

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, January 25, 1966.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation,
 Alsatian Dogs Act Amendment,
 Building Act Amendment,
 Citrus Industry Organization,
 Country Factories Act Amendment,
 Eight Mile Creek Settlement (Drainage Maintenance) Act Amendment,
 Fauna Conservation Act Amendment,
 Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment (Morphettville),
 Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment (Betting Control Board),
 Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment (Totalizator),
 Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment (Decimal Currency),
 Maintenance Act Amendment,
 Municipal Tramways Trust Act Amendment,
 Oil Refinery (Hundred of Noarlunga) Indenture Act Amendment,
 Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances, Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment,
 Pharmacy Act Amendment,
 Pistol Licence Act Amendment,
 Prices Act Amendment,
 South Australian Housing Trust Act Amendment,
 South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act Amendment,
 Stamp Duties Act Amendment,
 Statute Law Revision,
 Superannuation Act Amendment,
 Supreme Court Act Amendment (Salaries),
 Veterinary Surgeons Act Amendment,
 Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment.

DECIMAL CURRENCY BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, informed the House that he had reserved the Bill for the signification of Her Majesty the Queen's pleasure thereon.

BENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

DEATH OF SIR RICHARD BUTLER.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Sir Richard Layton Butler, K.C.M.G., a former Premier and a former member for the Districts of Wooroora and Light, and place on record its appreciation of his public services, and that as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased honourable gentleman the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The late Sir Richard Butler distinguished himself in the public life of this State. He was a member of the South Australian Parliament from 1915 to 1938; he held the office of Premier and Treasurer of the State from 1927 to 1930, and from 1933 until he resigned from Parliament in 1938; and he served as Leader of the Opposition from 1930 to 1933. I pay a tribute to the sincerity and devotion to duty that marked his service in this Parliament. It was during his term as Premier that stress was laid on the need for industrial expansion in South Australia, and I pay a tribute also to his recognition of the importance of the promotion of industry within the State. Sir Richard also performed public duties as Director of Emergency Road Transport during the Second World War. He had high personal qualities and was an outstanding family man. On behalf of the Government I extend to his widow and other relatives our sincere sympathy in the sadness they have experienced at his passing.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to associate myself with the Premier's remarks and to second the motion. Sir Richard Butler's services as a Parliamentarian ceased in 1938, so that few members in the House today were privileged to serve with him. You, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Mr. Stott, Mr. Shannon and I are the only four, I think, who were with him in the 1933-1938 Parliament, and who still are privileged to serve in this Parliament. To appreciate Sir Richard's service to the State it is appropriate that we cast our minds back to the stage of South Australia's development when he was Premier, particularly in the period 1933-1938, for we

would then realize just what dividends his work had paid the community since then. It is interesting to recall that the Parliament House of which we are so proud was unfinished at that time, and that one of the Bills he introduced enabled the building to be completed.

However, I think that the most significant Bill introduced by Sir Richard, the one that probably had the biggest ultimate effect on the State, reduced company income tax to a flat rate of 2s. in the pound, with the express intention of encouraging secondary industry to be established in South Australia. At that time Whyalla was a small community of only 400 people, principally engaged in exporting iron ore. You may recall, Sir, that Port Augusta, in your district, was regarded by banks as unworthy of investment, no money being available for housing projects in Port Augusta at that time. We were then purely and simply a primary-producing State: we had no secondary industry potential whatsoever.

However, because of the impetus that Sir Richard gave to the economic development of secondary industries here, we have since been able to achieve the balanced economy that has raised the standard of living of South Australians, improved the Government's financial strength, and enabled better social services to be provided. Indeed, when we consider the work commenced by this honourable gentleman and the ultimate effect it has had on the State, I think every member will realize that the tribute paid to Sir Richard Butler by the Premier this afternoon is more than justified.

I do not believe that Dick Butler had an enemy in the world: he was popular with all members of the House when he was here, and was a friend to all of us. I know of no honourable member in the House at that time who was better liked or more respected than the late honourable gentleman.

I associate myself with the sentiments expressed concerning this great man, who was a true citizen of South Australia. The Premier said that he was a true South Australian, and I wholly endorse that remark. Sir Richard fought and worked for the State, and I am sure that, when the history of the State's development is written, his name will be well to the forefront of those who have served the State's citizens.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): Although it is unusual for a private member to speak to such a motion as this, I feel

duty bound, because of my association with Sir Richard Butler, to add to the remarks of the Premier and the Leader concerning Sir Richard's political history. In the late 1920's at the approach of the depression, Sir Richard, having seen what was happening in the financial world, warned the people of the State that they were facing hard times. As a result of his so-called pessimism he was relegated to the Opposition benches at the 1930 election. In 1933 he was elected Premier with a large majority in this Chamber, and so he inherited the conditions he had foreseen. At that time we saw probably the greatest financial stringency this country has ever known.

To his credit, Sir Richard was the first State Premier to balance his Budget following that financial debacle. I believe it is correct to say that that was the start of the continuing prosperity that the State enjoyed under his direction and afterwards under the direction of Sir Thomas Playford. By his forthright approach Sir Richard secured industries for the State and, having got our toe in (so to speak), we have since held our position in the secondary industry field. For this reason I believe the late Sir Richard Butler can be thanked for the fact that the State now has a balanced economy. I speak as a close friend of Sir Richard. He had no enemy: indeed, I never knew a man with a more lovable character or a man who would go so far out of his way to do someone a good turn. At the same time, I never heard of his doing anyone a bad turn. I should like to have that statement as my epitaph when I die.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): When I was elected to this House in 1933 Sir Richard Butler was Premier. What the member for Onkaparinga said about the difficulties foreshadowed for the 1933 Parliament was true: credit stringencies and low prices heralded the return of the Butler Government in 1933. I entered the Parliament with a difficult task, and had to fight a strong Premier and a strong House. Although we fought many hard battles in those early days, Sir Richard was always ready to listen to a well founded case and take it to Cabinet, and the results could be seen in subsequent legislation. During that early period Governments in all States faced a task made difficult by financial stringencies not only in Australia but throughout the world. Sir Richard was prepared to go to the highest level to afford whatever relief was possible, but little was possible in those days. During that period, although there were hard fights

on principles and policies, he always remained a firm friend. Some people called him "Dismal Dick" because of his pessimism and his views on certain things, but in this Chamber he once said, "The title is wrong: I should be called 'Cheerful Richard'." That typified his character: he was always cheerful, but he had the knowledge to foretell what would happen.

I am honoured and privileged to have been a member of the Parliament as long ago as was Sir Richard, who ably led this State as the Leader of the Government of the time. Although we had many fights, we remained firm friends. The last time I saw him was at the races, where we had a friendly drink together. He then looked well, and I wished him the best of health for 1966, but unfortunately that wish was not to be fulfilled. I add my sympathy to that already expressed to his family and relatives on losing a great man, whom it was an honour and privilege to know.

The SPEAKER: As the fourth remaining member who served with the late Sir Richard Butler, I associate myself personally with the tributes paid to him. Members will know that I took an active part in opposition to his Government. He did many things with which I did not agree, but I could not serve in a sphere such as this without learning over the years to appreciate his qualities. I agree with all that has been said about the outstanding qualities of the late Sir Richard. I remember him as Premier in the depression years. Perhaps the outstanding things in my memory are the measures he introduced which have had long-standing effects and which had my support. The Leader of the Opposition referred to Sir Richard's vision in having this Parliament House completed. I remember that he negotiated the agreement with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, which established the blast furnace at Whyalla, and that he provided for the building of the Morgan-Whyalla main. I remember vividly his speech when he explained the measure relating to the agreement and the picture he drew of the development that would take place in South Australia as a result. We remember him also because of the establishment of the cellulose industry and the Housing Trust.

I believe the House will agree to my mentioning also that during the last week two other members who served with the late Sir Richard have passed away. I refer to the late Mr. Albert Thompson and the late Mr. E. J.

Craigie. They were both members of this Parliament when Sir Richard was Premier. I pay a tribute to them for their contributions to the public life of South Australia.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[*Sitting suspended from 2.25 to 2.45 p.m.*]

PETITIONS: TRANSPORT CONTROL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG presented a petition signed by 189 electors residing in the Eyre and Flinders Districts. It urged that no legislation to effect any further control, restriction or discrimination in the use of road transport be passed by the House of Assembly.

Received and read.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER presented a petition signed by 953 electors, the majority residing in the Angas District and the remainder in the Barossa, Light and Murray Districts. It urged that no legislation to effect any further control, restriction or discrimination in the use of road transport be passed by the House of Assembly.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS

HOUSING.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: An article in this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Major Slump in Housing", contains the following report from Canberra:

Last year saw the biggest slump in home building since the 1961 collapse caused by the credit squeeze. The drop in South Australia was the biggest of all States on a comparative population basis. Figures issued today by the Commonwealth Statistician show that approvals of new houses and flats in South Australia were down to 11,631 against 14,576 in 1964. Australia-wide approvals fell from 124,569 in 1964 to 114,921. The total value of all buildings, including alterations and additions, also dropped in South Australia—the only State to record a fall in construction value. The 1965 figure for South Australia was £87,700,000 against £96,600,000 in 1964.

This statement is supported by the report of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics for December, 1965, which shows clearly that there is considerable slackening in the building industry. It is also supported by personal observation. Will the Premier, as Minister of Housing, obtain a report on the prospects of the building industry?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report on the question raised by the honourable member, and inform him when I have it. However, I shall want to know more about the matter than what has been said by the honourable member.

GARBAGE DISPOSAL.

Mr. McKEE: I have noticed a report that the Port Pirie District Council is concerned about foodstuffs containing meat taken off oversea ships at Port Pirie. The council is concerned that this practice could easily lead to the introduction of foot and mouth disease and swine fever. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether his officers have reported to him about this matter and, if they have not, will he obtain a report?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I noticed the report in this morning's newspaper referring to Port Pirie and to the concern about food-stuff from ships and the possibility of its going into the garbage cans of householders and being fed to pigs without its being properly treated. My department, which is interested in this practice, has kept a close watch on it. One of my officers, at the request of the Board of Health, attended a meeting at Port Pirie and explained to the people the dangers should this practice continue. At present, many people are concerned about the possibility of foot and mouth disease entering Australia, and no doubt this is the reason why the statement referred to by the honourable member was made. However, there is nothing to indicate any likelihood of foot and mouth disease being brought into the country through the system operating at present, but we cannot be too careful, and all precautions should be taken. As people at Port Pirie are collecting the waste food to feed to pigs, the Port Pirie council and my department are concerned about it. It was suggested at the meeting that the council should install a steam cooker and take over all refuse from houses for the feeding of pigs, but this suggestion was rejected by the council, and no doubt it had good reason for rejecting it. The onus is now on the Agriculture Department to ensure that every precaution is taken. People who collect foodstuffs from refuse should ensure that every article is steam cooked before feeding it to pigs or any other animals, and that every precaution is taken to prevent the introduction of a disease. My department is fully conscious of the present situation and is watching these proceedings with interest. It may be necessary to introduce regulations to ensure that people steam cook refuse to eliminate any chance of disease being brought in.

ONKAPARINGA VALLEY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. SHANNON: I sympathize with the Minister of Works in his problems regarding

the water supply in South Australia, and realize that he has inherited a difficult season. I have been pestered by some residents who are seeking reticulated water to help control bush fires. Even if we have to pay for it, water is worth its cost, because it affords protection from bush fires. Can the Minister say when work will commence on laying the main from the Chandler Hill tank to Cherry Gardens and Heathfield and when action will be taken to augment the supply in the Onkaparinga Valley scheme, which supplies that tank, so that the extensions now being sought will be practicable?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret that I cannot give a date at this stage. The Leader of the Opposition has also approached me, by way of a deputation, regarding services in his area and in the Mount Lofty area, where a terrific fire risk exists. Although the department is sympathetic and would like to provide the greatest degree of safety for all areas, this is not possible. However, in view of the honourable member's question I will refer the matter to the department, obtain a detailed report, and inform the honourable member when I have it.

MAIN NORTH-EAST ROAD.

Mrs. BYRNE: As the Main North-East Road at Holden Hill is at present being widened by the Highways Department, can the Minister representing the Minister of Roads say to what extent the road is to be widened and when the work is expected to be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

AIR-CONDITIONING.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand it is the Education Department's policy not to subsidize the cost of air-conditioning schools, and that that policy has existed for a long time. The department has recently introduced Samcon schools which are ideal in the northern areas where extremely high temperatures are experienced. Although the department will not assist in subsidizing the costs of such services in existing schools, I understand that the Victorian Education Department is supplying coolers for schools in the northern part of that State, and that the New South Wales Education Department subsidizes school committees in respect of such items. As I have heard much talk about uniformity for the sake of

uniformity, will the Minister, if only for the sake of uniformity (although this matter is far more important than that), consider altering the present policy so that subsidies can be provided for water-cooled air coolers to be installed in schools in our northern areas, particularly in such places as Whyalla, Port Augusta and Quorn, to make conditions more bearable for the students?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: True, as the honourable member has said, it has not been the Education Department's policy to subsidize air cooling in the way he describes. In fact, I do not think it has ever been the department's policy to do that. True, too, the building of Samcon schools will not benefit existing schools, but we are very conscious of the need for cooling in hot places, and I have issued instructions that primary schools to be built in future are to be of the Samcon type wherever practicable. I shall examine the honourable member's request in regard to subsidizing the cost of air cooling at other schools, but I point out that, although we increased by 10 per cent the amount of subsidies on the Budget, that sum was obviously insufficient, in the same way as the previous Government found its amount to be insufficient. For the past three or four years the subsidy payments have had to be deferred towards the end of each financial year. In order to try to obviate the need on this occasion we have introduced an equitable policy in respect of subsidy applications. This has been well received, as it ensures that the money available is equitably distributed. Obviously, with the shortage of subsidy money, it becomes difficult to extend subsidies in further directions, but I shall have the matter examined and give the honourable member a report.

PORT RIVER.

Mr. RYAN: The Minister of Works is probably aware of several recent press reports regarding dissatisfaction caused by the obnoxious odour in the upper reaches of the Port River. My colleague the member for Semaphore and I have frequently visited this locality, especially on hot days when the odour exists in the evening. Residents complain that it exists in the Port River (which naturally comes under the control of the Harbors Board) and arises from the pumping of effluent by the Engineering and Water Supply Department from the Port Adelaide treatment plant. I can vouch that this problem exists, and on numerous occasions we have raised with the departments concerned the matter of rectifying

the position to the satisfaction of the residents in the area. Will the Minister have the position examined in the hope that a satisfactory result for the people directly concerned will be obtained?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not deny the presence of the odour to which the honourable member referred, but I point out that some odours arose largely through the building of a causeway in connection with the development of the upper reaches of the Port River. The Engineering and Water Supply Department emphatically states that no odour arises as a result of the pumping of effluent from its treatment plant. Apparently, the odour results from the presence of stagnant water in the river. While some bacteria may emanate from the treatment plant, the trouble is considerably aggravated by the dumping of refuse by residents along the upper reaches of the river. Nevertheless, this matter has given three Government departments much concern and, being anxious to remedy the position, officers of the Public Health Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Harbors Board will confer early in February. The Government is awaiting a finding before taking further action.

VIETNAM PAMPHLET.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to a pamphlet entitled "Vietnam: Recent Statements on Australian Policy" which I understand was sent by the former Prime Minister (Sir Robert Menzies) to headmasters of secondary schools some time after the House adjourned at the beginning of December but before the end of the last school year. I also refer to reports that the Minister directed that these pamphlets should not be used in the schools. I remind the Minister that on August 17, in reply to a question on notice that I asked him, he said:

The policy of the Government is to encourage discussion of important public issues in current affairs groups at departmental schools—and I remind the Minister that this arose out of the question of Vietnam—

and that both sides of the question should be presented by speakers who are accepted authorities on the subject, invited with the authority of the headmaster.

I do no more than refer to the fact that, for better or for worse, Australia is deeply committed in Vietnam and that this is a matter of vital importance to the Australian people. Therefore, can the Minister say why, on this occasion, he acted to discourage discussion of a topic of great importance in and to this country instead of encouraging it, as was his

former policy, by ensuring that both sides of the case were presented in schools? Secondly, can the Minister say whether, with the approach of the new school year and for the reasons I have given in explanation of my question, he will allow the pamphlet to be used?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Of course, the honourable member is getting mixed up with two entirely different things. First, he is referring to what I had to say regarding current affairs group discussions and the presentation of two sides of the case at those discussions. That has nothing whatever to do with people sending leaflets to headmasters in our schools, without reference to the Minister of Education, with a view to their being distributed by the headmasters. The two things are not analogous. As a matter of policy, I would issue the same instructions to headmasters in relation to any particular pamphlet—no matter whence it came—which was sent to headmasters, without reference to the Minister of Education, with a view to its being distributed. The current affairs group at each school can discuss this matter, as I indicated before. That policy has not been altered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out that this pamphlet contains extracts from speeches (many of them made in Parliament by the Prime Minister and other senior Commonwealth Cabinet Ministers), so it is not just a pamphlet originating from anybody. In view of that, and in view of what the Minister has said about current affairs groups, will he allow this pamphlet to be used as study material by current affairs groups in high schools? Further, if he intends to prevent such pamphlets from being circulated in schools, what steps does he intend to take to ensure that pamphlets giving the other side of the story are also prevented from circulating?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: When these pamphlets were received by our headmasters they immediately informed the department. If any pamphlets of this character are received by our headmasters I expect them to notify our department, and I have every confidence that they will. Consequently, the department would take the same sort of action in such a case.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you allow this pamphlet to be used as material for current affairs groups?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: If a student wishes to use that pamphlet he may certainly do so, but I point out that all this is a great

flurry about very little, because the Commonwealth Government, having had ample opportunity to put its case in the press, has done so. The students of our current affairs groups take cuttings out of the press and use them as a basis for many discussions.

Mr. Hurst: They are encouraged to do it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. The policy in regard to the question of how our current affairs groups function has not been altered. There is nothing to stop students from discussing this matter in the same way as they have been discussing controversial topics for several years.

HAWKER WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Recently I received several letters from Hawker householders complaining of the strong odour emanating from the local water supply. Hawker has unfortunately been suffering from a very unsatisfactory water supply for many years. It is difficult to obtain a good supply of water (which is what the town really needs), but over the past couple of years a bore has been put down which has not been used when the local reservoir has had water in it. The local reservoir now contains water, which is being used. Over the years, however, the reservoir has accumulated much rubbish in the catchment areas. About 12 months ago when I visited the reservoir I could smell the stench coming from the water. I have often advocated that this reservoir be cleaned out, but this is difficult to do because at almost all times a small quantity of water remains in the reservoir even when it is not being used. However, this could be taken out by mud scoops. Will the Minister of Works examine the problem confronting householders at Hawker and see whether, if the stench is as bad as these people claim it is, another source of supply, such as the bore, could be used as soon as possible?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the difficulties regarding the Hawker water supply as I once examined it in company with the honourable member. Although I know nothing of the present problem, I shall certainly have it investigated with a view to having some relief afforded the townspeople of Hawker.

UNROADWORTHY VEHICLES.

Mrs. STEELE: Concern is being expressed by various sections of the community over the dumping in South Australia of unroadworthy vehicles classed as unuseable in the Eastern States. This is a potential threat to the

safety of road users in this State and constitutes an extra traffic hazard that should be avoided at all costs. To deal with this situation, can the Premier say whether the Government will consider setting up, forthwith, a committee consisting of the Commissioner of Police, the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, and a representative of the Chamber of Automotive Industries to review the matter and make recommendations to the Government on what action should be taken to stop this practice?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am willing to examine the honourable member's suggestion. I will obtain a report concerning the matter because I believe it is most important.

NORTH YELTA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HUGHES: I have received the following letter from some of my constituents:

We, the undersigned, wish to draw attention to the extremely poor water supply to our homes (situated at North Yelta, off the main road) from approximately 7 a.m. until 10.30 p.m. during the summer months. On the hottest days, when the water is most required, we are absolutely without tap water, sometimes for periods of up to an hour. Besides the inconvenience caused through insufficient water in the home and for maintaining fruit and vegetable gardens, the position in case of fire is very serious. We would be obliged to watch our homes burn. Those of us wishing to install septic toilets are deterred by the knowledge that there would not be sufficient water pressure to flush same. The Engineering and Water Supply Department was notified by letter of the position some time ago, but as yet no reply has been received. We ask that prompt action be taken to provide this area with an adequate water supply. We feel that we are paying for a service which we do not receive, and would sincerely appreciate your support in this matter.

The letter is signed by J. S. Pedler and 15 other ratepayers. There is a 10in. main nearby and it would not be very costly to have a few new pipes laid in this area, where 16 houses are close together. Will the Minister of Works ask his officers to investigate this matter with a view to making improvements?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the honourable member that I will treat this question with the degree of urgency it warrants. I am disturbed by the nature of the matters to which he refers, and I will obtain a report and let him have it as soon as possible.

GRACE DAYS.

Mr. COUMBE: I believe that payments have been made in respect of grace days to members of the Police Force and officers of certain Government departments who had to perform

duties in connection with the public over the Christmas holidays when other officers were on leave. Incidentally, I support the extra payment in respect of grace days worked. If my facts are correct, can the Premier say whether the Government intends, either now or in the future, to extend this privilege to officers and staff of the Railways Department who work in circumstances similar to those of the officers to whom I have referred?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report on the matter and make it available.

WARNING DEVICES.

Mr. BURDON: On September 14 last I received a reply from the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, to an earlier question about the provision of warning devices at railway crossings in Mount Gambier. I raised this matter on many occasions, and a warning device was installed several months ago at the White Avenue crossing. In his reply, the Premier said that an inspection would be carried out and conditions would be observed at other crossings. Will he now say whether this inspection has been carried out and, in view of a fatal accident that occurred during the Christmas holiday period at the Pick Avenue crossing, will he seriously consider the request for warning lights to be installed as soon as possible at all the remaining railway crossings at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report from my colleague, the Minister of Transport.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. RODDA: I have previously discussed with the Attorney-General the shortage of justices of the peace at Kalangadoo, and since Parliament adjourned I have received further representations from the police sergeant there. Because of sickness and people leaving the district, there is an extreme shortage of justices, and I understand that there are one or two nominations that would be suitable. Will the Attorney-General see whether he can afford some relief, as justices are being brought to Kalangadoo from other areas to do the court work?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall have the matter examined immediately to see whether urgent relief cannot be provided. A survey of justices has been made, and quotas have been tentatively established for most districts. Before adopting final figures for these districts I intend to circularize all members, informing them of the tentative quotas to be established

for police districts within their areas and inviting their comments so that it may be seen whether, when we adopt the quotas for the areas, they will be adequately served with justices and so that honourable members may know exactly what justices are available in the areas they represent. I hope that with the assistance of honourable members we shall shortly have a satisfactory system operating.

TATTOOING.

Mr. LAWN: As my question concerns policy, as the matter has been the subject of police investigation, and as the Premier represents the Chief Secretary in this House, I address my question to him. Last year an employer in the metropolitan area told me that many females who came to him for employment had to be refused work because they had been over-tattooed. Had it not been for the tattooing, he would have been prepared to engage them. He suggested that it should be an offence for a person to disfigure a minor. I promised to raise the matter, but I overlooked it. Earlier this year there was a press report of a similar occurrence in New South Wales: a 17-year-old girl said that wherever she applied for employment she was refused because of over-tattooing, and that she was too embarrassed to attend a dance. Since then, a fund has been set up on behalf of this young lady to enable her to have a skin graft. The employer I mentioned communicated with me again last week, following the press report about the occurrence in Sydney. He said that he had raised the matter with the Police Commissioner last year and that the Commissioner had submitted a report to, I think, the Chief Secretary or Minister of Social Welfare. Will the Premier consider this matter to see whether legislation could be introduced making it an offence for any person to disfigure a minor?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up this matter with my colleague the Chief Secretary and, as soon as I obtain a report I will give it to the honourable member.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works the report of the departmental committee investigating the possible use of effluent from the Bolivar sewage treatment works?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret that I have not a full report, although I have an interim report that I am willing to make available to the honourable member. I have been told by the chairman of the committee that it will not be possible to provide a detailed report

before May or June of this year. I know that this matter creates much concern, but I am sure that if the honourable member looks at the agenda for the meeting of December 13 last he will see that the committee must do a terrific amount of work before it can reach a satisfactory conclusion. We appreciate the real problems of the growers in the area. However, a soil survey of 32,000 acres must be completed before a proper conclusion can be arrived at. The honourable member can rest assured that we will do everything we can to get the final report as soon as possible.

Mr. HALL: I appreciate the effort by this committee and the time spent by it, but I understand that it will investigate generally a possible irrigation scheme somewhere north of the Bolivar treatment works, whereas the immediate problem in the Virginia area is to supplement the available underground water supplies immediately. I am told by several residents of Virginia that some European cities successfully use effluent from sewage works on market gardens, and that around Sofia thousands of acres is watered by sewage effluent. As this is an extremely important matter to the area north of Adelaide and, consequently, to nearly all citizens of this State who purchase the vegetables and other produce of this area, will the Premier arrange his itinerary for his forthcoming overseas trip so that he can personally investigate, not so much the technical means of using effluent but how much it is used and in what areas, and perhaps consider some of the more notable features of this irrigation scheme?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague, the Minister of Mines, and his department are arranging the overseas visit, which is associated, in particular, with the use of natural gas and with oil resources. No mention has been made of other matters or of the countries to be visited. It will be difficult to alter the itinerary to visit the places referred to by the honourable member. Certain verbal information I have received is that it would not be a successful proposition to use the effluent for the purpose referred to in the Virginia area. I am not expressing my view, but that is the information given me. In view of what the Minister of Works told the House this afternoon I have not examined it closely, but if these visits can be arranged they will be.

GRANGE SWAMP.

Mr. BROOMHILL: My question concerns the backwaters of the Port River in the Grange area, and I wish to make it clear that it is not

related to the question previously asked by the member for Port Adelaide. During the summer months the backwaters of the Port River cease to flow, and this results in the river becoming a mass of reeds and the water stagnating and attracting flies, rats and mosquitoes, which become a nuisance to residents of the Grange area. The residents have asked me to bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Marine. It has been suggested that dredging this portion of the river will correct the position. Will the Minister ask the Harbors Board to consider its responsibilities in this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall certainly take up this matter with the Harbors Board. I am surprised at the honourable member's comments, because recently a docket appeared on my table containing a letter from the health department of the Woodville City Council asking that the council be not compelled to pay a fee to eradicate mosquitoes, as the action of the Harbors Board in the area had eradicated mosquitoes. However, as we now have this conflicting report, I shall have the matter investigated for the honourable member and give him a reply as soon as possible.

ABORIGINAL RESERVES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs provide a list of the unoccupied and unmanned Aboriginal reserves referred to in the Bill before the House, and indicate their approximate acreages?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall have the list prepared for the honourable member.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Several times in this House I have referred to the much-needed installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Goodwood Road and Greenhill Road, Wayville. At present this intersection is controlled at peak periods by a police officer who performs an outstanding feat in guiding traffic from all angles. As lights are contemplated this year, can the Minister of Lands obtain a report from the Minister of Roads concerning the intended starting date of this project?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member as quickly as possible.

STUDENTSHIPS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the matter of studentships for young men and women in the Public Service and the anomaly

—one might say the injustice—which has arisen because these studentships have been back-dated to January 1. Perhaps I can explain more fully by illustrating an actual case which has been referred to me of a young man in one of the Government departments. He has been in the Public Service since 1961. He has been doing a part-time Bachelor of Technology degree course, and his salary has risen to something over £1,000 a year. At the beginning of 1965 he was awarded a State Government studentship which, as the Premier will know, entitled him to attend the Institute of Technology, with all fees paid except, I think, for the general service fee and statutory fee, and in addition to receive an allowance of £370 a year. This scheme undoubtedly is a boon for those who are starting fresh from school to do a course, because they can get the allowance from the beginning of January and therefore they can receive some payment during the long vacation before they have actually begun their work; however, for those who are in the Public Service already what happens is that, because the studentships are not announced until just before the beginning of the term, people before that time work at their normal duties in a department and they are paid their normal salary but because, under the terms of the studentship, they are not allowed to earn more than a certain amount (£7 a week in the case referred to me), they are then obliged during the period of their studentship to refund an amount which is sometimes about £100, so that over the whole year they do not get more than the allowance. The effect is that they work at their normal duties in a department for six or seven weeks or maybe more for only £6 or £7 a week and not for their normal wage, and this is an anomaly. I understand that representations have been made to at least one Government member, I think the member for Glenelg, and also to the Premier, and I have seen a copy of a letter the Premier wrote a few weeks ago in which he acknowledged that there was hardship (that was the word he used) in particular cases. As I understand that this is the case for a number of young men and perhaps women, too, in the Public Service (I have been told, well over 30) I ask the Premier whether, as there is an admitted hardship and anomaly here, the Government cannot look at this again, either to ensure that the people who are already in the Public Service are paid at their proper rate of pay while they are working at their normal job or at least that the studentships

be announced before January so that these persons can have a holiday rather than work at a very much reduced rate?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think the honourable member almost answered his own question when he said that the Government agreed to the people entitled to these scholarships receiving a payment as from January 1. In the particular case the honourable member referred to, the person concerned has already had 12 months at the Institute of Technology, and he has now been recommended by the department to take a further 12 months at the institute. During the Christmas vacation these students are required to resume employment at a rate of pay appropriate to their status instead of taking leave. They are also expected to consider the department in which they are engaged by putting in some time during the period between the break-up in December and the resumption the following year.

Mr. Millhouse: There are quite a number of them.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member may have quite a number of them, but I have only the one. I do not know whether the honourable member has obtained his information from the Secretary of the Public Service Association, who has written about the same matter. The Government is considering the matter further. A point that is always missed in these cases (and I suppose this example would be as good as any) is the expectation of increased salaries after these people have completed their training. In fact, this Government has found that such people will remain for a certain period of time but that as soon as they are free to leave they will do so. The Government introduced a policy to pay these people for these studentships from January 1. This matter is still being considered by the Government.

RABBITS.

Mr. RODDA: My question relates to the State-wide problem of the increase in the rabbit population, although I am mainly concerned with the position in the South-East. As I understand that the Lands Department has a policy on rabbit destruction, will the Minister of Lands make some statement on the problem of the rabbits in the South-East and on his department's policy?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am aware that there has been a marked increase in the rabbit population in recent times. Landholders generally are only now becoming aware

of this, and I hope that as a result of their awareness they may take positive action regarding the destruction of these rabbits. The honourable member was good enough to indicate that he would ask this question, and I have obtained the following report:

The Lands Department for some time has made available the services of vermin control advisory officers to any council wishing to exploit an efficient means of controlling the rabbit population. So far three councils have taken advantage of this service—Tatiara, Meningie and Robe. The procedure of the council includes:

- (1) Employment of a suitable person to be a rabbit control officer, who is trained by the department's Vermin Control Advisory Staff.
- (2) Provision of vehicles and equipment.
- (3) Purchase through the Lands Department of the necessary poison.

At present the scheme is self-supporting in that landholders engage the council to carry out rabbit control operations on a cost basis. The assistance of the Lands Department is not financial, but purely technical and organizational. In doing this the department trains council officers in the technique of rabbit control; authorizes suitably trained persons to handle "1080" poison; makes available and controls the use of "1080" poison; assists in the organization and administration of the scheme; and continues to be available to the council in an advisory capacity. Fears have been expressed concerning the effect of these measures upon native fauna. However, there has not been any noted destruction of wild life probably because of the techniques used. Rather it is felt that by controlling the rabbit population, regeneration of fauna populations is facilitated by reason of the greater food supplies available.

LOTTERIES REFERENDUM.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General an answer to my question of November 30 about the flash broadcasts over the Australian Broadcasting Commission's stations advising people to vote with a cross at the referendum?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A letter from the Acting Manager of the Australian Broadcasting Commission, Adelaide, reads, in part:

I should like to assure you that we have made very careful investigations into the allegations that "on November 20, while the referendum was in progress, frequent broadcasts were flashed over the Australian Broadcasting Commission's stations advising people to vote with a cross". It is quite clear that if such broadcasts took place they were not from the A.B.C. radio or television stations.

HACKNEY BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: I was delighted last year to see the progress made on the reconstruction and rebuilding of the Hackney bridge over the Torrens River at Walkerville. However, recently there has been complete cessation of

activities at this site. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government ask his colleague whether this cessation is caused by the contractor's men being on annual holidays, or whether there is another reason for the stoppage? Will he also ascertain whether this work will be continued soon?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get a report on this matter.

KEITH ROBBERY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently, after a robbery at Keith the police chased a car, the occupants of which left it and took to the scrub. The next morning the Keith Aero Club plane went over the scrub area and, to use a common expression, flushed out these people, who came into Bordertown and gave themselves up. I understand that in the case of murder the police sergeant or officer in charge can virtually commandeer anything he wishes to assist in searching for the suspects, but that, under the circumstances I have mentioned, he cannot requisition an aeroplane in that way and that the aircraft must be flown at the expense of the people who operate it. I understand that at present there is no means of obtaining compensation for the costs incurred. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Chief Secretary and ascertain whether in such cases, where a police officer may consider it necessary and convenient to use an aircraft to search for criminals, some compensation might be paid to those people who provide the aircraft?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall take up that matter with the Chief Secretary and bring down a report as soon as possible.

LEGISLATION.

Mr. HALL: As 24 items remain on the Notice Paper under Government business, and as I believe further legislation is to be introduced this session, will the Premier say which matters will definitely proceed and thereby assist members in knowing what time can be devoted to debates, so that no time will be wasted?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Notice Paper contains 24 items, as well as a contingent notice of motion that does not belong to me, and the Government intends to introduce 14 other matters. I am not responsible for the time taken by members in speaking to measures before the House. If members opposite desire to make lengthy speeches, I cannot control that, but I should hope that they

would use a little discretion and not challenge the Chairman's ruling on certain occasions, thereby wasting time. I expect to be able to dispose of the items on the Notice Paper in as short a time as possible, and I will certainly not be a party to moving the gag in order to do so.

COST OF LIVING INCREASE.

Mrs. STEELE: The report of the Bureau of Census and Statistics published a few days ago showed that the cost of living in the December quarter had increased more in South Australia than it had in any other State, namely, by 5s. a week. Detailing some of the price increases in Adelaide, the report stated that miscellaneous items rose by 3s. 9d. a week, potatoes by 3d., other foods by 9d., clothing and drapery by 3d., housing by 1s., and household supplies by 3d., and it is pleasing to see that the price of meat at least fell by 1s. 3d. Will the Premier obtain a report from the Prices Commissioner showing the price increases that have occurred in the general categories mentioned, and also the factors that have contributed to such increases?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Because of the December price of potatoes I was somewhat surprised that the figure was not even more inflated, but I shall obtain a report from the Prices Commissioner as soon as possible.

TORDON 50.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have been concerned to see how widely skeleton weed has spread this year. I understand that, from the trials conducted, by far the most satisfactory weedicide has been Tordon 50, but that no concession in price is given to large users of this weedicide. Indeed, the same rate is paid for 100 gallons as is paid for one gallon. Will the Minister of Agriculture investigate the matter, in view of the effectiveness of this weedicide and of its cheapness per acre compared with the price of other similar weedicides, and ascertain whether a concession could be granted to those people seriously trying to control the weed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SERVICE).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 2. Page 3450.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I rise to support the Bill and to agree in principle with its amendment to the principal Act. Long

service leave is accepted by the general public. It is a reward for long and faithful service by an employee and it also serves a useful purpose because it provides something at stake for an employee in keeping the same job, which means greater production and is of benefit to the community as a whole. I approve of new subsection (5) (a) of section 18c which provides for the transfer of officers from the South Australian Institute of Technology and the South Australian School of Mines. The interchange of teaching staff between these branches of the department will be of benefit to them. I do not know whether new subsection (5) (b) goes too far in providing for continuous service of a teacher throughout the Commonwealth. I do not believe this provision is so necessary as new subsection (5) (a). However, I support the Bill and trust that its passage through the House will be speedy.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): The former member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) would be delighted at the speech I am going to make because he used to tell me that I talked for too long; I do not intend to do so now. I asked questions of the former Government concerning this matter, without much success. I am delighted that this Bill has now been introduced. It seems to me elementary justice that a public servant transferring from one branch of the Education Department to another should not suffer the loss of continuity in respect of his long service leave. I am happy to support the Bill, and I congratulate the Minister on introducing it.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL).

Adjourned debate on the question "That this Bill be now read a second time"—which the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford had moved to amend by striking out all the words after "That" and inserting in lieu thereof:

The Bill be withdrawn and redrafted to provide—

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

(Continued from July 29. Page 761.)

Mr. HALL (Gouger): The Bill has been on the file for a long time as is indicated by its being No. 13. Possibly, in some converse way, I shall, because of the time it has been on the

Notice Paper, say less than I would have said had the Bill been dealt with earlier in the session. Although the Bill has been on the file for a long time (and perhaps it has been neglected by the House until today), it is widely known in South Australia that the Bill exists and is on the file of the House. It is known amongst the public by two words expressed by the Leader—"it's crook". Those two words have resounded throughout South Australia and express what the public thinks of the Bill's intention. The Government certainly does not flaunt its ideals in the Bill because they are hidden under many technical details; the Bill has many basic faults. If the aim of the Bill were to set up a better system of electoral boundaries in South Australia, it should not be introduced with basic defects: it should have sound basic principles.

In considering a system of redistribution where different emphases are placed on city and country districts, one should first carefully consider the boundary line to be drawn between city and country districts. This should be a basic principle in drawing up a new system of distribution. Attention must be given to quotas, the work of districts, tolerance of districts, and so on in considering where a start should be made on this all-important boundary between city and country districts.

Mr. McKee: Ask your Leader! We often asked him and didn't get anywhere.

Mr. HALL: I ask the member for Port Pirie to tell me where this metropolitan boundary is. I well remember asking the member for Gawler whether he thought the present metropolitan boundary, which was fixed as long ago as 1954, was a realistic one, and of course he replied "No" in a determined manner. Yet in this most important legislation the boundary is fixed by the Australian Labor Party as it was fixed in 1954, before the expansion of the last 12 years took place. This is bringing it up to date! The great shining ideals of last March are translated into legislation that has at its very basis the distribution set-up of 1954. On page 7 of the Bill it is clearly stated:

In this section "Country area" means any area outside the areas comprised in the electoral districts . . . as such electoral districts were defined at the time of the passing of the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act 1954.

Therefore, the 26 electoral districts which have been hawked around this State as being equal to the present 26 districts are going

to include a significant portion of the metropolitan area which the present Government fails to recognize and fails to include in its legislation. Does this mean, then, that some of the inequalities which are inherent in country areas, such as higher freight charges, will be perpetuated in these near-metropolitan areas? As the member for Gawler knows, the most unpopular imposition is the increased price of beer, which costs one penny a bottle more in Elizabeth and Para Hills. I can remember when the increase was twopence at the latter place. Is that place in the country or is it in the city? The member for Gawler knows full well that his Elizabeth and Salisbury districts are in the metropolitan area, and he would not deny it except in this legislation.

Mr. Clark: No, there are other things, too.

Mr. HALL: Surely the honourable member does not say that that is correct?

Mr. McKee: You said you were decentralizing industries in the country by establishing them at Elizabeth.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member is using a peculiar argument. For as long as he has been here we have always been wrong and he has always been right, yet now for his own convenience he says we were right. In the 1954 Act, which was drawn up before the previous Government built Elizabeth, the metropolitan boundary was far more realistic than the boundary the honourable member adopts now. If the honourable member is going to put things right, why is he going back to 1954? Of course there is some motive. This is not an idealistic scheme, otherwise we would have the true metropolitan area, and this is the one basic factor which shows this legislation up for what it is. In the words of our Leader, it is crook, and those words will resound around this State and will be remembered and always associated with this Bill.

Mr. Clark: What! After what he had been doing for 30 years!

Mr. HALL: There are other great defects in the Bill. A permanent commission is to be set up to look at the boundaries in South Australia and come to conclusions which will be accepted or rejected by the Government without presentation of its findings to this Parliament, and that is a direct negation of the views put forward by the present Premier in his policy speech when he said that he would do away with Executive control and bring all of this State's affairs under Parliamentary control. He is now endeavouring to reverse

this procedure and place under Executive control the very basis on which members of Parliament are elected. Another great defect in the Bill is that it frequently mentions the Legislative Council but does so only with the object of abolishing it. I challenge the Government now to ask the people of this State what they think of the Legislative Council. The Premier and some members opposite are very keen on referenda, but I guarantee that they would not attempt a referendum on the question of the popularity of the Legislative Council. Since such obnoxious pieces of legislation came into this House in the last session, many people who have taken the Legislative Council for granted are now regarding it as their only backstop against totalitarian government. The people who so greatly fear for their livelihood and their future because of the succession duties legislation and the road transport legislation and the other Bills we still have to discuss are looking to the Legislative Council as a safeguard of their democratic rights. Those people have a new interest in that body.

Mr. Freebairn: The member for Port Pirie would make a very good Legislative Councillor.

Mr. Clark: He is much too young.

Mr. HALL: I admit that he has exhibited a very conservative turn of mind today. Although his adoption of the 1954 definition of the metropolitan area makes me think that he would make a good Legislative Councillor, I feel that he is far too idealistic.

Mr. McKee: You are speaking in support of the minority again.

Mr. HALL: There is a contention that country interests will still maintain their political representation, because although the House will be increased to 56 members there will still be 26 country members. The metropolitan boundaries will be unrealistic, but 26 districts will exist in the so-called country areas under this legislation. Therefore, it is contended that the political representation will not alter, but the 26 country seats will be in a House of 56 instead of one of 39. The member for Wallaroo spoke at some length, and had a peculiar idea that as long as he personally gave good service to his constituents the ratio of the country seats held would not matter. He said that he gave his constituents service six or seven days a week to deal with the various problems. Someone interjected, "Don't you think that the ratio of representation to city electors may be more important than the quality of the representation?" He answered by saying, "I know the people in my district are adequately

represented and they have every confidence in this Government. When this Bill is passed (as it should be), they will know they get equal representation, as they do now." Equal representation! In a House of 56 will they get the same representation as in a House of 39? Surely this cannot be so, and I am sure that country people are not swallowing that argument. The Government is not putting all the facts of this legislation before the House. This Bill will greatly reduce country representation. I am not saying that this will not alter in whatever scheme is put forward. It is obvious that the city must have more representation than it has now.

Mr. Clark: You admit that?

Mr. HALL: We know it must be greater than at present, but how foolish for the Premier to say that the ratio of country representation will not be altered. That is ridiculous and unrealistic, and is flying in the face of population trends. For him to say that country representation will remain the same makes one wary of the Bill because of the lack of quality that supports it. We have seen enough anti-country legislation this session to warn us what would happen to country areas if they were deluged under the ratio introduced by this Bill. The money available to subsidize swimming pools in country areas has been drastically reduced by the Government this year. Despite the Premier's assurance that the swimming pool subsidy would be sympathetically considered, it has been fixed at about one-third of last year's and is not being increased. One group in my district had a strong claim for a subsidy which they would have got under our Administration, but they are being denied it by the present Government. We voted £25,000 for these subsidies last year, but this Government has voted about £7,000 for this year. That indicates the Government's attitude to country areas. Because of this alarming trend, we need to ensure that country districts are not entirely disregarded as they would be by this legislation. It is one of the facts of political life in this State that the Labor Party has hoodwinked the people by its one vote one value cry. During the last election campaign I met people who said that they were for the Labor Party, the one vote one value Party. I would ask them, "Is the Labor Party a one vote one value Party? How does it conduct its own affairs?" I would then tell these people the make-up of the Federal Executive of the Australian Labor Party which makes the rules and regulations binding on all members of that Party.

Mr. Shannon: It fixes the policy.

Mr. HALL: Yes, it does.

Mr. Clark: Do you know anything about it?

Mr. HALL: There are six people from each State to make the rules that are binding.

Mr. Freebairn: Are these the faceless men?

Mr. HALL: Yes, they were referred to by the Prime Minister as such. An equal number of people from each State make up the Federal A.L.P. Executive so that a ratio of eight or 10 to one in voting value exists when one has regard to the population of the States. Members of the Labor Party prattle about one vote one value, but when this is explained to people who have been hoodwinked so well, these people change their ground.

Mr. Clark: Their votes don't show that.

Mr. HALL: They have been hoodwinked fairly successfully but now they are looking for something more than is contained in this legislation. People look at the bread and butter issues and how they affect their pocket, housing and budget. They are not getting the results they expected from the legislation that has been introduced.

Mr. Freebairn: They are becoming disgruntled in Barossa, Chaffey, and Unley, too.

Mr. HALL: I would have thought that the member for Unley would not have been associated with the radical legislation that has been introduced. If the member for Unley intends to be associated with this legislation he will have to take the consequences. When one hears this one vote one value story and sees the legislation which has been introduced but which contradicts that story (and we know that it is a ratio of eight or 10 to one in regard to the voting powers of the Labor Party's policy-making body), one wonders how members opposite can still advance the ideals that they have advanced in the past. When one sees the completely unrealistic metropolitan boundary and the complete control by Executive power over the boundaries as they are drawn by the Electoral Commission, and when one hears the spurious argument that the country interest will retain the same ratio of representation, and the pretence that exists behind the one vote one value claim advanced by a Party that does not in any way adhere to it, one realizes that all the technical details of the Bill become unimportant, because they are not worth considering when they are based on such a fallacious theory. I deplore the Bill and hope that it will be heartily opposed.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in support of the Bill. It seeks to amend the South Australian Constitution, as the Australian Labor Party proposed in its electoral policy at the election held in March last year. Honourable members are fully aware that the Labor movement has for many years campaigned for electoral reform. Real electoral reform is long overdue in this State. In my personal campaign which was spread over two years I made sure that the many electors to whom I spoke knew what our broad proposals on electoral or constitutional reform were, and this Bill covers all those proposals. If there were any doubts about our intentions, they were certainly not evident in proposals advanced by the Labor Party when in Opposition, because the basis of the Bill is the same as that put before the Parliament by our Party in 1962. It is a source of pride to me that the A.L.P., among other things, gave the electors a positive proposal on electoral and constitutional matters, and that we in no way tried to disguise our policy.

We believe that once our policy is decided on and endorsed by the people (which it was) we are bound to give effect to it at the first opportunity, as we are doing now. The Bill implements our policy; it has been clearly explained, and should be understood by all members. It makes three important and much needed changes to the Constitution. First, it increases the number of House of Assembly members from 39 to 56, the new Assembly districts to be defined by an Electoral Commission to be set up. Secondly, it seeks to provide for one roll of electors for elections for both Houses of Parliament: that is, all electors entitled to vote for the House of Assembly shall be entitled to vote also for the Legislative Council. Thirdly, it makes a major amendment to the deadlock provisions.

The existing Constitution Act of 1934-1963 is a most curious and deceptive document, because it seems to give the electors the absolute right to elect a Government of their choice by a simple majority whereas, in fact, it was originally designed by the Liberal and Country League and subsequently modified to achieve the same end as that of the one-Party system of government. The Constitution Act provides a universal adult franchise whereby everyone has the right to vote for the House of Assembly, but it permits a completely false value in respect of votes from various parts of the State, as though each has a different sense of responsibility. This is because the original

rural-dominated Legislatures set up a formula designed to deny the city, as it grew to great size, the representation it merited on the basis of population. Thus, it developed that the city dweller's vote, by and large, was greatly diluted, because the rural voter obtained greater representation when he cast his vote. The present electoral set-up is clearly unbalanced. The *News* editorial of February 26, 1964, stated, among other things:

The Government's Bill—referring here to the previous Government—to change electoral boundaries has been thrown out and the electors of this State are back where they started—with a clearly unbalanced electoral set-up. The Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, himself admits the present basis of electoral boundaries is "disproportionate".

Mr. Clark: It took him 30 years to find that out!

Mrs. BYRNE: The article continues:

He has said: "I agree that this is disproportionate, but I want to point out that they (the Opposition) are proposing to vote for the continuance of the disproportion which exists at the present time." Having agreed that "disproportion" exists, it is going to be difficult in future for the Premier to deny the much harsher term which the Opposition chooses to use—"gerrymander". It is not much use for the Premier to claim that in throwing out his Bill the Opposition has voted for a continuance of the present system. In their view, they have voted against what they considered to be an extension and a perpetuation of the present set-up.

Again, in its editorial of February 21, 1964, the *News* stated:

Democracy—government by the will of the majority through an elected Parliament—has reached a dangerously low ebb in this State. Real electoral reform has been overdue for years.

This "low ebb" is a result only of the present electoral system that exists. In 1938 the Liberal Party, after introducing the present electoral system, was elected to govern the State for the first time under the present electoral set-up, which over the years has been described not only by Labor people but by political observers and commentators throughout the world as one of the most disgraceful gerrymanders possible. This electoral set-up kept the Liberal Party in power despite consistent adverse votes by the people over a long time. In fact, the previous L.C.L. Government had a majority vote for it only once since 1938, and yet remained in office until March of last year. This must surely indicate the unjustness of the present electoral system. Under the present system, two-thirds of the electors elect one-third of the members, and one-third of the electors elects two-thirds of

the members. An electoral system should give every single qualified elector a fair and equal say in deciding who shall have the right to govern the State, and, whatever the electoral system, the principle of one vote one value should be observed as near as is practicable.

Mr. Shannon: Is that what you are doing in this Bill?

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes. Our Government, by introducing the Bill, is correcting the present position, so that at all times the will of the people will be heeded, and Parliament will fulfil its role in serving the people. No longer can we tolerate the situation in which the people are regarded as the servants of the Parliament, the State, and of those who tailored the Constitution to serve their selfish ends. Our Government is interested in the people—the whole of the people—and intends to see that every section of the population is prosperous, knowing full well that any depressed part of the population drags down the standards of the rest. For that reason alone, the principle we must follow is one of giving everyone an equal say in who governs. That is what this Bill seeks to do, namely, to have a House of Assembly of 56 members, based on one vote one value, with no decrease in country representation.

Mr. Freebairn: Is that in accord with your Party's platform?

Mrs. BYRNE: The honourable member can go to the Party's office and obtain a copy of our platform for 5s.—the same as anybody else. The increase in the number of members of the House of Assembly to 56 is reasonable. A comparison of past representation with the number of electors on the roll of the State proves this. Originally, on April 22, 1857, there were 36 members with 15,672 electors on the roll. When this legislation was introduced in 1938, there were 39 members with 364,884 electors on the roll. In 1965, there were 562,824 electors on the roll still electing 39 members, as in 1938. It is obvious that if there were 36 members originally with 15,672 electors on the roll, there should be more than 39 members today. Proportionately there should be 1,292 members, which is a 3,527 per cent increase. Of course, this borders on the ridiculous. Again, when 39 members were introduced in 1936, at the first election after that date (in 1938) there were 364,884 electors on the roll. Therefore, in comparison there should be 60 members now, but we ask only for 56.

The Leader of the Opposition has claimed that the Bill does not allow for adequate representation of rural interests, and that

claim portrays clearly the difference between the Government and the Opposition. The Leader claims that, under the present system, rural interests (he shied away from the words "country people") need adequate representation in the Parliament, as apparently those country interests are animals and possessions as well as people. I cannot agree that a sheep should have a vote as is implied by this attitude. Opposition members have claimed, but have never been able to prove, that the lopsided South Australian electoral system is necessary to protect the interests of the country against those of the city. They give an excuse that the standard of amenities provided in the country is still lower than that in the metropolitan area. Of course, the facilities are lower as the previous Government did not decentralize industry, because it knew that if it did so Labor voters would move into country-held Liberal seats on which the then Government relied for its majority. There is no reason why the electoral system should be the means whereby country dwellers should receive compensation for any disadvantage in country living. The proper way to compensate for this is to allow various forms of concessions but not to penalize a voter for his political beliefs.

Another thing which will be said in opposition to the Bill is that it increases Labor representation in the Parliament but, apart from that being in accord with the vote of March 6 last year, one very beneficial effect will be to increase the number of members who give full-time representation to their districts, and a member of Parliament's job is a full-time one. If it is not carried out as such, some part of it is neglected. One of the many good things that will come out of this electoral set-up is more adequate representation, a better service for those who pay our salaries, and a Parliament more in touch with and attuned to the needs of the people. The electors in my district of Barossa, a representative group ranging from primary producers to industrial workers, must be accepted as a good cross-section of the people of South Australia. During my election campaign I spoke to many of them. In fact I think I personally spoke to more electors than did any other candidate, and the overwhelming majority supported the general principle of one vote one value that is embodied in this Bill.

Even confirmed Liberal supporters admitted that the existing system was unjust and did not reflect any credit on the Government of the day. The tenor of many of the remarks

was that if the Government was not wanted by the people then it should vacate office. Many migrants in the Barossa District were even more emphatic in their views. Some went as far as to comment pointedly upon the failure of the Labor Party to take drastic action to remove the Government after its defeat in 1962. Therefore, I know from personal experience that the principle of one vote one value, as contained in the Bill, is what the people want.

The appointment of an Electoral Commission consisting of three commissioners of whom one shall be a judge of the Supreme Court who shall be chairman of the commission, one the Surveyor-General, and one the Assistant Returning Officer of the State, to undertake the dividing of the State into 56 approximately equal electoral districts for the House of Assembly, thus taking the power out of the hands of the Government of the day, is something surely every reasonable member will agree with. This permanent independent commission will also be required to redivide the electoral districts from time to time whenever they become, through shifts of population, much more or much less than the average of other districts. Manipulation of electoral boundaries by unscrupulous persons to maintain their own power will become a thing of the past.

Mr. Nankivell: Who are you looking at?

Mrs. BYRNE: I am looking at the honourable member's side of the House. The Government will also provide for adult suffrage for Legislative Council elections and for the same deadlock provision between the Houses as exists between the House of Commons and the House of Lords. This proposed constitutional change for the Legislative Council means that all electors entitled to vote for the House of Assembly will be entitled to vote for the Legislative Council, whereas the present franchise is restricted to the following:

An owner of freehold estate of clear value of £50; a leaseholder of leasehold estate of clear annual value of £20 under a lease granted for three years (or which contains a right of purchase); a registered proprietor of Crown lease on which there are improvements of his to the value of at least £50; an inhabitant/occupier of a dwelling house; and persons with certain war service qualifications.

Of course, this is undemocratic and denies to many people of the State a voice as to who shall sit in the Legislative Council. Under the present South Australian Constitution the Legislative Council has formidable powers, which is just another reason why everybody entitled to vote in the House of Assembly

should have a say in the Legislative Council's representation. The present set-up is also unjust because, even with an extraordinarily great majority in the Lower House under a universal franchise, the Upper House is able to sack a Government in the Lower House; so the minority retains the right of veto by means of a selective franchise for the Legislative Council designed to go even further than the provisions for the House of Assembly election in putting unjustifiable power in the hands of a very small minority of the people.

To illustrate my point I turn now to the recent State elections to give some idea of the vote that returned 21 Australian Labor Party members, 17 Liberal and Country League members and one Independent member to the House of Assembly. The figures reveal an ugly picture of democracy as conceived in this State.

Mr. Freebairn: What happened to the Labor Party candidate in Light?

Mrs. BYRNE: I am coming to that. There were 562,824 people eligible to vote on March 6, last year, in 39 House of Assembly districts. Of the 513,064 votes cast, the Australian Labor Party received 274,732 or 53.5 per cent, and the L.C.L. received 183,630 votes or 35.8 per cent. If we credit each of the two Parties with the whole of the potential votes in seats in which they were not opposed, the A.L.P. vote was 305,127 votes or 59.8 per cent and the Liberal Party vote was 199,571 or 36.7 per cent. All of the electors on the Legislative Council roll are also on the Assembly roll, yet we find this position: eight out of the 10 members of that House were elected on the votes cast, totalling 85,966 or 15.3 per cent of those electing the Assembly.

Applying the same principle of crediting the whole vote to the Party unopposed by the other major Party, the result is that the voting for the L.C.L. was 85,966 or 49.9 per cent to return eight members, and the A.L.P. vote was 86,241 or 50.1 per cent to return two members. In other words, it requires only 15.3 per cent of the Assembly electors to grant to the L.C.L. members the power of veto over an A.L.P. Government elected by 53.5 per cent of the electors. In case members have not grasped the significance of those figures I will repeat them. The A.L.P. Government was elected by 53.5 per cent of the people, while only 15.3 per cent of the electors placed a practically limitless veto in the hands of the L.C.L. members of the Legislative Council.

Mr. Nankivell: It could not be in better hands.

Mrs. BYRNE: It is our intention to give the people the right to vote us the means to abolish the Legislative Council if they wish to do so, and surely there is a sound case for this. Idealists may claim that the Legislative Council is a House of Review, but those people are deluding only themselves. In Party government the Upper House is purely Party political, and any opposition to this Bill will be on purely Party lines. Where one Party has control over both the Lower and Upper Houses, each House is a perfect reflection of the other, and the amount of review is confined to emphasis of the extremist views of the other.

Mr. Casey: Isn't it supposed to be a House of Review?

Mrs. BYRNE: It is supposed to be, but it is not. In our view, it is undesirable and unnecessary and a waste of the taxpayers' money. It is interesting to see just how much review actually takes place. I have some figures here which will interest the member for Frome, who has just raised this point. I have calculated figures relating to the Legislative Council sitting hours and the Bills it has reviewed during the last six years, and have included them in the following table:

Year.	Number of Bills.	Sitting days.	Total sitting time.		Average sitting time per day.		Average time per Bill of all time.		Average time per Bill after allowing $\frac{1}{3}$ of time for other business.	
			Hrs.	Mins.	Hrs.	Mins.	Hrs.	Mins.	Hrs.	Mins.
1959	56	41	90	44	2	13	1	37	1	5
1960	75	49	93	18	1	54	1	15	—	50
1961	53	33	84	59	2	35	1	36	1	4
1962	61	36	77	50	2	10	1	17	—	51
1963	81	44	111	51	2	33	1	23	—	55
1964	55	34	77	43	2	17	1	25	—	57
	381	237	536	25	2	16	1	24	—	56

[Sittings for 1963 extended into 1964 for six days.]

Mr. McKee: Do you think they are overpaid?

Mrs. BYRNE: I do not think I will debate that question at present: I will leave that to the electors to decide.

Mr. Jennings: To think they are opposed to the 40-hour week. It is a 40-hour year for them.

Mrs. BYRNE: I made the analysis that I have just quoted in order to assess how effective the Legislative Council is as a House of Review. In working out the figures of the average time spent by the Legislative Council on each Bill I took into account the whole time occupied and then I allowed for one-third of the time for other business of the Chamber. The figures are as near as possibly could be calculated, and whenever records were not readily clear any benefits such as not deleting time for adjournments until the ringing of the bells and such things as that were allowed to go the Council's way. As a result, in some cases the average times may be one or two minutes above the correct time. The figures for the six years from 1959 to 1964 inclusive make it clear that there is scant review accorded Bills. The summary shows that in six years the Legislative Council

sat for 237 days and dealt with 381 Bills, with a total time of 536 hours and 25 minutes. The average time of each day's sitting was two hours and 16 minutes; the average time on the basis of all the time being occupied with Bills is one hour 24 minutes for each Bill, and assuming that one-third of the time was taken up with other business the average time occupied for each Bill works out at 56 minutes. These times include the explanation by the Minister introducing the Bill, and naturally he would only put the favourable reasons. I stress that the clear explanation of any Bill would take an appreciable portion of the assessed time. A review of any subject implies that it is examined closely to make sure that there are no omissions and that there will be no hasty decisions which can have any unexpected repercussions. Therefore, this analysis of the times spent in the Legislative Council dealing with business of the Parliament reveals that the so-called close examination of legislation is even more hasty than the original consideration, whereas it should at least be the same.

I have prepared the following table in respect of sittings of the House of Assembly from 1959 to 1964:

Year.	Number of Bills.	Sitting days.	Total sitting time.		Average sitting time per day.		Average time per Bill of all time.		Average time per Bill after allowing $\frac{1}{3}$ of time for other business.	
			Hrs.	Mins.	Hrs.	Mins.	Hrs.	Mins.	Hrs.	Mins.
1959	58	56	249	14	4	27	4	18	2	52
1960	76	56	214	30	3	50	2	49	1	53
1961	55	43	203	7	4	43	3	42	2	28
1962	63	48	210	27	4	23	3	20	2	14
1963	84	52	233	34	4	30	2	47	1	51
1964	58	37	177	43	4	48	3	04	2	03
6 years	394	292	1,288	35	4	25	3	16	2	11

[Sittings for 1963 extended into 1964 for six days.]

As with the other table I have shown, the average time for each Bill based on the total sessional time and based on two-thirds of that time after allowing one-third of the time for other business. The one-third of the time in both cases spent on business other than Bills is a matter of speculation, as it would take much research to establish the correct fraction. However, members with more experience than I have, have informed me that it would be close. The total sitting days for this period was 292 for a total time of 1,288 hours 35 minutes. The Assembly sat on an average of 4 hours 25 minutes each day and dealt with 394 Bills at an average of 196 minutes a Bill on the first basis, or 131 minutes on the second basis. No doubt it can be claimed that some important and controversial Bills take much longer than the average time shown, but that makes the picture worse as the time for review was even shorter in the case of other Bills. From this it can be seen that in this House consideration of each Bill took an average of nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ times longer than that given in the Legislative Council.

It is obvious that the much vaunted review has been a most cursory one, and that the Upper House has served as nothing more than a rubber stamp for the Lower House. Rather than have the false sense of security that the Legislative Council provides, it should be dispensed with and this House made to accept the onus to see that all Statutes are as near perfect as human nature will allow. We are capable of accepting that responsibility and should honour it. These figures, as well as proving conclusively that the Upper House is not acting as a Houses of Review, reveal that the Legislative Council is, in fact, not a House of Review but a "House of Rest". I refer now to the sitting times of the Legislative Council. In 1959, it was 90 hours 44 minutes; in 1960, 93 hours 18 minutes; in 1961, 84 hours 59 minutes; in 1962, 77 hours 50

minutes; in 1963, 111 hours 51 minutes; and in 1964, 77 hours 43 minutes. These figures show that the longest sitting was 111 hours 51 minutes, which is not quite a 3-week working week of 40 hours, and in two other years the Legislative Council sat for less than 80 hours in each year, or two working weeks.

Mr. Quirke: Can you say how many hours were spent outside this House concocting those figures?

Mrs. BYRNE: More than the Legislative Council sat in any one year. It is well known that when Parliament is not sitting it is the House of Assembly members who have most work referred to them by electors, as the Legislative Council members are unknown. Indeed, most electors do not know of their existence or their names. I have referred to the Council and people have thought that I was referring to the local government authority. The Legislative Council consists of 20 members, the State being divided into five Legislative Council districts each represented by four members. The term of members is six years—half of the members retiring every three years. Similarly to when first inaugurated, the Legislative Council is elected on a restrictive franchise, principally on a land-owning or occupying franchise, with, in addition, certain war service qualifications. Voting and enrolment is not compulsory. Under statutory requirement, a session of Parliament must be held annually, and the present arrangement is that both Houses meet in the same months, on the same sitting days, but with slightly different sitting times. Before a Bill can become an Act and the law of the land, it must pass through a number of similar stages in each House, and then receive the Royal Assent.

When the Bill has been agreed to by one House, it is transmitted by written message, signed by the Presiding Officer, to the other

House for its concurrence. Here the Bill is, with the exception of the introductory preliminaries, subject to a similar gamut of procedure—three readings, with a Committee stage between the second and third readings. Any amendments made by one House in a Bill received from the other House are considered by the House of origin. Except as to money Bills, the Legislative Council has equal power with the House of Assembly in respect of all Bills. Financial business must originate in the House of Assembly, and the Legislative Council may not amend any money clause but it may suggest amendments thereto. It is obvious that, except as to the method of electing both Houses, little difference exists between the functioning and powers of the two Houses, and, in fact, duplication takes place. The bi-cameral system is nothing less than an utter waste, and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

I turn now to the deadlock provisions as contained in the Bill. The Constitution, as well as providing that only those who have certain property or ex-service qualifications may be allowed to vote for the Legislative Council, then gives that Chamber the power to veto any act by the Lower House. In fact, the Constitution makes a sham of democracy. The South Australian provisions dealing with conflicts between the Houses (contained in section 41 of the Constitution Act) are cumbersome and costly to operate, and have never been used since they were included in the Act in 1881.

Three major conditions must be satisfied before the deadlock provisions may be applied. First, a Bill must be passed by the House of Assembly and rejected by the Council. Secondly, this rejection must be followed by an election for the House of Assembly. In the normal course of events a Premier calls on the Governor to dissolve the House of Assembly after an important piece of Government legislation has been rejected by the Council. Thirdly, after the election, the deadlock provisions can operate if the Bill previously rejected (or if a Bill with substantially the same objects) is again voted down by the Council, after being passed by an absolute majority of members of the House of Assembly.

After these three conditions are fulfilled the Governor may, within six months after the second rejection of the Bill, take one of two steps to resolve the deadlock. He may order a double dissolution of both Houses of Parliament, in which case every seat in both Houses becomes vacant. On the other hand, the

Governor may issue writs for the election of two additional members for each Council district. By constitutional practice, the Governor would in the normal course of events be bound to accept the advice of the Premier on whether either of these procedures should be followed, or on whether deadlock provisions should not be used at all. No further provisions are made in the South Australian Constitution to overcome disagreements that persist after the unwieldy provisions in section 41 have been used.

As I previously stated, because these deadlock provisions are cumbersome and costly to operate, they have never been used since they were included in the Constitution in 1881. In practice, the main method of resolving deadlocks has been to use the provisions in the Standing Orders of both Houses, which set out that a joint conference of five members from both Houses may be called to discuss informally differences between Houses. The repealing of the existing deadlock provisions, and the insertion of new provisions as contained in the Bill, will bring the State Constitution deadlock provisions into line with those in existence between the House of Commons and the House of Lords. It is well known that the South Australian Parliamentary procedure in many ways follows that of the House of Commons, so why should this not be the case in respect of deadlock provisions?

At present the sources of authority for the procedure of the Parliament of South Australia are to be found in certain Statutes, chief of which is the State Constitution Act, in the Standing Orders of each House, the Joint Standing Orders of both Houses, and in Speakers' decisions and rules of practice that have been made over a number of years to meet local requirements. In all cases not so provided for, resort is had to the rules, forms and practice of the House of Commons at Westminster. I repeat: why should we not have the House of Commons deadlock provisions as well? Apart from that, these deadlock provisions are a definite improvement on those contained at present in the Constitution which are so unworkable that they have never been used. How much better it would be to replace these provisions with some that have been tried and have proved acceptable!

These amendments are necessary, because history has proved how a group can with unlimited power abuse that power if circumstances permit. These safeguards are needed against that happening, on the principle that prevention is better than cure. Any person with a sense

of responsibility must endorse this aspect. Only those who have private reservations about the personal advantages they can obtain from such unlimited powers oppose dilution of the Legislative Council's considerable powers. At present the electors who elect the Government have no such right as the last say, as the power of veto is reserved for a small minority that amounts to only 15.3 per cent, as was shown in the last election. It may be claimed that not on any occasion has the Legislative Council acted capriciously to prevent implementation of endorsed Government policy, but it must be remembered that for the past 32 years the same political Party (the L.C.L.) has been in control of both Houses.

However, the very fact that these veto provisions are in existence is an intolerable threat that must be removed—intolerable, because they can be invoked by sectional interests, and the present electoral system in this State has proved conclusively that sectional interests will, when they so desire, use their power to promote their own policies against the wishes of the people. That proof lies in many things, mainly in the matter we are now debating. Obviously, while the Legislative Council continues in existence, provision has to be made for the absolute power of veto so unjustly vested to be eliminated. The *Advertiser* editorial of November 30, 1963, stated:

Without stable Government, we can expect no progress, but rather, a frustrating situation in which it would be difficult even to preserve the *status quo*. The Opposition must be able to raise its voice, but not so loudly or so forcibly that all differences of opinion end in stalemate.

This Bill is practicable, as it limits the power of the Legislative Council to one only of delaying legislation passed by the House of Assembly. The first and most used consequence of this would be a greater tendency to confer and conciliate on any disputed legislation, because the members of the Legislative Council would be well aware that unbending opposition would only delay but not change proposals, while a conciliatory approach could modify features in the proposals. We have been looking forward to the Bill for years; it will go a long way towards giving the people of this State an absolute right to elect a Government of their choice, by means of a simple majority. The present system was designed purely to retain the reins of government for the previous Government, and it took 32 years to depose it. A Government retained in office by that means shows a ruthless disregard for the wishes of the people. It leads to a belief that the

people and the State exist purely to serve the Government and its supporters, which has caused South Australians (who are not noted for their political activity) to have a lasting impression of an arrogant disregard for the wishes of the people, with the result that for many years to come there will be a feeling of mistrust. If this Bill is vetoed by the Legislative Council, the L.C.L. will be entirely discredited and be lucky to poll even 30 per cent of the vote in future.

Mr. Ryan: It will answer to the electors of the future if it does.

Mrs. BYRNE: This Bill must be passed by Parliament to restore to the people their rights and to ensure that the Government, whatever its political beliefs, serves the people or is replaced by a Government that will. I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Mrs. Byrne used many figures which, as an accountant, I do not think were fair. She quoted figures which purported to show that each day members of this place sat for about twice the time that members in another place did. But there are about twice the number of members here, and they would take a considerable time in making their speeches. Also, during the period she mentioned, there were only four members in the Opposition in the other place, and Opposition members talk at least six times as much as Government members do. That is so with this Government as it was with the previous Government. So the whole argument in that respect was fallacious.

I believe in fair play. At first glance one vote one person sounds good, but just what would have been the results if there had been one vote one person at the last election for a House of 39 members? With what representation would we have finished up for the country? There would have been three Labor members in this House representing the country areas, whereas 10 represent them at present. One member would have been from Mount Gambier and he would have represented an area with a 60 or 70 per cent urban population. The other two would have come from around Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla. They would have represented an entirely urban population. Who would these members have been out of the four possibilities—the members for Frome, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla? Perhaps the member for Frome would have been one. The member for Barossa said sheep counted in the last election. If so, the member for Frome

would have beaten the member for Port Pirie, as the latter would have had only his greyhounds to count on. Possibly, we would have had one country member in the present Government.

How can we say that that leads to equality? I looked up the meaning of "equality" in the dictionary: it means "even in numbers and size" and so on. The definition goes on to state that it means "evenly matched". How can anything be evenly matched when we have proportions like that? In moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply last year the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) said that she was proud she represented a section of the community on behalf of the Labor Party, and that the result confirmed the fact that the Labor Party's policy was acceptable. But the Labor Party represents a certain section of the community whereas we on this side consider we represent a wider section. In connection with one vote one value the definition of democracy is "government by the people". That is a form of government in which the sovereign power resides in the people as a whole and is exercised either directly by them or indirectly by officers elected by them.

Mr. McKee: Do you agree with "government by the people"?

Mr. McANANEY: How are we going to get evenly matched proportions and justice? When one talks about democracy one always means people not individuals. People are defined as bodies of persons with a community of interest. Therefore, with one vote one person we would finish up with one section of the community not being represented at all.

Let me give an example. At present, with transport control, about 75 per cent of the people live within 25 miles of Adelaide, and about 25 per cent of the people live outside that radius. Every action taken by this Government has been against a section of the community. That applies also to succession duties. In the modern society with wages and private superannuation, there is no necessity for people to build up considerable assets, but, if we want to operate a system of free enterprise ownership with a small property, we must save or we shall not be on that property for very long. People of that type must save. This is the policy of the community which must save if it is to stay in business.

Mr. McKee: Which Bill are you dealing with?

Mr. McANANEY: If we destroy that capital, such people cannot function properly, but that will happen if we have a system of

electing a Government with only one viewpoint. This happens when there are 10 members of the Government representing country areas and, under one vote one person in a House of 39 members, we would have had only three members, who would all have represented urban areas. The Labor Party has accepted the fact that there should be some loading in favour of the country. I would be ashamed to be a member of this 38th Parliament—

Mr. Ryan: You can resign at any time.

Mr. McANANEY: We want some system of redistribution that makes all sections of the community evenly matched, with an even chance of having some say in the Government. If that is to be so, we must have a definite arrangement; otherwise, community interests will not be evenly matched. A person living in an urban area like Elizabeth will have a different vote from the vote he would have if he lived in North Adelaide. Under this Bill we cannot carry on as we are because Adelaide is expanding, and the population will increase. If this Bill is passed and operates as an Act for some years, there will be a bigger quota in some country districts than in the city areas.

Mr. Langley: It is going up in some cases by about 700 or 800. It is not declining.

Mr. McANANEY: There are some city areas with fewer voters than they had three years ago.

Mr. McKee: What do you think of the present situation?

Mr. McANANEY: What we need is a good redistribution. The previous Government tried to correct the position in relation to additional voting rights for women in respect of the Legislative Council, but members opposite refused to have anything to do with it. Nobody says that the present set-up is right. It will be a disgrace if we do not come up with something that is fair and reasonable, but the solution is not an incomprehensible Bill like this one. We have had too many Bills of this type already.

I think 50 members in the House of Assembly would be adequate, having regard to the number of voters, and that number would not place undue strain on House services. However, I think the proposed increase to 56 is unnecessary. It is ridiculous that the member for Wallaroo represents only about 6,000 people in a small area, while the member for Frome represents even fewer people in a much bigger area.

Much has been said about the Legislative Council, but an examination of the legislation passed over the years shows that it has been

a House of Review and has served a useful purpose. When I came here, I was amazed that, as a member of the House of Assembly, I had no contact with the members of the Legislative Council. I found that that Chamber was a House of Review and that members went their own way. The member for Barossa said that nobody knew of the existence of the Legislative Council, but a television programme showed that every young person at the university asked about the Legislative Council knew of the Chamber's service to the community and said that, if the Council was to be abolished, the only way that should be done was by the people at a referendum held in conjunction with a general election, so that additional expense would not be incurred.

The Government cannot make 50 or 60 vague references in an election speech and then say that it has a mandate to do all the things to which it has referred. The Government may say that it has a mandate to introduce transport control, but country people are unanimous that they do not want such a measure. The Government cannot say that it has received a mandate at a general election; that must be given at a referendum.

In New South Wales, the Australian Labor Party appointed eight (I think that was the number) members to the Upper House, but the members of that place would not vote their Council out of existence. I think that the Legislative Council will continue to provide a useful service to the community of South Australia. When one compares the Legislative Council with the House of Lords, one must remember that the method of election to that Chamber is restrictive. In fact, members of the House of Lords are nominated rather than elected. That is not so here; nearly everyone who wishes can be enrolled to vote for the Legislative Council. One section (single people who do not own or rent houses) is perhaps penalized, but that is the only section that cannot vote for the Upper House. I do not believe in compulsory voting for any House, but if we are to have compulsory voting it should be only for the House of Assembly. As the Legislative Council is a House of Review, I think only those who want to vote for it should do so. If they do not want to meet their responsibilities, they should not be compelled to do so.

Mr. Ryan: How about telling the truth? The wife of a man living in a rented house cannot be enrolled.

Mr. McANANEY: Members opposite refused to pass a Bill that provided that the wives of people already enrolled would be able to vote.

Mr. McKee: We wanted all Assembly voters to be on the roll; you cannot deny that.

Mr. Ryan: You are talking a lot of hot air!

Mr. McANANEY: Perhaps the honourable member should apologize to me for saying I was not telling the truth when he was not able to prove that I was not.

Mr. Ryan: I did prove it. Talk sense instead of rubbish!

Mr. McANANEY: I am sorry if I am talking over the honourable member's head.

Mr. Ryan: No wonder your Party lost the election!

Mr. McANANEY: The Labor Party has accepted the principle that there should be a smaller quota for country districts. I have already said that, with a change in population in many places, in a few years the quotas in some country districts will be greater than those in the city, and I point out that this legislation will be permanent. What sort of legislation is it that does this? The Bill should contain a definition of "urban areas" so that when a country area became urban it would have the urban quota. This would allow the principle accepted by the Labor Party to operate. There would not then be the ridiculous situation that the votes of people in these urban areas would not have as much value as those of people at Whyalla and Port Pirie. If this were done, this legislation could operate effectively for a long period. If some of these anomalies were removed the Bill would perhaps be acceptable to both Parties, as it would be fair and would protect country areas. This would prevent what would have happened if the provisions of this measure had been applied at the last election, when there would have been only one member opposite who represented a country district. We must get down to something definite rather than something that could be interpreted in so many different ways. The Premier said that two country areas were to have a smaller quota than other country areas. However, with the great movement into country areas, in three years' time those two areas might not have a quota. We have asked for the Bill to be redrafted. Perhaps then the Government could bring forward a Bill dealing with community interests and providing for evenly matched districts. Perhaps then country people would be sure of having some representation and a definite say in the

government of the country in the years to come. We will agree to something that is permanent. I take exception to that part of new section 84 that states "notwithstanding anything in this Act to the contrary". Although I am a layman, I believe that is something that should not be included in the Bill.

At first glance the principle of one vote one value appears attractive. However, community interests must be respected; there must be a loading in some areas so that the electors are more evenly matched, because this is highly desirable. I shall support the amendment that provides for the redrafting of the Bill because the Bill is vague, contains too many loopholes and is not flexible enough to meet future needs. The findings of the commission should be brought back to Parliament and definitely proclaimed. Perhaps there

should be a referendum on redistribution. It has not been in the best interests of the State to have all this talk by the Government about a gerrymander in South Australia. It is not good for young people to hear so much about a gerrymander. In any event, the facts prove that there would not have been much difference in the result of the last election if there had been one vote one value. Perhaps there may have been 22 Labor members to 17 Liberal instead of the present representation, but there would not have been any representation of country people in the Government. I oppose the second reading.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.46 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 26, at 2 p.m.