HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 24, 1962.

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

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.

INDUSTRIAL CODE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Can the Premier say whether the Government will introduce a Bill to amend the Industrial Code this session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government intended to introduce a Bill this session, and in fact that was referred to in His Excellency the Governor's Speech. Conferences have been held between the department, employers and trade unions, and many matters have been agreed on in principle, some of them in detail. I think 29 amendments have been agreed on by both parties as being desirable in general principle, but unfortunately the Government's legislation is not yet prepared. The legislation has not yet been resubmitted to the employers and the trade union movement to make sure that it is in accordance with the agreement, and under those circumstances I do not expect that it will be ready for honourable members before the House prorogues. The Government will have the matter discussed in Cabinet, but at the same time it will take the responsibility of getting the Bill printed (and I hope that that can be done before Christmas) and distributed to every member, together with an explanation of the clauses, so that members may study it. If the Bill is before members for a considerable period and they have a full explanation of it, they will have a chance to study it, and I think that under those circumstances it could probably be dealt with early next session. This is complicated legislation, and it is necessary to get the best we can and to secure substantial agreement between the two parties most concerned with its successful operation. I regret to tell the Leader that I doubt that the legislation will be ready for consideration this session.

GRAPE PRICES.

Mr. LAUCKE: The degree of stability and understanding that has been attained in the grapegrowing and winemaking industries through the system of arbitration between the two parties on the prices of grapes, with the Prices Commissioner as the arbiter, is one of the outstanding achievements in industry in recent times. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to make the services of the Commissioner again available this year for a continuation of this desirable system?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I agree with the honourable member. I believe that Mr. Murphy has done valuable work in connection with grape prices over the last few years, and that the industry desires that work to continue. I am sure that Cabinet would agree to Mr. Murphy's making a survey, in consultation with the industry, of a similar type to that which he undertook in the last two years. The wine industry last year had a particularly heavy vintage, and the winemakers, in accordance with a Government request, took in large additional quantities of grapes. Consequently, nearly every winery in the State now has some embarrassment regarding stocks. I believe it will be necessary for some of the grapes normally produced for drying purposes to revert to that purpose this year if the vintage is to be successfully handled. That is a matter that Mr. Murphy might also investigate when acting on the suggestion of the honourable member regarding prices.

CANNERY TAKE-OVER.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Premier say whether the Brookbern cannery at Loxton, with its assets and liabilities, has been taken over by or transferred to the Riverland co-operative cannery and, if it has, whether growers who were owed money for fruit supplied to Brookbern will be paid?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This property was in the hands of a receiver and its disposal would obviously have to be arranged and approved by him. I heard unofficially that the receiver had made a move to dispose of the factory along the lines suggested by the honourable member. I do not know whether this has been finally arranged or not, but I shall inquire.

TRANSPORT CONTROL BOARD.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my question of October 16 about the Transport

Control Board's decision on an application by a bus operator regarding a charter trip from Whitwarta to Adelaide?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman of the Transport Control Board reports:

The board has checked its records for the past four months and can find no instance where an application to transport the Whitwarta Women's Agricultural Bureau has been refused. If, however, an application similar to that referred to in the question were made the board would require to know why the rail service could not be availed of. The member for Gouger has expressed the view that, irrespective of the service provided by the Railways Commissioner, competitive road service should be provided. This view is contrary to my board's interpretation of the Road and Railway Transport Act and is also at variance with the policies of the transport control authorities of the other States of the Commonwealth. It is respectfully pointed out that the luxury air-conditioned type Bluebird rail car operated daily between Gladstone and Adelaide via Balaklava compares more than favourably with any road coach. The service is fast, averaging approximately 40 miles an hour between Balaklava and Adelaide, and gives over nine hours' time in Adelaide to persons making a day return trip. If more time in Adelaide is desired an additional three hours is possible by using an earlier rail car. This rail car is not the Bluebird type. In determining the merits of permit applications the board is unable to completely ignore railway service and its task is frequently made difficult by applicants supplying inaccurate or inadequate information. Unquestionably the extensive demand for road transport which exists today is due to road operators quoting charges below the railway rates. The board has been granting all applications for charter hire covering conveyance of pensioners, and the number of coach tours made by pensioners is phenomenal. In pursuance of this policy of granting road transport to pensioners, the board issued permits for 39 buses to transport pensioners from the Adelaide metropolitan area to a Kadina rally on Tuesday, October 16. It could well be said that these pensioners numbering about 1,500 should have travelled by train, as a special train could readily have been provided for this number and the majority would undoubtedly be frequently availing themselves of the benefit of Government concessional fares when travelling within the metropolitan area.

PETERBOROUGH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the proposed reclassification from class II to class III of the Peterborough Primary School and whether the number of classified schools could be increased to permit country primary schools to remain class II schools and thus have the benefit of better teachers?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of Education reports:

As you pointed out in your reply, no-one wishes to see any large primary school reduced in classification unless there is a substantial drop in the attendance. The enrolment at the Peterborough Primary School is 534 pupils whereas the Mitchell Park Primary School, which I have suggested should take its place as a class II primary school, has an enrolment of 830. It is also suggested that three new schools next year—Elizabeth Downs, Elizabeth West and Hincks Avenue (Whyalla)—should open as class II schools. The enrolment at all these schools will initially, or within a very short time, be in excess of 600 pupils. Certainly no-one, least of all the Superintendent or I, likes to see a school reduced in status if it can reasonably be avoided, and certainly in this case considerable thought has been given to the position. On the other hand, the number of schools in each class has been determined by the regulations and I consider it would be unwise to vary these to meet the needs of a particular school. The present headmaster of the school has asked for a transfer as from the beginning of next year and this fact, combined with the number of enrolments, seems to make it an appropriate time to reclassify the school. The man who will be recommended for appointment as headmaster of the Peterborough Primary School is an experienced and able teacher and his work has been outstanding. He is vigorous in his methods, devoted to his duties and has shown his capacity for administering a school. He is also loyal to the parents, to the children, to his staff and to his superiors, and he can be counted on to co-operate with the school committee and parent organizations to the fullest extent.

I have received representations from other local sources about this matter. On the wider question of reclassification to prevent any down-grading of large country schools, which has been considered and deferred for the time being, I have received a letter from the Teachers' Institute asking whether it could see me soon to discuss the whole question. I have replied that I shall be pleased to do so as soon as is convenient after the House prorogues, when there will still be time to reconsider the whole matter of reclassification generally, but I do not think this will affect the Peterborough school.

BANK CHARGES.

Mr. HARDING: My question, concerning charges by banks for cashing cheques, follows on similar questions asked by the members for West Torrens and Hindmarsh. In yesterday's press it was reported that some organizations (including councils) and tradesmen were charging 3d. a cheque and other organizations and tradesmen were not. Can the Premier say whether there is any policy in this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Consequent on the trading banks and the

Commonwealth Bank bringing in a new scale of charges for a cheque that is cashed by the bank, ultimately 3d. has to be paid for the cashing of that cheque. Many traders who cash cheques purely for the convenience of their customers say that they would not be prepared to cash those cheques and lose 3d. on every cheque they cash. Under those circumstances some traders have refused to cash cheques unless the person getting the cheque cashed will make up to them the 3d. that would otherwise be lost to them. When an account is being legitimately paid by a person by cheque I know of no case under those circumstances where a charge is being made. The person concerned ultimately has the matter in his own hands: if the trader he is dealing with charges him exchange on a cheque when paying the account, I suggest he could possibly find someone else who would be pleased to have his custom and not to charge his customer under those circumstances. I suggest that that would not be an improper thing to do. Coming to the changing of a cheque, not associated with any other transaction, the trader obviously would be 3d. out of pocket on every cheque he changed, with no compensating advantages to himself. So far as I know, there is no rule on the matter. Some businesses charge a fee, others do not.

COUNTRY INDUSTRIES.

Mr. BYWATERS: In His Excellency the Governor's Speech when opening Parliament reference was made to the establishment of a department to assist secondary industries, particularly in country areas. Does the Premier intend to bring down a Bill for that purpose this session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The preparation of a Bill is proceeding, but I was not at all happy that all the details of the problem had been worked out successfully. The Government does not intend to proceed with that matter until next session.

TINTINARA AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Education a question concerning the craft centres at the Meningie Area School and the Minister indicated his interest in the construction of such centres at country schools. Will the Minister have the question of the establishment of a craft centre at the Tintinara Area School investigated to see whether a woodwork centre could be constructed there next financial year or, if not by then, as soon as possible?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do that.

PORT PIRIE RAILWAY FACILITIES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding drinking facilities at various points in the Port Pirie railway yards?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Railways Commissioner reports that water bags have been in common use, both within the department and by the public, for many years. Where the reasonable needs of employees are met by their use, the Railways Commissioner is of the opinion that the expenditure of public funds in the provision of more elaborate facilities is not warranted.

HAWTHORNDENE AND BLACKWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOLS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On the Loan Estimates this year provision was made for the erection of a new primary school at Hawthorndene and for extensive additions to the Blackwood Primary School. Since then, work has started on the Blackwood school and that has prompted inquiries regarding plans for the erection of an entirely new primary school at Hawthorndene. Can the Minister of Education say what are the plans in that respect?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am anxious that work on this school should be commenced and completed and the school opened as soon as possible. I have received the following report from the Director of Public Buildings Department:

Preliminary sketch plans have been prepared for the erection of a new primary school at Hawthorndene. It is anticipated that the final scheme will be completed and available for tender call towards the end of this financial year, subject to funds being approved. We shall know later in the financial year how much of the slack we can take up in devoting funds to new schools that are not already scheduled.

PUBLIC RELIEF.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Premier a reply to my question of October 9 regarding an investigation by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department of a case where children had been adopted by a family?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following report from the Under Secretary:

The Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board does not supply clothing out of Government funds for children on relief. At times there is some second-hand clothing available—some of this was given to this child. The department did not have any second-hand shoes to fit. The second-hand clothing which the board passes on is generally clothing left at the department by people desiring to help families in poor circumstances.

The honourable member can see the full report if he so desires.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Representations have been made to me that country people would be assisted if offices of the Public Trustee Department were established in the larger country towns. Will the Minister of Education inquire of his colleague, the Attorney-General, whether this would be practicable?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do that. This matter has been raised previously, on one occasion by the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston), and I obtained a report which, if I remember correctly, stated that it was not practicable at that stage. Mr. Freebairn having raised the matter, I will ask the Attorney-General whether it can be reconsidered and either he or I will inform the honourable member of the result of the investigation as soon as possible.

PORT AUGUSTA CENTRAL PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHES: Will the Minister of Education obtain from his department a report on proposals to establish at the Port Augusta Central Primary School a central library and suitable accommodation for the headmaster and other members of the staff. I point out that this is one of the oldest schools in the State and has an enrolment of about 700. Although applications have been made for the installation of a central library, to my knowledge for at least 10 years, and possibly for longer than that, the department has not seen its way clear to accede to the request. The last reply received was to the effect that a new school had been recommended to be built in another part of Port Augusta, and the department wanted to wait until the reaction on the central school could be determined following upon the opening of the new school before reaching a final decision on the application. Will the Minister obtain from the department a report on when the fourth school is likely to be recommended for establishment? If there is any delay in building it, will he exercise his prerogative and specially consider the long-standing claims of the central school for this amenity which those associated with the school are convinced will be required whether or not the fourth school is built?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As the honourable member is aware, I am sympathetically disposed to the requests that have been made. I have visited the school twice at the honourable member's request and in his company, and in the company of members of the school committee, the district inspector and the headmaster. I think the parents and the children deserve some of the improvements that have been suggested. I have had some discussions with the Director of Education who, in turn, has had investigations made with the Public Buildings Department and received an estimate of £14,000 or £15,000 as the probable cost of the solid construction improvements suggested.

But I have also been advised by the Director that, when the proposed new primary school at Carlton is erected, the enrolments at the Port Augusta school will drop from about 750 to 400, and he poses the problem for my consideration whether, in view of that probable happening, the expenditure of about £15,000 on solid construction additions to the Port Augusta school is warranted. That is as far as we have gone at present. As soon as I can get some time after the House is prorogued, I shall endeavour to have a further and final discussion with the Director to see whether I can give positive and definite replies to the honourable member soon.

CAMPBELLTOWN HIGH SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Education say whether any consideration has been given to the official opening of the Campbelltown High School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. Consideration has been given to the opening of this school and a number of other very fine primary and secondary schools. The difficulty is to fit them all into the allotted time. With the approach of the end of the year and the examinations for the high school students, it was considered appropriate to postpone some official openings until the new year. It is proposed, subject to a discussion with the honourable member, members of the high school council, the headmaster and staff, to fix a date reasonably early in the new year for the official opening of this fine school.

WHYALLA PETITION.

Mr. LOVEDAY: On October 16 I asked the Premier a question about an all-road bus service from Whyalla to Adelaide and from Adelaide to Whyalla. He said that the matter was being examined to see whether something could be done. Can he tell me whether a decision will be reached before the end of this Parliamentary session and whether I am likely to get a reply soon?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know whether a decision will be reached by the end of the session because, first, I do not know how long the sittings of the House will continue and, secondly, I do not know how long it will take to reach a decision, so in those circumstances I cannot be very definite about the matter; but, if a decision is not reached by then, I will see that the honourable member gets a reply as soon as possible.

MILLICENT COURTHOUSE.

Mr. CORCORAN: On September 27 I asked the Minister of Works a question relating to the construction of the new courthouse at Millicent and, during the course of his reply, he indicated that tenders would be called shortly for the construction of this building. Has a contract been let?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, but the tenders for the contract close on October 30, in one week's time.

TAKE-OVER BID.

Mr. CURREN: My question refers to the negotiations that have been taking place for the take-over by Foster Clark (S.A.) Ltd. of the assets of Brookers (Australia) Ltd. Can the Premier say whether a satisfactory arrangement has been arrived at between those two companies and the Government regarding the take-over or acquisition of the assets and liabilities of Brookers (Australia) Ltd. by Foster Clark (S.A.) Ltd.?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The answer to that question would be "No" because there have been no negotiations between Brookers, Foster Clark and the Government: the negotiations have been between Foster Clark and Brookers. The Government was interested only as a creditor and had no direct negotiations in the matter. An agreement was made between Brookers (Australia) Ltd. and Foster Clark (S.A.) Ltd. for a take-over and, as far as I know, that has been completed. The Government was not a third party in those negotiations: it was a secured creditor through the State Bank and still is a secured creditor in that project.

SALK VACCINE.

Mr. CASEY: My question concerns the administration of Salk vaccine to people outside local government areas. I understand that in all local government areas the local council pays the fee to the person (a medical officer) who actually vaccinates people with Salk vaccine. However, in some cases people living outside local government areas have to travel long distances with their families to centres at which they can receive the vaccinations. In view of the concern of people living in such areas, can the Premier say whether the Government can grant concessions to those people who want to be vaccinated with Salk vaccine?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The information that has been conveyed to the honourable member and which he mentioned in explaining his question is not entirely correct. The Department of Public Health has informed me that it provides for Salk vaccine injections to be given outside local government areas, first, by departmental medical officers who make organized trips to these areas to give the injections and, secondly, by officers of health appointed by the Government to give injections in outlying areas and who are paid at the rate of 2s. 6d. an injection.

MATRICULATION STANDARDS.

Mr. CLARK: The weekend press published details of the new matriculation standards. As the Minister of Education knows, many members have been expecting information on this matter and are interested in it. Has he additional information to give on this topic, or will he make a general statement on it?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Of course, as the honourable member is aware, the council of the university is an autonomous or semi-autonomous body entrusted under the University of Adelaide Act with making regulations on matriculation standards. In conformity with its powers it appointed a subcommittee about two-and-a-half years ago to investigate the whole problem. The subcommittee made a couple of interim reports and then a final report, which was considered by the university council and approved in principle. The Vice-Chancellor then wrote to me asking whether I could give him an approximate date when the new conditions could apply to our departmental and other schools. Following that, I had discussions with the Director of Education and with principal officers of the Education Department, and yesterday I had a further discussion with the Vice-Chancellor and the Director of Education together. I hope that a final decision on the whole matter will be made by the university council at its next meeting which, I think, is to be held next Friday. The matter should then be cleared up to enable it to be placed before the university senate meeting late in November. I do not think it would be proper for me to give further information now: it would be far better

for any announcement to be made by the university. I believe that the whole problem is close to being solved satisfactorily. I am delighted with the outcome because, as the honourable member knows, I took a great personal interest in it two or three years ago, and although the conclusions arrived at by the subcommittee are not 100 per cent as I envisaged, they are about 90 per cent. Although there may be growing pains attached to the new system, if and when it comes into operation it will be a major step forward in the cause of education.

SANDY CREEK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LAUCKE. I have received a petition addressed to the Minister of Education and signed by 99 of my constituents. The signatories are parents of children attending the Sandy Creek Primary School and/or residents of Sandy Creek and district. They have requested that I present this petition to the Minister. The petition refers to correspondence addressed by me to the Minister in which certain difficulties regarding (*a*) classroom accommodation at the Sandy Creek school, (*b*) schoolground playing area, and (*c*) the condition of the school residence, were mentioned. Broadly speaking, an investigation is sought into these three points, together with the all-important question of the retention of school facilities at Sandy Creek as opposed to that school's absorption into other district primary schools. The petition concludes:

We are deeply conscious of the necessity and desirability of retaining our school at Sandy Creek as the very basis of our community life.

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand from the honourable member that this is not a petition he is presenting to this Parliament but a petition to the Minister.

Mr. LAUCKE: I shall not proceed further with the petition. Will the Minister give it his earnest consideration with a view to giving effect to its requests?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, I shall be pleased to do so. I go further, and say that if I were a resident of Sandy Creek I should be only too pleased to become the hundredth petitioner because, as a former resident of a country area and a representative in Parliament of a country district, I endorse what his petitioners have said—that these country schools, in addition to serving the needs of education, are frequently community centres. I strongly disapprove of country schools being closed down unnecessarily in the cause of consolidation, which is a good thing if it is not carried too far. It is good if it is sparingly used. However, it can be overdone, and, I think, in some cases it has been overdone and many country districts are the poorer as the result of the closing of their schools. I hasten to assure the honourable member that no suggestion for the closing of the Sandy Creek school has emanated from me or, as far as I know, from the Education Department. I do know, however, that an outside source recommended to the Director of Education that serious consideration should be given to closing the school and consolidating it with Gawler because of the poor condition of the school and the school residence and its close proximity to Gawler. As a result of that, an assistant superintendent of primary schools and the district inspector visited the school and at a meeting with parents asked the parents to consider the advantages and disadvantages of consolidation, but I think they gauged that the feeling of the meeting was that the parents did not favour it. Consequently, investigations have been made with a view to purchasing another site, because I understand that the present area is restricted and is on poor, sloping land. Although no decision has been reached, and no recommendations have reached me concerning the matter, I hope that the alternative will be that another site will be purchased and a new school erected near Sandy Creek.

STATE BANK LOANS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply from the State Bank regarding the waiting time for housing loans?

Th Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have been in touch with the State Bank on this matter. The Under Treasurer (Mr. Seaman) has informed me that the present waiting time at the State Bank from date of inquiry to date of acceptance of a detailed application is about 38 weeks. It then takes about 10 weeks from acceptance of the application until approval by the board. The total waiting time is therefore about 11 months. The waiting time has increased somewhat because of the heavy volume of applications which followed the announcement early this year of proposals for increased funds and extended terms and the scheme for waiving loans upon the death of the breadwinner. It is believed that the waiting time at the Savings Bank is fairly comparable, but it is much less at other institutions such as the Commonwealth Savings Bank and the building societies. The State Bank has the heaviest demand made upon it because generally its terms are the most favourable to the borrower

PORT PIRIE OFFICES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the proposed erection of a new office block at Port Pirie by the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have obtained some information on this matter. The proposed building referred to is an office building in the new premises that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has acquired in Senate Road, and it replaces the old office and depot in Florence Street. Tenders for the new building have been called and tenderers have been invited to tender using various types of building materials. The tenders close tomorrow, October 25. The cost of the building will not be known until the tenders have been received and the contract has been let.

MILLICENT WATER SCHEME.

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Minister of Works say when the construction of the two water tanks for the Millicent water scheme will commence?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Tenders are being called for the erection of these tanks in the middle of November.

LOW-DEPOSIT HOUSING SCHEME.

Mr. RICHES: The Premier has announced that the Housing Trust will eventually be prepared to build low-deposit houses in areas in which it has an interest and an organization capable of conveniently collecting rents. Port Augusta is one of those places. In order to ascertain whether there would be a demand in that area for low-deposit houses, the local newspaper in its last issue printed a coupon and invited people interested to post a coupon to the office in a specially marked envelope. Within 24 hours, 30 such applications were received, and I now have them. The purpose of this survey was merely to ascertain the demand and for no purpose other than to form part of a case for the operation of this scheme in that area. If I hand those letters to the Premier, will he place them before the trust to help it reach a decision as to the possibility of extending its operations to this area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

PARKSIDE CRAFT CENTRE.

Mr. LANGLEY: It has come to my notice that the woodwork and domestic art centre in Kenilworth Road, Parkside, may be closed to primary schoolchildren in my district. As this affects many young boys and girls at schools in my area, can the Minister of Education say whether this move was proposed by the department?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am not aware of the circumstances of this school, but it is the considered opinion of the Director of Education, whose responsibility it is for the setting of the courses for all the various branches of education, that craft work is better suited to the first year of the secondary course than it is to the primary grades. He thinks there is a fair amount of wasted time and effort in teaching woodwork to primary schoolchildren, and he proposes—and I have agreed with his proposal—that this work be transferred into the first year and onwards of secondary education. I will see whether it is intended to close this centre at Parkside and, if so, when, and I will let the honourable member know.

MURRAY BRIDGE CROSSING.

Mr. BYWATERS: In August last I asked the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, whether he would obtain a report for me regarding the erection of a bridge over the railway line four miles south-east of Murray Bridge. An earlier report stated that tenders were to be called soon and that it was expected that the work would be carried out at a fairly early date. Has the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, any further knowledge regarding this project? Can he say whether the tender has been let, and when the work is likely to be carried out?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: So far as I know, no tender was let prior to this week, but as I was not at Cabinet on Monday it is possible that a tender was considered then. I will have the matter examined.

PORT PIRIE HOUSES.

Mr. McKEE: I understand the Premier has a reply to a question I asked recently regarding the reason for the Housing Trust's building three new houses at Port Pirie for a Government department.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The General Manager of the trust states that the trust intends to build three new houses at Port Pirie on behalf of the Police Department.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Bridge to Replace Jervois Bridge, Port Adelaide.

Ordered that report be printed.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Marine) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Harbors Act, 1936-1955.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to amend the Harbors Act, 1936-1955, so as to enable the Harbors Board to give effect to an arrangement it proposes to make with the Commonwealth pursuant to section 71b of the Act for the exchange of certain lands. That section, which was added to the principal Act by the amending Act of 1955, confers power on the board, with the Governor's approval, to enter into an arrangement with the Commonwealth whereby the board will transfer to the Commonwealth certain lands in exchange for the transfer to the board by the Commonwealth of the Dean rifle range and adjacent land at Port Adelaide. For the purposes of giving effect to such an arrangement, the section also empowers the board to acquire land by agreement or compulsory process.

Negotiations have been in progress for certain land at Humbug Scrub to be given to the Commonwealth in exchange for the Dean rifle range but the Crown Solicitor has advised that, while the powers given by section 71b are appropriate for the acquisition by the board of freehold land and for the transfer of that land to the Commonwealth, there are serious difficulties in applying those powers to some of the land at Humbug Scrub which comprises, in addition to freehold land, Crown lands dedicated as a forest reserve and Crown leaseholds.

So far as the forest reserve is concerned, there is some doubt as to whether the board can compulsorily acquire Crown lands or whether the process of compulsory acquisition from the Crown is appropriate for the purposes of the section. There is no power either in the Harbors Act or in the Crown Lands Act to grant the land to the board for the purposes of the section even if its dedication as a forest reserve were revoked.

So far as the Crown leaseholds are concerned, the position is equally anomalous. Section 71b would probably enable the board to acquire a lessee's interest in a lease by compulsory process in which event the board would acquire the rights and obligations of the lessee and no more, and would not be in a position to transfer the fee simple to the Commonwealth. It has therefore become necessary to make specific statutory provision for the acquisition by the board of the types of land concerned to enable it to give effect to its arrangement with the Commonwealth. Clause 3 accordingly adds four subsections to section 71b of the principal Act.

New subsection (2a) provides for the resumption of the forest reserve by the Governor and the granting of the fee simple of that land to the board to enable it to give effect to the arrangement on payment by the board of such consideration as the Minister of Lands may fix on the recommendation of the Land Board. Subsections (2b) and (2c) provide for the surrender or resumption of the Crown leases and the granting of the fee simple of such land to the board to enable it to give effect to the arrangement upon payment by the board of consideration similarly fixed. Subsection (2d) applies the provisions of the Crown Lands Act to any such surrender or resumption and deems any such resumption to be a resumption for a public purpose.

Mr. RYAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

EXCESSIVE RENTS BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the relief of tenants from excessive rents, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is, shortly stated, to make provision to enable tenants of dwelling houses to apply to a local court if they consider they are being charged an excessive rent.

As honourable members know, the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act will expire at the end of this year. The Government has given careful consideration to the question whether that Act should be renewed for a further 12 months and has decided that it would be preferable to let it expire and substitute a new and simpler Act. The present Act is lengthy, technical and complex. It has become so overlaid with amendments, provisos and exceptions as to be, I may say, almost unintelligible. Furthermore, the Government is of

the opinion that the existing controls that have been in force for so long should now be allowed to expire.

I point out at the outset that the present Bill will not apply to a written letting agreement for a period of more than one year. It is considered in these cases that the parties concerned will have given full consideration to the question of rent before binding themselves for a term of a year or more. Nor does it apply to substandard houses the rentals of which are fixed under the Housing Improvement Act; they will be continued.

Clauses 6, 7, 8, and 9 are the principal operative clauses of the Bill. Under clause 6, any tenant may apply to a local court to determine whether his rent is excessive, and clause 7 provides that the court shall hear the application and either dismiss it or, if it considers the rent is excessive, make an order fixing the rent, which is final and remains in force for one year.

Mr. Riches: Would a tenant have to employ a solicitor for that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will come to that point later. Subclause (1) of clause 9 provides that an order fixing the rent remains in force notwithstanding any alterations, additions or repairs or any change of ownership or tenancy in the premises. Clause 8 sets out the criteria to which the court is to have regard in the exercise of its powers. These are self-explanatory and, indeed, most of them appear in one or another form in the present legislation. Clause 9 (2) and (3) and clauses 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 contain provisions for the enforcement of the Act.

Clause 15 provides that a notice to quit cannot be given while an application to a local court is pending or an order fixing the rent is in force unless the local court grants such leave, the grounds being non-payment of rent or failure to perform the conditions of the letting agreement, failure to take care of the premises, conduct constituting a nuisance, use of the premises for an illegal purpose or other special reasons. Clause 16 of the Bill makes permanent the present provision of the Rent Control Act prohibiting distress for rent. Clauses 17, 18, 19 and 20 are machinery clauses.

If I may reply now to the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), I emphasize that this will be a new Act and, until the standard that is going to be approved by the court is known, there will undoubtedly be some cases that should be proved before the court. Some cases will, no doubt, be brought by people who, by the very fact of their lack of means, will not be able to take advantage of the Act as it now stands. I appreciate that point. As an administrative measure, the Government intends to appoint the Prices Commissioner as an authority to whom any honourable member or any person who believes that he should take advantage of this new Act can go. The Prices Commissioner will have officers who will investigate these cases, and the Government will go so far as to make available to the Prices Commissioner a sum of money to test cases in court if he believes that they should be so tested. So we are not going to ask the legal profession to handle these cases under the Poor Persons Relief Act (something in excess of what the present arrangement covers) but the Prices Commissioner will be instructed to have officers who will be prepared to go into cases and, if the person concerned is not able to see that his rights are maintained, the Government gives the undertaking to the House that the Prices Commissioner will authorize a proper legal representative to take the case and see that the matter is tested properly before a court.

In many respects this legislation will be better than the present legislation. I am not quite sure of the percentage of houses covered by the present Act but, as far as I know, they are houses that, in the first place, were built before the end of the last war and, in the second place, have not been exempted for half a hundred reasons that have transpired since, so there are today many houses in this State not subject to any control whatsoever. In some cases that have come to the notice of the Government undoubtedly excessive rents are being charged.

Mr. Lawn: Are houses under lease covered by this legislation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: All houses are covered. This legislation covers excessive rent. A court can deal with a case where it is considered that the rent charged is excessive. When I say "all houses" let me correct that to "all houses not under a lease of a year or more". Where there is a written agreement of a year or more, this new legislation does not interfere with that agreement. But obviously, I point out to the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), where an agreement for a year or more has been entered into, the parties have consented to it.

Mr. Lawn: Yes, but one party may be under duress.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, I will not accept that. In any case, by the time the legislation is well into operation the year will have expired. My point is that this Bill will cover probably twice as many houses as were covered previously because it will cover houses that have been exempted under the old legislation for half a hundred different purposes: they have been built since a particular date, they have been exempted because they have been sold, or something or other has happened to them. So this legislation will cover many houses. I should say, in fairness to the explanation I am giving honourable members, that this Bill does not automatically fix a rent. A rent is fixed by a board which has rules that are eminently fair to both sides in considering what a rent should be. I believe that the rules set out are those used in the New South Wales legislation.

Mr. Jennings: Does the assistance of the Prices Commissioner apply only to people in necessitous circumstances?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. He would give advice, investigate any case and provide legal aid in necessitous cases. I hope that clears the matter for the honourable member. It is obvious that after this legislation becomes law several decisions will be made before the position settles down.

Mr. Lawn: Is it possible that various magistrates will interpret the rules differently?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think that criticism would apply to any law, particularly where penalties apply. One magistrate may impose a different penalty from that imposed by another magistrate, but a general level of penalties will soon be established.

Mr. Lawn: I am not speaking of penalties but of fair rents and the magistrates' interpretations.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member had been listening he would have realized that I understood his question. He has asked whether one magistrate might interpret a fair rent differently from another magistrate. I had agreed that that was possible, but I point out that that happens with the imposition of penalties. One magistrate may impose a higher penalty than another, but it is not long before comparisons are made and the penalties level out.

Mr. Lawn: But only one magistrate is appointed to one position.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: One magistrate could not possibly handle all this work because there are so many areas, and we have provided that the magistrate in whose jurisdiction a matter arises will determine the question. I believe that this legislation will be an improvement on the existing legislation and that it will be much fairer. In the present legislation the controls have been lifted on many types of houses, but the proposed legislation will be a better method of curbing excessive rents.

Mr. Jennings: Is the legislation for any specified time?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. The existing legislation has to be reviewed annually, but this legislation will not terminate. It sets out the criteria upon which a magistrate shall consider an application. The Government intends, through the Prices Department, to give a lead. The Housing Trust, which previously administered the legislation, will be subject to these provisions, and its rents will be as open to challenge as any other rents.

Mr. Lawn: You have said that this legislation will not be limited to a specified time, but the Prices Act is.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I realize that, but in order to get this legislation working the Government proposes, through the Prices Commissioner, to do what I have mentioned. I understand that several officers of the Housing Trust who have been dealing with rent control may now be redundant and that possibly they may be transferred to the Prices Department where their specialized knowledge would be useful.

Mr. Lawn: The Prices Act should be made permanent legislation, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We might have to examine that matter next year, but I point out that it would be entirely improper for me to reflect upon a decision made in this House yesterday.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

Mr. LAWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot rise on a point of order whilst a motion to suspend Standing Orders is being considered. The question before the Chair is that the suspension of Standing Orders be agreed to.

Mr. Lawn: No!

The SPEAKER: There must be a division.

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr. LAWN: Mr. Speaker, when I said "No" I did not realize that that would necessitate a division. I did not ask for one.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member seek leave to call the division off?

Mr. LAWN: Yes.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the suspension of Standing Orders be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1956. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN moved:

That the Bill be printed and that the second reading be made an Order of the Day for tomorrow.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: On a point of order, I should like as many of these second reading explanations as possible to be delivered, but later, after questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The Leader would be in order in moving to amend the motion moved by the Minister, or the Minister of Agriculture could test the feeling of the House.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: May I ask the Leader whether he would like the Bill to be explained now?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: There is still time remaining for questions. I do not object to second reading explanations being given after the completion of questions.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I quite agree, and move:

That the second reading be taken on motion.

Motion carried.

Questions resumed:

RAILWAY REFRESHMENT ROOMS.

Mr. RICHES: Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Railways, call for a report on the possibility of repairing the floor and renovating the refreshment rooms at Port Pirie and Bowmans railway stations with a view to having that work done before the influx of travellers on the way to Perth for the Commonwealth Games? Those rooms are in a very bad state of repair, and I consider they are a bad advertisement for the State. If the Premier will have the attention of the Railways Commissioner drawn to this matter I shall be grateful.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall be happy to do that. I agree with the honourable member that at a time like this many travellers will be passing through for the Commonwealth Games, and that it would be desirable for our refreshment rooms to look attractive and thus give some kudos to the State. I am only sorry that the honourable member did not raise the question earlier to enable more time to be given to the consideration of this matter. However, I shall do my best to see whether some action can be expedited.

PETERBOROUGH HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CASEY: Will the Minister of Education take up with the appropriate body the recommendation made some years ago for the modernization of the domestic arts centre at the Peterborough High School? Will he also take up the question of the provision of toilet facilities at that school? At present the toilets cater for 75 boys and 75 girls, but as a result of the expected increased enrolments within the next two years they will have to cater for 100 boys and 120 girls, or *vice versa*. Will the Minister see that these extra facilities are provided?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: First, let me say that I am not aware of any representations having been made to me on the matter; they may have been made on a departmental level some time ago and not communicated to me. As the honourable member has now raised the matter with me, I shall be only too pleased to have it investigated and to give early and, I hope, sympathetic consideration to the request.

PORT AUGUSTA ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE.

Mr. RICHES: Yesterday the Minister of Education answered my question on notice regarding the promised erection of a temporary boilermaking shop for the adult education centre at Port Augusta. The reply stated that a survey of the site would be carried out by the Public Buildings Department as soon as the exact location, details and dimensions of the site were clarified. The corporation has given permission for the erection of this building on the site selected by the department immediately adjoining the present school area, and we do not know why it is necessary for this matter to be held up for a survey or anything of that nature. No lease or anything of that nature is involved. Will the Minister use his endeavours to see that no further

avoidable delay occurs through technicalities of this nature?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so. I must confess that I was surprised to receive the report that I gave in answer to the honourable member's question, because I attended a discussion on or adjacent to the site with the honourable member in his dual capacity as member for Stuart and Mayor of Port Augusta. On that occasion the Superintendent of Technical High Schools and the chairman and members of the high school council were present. I thought the site was sufficiently well located and that we had come to an agreement on the matter, and I reported that back with minutes of the conference to the Director of Education. I naturally thought that the proposals were to be put into operation once they left my hands. Apparently the officers of the Public Buildings Department who received the request considered that it was necessary for this survey to be made. I will endeavour to have the matter expedited, because the main thing is to get the boilermaking shop installed and in working condition. If I cannot get any finality for the honourable member before the House adjourns I shall certainly write to him at the earliest possible moment.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. HUTCHENS: There seems to be a misunderstanding that I should like cleared up, because all members want this House to work as smoothly as possible. It appears that due to some misunderstanding today we have had a number of motions to suspend Standing Orders. Perhaps the Government thought that question time was over, but that was not so. I ask the Premier whether in future when such moves are made he will be kind enough to advise the Leader of the Opposition in order that we may work in harmony?

The SPEAKER: I think probably I should intercede before the question is answered by the Premier. When I called upon the Minister of Works I had not received any notice of more questions. Having called on the Minister to seek a suspension of Standing Orders to enable him to give a second reading explanation, I could not call on questions in the middle of a suspension of Standing Orders, but that did not prevent questions from being resumed after the second reading explanation had been given. Had I received notice I would not have called on the Minister at that stage. Does the Premier desire to reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government greatly appreciates the co-operation it continually gets from the Opposition in the conduct of the House. I assure members that there was no desire on the part of Ministers to curtail questions; what the Government desired was to get Bills on the Notice Paper so as to give members the best opportunity to see what was proposed. That is where the difficulty arose. The Minister of Works had told the Speaker that, as the Government had several Bills to introduce, it wished them to be called on at the conclusion of questions and before Orders of the Day. Incidentally, Ministers had concluded that members had completed questions before they started to give second reading explanations.

OPPORTUNITY CLASSES.

Mr. RICHES: Yesterday, in reply to a question about the establishment of senior opportunity classes as Port Augusta, the Minister of Education said that the Senior Psychologist had reported that the detailed investigations required had by no means been completed. Will the Minister make the report available to me or will he check the accuracy of the statement, as I was under the impression that the Senior Psychologist had made a firm recommendation?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be only too pleased to comply with the honourable member's requests, check the statement and make the results available.

BUSINESS NAMES BILL.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to make provision with respect to the registration and use of business names, to repeal the Registration of Business Names Act, 1928, and certain other Acts amending that Act, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its objects are to revise the law relating to the registration and use of business names in this State, to remove anomalies and defects in

that legislation, and to bring it into line with legislation in force or proposed to be brought into force in the other States and Territories of the Commonwealth.

When the uniform Companies Bill was under consideration by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, the need for bringing the legislation relating to business names into line with parts of the Companies Bill became apparent. The law relating to business names affects the commercial community throughout Australia and some of the considerations that made uniformity in company law desirable apply to the law relating to business names as well. For instance, the provisions in the Companies Bill for the regulation and control of the use of names by companies would not be fully effective unless similar provisions for regulating and controlling the use of business names were written into the business names legislation, thus facilitating the co-ordination of control in the use of business names throughout Australia.

An examination of the business names legislation in each State has revealed other deficiencies and anomalies in the present law of each State and Territory of the Commonwealth, and the standing committee accordingly directed the preparation of a uniform Business Names Bill suitable for adoption by all States and Territories subject to necessary variations to suit local needs. That Bill has since been passed in New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and Tasmania. Some of the more serious anomalies and defects detected in the business names legislation of this State are as follows:

(*a*) Section 4 of the Registration of Business Names Act, 1928-1961, requires the registration of every firm, individual and corporation carrying on business under a business name that does not consist of its or his true name, but section 22 of that Act refers to the registration of a business name and provides for the striking of a business name off the register in certain circumstances. This could have the odd result that a registered firm, individual or corporation would not be precluded from carrying on business under a business name that had been struck off the register because the registration of the firm, individual or corporation as such would be unaffected by the removal of the business name from the register.

(*b*) The provisions of the Act are quite inadequate for compelling the notification of all relevant changes in the registered particulars relating to persons carrying on business under business names, especially where the persons are outside the State or the business is of an itinerant nature.

(*c*) An individual or firm that contracts to perform specified work or supply specified materials within a period of 12 months is exempt from registration under the present Act. This would permit an individual or firm from another State to enter into a contract to perform in this State major building construction or engineering works that are completed or agreed to be completed within 12 months and to carry on business in this State without registration and without appointing a resident agent for accepting legal process on behalf of his non-resident principals.

These anomalies and defects have received attention in the uniform Business Names Bill. The Bill which is before this House is substantially the same as the uniform Bill except for certain modifications and improvements that have been made to suit the needs of this State. As honourable members are in possession of the explanatory notes relating to the clauses, I shall deal only with the principal changes this Bill will make to the present law. Instead of requiring the registration of individuals, firms and corporations, the Bill requires the registration of the business name under which a person (including a corporation), either alone or together with others, carries on business if the business name is not the true name of that person or the true names of all the persons so carrying on business.

The Bill also contains adequate provisions to enable the Registrar to keep his registers up to date and to compel notification of all relevant changes in the registered particulars relating to registered business names and, where the persons carrying on a business under a registered business name are outside the State or have no usual place of residence within the State, they are required to appoint a resident agent who shall, until notification of his removal is given to the Registrar, be responsible for accepting notices and legal processes on behalf of his principals.

In lieu of the exemption from registration granted by the present Act to an individual or firm that contracts to perform specified work or supply specified materials within a period of 12 months, this Bill will exempt a person who conducts under a business name an isolated transaction that is completed within a period of 31 days and who does not repeat similar transactions from time to time. The law governing the use of business names is stated in similar terms to the law governing the use

of names by companies under the Companies Bill.

Other provisions similar to those in the uniform Companies Bill (*a*) enable the Registrar to destroy or give to the Public Library documents that have not been in force for at least 12 years (which enables space in the Registrar's office to be cleared of unimportant and obsolete documents); and (*b*) empower the Registrar, after giving notice to the persons concerned, to cancel the registration of a name that has been registered through inadvertence, etc., but this power cannot be exercised without the Minister's consent in respect of registrations under the present Act, and the Minister may override any notice given by the Registrar for the cancellation of a registration.

Administration of the legislation is further facilitated by empowering the Registrar to require verification by statutory declaration of documents whose authenticity he has reason to doubt and to correct any error appearing in the register or in any certificate of registration. The Bill also makes specific provision in respect of offences committed by corporations and in respect of service by the Registrar of notices on persons in relation to whom a business name is registered. Like the uniform Companies Bill, the uniform Business Names Bill was widely circulated among interested organizations and revised in the light of the comments received from them and other interested persons.

Apart from the changes referred to by me, the Bill does not make great changes of principle or policy expressed in the Registration of Business Names Act which the Bill will replace. There has been no substantial revision of that Act since it was passed by this Parliament in 1928. This Bill represents an important advance on that legislation and not only removes the anomalies and defects that have been detected in that legislation but also serves to bring the legislation of South Australia in this field into line with the rest of Australia.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I thank honourable members for their courtesy in allowing Standing Orders to be so far suspended as to enable me to move the second reading of this Bill. I regret the earlier confusion. It is just that it is desirable to give the second reading explanation as soon as possible.

The Bill provides for a number of things, but principally it extends the operation of the Act from the 1962-1963 season to the 1967-1968 season. This is not the first extension of the Act, and it is, I believe, welcomed by all parts of the industry in South Australia. In fact, if there were any move at all, it would be to merge the operations of the various barley-marketing authorities into an Australia-wide organization if possible. This will possibly be achieved some day, but not now. Apart from extending the life of the Act, many of the proposed amendments have been discussed by the Victorian Minister of Agriculture and myself. Similar legislation is enacted in both State Parliaments and for it to be effective it must be approved by both Parliaments. The Victorian Minister and I are agreed on almost all of the proposed amendments, but Victoria may make other suggestions later. It is obviously desirable that our legislation should be passed this session and I have communicated with my Victorian counterpart, who is happy about the introduction of this Bill in its present form. I cannot say whether later he may suggest alterations to the Victorian legislation, but I believe the legislation will be accepted in both States.

It proposes to amend section 4 of the principal Act to provide that the Chairman of the board be nominated by the Governor of South Australia. South Australia grows a great preponderance of the barley produced in both States. The board comprises two growers from South Australia, one from Victoria, a representative of brewers and maltsters, with a chairman from South Australia (the Director of Agriculture, Mr. Strickland). The South Australian nomination of a chairman was originally agreed upon by the Minister of Agriculture, and it is now proposed to include a provision in the legislation giving effect to that agreement. The provision will not alter the board's composition. When the late Mr. Spafford died, Mr. Strickland was appointed Chairman and his term will expire concurrently with the expiration of the terms of the other board members.

The Bill also provides for the appointment of another grower member from South Australia. Victoria has one grower representative, and at present has the right to nominate an observer to attend board meetings, but that observer has no powers or responsibility. Victoria has indicated that it believes it should have extra representation and has requested that this observer be appointed as a full member of

the board. I have accepted this as a reasonable suggestion, but did so knowing that there would be strong support in South Australia for the appointment of an additional South Australian grower member.

Mr. Hutchens: How many are on the board?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If this Bill is passed I think there will be seven. The board will have an additional member from Victoria, to be nominated by the Victorian Governor, and South Australia will have an additional grower member elected by growers. Our new member's district is not specified in the Bill, but it will be specified by proclamation and there will be no difficulty in determining a suitable area. The Bill provides that the appointments will take effect on September 1, 1963. This coincides with the date on which other board members take office for a new term. If this provision were not included in the Bill the Victorian nominee would immediately become a board member, which would be inequitable.

By clause 4 the word "Australia" is deleted from section 18 of the Act and "South Australia and Victoria" inserted in lieu thereof. Under that section it is the board's responsibility to see that the requirements of Australia are met in the event of a heavy marketing programme. Without this limitation, in a bad season it would be possible for the board to sell all the grain it had without considering the reasonable requirements of the country. The board must take account of the expected home requirements. Other States have marketing boards, but only South Australia and Victoria are bound by the provisions of this legislation and it does not seem reasonable that other boards should have power to sell all their barley if it suits them whilst our board is limited and must consider the requirements of those States that do sell all their barley. The amendment therefore proposes that the board shall have regard to the needs of South Australia and Victoria—the two States operating the board.

The principal Act at present uses the words "the amount received or to be received from the sale of barley of the same botanical classification", and the Bill strikes out the word "botanical". It has been decided that this word is unduly restrictive. Nor is it clear as to its exact meaning in reference to the distinction between six and two-row barley. The board is firmly of the opinion, and so also is the Victorian Government, that the word "botanical" should be omitted, and I believe there will be no objection whatever to that. It is a small amendment, and I doubt whether much significance is attached to it. The last clause extends the operation of the Act.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE POPPY DAY TRUST DEED BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill to amend the Poppy Day Trust Deed of the Returned Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia (South Australian Branch) Incorporated. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is introduced at the request of the Returned Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia (South Australian Branch) Incorporated, and is designed to amend what is known as the Poppy Day Trust Deed of the league to enable it to provide houses for aged ex-servicemen and their wives. The deed was made in May, 1948, certain moneys then held by the league being paid over to nominated trustees to be held by them as a general fund for the purposes set out in the deed. In general terms the fund can be used for the relief of necessitous cases of distress among ex-servicemen, such assistance to be by way of loan or free gift. I do not go into detail as to the terms of the deed. It is enough to say at this stage that there is no power to acquire land for the erection or letting of houses.

The league has informed the Government—and honourable members will already be aware of this—that the prime objective of the league has been the relief of distress and the comfort of veterans and their dependants. The executive of the league has been considering ways and means by which its activities could be broadened. Its War Veterans' Home at Myrtle Bank provides for the single ex-serviceman, but it now desires to provide houses for aged couples. To do this, funds would have to be found, and the league has requested an alteration to the trust deed to enable the fund to be expended for what appears to be a very desirable purpose—in particular, to enable the acquisition of land and the erection and letting of houses and the enlargement of the class of recipients of benefits under the deed to include aged ex-servicemen and their wives.

The trust fund now amounts to some £63,000, and it would be proposed to utilize

some of the fund, together with subsidy assistance from the Commonwealth Government under its legislation, for the purpose of providing houses for aged ex-servicemen and their wives. The present Bill, by clauses 3 and 4, makes alterations to the trust deed in terms requested by the league. While in the ordinary course such alterations would form the subject of a private Bill, the Government has felt that, having regard to the worthy objectives sought, it would assist the league materially if this measure were introduced as a Government measure. As the Bill is in the nature of a semi-private Bill, it should, I believe, be referred to a Select Committee for consideration and report. I ask the House to agree to its passage forthwith so that the Select Committee may be appointed. I understand that there has been some consultation regarding its personnel. If the Committee could be appointed today I believe it would be possible for it to report at an early date, possibly early next week, so that the matter could be finalized as soon as possible. I think all members will agree with the request of the league, as it will be enabled to expand its already worthwhile activity into something broader. As the league is a responsible body and has rendered splendid service to its members, particularly its older members, I believe members will gladly grant the necessary amendments which the league requires to the deed in order to enable it to extend its activities in this field. I am prepared to nominate the members of the Committee if the second reading is agreed to without delay.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): It gives me much pleasure to endorse the remarks of the Minister of Works. As it is necessary for a Select Committee to examine the Bill, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Bockelberg, Corcoran, Harding, Jenkins, and McKee; the Committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on Tuesday, October 30.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Acting Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act, 1934-1958. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is necessitated by the enactment by the Commonwealth of a Weights and Measures (National Standards) Act in 1960. That Act provides, among other things, that on a date to be fixed the standards of weights and measures provided under it shall be the standards for the whole of the Commonwealth. It is proposed that this provision will become effective in January, 1964. Amendments to our own legislation will be necessary in due course but, in the meantime, the Commonwealth has established standards of measurement and will be supplying verified and certified standards to the States so that the State authorities can verify their local weights and measures against the Commonwealth standards. This will enable the State authorities to be in possession of all the necessary verified weights and measures when the Commonwealth standards become the sole standards throughout Australia in 1964.

This Bill will provide that during the interim period standards provided by the Commonwealth may be used for verifying State standards and used for all the purposes of the State law. The amendment is of a technical character and follows similar provisions being enacted in Victoria.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Acting Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dog Fence Act, 1946-1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its objects are to clarify the responsibility of owners of the various sections of the dog fence to keep the fence properly maintained and in dog-proof condition at all times and to place the same responsibility on lessees of Crown land on which any portion of the dog fence stands. Section 22 (1) of the principal Act casts on the owner of any part of the dog fence the duty of causing the fence to be inspected at proper intervals, of maintaining it in proper condition and so that the fence is at all times dog-proof, and of taking all reasonable steps to destroy all wild dogs in the vicinity of the fence.

In a recent case, where the lessee of Crown land was charged under that section, it was successfully contended: (*a*) that the lessee was not the owner of the part of the fence standing on the leased land as the fence was a fixture attached to the land and, the land

being owned by the Crown, the ownership in the fence was also vested in the Crown; and (*b*) that the requirement to maintain the fence so that it is at all times a dog-proof fence does not imply that the owner must always keep the fence in a perfect dog-proof condition. The result of this case has caused some concern to the Vermin Districts Association and the Dog Fence Board as it throws some doubts on the effectiveness of the provisions of the Act for ensuring that fence owners keep their sections of the fence in dog-proof condition and properly maintained.

The Crown Solicitor has reported that it would be extremely difficult to enforce those provisions of the Act unless the ownership of the fence standing on Crown leasehold land is, for the purposes of those provisions, deemed to be vested in the lessee and an absolute duty is cast on the owners to keep the fence dog-proof at all times.

Clause 3 accordingly re-enacts section 22 (1) of the principal Act with all its present elements but the new subsection also clearly imposes on the owner of any part of the dog fence the duty at all times to keep it properly maintained as a dog-proof fence and in dog-proof condition. Clause 4 adds a new section 24a which provides that, where any part of the dog fence stands on land comprised in a Crown lease, the lessee shall, for the purposes of Part III of the Act, be deemed to be the owner of that part of the fence, but as certain parts of the fence standing on pastoral leases are vested in vermin boards the responsibility for maintaining them will remain in those boards. These amendments will remove the doubts created by the decision in the recent case to which I have referred and facilitate the enforcement of the Act.

Honourable members will be aware that the Dog Fence Board is primarily a board of landholders and is almost completely supported by the graziers concerned. I have no doubt whatever that an overwhelming body of opinion would favour this Bill.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1642.)

Clause 31—"Repeal of sections 172 and 173."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): We reported progress last night so that we could consider some amendments that I had moved. At this stage I seek your leave, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw them with a view to moving other amendments.

Leave granted; amendments withdrawn.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

To strike out subclause (1) and insert the following subclauses:

(1) Section 172 of the Licensing Act, 1932-1960, is amended by striking out the words "aboriginal native of Australia or half-caste of that race" therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Aboriginal or person of Aboriginal blood".

(1a) Section 173 of the Licensing Act, 1932-1960, is amended by striking out the words "aboriginal native of Australia or any half-caste of that race" therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Aboriginal or person of Aboriginal blood".

(1b) The Governor may by proclamation declare that the provisions of sections 172 and 173 of the Licensing Act, 1932-1960, shall not apply in any area or place specified in such proclamation and may from time to time by further proclamation revoke any such proclamation or add to or vary any area or place so specified.

(1c) The provisions of sections 172 and 173 of the Licensing Act, 1932-1960, shall not apply within any area or place so specified in any such proclamation during such time as the proclamation remains in force.

I have consulted with the Parliamentary Draftsman and the Crown Solicitor on the form of this amendment, and it appears to them that this is the only way in which the matter can be resolved—to incorporate the sections of the Licensing Act that the Committee has already decided to retain in this clause and to provide for the progressive repeal of these sections throughout the State. The Crown Solicitor and Parliamentary Draftsman have agreed on this draft. Therefore, I am satisfied that it is in proper legal form and that it is necessary also to have the amendment in this form in order that it shall be legally proper.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I was dismayed to observe the form of the amendment. Last night in Committee an amendment to clause 31 was carried that provided for the repeal of sections 172 and 173 in such areas as should be proclaimed. Once the repeal was made by that proclamation, then in respect of that area that section of the Licensing Act was repealed; it could not be revived by a subsequent proclamation.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Crown Solicitor does not accept the view that it can be done in that way.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I cannot see why it cannot be done in that way. There is not the slightest reason why it cannot be said that

sections are repealed in certain areas of the State.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: They say not; I wouldn't know.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I should be obliged if I could have their opinion before we further discussed this amendment, because it certainly alters the position considerably. The Minister asked for permission to reconsider this clause solely for the purpose of clearing up the definitions contained in sections 172 and 173 regarding who were Aborigines and who were half-castes. It was solely on that basis of that definition that we agreed to the reconsideration of the clause because we are not prepared to recommit the whole question of the amendment that was passed in Committee yesterday. This, in effect, does recommit what is, to us, a vital principle of the amendment that was carried. In these circumstances, before we proceed further with the amendment, I should like to know the basis upon which the Crown Solicitor and Parliamentary Draftsman come to this conclusion, because it is entirely novel to me. I hope the Minister will consult with me on the subject so that we can get some sort of agreement because, as matters stand, we are not able to agree to an amendment in this form. It does not comply with the principles of the amendment as they were understood by the Opposition when it was moved and carried in Committee yesterday. The amendment goes much further than clearing up the definition of an Aboriginal native of Australia or any half-caste of that race provided in sections 172 and 173. Under the circumstances, will the Minister report progress so that we may get some agreement on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have no objection to asking that progress be reported for a brief period so that the honourable member can have the opportunity of considering his position. However, it is essential that we complete our consideration of this legislation today.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

In Committee.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have consulted with the Parliamentary Draftsman and discussed with him the views of the Crown Solicitor on this matter. It appears that the Crown Solicitor's view—and to a certain extent the Parliamentary Draftsman agrees—is that this is a better method of doing what we tried to do last night than what we actually did last night. There are some doubts about the validity of repealing sections in respect of certain areas of the State, but to proclaim that those sections shall not apply in various areas of the State will achieve the same result. Where, however, I have differed from the Minister is that certain of his words about revoking proclamations would undo some of what we did last night, and as a result of discussions with him I understand he is prepared to accept an amendment that will restore the provision, in effect, which we wrote in last night and make the only practical change an alteration to the definition of Aborigines and half-castes in the Licensing Act sections effective. In those circumstances I agree to the deletion of subclause (1) as amended last night with a view to inserting new subsections which will be amended. I move to amend the Minister's amendment as follows:

(1) In proposed subclause (1b) to strike out "revoke any such proclamation or".

(2) In proposed subclause (1b) to strike out "or vary".

(3) In proposed subclause (1c) to strike out "during such time as the proclamation remains in force".

Mr. Dunstan's amendments carried; the Hon. G. G. Pearson's amendment as amended carried.

Clause as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1961.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed primarily to make provision in the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1961, whereby approved insurers under Part IV of that Act are made collectively responsible when one of their number becomes unable to meet its obligations under a policy of insurance issued under that Part. This Bill also corrects a small drafting error that has been detected in section 12 (5) of the principal Act. The principle of

the collective responsibility of all approved insurers for certain liabilities arising from road accidents has already been accepted by Parliament and is the basis of several existing provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act. The underlying idea is that each approved insurer must take a share of these liabilities, which are not the particular concern or responsibility of any one of them. The most familiar case is the responsibility for damage done by the hit and run motorist whose identity is not known and whose insurer (if any) is not known. Another familiar case in relation to which legislation has recently been passed is the case where the person doing the damage is known but he is not insured. In such cases the liability for the damage caused is passed on to all the approved insurers through the medium of a nominal defendant who is a person appointed by the Treasurer in order that he may be sued for the damage which has been caused. It is proposed in this Bill to adopt the same machinery in order to ensure payment of the liabilities of the approved insurers who have become insolvent or bankrupt. In such a case, however, there would be an approved insurer whose identity is known and a policy of insurance under and in relation to which that insurer has not only duties and liabilities but rights and powers as well. This Bill proposes to transmit those duties, liabilities, rights and powers to a nominal defendant and to place the nominal defendant in the shoes of the insurer. It is intended that the transmission should not have effect automatically upon the commencement of winding-up proceedings in relation to an insurer or upon an insurer entering into a compromise with its creditors, but only when, after considering the circumstances, the Governor has made a proclamation applying the legislation to an insurer whose winding-up commences, or which enters into such a compromise after the Bill becomes law. Clause 3 corrects the drafting error referred to earlier.

Clause 4 inserts in the principal Act a new section 118a, subsection (1) of which provides that, where the Treasurer is satisfied that an approved insurer, being a corporation, has insufficient assets to meet all its liabilities and is being wound up or has entered into a compromise with its creditors, the Governor may, on the Treasurer's recommendation, by proclamation declare that the section applies to that insurer, and thereupon the Treasurer appoints a nominal defendant in relation to the insurer. Subsection (2) is designed to restrict the application of subsection (1) to cases where the winding-up commences or the compromise is entered into after the Bill becomes law. Subsections (3) and (4) in effect place the nominal defendant in the shoes of the insurer so far as its rights and liabilities under a policy of insurance and under Part IV of the Act are concerned. Subsection (5) imposes a duty on the insurer, or the liquidator of the insurer, when requested by the nominal defendant, to furnish him with information, books and papers and to give him such assistance as he reasonably requires in relation to relevant claims, actions and judgments against the insurer. Subsection (6) provides for the liabilities incurred by the nominal defendant under that section to be shared between approved insurers in accordance with a scheme approved by the Treasurer or (in the absence of such a scheme) in such proportions as the Treasurer directs.

Subsection (7) provides that the amount of moneys paid out or incurred by the nominal defendant under that section may, in the winding-up of the insurer or in any compromise between the insurer and its creditors, be proved as a debt due to the nominal defendant by the insurer and that any amounts received by him as dividends out of the insurer's assets or recovered by him on account of the insurer must be paid to the approved insurers in such proportions as the Treasurer directs. Clauses 5 and 6 make consequential amendments to sections 119 and 120, respectively, and are complementary to the new section 118a.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1948-1960.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Government has had representations formally from the Parliamentary Labor Party and informally from a number of members for amendments to the Parliamentary Superannuation Act to deal with two matters. The first relates to a guarantee that a member, his widow, or his family, shall at least receive back, in pension or otherwise, the actual amount of his contributions, and the other to the anomaly that a member serving more than 18 years continues to make his contributions without any increase in prospective annual pension, and in fact with a decreased expectation as to the aggregate pension. Obviously, a member's life expectation upon retirement decreases the longer he serves before retirement.

The amendments to section 13 of the principal Act by clause 2 provide in effect that the increase in pension entitlement which at present applies as a member's service increases beyond 10 and up to 18 years shall continue beyond 18 years up to 30 years, but the increased pension for the added service beyond 18 years shall apply to each extra three years rather than for each extra year of service. This is in precisely the terms requested by the Parliamentary Labor Party, and it has seemed to the Government a justified and moderate request.

The amendment to the existing section 19 (clause 4) is to rectify an obvious inequity. At present if a member who has not qualified for a pension dies, his contribution is returned to his widow or, if he leaves no widow, to his personal representatives. However, if a member who has had at least 10 years' service, and thus would have qualified for pension, dies leaving no widow, there is no provision for return of contribution to his personal representatives although he would not have received one penny in pension.

New section 19a (clause 5) will provide, in effect, that if a member or his widow do not receive in pension at least an amount equal to his contributions the difference shall be paid to his personal representatives. This provision is comparable with that provided two years ago in the South Australian Superannuation Act as applying to Crown officers and employees. Actually it goes somewhat further than the Parliamentary Labor Party requested. The Party asked that such a payment be made where there were dependent children. However, there are difficulties and possible inequities in a precise definition of dependancy, and the wider provision proposed is now a very common one for superannuation schemes. The circumstances calling for a repayment of an excess of contributions occur very seldom and in fact there has not been one case up to the present in the 14 years of existence of the fund when a member and his widow have received in pension less than the total contributions. The final provision made by clause 6 makes it clear that the amendments to section 13 are to affect present pensioners and present widows as well as the members who still contribute and who may contribute in the future.

The cost arising from the amendments now provided will clearly be relatively small, although it is difficult to make at present any very precise estimate of ultimate costs. The present cost will be a little under £1,400 a year and may ultimately rise somewhat, perhaps to about £2,000 a year. In the present state of the fund and the sharing of the cost between members' contributions and Crown subsidy it is not considered that higher contributions from members will be required to cover these amendments. The principal Act requires that the Crown shall pay into the fund amounts equal to members' contributions and make such further contributions annually as the Actuary may certify to be required. It would seem clear that the effective long-term Crown contribution will necessarily continue to be somewhat greater than a 50-50 subsidy to members' contributions, but almost certainly it will not exceed 2 to 1. The effective subsidy to new entrants to the fund for Crown officers and employees is now about 2 to 1 and that ratio is quite common in other superannuation and pension schemes in Australia.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): As the Minister has said, a full discussion was held in relation to this matter and the results were placed before the Government which in turn has introduced this measure to increase superannuation benefits. The Labor Party considered that one or two matters needed clarification. From information we received before this Bill was introduced, we considered it was necessary to make the legislation apply to all and not only to members with children. The Public Actuary estimated that the ultimate cost of the new provisions would be about £2,000 a year. On this aspect, I point out that the life expectancy of even younger members decreases for every year they are in harness. By and large, this fund imposes no hardship on the Government because members

pay into it and render a service to the people they represent. Consequently, the Opposition believes the Bill is reasonable, and I have no hesitation in supporting the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Amendment of principal Act, section 13."

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): This legislation provides for Parliaments of three years' duration, but an election could be held at any time after January 31 and a Parliament might not be for a three-year period. I consider that these provisions should relate to the life of a Parliament rather than to a three-year period.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): Section 11 (2) (*a*) provides:

> If a member is elected to Parliament between the 28th day of February and the first day of August in any year, his service shall be reckoned as from the first day of March in that year.

I think that answers the Leader's question.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, section 19."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This Bill and, I suppose, the principal Act provide for only male members of Parliament; no provision is made for female members. I do not know whether there is any reason why provision should not be made now for not only a widow but a widower. It seems logical and reasonable now that we have, at long last, female members in the South Australian Parliament.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My brief researches into this matter reveal that it is not possible to make the improvement the honourable member has suggested as being desirable (to which I agree) without a new clause being inserted in the Bill. Although the singular includes the plural and the male the female in the Acts Interpretation Act, the widow does not appear to include the widower, so it is necessary to have a new clause, which would take some time to draft. Therefore, I suggest that we let the matter rest as it is for the time being. We can easily remedy this defect later—if not this year, next year, if necessary. If the honourable member is satisfied to leave it there, we can make further progress.

Mr. Millhouse: The Minister is prepared to undertake to look into it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I speak purely as an individual member of Cabinet. Cabinet has not considered this point but I see no reason why it should object to the proposal.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 and 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

VERMIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1607.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I had not intended to speak on this Bill but yesterday a constituent of mine engaged in commercial rabbit breeding approached me and pointed out that the Bill as introduced would completely destroy his business; also, that many people in the State were in a position similar to his.

Mr. Hall: How many did he keep?

Mr. JENNINGS: About 2,400. It is clear that this constituent is by far the largest breeder in the State and therefore, I suppose, necessarily the most interested. After that man approached me yesterday I saw the Minister, who made it clear that he wanted the legislation to go through as quickly as possible. It was arranged that my friend the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) should speak in the debate. He had made up his mind to support the Bill, which he did eloquently, as we all know. However, the Minister was kind enough to agree to arrange for the executives of the association concerned to come to Parliament House to see him; but he was busily engaged yesterday. He arranged for the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) to secure the adjournment of the debate to give him (the Minister) an opportunity to see these gentlemen. However, he then got involved in the debate on the Fisheries Act Amendment Bill and was engaged in this Chamber all the afternoon, which meant that he had to see my friends during the dinner adjournment. He gave them a good hearing but made no promises. I do not know what has transpired since but, as the Bill stands, it inflicts a great hardship on people who have invested large sums in this industry. I still hope that the Minister will further investigate the matter, if he has not already done so, and that, as a consequence, we shall provide for something more just than, on the surface, the present Bill does. I support the Bill.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I am in complete accord with the policies formulated to control and finally eradicate the wild rabbit. The success that has attended the policy of rabbit extermination in the last decade

or so is of national importance. Every member present knows that, had a firm approach to the control of wild rabbits not been made, we should not have witnessed such spectacular increases in the sheep and cattle population of this State in recent years. I have no illusions about the vital need for eradicating the voracious wild rabbit as the basis for expanding our grazing and cattle industry. However, I am concerned about the possible effect of this Bill on those men who have entered into the industry of breeding rabbits commercially. No injustice should be done to those who have, within the law, set up such an industry.

Mr. Riches: The people who buy rabbit meat also have an interest.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, but the important aspect is that the man who has invested for a given purpose should not find overnight that his investment has been wiped out. That would be manifestly unjust. The Bill should be amended to afford the established operator a reasonable opportunity of amortizing his capital costs. I have discussed this with the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) and the Minister of Agriculture, and they agree that there is merit in my claim that injustice could be done to people if this Bill were passed in its present form. The Minister said that a considerable hardship could be imposed on individuals if this legislation were delayed until an industry became firmly established.

Yesterday morning I received a communication from a constituent of mine from Houghton. He is a young returned soldier, an excellent type, who began, some time ago, to breed rabbits commercially. He experienced great financial difficulty in starting off, but he received assistance from his parents and then mortgaged his house to secure the necessary capital. He now has an investment of £4,358. I could not support a Bill that would inflict a hardship on such an individual, and so I have designed an amendment to enable permission to be granted by the Governor for the keeping of rabbits when such rabbits are kept in accordance with such conditions as may be associated with the permit. Such an amendment will ensure that we do not harm an individual who has an investment in this industry. At the same time we will maintain a constant policy of rabbit eradication.

Councils all over the State regard the eradication of rabbits as vitally important to their districts, and each year, within a given period, action is taken to ensure the eradication of rabbits by landholders. Myxomatosis has been of great assistance in depleting our rabbit population but, if we were not completely alert to the need for maintaining such a valuable eradication agent as myxomatosis, rabbits would again assume disastrous plague proportions. I support the Bill provided that protection is afforded to those who have up to this moment invested in breeding rabbits commercially.

Mr. Millhouse: Why should we stop there?

Mr. LAUCKE: Because I believe that the experience of other States could well become the experience here ultimately. By stepping in at this stage, without hurt or harm to individual enterprises, I think we are acting correctly.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I support the Bill. I recognize the points brought forward by the members for Enfield and Barossa. No member wants legislation to penalize any individual, at whose expense the State could be aided. I understand that the Minister intends to amend the Bill to enable commercial breeders to continue their operations for a limited time. We cannot afford to take risks with the present victory that has been won in the fight against rabbits, which would be one of the hardest fought campaigns in the agricultural field in Australia. Any person with knowledge of rabbit infestation in country areas is aware of the damage the pests cause and the effort and resources that must be used annually in fighting them. I know from my experience on a small river property in which I am interested that it takes at least two weeks a year to poison rabbit burrows in a three-quarter mile section of a bend in the river. It is an area of cliffs and bushes. It is dispiriting activity. Prior to the introduction of myxomatosis, landholders felt that they were fighting a losing battle, but the spread of myxomatosis has been of inestimable value, and I trust that all efforts will be made to prevent the spread of an antidote to myxomatosis. Landholders now engage extensively in ripping, and they co-operate in combating this pest.

I should like to see a prohibition on the commercial breeding of rabbits, but I should not like to see the present breeders cut off in their prime. Australia owes much to myxomatosis and it would not be overstating the case to claim that the increased production resulting from the advent of myxomatosis has been reflected in the living standards Australians enjoy. I should not like to see any risk taken that might cause this good work to be undone. Although I cannot see how this Bill could take care of the matter, I

should like to see the importation of rabbits into South Australia banned. I say that because there is a possibility that imported rabbits could have been inoculated with fibroma vaccine before they came to this State, and if that were so there could be a risk of that antidote to myxomatosis spreading here. I have looked at the Bill and I can see no way of amending it or inserting an extra clause to provide for such a ban without an instruction. However, as the Bill is rather urgent and time is getting on, I shall not attempt to do that at this stage. I mention that matter to the Minister because I consider that the importation of rabbits into this State should cease altogether. I support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I support the Bill. As one who has had some horrible experiences with rabbits in years gone by, I say that we as a Parliament would be extremely foolish if we took any risks in supporting commercial breeding of rabbits. Other States have tried it, and already they are in trouble. We have only a very few commercial breeders at present, and possibly it is because we have so few that we think we might be doing them an injustice under this Bill. Personally, I think it would be far better to compensate these people and get rid of them and ban altogether not only commercial breeding but the keeping of rabbits in any shape or form. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) spoke of the danger of imported rabbits having been inoculated against myxomatosis. Although we are decreasing the hutches or the area in which rabbits can be kept, there is nothing to stop people importing inoculated rabbits from another State and putting them in these hutches, from which they will eventually escape.

Mr. Hall: They have escaped.

Mr. HEASLIP: They escape and get away as inoculated rabbits, immune from myxomatosis, and when they breed they breed an immunity that myxomatosis has no power to overcome. It would be disastrous if that happened. Already myxomatosis has lost much of its strength and is not nearly so effective as it was. If that immunity existed we would be back to where we were before myxomatosis played such a wonderful part in the eradication of rabbits. I think we are playing with fire at present in allowing rabbits to be kept as domestic pets and for commercial purposes, and I consider that we will be extremely foolish if we allow that to continue. I personally would favour banning rabbits as pets. I would compensate those commercial breeders who already have numbers of rabbits, and would get rid of them altogether. If commercial breeding is such a benefit, those people can go to another State that allows that activity. I say that in South Australia it would be far better if we did not have commercial breeders. I certainly favour industries, but the breeding of rabbits is an industry that I do not favour. When they were so thick and we had the trappers on the job, it was claimed that it was a wonderful industry and that the State was making much money out of it.

Mr. Jennings: And if they caught a small one they would let him go, too.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course they did, to breed again. However, we were not told how much we as a State were losing in having these millions of rabbits eating the feed and preventing us from carrying sheep or cattle and growing wheat. The whole thing was out of proportion. Although I have not seen the proposed amendments, I do not think they are what we want. I believe that it would be better to compensate those who have rabbits and to prohibit those people from keeping them. What is now being allowed is far too dangerous and could undo all the good work that myxomatosis has done in the past. I strongly favour the Bill as it stands.

Mr. HARDING (Victoria): I support the Bill, because I consider that if I did not I would be letting my own district down. Probably I was one of the first, if not the first, to bring before the House the question of fibroma virus. If the commercial breeding and keeping of rabbits is not checked at this juncture we will find ourselves in a similar position to that which exists in New South Wales, where the number of commercial breeders has grown to such an alarming extent that those people have now persuaded one of the largest primary producers' organizations, whose object is to look after the interests of primary producers, to accept them as a branch or section of the organization. I support the Bill vigorously, because I think we should nip this thing in the bud. I agree with previous speakers that the time will come when we will find it necessary to ban the keeping of rabbits. The rabbit does not have to escape from its hutch to spread the fibroma virus. The virus can be spread by flies or mosquitoes; in fact, any sucking insect can spread it from one rabbit to another.

One member spoke of the victory that has been won, but I issue the warning that the victory has not been won. I suggest that most country members in this House will admit that they see more rabbits on the roads and in the fields in South Australia today than at any time during the last five years. Let us not deceive ourselves and think that we have already had a victory. Recently a person who accompanied me to the South-East told me that he had not seen so many rabbits between Murray Bridge and Naracoorte for the last five or six years. I support the Bill most strongly. I hope that when the amendment comes forward it will be seriously considered. I do not think this commercial undertaking has grown to a very large extent, and I dare say the Government will be able to assist by compensating those people who have in good faith taken up the commercial breeding of rabbits.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I, too, support this Bill, but I agree with the remarks made by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) and the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke). I do not think this House should out of the blue pass a measure that will cause, even if only in one or two cases, heavy financial loss to people who have entered into an industry in good faith.

Mr. Jennings: And within the law, too.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, within the law. They should be compensated in some way or given time to realize on the assets they have. Although I support the principle enunciated by the Bill—the destruction and prevention of breeding of rabbits—I want some assurance that nobody will be victimized after having entered into the industry within the law and having spent thousands of pounds. The quickest and easiest way to do this would be to compensate them fully or ease the losses to the absolute minimum over a period. I doubt whether the immunization of rabbits with the new inoculant will confer perpetual immunity to myxomatosis. I do not think this can happen because the effect of inoculants on rabbits, with their close generations, will gradually lessen just as the strains of rust-resistant wheat constantly being produced by the Waite Research Institute and the Roseworthy Agricultural College are rust-resistant for only one or two seasons, after which a mutation takes place in the rust spores and there is no further immunity. I believe it is possible that rabbits can develop a natural immunity to myxomatosis.

Mr. Hall: You cannot deny that it is still working.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not deny that, but this matter needs constant research. Perhaps stronger types of myxomatosis can be developed to counter the immunity that some rabbits have apparently built up, but this will be a constant war. I agree with the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) that the rabbit population in some areas is increasing, but that does not apply to places near Clare where, if one were depending on rabbits for a feed, one would die of starvation.

Mr. Hall: The best type of myxomatosis is yet to come.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not deny that, but possibly rabbits can develop a natural immunity to it. These things happen in the normal scheme of things in nature; if they did not, whole masses of fauna would disappear from the face of the earth. Animals have their own protective means inherent in them. Although I support the Bill, I agree with the warning that we should not think that because we get rid of white rabbits it is any more than a single step. We still have to keep at the problem and not rely entirely on myxomatosis. We must ensure that every landholder with warrens on his property takes steps to eradicate this pest, and the law must be rigidly policed. Wherever rabbits appear, they must be destroyed, and this is a constant job. I support the Bill with the proviso that I do not want hardship caused to one or two people who, inside the law, have invested money to build up an industry. I do not think this House should cause people financial loss without there being some means by which they can be compensated.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Restriction on duty to destroy vermin on travelling stock reserves and rabbits in cages."

Mr. LAUCKE: I move:

In new section 36(1)(*b*) after "land" second occurring to insert:

or (*c*) conferring a power or imposing a duty on any person to destroy rabbits kept by any person who has been granted permission by the Governor to keep rabbits where such rabbits are kept in accordance with such conditions as may be attached to the permission.

This amendment is moved so that no grave injustice will be done to those people at present engaged in commercial rabbit breeding. It will

enable them to continue in certain conditions and at the discretion of the Governor, which will avoid hurting someone who within the law has begun to operate a business, then to find through the action of Parliament that he is deprived of his ability to continue or to recoup his outlay.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): The Government is prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I approve of the amendment, which leaves the matter entirely in the hands of the Governor, although in effect it will be in the hands of the Minister. I do not object to that specifically. However, the member for Barossa placed emphasis on people who had already started in this business. In my district is a man who wanted to start in this business (which he could have done) but who was discouraged by the threat of this legislation, rumour of which had been circulating for some time. I should like an undertaking that the Minister, while not necessarily granting permission, will at least not close the door to this case of a person who has it actively in mind to apply to him.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: By this amendment the person referred to by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) had a perfect right to approach me about this matter in the hope that he would be allowed by the Government to do as suggested. On the other hand, the honourable member asked me if I would be prepared to consider this. Whereas I recognize the right of anybody to approach me, my feelings in the matter would be not to permit the establishment of any new persons in the industry. This gentleman had broached the subject previously and been informed that the breeding of rabbits was discouraged by the authorities. It is commendable on his part that he has held his hand and not gone into the industry, an action that I appreciate. Whether that constitutes a particular hardship is difficult to establish without knowing the full circumstances but I should not like to indicate at this stage that there is any possibility of allowing new people to establish in the industry. Nevertheless, a man has a perfect right to make a request in that direction.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want to press this matter unduly but am disappointed with the Minister's attitude. He admits that he does not know all the circumstances yet says that there is no chance of this case being considered sympathetically. I protest against that attitude and ask him at least to keep an open mind until the application has been made.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall be prepared and pleased to meet the gentleman concerned and discuss his problem with him, but I want to be realistic about this and not mislead the Committee by implying that he may be allowed to start in the industry. Therefore, I thought it was better to be open about it and say that my present feeling is that nobody should be allowed to start in the industry. That is the only proper answer I can give. Nevertheless, with that warning, I should be glad to meet the person in question and discuss the problem with him.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clause and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 17. Page 1521.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the Bill which is found necessary because some articles of meat manufacture are not at present covered in respect of swine fever. At the outset I commend the Agriculture Department, and particularly those concerned with stock, for their fine efforts over recent years to contain the diseases that could ravage the stock of South Australia. The incidence of swine fever in New South Wales, as mentioned in the second reading explanation, called for eternal vigilance by the Agriculture Department to see that the disease did not enter South Australia for, if it did, it would be a major calamity for the State and the swine breeders, who would be vitally concerned if it became prevalent. As the Minister stated, in many instances the outbreak was minor, which made it even more difficult to detect. The fact that there has been no outbreak in South Australia since the war is a credit to the department, which has been most vigilant. The amendment will prohibit the importation of salami, metwurst and other processed meats.

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

Mr. BYWATERS: Clause 3 relates to the importation from other States of processed meats. I agree with the Minister that this provision is essential because it will help to

ensure that swine fever does not enter this State. I was interested to read that bees are now included in the definition of "animals", but I am interested to know how they will be regarded when stock branding is considered. I imagine it would be difficult to brand a bee. Clause 4 refers to foot-rot. The department has taken every care to ensure its eradication and I am pleased that the Bill tightens the legislation in this respect. I know of an instance where a man purchased from the abattoirs stock infected with foot-rot. He took them to his property, but instead of slaughtering them he carefully cleaned their feet, using a formalin bath, and sold them to innocent purchasers. It was subsequently discovered that the sheep were still infected. Infected animals should be sold only for slaughter, and this is what clause 4 provides.

The Bill proposes that persons must notify the department of any diseased stock. Most farmers know when their stock is diseased and they are careful to take all precautions. The Agriculture Department stock inspectors do a good job, and when notified of the presence of a disease do their utmost to eradicate it. The presence of disease in stock is *prima facie* proof that the owner knew of or suspected its presence, and the onus is on him to satisfy the court that he did not. At first glance I thought that this transfer of onus was unjust, but upon reflection I realized that a stockowner should be prepared to accept this responsibility. The Bill improves the existing legisation and I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support the Bill. However, clause 3 refers to all raw, partially cooked, manufactured or processed animal products and this could have repercussions in an area where a fruit fly road block is established. The Minister has said that partially cooked meat includes tinned ham that is sold under the trade name "Mayfair Ham", which is imported from New South Wales. Can the Minister say whether tinned hams up to 2-lb. in weight are eligible for entry to the State through fruit fly check blocks whereas hams above that weight are automatically confiscated? I know of a person who was returning from another State and who had a 2-lb. tin of ham confiscated. I think that in fairness he should have been compensated for that confiscation.

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

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1601.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): As is to be expected, I oppose the Bill in its present form. Legislation I have presented to this House already this session has dealt with electoral reform but certainly in a way much different from that of this Bill, and as a result of that Bill I cannot present amendments in line with our policy as they would be out of order. If I cannot move in that direction, have members opposite any amendments they wish to move? I could suggest some. I admit that a recent press report did attribute a certain statement to me, but I assure members that at that time I had in mind the Bill that I introduced on the first day of this session to give effect to the principle of one vote one value. The *Christian Science Monitor*, an American publication, on September 12, 1962, under the heading of "One Man One Vote urged on States", contained the following:—

> Drawn up by 15 political scientists, scholars, and commentators from various parts of the country, a statement of basic principles for legislative apportionment concludes that there is no justification or logic in the American democratic heritage for utilizing any other basis than population for representation. . . . A recent survey by Charles S. Rhyne, past-president of the American Bar Association and counsel in the case, indicates that 48 court cases are now pending in 30 States to force reluctant, rural-dominated legislatures to redistrict in one of the biggest changes in United States political history . . . In the year 1962 no basis of representation other than population is defensible if candidly stated and examined for what it is. "But acres do not vote, nor do trees. When a sparsely settled area is given as many representatives as one much more populous, it simply means that the people in the sparse area have more representation. No matter how stated, it is people who choose the representatives," according to the statement.

Members of my Party are not the only people who believe that in electoral or constitutional matters people are more important than the trees and acres mentioned in the article. I consider the drafting of clause 2, particularly the definitions of "primary production" and "rural areas", to be most cumbersome. I am not a draftsman and I am not reflecting on the Parliamentary Draftsman or his assistants, who were probably told to draft a Bill to satisfy the Government. The Bill defines "rural areas" as:

Those parts of the State the income and livelihood of the majority of the inhabitants of which are derived predominantly from primary production or from the supply of or processing of goods or services for persons engaged in primary production.

From this definition it would appear that the commissioners will have a difficult job in determining just what constitutes a rural area. Does the Bill mean, for example, that men engaged in the Woods and Forests Department will be denied the right to be considered to be in rural areas if they are engaged in timber mills on case and board production? Who will be able to determine whether these products will find their way to primary producers or to secondary industries? I believe that attention should be given to this clause.

Rightly or wrongly, I have always thought that afforestation is related to primary production but that when timber is cut it is then related to secondary industry. If men are engaged in processing fruit cases for River Murray areas, they are really engaged in a primary production capacity. With all due respect to the judge who will be a member of the commission, I do not know how he will be able to determine whether timber used for making these cases will be used for rural purposes. Is it that some timber may go into a packing shed, while other timber may be used as flooring in the building of a house and not necessarily reach a primary producing area? It is hard to get into the Government's mind on these matters. I do not blame the Parliamentary Draftsman. I have given this only as one illustration that will face the commissioners, and it supports my contention that this definition is most cumbersome. It is purely an attempt to divide the people by occupations and to represent occupations rather than the people in Parliament.

I frankly admit that our policy previously provided for proportional representation but not necessarily on the same basis as the Tasmanian system. However, if we now had representation on the same population basis as Tasmania, the people of South Australia would be entitled to more than 90 members. In any case, surely our Party is just as eligible to change its policy as are members opposite to change theirs, and I think the Premier will admit that our change of policy over the years has been on a much less radical scale than that of the Liberal Party. The Premier represents a Party that is an opportunist group prepared to clutch at any straw in its attempts to remain in office. I would emphasize that our policy that has evolved over the years in regard to electoral reform has never departed from the principle of one vote one value, which is a necessity for the foundation of a democratic Parliament.

If we took the number of members in 1938 (which was the first Parliament formed after the reduction of Assembly members to 39 in 1936; I think all members will agree that this was a particularly small House) and adjusted it solely for increases in population, we should be justified in seeking a representative House of more than 56 members. Further, the policy speech that I delivered recently on behalf of the Australian Labor Party gave me a mandate from the people of South Australia to proceed with constitutional and electoral reform to ensure equitable electoral boundaries with one roll for all Parliamentary elections, the retention of compulsory enrolment and voting, and the appointment of an electoral boundaries commission on a basis similar to that of the Commonwealth and most other States.

The Bill before us does not cover any of these matters but selects a purely arbitrary figure of 40 members, with a special proviso about the possibility of 42 members in special circumstances. However, of the 40 members, 20 are to be in rural areas and 20 in non-rural areas, according to the hazy definition I referred to earlier. But the indications are that a reduced rural vote would still be worth approximately three non-rural votes. To me, there is no justification for dividing the population of this State in this arbitrary fashion. The Premier contends that, if we had one vote one value, the bulk of the representation would be close to the metropolitan area. We have had three decades of the one type of Liberal administration. Surely, if there is congestion in the metropolitan area, it cannot be the fault of the Labor Party. Rather must it be the fault of the Government that has had the administration of the State for so many years. This certainly proves our contention that the Government has never had a policy either capable of or suitable for decentralization of industry in this State. Do I need to remind honourable members of the recent action of the Government in creating further centralization by its recent Abattoirs Bill, together with its proposal to establish another huge power station in the metropolitan area? In any case, if the Government's policy leads to centralization of population, surely it has not reached such an autocratic state that

it is prepared to deny these people their democratic right of electing the Government of their choosing.

The Labor Party believes in democracy, democratic government, and in the control of Parliament by democratic methods. One fundamental principle of democracy is that the people should be able to change the Government if they want to. In fact, they should be able to elect the Government they want and defeat the Government they do not want, and even with the gerrymandered system it was becoming increasingly apparent that that system had outlived its usefulness and that there was every prospect of the Government's being ejected from its citadel. Therefore, it became necessary for the Government to put forward another restricted reference to a body of electoral commissioners in an attempt to ensure its continuation in office on a minority vote.

My final point is that, 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 members. Even this session I introduced a Bill, the first Bill for the session, which sought to introduce the system of one vote one value into the South Australian Parliament, but it was strongly rejected by the members opposite, just as they have strongly rejected similar approaches by the Labor Party over many years. The consistent attitude of the Liberal and Country League members in this State in voting against any attempt to make our Parliament more democratic shows a lack of respect for the democractically expressed wishes of the people and must, if persisted in, bring our Parliamentary institution into disrepute. No matter how fair and honest the commissioners may seek to be, the cumbersome and restrictive terms of reference completely hamstring any investigation they may make. As the Bill makes no attempt to make the Parliament a more democratic institution, we shall oppose it in its entirety. I question the Government's sincerity in introducing it. I believe it was introduced for Party political purposes and for propaganda. The Premier has already admitted that the Government could have appointed a commission without Parliamentary approval. I have publicly announced my Party's opposition to this type of legislation. The Bill proposes to reduce the number of country representatives from 26 to 20. Why should country people be denied adequate representation in this Parliament? I challenge the Government to deny that country areas will be deprived of some representation. I could not find sufficient words within the limits of Parliamentary language to describe my feelings on this aspect. Instead of appointing a commission, I challenge the Government—as I have through the press—to contest an immediate election with the present boundaries. I will oppose every clause and, if necessary, divide on every clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is the first time since I became a member of this House that I have spoken on an electoral reform proposal. When I became a member (and, indeed, until about six weeks ago) one of the principles of the Liberal and Country League, of which I am a member, was the maintenance of the present ratio between city and country members—26 country members and 13 metropolitan members. As a member of the L.C.L., I believed that I was under an obligation to support that principle, and I have done so for the last seven-and-a-half years. I referred to this matter obliquely in my first speech in this House. However, six weeks ago at the last annual meeting of the L.C.L., that principle was altered, and it now reads:

The practical recognition of the need for adequate country representation.

That, of course, is a much less definite and rigid principle. I can now, therefore, give my views, as I have been invited to do by members opposite, on this matter, and I shall do so briefly. I believe—and I make no apology for saying this—that the general rule in any democratic community should be one vote one value. I do not agree with the Premier's reasoning on this matter when he introduced this Bill. I believe that we are here to represent the people—men and women and not interests, industries or anything else—and it does not matter to me what a man is worth in terms of money or what he does; he is still entitled to representation in Parliament. However, having said that, I will admit frankly that during my seven-and-a-half years here I have, to some extent, revised my views, because I now realize that in a State such as South Australia, which has vast sparsely populated areas, there must be exceptions to the general rule. Members opposite may doubt my sincerity in saying this, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am entirely sincere in that belief. It was not a belief that I held before I came here, but from watching the genuine difficulties of country members representing large districts—and that applies to members on both sides—I have come to the conclusion

that there must be exceptions to the general rule that I have just propounded. The areas that have to be covered by members servicing their districts and the fact that some districts contain several comparatively small communities with their own peculiar difficulties and separate outlooks on matters are things that cannot be ignored, no matter how much we should like to do so.

Having stated that there must be exceptions to the rule, the real question is how much departure should be allowed from the general rule. That, of course, is the crux of any consideration of an electoral system in a State like South Australia where over 60 per cent of the population lives in the metropolitan area and under 40 per cent outside the metropolitan area. Frankly, this Bill departs rather more from the general rule than I should like. To put it the other way, I believe that it does not go far enough towards the principle I believe in. On the other hand, this Bill—and I think the Leader of the Opposition will admit this—is an improvement, a step in the right direction, compared with our present electoral arrangements.

When the Premier was speaking yesterday, members opposite objected that the metropolitan area would be much larger that it is now and that, therefore, the increase in representation would not be the full seven, and I think that is right. The metropolitan area under this legislation will be much enlarged and, correspondingly, the rural areas (as they are described in the Bill) will be decreased. Nevertheless, it is a long forward step, and for that reason I am prepared to support the second reading. If I understood him correctly, the Leader of the Opposition criticized the principle upon which the Bill was drawn. I must admit that when one looks at it the principle is a little unusual. I know of only one other community in the democratic world that has its electoral system based on the same principle, and that is the State of Minnesota in the United States of America. However, I think we should look beyond the principle upon which this Bill is drawn to the probable result and, of course, as all members are aware, we shall have that opportunity before there is any chance of the proposals embodied in this Bill becoming part of the law of South Australia, because any report made by the commissioners must come back to this place to be embodied in an alteration to the Constitution.

But what is the probable result of the commissioners' deliberations? We cannot say. I forget the word the Leader used—I think it was "hazy"—but we can have a pretty good idea of what will happen and what the result is likely to be. We shall have an enlarged metropolitan area, probably taking in the subdivision of Morphett Vale to the south, probably part of the subdivision of Highbury in the electoral district of Barossa, and a good slab of the subdivision of Gawler to the north, and possibly other areas. We do not know what the commissioners will do, but that is likely to be the other area of the State or the enlarged metropolitan area, and that area will have 20 members. The rest of the State will also have 20 members or—and this again is left entirely to the discretion of the commissioners—it might have 22 members. That is something that the Leader of the Opposition did not really deal with in any great detail.

I have very carefully looked at the figures on the likely result. Perhaps it is not much more than guesswork, but I do not agree with the Leader that the quota for the rural seats will be only one-third of the quota for the metropolitan seats. I think his arithmetic is sadly astray if he thinks that is the case; it will be nearer 2 to 1, as far as I can see. Of course, that is something we shall have to look at in due course, and, as I have said—and I emphasize this point—we shall be able to do that probably in the next session of Parliament. I also say quite deliberately that when we do have a look at it I shall not feel myself committed to support whatever the findings or the report of the commissioners may be simply because I am prepared to support the second reading of this Bill. I reserve my right entirely to look at the results, whatever they may be, and the report that is brought in by the commissioners and to say then whether I am prepared to support any constitutional amendment in this place.

We will, after all, next year be only in the second year of a three-year Parliament, and it will not be too late, in my view, if the report is not satisfactory to me, to have another look at this and perhaps to start out on a new principle or another principle of electoral reform. For the moment I am prepared to support the Bill, because although it is not all that I personally want I consider—and I say this quite sincerely—that I owe a duty of loyalty to my Party, and I believe that it cannot be denied by anybody that it is a step and quite a long step in the right direction.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I listened with fascinated interest to the words of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). I note his concluding remarks with very great interest indeed, because he has said that nobody can deny that this Bill is an improvement on the present situation. I hasten to say at the outset that I most vehemently deny that it is. I believe that this measure was carefully worked out with the help of Mr. Seaman as a diabolical plot to worsen the gerrymander in this State and keep in office in this State the dictatorship under which it has suffered since 1933. It is quite clear on any examination of the provisions of this Bill that the honourable member's analysis of what the Bill means is incorrect, and that he has not paid sufficiently careful attention to the definition clauses of the Bill and their effect upon the instructions to the commission as to what precisely it has to do.

The Labor Party has put forward its proposal. It did this at the outset of this Parliament, and the Bill is still on the file. We believe firmly that the only principle of representation is representation of people, the same principle as the member for Mitcham enunciated at the outset of his speech this evening. That is the principle of this Party, and we believe it is the only proper principle in any democratic country; it was certainly the principle upon which the honourable member was supported in the Liberal Party conference a short time before he was preselected for the seat of Mitcham. That section of the Liberal Party at that stage of proceedings unfortunately did not seem to get a majority in the conferences, not that that seems to make much difference because conference rulings do not seem to bind the Premier.

We put forward our proposal and it failed in this House upon the vote of the Government and upon your vote, Mr. Speaker. We now are in the position that we must examine any proposal that is put forward, not to see whether we can obtain our proposal (because that has gone by the board) but to see which of the two evils we are presented with would be the better—the proposal that is now put forward or the present system. I must say that when the instructions were given to the commission to draw up the present system, every member on this side of the House bitterly opposed them. I, Sir, was suspended from this House because of what I said about the Premier on that occasion and his motives in putting the measure forward, but my words on that occasion were mild compared with the feelings to which I would wish to give expression this evening could I do so within the terms of the Standing Orders. This is far worse than what was done on the last occasion.

However, it is interesting to note why it is that the Government has departed from what it did in 1936 and in 1955. Why is it that the Government has suddenly thought up some entirely new principle of electoral representation? Prior to that it said, "We in South Australia since 1872 have had the principle that there were to be twice as many seats for the people in the country areas as there were for the people in the city areas, and the country areas seats were to be equal and the city area seats were to be equal as between themselves."

Mr. Clark: And that must remain.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. Of course, in 1872 twice as many people were living in the country as were living in the city, and that is why there were twice as many seats. The Government said that that was the principle that was laid down, and to that they stuck fast. Now it has come unstuck. Why is that? The simple reason is that if the Government redivided this State on the same instructions to a commission as were given in 1955, it could not retain office. It knows that perfectly well. It also knows that we would retain all the metropolitan seats that we now hold, and that we would win an extra three country seats. It could not stay so it had to think up something else, and the "something else" was a completely novel basis for representation in any purported democracy.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) referred to the State of Minnesota (U.S.A.). However, under the Constitution of the United States of America the principles of representation adopted by that State will go by the board, too. As pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, the Supreme Court has ruled that the sort of thing that has taken place in South Australia cannot continue in America and that one vote one value must be maintained by State Legislatures, which will be forced to redistrict in accordance with the principles laid down in the U.S.A. Constitution. Of course, the Premier says that one vote one value does not obtain anywhere in the world except Victoria. He then tried to get away from Tasmania, and he forgot to mention the House of Representatives. He is always careful to say

there is nothing anywhere in the world like what the Opposition proposes except in the places he prefers not to talk about.

There has been a precedent for the kind of thing the Premier proposes in this Bill—for this basis of representation. It was laid down by a gentleman who, happily for the world and for his country, was compelled, in a most unpleasant manner, to join his forebears. He was not fond of the Chamber of Deputies of his country which, prior to his advent to power, had been elected on a democratic basis of representing the people. In his lectures he said:

But a time will come when the Chamber of Deputies will have to decide its own fate. Are there any Fascists who feel inclined to weep at this hypothesis? If there are, let them know that we shall not dry their tears. It is quite conceivable that a National Corporative Council may replace *in toto* the present Chamber of Deputies.

The Chamber of Deputies has never been to my taste. This Chamber of Deputies has now become anachronistic even as regards its name; it is an institution we found and which is foreign to our mentality and to our passion of Fascists. The Chamber presupposes a world we have demolished; it presupposes the plurality of parties and not infrequently the hold-up of the ministerial diligence. Since the day on which we annulled this plurality, the Chamber of Deputies has lost the essential reason for which it was formed.

He went on and abolished it and set up a National Council of Corporations. Indeed, it is a step in that direction that the Premier proposes to take now, as he proposes to get rid of the House of Assembly on the present basis of representing people and to transform it partly into a House that represents function. Mussolini set up a National Council of Corporations that had several sections—a section for the liberal professions and arts, a section for industry and artisans, a section for agriculture, another for commerce, another for land transport and inland navigation, another for sea and air transport, and another for banking. That was the basis upon which people were represented in the Government of Italy under Signor Mussolini. He said that the basis upon which people should be represented was the work they do, the function they perform, or the industry or craft in which they are engaged.

Mr. Bywaters: Do you think history will repeat itself?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Being a charitable person, I should not like the Premier to come to the same end as Mussolini, but I hope his political demise will be equally sudden. That was the only precedent the Premier could find for the sort of thing proposed in this Bill, but he proposes to have only two sets of function—agriculture and the rest—instead of the seven Mussolini had.

Mr. Loveday: Agriculture *versus* the rest!

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, according to him. In South Australia we shall have representatives of agricultural workers, agricultural railway employees, agricultural lawyers, agricultural shopkeepers, agricultural nurses and agricultural doctors—that is the kind of interest that will be represented here. Those of us who are representatives of people of other areas of the State will be representing not people but industrial workers, industrial lawyers, industrial shopkeepers, industrial doctors and nurses, and industrial artisans. Have members ever heard of anything so absurd?

I turn now to the way the Premier defines this "rural interest" about which he talks in the Bill. At least, it could be said for Signor Mussolini that, although his premises were shocking, he proceeded in a logical manner. However, even on his stated premises, the Premier has not proceeded in a logical manner. One may well say that he is working on the old adage that a politician deals in logic and numbers and that, provided that he has the numbers, he does not worry much about the logic. That appears to be the Premier's attitude. The only logic he sees is drawing the seats in this State so that he can maintain himself in office on the minority vote.

I turn now to the definition of "rural areas" to show what rural interest is to be maintained. In the definition clause "rural areas" means:

Those parts of the State the income and livelihood of the majority of the inhabitants of which are derived predominantly from primary production or from the supply of or processing of goods or services for persons engaged in primary production.

Let us analyse those groups of people. First, there is to be a majority of people in any particular area who derive their livelihood predominantly from primary production—that is, either the workers directly engaged in primary production or the people who have retired from it but have some interest in it (retired farmers). Primary production, however, is defined in such a way that a major portion of the primary production of this State—mining and quarrying—is excluded. In the *Statesman's Pocket Year Book* mining and quarrying appear in the primary production section. They are in fact part of primary production but they are carefully excluded here because the Premier does not want workers in these industries to be classed as being in rural areas.

Mr. Loveday: Or fishermen.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is so; fishermen are out as well. Apparently they are not producing anything primary, so rural areas include some primary producers and some people who obtain their livelihood from some kinds of primary production.

Mr. Clark: And the primary producers in my area are to be put into the metropolitan area.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is so.

Mr. Riches: Where are school teachers?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Apparently they will be either agricultural or industrial school teachers. They do not seem to count. They have to go with one interest or another. The Premier has a slight difficulty because, if we look at the statistics of those employed in rural occupations, we find that the total (including occupiers, unpaid relatives and paid employees) is 36,000 from a total enrolment of 531,228 voters. The Premier has to include a few other people in his definition of "rural interests" so he has to go to those who supply goods or services to persons in primary production, but it is only those who live in certain areas close to primary production who are to be included in "rural interests". Under Signor Mussolini's proposal everyone with a certain interest was included.

For instance, one could say that the workers at John Shearer's plant at Mannum were engaged in servicing or providing goods to persons engaged in primary production, but the same kind of people who equally are providing goods to persons engaged in primary production and who are resident in Adelaide are not to be in it. The workers in the same firm who work in Adelaide are not to be included in the rural interests. The people who are producing agricultural machinery in the same way in the metropolitan area are not to be in the rural interests. An accountant living in a country area looking after the books of farmers is to be in the rural interests but an accountant here in Adelaide whose entire work is the servicing of farmers in respect of their income tax returns and doing their books is not. There are large areas of the West Coast where the farmers rely on accountants in Adelaide for the preparation of their books, and accountants here who do no other work than that are not to be in the rural interests.

Where do we stop? The provision of electricity to farming areas is the supply of a service but the employees in that concern who do not live in the country areas, although they are directly concerned with the provision of electricity for the country areas, are not to be included in the rural interests. I can give other examples of this kind. There are all sorts of services within the metropolitan area or in the closely associated areas where there is a direct supply to primary producers but they are, apparently, not to be included in the matter. Then we go to a new series of people. The next group which is to be included in the numbers to be counted to get the number of inhabitants engaged in rural occupations comprises those engaged in the processing of goods for persons engaged in primary production. It is to be noted that that does not provide for the processing of primary production; it is the processing of goods for persons engaged in primary production. In consequence, the forestry industry, including the milling of timber, will not be such a process because the millers are not doing the work for persons engaged in primary production. The only process that will come within that definition will be where the primary producer's own goods are being, under a contract that he has made, processed by somebody else but they remain his goods. So, for instance, a co-operative dairy will be within it but a timber mill will not.

In these circumstances, the actual number of people who are within this definition as being persons who would be in rural avocations, according to this definition, would be very small. Let us reckon it up. There are 36,000 people engaged in rural occupations. We could add another 25,000 for the retired people and the spouses, who are not counted in that figure. Unpaid relatives are in fact counted in the figure but, if we added spouses not doing any sort of work in rural occupations and retired people, we would get a figure of 25,000; it would not be many more. Then, if we doubled the figure that we had already got (the figure of 61,000) for those people who were supplying goods, such as groceries, to people in country areas, or processing their goods, that would be a very generous figure and we could get a figure of 122,000. Upon that basis it is proposed to provide 20 seats in this Parliament out of a maximum of 42—that is, approximately one-quarter of the enrolled electors of this State.

Let us see what the rest of the State will comprise—and here the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) has not carefully concerned himself with the provisions of the Bill. The rural areas are to have 20 seats. As I have pointed out, those rural areas will be only a

proportion of the country area of South Australia. They will be those country areas where a majority of the people are engaged in the restricted rural avocations that are within the definition. There are many sparsely settled country areas at present not within the definition. Take, for instance, one of the largest districts in the State—Frome. Of the subdivisions, three at any rate are not within the definition of "rural area". The subdivision of Peterborough has not a majority of the people in rural avocations; the subdivision of Terowie is not such an area, neither is the subdivision of Beltana. They are not rural areas within this definition, and it is to be noted that the commission is to retain not only boundaries of existing districts as far as possible but existing subdivisions as far as possible. So it is within those subdivisions that it will decide whether people are within rural avocations or not. It will take those areas and say: "What is the position here? Is this a rural area or not?" In Beltana most of the people are engaged either upon the railway or at Leigh Creek, and those who are engaged in purely rural pursuits and primary production are a minority of the citizens of that subdivision. In Peterborough most of the people again are engaged in railway employment, and that is not the provision of a service purely for primary production. The service is for other purposes; similarly, in Terowie and other country districts throughout the State.

Let us go to the South-East. In Mount Gambier the majority of the people are not engaged in rural avocations; neither are they in Millicent because the timber millers and those people working in the timber mills and the pulp mills and the fisheries will outnumber the rest of the citizens of that area, and they are not in rural employment, according to this definition. What will the result be? The member for Mitcham says that the rest of the State, other than these 20 rural seats, is to be divided into 20, or perhaps 22, seats, and that will be basically the metropolitan area, a little enlarged. He says, "It will take in, probably part of Gawler, Highbury and Morphett Vale, and then it will have 20 seats."

Mr. Clark: All the rapidly expanding population areas.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. That is the very least that the commission could do but, strictly speaking, in accordance with its terms of reference, I do not think it can do only that. Although the Premier is including a proviso here to the effect that there may be two non-rural seats in certain areas outside 30 miles from the General Post Office, those are not the only non-rural seats we can have within that area. Part of the 20 seats for the rest of the State can be a long way outside 30 miles from the General Post Office. Let us read this proviso:

> (*b*) divide the remaining area of the State into 20 approximately equal Assembly districts:
>
> Provided that if it appears to the Commission that such remaining area of the State comprises any part or parts of the State outside a radius of 30 miles from the General Post Office at Adelaide, the Commission may provide for one or two additional Assembly districts comprising any such area or areas if such district (or, if two, each of such additional Assembly districts) is of sufficient size to enable compliance with subsection (2) of this section.

Of course, subsection (2) provides that the quota of electors shall be at least two-thirds of the average number in the remaining 20 Assembly districts. That does not mean to say that some of the 20 are not going to be outside the metropolitan area; it only provides permission to have an additional two with a quota of two-thirds of the average of the remaining 20. It is clear from the definition that much of the non-rural area can be a long way outside the metropolitan area. I have instanced the areas of Mount Gambier and Millicent, but let us consider areas to the north of Adelaide. Wallaroo is not a rural area within this definition, nor is Port Pirie, Stuart, Whyalla or Port Lincoln, and consequently there could be several non-rural areas outside the metropolitan area with the same quota as the metropolitan area.

Mr. Riches: Ridley would disappear altogether.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, that will go. Within the so-called 20 rural seats there will be a reduction in the present quota for country seats. They will be below the 6,000 mark. Then we will have a couple of seats with a quota of about 13,000 and the remainder will have a quota of 19,000 or 20,000. However, that quota could be provided well outside the metropolitan area. That is the effect of the drafting of this clause as it stands. Why is that done? I suppose it is inevitable that when one has seen the effrontery with which the Government approaches the House upon issues of this type one is at first left mouthing in speechless frenzy, but then one becomes somewhat blasé—one is beyond shock. On this occasion I can only say that I am not shocked;

I am suspicious of the Government's motives, because that is what I have been taught to be on this issue.

The Government has had a long time in which to prepare this measure. It did not think it up yesterday. It has had, I know, a sample of what could happen under this proposal. This was prepared by Mr. Seaman, and it indicated what its effects could be and what the result would be to the Government. The result obviously would be to establish a series of pocket boroughs in South Australia to maintain a minority rule at the expense of the majority of the people of this State. Let me turn now to some of the statements the Premier made when he introduced this Bill. He said that if the Opposition's proposals were introduced the position would be that approximately 66 per cent of the members of this Chamber would represent districts only a stone's throw from the Adelaide Town Hall. I admit that in many respects the Premier's capacity is great, but I doubt whether he could throw a stone from the Adelaide Town Hall into my district, which is one of the closest districts, and as to the other metropolitan districts I am even more doubtful.

Mr. Casey: He could use a shanghai.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Even that would not carry a stone the necessary distance. The Premier indulges in all manner of absurd and colourful language, but he cannot escape the fact that the basic principle of electoral representation is that it provides members to represent the people wherever they are. It is not true that in order to establish the principle of one vote one value we would have to have a House so large as to be unduly cumbersome, costly and ineffective. If we increased the size of this House to provide for one vote one value, and to maintain, as my Party believes, the present number of members serving country areas—as we said at election time and as we maintained in the Bill we introduced at the beginning of this session—we would not have to provide a House as large as most lower Houses in other State Parliaments in Australia. How can it be said that it would be unduly cumbersome, costly and ineffective as a Legislature? Are the other State Houses unduly cumbersome, costly and ineffective? Of course they are not! The strange thing about the Premier's proposal is that he proposes to increase not the members of this House but the members of the other House. He says that we cannot have additional members here to bring the numbers up to something resembling a better equality—

Mr. Fred Walsh: They are over-worked in the other House.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. Why the Government should burden members of the other House—and I speak with no disrespect to the members from our Party there because we burden them with work outside the House, although the same does not seem to apply to Government members who are leisurely and otiose in their fashion—I cannot understand, but their august number is to be increased.

Mr. Clark: By 20 per cent.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, so that they will be able to stagger through their work more effectively. I cannot imagine anything more cynically absurd than the proposal that the Premier put forward on that score. How can he possibly justify a refusal of a reasonable increase in members here to bring this House back to the number of members it had when he was first elected, especially when the population of this State was much smaller than it is now, and at the same time increase the number of members in the other House at the expense of the public? The other House sits on an average of 109 hours a year.

Mr. Ryan: Is that the award provision—109 hours?

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is the average. On the one hand the Premier says that it will be cumbersome, costly and ineffective to increase the members of this House and on the other he proposes to load the taxpayers with an additional four members in the other House. He will give this House an additional three members at the most, and possibly only one. Of course, the Premier does not intend to provide extra members in this House, simply because it would make his electoral position unpleasant and unfortunate. He suggests that the reason why he is going to rely upon the election of members not to represent people but to represent rural industry—and he got hot under the collar when I expressed surprise about this basis of representation—is that primary industry provides all the export income for the State. As I have already pointed out, it is difficult to separate what is and what is not primary industry. Do the people in the metropolitan area who supply services to keep farmers going—and whose employment relies upon keeping farmers going—have no part in the export income that is earned? Do the workers at the Metropolitan Abattoirs play no part whatever in the earning of export income from meat?

Mr. McKee: What about those engaged in manufacturing machinery?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. How can they be separated? The plain fact is that not only is it not possible to separate out people on the basis of the work they do and to say, "This person shall be represented in this interest as against a person who shall be represented in that interest", but it is enormously mischievous to this State to try to set people against one another upon that basis, or to say that there is a difference between city and country people and that their interests are opposed to one another. The only way in which this State can advance is for us to advocate balanced development and treat each area equally, because every area relies upon the other and we are one people who can go forward together only on that basis. That is the only proper and responsible thing for any member in this Parliament to say or do. The Premier then went off on a little bit more of that garbling of his proposals that he is very fond of when he is putting something forward that he does not want people to understand. He said:

> Under this Bill the present representation of the metropolitan area, which is 13 members, will increase to 20.

He knew perfectly well that that was not true. He meant the people to understand that the present metropolitan area was to get 20 members instead of its present 13, but he knows perfectly well that on the basis of the 1955 distribution, even supposing the member for Mitcham's contentions were correct as to what the commission will ultimately do, that area would be entitled to at least 18 members now. The Premier comes forward and says, "We are going to give a 50 per cent increase in representation to that area." What nonsense. He wants the people to believe that this is some measure of improvement, in the way the member for Mitcham has spoken of it, instead of one of the most dastardly pieces of chicanery that this Parliament has ever been forced to see. The Premier finally said that the quota for a country district would increase and the quota for a metropolitan area would decrease. It is conceivable that the quota for a metropolitan area will decrease slightly. On any analysis of this Bill it is likely that the quota in the non-rural seats, apart from the two seats that are to have a two-thirds minimum of the rest of the non-rural seats, is likely to be about 19,000; it could be more, but possibly it will be about 19,000. The average quota at the time of the last redistribution was, in fact, 23,000 for the metropolitan area. In consequence, the quota will be a little less, and about half the number in the district of the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), which now has about 36,000 voters, and under the present undemocratic set-up represents in this House more voters than the districts of the Premier, the Minister of Lands, the Minister of Works, the Minister of Agriculture and you, Sir, combined. But Sir, we shall have under this new system still a grossly loaded quota as compared with the quota in the so-called rural seats. It will be basically unfair, and it will not be within the exceptions to the principle of one vote one value referred to by the member for Mitcham. The member for Mitcham said that the only departure from the principle of one vote one value should be on the basis of size of area and practicability of servicing it, and that that was the only basis.

I do not agree that in redividing this State we shall have an unreasonable increase in the number of members of this House when we are faced with having to provide that exception, but even if that exception were granted and we do not get a sufficient increase in the number of members, this Bill does not provide for the exceptions; it does not proceed on the basis of exceptions of that kind at all. We could get quite small so-called rural areas and quite vast so-called non-rural areas under these instructions to the commission. I hope the House will not agree to setting up a commission with instructions of this kind. I assure honourable members opposite that members on this side of the House are bitterly opposed to this provision and to anything to do with the Bill, because it is rotten; it departs from previously accepted statements issued by the Government as to the basis of representation; it denies the people in the country the number of members who should service them; it differentiates between people in country areas, putting some at a disadvantage as compared with others; it does nothing effective to rectify the unjust South Australian electoral system; and its aim is to maintain the Playford dictatorship against the wishes of the people of this State.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): This Bill can be described only as a piece of political window-dressing, obviously put forward in an effort to delude the public that the Playford Government is becoming more democratically-minded. It is so obviously a Bill that could never be accepted by members on this side that one is justified in making that statement. In fact, the Premier went on to say in his second reading explanation that there would be no

difficulty whatever in members on this side defeating the Bill after the commission had brought down its findings. What is the point in putting up a proposition that obviously could never be accepted by members on this side if it can be so easily defeated, as suggested by the Premier? He must know that this Bill is completely unacceptable, because when we analyse it we see that its clauses are designed to get together in certain pockets the people who are likely to vote Labor and to ensure that where there will be a rapid growth of population those people will be contained within those pockets. It is interesting to see that there is no limit at all to the number of electors that may be placed in areas which are to be described as non-rural areas outside the so-called metropolitan area. For example, clause 6 (2) states:

> . . . the Commission shall ensure that the number of electors in any additional Assembly districts (or, if two, each of such additional Assembly districts) shall contain a number of electors equal to at least two-thirds of the average number of electors per district in all the remaining 20 Assembly districts referred to in the said paragraph (*b*).

Clause 6 (3) provides that there shall be a 10 per cent margin either way on the Assembly district with the exception of those additional districts provided by the commission. In other words, there is no limit whatever to the number of electors in those particular areas which I shall term "country industrial areas". Later on, I will show just what that could mean, particularly regarding areas in the north. The remarkable thing about this Bill is that it departs so entirely from everything that Government members have said in the past, and only comparatively recently. When we were speaking on the measure we introduced in 1960, when we asked for a more just electoral system, every Government member who spoke said that our proposals would mean a reduction of the members representing country areas, and that they were bitterly opposed to that. I think it was the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) who said that our proposals would mean a reduction of five seats in the country areas, and that he strongly opposed that. The Premier said something similar. He asked whether members opposite could justify taking away country representation at a time when they were complaining about centralization.

The Premier has introduced a Bill that reduces the number of rural area districts from the present 26 to 20, yet every member opposite has previously said that he could not tolerate a reduction of country seats at any cost. This Bill, of course, looks to the future, it being realized that there will be a big population expansion in various parts of the State. The idea is to get these spots classified as particular electoral districts and the number of electors in areas where people are likely to favour Labor built up so that they will have no influence on so-called rural districts. It is easy to show that that is the case.

The Premier said that country quotas would increase and metropolitan quotas would decrease. If we take the total number of electors at the last election (531,000) and the Premier's statement that the metropolitan quota will be about half the quota of the district represented by the member for Enfield, we will have 20 metropolitan seats each with a quota of 17,000. Then we have to allow for at least two country industrial seats with a quota of at least two-thirds that of a metropolitan seat, so they will be seats of 12,000 electors. As the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) pointed out, two country industrial seats will not be the limit that can be provided under this Bill. If we allow for 20 metropolitan seats of 17,000 and two country industrial seats of 12,000, there are 166,000 electors left to be distributed among 20 rural seats (assuming that they are all classified as rural seats). That would give a quota of 8,300 for rural seats, but, as the member for Norwood pointed out, it is more than likely that the metropolitan quota will be 19,000 instead of 17,000, in view of population trends in the city. That would mean that there would be a quota in rural area seats of about 6,000, showing clearly that the analysis made by the member for Norwood was correct.

As the Bill makes no restriction whatever on the total number of electors in country industrial seats, it is obvious that the more electors placed in country industrial seats the lower will be the quota for country rural seats. This Bill simply provides for a large number of country pocket boroughs so that they can dominate this Parliament for a long time; that is obviously the design of this Bill.

It is interesting to investigate what could be done in northern towns under this Bill. At the time of the last election, Port Pirie had 6,608 electors and Port Augusta 5,151. In the Port Germein subdivision there were 3,058 electors. The Port Augusta and Port Germein subdivisions are in the Stuart district, which had a total of just over 8,000 electors. A

country industrial district visualized under the Bill must have two-thirds of the number of electors that a metropolitan district has, so, assuming that a metropolitan district has a quota of 18,000 or 19,000, a country industrial district must have a quota of 12,000 or 13,000. In the last election Whyalla subdivision (including Iron Knob and Iron Baron) had 6,773 electors and Woomera subdivision had 2,321 on the roll. In other words, this Bill is designed either to throw Port Augusta and Port Pirie together as one electorate or to throw Port Augusta and Whyalla together as one electorate, and so do away with a Labor member. The same will apply wherever the provisions of this Bill can be made effective in similar areas where there is likely to be an expansion of population or where a similar situation exists. That, of course, is the object of the Bill.

Whereas in Whyalla the population could increase in a relatively few years to 30,000 people, that would not necessitate the electorate's being divided, there being no limit in the Bill to the number of electors who can be kept within a country industrial district. In other words, the people of Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta are, from the point of view of their electoral voice, likely to be regarded as second-class or third-class citizens. Their vote will be worth only one-third of what a vote of a man living at Cowell or Kimba will be worth. What justification can there be for such discrimination?

It is obvious, too, that this Bill is designed to deal as far as possible with seats that will be held by Labor by a narrow margin. Obviously, under its provisions the quota for rural areas will make it possible for certain areas to have a small number added to them with a view to destroying the possibility of Labor's holding those particular seats. The whole design of this Bill is in that direction. It is intended to divide the people of this State into two opposing factions; that is what it would develop into.

We have been told that there is some great distinction between people living in one part of the State compared with those living in another part with regard to their future. I think the member for Norwood dealt with that adequately when he pointed out that the people of this State had one future, not two separate futures. What are the disabilities under which people in the country labour? Are not those disabilities the same for people at Port Pirie and Port Augusta as for people at Cowell, Kimba or anywhere else in the country? All the things that affect them socially are identical. Why make a discrimination? They live some distance from the metropolitan area and as a result pay more for some things. They also lack some social amenities simply because they are distant. What difference does it make whether they work at Whyalla, Cowell or Kimba? All those people are in the same position as regards the lack of various things obtainable in the metropolitan area: yet this ridiculous discrimination is to be made in this Bill purely for Party-political purposes.

I turn now to clause 6 and refer to this provision about the area that is declared as being not within the rural areas of the State. It reads:

(1) Subject as hereinafter mentioned, the Commission shall—

(*a*) divide the rural areas into 20 approximately equal Assembly districts;

(*b*) divide the remaining area of the State into 20 approximately equal Assembly districts:

Provided that if it appears to the Commission that such remaining area of the State comprises any part or parts of the State outside a radius of 30 miles from the General Post Office at Adelaide, the Commission may provide for one or two additional Assembly districts comprising any such area or areas of such district (or, if two, each of such additional Assembly districts) is of sufficient size to enable compliance with subsection (2) of this section.

It refers to 30 miles from the General Post Office. One has only to look at a map to see the answer to that. Today we had placed on the table of the House the report of the Town Planning Committee on the metropolitan area, at page 280 of which is a map of Adelaide showing the distribution of the population. A perusal of this map reveals why 30 miles from the General Post Office appears in the clause.

Mr. Clark: That is most obvious.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Quite, because, by extending the area to 30 miles from the G.P.O. (it is described not as the metropolitan area but as an area within which metropolitan seats may be determined) we take in Gawler and go to a point beyond Sellick's Beach in the other direction. The obvious intention here is to enable areas in which there are firm Labor strongholds today to be brought in and declared metropolitan electoral districts so that they can have the metropolitan quota. Today, Gawler is regarded and classified as a country electorate with well over 20,000 electors on the roll. The drawing of the Bill in this manner will enable the commission to declare the Gawler area a metropolitan electoral district and so bring the quota up to

the maximum it can have for a metropolitan seat. Looking south, we see that the area described as the Noarlunga and Willunga area is one of the areas wherein this report on the metropolitan area of Adelaide points out there will be terrific population expansion in the near future. Here again, it is undoubtedly considered that this area will return a Labor member, so the idea is to create another metropolitan electoral district with the metropolitan electorate quota to ensure that it does contain the largest number of Labor supporters possible in an area, so that they will not affect a rural area.

I do not propose to traverse the ground already covered by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), who has pointed out that the provision of another Legislative Council district is quite unnecessary. He said: "How can the Premier justify this?" Of course, to the public it cannot be justified but I think there is a good reason for it. An examination of the clauses reveals a good reason from the Premier's point of view, because clause 7 (2) provides:

In making the division under this section the commission shall provide for three Legislative Council districts in the rural areas and three in the remaining part of the State: provided that a Legislative Council district in the rural areas may include one whole Assembly district which is comprised in the remaining area of the State.

In my opinion, the object of that provision is that, when a new Legislative Council electoral district is determined, which may include the three northern towns, it will be possible for the commission to include within that Legislative Council area only one of those country industrial Assembly electoral districts. In other words, the boundary would have to be drawn in such a way that, if Whyalla and Port Augusta were one country industrial Assembly electoral district, the commission could not, because of this provision, bring in Port Pirie and the surrounding area, which would be another country industrial Assembly electoral district. That is done for the obvious reason that there is a possibility that, if two country industrial Assembly electoral districts were included in one Legislative Council area, then Labor might win that. So they are spread in between different Legislative Council areas if it is not desired to have them together but, when it is desired to have them together, it is declared that it shall be a country industrial electoral division for the Assembly. So the Government gets it both ways.

This Bill has absolutely nothing to commend it. It works not for representation of people, not for representation of human beings, but simply for interests which are being artificially opposed one to the other. It must cause an artificial division among the people themselves even in the districts that are classified as being rural, country industrial or metropolitan. It has no basis in logic whatsoever and I hope members opposite will realize the futility of putting up propositions like this that can be only detrimental to the State rather than helpful to its progress. It must, by virtue of the division it makes, increase the feeling between the two sets of people. I read recently that the Minister of Education himself when addressing some people deplored the feeling between what are called the people engaged in primary production and those in the metropolitan area. This Bill, if it is given effect to, can only make the position in that direction much worse than it is at present. Everything should be done to reduce that feeling.

It is not true that members on this side have no concern for primary interests in this State. In fact, an examination of what the members on this side of the House have done and have tried to put forward in legislation over the years shows clearly that they are concerned about decentralization and are just as fair-minded about the people living in the country as those living anywhere else. It is nonsense to try to put up this argument that, because of the difference of feeling of these two sets of people, one has to differentiate and discriminate between people in the metropolitan area and those in the country; and, not only discriminate between those sets of people, but discriminate again between people in the country who are regarded as industrialists and those who are regarded as primary producers. I hope that the Bill will be opposed not only by members on this side but by Government members. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I only want to say a few words on this matter. I probably would not have spoken at all except that I wanted to give my interpretation of "rural areas" which differs from the interpretation given by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). It is proper that this interpretation should be included in *Hansard* so that at some later stage, if a commission wants to know the Government's attitude, it will be available. I do not agree with Mr. Dunstan's remarks that this Bill is designed not to represent people:

it is designed to represent people. As far as the representation of the House is concerned, it will be better, in many ways, from the Opposition's point of view than the present distribution provides.

I believe that it is possible under this Bill to have two non-rural areas outside of the metropolitan area. It is impossible to have more than two. Let me make that clear. I disagree entirely with the honourable member's definition regarding forestry. In the many definitions of "rural pursuits" or "primary production" it is not customary to include the word "forestry", but the Government has included it directly here, because it realizes that the people engaged in that industry are essentially the same as those engaged normally in other rural areas. I just wanted to correct the interpretation that the honourable member sought to put on this definition. His interpretation is not the one upon which any submissions would be made to the commission, so far as the Government is concerned. The definition of "rural areas" was designedly made as wide as possible to give a general representation to country areas. The net result of the Bill will be to substantially increase the representation of the metropolitan area. The Leader of the Opposition apparently believes that a big House will be a better House. I do not believe that. I believe that an effective House is a House of the type we have had in South Australia for the last 30 years. In this House we have had no restrictions on the length of time a member can speak; debates are not concluded by applying the gag (which I do not think is in accordance with the best Parliamentary practice); members are given an ample opportunity to adequately express themselves; much more time is permitted for questions; fuller questions and fuller replies are permitted; and time is available for the discussion of private members' business. As a matter of interest, I have been to other State Parliaments and have noted that in the larger Parliaments private members rarely have time to introduce measures that they consider should be discussed by the House. As honourable members know, it has been the practice for many years here to provide time for private members' business. Indeed, private members—including the Leader of the Opposition—have introduced legislation that I believe has been of significant value to the State.

I thank honourable members for their consideration of this Bill. I assure members that the Government does not seek a restricted application so far as rural areas are concerned. The "rural areas" definition was designedly made wide so that it would cover in general terms areas that would normally be outside the metropolitan area. The debate has shown a sincere consideration of the problem, and I hope that that will be the continued tenor of the debate.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The SPEAKER: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote for the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I think I made it clear that I oppose the interpretation set out in relation to "primary production" and "rural areas". This is the first time that such terms have been used in electoral measures of this nature. The measure could have been drafted more simply, and the definition of "primary production" omitted. Rural areas could have been defined as all areas outside what has been defined as the metropolitan area. The present single electorate system has operated for the past 24 years, although its basis was never agreed to by members on this side of the House. This scheme will be far different and inferior to that embodied in the present system. We on this side of the House have clearly indicated what we think of these proposals. Even the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) could not explain to our grade VII schoolchildren what this clause means, and yet those children are well tutored in civics and Parliamentary procedure. The definitions under the present system are much clearer than those contained in this Bill. We provided for 13 metropolitan seats, and the other seats were contained in the rest of the State.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Premier said he did not believe that this definition provided for representation of interests, but that it still provided for representation of people. That is not what he said when he introduced the Bill, because he then said specifically that "the Bill proposes, therefore, that the rural industries shall have 20 seats in the House"—not that the people living in rural areas would have that representation. The representation was to be on the basis of industry, and I inquired about it. The Premier went on vociferously and said that I was very intolerant of rural industries except at election times. That was nonsense. The Premier said he wished to say a word or two to be incorporated in *Hansard* so that the commission would know what the Government's mind was on this subject, but the commission will not be looking at *Hansard* to find out what the purposes of this Bill are.

The principles of legal interpretation, as the honourable member for Mitcham will tell the Premier, are such that courts and judicial and semi-judicial tribunals are not allowed to examine the debates of the House to see what one particular member may have meant by one section. The commission is required to look at the result which is the Act. The wording of the section is such that dire results could occur to the people, because the section will not produce the result that the Premier has announced as his intention. Therefore, how can the Premier say that processing of goods for persons in primary production is going to cover the processing of primary production in country areas. It is not; it cannot and it does not. In these circumstances the Premier has not done what he just told the House he has set out to do and the results to the State will be dire if they ever become embodied in an Act resulting from the commission's report. If this has to rely on my support it is a dead duck right now.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. As there is an equality of votes I cast my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 3—"Appointment of Commission."

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 4—"Procedure at meetings."

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5—"Application of Royal Commissions Act."

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 6—"Redistribution."

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Subclause (1) (*a*) provides that the commission shall divide the rural areas into 20 approximately equal Assembly districts, but this will deny country people some representation. I have always thought the Premier to be an advocate of representation for country people. Whenever we have sought to implement the principle of one vote one value he has told us that the country requires adequate representation. How can his statement be reconciled with this proposal to reduce country representation by six seats? Will Gawler be considered as a country seat? What about Onkaparinga? Will the subdivision of Clarendon be included in the metropolitan area?

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being equality of votes, I cast my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 7—"Redivision of Council districts."

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I did not mention this clause in my second reading speech because I considered that I might become too hostile if I referred to the Legislative Council, particularly having regard to the proposed increase in the membership. Members of that place are not as busily occupied on constituents' business as are members of this House. For instance, members of the Northern District have been accused of not paying enough attention to matters concerning the Leigh Creek coalfield. The Minister of Education attends naturalization ceremonies regularly, but how often do Legislative Council members in that district attend? I believe there are already sufficient members in the Council, if we are to retain our bicameral system. At any time I would advocate the abolition of the Council. The bicameral system is not required in South Australia or in any other part of the Commonwealth. Earlier I referred to the *Christian Science Monitor* in the United States of America. It said that in that country there was no need for the system. I do not suggest that we are more enlightened than people there, because we can still learn much from them. I believe that Americans publicize the matter because they want people in other countries to know that they are not satisfied with the system. The proposal in the Bill for another Council district would increase the membership of that place by four. Is that why the Government wants to reduce the total country representation by six? Is it part and parcel of the bargain? Even at this stage, we would not take exception to the Council if its franchise were the same as for the Assembly and the National Parliament.

Mr. Clark: You believe that it still would not be necessary?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: It is certainly not essential, and its franchise should be altered. If it were the same as for the Assembly the people could have the opportunity to say whether they wanted to continue with the bicameral system. The Premier has not given one good reason why there should be another Council district and an additional four members in that Chamber. Why has the clause been included in the Bill?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I am happy to tell the honourable member why I included the clause. Now there are three rural and two non-rural Council districts. By providing an extra district we would have an improved and better balanced Council. The Party representation would not be so unbalanced. I believe that there is a strong case for another non-rural Council district.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: If the clause is passed, will the State be divided in such a way as to provide for three non-rural Council districts? Will the other three be country-city districts? Mount Gambier could be in one district and Port Pirie and Whyalla in others.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That would not be the interpretation I would put on it. I do not regard Mount Gambier as a non-rural seat. The honourable member's interpretation is not mine. The commission has a wide range of discretion under the Bill. It decides where boundaries are to be established and what particular areas come under the definitions of rural and non-rural.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Premier seems to have overlooked the effect of subclause (2), about which the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) spoke during the second reading debate. Assuming the Premier's contention is correct, that the commission will provide only two non-rural seats outside 30 miles from the General Post Office, only one of those may go into any one of the non-metropolitan Legislative Council areas. In other words, he will divide the areas up and, if those two non-rural seats are in the Mid-Northern and gulf towns, as would appear to be the case from what he has said tonight, they are to be divided up so that they are put in with any supposedly rural areas to make certain that the community of interest that they may otherwise have does not outweigh the vote of the Liberal and Country League in those two Legislative Council districts. That is a complete departure from previous proposals on maintenance of the community interest in an electoral district—not a view that is particularly valid but one that the Government has always urged previously and is urging as far as the rest of the redistribution is concerned. That would mean, in fact, that each of the three country cities would be in a separate Legislative Council district, assuming that the Premier's contention were correct, that there would be only two non-rural seats outside 30 miles from the G.P.O.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 8—"Matters to be considered."

Mr. FRANK WALSH: This clause is important. Subclause (1) reads:

In dividing the State into Assembly electoral districts the Commission, so far as is compatible with the provisions of section 6, shall endeavour to create Assembly districts in each of which respectively the electors have common interests.

Under the existing provisions and even with the proposed extension of the metropolitan area, I still believe that certain areas will have to be regarded as fringe country areas. Therefore, I fail to see how we can have "common interests". For instance, if certain people in the Gumeracha district are growing apples, electors in Magill will be eating them, but I do not see that there would be much common interest. The boundaries of existing districts and subdivisions are to be retained as far as possible, but I point out that the Gawler District, for instance, has one subdivision containing almost 24,000 electors. A district must have a reasonable shape with reasonable means of access between the main population centres therein. I have heard members, including the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), complain about the difficulties of travelling from one country town to another. For instance, in the Frome District, the member would have to travel 150 miles from Peterborough to reach the boundary of his district. The Government should supply him with a helicopter or some other fast means of transportation. I oppose the clause because, if it is difficult for a country member to adequately service his district now, it will be impossible if the country representation is reduced by six.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes I give my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 9—"Representations to Commission."

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes I give my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 10—"Report."

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes I give my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 11—"Financial provision."

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Title.

The Committee divided on the title:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Sir Cecil Hincks and Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. As there is an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Title thus passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.05 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 25, at 2 p.m.