courtesy to be extended toward me tonight. There was not one dissentient voice to the motion for the suspension of those Standing Orders. If any member on the opposite side had asked for an explanation on any of them it would have been readily available. I can only conclude that it was a unanimous decision that I should have the suspension of those Standing Orders. There is the question: "Who is in charge of the House on this occasion?" Is it we, the Opposition, or is it the Party led by Sir Thomas Playford, which claims to be the Government? The Opposition, on the first appropriate occasion, has taken the business out of the hands of the Government.

Mr. Shannon: That will be resolved tonight.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Government members had the opportunity to speak, but they were silent. If Sir Thomas Playford is still going to claim this as a no-confidence motion—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader must say "the honourable member."

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to address him as the member for Gumeracha, if you so insist, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: He is the honourable the Treasurer.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Very well, Sir. I stand by what I have already said. I hope that in the event of your being called upon to give

a casting vote on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, you will not be voting on a motion of no confidence. You, Sir, have not had an opportunity to say anything on the matter other than that it is a most important matter and that it has precedence over any other business of this House. I do not see why I should have been expected to seek the Premier's permission to introduce a Bill; I am mindful of what the Standing Orders provide in that respect. The most important issue confronting the people of South Australia today is the question of how they elect their Parliament, and the most important matter for all concerned is whether or not the Constitution Act should be amended in that respect.

No Party in this House is capable of obtaining an absolute majority, and therefore both Parties have to rely on the support of those who have been elected as Independents. We are therefore in a sorry position so far as legislation is concerned. If I read the newspaper headlines correctly, the Premier stated that he went to the electors of the State for an absolute majority. This Bill is therefore most important, because the Premier gave the impression that an absolute majority was most desirable. I do not think the Premier would deny that. Why has this Bill become such an important issue that it has to be declared a motion of no confidence? This Bill, or some sections of it which would give the people of South Australia the opportunity to have a Government that could govern, could have been accepted, and failing that there could at least have been a reasonable attempt by the Party claiming Government to amend it. Ample opportunities have presented themselves, but it is a silent House as far as members opposite are concerned. Surely a democratically elected Government should have more than one mouth-piece. Are members opposite admitting to the people of this State that they are not capable of debating the Bill, or have they been flogged into submission by their one spokesman? On this most important measure, we have had only one Government speaker. The member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) might give a bit more consideration to these matters instead of giving me a nice smile that could mean anything.

During the election campaign I said, more than once, that there was a need for an increase in the number of members of Parliament. I also said that there was a need for one roll for all Parliamentary elections, compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting. I stand four-square on the question of the Party

system of government, and I have never deviated from that stand. I say that without reflecting on any member. We have had 39 members in this House since 1938, and I think it is reasonable to say that our population has nearly doubled since then. The Government in 1953, through weight of numbers, was able to increase the number of Ministers by two without any increase in the number of members. It is obvious that we are gradually coming more under Executive control, and at the same time we are denying the people control of the destinies of the State. What does the Government say about that? I claim we are daily getting closer and closer to Executive control, for our population is increasing and we have fewer members of Parliament than we did prior to 1938.

The Premier referred to the philosophy of the people, but his concern in that respect is rather difficult to understand. One cannot escape the conclusion that we are getting nearer and nearer to Executive control. I hope it will never come to that; it certainly will not in my time if I have a voice to protest, and that is why the Bill was introduced. It was to protect us against that type of thing. In his speech the Premier referred to the quotas of electors necessary to return a member of the Senate in the various States. I do not think it was in good taste to mention Senate representation quotas, because the Premier knows as well as I do that there is equal representation from each of the States in the Senate. I think the founders of the Commonwealth Constitution foresaw the possibility of what could happen and made an effort to safeguard the position. I suppose the Premier has already been informed that in Western Australia and Queensland there will be an investigation under the Constitution as to representation because of the lopsidedness of certain districts. He mentioned the district of West Sydney. It is well known that in New South Wales there will be one metropolitan seat abolished because of the quota system of representation. In South Australia, it is already known that in the Federal districts of Kingston, Boothby and Bonython there must be a review of the position because of the increase in the population in those areas.

As to my Party having a mandate for this legislation, I used the word "mandate" three times when I introduced the Bill, and I make no apology for that. I also mentioned that only one member from the other side had challenged my claim that we have a mandate. There has already been mentioned that 63

per cent of our population resides in the metropolitan area, and 37 per cent in the country. Under the terms of the Bill that 37 per cent would have 45 per cent of the representation in this House, and that is a pretty good representation.

Mr. Shannon: Of course you are avoiding what Mr. Dunstan admitted: that you are going to include some of the metropolitan electors in country districts to make up the quota.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: We do not have to go far afield, either north or south, to ascertain which is country and which is not. At Sturt Creek, near the Flagstaff Hotel, we find that is the commencement of Mr. Shannon's district. If that area is to be called country, I am doubtful whether it will ever get a supply of water, let alone many other desirable amenities. That is not very good reasoning on the honourable member's part. But let me assure him that my Party will have no hesitation in putting more of the fringe metropolitan area, as it is defined under the existing legislation, into some of the country centres.

Mr. Shannon: I thought we might get that.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: If we took the district of Gawler as an illustration and included Elizabeth in that area, that is not decentralization. To me it is only another fringe area of the metropolitan area. If the Government were sincere, there would be no fewer than three districts in the present Gawler division. The Premier has objected to my claim to have a mandate. I have already mentioned that my Party polled 54 per cent of the votes as against 34 per cent by the Liberal and Country League. During my speech on the second reading I certainly claimed to have the mandate of the people as a result of the policy advocated during the recent election campaign. The Premier objects to my claim and therefore I wish to quote briefly some figures. I have already mentioned that the Australian Labor Party polled 54 per cent of the votes cast during the election campaign as against the L.C.L. vote of 34 per cent, but let us consider the respective percentages of electors that each Party represents. The percentage of electors in the 19 districts held by the A.L.P. is 59, whereas the percentage of electors in the 18 seats held by the L.C.L. is only 39; and the percentage of electors in the districts held by the Independents is only two. Carrying this a step further, the Premier said that those two districts would have no say in who was going to form the Government. He is pre-

pared to deny 59 per cent of the people any say in who is going to form the Government in order to try to force the Independents into the position of having to support the Government on this measure. At present the country representation is 26 seats and, as has been stated, I guaranteed to the electors during the election campaign that the A.L.P. would not reduce the country representation.

We on this side of the House are very mindful of the desirability and the necessity to have greater representation in the Parliament of South Australia. This is a most important factor associated with the Bill. If the people of South Australia are to be represented adequately the number of members in this House must be increased. We have not attempted in this Bill to suggest where the districts should be, but have stated a broad principle. Under our proposal a permanent electoral commission of three will be appointed. It will comprise a judge of the Supreme Court, the Surveyor-General and the Chief Electoral Officer and it will inquire and make recommendations respecting the division of the State into 56 electoral districts for the House of Assembly and five electoral districts for the Legislative Council; divide each of the Assembly districts into subdivisions; publish any proposed new electoral districts and any proposed alteration of an existing electoral district in the *Government Gazette* and in the newspapers circulating in the district; consider any objections in writing that may be lodged with it within two months from the date of such publication; and present a final report on its inquiries and a final recommendation thereon to the Governor.

We are not attempting to foist our opinions on the commission. We have sufficient confidence in the appointees. In the last 29 years we have not had an opportunity to appoint a judge of the Supreme Court, a Chief Electoral Officer or a Surveyor-General. We have not been in office to do so, yet we are prepared, in the interests of the people of South Australia, to give the right to those persons to introduce a system that will give one vote one value and a Parliament that will govern in the interests of the State. I hope the Bill is carried.

The SPEAKER: This being a Constitution Act Amendment Bill I have counted the House and there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House and a dissentient voice on the question that the Bill be read a second time, it is necessary to have a division.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ralston, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, and Heaslip, Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pattinson, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are 19 Ayes and 19 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote in favour of the Noes and so the question passes in the negative.

Second reading thus negated.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

That during the present session, unless otherwise ordered, the House meet on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in each week, at 2 o'clock.

Motion carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

That during the present session, on Tuesdays and Thursdays and after the 6 o'clock adjournment on Wednesdays, Government business take precedence over other business, except questions.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 18, at 2 p.m.