

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, February 25, 1964.

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

PETITIONS: ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla) presented a petition signed by 4,804 electors. It stated that the report of the 1963 Electoral Boundaries Commission provided for an alteration in boundaries of House of Assembly districts whereby the districts of Whyalla, Port Augusta, and Port Pirie would be replaced by two new districts; that the suggested alteration would mean that some residents of Port Augusta would be placed in a district containing Port Pirie and other areas, and that the remainder would be placed in a district containing Whyalla and other areas; and that the interests of citizens of Port Augusta would thereby be ignored and harm done to residents of Port Pirie and Whyalla, who would be unfairly placed at an electoral disadvantage compared with residents of other country towns. The petition requested that the House of Assembly reject any measure designed to bring the recommendations in the report into effect.

Received and read.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart) presented a petition signed by 3,400 electors identical in content with that presented by the member for Whyalla.

Received and read.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie) presented a petition signed by 3,792 electors identical in content with that presented by the member for Stuart.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS.**BEDFORD PARK DUST NUISANCE.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have received by mail a petition and a letter from residents in the Clovelly Park and Burbank areas, which are in my district, concerning the dust nuisance at Bedford Park in the area that is now being prepared for use by the University of Adelaide. The petitioners realize that the work is necessary to provide an additional university, and they commend the university for its efforts. However, they are perturbed at the dust nuisance. The whole frontage of the Bedford Park area has been ploughed up or graded to such an extent that it is now unrecognizable. These people have suffered intensely from the dust since last October. I took up the matter with the Vice-Chancellor

of the university at the time, and I have now forwarded the petition to him. Can the Premier say whether the Government can help solve this problem either by commencing immediately the preparations for the watering system that will be used eventually, or by providing more equipment for watering along the frontage of the area so that the residents will not be inconvenienced by the dust nuisance?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This work is being done by the university and the honourable Leader will appreciate that I would not normally know the conditions and terms of the contract. In those circumstances, I am unable to give him a reply as to what action should and could be taken. Normally, a contract of this description contains a provision that no nuisance is to be created in carrying out the work or that steps must be taken to minimize any nuisance created. Frequently there are clauses regarding the date of completion and other matters, but I do not know whether such clauses are in this contract. I will inquire to see whether action can be taken to rectify the position. As the honourable Leader knows, the Government is providing most of the money for this contract, and I am sure that my colleagues will not object to the cost of minimizing this nuisance being covered by the cost of the project. I will inform the honourable Leader soon.

WINE GRAPE PRICES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Many grape-growers in the Barossa Valley are concerned whether they will be able to dispose of their entire grape crop this year, in view of statements made in circular letters recently received by them from some of the major wineries. One circular stated:

Since we notified you in January that we would accept the same total tonnage as last year, the announcement of 1964 grape prices has revealed an increase in the price of doradillos, which for our purposes is out of proportion to other varieties. We regret that this altered situation has forced us to restrict our purchases of doradillos to 50 per cent of last year's tonnage. So that you may deliver the same total as last year, the reduction in doradillo tonnage may be transferred to grenache and mataro.

Another winery issued a circular which stated:

We have made a survey of grape estimates given us for the 1964 vintage and find that estimates are in excess of our requirements. It is therefore necessary for us to restrict our intake of grapes and we advise that at this stage we can accept the same tonnages as delivered by you during the 1963 vintage. The position will be reviewed during the vintage and it is possible that we may be able to accept some additional quantities.

I understand that the position has been further aggravated by the availability, at a lower price, of grapes from the River Murray areas. Is the Premier aware of the actual position of the viticultural industry in South Australia at present, particularly in the Barossa Valley, and, if so, can he state whether there is any cause for alarm regarding the disposal of the grape harvest?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: An article appeared in the press—I think in the *Sunday Mail*—on this matter and I naturally inquired to determine the basis of the article. I have consulted with the Prices Commissioner. Information at my disposal indicates that with the exception of one large winery the wineries have reasonably willingly accepted the Prices Commissioner's determination. I understand that one large winery would seek to upset the determination, but generally it has been accepted. Two factors come into this question. I am informed that grapegrowers, when submitting estimates of their crops, tend to enlarge the tonnages to be sure of a cover in the event of the winery reducing its intake. From what Mr. Murphy said, some of the estimates that have been submitted concerning the size of the vintage of individual properties have been expanded. He assures me that the position with doradillos is entirely sound and there should be no trouble in properly placing the harvest. He emphasizes what I am sure everyone associated with the wine industry realizes, namely, that grapes that have been planted primarily for drying purposes should be so used. These grapes are grown mainly in the river area; indeed, the main sultana crop is from the river area. The Prices Commissioner informs me that, provided all parties co-operate, the position of the industry is entirely sound. It is capable of taking, and should profitably take, the total vintage available to it provided that the drying grapes are used for the purpose for which they were planted.

BANKING BY JUVENILE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I was extremely disturbed by a press article that a 15-year-old girl is missing with about £700 that she was ordered by her employer—apparently from a supermarket in my district—to bank. I believe that such a request of a juvenile on a low wage is a grave temptation. Will the Premier consider the advisability of introducing legislation to protect young girls from such temptation, particularly while they are on low wage rates?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Many curious implications are involved in legislation of the nature suggested. If the honourable member stopped to consider what was involved he would not be so keen on it. I admit that it was not a good thing to send a comparatively young girl to the bank with such a large sum. Apart from the temptation to the girl, the safety of the girl should also be considered. Modern society being what it is it is not wise to place such a sum in the hands of a child. I do not think we should enact legislation to prohibit people from occupying a position of trust merely because a small percentage cannot always be worthy of such trust. That is the real point of the question. The Government has not contemplated legislation on the lines suggested.

EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Works recent information regarding tests in the Polda Basin; has the consumption of water on Eyre Peninsula increased to any extent this year; what quantity of water has been pumped from Polda Basin; and what is the position generally of water on Eyre Peninsula—are we gaining or losing ground on the supply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Last week the honourable member intimated that he wanted information but the scope of his questions now greatly exceeds the scope of his earlier question, so I cannot give him all the information he now seeks. The Engineer-in-Chief has supplied the following progress report on investigations into the Polda Basin:

Up to the end of December, 1963, a total of 238 observation bores were drilled in the Polda-Bramfield area. Results of drilling indicate that good quality water of less than 1,000 p.p.m. occupies an area of about 50 square miles in the vicinity of Polda. To the west there is an area of brackish and saline groundwater where salinities rise to more than 10,000 p.p.m. in some areas. This zone of poor quality water is known to extend west as far as Mount Wedge and for several miles north and south of the main road. Good quality water with salinity usually less than 700 p.p.m. has been obtained in a number of bores north-east of Bramfield and also north-east of Mount Wedge.

Levels of water table have shown a marked rise, following the temporary cessation of pumping in April and the heavy winter rain. At the close of the period, pump tests were done on two bores and yields were relatively large with only small drawdowns. Pumping from the trench was resumed in September and has been continuous to the present time. A total of 162,000,000 gallons was pumped during this period.

A layman usually refers to water quality in terms of grains a gallon. If the honourable member wants to convert the figures I have given in parts per million to that figure he should multiply the parts per million by .07 to get the grains a gallon. I cannot tell the honourable member whether the consumption of water has increased this summer on Eyre Peninsula because of the availability of high-quality water from Polda Basin. We have not been able to maintain pumps at a full pressure from Polda all the year because during cool spells we have filled the tanks at Minnipa and therefore pumping has had to be restrained somewhat. However, I think it is perfectly true that, whenever good quality water is supplied, the consumption invariably increases, not necessarily immediately but, as people become aware of the quality of the water and the possibilities of gardening and so on to be derived from the better quality, they invariably extend their operations and increase their use of water. The testing of Polda Basin is proceeding actively, and indeed I hope to step it up a little, in view of the importance of this basin to future development. At present it does appear that with Polda Basin and other reserves that we have on Eyre Peninsula, perhaps less important but nevertheless relatively important, we have sufficient water on Eyre Peninsula for, say, the next 10 years. However, with Eyre Peninsula developing so rapidly and stock numbers rising, I should not like to predict beyond that point. I believe that we will have water for a much longer period than that, but I qualify that with the statement previously made.

NORTHFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS: Last Saturday the Minister of Education and I attended a happy function at the Northfield Primary School—certainly much happier than the incident that occurred there only recently—when the Minister opened a new swimming pool. At afternoon tea the Minister made some proposals to the committee assembled about the erection of a permanent building there, and he asked me to remind him of this matter when the House met on Tuesday. As I believe the Minister has now had a chance to discuss this matter with his departmental officers, can he report further? Can he also tell the House whether further action has been taken in connection with the two very young boys at that school who were suspended for allegedly lighting the recent unfortunate fire there?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Perhaps I could deal with the second question first. I discussed that matter with the honourable member, the Superintendent of Primary Schools, the chairman and members of the school committee, and the headmaster and infant mistress there, and I decided that in all the circumstances I would lift the suspension of these two boys as from yesterday. This, of course, gave them a fortnight to think it over. I am informed today that one of the boys returned to school this morning, but the other one (who was the ringleader, the one whom I described as very smart, precocious and arrogant) has not returned for the very good reason that he appears to have left the district and also, I am told, the State. As far as I am concerned, I would regard his departure, in the words of the poet, as being unwept, unhonoured and unsung. Dealing with the more important question, I have received a report from the Director concerning this matter which I think I cannot do better than read. He states:

Although not all the timber classrooms in the school were fully in use at the time of the fire, and this fact made possible the redistribution of classes, it was decided with your approval that the six classrooms which were totally destroyed should be fully replaced in order to provide for the anticipated increased enrolments which will occur towards the end of this year or early next year, from the large number of new houses being erected near the school. It has been ascertained that 100 new houses are being erected in the immediate vicinity of the school and 30 more just north of Grand Junction Road. It is expected that all necessary repair work, including the dual classroom block and the canteen, will be made good soon and that the six classrooms which were totally destroyed will be replaced as soon as possible. In fact, the first four rooms, forming a quadruple unit, will be completed by the end of April. In addition, an activity room is being provided. In this way there will be full accommodation for the additional mid-year enrolments and we will be able to bring back to Northfield those classes which are temporarily accommodated at Strathmont. There will also be fully sufficient accommodation for the additional enrolments next year.

A longer range plan, however, is, I consider, required at this school. For this purpose I suggest that consideration should be given to the provision of a new infant school building in solid construction with eight or 10 classrooms. A recommendation along these lines will be submitted for your consideration, although it is certain it cannot be begun in the coming financial year. In the meantime, new and more stringent instructions are being drawn up for caretakers at our schools. These instructions will stress three points in particular:

- (a) It is a prime duty of caretakers to be on the alert at all times when

unauthorized persons, including children, may be expected to be in the vicinity of the school building. This applies particularly during weekends and in vacations.

- (b) It is essential that caretakers should ensure that all doors, and especially classroom doors, are properly secured outside and that any faulty locks should be immediately reported and the faults remedied.
- (c) That rubbish bins are emptied regularly, at least once a day in term time, and that papers are not left in rubbish bins during weekends or in vacations.

In addition, a circular instruction is being drawn up to send to schools to provide that matches and other dangerous material should not be left by teachers in classrooms.

I have approved of all the recommendations of the Director.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE.

Mr. LAUCKE: I refer to the urgent and vital need for deep drainage to be provided in two areas of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully, areas which cannot be serviced by local effluent disposal schemes. One area is the Holden Hill area, and the other forms the catchment for the Hope Valley reservoir. I am concerned at the insufferable conditions that will arise in winter months in connection with the disposal of septic tank effluent at Holden Hill. Altogether, 380 houses have been erected there, currently representing a development of 60 per cent of the area. Because of the extremely poor absorption qualities of the soil, septic tank effluent must be pumped from holding pits even in the summer months, and this runs into the water tables of the streets. With further building going on in the area, the effluent problem will be accentuated. Deep drainage is also vitally necessary in the catchment area east of the Hope Valley reservoir to prevent pollution of that reservoir. This, I understand, is being investigated. Can the Minister of Works say when this catchment area will be sewered and whether consideration is being given to sewerage the Holden Hill area at the same time?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report on the matters raised. I think I should preface my reading of the report by pointing out to the House—the honourable member is well aware of it—that the two areas to which he refers are separated by high land and that for the purposes of sewerage they essentially constitute two parts. With that background in mind, I will now refer to the report. Regarding the maps of the area which the Engineering and Water Supply Department has shown me, Holden Hill comprises a large area and

includes both the areas the honourable member has mentioned and also additional land. Therefore, the whole area is referred to as Holden Hill, which reference causes some misunderstanding in discussing the matter. Sewerage work has been commenced already in the subdivisions of United Dominion Corporation and Modern Tract Development Proprietary Limited. These areas are on the northern side of Dry Creek and drain into the Dry Creek Valley main trunk sewer, which is also under construction and should be completed by June or July. Planning of a scheme for the sewerage of the housing development in the catchment area to the east of Hope Valley reservoir is nearing completion and will receive the consideration of the Government at an early date. At present it is not possible to say definitely when this area will be sewered, as this will depend upon the extent of the Loan funds available. However, it is hoped that the work will be put in hand during the 1964-65 financial year. Except for the easterly part (section 306), which is within the Hope Valley catchment area, Holden Hill cannot be included in the Hope Valley scheme; that is, that portion of Holden Hill on the northern side of the high land and the north-western side of the reservoir.

The portion of Holden Hill adjacent to Valiant Road is in the Dry Creek watershed, and consequently that area which comprises Sections 518, 308 and 309 must drain north-westerly across the Main North-East and Grand Junction Roads to the Dry Creek Valley sewer. Until the intervening land (sections 312 and 529) is subdivided and developed, there is little prospect of the sewer rates from Holden Hill area showing a return on the outlay sufficient to justify the sewerage of the area. Inquiries have been made by a subdivider regarding the sewerage of a proposed subdivision in section 529. If and when this comes about, extensions of sewers to Holden Hill will be further considered.

CRUELTY AT ABATTOIRS.

Mr. LAWN: On October 29 last year, as a result of a statement made to the *Sunday Mail*, I asked the Premier a question about treatment of calves at the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs. The Premier had the matter investigated by an officer of the Police Department and gave me a reply. Since then a member of the Veterinary Aid Trust Incorporated of South Australia has contacted me and drawn my attention to a provision of the Victorian Statutes. He has asked me to raise the matter

again to see if a similar provision can be introduced into our legislation. The Victorian provision is as follows:

No person, whether as principal or agent, shall sell or offer for sale or purchase or drive or convey any calf which appears to be unfit by reason of weakness to be sold or purchased or to be driven or conveyed to its intended destination.

Will the Minister of Agriculture have this matter investigated to see whether a similar provision is included in our legislation and, if it is not, will he consider introducing amending legislation to this effect either during this session or next session?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, I will examine this matter. I am anxious to avoid unnecessary suffering to animals if it can be avoided. This is the first time I have heard the provision that has been referred to by the honourable member. It occurs to me that it would be most difficult to police, and I wonder how effective it would be. That does not mean that I disapprove of the purpose of that legislation, however, and I shall be happy to see whether there is any way in which we can further provide laws that will ensure that animals do not suffer unnecessarily.

WAROOKA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on February 18 about further water supplies south of Warooka?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief states that drilling by the Mines Department on southern Yorke Peninsula is still in progress. Of 14 bores drilled, three have produced potable water, and these are now being pump-tested to ascertain the quantity of water available.

PORT PIRIE WEST SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on February 18 about paving and drainage at the Port Pirie West Primary School?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have ascertained from the Director of Public Buildings that tenders have been called and that they close today.

MEDICAL OFFICER'S DEFERRED PAY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In May last year, at the request of a constituent, I took up with the Minister of Health a matter concerning the payment of a resident medical officer at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This officer was the married daughter of my constituent.

During the term of her 12-month engagement at the Royal Adelaide Hospital she became pregnant. She stayed at the hospital until the eighth month of her pregnancy and then obviously had to leave before completing the 12-month engagement. However, she returned to the hospital as soon as her baby was weaned and completed an aggregate of 12 months' service as a house surgeon or resident medical officer. Unfortunately, at the end of that time the board saw fit to retain £60 8s. 2d. deferred pay. At the request of my constituent, I took up this matter with the Minister of Health and asked that the decision be reviewed. During the last few months I have written him several letters, and I have received replies. The latest of those replies, which was signed by the Acting Under Secretary, was in part as follows:

The Chief Secretary directs me to advise that in future no amount will be retained from the salaries of resident medical officers pending the completion of their term of appointment. However, the board of management Royal Adelaide Hospital does not recommend that the decision be retrospective, but should operate from February 1, 1964. There would be many persons affected by a retrospective decision. I am glad that the board has changed its policy and will not in future retain sums from the salaries of resident medical officers, which it has done in the past, as this has caused hardship. However, I am disappointed that the case I took up with the Minister, which was apparently partly responsible for this change in policy, is itself being left unredressed. I think this is wrong. If I give the Premier the names of the people concerned and the correspondence will he ask his colleague, the Minister of Health, whether this case can be reviewed, by Cabinet if necessary (as this is a matter of policy), with a view to making payment of the £60 8s. 2d. retained in the circumstances I have outlined?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think the honourable member will realize that retrospective decisions always include some people but exclude others. However, having made that qualifying statement, I will consider the matter and let the honourable member know.

WHYALLA AERODROME.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Minister of Lands say whether the survey of the old aerodrome at Whyalla has been completed, and if it has, whether any plans have been drawn up for subdivision of Housing Trust areas there?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am not sure whether it has been completed, but I will inquire and let the honourable member know.

ROSEWORTHY AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question is prompted by a statement appearing in a newspaper that I prefer not to name. Can the Minister of Agriculture say how many students are at present attending Roseworthy Agricultural College and whether it has a full complement? What is the normal annual first-year intake, and how many applicants have been turned away this year because of the lack of accommodation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The average number of students that can be accommodated at the college is about 100 and the maximum intake for the first-year course about 45. There has been a heavy demand for admission to the college this year, and some applicants had to be refused admission because of the lack of available accommodation. This position had not arisen in the past to the same extent as it arose this year. Several improvements are at present being made to the college, and the students' comfort is being improved. In addition, an oenology course is now in full operation. It is difficult to anticipate the number of students requiring admission. This year the successful applicants were not told until well into January, although we knew months in advance that there would be too many applications on this occasion. It was difficult to find out who wanted to attend the college and who did not want to. Only a year or two ago the oenology course almost collapsed because of the lack of interest. Although it was probably the only oenology course south of the equator (certainly in Australasia), there appeared to be no students for it; but with the assistance of the Wine and Brandy Producers' Association and other viticultural associations the course was filled quickly, and now it is operating successfully with little difficulty. The number of applicants for the agricultural course is greater, however, and it is not possible to accommodate them all. I do not know what will happen next year but, if necessary, efforts will be made to accommodate more students in the future.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. CASEY: Rail standardization between Broken Hill and Port Pirie is inevitable during the next few years. Can the Premier say whether the Government has decided whether the 4ft. 8½in. line will be continued from Port Pirie to Adelaide? Previously the member for Port Pirie has asked questions about

this matter, but we have been told that many problems are involved in the route from Port Pirie to Adelaide. Can the Premier say whether the Government has had any report on the advisability of continuing the 4ft. 8½in. line from Peterborough to Adelaide by the direct route? With a 4ft. 8½in. line from Port Pirie to Adelaide, Adelaide to Broken Hill and Sydney traffic will travel *via* Port Pirie to avoid the change of gauge. A 4ft. 8½in. line from Peterborough to Adelaide would overcome the problem of change of gauge, as there would be a standard gauge to Broken Hill and Sydney, which would be used also for the transcontinental line from Perth to Adelaide. Has the Premier any information on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is an important question. Obviously, when the standard gauge railway line from Port Pirie to Broken Hill is completed a line will be necessary to connect Adelaide with the new standard gauge line so that trains can run westward to Perth and eastward as far as Brisbane. Up to the present there has been no determination of policy on this question. Before this topic was discussed with this State, and before the question of the Silverton Tramway Company had been determined, the Commonwealth Government announced that it was prepared to go on with the standardization from Port Pirie to Broken Hill. Last week I received a letter from the Prime Minister inviting me to confer with the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport regarding the Silverton Tramway Company and I have arranged a conference on this matter for next week. At the same time, I intend raising several additional matters with the Commonwealth Minister. I have not formally discussed railway matters with him since his appointment, although I know the honourable gentleman. I will take advantage of the conference to discuss several other matters with him, and undoubtedly one will be the question of rail standardization, the most suitable place for a link between Adelaide and the new standardized railway line, and to what extent the Commonwealth Government is prepared to be a party to constructing that line. It is obviously a question that will arise for early determination.

Mr. Riches: In connection with Whyalla?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Whyalla is rather a different question—

The SPEAKER: And from a different source.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Dealing with the original question, I will discuss this matter with the Commonwealth Minister and, when information is available, I will ensure that the honourable member receives it.

RURAL ADVANCES.

Mr. HEASLIP: During the weekend I met hundreds of country people, many of whom were interested in the Rural Advances Guarantee Act passed this session. I was able to advise them on the method of making application, but at the same time the question of finance was discussed. If the Premier is not aware that some private banks have refused to entertain proposals under this Act, will he inquire whether this is so? If it is, will he ascertain the reasons for this refusal?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When introducing the legislation, I said that I presumed, judging from our previous experience, that initially the advances would be made through the State Savings Bank and the State Bank. I also said that some banks might not be interested in the advances at present. Incidentally, a similar position obtained when the Industries Development Act was introduced. The first application under that legislation was from the cellulose industry in the South-East. That industry had been banking with a private bank, but the bank informed me that it was not its policy to undertake a guarantee of the nature provided in the legislation. Consequently, the State Bank accepted the guarantee and provided the money. It has had the account ever since. The bank that refused to take the account has often said since that it would be happy in future to operate under that legislation. I do not think there will be any problem with rural advances, although it may be necessary for a start for the State Bank and the State Savings Bank to make the advances. Those institutions are able financially to handle the business that will be offering, and are willing to do so.

FULHAM GARDENS SEWERAGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: In recent years I have asked many questions about sewerage the area east of Henley Beach and Grange, and including Fulham Gardens and Seaton. I have been informed that a scheme is being prepared by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and that it will be referred to the Public Works Committee. Can the Minister of Works say when the scheme will be referred to that committee for inquiry and report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The last advice I had from the Engineer-in-Chief was that

this scheme would be completed by about the end of this week. I expect to see it as soon as the Engineer-in-Chief has examined it. There will be no delay in referring it to the committee. I have not seen the scheme and do not know what problems may be involved, but it is expected to be ready by the end of this week and I am sure that after the Engineer-in-Chief has seen it he will forward it to me.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the testing of a bore for a town water supply at Watervale?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief reports that the second bore has been completed at Watervale and in a 72-hour pump test conducted by the Mines Department yielded 2,500 gallons an hour. The water contains 743 p.p.m. and is of acceptable quality for a township supply. However, the supply is rather small and consideration is now to be given as to whether the bore can be incorporated in the township supply. The honourable member will appreciate that 743 parts per million represents about 50 grains to the gallon if he uses the table I gave earlier in reply to a question asked by the member for Eyre.

MOUNT GAMBIER PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Education a reply from the Attorney-General to the question I asked some time ago about a new courthouse and other public buildings at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Attorney-General has informed me that the siting of the various Government buildings at Mount Gambier has been approved. Working drawings of the office block are in course of preparation and sketch plans of the courthouse for estimating purposes are being completed.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM.

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Minister of Works recall last November my asking him a question about the Islington sewage farm and suggesting that in view of the Government's proposal to vacate this area when the Bolivar scheme was completed an advisory committee should be established to plan its future? The Minister undertook to refer this matter to Cabinet. Did he refer it to Cabinet; has he anything to report as a result of such reference; and can he say when the land at Islington will become available for subdivision?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Cabinet has frequently discussed this matter but I cannot inform the honourable member that any decision has been reached on appointing a committee or on whether this land should be disposed of and to whom. This is extremely valuable land; many people want it, some for industry and others for recreational purposes. I believe its future use is involved in a question asked earlier by the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) about the possibility of additional railway services coming into Adelaide. With the rapid development of the State and of the metropolitan area the Government believes that it would be unwise to commit this land to any purpose until it is available for use other than for the purpose for which it is at present being used.

TEACHERS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently an advertisement appeared in the *Sunday Mail* and in the *Education Gazette* calling for applications from former teachers to act as relieving teachers. Can the Minister of Education say whether there has been any response to these advertisements, and can he comment on the present shortage of high school teachers?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTERSON: There has been a response, but not a very ready one. Most former teachers have either engaged in other occupations or are married with families and cannot hurriedly respond to such advertisements. The Superintendent of Recruitment and Training has informed me that there has been a satisfactory response but he reiterates that the real source of supply is from recruits from teachers training colleges. We have a shortage, and we will have a shortage for some years, of highly trained and specialized teachers in our secondary schools, particularly high schools, but we are rapidly overcoming the shortage primarily from the many hundreds of fine young men and women coming from the three teachers training colleges and also to a limited extent from a small number of fine former teachers who are returning to the fold.

SMALL BOATS.

Mr. BYWATERS: Last week, in asking the Premier a question about the control of small boats, I referred, among other things, to water skiing. I said that I was under the impression that a committee had been established to consider the position. The Premier apparently took it that I meant a Government committee, but I did not. I understand that the committee was set up by the Municipal Association and included representatives of the

Harbors Board, Police Force, National Safety Council and possibly other organizations. Has the Premier had a report from this committee, and is any action contemplated by the Government?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Premier has asked me to deal with this question because this morning I sent a report to him which is still in the course of transit and which contains a summary of the position by the General Manager of the Harbors Board. This report set out the requests and proposals which had been made on behalf of the river councils and under which they had suggested that the board assist them or provide information that would enable them to draft a model by-law for the purpose of controlling small boats on the river. The proposals which the Upper Murray councils advanced were that they should provide for control of the behaviour of boats and also that it should be compulsory for the driver to be licensed and the boat registered. Those two latter matters are contrary to the Government's policy in this matter, for the Government believes that they are unnecessary and would be a nuisance and an annoyance to people who use small boats. However, we believe that it is advantageous to have regulations to control the behaviour of boats. Several municipal councils have already availed themselves of the legislation enabling them to draft such by-laws, and from all appearances the by-laws they have drafted are working very well. The text of the report I saw this morning pointed out those matters and suggested that councils be invited to re-submit their proposed by-laws with the provisions for registration and licensing omitted.

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT.

Mr. RICHES: Can the Premier say whether the Government is yet able to implement the provisions of the Housing Improvement Act in any part of the State? Many of us regarded that legislation as heralding something long overdue and desirable in South Australia. We realized, particularly because of the need for new housing, that the Act would not be easy to implement and, as far as I know, it has not been implemented, at any rate in the country. Can the Premier say whether the Government is not moving into a situation now where some effect could be given to this legislation, particularly in the older established towns and cities?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure about what phase of this legislation the honourable member is directing his

question. The Act, of course, has operated for many years, and in many instances it has been very effective. Although the Act has never been used to acquire property compulsorily, it has had the effect of improving the quality of the housing because if the housing is substandard the Housing Trust can—and frequently does—fix a rental based upon the fact that the accommodation provided is not up to a reasonable standard: it has fixed a low rent because the standard of the housing has been low. The owner of a house knows that until he improves the premises he cannot get a full normal rent for it. That provision has applied for many years, and it has been successful. The honourable member no doubt knows, from his association with local government, that local government authorities have condemned unfit premises. Although, as I said, the Government has never actually used the power of compulsory acquisition of such properties, the Housing Trust has frequently used the power to determine rents, and many people apply to the trust to have their rents determined under this legislation.

RENMARK ADULT EDUCATION.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made with the acquisition of land at Renmark for the establishment of a new adult education centre?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Not just at the moment; it has been a long and painful process, and I am not aware just at present what is the final stage. However, I will inquire tomorrow and see if I can get finality on the matter.

TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. RYAN: The attention of the Minister of Railways has often been directed to the lack of amenities on the Adelaide to Port Pirie train, which is the connecting link of the transcontinental railway. In the past the Minister has stated that the arrival time at Port Pirie would be altered to an earlier time to allow a stop for refreshments at Bowmans. Recently, members of this Parliament on their return from a visit to Western Australia were alarmed to find that the train did not stop between Port Pirie and Adelaide, and this, in really hot weather, can be tiresome to the passengers. In view of the previous statement made, will the Minister of Works take up with his colleague the question of improving the amenities on the connecting link of the transcontinental service between Port Pirie and Adelaide?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This matter has been the subject of reference in this House, and I think I have given some replies from my colleague to questions on it. However, I cannot recall any reply I have given which indicated that arrangements were to be made for a stop at Bowmans.

Mr. Ryan: It is in the 1960 *Hansard*.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am speaking from memory. The honourable member says that the Commissioner indicated that he was considering that course, so I have no reason to doubt that he considered it, although I cannot recall the statement. In view of the honourable member's question, I will take the matter up again and see what the Commissioner's views are now.

NARACOORTE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HARDING: On October 2 last year I raised the question of stormwaters flooding properties adjacent to the Naracoorte High School No. 2 oval. I understand that the Minister of Education took up the matter with the Minister of Mines, when it was decided that, if thought suitable, bores would be sunk with a view to draining these floodwaters. Will the Minister take this matter up again with the Minister of Mines and endeavour to obtain an early reply?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, I shall be pleased to do so.

MANSFIELD PARK SEWERAGE.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on February 20 about a sewer extension to Waller Street, Mansfield Park?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member was concerned about this street, which appeared to have been left out when surrounding streets were seweraged. The Engineer-in-Chief has informed me that Waller Street is included in the approvals for Mansfield Park and is scheduled in the next phase of sewer construction following the sewerage of Housing Trust houses. It is expected that the sewer in Waller Street will be laid in the next few months.

BLANCHETOWN BRIDGE.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Roads, whether it is intended to have an official opening of the new Blanchetown bridge, which I understand is nearing completion, and, if it is, whether a date has been fixed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Some consideration has been given to this matter, the details of which I will get for the honourable member tomorrow.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT.

Mr. CURREN: Will the Premier say when the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act will be proclaimed and when regulations under that Act will be gazetted?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think that the necessary machinery is ready to be set up and that the Act is to operate on April 1, but I will confirm that date and inform the honourable member tomorrow.

BUILDING TRADE BANKRUPTCIES.

Mr. LAUCKE: The number of bankruptcies in the building and plumbing trades in recent years has seriously embarrassed suppliers of goods to these trades. Often companies unable to meet their commitments have been assisted in obtaining their requirements from gaining Government contracts, which have given them an aura of stability and creditworthiness. Some of these companies have paid-up capital amounting to only a few pounds; the directors lend funds and withdraw them as soon as things go wrong. The result is that the liability of these companies is restricted to this token capital holding, and creditors are left lamenting. Will the Premier say whether the Government investigates the background and financial position generally of companies before accepting tenders from them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is not always easy to get the complete picture of the financial resources of any company, but frequently the Government refuses to accept the tender of a company, even though it may be the lowest, if there is any doubt about its financial ability to undertake the work. I emphasize that it is not always easy to get the full picture of what resources are available to a company, but often the Director of Public Buildings recommends a tender third or even fourth from the lowest on the tender list on the grounds that the other tenderers may not be able to undertake the work expeditiously or that there is some doubt whether they have the financial resources to complete the work. The answer to the honourable member's question therefore is, "Yes, as much as we are able to do so."

PORT PIRIE TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on February 19

about a proposed technical high school at Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have been advised by the Director of the Public Buildings Department that plans and specifications for the Port Pirie Technical High School are completed and quantities are now being prepared. He anticipates that tenders for this work will be called on March 31 and will close on May 5.

HILLS RAILWAY SERVICE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Over the weekend I was speaking to a neighbour at Eden Hills—a waterside worker—who has a problem. This man is often on night shift and, when he is, he catches the last train from Port Adelaide, which leaves at 11.11 p.m. and arrives at Adelaide at 11.31 p.m. The last train from Adelaide to Bridgewater, which he must catch to get home, leaves Adelaide at 11.28 p.m. In other words, there is a gap of three minutes by which he misses his connecting train. I understand this was brought about by an alteration to the time table a short time ago, before which there was a two-minute overlap the other way and he was able to catch the Bridgewater train. This man does not know from week to week when he will be on night shift. He buys a weekly ticket, but when he is on night shift he cannot use it and must take his motor car. Will the Minister of Works refer this matter to his colleague, the Minister of Railways, with a view to having an adjustment made to the time table, either of the Port Adelaide to Adelaide train or the Adelaide to Bridgewater train, to allow the connection to be made?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

HOUSE VACANCY.

Mr. BYWATERS: A house in Montgomery Avenue, Murray Bridge, formerly occupied by a police officer who vacated it and moved into another police house in May 1962, has since remained empty, although other Government houses have been built for departmental officers. The weeds have grown considerably and the house has deteriorated. Neighbours have complained that because of the poor appearance of this house the value of their properties has been reduced. Will the Minister of Works ask the Public Buildings Department to ascertain why this house has been left empty for so long, and what the department intends to do with it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

KAPUNDA GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand that the Department of Mines is undertaking a geophysical survey in the Kapunda area. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report from his colleague, the Minister of Mines, about this survey?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. Normally the question might have been addressed to the Premier, who answers questions to the Minister of Mines. However, the honourable member can be assured that it will be attended to.

DENIAL BAY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: It has been brought to my notice that, although £16,000 has been allotted for jetty repairs, the Harbors Board is contemplating closing Denial Bay as a shipping port even though wool and other commodities are carried from as far away as Bookabie, Penong, Charra and Koonibba Reserve to this port. Can the Minister of Marine say whether this harbour is to be closed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am unable to confirm or deny the report, because I have not seen a report of the board's consideration of it. If the board intends to close the port it would obviously be because the use made of it has decreased and it no longer justifies retention. Funds may have been allocated for the preservation of assets. The board, by its Act, is not permitted to dispose of its assets in any shape or form and, therefore, must maintain them. I do not know whether that is a good or bad thing, but it is a fact. I will inquire and let the honourable member know whether it is intended to close the port. I will also obtain from the board a schedule showing the tonnages that passed outward and inward through the port during recent years.

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. LAUCKE: The report of the Industries Development (Special) Committee on decentralization suggests that certain Government departments could well be located in country areas. The Barossa Valley is mentioned as a suitable venue for the Agriculture Department. Can the Premier say whether this proposal has, as yet, been considered by the Government? If departments are to be decentralized, would Greenock be considered as the venue for this department? I should be happy to list for the Premier the undoubted advantages and qualifications of this delightful town for such a purpose.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am sure that every honourable member is fully conversant with the qualifications of Greenock, and the illustrious representation it is providing in this House. As yet the Government has not considered the recommendations of the special committee. Frankly, I doubt whether the Government will accept that recommendation. The Agriculture Department has to be available to the public for every minute in every hour of every day to help solve problems as various people ask the department's officers for specialized information. No doubt it would be delightful for people to go to Greenock, but I doubt whether the department's work would be facilitated by moving so far from the metropolitan area. Plans have been approved for much of the department to move outside the city proper into the district of the member for Enfield. This move will remove many parking problems for clients of the department, without taking them as far out of the city as has been suggested by the honourable member.

ATTACHMENT OF EARNINGS ORDERS.

Mr. Lawn for Mr. DUNSTAN (on notice):

1. Why have no regulations been made providing for the making of attachment of earnings orders pursuant to the Maintenance Act Amendment Act, 1963?

2. When will such regulations be made?

3. When does the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board expect to begin to use these regulations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. It has not yet been possible to settle all the details that will be needed in the regulations.

2. A precise date for making the regulations cannot yet be given.

3. The regulations will be used in suitable cases from the time they are effective.

TEACHERS' PROMOTIONS.

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice):

1. Following the decision not to transfer teachers during the last two terms, was it agreed with the South Australian Institute of Teachers to give teachers gaining such promotion the status of the new position as from the date of the position becoming vacant?

2. When was this policy altered?

3. Why was it altered?

4. How many primary school teachers gaining promotion were affected by this new ruling up to November 30, 1962?

5. What difference did the new ruling make to their position on the promotion lists operative from May, 1963?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The replies are:

1. Yes.

2 to 5. The policy agreed upon has not been altered.

OPPORTUNITY CLASS.

Mr. RICHES (on notice):

1. Has any decision been reached on the long standing request for the establishment of a senior opportunity class at Port Augusta?

2. If so, what are the present proposals on this matter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The replies are:

1. A decision was made in 1963 and conveyed to the honourable member that special senior classes should be established at Port Augusta, but that it was not considered a matter of urgency.

2. Another investigation into the likely numbers for such classes will be made when accommodation becomes available. It is unlikely that this will be done before the erection of the new school at Carlton.

PORT AUGUSTA SCHOOLS.

Mr. RICHES (on notice):

1. What stage has been reached in negotiations for the construction of the following buildings at Port Augusta: (a) adult education centre; (b) fourth primary school; and (c) extension to the shelter shed at the central primary school?

2. When is it anticipated that a start will be made on each of these projects?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The replies are:

1. (a) and (b) The Public Buildings Department has been asked to prepare sketch plans and estimates for both the Port Augusta Adult Education Centre and a new primary school at Carlton. It is not possible at this time to indicate when the building of these schools will commence.

(c) Neither the Education Department nor the Public Buildings Department has any knowledge of a request for extensions to the shelter shed at the Port Augusta Primary

School. However, if this refers to the extension and enclosing of the verandah of the main building, tenders for this work closed on February 11, and are at present under consideration prior to a recommendation for acceptance being made.

2. *Vote* No. 1.

PORT AUGUSTA BUILDINGS.

Mr. RICHES (on notice): When is it anticipated that tenders will be called for the erection of a new police station and a new gaol at Port Augusta, respectively?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is anticipated that tenders will be called next Thursday, February 27, for the erection of a police station at Port Augusta. The Director, Public Buildings Department, states that tender documents are nearing completion for the proposed new gaol at Port Augusta.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 20. Page 2049.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The most important issue confronting the people in South Australia today is the question of how they elect their Parliament and what amendments should be made to the Constitution Act to provide a sound basis for the continuation of democratic government in this State. During the 1962 election campaign, the Premier stated that he went to the people for an absolute majority which was essential for a good government. The people in their wisdom voted overwhelmingly for a Labor Government but were denied this form of government because of the doubtful tactics of members opposite. Members on this side have consistently advocated one roll for all Parliamentary elections, compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting, a House of Assembly to consist of 56 members representing single electorates and elected with the simple majority, and the cross system of voting.

Members will recall that at the opening of the 1962 session of Parliament, I suspended Standing Orders to introduce a Bill to amend the Constitution Act along these lines. It is essential for a Government to have a working

majority, and I believe the Bill I introduced on that occasion would have achieved this purpose. Whilst I admit that the suggested amendments to the Constitution Act may have permitted the formation of a Labor Government, the people would still have had to record their vote in favour of a Labor member for the additional seats to be won at succeeding elections. In any case the electors under a democratic system should be able to change the Government if they wished to.

Two factors are forcing the Government to make a change. The first is that with the present distribution it faces defeat at the next election. However, an even stronger force is at work, and it is the mounting criticism against the autocratic Government which has remained in office contrary to the votes recorded by the electors in 1962. This legislation before us is an attempt at survival to govern by the Liberal Party instead of being progressive legislation in the interests of the people.

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding any further at the moment, I indicate that I entirely disagree with the verbiage of the Premier when he said:

The basis of the redistribution of the State into Assembly districts as recommended by the commission is, in fact, the abolition of the notion of the metropolitan area as it has existed over the years and substitution of provision for the election of 20 members from primary-producing districts, 20 from non-primary-producing districts adjacent to the capital city, and two additional members from non-primary-producing districts representing industrial areas away from the capital city. In the first instance, and as I have already indicated on other occasions, I have always extended to you, Mr. Speaker, your freedom on your voting decisions from time to time, but you will agree that the Bill introduced to provide for this commission was carried on your casting vote.

Concerning the Premier's remarks regarding "metropolitan area", I believe it is most reasonable to accept that the term "metropolitan Adelaide" as used by the Town Planner would constitute the area for 20 members under the commission's proposals. My understanding is that the electoral system that obtained during the 1938 elections, and which has continued since, defined 13 metropolitan and 26 country seats, but in this report I am reminded of abstract art because of the way in which the boundaries have been drawn. I believe it is a fair claim that community of interest seems to have been forgotten. The

commission's report has undoubtedly satisfied the Premier, because he is determined that 20 members only are to come from metropolitan Adelaide, and 20 are to come from rural areas irrespective of the disparity between the populations residing in the two areas. In addition, the electors in the Labor-held seats in the north—namely, Port Pirie, Stuart and Whyalla—are to be combined and reduced from a representation of three seats to two seats. However, I intend to refer to this matter later.

The Premier also attempted to make disparaging remarks about the proposal put forward by the Labor Party for 56 members in the House of Assembly without reducing country representation when he said:

It would mean that country districts would still lose their political influence, and, in the second place, the country would be saddled with the cost of maintaining a large number of politicians who would not have any useful work to do.

When the Labor Party speaks of a House of 56 members it visualizes the abolition of the Legislative Council, so that in the overall position there would be a reduction of members. While the Premier was making this criticism, he endeavoured to justify an increase in the number of members in the Legislative Council and stated that provision would be made to have an equal number of rural and non-rural members which would undoubtedly strengthen the numbers of the Opposition Party and, in that respect, provide a better balanced Chamber. I assure the Premier that under no consideration would I ever subscribe to an increase in the Legislative Council by an additional four members because I believe very definitely that an increase in the members in the Legislative Council would lead to an additional number of politicians who would not have any useful work to do.

Before any alteration is made to the Constitution there should be recorded a majority vote in favour of the change. This was achieved by the Labor Party at the last State election when 56 per cent of the people voted for our policy, which included a promise of electoral reform in accordance with the Bill I introduced in 1962 and which was steadfastly rejected by the Liberal members. In no circumstances can the Government claim to have a mandate to attempt its suggested amendments to the Constitution Act. The people, however, still have a protection, for the principal Act provides that an absolute majority in

both this House and the Legislative Council respectively is required before any alterations to the Act can be submitted to Her Majesty for Royal assent. The Government has the voting strength in another place completely in its favour because of the restricted franchise, but I will elaborate on this point later. The position in this House is different, as members on this side have sufficient strength to insist that the majority wishes of the people are carried out. In the past, members opposite have been able to bludgeon their legislation through, knowing full well that it was only a formality for it to be endorsed by their counterparts in another place. On this occasion, however, I firmly believe that it will be necessary for Government members to reconsider the proposed constitutional changes if they are to be passed by this House. I consider that the proposition the Premier has placed before us is purely a twisting of the electorates solely in the interests of his own Party and for the purpose of guaranteeing its remaining in office irrespective of the wishes of the people. As I have said before, the people should have the power to change the Government if they wished to do so.

Mr. Lawn: In a democracy they do.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Under the present system it is practically impossible for this to happen in this State. At the last election, 56 per cent of the people said they wanted a change of government, but because of the gerrymander it was denied them; and under the proposed system, 68 per cent of the people could vote for a change of government, and this could be denied them by the Government in power. Regarding the 22 seats mentioned for the country areas, we have the three industrial seats in the northern areas—Port Pirie, Stuart, and Whyalla—but under the terms of this Bill these will be restricted to two and there will be no provisions for maximum quotas of electors. I do not need to remind the House how interested my colleagues from that area are, for this afternoon three petitions were presented to this House in protest against the proposal.

Mr. Lawn: Those petitions disclose that the people are very much interested in this matter.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: There will be no limit to the number of electors who may, and undoubtedly will, reside in these three important industrial centres, and if the Premier or any of his followers claim that they believe that the industrial workers of this country must be cared for and offered the best that

can be provided from this country, it must be considered as a sham on their part. It is well known that all three of the principal districts of Port Pirie, Whyalla and Port Augusta will expand and continue to expand, and to suggest, as this amending legislation does, that a three-member area be now reduced to two is beyond all reason and not within the meaning of sincerity under democratic principles. In contrast, I stand four-square behind Labor Party principles, which aim to continue to foster the democratic system of government. I might mention that the definition of "democracy" as contained in a new English dictionary edited by Dr. James Murray states:

Democracy is government by the people; that form of government in which the sovereign power resides in the people as a whole and is exercised either directly by them (as in small republics of antiquity) or by officers elected by them; in modern use often more vaguely denoting a social State in which all have equal rights without hereditary or arbitrary differences of rank or privilege.

This definition aptly describes the procedure we attempted to introduce in 1962 and which was so strongly refused by members opposite. What we require is something similar to the Commonwealth system in which the first principles are set out in the Constitution Act, but if there are disproportionate movements in population it is obligatory to have a redistribution so that continuous democratic government is assured. The Commonwealth Joint Committee on Constitutional Review had this to say in 1959 regarding electoral quotas:

Whilst appreciating that complete uniformity in numbers upon redistribution is not practicable, the committee considers that a permissible margin of one-tenth on either side of the quota for a State should allow sufficient flexibility in determining the electoral divisions for the election of members of the House of Representatives of the Federal Parliament. The adoption of a maximum margin of one-tenth would make a material contribution towards preventing possible manipulation of the divisional structure of a State for political purposes.

That is the whole crux of our criticism in this State. The Government is attempting to further manipulate a gerrymander for the sole purpose of political survival. We on this side believe that the object of a Constitution in a democracy is to provide a basis so that the people are able to govern themselves. It is not for the purpose of protecting some interests more than others, nor is it concerned with the continuation of a particular Party in government, and the sooner the Premier realizes that he is not permitted to alter the Constitution

without a mandate from the people, the sooner we can get to the task of amending the Constitution Act so that the democratic principle of one vote one value may be safeguarded, and the sooner the possible abuses of power-hungry political opportunists may be negated. That is our responsibility to the people of this State, and that is what the Premier should be attempting if he believes in democratic government. As I said earlier, we on this side are opposed to the bi-cameral system of government, and we look forward to the day when the Upper House will be abolished. As the Premier has indicated that there are to be four additional members in the Upper House, there would be 24 members to review the legislation passed by the 42 members in this House.

Mr. Jennings: The story would be even worse than it is now.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I agree, and I would say that absenteeism in that House would be more pronounced than it is now. We believe the correct approach is first to expand this House nearer to its correct size so that the people in South Australia will have adequate representation. The expansion of the Legislative Council will not provide the additional representation that is necessary. In fact, the abolition of the Legislative Council would involve no great loss at all to the community except to the privileged class it now represents. This is particularly so because there is a restricted franchise for that House which a person must satisfy before he is eligible to vote for a member, and I can see no logical reason why a House of Review should be elected on a restricted franchise. While it may claim to be a House of Review, it is definitely a House of initiation. If it were only a House of Review, why should the Ministers in that place introduce legislation amending the various State Acts? Members on this side believe that so long as the Upper House remains with us it is only decent and democratic to have the same Parliamentary roll for all Assembly and Council elections. In addition to ignoring the problem of democratic representation in the Legislative Council, the Government has also ignored the question of resolving deadlocks between the two Houses. Perhaps this may have been intentional, but I believe the Legislative Council should not have the power to delay for more than 12 months any legislation that is insisted upon by the House of Assembly, and I believe the Government should have included this provision in this amending Bill.

There are 39 members in this Chamber, and this number has remained unchanged since 1938. In the last 25 years the population of this State has increased by more than 60 per cent and, if we desired to make alterations in the number of members purely to cater for changes in population, this House should be enlarged to comprise at least 56 members. As a firm believer in the Party system of government, I consider that this Bill is contrary to the encouragement of democratic government. To achieve this object, I believe in the abolition of the Legislative Council, a House of Assembly of 56 members representing single electorates, periodical redivisions of electorates to provide for movement of population, and compulsory enrolment and voting for all Parliamentary elections.

Most of these objects were provided for in the Bill I introduced in 1962 to establish an equitable electoral system, but it was out-voted on the casting vote of the Speaker. When that Bill was out-voted, I know that within the Liberal and Country League organization the view was expressed that my Bill instead of being rejected should have been amended to provide for a House of 44 members by taking the 11 Commonwealth divisions and dividing them equally into four separate single electorates. Even at this stage, if the Government had had any real appreciation of democratic government, and had it introduced legislation along the lines I have just mentioned, I believe there would have been a deal of merit in it and that it may have been successful. I am prepared to indicate now that I would have asked my Party to agree to such a proposal as being a correction of some of the anomalies caused by the Government's gerrymander. Most certainly it would have been an improvement on the hotch-potch now proposed and would indeed have been a reasonable approach towards overcoming some of the difficult problems associated with electoral reform.

I have heard suggestions made by the Premier on many occasions to the effect that increasing the number of members in the Legislative Council would increase the numerical strength of representation in the various electorates, but these are kindergarten suggestions. Whilst I have already mentioned some matters associated with the Legislative Council, let it be understood that, under the limited franchise extended under the present Constitution, if all people who were entitled to be enrolled for the Legislative Council were enrolled and those who normally voted Labor exercised their voting rights, it would be possible for Labor

to obtain a majority in the Legislative Council. The proposals now before this House do not provide reasonably equal opportunities and representation under an electoral system and would, I believe, deny forever the right of the Labor Party to have a majority in the Legislative Council. I doubt whether under these proposals the Labor Party can ever expect to govern in its own right. Let it be remembered that the Legislative Council is a limited-franchise Chamber. This Bill extends the franchise to a limited extent by giving a vote to the spouse of a person now entitled to vote for the Legislative Council, but the autocratic provision that a person must be 30 years old before being entitled to nominate for that Chamber is to be retained.

Mr. Hutchens: Do not forget that most South Australians are under 30 years.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: That is so. I have confidence in the youth of this country. With the educational standards now demanded, people should not have to wait until they are 30 to be able to nominate for the Legislative Council. Let me now give an example of how people can be disfranchised. Next Sunday afternoon the Minister of Education will open a new science block and classrooms at the Dominican Convent at Cabra. Undoubtedly he will acknowledge the work of the teaching sisters there. However, he will not tell these teachers that he is a prominent member of a political Party that denies them the right to vote for the Legislative Council. I remind the Minister that there are 700 teachers in this category in South Australia who are all denied this right. It is no good praising them on the one hand and forgetting their right to vote on the other.

If we have confidence in the youth of this country, we should say that we have. We should not have any age restriction on nomination for the Legislative Council except that a person must be over 21 years of age. A high standard of education is now required, and many parents are making a great sacrifice so that their children can obtain a good education. It is no good buying 1 lb. of apples comprising three apples to feed a family of five, because people do not want bits and pieces. In the same way, we do not want bits and pieces in this legislation. I could say many things about this legislation but my words might be considered unparliamentary. Many matters associated with education need reviewing.

The only disqualification in relation to child endowment is age. By comparison, the only qualification for voting should be age. If educational standards are to be cultivated, they have to be linked with child endowment, and there would be no need to have a section standing at the end of the line awaiting free books. I have confidence in the youth of this country, but it does not appear to be in the L.C.L. organizations. There should be an unlimited franchise for the Upper and Lower Houses, with age the only qualification.

As Leader of the Australian Labor Party in this State and as a firm believer in the Party system of government, I remind not only this House but the people of South Australia that, as a result of the decision of the people at the 1962 State general elections, I won that State election, under the Party system. I am the Leader of the only political Party that has been denied the right of office to govern, and it is not for me on this occasion to suggest how the Playford Party has retained the Treasury benches of this State. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, that your political life in this State was extended as a result of the efforts that were made by one of my very respected colleagues, the Hon. R. S. Richards, Leader of this Party for many years. Do not ask me to go into detail, but I would have thought that out of some consideration it may have been your pleasure to have offered some better appreciation of the benefits you derived from that period. Need I also remind the Hon. the Minister of Lands of his career in this Parliament. However, let me assure both of you as members of this House, that if you are to serve the people justly on electoral matters you will at least oppose this legislation. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I oppose the Bill, and do not intend to speak at length on it. Since I became a member in 1952 the Party of which I am proud to be a member (the Australian Labor Party and the Parliamentary Labor Party in this House) has sought on countless occasions to obtain electoral reform. No-one wants it more than I do. I am supposed to represent a country district with a population about four times the size a country district should be. Naturally, one would assume that any attempt at electoral reform would have my keen and instant approval, but I cannot give it to this legislation as it is not electoral reform at all. To put it bluntly, the best way to describe it would be that it is

a further L.C.L. effort to deform the already grossly mis-shapen electoral system in this State. In fact, it would make it an even more undemocratic freak. I have heard the present system described as a misbegotten monster, but I do not know what the proposed system would be.

The Bill provides for two main plans to thwart the wishes of the people of this State. The Leader of the Opposition has gone to some pains today (and has done it ably) to show what would be the effect of this legislation. It appears that an additional district is to be introduced for the Legislative Council, and that this new district would almost certainly increase the number of Labor members in the other place. On the face of it, from my Party's point of view, that seems a good thing, but it is simply a sop thrown to the Opposition. As we find that sop unpalatable and impossible to swallow, we do not intend to try to swallow it. As the Leader of the Opposition has emphasized, it would make the gaining of a majority in the Council (already a difficult job for members of our Party) virtually impossible. The introduction of this district has been designed because the Government, after considering the increases of population in certain districts, has realized that if something is not done the Labor Party might win the districts of Midland and Northern. The additional district has been added to the Council with the blessing of the Government as an attempt to convince the Labor Party that it will get something good from the introduction of this new seat.

The giving of the vote in the Legislative Council to the spouses of people already on the voting roll for that Chamber would be laughable if it were not so serious. What generosity! One must immediately ask, "What about the other women? What about the many talented women who have as much right to vote as any man? Will they still be denied a vote?" No-one could possibly be expected to support the amendment regarding the Council. On a recent visit to Western Australia, with other members of this House, I learned that legislation had recently been introduced to take effect at the next election, giving Western Australians complete adult franchise for the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly with the same roll for both Houses. I am sure that some Labor members will be astounded to know, if they do not already know, that the Western Australian legislation was introduced by a Liberal member.

Apparently there must be different types of Liberal members in Western Australia. The main part of the Bill now before us deals with this House. The Premier, in his second reading explanation, said:

. . . the abolition of the notion of the metropolitan area as it has existed over the years.

Apparently the metropolitan area as we know it will go with one stroke of the pen, and a new metropolitan area will take its place. What hypocrisy that is! I am sure all members remember the past. The Premier, after all, has always been adamant (and that is a mild word for his expressions of opinion on it) that the two-for-one principle (that is, that in South Australia there must be two country seats to one Metropolitan seat) is as sacred as the Ten Commandments. We have heard more than once that it would be altered virtually over his dead body. For years our hopes of electoral reform in this Chamber, by the introduction of electoral reform Bills by the Leader of the Opposition, have foundered on that two-for-one rock. I could quote many things the Premier has said, but I content myself with quoting what he said in 1953:

. . . generally speaking, the country is under-privileged . . . I believe the present electoral set-up has been of great benefit to them.—

meaning, of course, country people—

It would be a bad thing for the State if the representation were reduced.

In the following year he said:

Let me make it quite clear that I do not budge one inch from my belief that the present metropolitan representation is adequate as compared with the representation for country areas.

Again in 1954, at page 1411 of *Hansard*, he said:

If we are going to develop the State and provide for decentralization, that is no warranty for taking away representation by country members.

In 1958, when speaking on proposals to give additional representation to the metropolitan area, he said:

I believe it would have had a bad effect on the community and not improve the State's development. It would increase the centralization which every member desires to avoid.

I do not intend to quote similar statements. I have a sheaf of them, but they reiterate what I have already quoted. They indicate that the Premier has maintained a strong and hostile feeling against any attempt to alter the two-for-one set-up. That was his stated strong objection to any alteration right up until 1962. Of course, 1962 will probably be remembered in

the future history of the Liberal Party—that is if in the future the Liberal Party is remembered—as a fatal year, because in 1962 came a sudden change in the form of defeat at the elections. It was not an admitted electoral defeat, but it was an electoral defeat nevertheless. Suddenly the Premier, or some of his Party members, discovered that the two-for-one system must be discarded. This is the system that has stood the Liberal Party in good stead for so many years. Like the laws of the Medes and Persians, it must go.

The Premier and his henchmen have become like drowning men. The drowning Playford is grasping at the proverbial straw and is trying to turn it into a large haystack. Self-preservation has become more important than the sacred principles he has enunciated for more than 20 years. No longer is it a bad thing for the State to reduce country representation: it has now become essential. Country representation has to be reduced because, as the Premier said, he is now prepared to adopt “the abolition of the notion of the metropolitan area as it has existed over the years.” That really means the abolition of the country area as it has existed over the years. What reasoning has prompted the Premier on this? Has he said to himself, “After all, I can always bluff the people of the State. The press, radio and now television will help me to continue to present the fatherly figure as of old. People will realize once more that the benevolent dictator with the kindly smile is a pretty good fellow to rule South Australia”? We must remember that for more than 12 months the Premier has been trying desperately to forget the 1962 election results. He does not find it easy to do and, of course, we do not intend to let him do so. He cannot realize, nor can his followers, that the benevolent fatherly image—if it ever existed—has become blurred and tarnished, even more so since the 1962 election.

I am sure that the Premier, who is a sensible and shrewd man, realizes that in the eyes of most people his machinations to remain Premier have been disgusting. Even more people will be disgusted by this Bill which so obviously reveals the Premier’s willingness to sink all his often-enunciated principles simply to hang on to government a little longer. No-one knows better than the Premier that his statue has cracked and that its pedestal is tottering. In his second reading explanation he said:

The commission has recommended districts which in a substantial way maintain the existing districts.

He would have difficulty in convincing members that that is so. What about the district of Stuart? Apparently the people in that district do not believe that the Bill substantially maintains the district. We received evidence of that this afternoon in the petition that was presented to the House. The Bill virtually gets rid of the district altogether. What about the district of Rocky River? As far as I can see, that district is not substantially retained. From a cursory glance at the map I have gained the impression that it has disappeared. What about the district of Wallaroo? It will become a peculiarly mis-shapen district. It will not substantially maintain its previous identity.

Mr. Ryan: It is well represented.

Mr. CLARK: At present, but it is obvious that members opposite would prefer someone different to represent that district. The district of Murray is supposed to substantially retain its identity, yet apparently it will be made up of half of the existing Murray district and half of another district. What about the district of Frome? I well remember the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O’Halloran) describing that district as being bigger than the United Kingdom and Ireland in size. The Bill will add another area to that district bringing it closer to the metropolitan area. What about the district of Port Pirie? Another petition received this afternoon indicates that the people of Port Pirie are not happy with the proposed new district. What about the district of Whyalla? This afternoon when I was glancing through the report I realized what a mixture the district of Angas would become. It will comprise pieces from other districts, yet we are told that generally the districts will retain their present identities.

Let us look at the district of Gawler, which I have the honour to represent. Under the new scheme, that district is to have Salisbury cut off the southern end, and that area will be tacked on to the portion that is mainly in the district of the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), in which housing development is rapidly making the present district unsafe for the Government Party. The Government might say, “You can have no complaints about that; surely that will give you two Labor districts where only one existed before.” Yes, I think it will; but let us remember—and I believe this is the real reason why the two-for-one system has been completely jettisoned on this occasion—that the Gawler electoral district now has about 25,000 people and is growing all the time, and, if the two-for-one system

had been retained there, by the time the districts were re-adjusted on population sizes there would have been four more seats in that area and all would have voted Labor. It can be safely said, Mr. Speaker, that that would have been goodbye to Liberal and Country League government in this State. I believe most sincerely that this is the main reason for the introduction of the new boundaries, with this entirely new system of rural and metropolitan, or whatever it is called; and to even things up a little we have a special area created in the north, especially to get rid of one Labor member. Instead of the old system which, goodness knows, we have riled against enough, we have a rejuggling of electoral districts which is even worse. To say that the existing districts are substantially retained could not possibly be true; as a matter of fact, not many districts are substantially retained.

The Premier, in his second reading explanation, said that in the Government's opinion the commission had given effect to Parliament's direction in this regard. Well, I think it would have been better if he had said that the commission had given effect to the wishes of the Government plus one Independent. I make it clear that in my remarks this afternoon I have no intention of blaming the commission. After all, it followed the terms of reference that were given to it, and I believe that in the circumstances the type of report it brought down was the only sort of report it could have brought down. The Premier went out of his way to cast rather a slur on the Opposition because it did not give any evidence to the commission. Well, after all, the Opposition has always believed that numbers of people should be the criterion for electoral districts. How could we possibly support this scheme? What else could the Labor Party do but refuse to waste its time going along when the terms of reference would not allow us to put any of our feelings, our real aims and ideas, on electoral reform before that commission? It was impossible to do so, and Opposition members did not waste their time or the time of the commission trying to do so. We have always believed that electoral boundaries should be such that the people could elect the Government they wanted.

Mr. Ryan: They cannot do that in this State.

Mr. CLARK: We have always believed that the people should have that right, and we have aimed at achieving that state of affairs. I admit that we have not been very successful,

but we have always maintained—and I think most democratic countries except this one do—that the people ought to be able to elect the Government they want and to defeat the Government they do not want. I suppose that is as good a definition of "democracy" as one can get, because, after all, democracy is a difficult thing to define. This Bill has made it very plain that the policy of the Liberal and Country League and the Premier is to elect the Government they want and to defeat the Government the majority of the people want.

Mr. Ryan: Have they got a policy?

Mr. CLARK: This is the first time I have ever been 100 per cent certain that they have a policy, and that policy has been made manifest in this Bill. There is no need for me to say more. We have fought for electoral reform throughout the years, and nothing would make the Opposition happier than a Bill to really give electoral reform to this State. We have no such thing in this Bill, so I can do nothing else but urge members to oppose it, as I do.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): As the two former speakers have done, I oppose the Bill. It was interesting to hear the Premier refer to this measure as being one of the most important constitutional Bills brought down for many years. It is also interesting that this afternoon we heard the Leader of the Opposition speaking in answer to the Premier, and following him we had the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark), with no voice at all from the Government members.

Mr. Loveday: They reckon the Bill speaks for itself!

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, they seem to think so. Probably they are ashamed of the Bill, and because of that they do not intend to take part in this debate. They may surprise me and say something later, but at present it seems that they are quite content to sit silent and let members on this side speak in opposition to it. It is remarkable that this happens on many occasions when the Premier decides that he wants silence from his side of the House. I think the same thing has happened again today.

Mr. Hutchens: It might be taken down in evidence and used against them!

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, because often things are said that are not always what the Premier would like, and if this happened they would be in for severe trouble indeed. When speaking on Thursday the Premier referred to the Bill that we brought down at the commencement of this Parliament seeking a House of

56 members; he said that this would mean that country members would be paying for unnecessary city members. We on this side have advocated for a long time the abolition of the Legislative Council, and this in turn would provide for the situation that the Premier envisaged. The member for Gawler this afternoon referred to the redistribution suggested by the commission. In his second reading explanation the Premier said:

Honourable members will agree that the commission carried out the duties assigned to it in a competent and conscientious manner, and has given rulings with the desire to comply fairly and properly with the directions of Parliament.

I have no doubt that the commission in its wisdom endeavoured to comply with the Act as passed by this Parliament, but members will recall that on that occasion 19 members voted against the Bill presented to this House, so it was not in accord with the wishes of all members of Parliament: it was carried only by the Speaker's casting vote. I can realize the difficulty in which the commission was placed. In the past—as the member for Gawler rightly pointed out—with the ratio of two country members to one city member it was always a proud boast of the Government that it favoured the country having stronger representation in Parliament. This Bill, therefore, is a severe contradiction of their previous policy because we find here they are reducing the numbers by six in rural areas.

In this case the country people would have been very happy with the former attempt at legislation by the Opposition Party, in that they would have retained their present country representation. The fact that our intention was to increase the city representation to bring the numbers somewhat closer would not have been objected to by them. In this redistribution, the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) referred briefly to one or two districts. One of the ugliest of the districts he referred to is that of the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner). If this legislation is passed and he intends to contest this seat, he will find it difficult indeed to maintain his representation.

Mr. Ryan: He might be opposed to it.

Mr. BYWATERS: Quite a few members opposite could be opposed to this legislation. But to Angas, besides the Mount Pleasant subdivision, which is now a portion of that district, the Mannum portion of the district of Murray would pass. What is even more ridiculous, it would be taken down to embrace the hundreds of Peake, Price and Sherlock, making this an ugly piece of country to cover.

It would not be practical for a member to represent it.

I could mention other districts, as the member for Gawler did, but I do not want to speak entirely in my own words this afternoon as so much has been said outside this House. This legislation has probably created more interest than any other during my term in Parliament. So many people are critical of this attempt by the Government to hold on to office although it was soundly defeated at the last election that much comment has been made.

Mr. Lawn: All unfavourable comment, I take it?

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes. I want to read from *The Murray Valley Standard*, which covers the area with which I am associated and other parts as well. This article is headed "Loss of 'River' identity" and is as follows:

What is the reaction of Murray electors to the probability that the constituency, as we now know it, will disappear under the recommendations for revision of boundaries throughout the State? First impression is one of shock that three major Lower Murray towns—Murray Bridge, Mannum and Tailem—would be in three separate voting zones.

The report of the Electorate Commission, setting out elaborate new proposals, came before the Lower House at the end of last week, and was summarized in the city press next day. If it were adopted by Parliament, Mannum subdivision of Murray would pass to Angas, joining Mount Pleasant and a number of newly created subdivisions including the hundreds of Peake, Price and Sherlock which at present form part of the subdivision of Lameroo in the District of Albert.

Stirling Assembly District, which now has Strathalbyn as its chief population centre and base, could either retain that name or change to a new version of "Murray" which would take in that part of the existing subdivision of Murray east of the hundred of Monarto, which would, of course, include the town of Murray Bridge. Strathalbyn has 3,300 electors and the proposed subdivision of Murray Bridge about 4,350. Murray Bridge, Myponga, Chapman Bore, Monteith, Woodchester, Hartley, Strathalbyn, Bull Creek and Milang would be within the new Stirling (or Murray) District. Callington, Monarto and Monarto South would go to Gumeracha.

Albert, in addition to its present subdivision of Bordertown, would claim Robe from Millicent electorate and Tailem Bend from Murray. It would also embrace a new subdivision composed of part of the present subdivision of Meningie embracing hundreds of Coolinong, Glyde, Jeffries and Maleclm already a part of Albert. Alexandra would consist of Kingscote subdivision with the addition of Victor Harbour (taken from Stirling), the balance of Meningie subdivision remaining after allocation of part (as outlined above) to be retained by Albert, and territory south of the hundred of Myponga now part of the subdivision of Wilunga.

I say that for a member to represent the district of Alexandra he would need to go right around through Murray Bridge and down to the lakes to represent part of the other side of the peninsula. The article continues:

The report says the commission has given careful consideration to (1) dividing the State into Assembly districts in each of which the electors have common interests; and (2) creating districts which retain as far as possible boundaries of existing districts and subdivisions, are of convenient shape, and have reasonable access between the main centres of population. Bearing in mind the overall problems of the commission, and the certainty of some minor anomalies by reason of the need to draw territorial lines through districts which (for practical purposes) have an indivisible entity, the effects of the present plan are nevertheless somewhat startling. The river, as a major geographical feature and an important factor in effecting population grouping, is simply out of calculations. As one example, the dairying industry, occupying irrigated swamps from Mannum to Wellington, would have representation through three separate members of the Lower House.

Murray Bridge, as a major population centre, would no longer be a geographical centre, but rather a part of a "froghead" for the new Stirling (or Murray) constituency. Its natural surrounding district, from which it draws business and for which it provides services, would be cut off, on the western side, at a point six miles or so along the Adelaide Road; to the north, at a point just above Myponga; to the east along a north-south line from Bowhill; and to the south, along a line from Monteith to Naturi, embracing the former but excluding the latter.

As the effects of electoral boundary changes must be viewed in the long term, and not against a contemporary political background, it is probably not reasonable to discuss political implications in a critical light. It is interesting, however, to consider how the proposed changes would affect the sitting member for Murray. At the most recent polis, A.L.P. gained 980 votes in Strathalbyn to L.C.L.'s 1,892. Mr. Bywaters gained 2,778 in Murray Bridge for A.L.P. as against his L.C.L. opponent's 1,236. If this is the basis of support for the parties, Labor could expect 3,758 votes (in theory), in a reconstructed electorate of Stirling for the two main centres, to L.C.L.'s 3,128. Mr. Bywaters, who was this week asked to comment, said he would reserve his opinion. But he added that he would stand for Stirling if the proposed boundary alterations were adopted.

I can understand the editor of *The Murray Valley Standard*, in his summing up, stating that there would be approximately 600 votes in favour of Labor in the new district of Murray. The present member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) would be in somewhat of a quandary whether to oppose his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, for Alexandra or take the next choice as the member for Stirling

or Murray, whichever it was decided to name it. It would not be pleasing for him if his only choice were the latter, but I am afraid he would not have a choice in this regard.

Apparently one or two members opposite will not be happy if this Bill is passed. During the debate on another Bill last week Labor members accused members opposite of not wanting to speak, and I think this will apply with even greater force on this Bill to those Liberal members that will be opposed if this Bill is passed. I think they will personally thank us if we defeat this Bill. I know that the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), particularly as he has a far-flung district, will be jumping with glee if this Bill is defeated. As under the measure he will lose the area where he lives, he will be forced to go to Bordertown in one direction and to Robe in another. The only good feature for him is that he will have Tailem Bend to deflate some of his present ego caused by having been unopposed for so long! I seriously considered whether this might not be a better district for me to contest. If I did contest it, possibly the member for Albert would have stronger opposition than he has had in the past; I believe he has not been opposed in the past and that that has greatly helped him to remain in this House. Not having had the experience of how he would fare in such a district as this, he has had to make his own deductions from the Commonwealth vote, which is not always consistent with the State vote—far from it.

As the editor of *The Murray Valley Standard* has pointed out, I believe the general reaction of people outside is very much against the change of boundaries proposed in this Bill. Many people are most antagonistic about the approach that has been so evident in this matter. Suggestions have been made in the press that this could bring about an early election. If the Government goes to the people, I think it will receive a very big shock. I think the press has very audibly expressed public opinion in this matter. I cannot remember seeing any press statement in favour of this redistribution. Most of the people of this State have seen that the electoral gerrymander that has operated since 1938 will be even worse if this legislation is passed.

I cannot say much more because the Leader of the Opposition has covered policy matters and the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) has emphatically stated the opposition of the Labor Party to the Bill. I have tried to debate it on a personal note. I thought members opposite would have spoken and that I should have been

able to rebut their statements, but they have not, and I think that will be the position for the remainder of the debate.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): In supporting my Leader and other members on this side who have opposed the Bill, I draw attention to the twists and turns resorted to by the Government to produce a Bill of this character—twists and turns in trying to use words to mean something different from their dictionary meanings. Of course, they have had to do this to produce something to fit their purpose. Our attention was drawn to this by the remarks of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) on the Bill that provided for the appointment of the Electoral Commission. He then pointed out that the Liberal and Country League had had to throw overboard its old idea of the maintenance of a ratio of two country members to every metropolitan member, and that at the last annual meeting of the league this had been altered to the practical recognition of the need for adequate country representation. I emphasize the word “country” because it is amusing to note that it does not appear once in this Bill. It looks as though the league will have to amend its principles again because obviously it is not adhering to them.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think the league has any principles?

Mr. LOVEDAY: The word “country” does not appear in the Bill. It is easy to see why that is so. When the previous Electoral Commission was set up to adjust boundaries, it had to decide on so many country districts and so many metropolitan districts. Of course, the word “metropolitan” has had to be jettisoned too, because some parts of the State previously regarded as the country have been dragged into what is now known as the remaining area of the State. The remainder is the residue, so that everything that is not “rural” is now the residue! They do not count for much; all that counts is that minority that lives in the rural areas! This is an interesting play on words that must have caused much deep thinking by the people who worked this out, who must have found it difficult to find words to fit the present political needs of the L.C.L.

Electoral speaking, under this Bill there is no country district; a district is either a rural area or a part of the residue. The generally accepted meanings of the words “primary production” have been altered to suit the purpose of the L.C.L. It is no use looking at any recognized dictionary to understand the meanings of the definitions in this Bill. A consideration of the position in my district makes it

obvious what has been done in relation to the words “primary production”. Quarrying and mining are always regarded as primary production in statistical records and in general usage. These operations are accepted as being primary production, yet a situation has arisen whereby Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie have been excluded from areas considered to have most of the people therein employed in primary production or in processing the goods of those employed in primary production.

Mr. Ryan: Are they part of the residue?

Mr. LOVEDAY: They are. Whyalla is a case in point. In that district quarrying is carried on at Iron Knob and Iron Baron, and people are engaged in transporting the ore to the seaboard and in maintaining the equipment for these operations. Ships are built in the district to carry the products of primary production and to carry iron ore from Yampi Sound. At Whyalla there is a blast furnace that processes primary produce obtained from the quarries, and limestone obtained elsewhere in the State is processed. We have a host of fitters and other technicians making equipment for primary producers, yet we cannot come within the category of “primary producers”. It is a remarkable distinction. The amazing thing is that the words used in this Bill have completely lost their sense of meaning. Whyalla is referred to by the Premier as a non-primary-producing district. I shall not deal with Port Augusta or Port Pirie in this reference, because members representing those districts are capable of doing that themselves. Obviously the same sort of argument will apply and no doubt the members representing those districts will analyse the position to the satisfaction of members opposite.

Why should this discrimination be shown against the three northern cities, if not for purely political purposes? The House has today seen evidence of the reaction of the people in those three northern cities against the proposal in the Bill. We have had presented three petitions representing over 12 000 signatures from the three centres. Those petitions were organized and sponsored by the local government bodies in the three places. Concerning Whyalla, the petition deals only with the Whyalla subdivision, and not all of that, because the local government body at Whyalla is responsible only for the city of Whyalla itself, and has no power to organize a petition from outside the city area. Within that area 4,800 signatures were obtained

against the proposal to reduce the degree of representation the city now enjoys. The discrimination is resented strongly. It is amazing that in one of the few places in South Australia where there is rapid growth and where according to the estimates provided by engineers about work involved in a sewerage scheme and other facilities to be provided, there will be a population of at least 30,000. Yet, where there is this tremendous development the representation is to be reduced, and not only reduced on the present basis but reduced so that irrespective of the extent of the growth of population in the area there will be no alteration in the representation.

Another distinction is made regarding the two additional seats proposed (Port Pirie and Whyalla) that will include Port Augusta after it has been cut in halves. There is to be no upper limit to the electoral quota for the two proposed areas. Whereas other proposed electorates have an upper limit of 10 per cent above or below the electoral quota there is no upper limit for the two proposed additional seats. There is a deliberate attempt to deprive people of reasonable democratic representation in a place that promises to have the greatest development in the State outside the city of Adelaide. Apparently the area is to be penalized for being the fastest developing area in the State. Our friends opposite talk about the need for decentralization, the development of economic resources of the State, and so on: yet they put this penalty on the fastest developing area in the State outside the city of Adelaide. It is a place where many things are being done, probably because more things are required there than in many other electorates, because these other electorates have been stagnating for years and are likely to continue to do so. I now draw attention to one or two matters mentioned in the debate in this House during August, 1960, when the late Mr. O'Halloran moved:

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

One or two members on the other side at that time made a great play on the words "more just system" until the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) pointed out that they were being used legitimately in their proper sense. Surely members opposite will say no more about that matter in view of the way words have been used by them on the Bill now before

the House. In order to get out of a difficult situation the Premier then moved to strike out all the words after "House" first occurring and to insert in lieu thereof "any reduction in country Parliamentary representation must correspondingly increase the tendency towards centralization of population and industry". Yet, we see him here doing what he said then would increase the tendency towards centralization of population and industry. In this Bill he is reducing the representation from the country, although he does not use the word "country", and is doing what he claimed in 1960 should not be done. In concluding the debate then, after the Speaker had given a ruling on an amendment moved by the member for Norwood, the Premier said, "I have always said that there should be no reduction in country membership." What a *volte face*!

Until now Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie have always been regarded as country districts. I suppose any ordinary human being would say that those three cities are in the country, if we regard the country as something apart from the metropolitan area. Under the Bill, they are no longer in the country. They are now the "residue", and the residue is something that we often throw away. As a rule the residue does not matter, and it is clear in this Bill that the residue does not matter to the L.C.L. In his speech on the Bill the Premier made his usual attempt to decry the importance of the principle of one vote one value. Irrespective of whether we achieve that principle entirely, it has a tremendous value and is the real basis of democratic government; that is recognized all over the world. Every time he gets up on these measures the Premier tries to draw a red herring across the principle of one vote one value. He has said that no-one believes in it and that the principle cannot be found in use anywhere. In his second reading explanation of this Bill he said:

Examination of the voting systems of the other States and other countries does not disclose any such principle and indeed, at the present time, all Parties in the Commonwealth House have expressed doubts about blind adherence to any such basis.

I suppose he overlooked the 1959 report of the Commonwealth Joint Committee on Constitutional Review, which committee had equal representation of Government and Opposition members. The committee unanimously agreed:

In a spirit of democracy, as a general rule, equal weight should be accorded to the votes of electors.

It also said:

This is the spirit which the committee believes to be beyond question, namely, that the votes of electors should as far as possible be accorded equal value.

Yet, the Premier says:

Examination of the voting systems elsewhere does not disclose any such principle.

Unfortunately, these statements by the Premier are reported as if they are gospel, and seldom does a rebuttal from this side of the House get equal publicity. One would think that people in this State concerned with decent and democratic representation would at least print the rebuttal that we give to these ridiculous statements made on behalf of the Government from time to time. If the press is sincere in stating that it wants to see more democratic principles embodied in the Constitution of this State, it should be printing rebuttals of these stupid arguments. There is no need for me to deal with the question of the importance of the principle of one vote one value. The member for Norwood and others have dealt with this almost *ad nauseam* in the debates we have had on this question.

Giving a vote to spouses (a horrible word, I think) of qualified voters for the Legislative Council is a sop, but it is not really a sop to the Opposition. It has been coldly calculated that it will improve the support of the L.C.L. in the Council by the reasoning that the wives of Liberal voters are more likely to vote than are the wives of Labor voters. Under this proposition the spouses of qualified voters are to obtain a vote because they are married; no other qualifications! In other words, this is a calculated insult or, should I say, an unpremeditated insult to the many thousands of unmarried women in this State.

The qualified high-school teacher and hospital matron who remain unmarried and devoted to their work throughout their life apparently have insufficient political balance and intelligence to vote for this august body, the Upper House. To put it colloquially, "Wouldn't it slay you!" When the Government places this sort of proposition before the House, it must think that we are dumb not to be able to see through these ridiculous moves. No-one knowing anything about politics in this State would be taken in by this absurd proposition. Why not give a vote for the Legislative Council to everyone entitled to the franchise in the Assembly? Why adhere to the ridiculously out-of-date modes of voting? Today, no-one can justify this restricted franchise for the Upper House. The amusing thing

is that we have members opposite saying, "But it is easy to vote for the Legislative Council; you only have to have this and that." If it is so easy, why not make everyone who is eligible for the Assembly eligible to vote for the Council? Instead, we have this half-baked proposition to allow the spouses of qualified voters to vote.

As usual, the Premier has had something to say about our desire as a Party to abolish the Upper House. He has said that it is rather significant that, although there have often been Labor Governments in the Mother of Parliaments (I challenge that, because it depends by what he means by "often"; in the usually accepted sense of the word that statement is untrue), they have not seen fit to abolish a House which has been built up on hereditary qualifications and which is not an elected House such as we have here.

Mr. RICHES: They curbed its powers pretty extensively.

Mr. LOVEDAY: What he omitted to say was that the power of the House of Lords is not a fraction of the power of the Upper House in this State. The powers are different, and those of the Legislative Council far exceed those of the House of Lords. If any Bill from the House of Lords is unacceptable to the House of Commons that Bill never reaches the Statute Book because no debating time would be allotted to it, at any rate until the new Government came into power, and it might be revived then. The House of Lords cannot require the Commons to agree to amendments to a Bill from the Commons, nor can it delay a Bill indefinitely. It has no power in respect of money Bills, and since the passing of the Parliament Act (1943) any other public Bill that has been passed by the House of Commons in two successive sessions may be presented for Royal Assent without the consent of the Lords, provided a year has elapsed between the date of the second reading of the Bill in the Commons and the date on which it is finally passed in that House.

In South Australia we have an Upper House with almost every power of veto except in respect of money Bills, and despite all the announcements about its being a House of Review, it is obviously a Party House which has shown its capacity in the past of being purely obstructionist when a Labor Government has introduced legislation in the Assembly. Without Labor support in the Legislative Council for the Bill which resulted in the Electricity Trust of South Australia taking charge of electricity operations in this

State, the country districts would never have received the great advantages which they have from the trust. No-one will convince us that, in the event of Labor holding Government in the Assembly, the Legislative Council would not prove equally obstructionist again. The Premier said that the changes proposed in the Bill relating to the Legislative Council would provide an equal number of rural and non-rural members. He said that this would undoubtedly strengthen the numbers of the Opposition Party.

Mr. Jennings: That is why he is doing it!

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes. We notice him doing this from time to time with monotonous regularity. He said that in that respect it would provide a better balanced Chamber. Nobody on this side believes that; neither does anyone else who analyses the situation.

Mr. Jennings: No-one on that side does either.

Mr. LOVEDAY: With the growth of Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie, all in the Northern District, Labor has every prospect of capturing the Northern District seats, which would give the Party eight out of the 20 seats. The proposed addition of another district is to be made so that Whyalla and half of Port Augusta would be included in the Northern District, and Port Pirie and the remaining half of Port Augusta in the Midland District, in order to prevent Labor from winning the Northern District seats. Assuming Labor is likely to win two out of the three Central Districts, the position would be that Labor would hold eight out of the 24 instead of eight out of 20 in a comparatively short time if the boundaries remained unchanged. That is what the Premier calls strengthening the position of the Opposition and making the Council better balanced.

Another interesting point, too, is that if with the present boundaries Labor was to win eight out of the 20 seats, leaving the Government Party with 12 seats, one occupied by the President, the Premier might not be able to control a sufficient number of the remaining 11. In his opinion, that is probably a consideration. Here we have a proposition by the Premier that obviously will not stand analysis. No member in this House will believe, if he speaks sincerely on this point, that it has any validity at all, but there can be no justification in this day and age for any addition to the Legislative Council numbers. When one considers the opposition which the Premier has expressed to an expansion of this Assembly Chamber to a number to adequately deal with

the business and to provide a much better number to give a better selection for Ministers and committee members, it is difficult to reconcile his advocacy of four additional members to the anachronistic Upper House. Surely we have reached the limit of nonsense in relation to political representation in South Australia! If our Upper House had only the powers of the House of Lords and if it were elected on the same adult franchise as the House of Assembly is elected, with compulsory voting, there is nothing it could do which could not be done just as well, if not better, in one Chamber—in the House of Assembly—with an adequate number of members.

Queensland and New Zealand are examples of what has been done in this regard. No attempt has been made to replace the Upper Chambers in those places even when Liberal Governments have been in power for a long time. No-one has read that those places have ever suffered because they have not had one of these out-of-date Upper Chambers.

What is the Government's real reason in introducing the present proposals? In introducing the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill in 1962 the Premier pointed out that the Opposition could defeat it simply by sending one of its members outside. Members must realize that the Premier had already been unable to reach agreement with the Opposition when he made that statement. He must have known from the restrictive terms of reference included in that Bill that the Opposition could not possibly accept it; yet he advanced it. Unless the Premier had in mind some way of getting around the Constitutional barrier when the present Bill was introduced, then the setting up of the commission with its restrictive terms of reference and the introduction of this Bill were a sheer waste of time and a sheer waste of money. It can be described only as a lot of political window-dressing at the taxpayers' expense. The Premier says that the amendments are the most important that have been proposed to the Constitution since the beginning of the century when the Commonwealth Constitution was adopted. The only important amendment, in the sense that it does represent an improvement on existing legislation, is the giving of a vote for the Legislative Council to spouses of those already entitled to vote. That amendment has been proposed only from self-interest, not from any democratic point of view. I have pointed out that that in itself discriminates against the unmarried women of this State and suggests that they are not fit to have a vote for the Upper House.

The most important and most urgent electoral matter in South Australia—the provision of more democratic arrangements to enable the people to elect the Government they want—has been completely ignored, because this Bill is designed to perpetuate a gerrymander. It will substitute one gerrymander for another for the simple reason that the old one is failing in its effectiveness. The proposal before us in bald terms is for agriculture versus the rest. It will discriminate against many people in this State; in fact against the majority of South Australians and against unmarried women. The proposals can only create dissatisfaction and discord in the community. They will not solve a single electoral problem and therefore they should be condemned. Every member who wants to see any real progress electorally in South Australia should vote against the Bill.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): As I continue speaking it will become obvious that I oppose the Bill, as have my colleagues who have already spoken. In looking at members opposite I am reminded of a waxworks. One can hardly blame them for not speaking, because it would be extremely difficult for them to justify support for the Bill. I do not think the Premier has ordered them not to speak: I believe they are sufficiently shrewd to realize that to support such a Bill would make them less popular than they already are. I agree that there is need for electoral reform in South Australia. The majority of the people would wholeheartedly agree that electoral reform is necessary, but to rearrange the boundaries as the Government suggests would never be acceptable as electoral reform. The Premier's second reading explanation was designed more for the public than for members of this House.

Mr. Casey: Per medium of the *Advertiser*.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. The Premier was trying to convince the people that he was turning over a new leaf and was going to make a fresh start. He made every effort to convince them that this Bill represented the end of the Playford gerrymander and that in the interests of democracy and of the State he was going to discard for ever the despised gerrymander. He was offering something beyond their wildest dreams. He was going to give them back their political freedom. However, what he did offer? He offered a vote for the Legislative Council to the spouses of those already qualified to vote for the Legislative Council and he offered to further gerrymander electoral boundaries. This was sup-

posed to bring a joyous reaction from the people, but there was no such reaction. The people rejected his offer. Everywhere one goes people are discussing this Bill. They are amazed to think that the Government would attempt to suppress their freedom further than it has already been suppressed. People do not take kindly to a dictatorship, which is why they rejected the Playford Government at the last election, and why they will do so at the next election, whenever it is held. The people are fed up with the Government's half-baked compromises. They want equality of rights and they want to be allowed to have confidence in themselves. They want self-government. As I have previously stated, this House is little short of a mockery while it houses the disproportion of the gerrymander instead of a fair representation of a democratic electoral procedure. Therefore, the people are opposed to this Bill, because instead of improving the present position it is designed to worsen it. They will just not tolerate any further rigging of the electoral boundaries, for even the present distribution has very adverse effects on the State. Of course, the Government would claim that its gerrymander gives more attention to country needs.

One matter that comes to my mind is the question of Leaving Honours classes. For years country members have been begging in this House for the Government to establish Leaving Honours classes in country districts, but because of the Government's lack of interest in some country districts it refuses to do so, with the result that thousands of decent young Australians have been deprived of their rightful education. However, one of these classes was established in Port Pirie, and it might interest members opposite to know that although it was established only this year there are now 30 students in the class. Yet we were told by the Minister of Education and the Government that it would be useless to establish these classes in country areas because the enrolments would be insufficient. Possibly next year that Leaving Honours class at Port Pirie will have 60 students.

The Playford Government has not had a majority government for many years, and the last State elections really put the skids under it. The gerrymandering of the boundaries has caught up with it; that is obvious, otherwise it would not be attempting to put this Bill over. Government members are now like spiders caught in their own webs, desperately trying to rack their brains for some scheme to get them out

of it, but I am afraid it is going to backfire on them. The Playford Government for many years has been supported by a very faithful press, which has credited the Government with everything except the great earthquake, the flooding of the River Murray, and some fires that have occurred, but the people now realize, when an attempt such as this is being made, that things are not as rosy as the Premier and the press would like them to believe.

I now wish to point out a few anomalies and the reasons why the people continue to reject the Playford Government. First, most Australians are recognized as being pretty good sports, and they do not like to see one side win by unfair means. Apart from the many anomalies that exist under the present system, there are such anomalies as State socialization covering hospital provisions, education, child welfare, and relief of the poor and the aged, the provisions for which are the worst in Australia. Also, numbers of workers are deprived of the right to seek industrial awards. Workers are less covered by workmen's compensation in cases of accident and illness than in any other part of the Commonwealth. The Government tries to cover up these anomalies with announcements on television and through the press of great industrial expansion, but, Sir, everyone knows that the growth of industrial expansion in South Australia is the worst in the Commonwealth. Many industries come here because South Australia is a low-wage State. The Government is most generous in granting concessions to big monopolies, and that is another big attraction for them.

The legislation governing safety precautions is also the worst in Australia. That was borne out by a recent press report of the remarks made by the Attorney-General, who said that the rise in the industrial accident rate was most damaging to industrial activity in South Australia. Nothing has been done to rectify these anomalies in safety precautions. Furthermore, the industrial development that has taken place in this State has been centred almost entirely in the metropolitan area. We have told the people and we have told members opposite that decentralization of industry and of the Government's facilities is urgently needed, but the Government has refused to act in this matter, for the very good reason that this would interfere with its rigged boundaries. These are just some of the reasons why the Labor Party and the majority of the people of this State, who support that Party, oppose any further gerrymandering of the electoral boundaries

which would allow the Playford Government to cling to office to the detriment of the State and its people. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): In rising to oppose this Bill I find that I am at a loss for words to be able to characterize it within the terms of the Standing Orders of this House. I can but do my best, but what I have to say today is perhaps a mere shadow of what I should like to say to members opposite, for it is they who are responsible for this measure.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Say it outside.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I shall; I assure members that I do not mind saying it outside the House. This measure was shamelessly conceived, shamefully executed, and shamefully presented to this House, shaming because the insolence with which this most disgraceful measure has been brought before this Chamber is an insult to the Parliamentary system throughout the world. Why, Sir, nothing so disgraceful has ever happened within the Commonwealth before.

Mr. Coumbe: What about Queensland?

Mr. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member would like to talk about Queensland, then he may say something to this House later, instead of dallying in dumb disgrace upon the benches opposite, because that is what members opposite are doing; they have so little to say to justify this Bill that they cannot do anything but sit there looking gormless. I hope that my taunts will induce some kind of action, and I am pleased to see that at least members opposite have some little conscience and are squirming. I hope that members opposite may have some conscience, because if by their votes in this House they support this measure it will be ample demonstration to the people of this State that they are without a conscience.

I shall now turn to what the Premier has had to say on the Bill because he is the only member opposite who has had the gall to speak on it. I never cease to be amazed at the effrontery with which he says things of this kind, although I suppose honourable members ought to be inured to this sort of thing by now. The Premier said that the Bill is to provide a new basis for distribution in this House and that he does not propose to do anything about the system of one man one vote. I do not know whether he was referring to one vote one value, but I was not surprised to hear him say such a thing as there was no principle of one man one vote. In effect, the Premier believes in a plural vote because he wants to give some people a greater vote than others. Although he did not use the

term one vote one value, which is usually used by electoral authorities and writers on political science and matters of this kind, I presume that is what he was really referring to. He does not believe there should be one vote one value or, as he says, one man one vote in this State. He says that an examination of the voting systems of other States and other countries does not disclose any such principle. In this, the Premier is adopting the tactics of Dr. Goebbels. All that he can do is to say something flatly untrue and keep on repeating it in the hope that somebody will believe it. The Premier knows that what he says is untrue.

Mr. Lawn: Do you think he believes it himself?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course he doesn't. He only needs to look at the neighbouring State of Victoria where he knows that a Liberal Premier introduced a one vote one value system. There the system is two State seats for every Commonwealth seat, to be redistributed every time that Commonwealth seats are redistributed. Under the Constitution, Commonwealth seats are based on the principle of one vote one value. The Premier knows this system applies in Victoria. He knows that in Tasmania the seats are also based on the Commonwealth system and one vote one value applies. How can he say seriously, sincerely, truthfully and believingly that, on examination of the systems in other States, there is no such principle in electoral matters as one vote one value? Of course, the Premier simply says these things in the hope that in throwing out these statements somebody somewhere will believe them, no matter how untrue they are.

Since the Premier has not really said much about the justification for this fantastic proposal let us go back to what he said on previous occasions. It is not much use considering everything he has ever said because it would be a sort of yea and nay. He has said various things according to the times of the electoral measures. However, let us turn back to some of the things that he and other honourable members opposite have had to say upon the basis of electoral redistribution so that we may see what it is they use as grounds to justify this Bill. Why has the Premier previously said that the principle of one vote one value should not obtain in this State? He and the Minister of Lands and other members opposite have from time to time said that the primary producers of this State are those who are responsible for the production of the greater part of its wealth and that, therefore,

they should be given a predominant say in the future of South Australia. Of course, that is a very strange principle on which to base any electoral distribution. It is not through his citizenship or by virtue of humanity that a man obtains the right to a say in his future; the deciding factor is how much he contributes to the wealth of the community. On this principle a bookmaker who makes £10,000 a year should have ten times the say of a schoolteacher who makes £1,000 a year. According to this argument the bookmaker contributes more to the value of this community. Again, according to the Premier, primary producers are the backbone of the State and produce the majority of its wealth and, therefore, it is they who should have the predominant say in its future, regardless of the rights or abilities, the humanity or the citizenship of other members of the community.

I trust I have reported accurately what the Premier has said. If honourable members opposite think I am putting forward something inaccurate I should be glad if they would interject and point out where I am wrong, but I have honestly tried to present what the Premier, the Minister of Lands and others have said about the reason why primary producers should be given an overwhelming say in the government of South Australia—three times or more the say that anybody else gets. Of course, even if there were any justification whatever upon analysis for the argument that that is the thing upon which electoral redistribution should be based, it is still based on an entirely mistaken premise. In fact, primary production does not account for the major portion of the wealth of South Australia and to support this I ask honourable members to look at their *Statesman's Pocket Year Book*.

According to the last figures published by the Government Statist, the net value of primary production in South Australia was £134,009,000 a year. Of course, according to the definition of primary producers adverted to by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), which was specially written into the terms of reference to the commission in this particular matter, a few people have to be excluded from primary production and the figure reduced. Fishermen are not primary producers according to the terms of reference. That means £1,200,000 must be taken away from the total net value of primary production. Mining and quarrying are not primary industries and therefore £26,312,000 must be taken away from the total. That leaves £106,497,000 as the net annual value of primary production in South Australia.

Mr. McKee: According to the terms of reference.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. Secondary production which, according to the definition, now includes mining and quarrying, fishing and other matters ancillary to them, would then account for over £200,000,000 a year. That is the figure when only commodity production is taken. Non-primary production, according to the Government's own definition, is worth twice as much in commodity value a year as primary production. Of course, it does not end there because the wealth of this community is not merely contained in commodity production. What about services in the community? Any economist will say that in analysing the wealth of a community goods and services must be accounted for—services are not of nil value. What about the services which are given here, the Government services that exist, the services of the ordinary people in towns? What about dry cleaning services, shopkeepers, schoolteachers and university professors? On the analysis that only commodity production is to be taken into account, those people would be cut off.

Mr. Loveday: Part of their time is spent in serving primary producers.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. The value of services, excluding Government services, could hardly be estimated to be less than 25 per cent of the total wealth of the community. If we examine the national income and expenditure statements from the Commonwealth we shall find that, in personal spending for consumption, spending on services accounts for about one-quarter of the total personal spending in the community—and that is not taking into account the Governmental services that are rendered. In fact, the value of primary produce in South Australia and those engaged in purely primary production of commodities in South Australia would account for not more than 25 per cent of the wealth of this State, on the Government's definition of "primary production"; yet those 25 per cent are to be given a predominant say in the future of this State because, according to the Premier, they produce more than anybody else does. This is an absurd basis for any argument at all. In every leading country in the world where there is any tradition whatever of representative democracy, no such principle would be countenanced for one moment.

Let us take the position in Great Britain. There, the Boundary Commission is given an instruction supported by all sides of the House of Commons to get as near as possible to the

mean struck by the Commission so that there is only a small departure from the mean, and one vote one value is allowed. They allow only a small number of exceptions, in the case of about three seats out of the total 600-odd, because of difficulties of communication around the Scilly Isles and in one or two other cases. Otherwise, the only departure from the mean at all is where the Commission reports that it finds difficulty in getting close enough to the mean because it is forced to plan its electoral districts on the basis of borough councils, which have the same roll. It cannot split up a borough as we can split up subdivisions in Australia, so there is some departure from the mean beyond that which Parliament originally prescribed, simply because of the mathematical difficulties involved in working borough and Parliamentary rolls together. The leaders of all Parties in Great Britain have said that what the Commission must try to do is to get as close as possible to the principle of one vote one value, and the Commission has successfully seen to it that no minority in the community can be given a preponderant voice.

What of the United States of America? The Premier says that an examination of those countries shows there is no such principle obtaining as one vote one value. Apparently, he has overlooked the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States of America, the highest judicial body in that land, has pointed to the legislatures in the various States of that country and said that those of them that have put through the kind of gerrymander that the Premier is trying to put through here are offending against the basic principles of the U.S.A. Constitution, which demands equality between citizens, and that, if they do not derestrict their States, they will be subject to federal legal action.

Mr. McKee: Primary production is fairly important there, too.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course it is. The principles of political philosophers and the principles of the great statesmen of the British Commonwealth have never sought to set aside primary producers from others of the community and to suggest that there was some separation between them.

Let me turn to another of the objections that the Premier raises to the principle of one vote one value in this House, saying that this is the reason why he cannot introduce a measure of this kind. The Premier says it is difficult to represent country districts because of the long distances that have to be travelled to keep

in touch with the electors. We agree with him. We have every reason to agree with him because the Labor Party in this Parliament represents not only the overwhelming majority of the people of this State. We represent far more electors here than honourable members do on the other side, but we also represent the majority of the area of the State as well. The vast majority of the area of South Australia is represented in this House by Labor members. The honourable members for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and Frome (Mr. Casey) both have electoral districts larger than the British Isles in area. Why, they comprise the major portion of the Commonwealth district of Grey, which in itself comprises some two-thirds of this State. We do not believe that the present number of members representing country districts can be properly decreased, because thereby it will make country representation less efficient.

It will not be possible for members to travel the vast distances that now have to be travelled by the honourable members for Frome and Whyalla and then go further. The Premier, having said that it was not possible to decrease country representation (and he has said it here, as the member for Whyalla has pointed out, time and time again), now intends to reduce country representation, and particularly in the sparsely settled areas of this State. It will make the task of the members for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) and Frome almost impossible. The member for Frome would have to represent an area from Coober Pedy to Cockburn and from just north of Quorn to the Northern Territory and Queensland borders. The sparsely settled areas of this State will, under the Premier's proposal, have less representation than now, and he says he is doing this because we cannot justify one vote one value. If we had one vote one value upon the basis of the Labor Party's proposals to this House, there would be no reduction in the representation for those areas at all. Quite obviously, the Premier is not serious in suggesting that the reason why we cannot have one vote one value is the difficulty of representing country areas. He has now quite cynically done a complete *volte face* from the former statements he made in this House justifying country representation and saying it must be kept. He now does away with it because he knows that, if the present basis of country representation is maintained, he will not be sitting on the Treasury benches.

Let us turn to his suggestion that the increase in members that the Labor Party suggested

to this House was unwarranted. He suggested that we could not have the number of members in this House proposed by the Labor Party because it would mean that there would be a larger number of members of Parliament with nothing adequate to do. Although he proposes to increase this House by only three members—to make it no larger in fact than it was when it began, when the population of this State was very much smaller than it is now—he intends putting four more members in the Legislative Council. He does not mind about creating more members in that place, which is so constant in its representation of local interests, so easy of approach amongst its members to the electors, and (let me be truthful rather than sarcastic about this matter), on the Government's side at least, so assiduous in its cultivation of leisure with dignity! The Premier suggested that by putting four more members in the Upper House there would be more effective representation of the people of this State. I have been the member for Norwood for nearly 11 years, and during all that time four members of the Legislative Council have represented my district.

Mr. Bywaters: Nobody would know who they were.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I say without any fear of contradiction that not one elector in 100 in my district would be able to give the name of one of them. In the period in which I have been a member, I have seen the Hon. Mrs. Cooper at three functions in my district, the Hon. Sir Frank Perry at three, and the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill and the Hon. Mr. Potter at none, and I do get about in my district. Members opposite will perhaps pay me the compliment of admitting that, when there is a football club meeting, a church meeting, a mothers' club meeting or an annual canary fanciers' bean feast in Norwood, I am there.

Mr. Riches: Aren't you vice-president of most of them?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Or patron, or something of the kind. It would be difficult for Legislative Council members in my district to go to many functions without my being aware of their presence, but I have placed on record how much they are seen and known. For the Premier to suggest for one moment that the placing of four extra members in the Legislative Council will give more effective personal representation to the people of this State is sheer and utter nonsense. He knows the habits of Legislative Council members on his side, and he must know how untrue his suggestion is.

Let me turn to the reason for the Premier's present proposals. For a long time we had from the Liberal and Country League in this State a statement that it believed that the existing ratio of country to city representation should be maintained. These were the colours they nailed to the mast. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) disagreed with them, so he remained silent in this Chamber, though taunted often for many years on this subject. I regret to say that when he broke his silence it was to no very great effect. I wish he had stuck to the principles that he enunciated before he came into this House; they would have done him credit. However, the original proposal for two country seats for every city seat occurred in 1872 for the simple reason that there were then twice as many people in the country as in the city. There was one vote one value at that time. It was only after certain interests in this House, purely for purposes of electoral advantage, started to muck about with the original principle of one vote one value that obtained from 1856 until 1872, and said, "We cannot have too many Labor members coming in here. We will decrease their representation in the House", that this was altered. They proceeded to put to a disadvantage various areas where there were many working men. This process has gone on ever since until we have come to the lowest of the low. They were wedded to this principle of having two country seats for every city seat, and they felt it was sacrosanct as long as it was to their own personal advantage.

In 1955 the Premier produced his last gerrymander, which was on the basis of two country seats for every city seat. Unfortunately for the Premier, alterations in the distribution of population meant that if he stuck to that principle—the thing that he and the L.C.L. said must be maintained in the interests of this State—he was gone! If he had redistributed on the 1955 basis of 26 equal country districts and 13 equal city districts, he would have been out of office. He knew this, so he could not do it. He then had to think up a new system, and in this he carefully got examples drawn and numbers calculated to see how he was going to stay here. This was the only principle that obtained with him. He had a line drawn around the metropolitan area and then started to go a bit beyond, saying, "Of course, we cannot give a country quota to Gawler or Elizabeth. Although Gawler is a country town, we have to bring it into the metropolitan area. If we have these towns in the country, I am gone." Having

done that, he had this ring drawn around the metropolitan area and the adjacent rural areas, because what he says is "includes the rural areas adjacent to the city."

Apparently some rural voters do not count much with the Premier. He was to give them 20 seats and divide up the rest of the State into 20 seats. However, what would have happened then? He could not have got in. He could not have 20 equal country seats because he would be out of office. He then thought up another gambit, and this was the most beautiful one! He was going to provide a special quota for the northern towns so that their quotas would not affect the country areas. A special quota was to be effected so that these people would not be counted in the 20 country seats. In other words, he was going to select areas of the country, not those which produced the overwhelming amount of primary production but simply those from which he could get an overwhelming majority of the number of voters. They were carefully selected as his supporters in the main, and the people in these places were to be given one member for every 7,000 voters, whereas in the rest of the State there was to be one member for every 18,000, or as near as possible for the northern cities, and these cities would have at least metropolitan quotas in the next few years. Under this proposal 400,000 people would elect 22 members of this House and 146,000 would elect 20 members, and the Premier said that this was justice and equality!

The only other matter to which I wish to advert is why this measure has now come before this House. The Premier knew full well that, under the provisions of the Constitution Act of this State, in order to pass the measure in this House he had to have an absolute majority on the floor voting, apart from the Speaker. He has not got this, so he knew that this measure could not pass under the terms of the Constitution; anything else is forbidden and is declared specifically by the Constitution to be unlawful. But, Sir, all sorts of statements have emanated from some members opposite, even from Ministers at public meetings, that this measure will pass despite the provision of the Constitution. Now the Premier comes to this House and suggests in tones of injured anguish that it is monstrous to suggest that he ever intended to do anything contrary to the terms of the Constitution. When any member has the lack of scruples involved in presenting a measure of this kind

to Parliament, it is not wise for members opposite to take that kind of statement at face value. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I oppose the Bill.

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

Mr. LAWN: Believing that this Bill will be defeated, I will curtail my remarks considerably, which is not what I would have done had the circumstances been different. Our understanding of an amendment to the Constitution Act is that 20 members are required to support the measure for it to be passed. We have a statement by the Premier last session, when the commission was appointed, that if the Opposition disliked its recommendations only one Opposition member need absent himself from the vote for the Bill to be defeated. Recently the Premier assured the people of this State that in this Bill the Government did not intend to indulge in trickery, so I accept the fact that every member believes the Bill will be defeated. It proposes an increase in the number of members of the House of Assembly from 39 to 42. The reasons for adopting 42 and not 40 were adequately canvassed by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) this afternoon. There is a proposed increase of three members in this Chamber (only 8 per cent), but a proposed increase in the Legislative Council of 20 per cent of the present representation. Some members have mentioned that their constituents do not know their Legislative Council members. Time and again when people have wanted to see me urgently and I have not been at Parliament House they have been told about their four representatives in the Legislative Council, but from what has been said it is obvious that they do not know about them. When I was in Western Australia recently a man from my district came to see me here. When I saw him several weeks later I said that there had been no need for him to wait so long to see me because he could have gone to his four Legislative Council representatives. He argued with me and in the end I gave up trying to convince him that he had five representatives.

Mr. Ryan: Many people do not know that there is an Upper House.

Mr. LAWN: I argued with that man and said that in the Legislative Council representation there was the Central No. 1 District, Central No. 2 District, Midland District and Northern District. I tried to explain to him that every voter in South Australia had five

representatives in Parliament but he said point blank that I did not know what I was talking about.

Mr. Ryan: Some people think that M.L.O. stands for Methodist Ladies College!

Mr. LAWN: The Premier said:

One suggestion which has been advanced, to increase the membership of the House of Assembly to 56 merely to provide for this, cannot be accepted. In the first place, it would mean that country districts would still lose their political influence and, in the second place, the country would be saddled with the cost of maintaining a large number of politicians who would not have any useful work to do.

Have I not just pointed out the Premier's desire to increase the number of members in the Legislative Council by 20 per cent? He talks about politicians not having enough useful work to do, but members in this place know that when some people go to their Legislative Council representatives they are told to go and see their member in this place. They do not admit that they represent those people and I have seen a letter to that effect. Yet, the Premier talks about cluttering up Parliament House with useless politicians. No-one can say that the members here do not work for their districts. Whatever I may have said about members opposite, I know that most of them are actively associated with their districts. I will not say that for all of them. I am sorry that the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) is not present at this moment. The Government boasts about the fact that it has a lady representative, someone to look after the interests of women. Let us have a look at how the Government interests itself in the women of South Australia. My friend from Port Pirie points out that, of the waxworks opposite, apart from the Premier not one member from the other side has spoken on this Bill. The Premier will agree that the measure dealing with the appointment of an additional Minister was a secondary matter compared with this Bill. He says it is the most important constitutional matter that Parliament has had to deal with since Federation.

The Bill deals with spouses of qualified voters. Consider the position of a single woman, 24 years of age. Under this Bill she will not get a vote for the Legislative Council. She does not get one because she is single. Let us assume that at 26 years of age she marries, and she and her husband live with her parents because they cannot get a house. She is still not the spouse of a qualified Legislative Council voter, and therefore cannot get a vote.

Let us assume that at 28 years of age she gets a house after waiting two years for one from the Housing Trust. In this case I have been generous because the trust says that most people have to wait longer than that. However, let us assume that at 28 she gets a rental house from the trust. Then she and her husband become qualified voters for the Legislative Council. The Government wants the country to be populated and by the time she is 46 let us assume that this woman has raised a family—and we all believe that locally born people are better than migrants. Although this woman has done her duty and raised a family, if her husband dies she is no longer the spouse of a qualified voter for the Legislative Council. The Government says, “You have lost your husband who was qualified to vote, but you are no longer of any use to us and we are taking your name off the roll.” That is the Bill this Government has introduced to help all sections of the community!

Mr. Ryan: The spouse would not get a vote unless she applied for it personally.

Mr. LAWN: People have to apply for it, because it does not apply automatically. They are not compelled to place their names on the roll as they are for the Commonwealth Parliament. A single woman who is without property rights does not get a vote for the Legislative Council, but she does when she marries if her husband is entitled to vote. He has to be a returned soldier, own land or pay rent, but if they are living with a mother-in-law the wife does not get a vote. I am not stating a hypothetical case. Although this Bill could be discussed at considerable length, I am not in the habit of making long speeches. I say what I want to say and that is the end of it—I walk out. I do not apologize for riling honourable members opposite, as I did the honourable member for Burnside, last week, because I walk out and do not let them have the satisfaction of talking to me. Since I have been in this House I have heard Government members talking about the large areas they represent. I admit that they do represent large areas with many galahs, sheep, goats and plenty of stock yard confetti. At present each member of this House represents an average of 9,745 square miles. If this Bill were passed each member would represent an average area of 9,049 square miles, a reduction of 696 square miles. This House has had the opportunity to adopt our proposals for a House of 56 members, which would reduce in size the large areas complained of. Members opposite

have complained that I can talk to all my constituents in King William Street. We want to reduce the size of the areas represented by all members. The honourable member for Frome represents an area greater in size than Tasmania.

Mr. Hughes: He lives in his district, too.

Mr. LAWN: He does, and is a good representative. Even under the gerrymandering scheme he will still win despite what has been done to defeat him. Over the years I have been able to arouse enthusiasm about matters under discussion, but I am afraid I cannot do it with this Bill. I know that Government members have not been able to arouse any among themselves. Some members, including the member for Albert, are not happy with the suggested legislation. I do not know about the member for Rocky River. The member for Stirling is not jumping in his seat with enthusiasm for this Bill. If this Bill is passed he will be the member with the shortest record of service. He entered this House as a result of the Stirling by-election last year, but in the first election following the passing of this Bill, the Premier's newest recruit would be sacked. Perhaps the member for Stirling could still say that he was going to remain invincibly himself as he told us in his maiden speech. If this legislation were passed the district of Stirling would be amalgamated with that of the member for Murray. The people in both areas support wholeheartedly the statements in the newspapers circulating in those districts, so the honourable member can say that it is chilly for Willy down at Stirling. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. McKee: I don't think you convinced them.

Mr. LAWN: I am convinced that this Bill will be voted out on voices and that Government members will not call for a division.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): In opposing the Bill I do not intend to repeat what has been said, except to say that, speaking on behalf of the people whom I represent, I endorse what has been said from this side of the House. I know that few measures have created more interest in my electorate. I believe that the people were in general agreement with the Premier when he said that this is the most important measure that has been introduced in this House during this century, but they regard it as a measure that is dangerous to their rights. The three petitions presented today indicate that electors place some value on their rights. It is strange that, in these days when people are advocating the rights of minorities

(for instance, our Aborigines) to an adequate and equal voice in the government of this country, in the same year that they are given those rights electorally, it is suggested that we take away the rights of other people living in the same areas.

I oppose this measure on two grounds. I oppose it as a representative of one of the districts most concerned. People in that district wish to preserve their right of representation in this Chamber, and have expressed their concern over their signatures to a petition that was read in the House this afternoon. That concern has been expressed not by any one section of the community, or by a cross-section of it, but by the community at large. It is competent for this House to take notice of that expression of opinion. Members should know that these petitions were not canvassed from house to house. They were placed on a table and, prior notice having been given of the wording of the petition and its purport, the people were invited, if they so desired, to go to the table and sign the petitions. The response was spontaneous, as spontaneous in one city as in the other two. I consider that the petitions indicate the feelings of the people who are concerned, and as their representative, for the time being at any rate, I voice their opposition to this measure.

No political commentator, in the press or on the platform, has had a good word to say for this Bill. It has not been commended by anybody. No-one can see that it is going to do any good. Many of us believe that if its provisions are carried into effect it will set the cause of democracy back many years. It is not electoral reform: it will keep the State in the rut it has been in for many years so far as its electoral life is concerned. It is not good for a community to be placed in a position where it is not able to change the Government. One can speak of stable government. It can be commended provided the Government always governs with the consent of the governed, but it is not good for a Government to be able to retain office year after year despite the expressed dissatisfaction of the majority of the people at the ballot box. This Bill seeks to perpetuate that situation. It is wrong and is out of step with the outlook of the people of this State.

I oppose the Bill because I subscribe to the political philosophy of those who have a regard for democracy and who want democracy to work. I am one who is disappointed that people in other parts of the world who are in the process of forming the machinery for

governing themselves—for the first time in many instances—are not accepting our form of democracy as the type of government they want. Indonesia claims that it has a guided democracy and a paternal Government. There is trouble wherever people are unable to govern themselves by free and equal expression at the ballot box. When obstacles are placed in the way of free election and citizens are denied equal rights we are turning back the clock. This measure, which seeks to set up divisions in the community, is wrong.

The Premier has said that he wants to get away from the old conception of the metropolitan area versus the country. This Bill will not achieve that: it will perpetuate that distinction and, worse, it will create the same distinction in the country where divisions were never experienced before. The astounding result will be that a vote of a schoolteacher at Port Augusta will be worth two-thirds of the vote of a schoolteacher 25 miles away; the vote of an inspector of police at Port Augusta will be of less value than the vote of a junior constable 25 miles away; an officer at Woomera will not have the same voice in the government of this country as will a similar officer at Leigh Creek. How do we reconcile that kind of thing? The Bill contains anomalies from start to finish. I can find nothing in it to commend itself to the people. It will not make for a better Government or for a better and more workable Parliament. It will perpetuate a state of affairs and make certain for all time that the people will never have a chance to change the Government.

The Bill also seeks to bring about alterations in the Legislative Council. This has been dealt with effectively by the members for Whyalla and Norwood. I subscribe wholeheartedly to their expressed views. Separating Whyalla from Port Pirie in the northern districts surely cannot be accepted! Dividing Port Augusta into two districts in the House of Assembly and dividing the present Murray district into two districts is surely wrong. Where is the community of interest? We have had it drummed into us in the past that one of the considerations to be taken into account when the State is divided into electoral districts is the community of interest. This Bill completely overlooks that principle. This is a measure of expediency. It does not matter what principle one tries to establish, there are anomalies in this measure. If one takes population, area or community of interest as a consideration, the Bill will not measure up to any test. I hope that the House will not

agree to it, because I do not believe that the people will take it lightly. I have faith in the people. I have always had confidence in numbers, and I believe that if people realize that their rights are being taken from them and that many are being disenfranchised we shall have forcibly borne home to us the strong feelings that many hold on this measure.

When I first came into this House in 1933, at the same time as the Premier and you, Mr. Speaker, it had 46 members representing half the population that we have today. I thought that that was a good Parliament, but I do not think it has improved any by the reduction in numbers. Problems associated with immigration, development, and the need to maintain areas that have been developed have added to the responsibilities of ordinary members of Parliament. The responsibilities of the Ministry are greater and heavier than they were even in the days when the State levied its own taxation. I believe that members generally have applied themselves sincerely and efficiently to their tasks, but I also believe that Parliament has been weakened by the reduction in numbers and that there is a strong case for an increase in numbers. To say to those cities of the north that because they have increased in population they are to be denied political representation surely is wrong? The only reason for their being denied representation is that they are growing and prospering. No other reason has been advanced. That is not acceptable to the people I represent and I am sure I am speaking their mind when I ask the House to have nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I want to place on record my opposition to the proposals contained in this Bill. The whole principles of democracy, as I understand them, are in danger. I associate myself in every way with everything that has been said by the Leader and by my colleagues on this side of the House. I believe it is the duty of every Parliament to see that the Government can be changed by the majority of the people.

I believe in the principle of one vote one value, for I think that is the basis of all democratic thinking. However, there are times when that policy could not possibly be put into effect, and I think that that is the position in this State because of the vast areas in the north of the State which are so sparsely populated. However, any committee appointed by the Government should have uppermost in its mind at all times that the principle of one vote one value should be adhered to as closely as

possible. Like the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) I am amazed at the lack of speakers from the benches opposite. The Premier stated that this is probably the most important measure to come before this House for many years, and therefore it is amazing that we hear nothing at all from members opposite. This measure is vital to South Australia, for it affects not only the people that we on this side represent but the people that members opposite represent, and surely it is in the interests of those members to debate such an important measure. I represent what is known as a rural area and I am proud to do so; it is sparsely populated and extends over great distances, and under the proposed legislation that area will be increased. I say emphatically that if those areas in the north, such as the districts represented by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and myself, are increased, it will not be possible for us to do the job we wish to do and what we set out to do, for such a task would kill us and the members who come after us.

I firmly believe that the farmers and workers in rural areas should join with other classes of workers in other industries and strive to bring their rights and interests into line with each other and work for the common good of all. The legislation before us is quite contrary to my beliefs, and I cannot support one ounce of it. The proposals affecting the Legislative Council, in my opinion, are almost hypocritical. We hear quite often from members opposite how important it is for women to be represented in Parliament. The Government's proposals in this respect are just beyond my comprehension. I do not support this Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): Mr. Speaker, I, too, oppose the Bill. Everyone who has spoken in this debate, except the Premier, who introduced it, has opposed it, which is only another way of saying that no member on the other side has had the intestinal fortitude to support his own Government's legislation. I believe that this is probably the most blatant and barefaced piece of electoral trickery that has ever come before this House, and that is undoubtedly saying a lot. It is saying a lot, too, that this Government, which has specialized in electoral chicanery for a long, long time has, after all these years, produced a Bill which goes even further in electoral roguery than any of its preceding Bills did. Of course, we know that this type of legislation is very, very important to the Government, because it only occupies its position on the Treasury benches because of electoral manipulation. It certainly

is rather astonishing now to anyone who has any democratic aspirations and beliefs at all that the Government can impose a further gerrymander on top of a gerrymander.

Mr. Speaker, as many members on this side of the House have pointed out, this legislation is not electoral reform at all: it is only to institute and perpetuate a worsening of the electoral laws of this State and, heaven knows, they were bad enough before and are bad enough now. This legislation is a direct result of the debacle of the last elections, when the Government received only a minority of votes cast throughout the State and also on this occasion, for the first time in the history of the Playford administration, a minority of elected members supporting the policy enunciated by the Premier then. I do not need to go into how, despite these circumstances, the Government has been able to maintain itself in office, but I think it is fair enough to say—as every member of this House knows, which we are very glad to know that practically everybody in South Australia knows now—that the Premier is not only a good orchid, cherry and apple grower, but an exceedingly good horse trader as well.

It is certainly not reasonable to assume that this legislation is the result of a sudden attack of democracy on the Premier's part. The Premier is immune to democracy, he is impervious to democracy, he is armourplated against democracy. He can bluff the members opposite, but he cannot bluff me. The Premier has been absolutely resistant to democracy all his political life. He has been immunized against it, undoubtedly, and any appeal to him whatsoever on democratic principles goes in one ear and out the other like water on a duck's back. If I seem to have my metaphors slightly mixed, I caught that from the former member for Chaffey (Mr. King). Obviously, the only reason for this legislation is that the Premier knows that, with the expanding metropolitan area, the inner rural seats hitherto with only a microscopic population are now absorbing a tremendous number of people who vote for the Party of which I am a member, and those inner rural seats are now becoming virtually outer metropolitan seats, although they are certainly not described as that in the Constitution. Therefore, many seats held by Liberal Party members will be lost to the Party at the next election if the present boundaries are retained. That is the only reason for this Bill.

Mr. Clark: The 30 miles was no accident.

Mr. JENNINGS: No. Under the present electoral boundaries the district of Barossa will

undoubtedly be lost to the Liberal Party and we will no longer have the pleasure of the company of the present honourable member for that district. Glenelg will be lost and we will no longer have the company of the present Minister of Education.

Mr. Harding: Why are you so sad?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am not sad. Why does the honourable member think I am opposing this Bill? The seat of Gouger will undoubtedly be lost soon and the present incumbents of the seats I have mentioned are even now facing an ignominious end to their inglorious political careers and no doubt many of their colleagues will follow them. In his second reading explanation the Premier said, as he has often said, that he does not agree with the principle of one vote one value. He called it a so-called principle.

Mr. Bywaters: He did not call it "one vote one value".

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that is what he meant because he has called it that before. He denied that such a principle existed, but we all know that he is not too sound on principles at the best of times. He has made similar statements about one vote one value before. The Premier does not subscribe to any principle at all except the perverted principle that however the people of South Australia vote he will remain in office; that is the only so-called principle behind this legislation. To justify his oft-repeated statement that there is no valid principle of one vote one value, he dragged up some very hoary and completely irrelevant arguments about other Parliaments. These arguments are not new; we have heard them every time such legislation has been discussed in the House.

The Premier spoke about the Commonwealth Parliament and said something that is blatantly untrue: that now all Parties in the Commonwealth Parliament are advocating an electoral change that departs from the principle of one vote one value. Honourable members know that the Country Party wants this departure and that the Liberal Party wants it as far as it will react in its favour. Of course, under the Commonwealth Constitution it is not possible to perpetrate a gerrymander as has been done here, for that Constitution obliges Parliament to draw up electoral boundaries so that districts are nearly numerically equal as regards voters. The Premier then went on to discuss the Senate. This is something he always does, too. He said the Senate was not democratically elected—

Mr. Lawn: Because women got the vote!

Mr. JENNINGS: The fact women get a vote would certainly make it obnoxious to the Premier.

Mr. Shannon: Your Party favours retaining the Senate?

Mr. JENNINGS: We favour abolishing the Senate, and I assure the honourable member that we are in favour of abolishing the Upper House in this State, instead of inflicting a further burden on the people, as proposed in the Bill by adding a further four members to the Council. I do not think I need worry about abolishing or demolishing the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) as he is capable of doing that much more capably than I. The Premier has often talked about the Senate being elected undemocratically because it has ten members from each State. My Party does not necessarily agree with that principle. As I have just told the member for Onkaparinga, the Labor Party believes in abolishing the Senate.

Mr. Shannon: When was that passed by your Party.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Onkaparinga is out of order and he will be abolished if he is not careful.

Mr. JENNINGS: The way the Senate is elected is fairly obvious: a block vote of all the electors in each State. This produces a much better representation than in small districts where, by virtue of their composition, there can be a big majority for one Party in one seat and a small majority for the other party in another seat. Multiple voting, as for the Senate, gives a much better general reflection of how the people vote. The Premier also referred to the House of Lords. He said that, although there had been many Labor Governments (which is not true), they had done nothing to abolish the House of Lords, but what the Premier did not say, and what the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) very properly said this afternoon, is that today the House of Lords is little more than a debating chamber, and I do not think it is even of much importance as that. The House of Lords can do no more than hold up legislation. Many years ago, when this subject was being discussed in this House, the former member for Burnside accused the Attlee Government of gerrymandering the House of Lords by stacking it with Labor peers. This followed the Attlee Government's appointing of a few peers so that the Labor Government would have spokesmen in the House of Lords to explain its legislation.

The present Conservative Party Government has not interfered with the powers of the House of Lords, which powers were severely reduced by the Attlee Government. In fact, the present Government has made it possible for life peers to be appointed. The former member for Burnside, for all his solicitude on this subject, is no longer a member of this House. This does not do the Labor Party much good because his replacement is a member of the same political complexion, the only difference between them being that the present member for Burnside has no moustache.

It is proposed to have four extra members in the Legislative Council. The Labor Party has often said it intends to abolish the Legislative Council and I hope it will do so fairly soon. This legislation provides for four extra members in the other place. Our policy is 56 members in this House and—I cannot say “none” in the Legislative Council for there would be no Legislative Council; but, in spite of what the Premier said about an increase in the size that we advocate in this House, rather than provide for an extra number of politicians with little to do, in fact our proposal would reduce those and increase the number of effective members.

I cannot reply to anything that has been said on the other side because no member opposite has spoken. This proposal before us intends to reduce the number of metropolitan electors for each seat from an average of 25,567 to 18,349, and the rural seats will be about 7,000; but not the two country non-rural seats, which will be something entirely different—

Mr. Lawn: They will be 13,000.

Mr. JENNINGS: —because obviously they do return and will always return Labor members to this House. Indeed, those three important country towns in that area will now instead of having three seats have two between them. I know we shall take a vote on this matter shortly. I conclude by saying that the only purpose of this legislation is to perpetuate the gerrymander that has been inflicted on us for so long, for far too long, but which now is losing its effectiveness because of the change in the population of the State. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): Before I deal with this Bill, I should like if I may to take up two moments on what I believe was an unfortunate remark made by the honourable member who has just resumed his seat. He made a personal observation about the honourable member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele).

Mr. Shannon: Very crude.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There was no occasion to do that. The member for Burnside has given valuable service to this House and, if she does not speak quite so often as the honourable member for Enfield does, I can assure him that I would just as soon listen to her as I would listen to him. She makes up in quality for the volume generated by the honourable member when he speaks.

Honourable members opposite, I understand, oppose the Bill outright. I want to point out to the House what is involved in that. By not proposing to take the Bill into Committee to see what can be done with it, members opposite are proposing to defeat it outright. In the case of another somewhat controversial Bill at present before the House, I notice that honourable members having given considerable thought to it have decided that they will not oppose it outright but will amend it. I remind honourable members that when they oppose a Bill outright they oppose all the principles involved in it.

Mr. Clark: As you did with our electoral Bill!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We listened to what honourable members opposite had to say this afternoon without any interruptions. Let me develop my argument, as I have allowed members opposite to develop theirs—not perhaps with so much ability as honourable members opposite have displayed but, nevertheless, let me develop my ideas and express them. I wonder whether they have seen printed the remarks of their Commonwealth Leader to the effect that for some reason or other the Labor Party was not able to attract the votes of women at the last Commonwealth elections. It is rather significant that he has made those remarks at a moment when members of his own Party in this House without any thought are opposing what after all is an increase in the franchise of the Upper House by probably nearly doubling that franchise—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Probably 80 or 90 per cent of the increase would be in women voters.

Mr. Dunstan: We wanted to give everybody the vote, but you refused it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members opposite this afternoon have had a very good time and we on this side have not interrupted them. Apparently, they do not like what I am saying.

Mr. Ryan: I don't think you like it yourself!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Nevertheless it is true that the Opposition on the second reading will defeat a Bill the purpose of which is to give the housewife or home occupier the right to enrol for the Legislative Council. The second thing I want to say is that honourable members for many years—and particularly the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn)—have always said that the vote in this House has been gerrymandered.

Mr. Ryan: Can you deny it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) agrees with what I am saying. Their reason for saying that is that they say that the country vote is disproportionate to the vote of the city. The figures are usually quoted but they were not today because this Bill has an opposite effect; but they point out that in some of the smaller country electorates (for instance, the electorate of Frome, where the votes are fewer than 6,000) the votes are disproportionate to the votes in the larger districts, such as that represented by the Minister of Education where the votes are well over 30,000. I agree that it is disproportionate but I point out to the honourable members opposite that they are proposing in a few moments to vote for a continuance of that position.

Mr. Shannon: Exactly.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: They are proposing to vote for the present disproportion. They oppose this measure on the ground that they believe in one vote one value. They propose to say, as they have said on many occasions publicly, that they believe in the membership of this House being increased to 56 and that it should be arranged, as far as the Electoral Commission can do it, within 10 per cent of being one vote one value. The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) agrees that that is the position. Incidentally, it is not the position with regard to the voting rights in the honourable member's own Party, but we will not go into that because it is irrelevant to the debate and the Speaker would pull me up if I talked about the Labor Party's system of voting. I point out to the public and to some country members who probably have not taken the trouble to do the arithmetic involved in this suggestion that if it were carried into effect the great rural industries of this State would be represented in this House by only 15 or 16 members and the non-rural industries—the secondary industries—by 40 or 41 members. Incidentally, some of the members who complain about what is happening under the present system would not be here to complain in

the next Parliament because there would be no seats for them. If members take the trouble to do the arithmetic and look at the figures provided by the Electoral Commission they will see that there are about 538,000 electors in this State, which would give an electoral quota of a little over 9,600. Members have only to look at a quota of 9,600—if they like to get the actual figures regarding rural industries as determined by the commission, they will see that there are 145,000 rural votes—to see that 15 or 16 members would be representing the great primary industries. In other words, the development that is so essential to this State and the decentralization we hear so much about from time to time would completely fall down because of the lack of representation of country industries. It would be physically impossible because of distance for members to represent districts of the size that would be necessary in many parts of the State.

Members intending to vote against this Bill, which has the objective of increasing substantially the number of members in non-rural areas (in other words, reducing metropolitan quotas in some instances by nearly half), will be voting to preserve the present system. I emphasize that. They are therefore voting to prevent family duplication of the vote for the Legislative Council.

This afternoon three members presented petitions from country areas in relation to the proposed redistribution. The basis of these petitions, as I understood them without examining the scripts closely, was that there was to be the loss of one seat in the areas represented by the members who presented the petitions and that, instead of there being one from Whyalla, one from Port Augusta, and one from Port Pirie, there would be only two members from that area. It is rather interesting that on the one hand these members are objecting to a redistribution yet on the other hand the same members, as far as I know, took no steps whatever to put a case before the commission appointed by Parliament to consider this matter.

Mr. Ryan: Under your own terms and conditions.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As far as I know, the Party certainly did not do it, and that seems to me to be rather anomalous. If members opposite desired something different, they could have submitted a case. If they had done so, surely they would have had a much better case to argue in this House after having explored the avenues provided for them. I do not want to continue this

debate except to emphasize again that this Bill was designed to give very much greater equality of quotas than exists at present. It was also designed to give a vote to the housewife. Members opposite, because they have nailed their colours to the mast, will have nothing except 56 seats on a one vote one value basis, so they have not taken an opportunity to do something which in my opinion would have materially improved the present balance of the electoral system of this State; they have thrown it away without attempting by any amendment to improve the Bill. Members opposite know the procedure.

Mr. Dunstan: How do you alter the boundaries in the Bill when it has been before the commission? Be your age!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the member for Norwood desired to try to improve this Bill he would have been able to put forward instructions to the House to have that done. However, the Opposition has taken the view that it will defeat this measure. When I saw a report in the paper that the Opposition intended to defeat this Bill even to the extent of casting lots to have one member withdrawn from the Chamber, and when I saw later that one Opposition member unfortunately was ill and that lots would not have to be cast, I asked members of my Party, in the interests of saving time, (and I knew we did not have a Constitutional majority unless members Opposite were prepared to support the Bill) not to take up undue time debating this measure. However, that does not indicate that they are opposed to the Bill; I am sure that every one of them is very enthusiastic about it.

The SPEAKER: Pursuant to Standing Order 294, the section that refers to Constitutional amendments, I count the House. There being present more than an absolute majority of the whole number of the House, I put the question:

That this Bill be now read a second time. There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Turn the glass.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan,

Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Love-day, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

The SPEAKER: There are 19 Ayes and 17 Noes.

Second reading thus carried.

The SPEAKER: As the Constitutional provision requiring an absolute majority has not been complied with, the Bill cannot be proceeded with any further.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE BILL.

(Continued from February 18. Page 1968.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I bring up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence, and move:

That the report be received and printed. I do so, instead of moving that the report be received and read, because it will spare the Clerk from having to read the report which covers five pages of closely typed matter. With the report all the evidence and other papers will be on the table.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

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

Before "The" in the definition of "railway yards" to insert "section 368 of".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

After "of" first occurring in paragraph (c) of the definition of "the works" to insert "the northern side of that portion of North Terrace which lies between the projections of Morphett Street and George Street, so much of".

The amendment extends the works to include work on portions on the northern side of North Terrace, a work envisaged by the City Council, as part of the whole scheme. The Government was not aware of the position until the matter was investigated by the Select Committee.

Mr. SHANNON: I suspected that the Select Committee would run into problems, and I do not know that as yet all have been uncovered. I am still to be convinced that we are wise in making the entry from our northern areas into the city proper in what is virtually the centre of the city. During the second reading debate I said there could be possibly a connection from the northern areas, around the boundary of the parklands at North Adelaide, with West Terrace. This would have provided for traffic

not destined for the city but for places south and north of the city. It would not have precluded the entry of traffic into the city proper along Currie Street and other streets to the north. I believe we are making a mistake in endeavouring to bring traffic into the Hindley Street-Morphett Street intersection. Probably the Select Committee in this matter has taken the line of least resistance. I think that finally we shall have to adopt the West Terrace link, but in saying that I know I am opposed to the considered opinion of many experts. I am not denying that. I doubt whether the West Terrace proposition was properly considered and whether it was thoroughly investigated in this issue. I have relatives living in the Elizabeth area, and when travelling to see them I use the by-pass from Glen Osmond and do not go through the city. I use the ring road so that I am not embarrassed with traffic. As a community we have to consider the north-south access roads because they are our major problem. West Terrace is a marvellous boulevard, but it is being discarded in this proposition. I may have temerity in opposing the Select Committee's findings because they heard evidence from the people concerned, but I am sure that we are not doing the right thing.

Mr. CUMBE: Although the Select Committee was limited under the Bill, and did not have to consider other alternatives, realizing that it was an important project costing about £1,500,000, the committee, of its own volition and to enable it to report fully to the House, considered several alternatives and heard evidence from other parties. The committee made a thorough investigation and explored other avenues within its power to enable it to come to a considered decision.

Mr. Riches: How can a Select Committee do that in the time?

Mr. CUMBE: A Select Committee is limited in what it can do, but this committee had as many meetings and took evidence from as many witnesses as it could; it inspected the site and also a model of the suggested bridge and, after due consideration, presented its report. I did not move that the report be read because it contains five closely typewritten pages. The committee investigated the proposition suggested by the member for Onkaparinga. That bridge would cross the railway yards and the Torrens Lake at their widest part, and would then cut at an angle across the parklands to Jeffcott Street. I know this part well because it is in my district. This would be an extremely expensive undertaking.

If the member for Onkaparinga reads the Town Planner's report on Adelaide he will notice that West Terrace is to connect with the inner ring around the city proper. The Morphett Street bridge, irrespective of any other projects, will still have to be built. At present there are three major north-south outlets only into and from the City of Adelaide, the Albert bridge at Frome Road, the Adelaide bridge at King William Street, and the Victoria bridge connecting with the Morphett Street bridge. At present the Morphett Street bridge has one lane of traffic in each direction. Under the proposed scheme the bridge will carry three lanes in each direction, the same carrying capacity for which the major freeways and highways are being built. The life of the Morphett Street bridge is limited and its maintenance cost is high, and it will have to be replaced within a few years. Honourable members will realize that this project will have to be carried out irrespective of what is done in any part of the city, because it will carry a large volume of traffic direct from Hindley Street, an important commercial and shopping area of Adelaide, directly out of the city. This will reduce the volume of traffic travelling along King William Road. I suggest that this is the most adequate way to provide a suitable outlet for city traffic. Although other alternatives were investigated the committee agreed that this proposal was the most efficient and cheapest means of handling that traffic.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I assure the member for Onkaparinga that the proposed work is not one of the main arterial road works projected for city traffic. Much traffic comes to the city and an examination of the congestion at the corner of North Terrace and King William Street in peak hours clearly emphasizes the need of another north-south route from the city. Information which is now being prepared on the main arterial routes proposed to carry through traffic and to divert traffic from the densely trafficked areas will be released soon. That information was studied before this project was recommended. The Government would not spend £1,500,000 unless it were absolutely necessary. This project is the only way at present of relieving the traffic congestion from North Terrace and West Terrace. The honourable member suggested that the bridge should connect with West Terrace but traffic counts indicate that West Terrace is already overloaded at peak periods and certainly would not be suitable as a main arterial road.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I doubt whether anyone uses West Terrace and King William Street more than I do, so I am familiar with the traffic congestion. I agree with the member for Onkaparinga that sooner or later West Terrace will have to be further widened to cope with traffic requirements. West Terrace lends itself to widening, unlike most of our other terraces and streets. Whilst the member for Torrens referred to the Morphett Street bridge he was more concerned with the northern approaches rather than the southern approaches. I may have misunderstood the Premier but I believe he said that there was to be a limit on the land to be acquired north of Hindley Street.

Mr. Shannon: Part of North Terrace will have to be acquired.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Land will have to be acquired on the western side of the bridge from North Terrace to Light Square if the project is to be worthwhile. The Premier referred to future arterial roads. In this regard one should consider the totally inadequate Hilton bridge. Continual expenditure will be required on that bridge until a new permanent bridge is constructed. This will involve the acquisition of land down to Fisher Terrace, but this project will become more vital as our traffic increases. Perth has not spared itself expense in preparing for its future traffic requirements. At present it is planning for the further reclamation of the Swan River to provide a bridge additional to The Narrows bridge. It is also planning a freeway to take traffic 32ft. about Murray Street, Hay Street and the railway line, to South Perth. That will involve the expenditure of about £8,500,000. If Perth can afford such expenditure on projects due for completion by 1975, surely Adelaide can afford similar expenditure in meeting its future requirements! These factors should be considered now so that we will not be condemned by posterity.

Mr. LAUCKE: During the second reading debate I agreed with the views expressed by the member for Onkaparinga about the take-off point of a bridge from West Terrace. I have tried to take a long-range view, and the time will come when it will be necessary to have an exit from West Terrace to North Adelaide. The Morphett Street bridge proposal is a temporary measure to meet present needs arising from the traffic congestion on existing bridges over the Torrens. It does not view future requirements. We should look beyond the needs of this generation. I view with trepidation the proposal to expend £1,500,000 now and not to have as effective an outlet as could be provided.

(admittedly with higher expenditure) from a take-off point at West Terrace. I think that in the time of many of us we shall find it necessary to have further main exits linking up from West Terrace to North Adelaide. I realize that we are committed to the present conclusion in this matter, but I feel it my duty to reiterate that we must not look just at the needs or requirements of this generation: we should plan in order that we can provide for the undoubted numbers of vehicles that will be running on our roads in the next generation or two.

Mr. HEASLIP: I suppose I use this road as much as anybody in the House, and no doubt the Leader of the Opposition also uses it a great deal. I think the issue has been clouded by too much talk about a north-south by-pass for Adelaide. This bridge is intended not for that but for an exit from and inlet to Adelaide itself. If a bridge continued from West Terrace over the railway line and over the river, we would only be further crowding a road that has already been widened to double its previous width; it was really congested before and now it has become congested again, and it could not possibly take extra traffic. Under the town planning provisions, people coming from the south to the north of Adelaide will not even go into West Terrace, nor do we want them to do so. A ring route exists through Torrensville, a continuation almost of South Road, and we want people coming from the south to the north of Adelaide to by-pass the city.

The purpose of the proposed bridge is to allow the people to enter and leave Adelaide much more freely than they can now do. The congestion caused by traffic travelling along King William Street to the north of Adelaide over the City bridge will thus be overcome. I cannot see anything wrong with the measure. I consider that it is a good move and that the £1,500,000 will be well spent. If we do not spend that money now it will certainly have to be spent later.

Mr. CASEY: As a country member coming into the city I, too, am aware of the congestion at some of the busy intersections in Adelaide. If we widen the Morphett Street bridge we shall still be running traffic into Hindley Street, which, in my opinion, will be a one-way traffic street in years to come, and I do not think that will be beneficial for people coming in or going out of the city. I consider that an overway from Light Square over Hindley Street would be feasible and useful, for such an overway would divert traffic from a narrow Hindley Street. We

have to look to the future. If I had my way, Hindley and Rundle streets would be one-way streets today. This has to come eventually, just as it has in the case of Pitt and Castlereagh Streets in Sydney. It would not be satisfactory from the motorists' point of view for all the traffic from Morphett Street to come into a one-way street, and in my opinion the only way to overcome the problem is to route traffic over the top of Hindley Street to and from Light Square.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have been considering project that will cost about £1,500,000 or possibly a bit more, and this expenditure will provide for something that will last for generations, or at least a generation. My only regret is that we had such a little time to consider a project of such magnitude. The committee, of which I was a member, had its first meeting last Thursday, and it also met yesterday morning and again this morning. However, I am quite satisfied from the investigations that we have made and the evidence that we have taken that this is a perfectly proper and satisfactory proposition. Criticism has been levelled tonight about two things. The first criticism—and this was the story of the members for Onkaparinga and Barossa—was that the prolongation of West Terrace northwards should have been further considered. That alternative was dealt with and rejected in the report of the Town Clerk of Adelaide for these reasons: If we go directly north from the corner of West Terrace and North Terrace we pass across the railway yards and the river at a wide point where a bridge would be extremely expensive. We then have to go across the golf course, and although this to me is a secondary point it would spoil the golf course. The most important objection to that proposal is that it really does not lead anywhere; if the member for Barossa and other members look closely at the matter they will find that a prolongation directly north from West Terrace does not lead anywhere and is just not a workable proposition. If instead of that—and this was a proposal that we also considered—West Terrace from the junction of North Terrace is continued to link with Jeffcott Street, then there is a little more in it. However, there are still the other two objections, namely, the greatly increased expenditure because of the length of the bridge necessary to cross the river, and also the secondary point that it would go straight through the golf course, which in itself is probably not a good thing.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It would cause another intersection.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. It would be far more expensive, would have the other objections and drawbacks that have been mentioned, and would give us nothing that this present proposition does not provide. I consider that the suggestion of the prolongation of West Terrace is out. The other criticism that has been voiced here is as to where south-bound traffic across the bridge will end up. I have the plan here, and I can tell the Committee that the new works will provide a carriageway across the bridge itself of 70ft.—quite a wide carriageway. However, when south-bound traffic comes down the ramp between North Terrace and Hindley Street it will disgorge on to a thoroughfare with a carriageway of 139ft. when the work is completed, which is very wide.

Mr. Shannon: Leading where?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: First, into Hindley Street. There is a special provision for a little feed-off road to the east up Crippen Place and into Hindley Street to cut off the corner, but that width of 139ft. will continue south of Hindley Street through to Light Square. Although, on the recommendation of the committee, it is not specifically embodied in this project, the council has plans to acquire property on the western side of Morphett Street, between Hindley Street and Currie Street, so as to increase the width of that roadway again to 139ft. I am perfectly satisfied that that width will be sufficient to carry traffic across Hindley Street in a southerly direction into Light Square. Light Square is in the centre of the north-west segment of the city and no traffic problem exists there because Currie Street, which runs east and west, is a good, relatively wide street and Light Square, of course, can cope with the traffic. I suggest that south bound traffic coming in along this road will be properly catered for and this will not create a bottleneck for traffic coming into the city.

Mr. Casey: Would you say that the traffic would be better off going straight into Light Square, rather than converging into Hindley Street?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Traffic could do either one or the other with no difficulty. Whether traffic is one-way or not, it can take its choice between turning into Hindley Street or going straight across. This is a big project and I do not blame anybody for commenting on it, for it is something that will set the pattern

of traffic in this city for some time to come—perhaps a generation. I am satisfied, after working harder than I have ever worked before on a Select Committee, that this is the best project and I hope the Committee will accept the Select Committee's assurance that it has looked at all the points that have been raised tonight and has for good and sufficient reason rejected them in favour of the plan embodied in the Bill.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I agree with everything the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said. The Select Committee carefully considered all the points that have been raised tonight and directed many questions to the experts. What the member for Mitcham said about the proposal for the prolongation of West Terrace is true and the Select Committee was convinced to a man that this proposal led to nowhere and would have been far more costly than the Morphett Street bridge proposal. I regret the time for making inquiries was limited but the fullest possible inquiries were made and all members of the Select Committee applied themselves with energy and exercised their ability to the full in arriving at a decision. I am sure that the witnesses were completely honest and gave us the benefit of their expert knowledge. I am convinced that the Morphett Street bridge proposal is the soundest of the proposals that have been submitted.

Mr. SHANNON: I never like to make up my mind in a hurry about such a major project. I have never thought it wise to make a recommendation hastily about a matter that will involve the people of South Australia for some generations ahead. The honourable member for Mitcham referred to one generation being affected by this proposal. However, the Bill deals with a bridge to convey three lanes of traffic and will cost £1,500,000 and somebody will have to pay the piper if only one generation has the benefit of this expenditure. The proposal will have an effect on traffic not for a generation, but for a hundred years hence. I believe that it is about time Parliament appointed a special committee to deal with all aspects of public and private transport in and around the metropolitan area. It is high time Parliament was bold enough to look at this problem in the light of the report from the Town Planning Committee and consider what is likely to happen in 10, 20, 30 or 40 years' time. As yet I have not heard how much the prolongation of West Terrace would cost. All we have been told is that it would be expensive.

Mr. Millhouse: I have told you more than that.

Mr. SHANNON: If the Select Committee knows the cost of the West Terrace proposal its duty is to disclose it to the Committee. If it does not have a figure then it should admit it. No figure has been given for the acquisition of D. & J. Fowler's property. Honourable members do not know whether portion or the whole of this property must be acquired or whether that firm would be happy to sell half of the factory between North Terrace and Hindley Street. We do not know whether it will be possible to buy portion of the Overway Hotel and not the whole, or whether the portion left will be of sufficient size to make it saleable. At the moment these factors are imponderable and no answers have been offered to the questions raised. It would do no harm if the Committee decided to hold a proper investigation into the whole problem of traffic in the metropolitan area. I do not want it thought that I consider that the matter should be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee, because I do not believe that is the appropriate body to deal with it. An expert body should be set up. I do not want to nominate the members—there is no need to—but some obvious names spring to mind immediately. After all, public transport, railways and tramways come into it, as do the police, who have to look after these things. If we have to do some planning for the future and do not do it now, but do it patch on patch like Paddy's pants, we shall be in a mess. Under this Bill we are perhaps spending much Government money on a problem that finally will not be resolved.

I can envisage decanting three lanes of traffic coming in from the north towards Hindley Street. It has to be decanted into Hindley Street, or Currie Street to the east or Currie Street to the west. These three streams of traffic at this juncture will create certain problems. This matter should be investigated by a competent body of people who can report to Parliament what in their opinion is the right thing to do.

Mr. HARDING: Briefly, I support the amendment. I am of the opinion that we lag far behind Western Australia in our proposals for freeways in and out of the city. I agree with what the member for Onkaparinga has just said. I have not yet heard of any suggestion that even at Light Square there should be a parking area to accommodate these three lanes

of traffic coming into and going out of the city. This matter is not so urgent that it cannot wait another month or three months before being agreed upon.

Mr. McANANEY: As a member of the Select Committee I congratulate those members of the committee who have spoken and covered most points. The member for Onkaparinga suggested getting expert opinion on this matter, but we asked the Highways Department and the Police Department about it, and their attitude was that they had no interest in the actual count of city traffic. The City Council itself appears to be the only authority that keeps these records on city traffic. The problem that this bridge has to solve is getting people in and out of Adelaide. The problem of through traffic will be solved by an inner ring that is already being considered. I thought that an overway over Hindley Street and into Light Square was a good idea until the City Engineer, who was responsible for the count and control of traffic, pointed out that, if we put an overway over Hindley Street and endeavoured to speed up the traffic in that street, we would not accomplish much because the volume of that traffic was controlled by the other city squares and corners. We would not speed up the traffic along Hindley Street by means of an overway and, if Morphett Street were widened to the advocated width, it would give rise to a great volume of traffic across Hindley Street because eight to 10 cars would be going across there and the traffic would not be held up. An overway would be of no advantage. The cost quoted by an engineer for a suggested overway was about £500,000, but he could not cite any advantages arising from the expenditure of that money.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

After "Morphett Street" first occurring in paragraph (c) to insert "as lies north of Hindley Street".

This is a recommendation of the Select Committee. The purpose of it is to define more precisely the part of Morphett Street concerned.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

After paragraph (c) to insert the following new paragraph:

(cl) the opening, forming and making of a public street not exceeding thirty feet in width leading from Crippen Place to Hindley Street;

The purpose of this amendment is to include in the definition of "the works" a small by-pass street leading into Hindley Street without going around the hotel corner.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Plans to be approved."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

To strike out "said bridge" first occurring and to insert "works".

This means that all the works, and not only the Morphett Street bridge, will have to be approved by the Minister. This amendment is recommended by the Select Committee.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Entry upon railway property."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

After "Commissioner" first occurring to insert "(in this section referred to as 'the said Commissioner')".

This is purely a drafting amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Financial provision."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

After "shall" second occurring in sub-clause (3) to insert "be liable to".

This, too, is a drafting amendment. It has been suggested by the Parliamentary Draftsman to make it clear that the council does not pay interest on outstanding indebtedness to the Government as and when such interest accrues.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

After "date" in subclause (3) to insert "after the thirtieth day of June in the year in which the works are completed".

This amendment was also suggested by the Parliamentary Draftsman to make it clear that the City Council shall not be called upon to make any payments to the Government until after the completion of the works. This is in accordance with the understanding reached with the council.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

Before "thirtieth" second occurring in sub-clause (3) to insert "said" and after "June" second occurring to strike out "in the year in which the works are completed".

These amendments are both consequential on the amendments just carried.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

After "Treasurer" last occurring in sub-clause (3) to insert "Notwithstanding any provisions of the Local Government Act to the contrary, the Council is by this Act authorized to take all steps necessary to enable it to discharge its indebtedness under this subsection."

This amendment was asked for by the City Council to make it quite clear that the council could make repayments in connection with this matter without in any way infringing the Local Government Act.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

TRADES HALL BILL.

(Continued from February 18. Page 1962.)

Mr. LOVEDAY brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT.

1. In the course of its inquiry, your committee met on two occasions, and took evidence from the following witnesses:

Hon. A. J. Shard, M.L.C., Chairman of Trustees of the Trades Hall, Adelaide;
Mr. D. F. Collins, Registrar-General of Deeds; and
Dr. W. A. Wynes, Parliamentary Draftsman.

2. Advertisements were inserted in the daily press inviting persons desirous of submitting evidence on the Bill to appear before the committee. There was no response to these advertisements.

3. Your committee is of the opinion that there is no objection to the Bill, and recommends that it be passed in its present form.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SEMAPHORE COMMUNITY CENTRE TRUST DEED BILL.

(Continued from February 18. Page 1962.)

Mr. BOCKELBERG brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT.

1. In the course of its inquiry, your committee met on two occasions and took evidence from the following persons:

Mr. D. T. Bampton, Secretary/Trustee of the Semaphore and Port Adelaide R.S.S. and A.I.L.A. and Citizens' World War II Memorial Community Centre and Town Clerk of the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide.

Mr. L. J. King, solicitor, representing the R.S.S. and A.I.L.A.

Mr. M. F. Fendler, Secretary, Semaphore and Port Adelaide Sub-branch of the R.S.S. and A.I.L.A.

Dr. W. A. Wynes, Parliamentary Draftsman.

2. An inspection of areas affected by the Bill was also made.

3. Advertisements inserted in *The Advertiser* and *The News* inviting interested persons to give evidence before the committee brought no response.

4. The committee is of the opinion that there is no objection to the Bill, and recommends that it be passed, with two minor amendments made necessary because it was overlooked in preparation that the Treasury bonds mentioned in the preamble of the Bill had already matured and been realized.

The amendments suggested are as follows:
Page 2, line 27 (clause 3)—After "money"

insert "so much of"

Page 2, line 28 (clause 3)—After "fund"
insert "as does not consist of money"

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Insertion of new clauses in Trust Deed."

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

After "money" in new clause 3a (b) to insert "so much of"; and after "fund" first occurring to insert "as does not consist of money".

The explanation for these amendments has already been given.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Preamble and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 26, at 2 p.m.