

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 29, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I address a question to the Premier in the absence of the Attorney-General, although I believe it involves a question of policy and perhaps the question should be considered by the Premier. For some months applications made by members for the appointment of justices of the peace have not been dealt with. I have had several applications by police officers so that the normal work of the courts in the districts concerned can proceed. However, I believe a new policy has been introduced by the Government for the appointment of justices of the peace and, consequently, there has been some dislocation in certain districts concerning these appointments. This morning I received a letter from a district council about this matter. Can the Premier say whether the Government can expedite the appointment of justices of the peace, particularly where they are necessary for the execution of court work?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not an authority on this, but I know from past experience that it has not always been possible to have even emergency appointments made, and that in other cases there have been long delays. I am prepared to consider the matter to see whether an understanding can be reached, particularly where emergency appointments are concerned.

PRICES COMMISSIONER.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Premier say whether an appointment has been made to the vacant position of Prices Commissioner?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Applications for the position of South Australian Prices Commissioner, which will become vacant when Mr. Murphy's resignation takes effect on July 30, 1965, closed on July 27. The applications received are now being considered by the Public Service Commissioner, and I might mention that quite a number of applications have been received. Mr. L. H. Baker has been acting as Prices Commissioner since July 2, 1965, when Mr. Murphy ceased active duty, and in Executive Council today Mr. Baker was appointed Temporary South Australian Prices Commissioner, to enable him to carry out the duties of the office until a selection and

an appointment is made from the applications received. I mention the further point that according to the Prices Act and in terms of advice I have received from the Public Service Commissioner it is not practicable to have an Acting Prices Commissioner. Consequently, it was necessary to do what has been done.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: My question deals with the payment for repairing and maintaining assets purchased by school organizations for use at schools and which have been vested in the department. Some years ago Angaston Primary School organizations raised a considerable amount of money for building a swimming pool at the school and this pool has been extremely useful to the scholars. In recent times, some repairs became necessary, particularly to the single-phase motor that operates the swimming pool equipment and a bill for £25 6s. 8d. was received for repairs. The school committee forwarded an account for this amount to the department but a letter dated July 20, in the following terms, was received:

I have to advise that the department does not accept responsibility for these repairs and payment should be made out of school funds. Will the Minister of Education say whether his department will meet the cost of these repairs, or at least grant a subsidy towards the cost?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be happy to examine the matter for the honourable member and bring down a reply.

A.G.C. (INSURANCES) LIMITED.

Mr. BROOMHILL: A.G.C. (Insurances) Limited, a company carrying on business in Adelaide but apparently incorporated in New South Wales, does not exhibit outside its registered office or state on its bill heads the place where it is incorporated. As section 350 of the Companies Act, 1962, requires this to be done, will the Minister of Education ask his colleague, the Attorney-General, to have this company comply with that Act?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague to examine this matter with a view to having that done.

BARLEY BOARD.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked some time ago concerning the appointment of an Acting Chairman of the Barley Board while the Chairman is overseas?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that Executive Council this morning agreed to the appointment of Mr. J. J. Honner as Acting Chairman in the absence of Mr. Strickland overseas.

PORT PIRIE TO PORT BROUGHTON ROAD.

Mr. McKEE: My question refers to the Port Pirie to Port Broughton road which commences in my district and which runs through your district, Mr. Speaker, and also that of the member for Gouger. Naturally, I hope I receive no objections to my asking this question. I referred this matter to the previous Government; I understand that a scheme was formulated to have the road sealed, and that some survey work has been carried out. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads obtain any information he can regarding this project, and ascertain whether any steps have been taken to carry out this scheme?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague for the information.

BEEF ROADS.

Mr. CASEY: On a recent visit to Melbourne I made representations to the Acting Prime Minister (Mr. McEwen) through his private secretary in an endeavour to press for the Commonwealth Government's aid for our beef roads in the Far North of this State. Has the Minister of Works any information whether my representations have had any positive effect on the Commonwealth authorities?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received no official information on this matter, although I have heard something over the grapevine, and I understand that in the near future the Commonwealth Government will authorize an investigation consequent on the honourable member's representations. I will make strenuous efforts to see that if and when the Commonwealth Government's representatives arrive they will be accompanied by the appropriate people in South Australia, so that we may obtain the best possible results.

KANGAROO CREEK RESERVOIR.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yesterday the Minister of Works brought down a comprehensive report on progress on the Chowilla dam, which I am sure was appreciated by all honourable members, and which will be particularly useful. Another project requiring immediate attention is the Kangaroo Creek reservoir, where certain technical difficulties

were encountered. Earlier plans for this project had to be modified because of a geological fault discovered after the first designs were drawn up. Has the Minister of Works any information regarding the progress of work on this project, whether the difficulties encountered have been overcome, and whether it is still possible, if not at the precise site originally chosen but at a nearby site, to build the reservoir satisfactorily? I am sure that with the present water problems facing the metropolitan area, which are causing the Minister and his department much concern, there is a widespread interest in this project that would augment the metropolitan water supply. Further, can the Minister say whether the Kangaroo Creek reservoir can be constructed on the double-arch principle which was originally contemplated, or whether it would have to be a gravity arch or some other form of construction?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the question and particularly the final remarks made by the honourable member about anxiety concerning the present metropolitan water supply position. It is fairly serious and, as a press report indicates, I said yesterday that we would have to start pumping almost immediately at great cost to the State. It is important that we get on with constructing reservoirs according to the programme. I do not think the honourable member would expect me to have a detailed report at this stage, but I will get a report and inform him next week if I have obtained it so he may ask a further question, which I shall be pleased to answer.

BLACK FOREST HOUSE.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on June 23 concerning vandalism at a house in Forest Avenue, Black Forest?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The land in question is a quarter of a mile from the Black Forest school and is about 1½ acres in area. Adjoining it is another block that is in the process of being acquired with a view to providing a total area of 2½ acres. The 1½ acres in Forest Avenue was purchased in 1961 as a site for a future infants school. At that time the total area of the Black Forest school was just a little over four acres for an enrolment of 830 children in the primary and infants schools. The Master of Method, Black Forest Demonstration School, has advised recently that the house is in a very dilapidated condition and is steadily deteriorating. There is no front fence and all doors and windows are broken.

This land could be used to advantage as an additional playing area by children of the Black Forest school until a new infants school is built on it. I have therefore approved of a recommendation that the Director of the Public Buildings Department be asked to have the cottage demolished and removed, a cyclone fence with access gates erected along the 164 feet frontage, and the land graded to make it suitable as a playing area.

GILLES STREET SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: For some time a class has been operative at the Gilles Street school for deaf, blind children and, in passing, I pay a tribute to the teachers for the devotion and care they are giving to these children who are so tragically handicapped. To facilitate the teaching of these children, alterations and additions have been approved by the Education Department and have been referred to the Public Buildings Department for execution. The need is both great and urgent, and I ask the Minister of Works whether he will have inquiries made so that the necessary work can be expedited.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be most happy to do that and to inform the honourable member of the outcome.

MINIMUM DRIVING AGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the earlier part of this month, when the House was not sitting, there was a report in the *Advertiser* (on July 9) regarding a meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council in Perth, at which a report recommending various alterations in road traffic laws in the various States was adopted. This report contains some specific proposals which it was said would now be considered by the States. One in particular is the raising to 17 years of the age at which driving licences may be obtained; this would be a raising of the age in this State. Will the Premier say whether the Government has yet considered the various proposals in the report? If it has, will he say whether it intends to introduce legislation this session to adopt some or all of them, and, if some, which proposals?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: These matters are being considered by Cabinet.

ELIZABETH AND SALISBURY SCHOOLS.

Mr. CLARK: New high schools are projected at Elizabeth West and Salisbury East to augment secondary school accommodation in those areas. Because of the rapid growth

of those districts more accommodation will soon be urgently needed. Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made on these two schools? Have contracts been let for their erection, and about when will the schools be ready for occupation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Contracts for the erection of the new high schools at Elizabeth West and Salisbury East have been let this month. The contract for the Elizabeth West High School was let on July 19 to A. H. May Proprietary Ltd. and the contract time is 78 working weeks. The contract for the building of the Salisbury East High School was let on July 15 to A. V. Jennings Industries (Aust.) Limited. The contract time for building is 68 working weeks. In view of the contract times for these schools, it is hoped that they will be ready for occupation at the beginning of the 1967 school year.

NURSES' CAR PARKING.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent questions regarding extra car parking facilities for nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague has provided the following reply:

Previously Frome Road, except for a section at the southern end near North Terrace where the hour limit applied, was available for unlimited parking and was such that the council, having regard to its overall policy, included the section from North Terrace to Victoria Drive within the 4-hour limit area in order to make the spaces available to a greater number of people. Parking on the basis of four hours for 1s. is being enforced in the section between the pedestrian crossing near the medical school and North Terrace, and meters have been installed to facilitate the supervision of the time limit. With the installation of these meters the hour limit previously referred to was eliminated. Since the installation of meters cars have been required to park parallel with the water table and/or kerb between North Terrace and Victoria Drive. The council has no evidence of nurses having been molested at night because of their inability to park their cars near the nurses' home.

The Hospitals Department approached the Education Department about parking space being made available on land in Frome Road, which land it thought was under the control of the Education Department. Upon inquiry however, it was found that the land was under the control of the South Australian Institute of Technology, and the request has now been referred to the institute.

BORDERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On May 18 I asked the Minister of Education where matriculation classes would be established for the 1966 school year. I saw the statement that had been made about this matter but, as no reference was made to Bordertown High School in which I was particularly interested, I again referred

the matter to the Minister. I understand that he can now explain why Bordertown High School is unable to obtain a matriculation class for 1966.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The present enrolments and the estimated enrolments for next year at the Bordertown High School are as follows:

	1st Year.	2nd Year.	3rd Year.	4th Year.	5th Year.	Total.
1965	73	94	73	33	—	273
1966 (estimated) . . .	83	72	85	37	—	277

At the present time there is a staff of 16 full-time teachers and one on a part-time basis. This staff is fully occupied in meeting the needs of the present number of classes. It is clear from the figures mentioned above that the present number of classes must be maintained. In consequence, if another 15 students are added from the fifth-year matriculation (assuming 12 from Bordertown and three from Keith), it is clear that at least one teacher, and preferably two additional teachers, would be required to provide the additional classes that would have to be established.

So far as the quality and competence of the present staff is concerned, I believe the present staff could handle all likely subjects for fifth-year matriculation with the exception of chemistry. On the other hand, if the teachers concerned were assigned to teach their subjects to the fifth-year matriculation class, it is obvious that gaps would be left in the lower years. As these gaps must, of course, be filled, it is clear that we would still be faced with the necessity of providing one extra teacher. We are so acutely short of secondary staff that this additional teacher could not be provided except at the expense of another school.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yesterday the Attorney-General was good enough to table a docket concerning the appointment of a public relations officer. That docket, however, does not contain the applications of those applying for the position from within the Public Service and elsewhere. Will the Premier be good enough to table these other documents and the details of their processing by the Public Service Commissioner?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In the absence of the Attorney-General, I do not feel disposed at the moment to interfere in his records, but I will refer the question to him on his return.

ARTERIOSCLEROSIS.

Mr. HURST: I understand that the Minister of Health arranged recently for the honourable member for Adelaide to discuss with doctors at the Royal Melbourne Hospital the treatment of arteriosclerosis. Can the honourable member inform the House of the outcome of those discussions?

Mr. LAWN: I left Adelaide on July 11 by arrangement with the Minister of Health, who had arranged for me to see the surgeon in charge of the treatment of arteriosclerosis at the Royal Melbourne Hospital. Mr. Neil Johnson met me at the hospital on Monday afternoon (July 12) and introduced me to the Superintendent of the hospital, Dr. Jamieson, and a Mr. Flanc. Mr. Johnson told me that he had performed nine of these operations on patients suffering from arteriosclerosis, using air and oxygen, and it is intended at the Royal Melbourne Hospital, under his direction, to set up a clinic for treatment as outpatients of those patients suffering from this disease.

Mr. Flanc has been appointed by Mr. Johnson to do research on this and to supervise the development of all the equipment necessary, in conjunction with a Professor Ewing, and the treatment will be along the lines of that practised at Kassel in West Germany. I mentioned the views expressed here last year by certain doctors in South Australia: first, that they knew of a case that occurred many years ago in France of a bubble developing and going to the brain; secondly, that the continual puncturing of the artery would weaken the arterial wall. The reply I have received is that the result overseas is such that it cannot be refuted.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Has Melbourne got the machine?

Mr. LAWN: No. The nine cases I mentioned have been treated by manual injection. It is proposed that Mr. Flanc, in company

with Professor Ewing, will carry out the research and the development of all the equipment necessary, along the lines used in Germany. Those two people—one a surgeon and the other a professor—will have installed and will develop all the necessary equipment to treat arteriosclerosis patients at the Royal Melbourne Hospital, in a way similar to that adopted and practised in West Germany. Mr. Johnson also referred to me another paper about which I had not heard, written by three doctors in Canada—Dr. Baird and two others—and he told me that any member of the medical profession who read that paper could not be opposed to the method of treatment. He is full of confidence that the method will succeed, and he told me they would know definitely within 12 months.

COUNTRY BUILDING DEPOTS.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning the proposed locations for extensions of the Public Buildings Department in the country?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director, Public Buildings Department, has informed me that it is proposed to establish depots in the metropolitan area (subject to the acquisition of suitable sites) in each of the following locations: City and North Adelaide area; eastern suburbs; western suburbs; northern suburbs; and southern suburbs. Country depots are proposed for Nuriootpa, Port Pirie, Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, Murray Bridge, and Berri. It is also proposed that sub-depots will be established at Kadina, Port Augusta, Naracoorte, and Whyalla. I want to mention that some tradesmen and contractors in the country areas have expressed concern that the establishment of these depots may deprive them of work that they have obtained in the past. However, I make it clear that the intention of the department is to marshal and to seek the co-operation and assistance of established firms to enable the department more readily and promptly to carry out other works in country areas.

DRAINAGE BORES.

Mr. RODDA: A drainage bore, recently sunk at the Naracoorte High School, and two others immediately adjacent to it apparently are not functioning in the manner for which they were designed. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask his colleague, the Minister of Mines, to ascertain whether the geological characteristics of this area are such that with

the deepening of these bores the accumulated floodwaters in the area could be dispersed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague.

SCHOOL FIRE HAZARDS.

Mrs. BYRNE: In view of the many temporary classrooms that have been erected for the Education Department at State schools, can the Minister of Education say whether those buildings are a fire hazard? Also, can he indicate the number of fires, if any, that have occurred in State schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am pleased to get this question from the honourable member, because from time to time the argument has been advanced that timber frame classrooms are a serious fire hazard, and this argument is sometimes used for their rapid removal. The number of timber frame classrooms at present is more than 5,000. One fire occurred during the past three years in school hours—it was deliberately lit by a student—and four fires occurred outside school hours. Referring to escape measures and precautions, manual training teachers in country centres have installed emergency exits, hopper windows and drop-out panels to a standard design, as required in timber frame classrooms in schools where they are stationed, and at schools adjacent to these centres. In all other cases the Public Buildings Department has checked and installed emergency exits in timber classrooms. In addition, during the past 12 months the Public Buildings Department has supplied fire extinguishers to schools on various bases, and the kind of extinguisher for the different types of classroom is appropriate to the classroom. In 1961 evacuation tests from timber classrooms were conducted at one high school, and as a result the Chief Fire Officer reported as follows:

These tests have convinced all present that there is no reason to alter our former opinion, as during school hours there was no apparent danger of children being involved by fire, as pupils were under the supervision of a teacher and at the slightest sign of fire all children would be evacuated from the classroom a considerable time before the fire could reach a state whereby the safety of personnel would be involved.

Because of the facts revealed in the report, I think we can say without fear of contradiction that the fire danger to children in school hours through the use of timber classrooms is small indeed, and is certainly much less than many of the every-day hazards to which children are exposed in the normal course of living.

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS.

Mr. COUMBE: Some confusion and difficulty has been experienced by honourable members in keeping themselves acquainted with the numerous grants now received by the State from the Commonwealth Government for various educational purposes. Will the Minister of Education provide a schedule showing the various grants now made by the Commonwealth Government covering scientific, technical, tertiary and university fields in this State?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that, and will include information on scholarships.

RENMARK RIVER FRONTAGE.

Mr. CURREN: On April 9 this year I introduced to the Minister of Works a deputation from the Renmark corporation concerning the collapse of the river frontage at Renmark. The Minister promised to have an investigation made and to have plans drawn by engineers in his department. Can he say what progress has been made in the drawing of these plans?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Speaking from memory, I understand that the Engineering and Water Supply Department was to draw plans to aid the Renmark corporation in the rehabilitation of the river frontage. I believe that Mr. Ligertwood has conferred with the Town Clerk, and I am convinced that some work has been done, although I do not know how much. I will obtain a report and inform the honourable member.

PORT ELLIOT ROAD.

Mr. McANANEY: The District Council of Port Elliot is reconstructing the road to the barrages and, as the Minister of Works is aware, it is anxious to use sand from adjoining Engineering and Water Supply Department land. It asked the department to reconsider the decision not to make the sand available. Can an early decision be made as men are already working on the job?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall treat this matter as urgent and inform the honourable member when I have obtained a report.

TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Works indicate the cost of a temporary classroom and that of a permanent structure?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think the figures could be obtained, but it should be remembered that while the cost is important it is also important to provide accommodation in the shortest time. Temporary classrooms

have been erected so that the Education Department can fulfil its function of training our scholars. I shall try to obtain a report for the honourable member and inform him when it is available.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Government Printing Office?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Advice from the Director of the Public Buildings Department is that property at Kent Town has been purchased on which to build the new Government Printing Office. Preliminary planning is now proceeding. The need to clearly establish a basis of planning and design resulted in the project being separated into three phases:

Phase 1: Re-defining of objectives and functions of the Government Printing and Stationery Department.

Phase 2: Assessment of requirements to meet approved objectives and functions.

Phase 3: Design and, if approved, construction of project.

The Government Printer and the Public Service Commissioner are currently engaged on Phase 1. The time required for each phase cannot be gauged at this juncture, but because of the scope of the project reference to the Public Works Standing Committee will be necessary during Phase 3. The future of the project beyond this point will be dependent on the findings of the committee and, if approved, on the availability of funds at the time.

PORT PIRIE TRADE SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: On May 28, I received a letter from the Minister of Education informing me that arrangements to provide a building to train motor mechanics at the Port Pirie Trade School were in the hands of the Minister of Works, and that approval had been given to the Public Buildings Department to invite private tenders for the building, which is a pre-fabricated garage-type structure. Has the Minister of Works a report about this building?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have not got it at present, but I have seen a document referring to this project. I will obtain a report and inform the honourable member.

EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On June 16 my Leader asked a question in which the Premier was requested to obtain a report from the Crown Solicitor on the precise meaning of the term "commercial producer". The Premier was

good enough to say that he would get that report and, as the matter concerns the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture, can that Minister now define the term precisely?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. Apparently, the honourable member missed the announcement in the press during the recent adjournment of Parliament, and I also furnished the Leader with a copy of a telegram received from the Minister for Primary Industry in Canberra. The text of this telegram was that where a person did not sell or barter eggs he would be exempt, but the position was that the South Australian Egg Board should be satisfied that this was so. I specifically asked the Minister for Primary Industry how this would apply to charitable institutions and he said that in relation to these, too, the South Australian Egg Board would need to be satisfied that they were not selling eggs. The position now is that anyone who claims that he does not sell or barter eggs can write to the Egg Board and, if the board is satisfied, he will then be given a letter to say that he is exempt.

CIRCUS DEATH.

Mr. JENNINGS: I have been asked by constituents why a coroner's inquiry has not been held into the death of a man who was mauled by a lion from a travelling circus in my district. I have checked with the coroner's office and find that an inquiry has not been held. Will the Minister of Education take up the matter with his colleague, the Attorney-General, who, I imagine, would then refer it to the coroner?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall refer the matter to my colleague.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT.

Mr. COUMBE: The Government has announced that a committee has been set up to review and rewrite the large and unwieldy Local Government Act and a number of well qualified and very worthy persons have been mentioned as members of this committee. I make the plea that a representative of the Adelaide City Council be appointed to this committee. I do this because that council is represented on many Government and semi-government authorities, such as the Fire Brigades Board, the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Town Planning Committee, and also because of the council's unique position arising from the fact that large sections of the Act apply only to that council. Also, many citizens of this State are affected by the provisions of the Act as it applies to the city, either

through working in Adelaide or by travelling through. In those circumstances, will the Minister of Education take up the matter with his colleague the Minister of Local Government to see whether a representative of the Adelaide City Council can be appointed to the committee in question?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

UPPER MURRAY BRIDGE.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, say what stage investigations into the proposed site for a bridge over the Murray River at Kingston have reached?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to convey that question to my colleague.

STUDENTS' DRIVING INSTRUCTION.

Mrs. STEELE: In the last Parliament I raised with the then Minister of Education the matter of a practical driver-training course for students at senior high schools. The Minister informed me that the department was considering ways in which a larger number of the older students in the departmental secondary schools might benefit from the existing course held at the Police Advanced Training Wing, and at the time he was awaiting full details of a similar scheme operating in Western Australia. He went on to say that, when such details were available and other aspects had been considered, the Director would submit a report for the Minister's consideration. Can the Minister say whether the Director has submitted a report on this matter and, if he has, has the Minister considered it and is he in a position to comment on it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have had considerable discussions with the Director on this matter and I may say that I am greatly impressed with the driving instruction given by the police to secondary students during the holiday periods. I have raised with the Director the question of extending this particular method of instruction and I shall be pleased to bring down a report for the honourable member in the near future.

HIDE, SKIN AND WOOL DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Hide, Skin and Wool Dealers Act, 1915-1959. Read a first time.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marketing of Eggs Act, 1941-1963. Read a first time.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Veterinary Surgeons Act, 1935-1957. Read a first time.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 27. Page 706.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I thank honourable members for the courtesy of allowing me earlier to continue my remarks because of a contingent notice of motion I had given. I stated I should not be long in concluding my remarks, but in the first place I wish to refer to new section 79 (4) contained in clause 14, which was discussed, quite improperly, by my colleague the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Hon. D. N. Brookman) yesterday when he termed this measure the "Casey Protection Act". At the time you, Mr. Speaker, quite rightly asked him not to continue in that vein, as it was irrelevant to the matter before the House; but of course it is now relevant. We are now considering this matter as legislation, and I say advisedly that it was unfortunate that, when the Premier was discussing redistribution at a certain television interview, he should have singled out this particular district and that he should have in fact told the commissioners what he desired them to do in respect of the district of Frome. I admit that he said it publicly; he said the particular quota, 15 per cent up or down, obviously could not apply to the District of Frome.

That is quite unparalleled in the history of this State, where a commission is to be set up, and where the Leader of the Government—before the commission is ever established—has told it the answers it is expected to give. That is an unhappy start to the Premier's occupancy of the Treasury benches because, surely, if we are to set up a commission it is for that commission to decide the issues involved and for both sides to have the opportunity to make representations before the commission. New subsection (4) is undesirable, and I believe it

was included for the specific purpose of safeguarding the interests of at least one of the Premier's supporters. It should not be accepted by this House under any circumstances. I have a much more fundamental objection to make to the next provision in the Bill. Clause 14 inserts new section 80, which states:

In dividing the State into electoral districts for the House of Assembly the commission—
(a) shall have regard to the following criteria:

- (i) each electoral district shall be of convenient shape and have reasonable means of access between the main centres of population therein;
- (ii) not less than twenty-six electoral districts shall be wholly within the country area. In this section "country area" means any area outside the areas comprised in the electoral districts for the House of Assembly of Adelaide, Torrens, Prospect, Thebarton, Hindmarsh, Semaphore, Port Adelaide, Norwood, Burnside, Unley, Mitcham, Goodwood and Glenelg as such electoral districts were defined at the time of the passing of the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act, 1954;
- (iii) each electoral district which includes portion of a township in a country area shall, as far as possible, include the whole area of that township;

It is mandatory on the commission to consider those matters; the word "shall" is used, so that where a township's interest is concerned the commission shall consider it; the commission shall also consider the means of access or shape of the district concerned. However, the community of interest, which is of utmost importance, is only a supplementary consideration and of secondary importance, which the commission may or may not consider. It can please itself. Honourable members opposite laugh and think it is a wonderful joke to sacrifice country interests.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It is funny to hear you say that after all the years you have done it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall deal with this fully and to the Minister's satisfaction in a moment. Community of interest is most important but it is given only secondary importance, and that is a complete reversal of electoral principles which have been functioning for as long as I can trace them in Electoral Acts of this State and the Commonwealth.

The Hon.—R. R.—Loveday: They weren't principles.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: For the Minister's benefit I shall read from the

Commonwealth Electoral Act which was passed over 60 years ago, and which has been functioning ever since without any objection from any Party at any time. It states:

In making any distribution of States or inter-division the commissioners shall give due consideration to:

(a) the community or diversity of interest.

That is the first factor mentioned in the Commonwealth Constitution, and it relates to means of communication, physical features and existing boundaries or divisions. Therefore, we can see that the mandatory provisions selected by honourable members opposite are not actually mentioned in the Commonwealth Act at all. The interests of the rural areas will be sacrificed, and it is intended that this Bill will do just that.

Mr. Hudson: That is not true.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is the fact of it. Members opposite know that, so they cannot contradict it. There was a similar provision in a Bill passed in 1954, which is the subject of the present redistribution. I have gone through the debate as fully as I have been able during the time I have had at my disposal. I was not able to check every word that every member said, but I checked the debate in Committee, in which the then member for Torrens (Mr. Travers) went over this ground to some extent. However, I found no objection by the Labor Party to the terms used in that Bill, which became the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act, 1954. Section 7 (1) of that Act provides:

In re-dividing the State into Assembly districts the commission, so far as is compatible with the provisions of Section 5 of the Act, shall endeavour to create districts in each of which respectively the electors have common interests.

That is expressed in exactly the same way as in the Commonwealth Act—the community of interest of electors is placed in the forefront.

Mr. Coumbe: The Act says “shall”.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. Section 7 (2) provides:

The commission shall also, so far as is compatible with the provisions of Section 5 of this Act, and with subsection (1) of this section, endeavour to create Assembly districts, each of which—

(a) is of convenient shape . . . ; and

(b) retains as far as possible, boundaries of existing districts and subdivisions.

Community of interest was again preserved in that Act with the concurrence of the Labor Party in this House at the time. No amendment was moved and, as far as I can see, no member spoke against it, although in

speaking on another matter Mr. Travers touched upon it. This has been a feature of the Commonwealth Act since 1902, but in the present Bill introduced by the Premier community of interest in rural areas has been abandoned. This is not being abandoned in relation to country towns, but it is suddenly being abandoned for rural areas. I emphatically oppose the suggestion, because what is the use of this high principle of one vote one value if there is in any electoral district a minority that is completely outvoted in perpetuity because a rural area has been placed in an industrial district?

Mr. Shannon: There is no other method of gerrymandering it, you know!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is a convenient way. New section 79 (4) was designed to protect a particular member and it was stated that it was so designed, but new section 80 (b) (ii) is designed, in my opinion, to protect several members as it requires only that the commissioners “may” have regard to community of interest: it does not compel them to do so. That is the only difference between the two, and that is what makes it much more objectionable than the previous provision, which had a much more limited application than has this provision.

I have looked at this provision for a considerable time to find out the precise meaning of the words. I think probably they have some bearing on the Legislative Council, although strangely enough they appear in the provisions dealing with the division of the State into Assembly districts. If honourable members look at new section 80 (b) (ii) they will find an interesting provision. This new section provides:

In dividing the State into electoral districts for the House of Assembly the commission—

(b) may have regard to the following matters:—

(ii) Community of interest among the electors in each respective district:—

The following words are those that I do not understand. They would not be put there unless they had some purpose, although the purpose is not clear—

Provided that the interest of electors in any area other than a country area shall be regarded as common with those of electors in adjacent country areas;

When one sees the word “provided” in an Act of Parliament, one immediately becomes suspicious. I have seen an Act passed in this House that has set out several things, after which there have been words to the effect of

“Provided however that these clauses shall not operate at all”. I ask the Premier whether he can explain the purpose of these words in this Bill. I presume they have some meaning or they would not have been put there.

Mr. Quirke: They mean that Port Wakefield and Port Adelaide can be lumped together.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe that these words will ultimately have nothing to do with Assembly districts; I think their meaning will be found if one looks at the next paragraph, which deals with the Legislative Council. There is no suggestion of community of interest in relation to the Legislative Council, as the Government intends to abolish it anyhow. All of the terms relating to the Legislative Council are provided in about six or eight lines—short, sharp and shiny:

The commission shall also divide the State into five electoral districts for the Legislative Council. Four of such Council districts shall each consist of eleven whole Assembly districts and one of such Council districts shall consist of twelve whole Assembly districts. The commission shall also make the determination specified in section 11a of this Act.

Honourable members can see that the composition of Assembly districts can ultimately have a great effect on the composition of Council districts, because one can pick them and their composition almost *ad lib*. There is nothing about community of interest to be considered as far as practicable. There could be a Council district comprising rural areas and heavily industrialized areas.

Mr. Shannon: And not necessarily even contiguous.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is so. I can only think that the provision in new section 80 (b) (ii) has some bearing, though much study would be necessary to see what is desired in this matter. I believe we should have had the benefit of hearing what the Government had in mind when this provision was drafted. Further, the Government should have outlined why the essential principle of community of interest was to be completely submerged in this Bill. The Commonwealth Electoral Act, which has operated since 1902 and which has the approbation of all Parties, is completely wiped away by this new formula, which I suggest was designed not in the interests of providing some good form of Government in South Australia but rather in the interests of maintaining one Party on the Treasury benches. Be that as it may, I believe that the Bill is bad.

Mr. Coumbe: It is crook.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I used the word “crook” on a previous occasion and I do not retract it now. My Party does not object to a redistribution at this time: we believe it is desirable. As an instance of its need, the honourable member for Gawler now has included in his district a town that has come into existence since the last redistribution. I doubt whether Elizabeth was even a post office at the time of the last redistribution. The Opposition agrees that a redistribution is necessary.

Mr. Clark: But you want it on your terms.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We want it on the terms of the amendment I will move shortly. First, we want a realistic definition of the metropolitan area. For instance, it is complete humbug to say that certain areas adjacent to the District of Enfield are not part of the metropolitan area. These areas belong to the metropolitan area in every sense of the word; they are served by the metropolitan transport system and in every way share the same aspirations and the same community of interests as other areas included in the metropolitan area. It is obviously complete humbug to legislate for a limited definition of the metropolitan area, and Government members knew this when this Bill was drawn up. Secondly, we require reasonable representation for rural interests, but there is no assurance of this in the Bill. We know that the rural districts of South Australia are important to the economy of the State. We also know that the Labor Party is anti-rural.

Mr. Clark: The Leader knows that that is not fair.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We have already seen many instances of the Labor Party's attitude in this regard, and this attitude will be seen more definitely as the Government's legislative programme unfolds itself.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That is rubbish; that is all it is.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I am incorrect in saying that, the Minister of Education and the Premier will support my contingent notice of motion. Such support would show that I am wrong. After making careful calculations, I can say that it would be possible, under this Bill, for a Party to remain in power indefinitely without one supporter from the rural areas. In other words, a Party could completely forget the rural interests of the State without any fear of political repercussions. I believe that this is

bad. I am pleased that one or two districts represented by Labor members have a rural flavour because this has already been of considerable benefit in maintaining a reasonable objective for the Labor Party.

I conclude by saying that the Opposition has no objection whatsoever to a substantial increase in the representation of the metropolitan area. In fact, only two years ago I moved for a substantial increase but at that time it was not the policy of the Labor Party to have a redistribution. It considered that it would rather have a grievance than a redistribution. I do not blame Labor members for knowing their own minds on that occasion. My Bill was defeated before it could be considered in Committee. I move:

To strike out all the words after "that" with a view to inserting in lieu thereof:

the Bill be withdrawn and redrafted to provide—

- (a) a realistic definition of the Adelaide metropolitan area;
- (b) adequate representation for rural areas and at the same time provide fair representation for the metropolitan area.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I second the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the motion."

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): Last Tuesday afternoon and again this afternoon we have been treated to a great farrago of distortions, exaggerations and complete fictions by the Leader of the Opposition. This has truly been an amazing performance, one that I never expected to hear when I came into the House. It almost leaves me completely flabbergasted. Before analysing the Leader's remarks, I shall refer to some fairly recent history. In the 1962 election there was shown tremendous support for the Labor Party (unprecedented as far as this State was concerned) and ever-growing opposition from South Australians to the gerrymander of electorates that had applied here. In the debate on the Address in Reply I referred to that gerrymander as the most vicious in the history of Australia. I was criticized for using the word "vicious". Let me make it quite clear that what I meant there was that it was politically vicious, that it was politically designed to damage the electoral chances of a particular Party, the Labor Party; and for many years it has been successful in doing that.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the Labor Party's alleged support for the

1955 redistribution. He said, "In other words, this gerrymander we have been hearing about is something that the Labor Party assisted the then Government in providing." He argued that our whole statement about the gerrymander is, therefore, insincere. Before I entered this House I had heard of a master of half-truths, and had even met masters of the half-truth, but I had never met or heard of the master of the decimal truth—and that is what this is. It is a statement of the tiniest fraction of the truth that one could possibly manufacture. Let us get the facts straight. I should like to quote here from the remarks of the late Mr. O'Halloran (the then Leader of the Opposition) on the Bill introduced in 1955 but, before doing that, let me also make it clear that, when the Bill was introduced to set up an electoral commission so that a redivision of boundaries could take place, the Labor Party opposed the terms of reference; it opposed them vigorously throughout and continuously objected to them.

When the redivision came back to the House, the position arose that the Labor Party had a choice of two evils—either sticking with the existing distribution of boundaries, which were drawn up on exactly the same principle as the new one, and where seats were well out of line in both city and country, or agreeing to the lesser of two evils (which is what it was)—the new division where, as I shall quote in a moment, Mr. O'Halloran said that within the country zone and within the city zone there was now to be nearer equality between each district. This is what Mr. O'Halloran said (page 856 of *Hansard*, September 22, 1955):

The Bill represents the limit of democracy that can be expected from a Liberal and Country League Government which relies on the artificial distinction between the metropolitan area and the country. . . . This is the worst example of gerrymandering ever perpetrated by any Government in any English-speaking country.

He went a little further than I did: I said "in Australia". Mr. O'Halloran continued:

No doubt the Government will counter my argument by saying that this preponderance of voting power in country electorates is necessary to secure the proper development of country districts, but the very opposite has been the result in recent years.

It has gone on since 1955. There has been a continuous further development of the city area.

Mr. Clark: And the Leader of the Opposition told us that the other day.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. O'Halloran said later:

The only virtue I can see in this Bill is that it does remove the disparities which formerly existed as between electorates in the respective zones because there were clear and startling disparities under the old system. Prior to the suggested redistribution the average enrolments in the 13 metropolitan districts were 22,300 and the variation from the average was 5,300, or 24 per cent. In the country the average enrolments were 6,657 and the variation from the average was 1,623 or 24 per cent. The average enrolments for both metropolitan and country electorates under this Bill will remain the same, but the average variation is only 641, or 2.88 per cent in the metropolitan area and 253 or 3.8 per cent in the country.

He explained there quite clearly that the Labor Party was opposed then, and has always been opposed, to the fantastic weighting given to the country vote in that redistribution. To say that because we allowed it to go through, that because we accepted the lesser of two evils, we approved the principle of the terms of reference involved in drawing up that distribution, is a complete distortion of the truth.

We were in a difficult position at that time. I venture to suggest that, if we had not accepted that redistribution, we should not be in government today, because the one improvement that that distribution made was to give us one extra member in the form of the honourable member for Whyalla, now the Minister of Education and one of the finest adornments to the House that we could possibly have.

Mr. Coumbe: You'll get on!

Mr. HUDSON: It is not a question of getting on: it is just the truth. Let us hope we hear no more about this fantastic charge, no more of this business of replying to the accusation of there being a gerrymander by saying that the Labor Party approved the distribution in 1955. As I have said, nothing could be farther from the truth. Prior to 1961 the Liberal and Country League in this State supported the so-called principle of two for one—two country seats for each city seat—alleging at the time that that principle was embodied in the 1856 Constitution—"enshrined in the 1856 Constitution" would be a better phrase. It saw, however, from the 1962 election results that that principle would no longer work, would no longer produce the electoral results it desired to achieve—that is, the return of an L.C.L. Government, no matter how the people voted. So, at the 1962 annual conference of the L.C.L. the two to one principle was calmly

dropped altogether, and no mention of it has been made since. I have referred to the so-called origin of this two to one principle in the 1856 Constitution Act, but it can be just as easily said that the principle of one vote one value can be found in the initial distribution that took place in South Australia in 1856, when responsible Government was obtained. In fact, the distribution that took place in 1856 is remarkably similar to the kind of proposal we are putting up today. In the 1856 distribution, without going into all of its details, there was a slight effective weighting in favour of country areas. The so-called metropolitan area (it had to be stretched a little to include the then seat of Sturt) contained 12 of the 36 seats, and a little less than 40 per cent of the population. So there was a very slight weighting of the distribution of seats in favour of the country, as there is, in effect, in this Bill. In addition, the two seats that covered the sparse areas of the State (Flinders and Murray) had a number of electors that was much below the average. At that time the authorities recognized the difficulty that any member would have in representing these vast areas with very little population, and they took account of that in the two seats I have mentioned, just as there is provision in this Bill for account to be taken by the commission of two seats in the areas of the State that will be very difficult to represent because of sparseness of population and difficulties in communication.

Wherever these two seats are they will affect (we can only guess this) most of the existing District of Eyre (perhaps not all), part of the existing District of Whyalla, and most of the current District of Frome. The two members likely to be affected, as far as one can judge from the terms of reference, are the member for Frome and the member for Eyre. We have this similarity between what was done in 1856 and what is proposed to be done today, and I think it can be said quite confidently that in 1856 they were more concerned with the principle of one vote one value than they were with any business of two for one. They probably had never heard of two for one at all. The reason for this is that at that time there were multiple-member constituencies, but the number of members in each constituency varied considerably; it varied from one to six. The City of Adelaide had six members. It is quite clear, when one looks at it and thinks about it, that what they were concerned to do at that time was to get approximate equality in the number of electors represented by each member.

They came to the City of Adelaide, a convenient area, and as it had 3,600 electors they gave it six members. The electoral district of Burra (again, a convenient area) had about 1,900 electors, so they gave it three members, and they gave two members to other areas that had 1,200 electors. That pattern repeats itself throughout that distribution. To say that what Labor is proposing today is against the traditions that have been established in South Australia is the reverse of the truth, because in my judgment the first tradition that was established in this State with the advent of responsible Government was the principle of one vote one value.

Let us look now at the 1962 effort of the L.C.L. in dropping this so-called principle of two for one, and let us look first of all at what it would have meant if they had had a redistribution and stuck to that so-called principle. First, if they had adhered to the then definition of the metropolitan area and redid the then metropolitan area into 13 seats and the country area into 26 seats, the result would have been a distribution that would have involved the certain defeat of the then L.C.L. Government, because the district of Gawler, instead of being one country seat, would then have been three. To have extended the metropolitan area, as was done later in 1962, to cover all of Gawler and take in most of the Highbury subdivision, the St. Kilda subdivision of the district of Gouger, the Morphett Vale area, and to have stuck to the principle of two to one, would have produced an average quota for city electorates of 28,200, and an average quota for country electorates of 6,600; in other words, a ratio in the average size of a city seat to a country seat of 4.3 to one. That was too fantastic even for the then Playford Government to contemplate, so unceremoniously the much-vaunted principle of two for one was dropped and calmly forgotten. It is now supposed to be in the limbo, and it is considered to be very bad taste to ever raise the subject.

They had a problem in 1962. Whatever sort of distribution was introduced it was almost certain, unless electoral fiddling was incorporated into the terms of reference, to give the Labor Party a better chance of forming a Government. However, the previous Government, with a great deal of ingenuity, devised a system that on the surface looked fair but in fact was a worse arrangement than the one under which we operated in the 1965 election. I described it on one occasion (and I shall do so again now) as fraudulent, because it was designed to look fair to the people: it was

represented to the people as electoral reform, but in fact it was a further gerrymander of the existing gerrymander. It was completely bogus. I was asked at that time to write a report on the proposals that were submitted, and the first proposal I was asked to report on was the one of dividing South Australia into 40 electoral districts—20 country and 20 city. Among the 20 country seats there were to be three country industrial and 17 rural seats. I reported on that in a document which I entitled "The Art of Gerrymandering the Gerrymander". That was what the proposal was. The final proposal as eventually submitted to Parliament, however, provided for 20 city, 20 rural, and two country industrial seats. By the simple process of extending the definition of the metropolitan area to include all of the current seat of Gawler, the St. Kilda subdivision of Gouger (as I have said), part of the Highbury subdivision, and part of the Morphett Vale subdivision, the effect, coupled with the addition of the two country industrial seats around Spencer Gulf, was to offset completely the effect of giving so-called increased representation to the city.

The Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday afternoon said that his Bill was a very good Bill. As I have already said, it was nothing of the sort: it was a fraud. He also said that he introduced a Bill that gave a 50 per cent increase to the metropolitan representation, which is completely untrue again. The metropolitan area was increased by including those additional areas, and the number of seats went up from 13 to 20. The effect of taking in the extra area was to make the number of seats that would have been represented something like 16, so the effective representation was being increased from 16 to 20. The Leader of the Opposition manages to convert that into an increase of 50 per cent. This is the kind of respect for the truth that he has. Everyone who was asked to report on the 1962 Bill and on the distribution that was proposed in 1963 said that it was a worse system than the one under which we operate now, bad as it is. The chances of the Labor Party under that system would be less than under the present system, and the chances of getting a constitutional majority (and I have no doubt the previous L.C.L. Government knew this) under that "very good Bill" introduced by the present Leader of the Opposition, were almost nil. In a House of 42 members, to appoint a Speaker and still have a majority on the floor of the House meant that the Party had to win 23 seats out of the 42.

Mr. Shannon: How do you work that out?

Mr. HUDSON: It is simple, and I shall explain it for the honourable member. A constitutional majority on the floor would be 22, the absolute majority of the number of members of the House.

Mr. Shannon: Have you read the Constitution?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. An absolute majority of the members of the House of Assembly of 42 would be 22. To be able to appoint a Speaker and still have 22 votes, it would be necessary to have 23 members. The honourable member knows from what happened in 1964 with the rejection of the previous reform Bill, that without a constitutional majority on the floor of the House (an absolute majority of the members of the House) the Bill could not be proceeded with because it implied an alteration to the Constitution. That Bill would have required Labor to win 23 out of 42 seats in order to obtain a constitutional majority, which would have enabled the Labor Party to make a constitutional change, and that was virtually impossible. Furthermore, that Bill proposed a division of electoral districts that was worse than the scheme under which we operate now.

Let us consider what would have happened in March of this year if the Labor Party had agreed to that distribution. Let us apply the voting figures of March of this year to the proposed electoral districts of the 1963 report of the electoral commission. On my estimation (and I am not trying to fiddle it at all), among the rural seats (so-called "rural" on the Leader's definition of "rural", that is, excluding mining and quarrying), Labor would have won four seats and one would have been a marginal one, and the L.C.L. would have won 15 seats, one being a marginal win, and one seat would have been doubtful. The doubtful one would have been Frome where on my estimation the voting would have been 2,610 for the A.L.P., 2,557 for the L.C.L. and 79 for the D.L.P. That excludes postal and absentee votes. It is possible that that seat could have gone either way. The two country industrial seats would have gone to the Labor Party, and in the metropolitan area Labor would have won 14 with one a marginal win, and the L.C.L. six, with one a marginal win. The result would have been 20 seats for the A.L.P. and 21 for the L.C.L., with one seat doubtful. The Leader of the Opposition says in this House that he introduced a "very good Bill" and berates the Labor Party for not letting it pass, when, in fact, it would have worsened

the existing gerrymander, and made it more difficult for Labor to overcome the electoral disadvantages to which it has been put. It would have resulted in March of this year in the L.C.L. probably winning 21 seats and because postal and absentee votes usually favour non-Labor candidates, the L.C.L. would probably have won Frome, thus winning 22 seats to 20. Our chances of ever winning 23 seats and of being able to introduce a constitutional alteration would have been minimal. Is it any wonder that we opposed that legislation and exposed it for the fraud it was? I read now from a broadcast I made on the day that Bill was introduced into the House in 1964.

Mr. Nankivell: Did you say a forecast?

Mr. HUDSON: No, a broadcast. I do not wish to read it because it is my broadcast, but because it expresses as well as I can what I want to say about that particular measure. I quote:

Today is G day—gerrymander day. This afternoon in the State House of Assembly the Premier, not satisfied with the existing savage gerrymander, introduced a Government Bill to further gerrymander electoral boundaries in South Australia. The existing gerrymandered system is not enough for the Premier. He knows that as population expansion occurs in small country electorates close to the metropolitan area he must eventually lose. His Government's aim is to perpetuate one-Party Government in South Australia and the only way that can be done is to change the electoral system so that the effects of population expansion close to the metropolitan area and around Spencer Gulf can be nullified. The Government must gerrymander the existing gerrymander. The terms of reference for the Electoral Commission last year were specially designed to achieve this result, and the Bill introduced by the Premier this afternoon incorporates the report of that commission. Today is, therefore, a black day for democracy in South Australia—a day that will be remembered in our history, and a day that will mark the commencement of a supreme effort by the Australian Labor Party to defeat this undemocratic measure and bring about the demise of the Playford regime.

I am glad to say that that effort was successful, and when the Bill now before the House was introduced that particular blot on the democratic history of this State was partially removed.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: When the honourable member made that broadcast, was he an impartial lecturer in politics at the university?

Mr. HUDSON: I was a political candidate and was introduced as such, and the fact that I was a lecturer at the university at the time was never mentioned. Let me turn to the 1965 election results, as there are certain features in

that result which are most important and which should be made clear to the Opposition, and in particular to the Leader of the Opposition, who rattles on about rural representation. It is important to note how the rural areas of this State have voted.

It is difficult to try to estimate the total vote for Labor and Liberal as direct contests did not occur between the two major Parties in all districts. Only in 28 seats was there a direct contest. It is necessary to consider these 28 seats, and for the other 11 seats to take the Senate figures that applied in 1964. However, the Senate figures involve a serious underestimation of the Labor vote: first, because at the Senate election, the L.C.L. had the donkey vote, that is, No. 1 position on the ballot paper; and secondly, because of certain mysteries surrounding the L.C.L. method of selecting Senate candidates, there was a situation that attracted a few additional votes that they normally would not have got. Thirdly, and most important of all, in every case where a comparison can be made the figures show quite clearly that the State Labor Party polls considerably better than the Commonwealth Labor Party, and the reverse applies as far as the L.C.L. is concerned. That means that, in using Commonwealth figures for those seats where there was not a contest between the two major Parties, one under-estimates the Labor vote and over-estimates the L.C.L. vote. For those three reasons, these figures involve an under-estimation of the Labor vote. In the 28 seats where there was a direct contest, the vote was as follows:

A.L.P.	192,250
L.C.L.	164,985
D.L.P.	6,886
Social Credit	5,049
Country Party	2,116
Communist Party	342
Independent	2,018

For the other 11 seats, the Senate figures that I have used are purely subdivisinal figures, as is the case with the 28 seats where there was a contest. I have disregarded postal and absentee votes throughout in order that the figures can be placed on a truly comparable basis. The Senate figures for the other 11 seats are:

A.L.P.	70,888
L.C.L.	37,291
D.L.P.	2,245
Social Credit	706
Country Party	Nil
Communist Party	1,067
Independent	225

The totals of these two groups of figures and the percentages of the total are as follows:

	Votes.	Percentage.
A.L.P.	262,638	54.09
L.C.L.	202,276	41.66
D.L.P.	9,131	1.88
Social Credit	5,755	1.18
Country Party	2,116	.44
Communist Party	1,409	.29
Independent	2,243	.46

So far, my figures involve a deliberate under-estimation of the Labor vote. Let us now take this further and try to distribute the votes of the D.L.P., Social Credit, Country Party and Independents between the two major Parties. Again I will be conservative and assume that only one-third of the preferences of those other groups would go to the Labor Party and that two-thirds would go to the L.C.L. This would give a result that, if the people of South Australia were asked to choose between the A.L.P. and the L.C.L., 55.51 per cent would vote for the Labor Party and 44.49 per cent for the L.C.L. Because of the factors I have mentioned relating to under-estimating the Labor vote and the small adjustment because postal and absentee votes tend to favour non-Labor candidates, together with the fact that I have worked out these figures on a purely subdivisinal basis, I would say that support for the Labor Party would be somewhere between 56 and 57 per cent and, for the L.C.L. between 43 and 44 per cent.

I make this point to make it clear that, under any fair system of electoral distribution, the Labor Party should receive a significant majority of seats. If my rough estimate of Labor Party support of 56 per cent is accepted, it should be the case under a fair system that, when the Labor vote came down from 56 per cent to about 50 per cent, sufficient seats would change hands to place the Opposition in office. That is what I say would be a fair system, a system that enabled seats to go from one Party to the other as the Party vote fluctuated around the level of 50 per cent. I hope we can all agree that this would be a fair system.

Let me state here and now that one vote one value does not go as far as that from the Labor point of view because, as I am sure the honourable member for Stirling will agree and as all political commentators point out, the Labor Party suffers to some extent from a wastage of its vote because of the concentration of Labor voters in certain Adelaide suburbs and around Spencer Gulf.

I personally think that this particular wastage is much less than it was, because of population changes. However, a system of one vote one value will tend to defeat a Labor Government before the Labor vote actually declines to 50 per cent and an L.C.L. Government would be elected under such a system before the L.C.L. votes got up to 50 per cent.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Are you assuming that there is no similar wastage in some of the country districts?

Mr. HUDSON: An argument about wastage must be based on differential wastage. If all the Labor voters were concentrated in one seat and all the L.C.L. voters in another, one would cancel the other out. The argument must be that, if there is a wastage that adversely affects one Party (and there is a statistical method for estimating this), it is a wastage giving either Party a large majority in one area, such as a vote of 75 per cent to 25 per cent in a district such as Port Adelaide, compared with a district like Angas, which may be a fairly typical country seat, where the L.C.L. vote is between 60 and 65 per cent as against the Labor vote of 35 to 40 per cent. It is a differential concentration of majorities that produces this sort of wastage.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The honourable member will concede that there is point in my argument?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but I am saying that, having regard to the way population is developing in South Australia, if this wastage works at all, it works to the disadvantage of the Labor Party. Most of the political commentators, including Hetherington and Reid, assume that it works to the considerable disadvantage of the Labor Party, but I do not think they are right. I think that the population changes, particularly in the south-western and southern suburbs of Adelaide, have changed this situation to a marked degree.

Let me go into more detail about the use of Commonwealth figures and the fact that this involves an under-estimation of the Labor vote. This point is most important when we come to assess the proportion of rural representation and the question of how adequately the rural areas of this State have been represented by the L.C.L., or how adequately the people think they have been represented. Of the 28 seats in which there was a direct contest between Liberal and Labor in 1965, the State Labor vote in 22 was greater than the equivalent Commonwealth Labor vote and, in 18 of these 22 seats, State Labor polled significantly more than Commonwealth Labor and State Liberal polled less than Commonwealth Liberal.

In some of these cases it is a little difficult to make a comparison, because we find that, because of a change in the number of candidates, State Labor has polled more than Commonwealth Labor, and State Liberal has polled more than Commonwealth Liberal, or *vice versa*. In four of these 22 seats, while State Labor polls more than Commonwealth Labor, it is also true that State Liberal polled a little more than Commonwealth Liberal. However, in the other 18 seats State Labor polls significantly more than Commonwealth Labor and, conversely, State Liberal polls significantly less than Commonwealth Liberal. The margin in some cases is fantastic. For example, in Murray the State Labor vote is 67 per cent as against 43.4 per cent for the Commonwealth Labor vote.

Mr. Jennings: We've got a good candidate.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but if Commonwealth figures applied we would not win. In Millicent at the last election Mr. Des Corcoran obtained 61.7 per cent of the votes, as against 47.1 per cent for Commonwealth Labor (again, a seat we would not have won on Commonwealth figures). Chaffey (49 per cent State Labor, as against 46 per cent Commonwealth) is another seat we would not have won on Commonwealth figures. Frome was 58.1 per cent State Labor and 55.3 per cent Commonwealth.

Mr. Quirke: This applies to Liberal candidates, too.

Mr. HUDSON: It is mostly the Labor candidates that poll more than their Commonwealth counterparts. Very few of the members of the Party of the honourable member for Burra do.

Mr. Quirke: Yes they do.

Mr. Coumbe: Of course they do.

Mr. HUDSON: I shall give the figures to the honourable members. I have worked them out as fairly as I could. The triumvirate of city Liberal members in the back row should be looking pleased, because they will not get their pay-out here: I am talking about their country mates. I will come to the city Liberal members later. In the seat of Glenelg, again a seat we would not win on Commonwealth figures, the State Labor vote was 51.9 per cent, as against 48.4 per cent. Norwood, a marginal seat on the Commonwealth figures, was 58.3 per cent State Labor and 49.3 per cent Commonwealth Labor. Unley, a seat we would not have won on Commonwealth figures, was 51.2 per cent State Labor and 47.9 per cent Commonwealth Labor. Wallaroo is a country Labor seat in which we have had a terrific excess of State Labor over Commonwealth Labor—60.3 per cent for the State and 51.3

for the Commonwealth. Barossa was 51.7 per cent State Labor, as against 46.1 per cent Commonwealth Labor (again, a seat we would not have won on Commonwealth figures). Although the Commonwealth Labor Party obtains a majority of votes over the whole area of the State, if the Commonwealth figures had applied in the 1965 State election, the Labor Party would have won no more than 15 seats, perhaps only 13. In other words, on the present boundaries, if Commonwealth figures apply (even though the Commonwealth Labor Party in the Senate and in the House of Representatives can score a clear majority of the votes—about 51 or 52 per cent), the L.C.L. would have won the last State election with the result of between 24 to 15 and 26 to 13.

Mr. Coumbe: How do the Senate figures compare?

Mr. HUDSON: Much the same, that is, about 51 or 51.5 per cent. I am using sub-divisional figures for the State and Commonwealth, because that is the only way to make a true comparison. Some honourable members opposite have got up on their high horse about the position of State Liberal candidates. In the 28 seats where a direct contest occurred, and where we can make a comparison, only six State Liberal candidates polled more than their Commonwealth counterparts, and most of those were insignificant differences. In only two cases did a State Liberal poll more than a Commonwealth Liberal and State Labor poll less than Commonwealth Labor. The former point is illustrated in the case of West Torrens, in respect of which the honourable member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) crowed over the new member for that district because, he said, the Liberal vote had improved there so much. In the seat of West Torrens, however, the State Liberal vote was 42.9 per cent, and Commonwealth Liberal 42 per cent, so the State vote is a little better; but State Labor was 57.1 per cent, as against Commonwealth Labor 54.5 per cent—there were only two candidates in the State contest. To get a comparison we had to use Senate figures, and there were more than two candidates for the Senate. However, that is a case where no-one can claim anything one way or the other, because both State Parties polled better than their Commonwealth Parties.

The only two cases where the State Liberal member polled better than his Commonwealth counterpart and forced his State Labor opponent to poll worse were in two metropolitan districts and not in the country. The honourable member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) had

a slight margin over his Commonwealth counterpart—47.8 per cent, as against 47.4 per cent; and for State Labor it was 45 per cent as against Commonwealth Labor 47.4 per cent. The only member of the Opposition who had a significant margin over his Commonwealth counterpart is the honourable, learned and gallant member for Mitcham. He is the only member of the Opposition with any public image, and I cannot understand why the Leader does not resign immediately in favour of that honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: You are making my head swell.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Opposition is to win, it must get someone who can demonstrate statistically that his Party has the public image necessary to attract votes. The honourable member for Mitcham polled 65.1 per cent as against 61.9 per cent for his Commonwealth counterpart—a 3.2 per cent improvement.

Mr. McKee: Don't wrap him up too much, or we will have to get a headshrinker in.

Mr. HUDSON: He deserves all the credit he can get.

Mr. Millhouse: You almost win me over, you know.

Mr. HUDSON: In country seat after country seat (not all, but in a significant number) the State Liberal vote is significantly below the Commonwealth Liberal vote.

Mr. Rodda: How does the honourable member for Albert fare?

Mr. HUDSON: He is completely incomparable, as is also the honourable member for Ridley. In Murray the State Liberal vote was 33 per cent, and the Commonwealth Liberal vote 54.7 per cent; in Millicent it was 38.3 per cent, as against 51.3 per cent Commonwealth. In Chaffey the State Liberal vote was 46.8 per cent compared with a 52.3 vote in the Commonwealth election, and so on—comparison after comparison where in country areas the State Liberal vote was below the Commonwealth Liberal vote. This is clearly the result of the dissatisfaction there has been with the L.C.L. in country areas. One has either to assume that, or to assume that Labor members representing those areas have been much more diligent, active and determined in representing the interests of their electors than Liberal members have been. I would be willing, with some persuasion from the Opposition, to assume that. However, I have a feeling that Opposition members may prefer not to accept that point of view. If they do not accept it they must accept that this state of

affairs has resulted from dissatisfaction with the way in which the L.C.L. Government, led by a Cabinet in which seven out of the eight Ministers came from country areas, has represented country areas. The Leader of the Opposition now admits it, although he says a few other outrageous things on the way. He says, for example:

Which is the most favoured part of the State; which has the most amenities; which has the most public services; and which has its problems considered?

Later, he said:

For all the criticism that honourable members opposite raise, they cannot get away from the fact that country schools are substandard.

He went on to speak about how few fifth-year classes there were in country schools, and was very worried about this.

Mr. Nankivell: How many are there?

Mr. HUDSON: There used to be many in the 1930's, but they were cut out by the L.C.L. Government, and were not established again until the late 1950's. Neglect of education, in comparison with what was done in other States, can be shown up clearly in the official statistics. The neglect of education prior to 1957-58 is absolutely appalling, and the Leader of the Opposition now admits it; he admits where his Government fell down. Country people now have good representation. People on the Labor side are not narrow-minded; they realize they have a responsibility to the whole State and not just to their own areas. It is the official policy of the Labor Party to move towards a situation where in all major country high schools, including Bordertown, there are fifth-year classes. It is official policy of the Labor Party to inquire into country education to try to bring it to a par with standards in the city.

Mr. Nankivell: You have demoted two schools in my district.

Mr. HUDSON: We have not.

Mr. Nankivell: You haven't kept up the standard to matriculation level.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member cannot claim that for a moment. The matriculation year has altered and, if the previous Government had done its job on education so that there had been Leaving Honours classes in Bordertown before this year, there would be a matriculation class there next year. It is because the previous Government fell down on its job over a period of 27 years in office that this state of affairs now exists. I noticed my colleague, the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill), blanch when the Leader of the Opposition said on Tuesday that the city was always looked after for sewers. Perhaps we

had better not go on with that subject! The Leader of the Opposition had a habit of contradicting himself in the remarks he made on Tuesday afternoon. At one stage he said that, if the Bill were passed, rural representation in this State would be negligible. However, towards the end of his speech he had forgotten that he had said that, as he then said he objected to a redistribution that wiped out rural representation completely. It is that sort of exaggeration that makes one want to discount altogether anything he says. He must think the public is so foolish that it can be duped by this sort of statement.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The honourable member will agree that the Leader was speaking at that stage about minorities.

Mr. HUDSON: He said early in his speech that the Bill would make rural representation negligible, and later he went on to an even bigger exaggeration—bigger and better as he got warmed up—when he said it would be wiped out altogether. Let us turn to what he said about minorities. For years a minority has been ruling this State, and the Leader objects to any change. His record shows that he is against any change of the electoral set-up that will prevent minority rule. He wants absolute protection. What he did in the 1962 Bill shows that that is what he wanted. His Government intended to hang on to power at all costs. Regarding minorities, on Tuesday the Leader said:

When one says that democracy is the government of the people by the people, one must add, as the House of Commons has always done, "with due regard to the rights of the minorities".

He and the Legislative Council have had so much due regard for the rights of the minorities that they have had a minority Government, a minority control of the House of Assembly for about half of their period of office since 1938, and a minority control of the Legislative Council virtually since its inception. What the Leader is saying is that anything that upsets that minority control is anti-democratic because it does not show due respect for the interests of minorities. This is what the Leader says: the only way that due respect can be shown for the interests of minorities is to give a minority interest control in the Legislative Council so that it will have an absolute veto, if necessary, of anything that passes in the popular House. This is the only protection for minorities that the Leader seems to recognize.

Speaking about the composition of the Legislative Council, he said that the effect of this

Bill would be to give one extra Legislative Council district to the city and take one away from the country, and I agree. The effect of this may well be to remove minority control by the L.C.L. over the Legislative Council. He objects to that; he objects to anything that will or may remove that minority control. To talk about democracy in this way is a joke.

The Leader referred to the provision in clause 84 as being crook. I laughed when he used this word and, until he repeated it this afternoon, I thought he was using the word as a schoolboy would use it. A schoolboy might say, "Gee, it is crook that we cannot go to the football this afternoon." I thought the Leader was saying, in effect, "Gee, it is crook that the Labor Party is introducing this provision which will stop us from fiddling with the boundaries."

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: He said that it was crook because the commission would not come back to Parliament.

Mr. HUDSON: This afternoon he indicated he meant "bad" when he said "crook". In the past we have had a succession of gerrymanders in this State. With the best intention in the world we are endeavouring to insert a provision that will ensure, to the best of our ability, that there will be no more shenanigans. We are open to constructive suggestions. We want to ensure that we will not have to wait for years for a redistribution, and that redistributions will take place automatically. Honourable members cannot accuse this Government of doing what the previous Government tried to do. What the Leader said the other day about the Government introducing a Bill to provide a greater gerrymander than had been hitherto provided was a complete lie. This intention cannot be imputed in any way. The Government's object is to try to provide a fair system of representation and, as I tried to explain earlier, a system of one vote one value will provide this.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know the honourable member is new to this Chamber, but I do not think we should allow him or any other member to accuse another member of stating a deliberate lie in this Chamber. I take exception to the honourable member's saying that the Leader of the Opposition stated a complete lie. I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. Lawn: Say what words you take exception to.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have stated the words to which I take exception and, in any case, I am addressing the Chair and not the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I take exception only to the honourable member's stating that the Leader of the Opposition stated a lie. He used the term "lie" and I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Did the member for Glenelg use the words complained of?

Mr. HUDSON: I did not use the words "deliberate lie"; I said "complete lie". However, I shall withdraw the remark.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg has withdrawn the remark.

Mr. HUDSON: If it is not correct to use the words "complete lie", than I shall say that what the Leader said was a complete distortion of the truth.

Mr. Lawn: It is a terminological inexactitude!

Mr. HUDSON: Exactly. The Leader accused the Government of introducing a greater gerrymander than had been hitherto provided. I got a bit steamed up about that. All who know anything about this matter know that that is a complete fabrication. They know that a Party with the Government's record in Opposition could be reduced to the state of being sufficiently honest to say that all it wanted was a fair go. All it wanted was an electoral set-up that would enable it to become the Government if it obtained the majority of votes. This is a democratic way of doing things.

Mr. McAnaney: Then why do it in such a vague fashion so that nobody can understand it?

Mr. HUDSON: The Leader of the honourable member's Party claims that he understands it. The Leader of the Opposition said that it was always mandatory to consider a community of interest, and that this was a principle. It has always been the case that a community of interest is qualified, just as what the Government says about "township" is qualified. The Government says that each electoral district which includes portion of a township in a country area shall, as far as possible, include the whole area of that township. I am sure that the honourable member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) will agree with me when I say that the courts interpret Acts in such a way that, even though the word "shall" is used, if it is subject to qualification it no longer has a mandatory meaning but a directory meaning. The community of interest has always been subject to and would always be subject to qualification.

The Leader also said that our definition was designed to make a township dominate the surrounding country area. He cannot have it both ways. If we get a town of 8,000 people in the middle of a country area the best way to gerrymander this would be to cut the town in two so that one half dominated one surrounding area and the other half dominated the other surrounding area. Then we would have two Labor seats. That is the sort of principle that applied in Queensland, and we have specifically tried to exclude it here by saying that townships should not be split. Opposition members should be pleased that we have done that because, if they are really concerned about rural interests, this gives those interests greater protection. It prevents the splitting of country towns, and prevents them from dominating surrounding country areas. I have allowed myself to be distracted to the extent of discussing this question, and I have given an answer to the honourable member for Stirling. However, I wish to maintain a certain order in making my speech and not to be subjected to the wanderings and unconnected interjections of Opposition members.

Mr. Hall: We are following your speech.

Mr. HUDSON: That is not so. Each statement I make seems to bring an interjection from Opposition members. They are doing their best to destroy the framework of my speech.

Mr. Hall: Will other Government members support what the honourable member has said?

Mr. HUDSON: They will speak in their turn, and it is up to them to say whether they support me. I quote the following from the *South Australian Elections* (1959) by R. Hetherington and R. L. Reid:

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

It would make it possible but not certain. Of course, that is how it should be for both sides, and that sort of statement is quite fair. Here, in presenting our proposals to Parliament we have in effect made some concession to the country interests. If there is a specific country interest that can always be identified and if it requires for its development the peculiar representation that members of the Opposition seem to insist on, we make some concession to that point of view. We have also made some concession in the Bill to the problem that mem-

bers have in representing vast areas of the State in electoral districts like Eyre, Whyalla and Frome. The problems involved in representing those areas are quite different from those involved in representing the inner country areas. For my own part, I feel that being members of Parliament we represent people, not "trees or acres or economic interests", as the Supreme Court of the United States put it. In this modern age with modern means of communication and methods of transport, the problem of representing people in the city area is not that much more difficult than the problem of representing people in the country area—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You try it!

Mr. HUDSON: Let me finish—if proper provision is made to enable honourable members, and country members in particular, to take full advantage of the modern means of communication and transport. Some honourable members do not know what it is like representing in a city area 35,000 electors, all of whom have problems just as country people have them. A fair percentage of them come to see their member of Parliament at some time or other with a problem. If a member is conscientious, he cannot represent them properly; he may try to but inevitably he runs out of time. He cannot represent the number of people in a city district that we are today asked to represent. We can cry, as much as country members can cry, about the difficulties of representing city electorates, but we are a little more stoic, I suppose, and try to put our arguments on a more reasoned basis.

I come now to the Legislative Council. First, let me say something about the deadlock provisions proposed in this Bill. In a most fantastic argument the Leader of the Opposition said, in effect, "We have not had any trouble with the Legislative Council for the last 10 years. Why do you need a deadlock provision?" He, of course, envisages a continuous L.C.L. control of both the Upper House and the Lower House. He would rather like to believe that the fact that we now have a Labor Government is something that really did not happen; but we have a situation now in South Australia that has not occurred for 32 years, where one Party controls the Lower House and another Party controls the Upper House, and where, therefore, legislation that has popular support in the Lower House, as the result of an election, may get turfed out by the Upper House. We want a legislative provision written into the Constitution to provide that the Upper House, in these circumstances, has the power only to delay; that it does not have the absolute power

of veto; that we do not continue with the kind of situation where a minority can veto completely the majority will—and it is always one minority, never another minority. It is always one minority whose interest is protected in the Upper House.

Our proposal for the deadlock provision is fair and reasonable. It is a copy of what applies in the British House of Commons in respect of its relations with the House of Lords. In the commentaries that we read on that situation we find no significant criticism of the arrangement. It is recognized there that the power to delay possessed by the House of Lords is sufficient in most cases to guard against any hurried drafting that may have taken place. It is all that is necessary. If we regard the Lower House as the popular House, election to that House expressing the will of the people and the Government returned having a mandate for the policies it wants to follow, it is clear that the Upper House, which is not the popular House, should not have the present power of veto. All that we do in this Bill is to give the Upper House the power to delay for a period of a year, which should be sufficient to enable some sort of revision or review to take place. The argument of the Leader of the Opposition on this deadlock was completely fatuous and irrelevant.

I was taken to task by the Leader of the Opposition in the debate on the Address in Reply for not mentioning the fact, according to him, that the Hon. Charles Kingston was in favour of the retention of the Legislative Council. First of all, I would not hold it against anyone in politics in South Australia at that time if he was in favour of the retention of the Legislative Council, but I do hold it against the Leader of the Opposition when he quotes Kingston out of context and gives an entirely incorrect impression of Kingston's views. The part that the Leader of the Opposition quoted from Charles Kingston's speech (page 479, *Hansard*, November 28, 1900) is reported in the style of that time, as follows:

He did not favour the abolition of the Legislative Council. He never had, and he was pleased to have the opportunity of stating his views in that respect in their midst.

He continues further to the same effect. Those remarks were made by Kingston but, as I have said, they were out of context. This is what Kingston went on to say:

But just as he held that the Council should be a Chamber of revision and review, so also he held that once the popular will had been permanently ascertained on a question then it was the duty of both Houses of Parliament to

give expression to the popular sentiment and legislative effect . . . They would do well, whilst insisting on their rights to exercise their privileges as a revising Chamber, not to forget the still greater duty to record by enactment the popular will when that had been finally, properly, and definitely ascertained and declared.

He went on to record the fact that, in his view, issues that are made live questions at an election for the Lower House and return a particular Government give that Government a mandate for its policy. He also said that the popular will could be ascertained by means of a referendum. There is an important point here in that again, despite what the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech, we made the questions of electoral reform and our policy a central issue in the recent election campaign, and from the figures I have quoted it is quite clear that the people of South Australia gave us a mandate for our policy. Following on that, Kingston would say, "You have that mandate, and it has been expressed not only in the 1965 election but in the 1962 election; it has been definitely and permanently ascertained what the popular will is, and the Legislative Council therefore should give effect to that mandate."

The report of Kingston's speech goes on to say:

He had never advocated the abolition of the Legislative Council, but he had never felt so tempted to do so as he did that day on account of his experience in the Legislative Council during the past two months.

Again, later on:

If they only got a Chamber which acted as the Legislative Council had done recently, in a manner altogether foreign to the purpose for which it was constituted, the sooner it was done away with the better. He would like to say, on the subject of single Chambers, he had by no means the fear of that which was entertained by some members. The fact that they found it working well in Ontario and other Canadian States seemed to him to say a great deal in its favour.

I think it is quite clear that the Leader of the Opposition quoted Kingston out of context. He gave the impression that Kingston was in favour of second Chambers, no matter what, whereas in that very same speech, a few sentences later on, Kingston stated:

Although I am in favour of a Chamber of review and revision, if this Council keeps on behaving as it has done in the last few months, if it keeps on ignoring the popular will, then the sooner it is done away with the better.

He then went on to say that a single Chamber would work quite well and that he had not the fear of it that some other people had. I suspect that if Kingston were alive today and saw the attitude of members of the Opposition in

this House and knew that that attitude would be adopted by members of the same Party in the Upper House, he would say exactly the same thing: he would say that the Legislative Council is ignoring the popular will, that it is taking no notice of the popular mandate, and the sooner it is done away with the better.

Let me conclude my remarks (because I have gone on for a longer time than I intended) by reiterating what I consider to be the essential nature of our approach to this problem. What we have tried to do in this Bill is to be reasonable. We have made some concessions to the country interests where we felt it was reasonable to make a concession. For my own part, I would advocate assistance, particularly to country members, with telephone accounts and a system whereby all country members could make use of air services, where those were available, to bring them to and from the city. This sort of assistance would improve immeasurably the job of the country member; it would make it much less difficult for a member than it is at the present time in representing his district.

I hope that the future debate on this subject in this Chamber from members of the Opposition will not be of the same standard as that set by the Leader of the Opposition. If the debate by other Opposition members goes on in the same tone, making the same sort of wild statements as the Leader did—the same sort of distortions and exaggerations—then we might as well not debate the subject at all, because we would be wasting our time and just indulging in a slanging match. If Opposition members are not prepared to debate this subject on its merits, then I appeal to them to have a second thought about it and try to come into this Chamber and offer a reasoned speech instead of a complete collection of claptrap. I support the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I congratulate the honourable member who has just resumed his seat on the very valuable evidence that he has placed before the House this afternoon in connection with this Constitution Bill. During the course of his remarks, it was implied by interjections on several occasions, particularly by the honourable member for Albert, that the Labor Party, under a system of one vote one value, could not possibly provide service to country districts equal to that provided today. I am at a loss to follow that reasoning, because the members of the Opposition know only too well that they have country members on their side that are living in the

metropolitan area, and one of them in particular would have to travel some hundreds of miles before he made contact with his district. I think that before they make that type of interjection they should first put their own house in order.

I claim that if ever a Bill should commend itself to every honourable member, the Bill before the House this afternoon should do so. When speaking in this debate on Tuesday last the Leader of the Opposition acknowledged that consideration should be given to a redistribution of electoral boundaries. However, he was running true to form, because he condemned the Bill by stating over and over again that the provisions contained therein were "crook". I will tell the House why the Leader stated that the Bill was crook: it was because it was being introduced by a Labor Government. It is all right for the honourable member for Albert, who is not in his correct seat, to laugh, but that is quite true. The Leader said it was "crook", and he left no doubt in the mind of any member what he meant.

Mr. Lawn: The Leader of the Opposition would be an authority on crookedness, wouldn't he?

Mr. HUGHES: Before this Bill is put to the vote, we are going to prove definitely to Opposition members that the Bill is not crook.

Mr. Lawn: The people don't think it is.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course they do not. The Leader of the Opposition was in office for so long, dictating the terms of reference under similar Bills, that his attitude is that anything introduced into the House by the Labor Party is taboo, that it is no good for the country, and that the rural areas will suffer. He thinks the people of rural areas will be denied a voice in Parliament. When I was speaking on an electoral Bill as a member of the Opposition, an honourable member from the other side of the House interjected and said, "How would your people feel towards you if there were a system of one vote one value?" I left no doubt in that honourable member's mind how I felt on this question. Another member also made a similar interjection. I represent a rural area and the people of my district know only too well how I feel on this matter, but not one person from that district has objected to the terms of this Bill. I have not troubled to check up on the number of votes I received in the last election, but I know that my constituents have every confidence in me. Honourable members opposite may chide me and try to lead me off the track, but some of them have not had to face their

electors and do not know whether the people have confidence in them. If a certain Bill had gone through the House and one particular honourable member opposite had had to face his electors, I wonder how he would have felt? I am sure he would not have had enough breath left to interject.

Mr. Clark: Do you think that, if someone went into your district, your electors could be convinced that you were crook?

Mr. HUGHES: It would take more than the honourable member for Albert to convince them that I was crook, and I am confident of that. If my people thought they would not be adequately represented under the provisions of this Bill, they would have objected. They have not, and that is why I know that my people are not as concerned as members opposite try to make out. It would not matter to me if my district were enlarged and I was again elected to represent the people. I would give them the same service that they have received in the past. I have told my people from the public platform at election times that my door is open to them seven days a week if they have problems. This is not a promise that I have made at election time and forgotten for the next three years. They know that my door is open seven days a week, and that includes Sunday, too. I have said that on various occasions, and did not stipulate that they cannot knock on my door on Sunday if they had a problem and needed my assistance. No-one would hesitate to call on me or telephone me on any day, as my constituents know the type of representation they are getting.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The better the day the better the deed.

Mr. Clark: I get most of my customers on Sunday.

Mr. HUGHES: Perhaps my people know me better than the people in the Gawler District know the honourable member for Gawler, and I do not say that disrespectfully. I know he is well known in his district. Unless there is an emergency requiring assistance from me on a Sunday, my people have every respect for me and do not call on me on that day.

Mr. Millhouse: You are lucky.

Mr. HUGHES: They know that I am available to them for the other six days of the week, but perhaps people do not know when the honourable member who has just interjected will be available, and that applies to some other honourable members, too.

Mr. Hall: Don't you think that the ratio of representation to city electors may be more important than the quality of the representation?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think the honourable member realizes the implication of that question: I cannot follow it myself. I know that the people in my district are adequately represented, and that they have every confidence in this Government. When this Bill is passed (as it should be), they will know they will get equal representation, as they do now.

Mr. Hall: What do you mean by "equal representation"?

Mr. HUGHES: Put it as fair value. Let us say they will get the same good representation in the future as they have had in the past.

Mr. Hall: You do not worry about the quality of the representation?

Mr. HUGHES: I am speaking of the time I have been their representative. I know they have confidence in me, and I do not have to tour my district in a caravan. I do not need that sort of set-up, with a glass window and a vase of flowers, for my people to see me. They know where I live.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You have the homely touch.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and if the day comes when I have to tour my district in an elaborate caravan in order to obtain the confidence of my people, my Party should ask someone else to stand in my place.

Mr. Quirke: There would not be room to turn it around in your district!

Mr. Clark: The member for Gouger won't have to use the caravan for long.

Mr. HUGHES: No, and that is why it is being used now. It is being used to build up a false image with the electors so that they will support the honourable member at the next election. I am sure that if he is successful in the next one, it will be the last in which he is. I am sure he will want a better caravan than he has now. Nevertheless, perhaps the honourable member for Gouger is giving his people good representation despite his travelling in a caravan. However, I do not need a caravan to give my people good representation. They know they can find me if they want my assistance every day of the week, including Sundays.

During the last Parliament, the Playford Government introduced a Constitution Act Amendment Bill, knowing full well that it would not be acceptable to the House. The

Government knew this long before it introduced the Bill and, in fact, was very pleased with the publicity it obtained. From then until the elections, members of the L.C.L. used every avenue possible to write down the Labor Party. Everyone in the State knows that the Labor Party had consistently criticized the gerrymander that was created over the years by the L.C.L. Government, and so the Bill to which I have just referred was put up to be knocked down—

Mr. Clark: It was crook!

Mr. HUGHES: —and to enable the members of the L.C.L. to present to the people a false image of the situation. No member of the Opposition this afternoon can deny that statement. The L.C.L. wanted to tell the people, particularly in the country, that that Party was prepared to accede to the request of the Australian Labor Party to have a redistribution of electoral boundaries so that L.C.L. members could go out and say that the Bill had been rejected by the very people who had asked for it; and make no error, they did that. However, to the dismay of the members of the Playford Government of that time, it backfired on them. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. G. A. Bywaters:

That the travelling stock reserve in the hundreds of Eba, Lindley, Maude, Bunday, King and Baldina, and in land out of hundreds, shown on the plan laid before Parliament on May 13, 1965, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1960, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown lands.

(Continued from July 1. Page 655.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): This motion concerns an area comprising roads, most of which are in my district, and there is no opposition to the action to be taken. In the past the road was of great value indeed. It extended from the Far North, through Burra, via Florieton to Morgan, across the river and down to the South-East. Used for the droving of cattle, it served its purpose well, but motor transport is now available and the road has outlived its usefulness. In some respects, it can

be a menace because of noxious weeds on it and also because of straying cattle.

This motion brings the road back under the control of the Department of Lands, but some people are anxious to have parts of it used for certain purposes. I am not speaking of those people to whom grazing rights will be allotted in the ordinary course of events. Naturally, parts of the road contiguous to grazing properties will be allotted for that purpose; but areas, particularly between Burra and Morgan, are extremely valuable for other purposes and they should not be grazed on under any circumstances.

Part of the road near Morgan is known as Black Oak Forest. The road has not carried stock to any great extent and there is a fine growth of native black oak that the District Council of Morgan is particularly anxious to have fenced off and preserved.

The council is prepared to give the attention necessary so that the area can be preserved for all time as a reserve devoted primarily to the preservation of that species of timber. Other picturesque areas near Burra are sought as reservations for picnic areas. They are ideally suitable for that and I suggest that, when parts of the road are allotted, these factors be considered. I know that both councils concerned will be consulted: they have already been approached. However, I do not think the District Council of Burra has yet replied, although the District Council of Morgan has clearly stated its intention.

I have no desire to delay this motion. To break this road up is a good, practical step. There will always be a track or road, but it will not be of the present magnitude. The area will again become Crown land and, as such, it can then be allocated either to owners of contiguous property or as reserves for certain purposes, such as the two I have outlined—for the preservation of the black oak and for picnic reserves under the control of the two councils of Morgan and Burra. I commend the motion to the House.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.15 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 3, at 2 p.m.