HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, January 26, 1966.

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

PETITION: TRANSPORT CONTROL.

Mr. HEASLIP presented a petition signed by 156 electors residing in the Rocky River and Frome 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

MENTAL INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the field of mental health and the provision of institutions in this State so that the intellectually retarded may be segregated from the mentally ill. I remind the Premier that last year, I think on July 13 and 19 respectively, the Public Works Committee reported on the Strathmont Hospital and Training Centre and the Elanora Hospital and Training Centre, the first to cost £2,851,000, and the second, £3,186,000. Those reports were laid on the table of this House subsequently. So far as I am aware nothing has since been done regarding the erection of these two institutions, and I further remind the Premier that under the Federal States Grants (Mental Health Institutions) Act of 1964 we can recoup one-third of the capital cost of these institutions, provided that the money is spent before June 30, 1967. If we are not to miss out on that recoupment (as we seem to be in danger of doing in the field of education) something will have to be done soon. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to proceed with one or both of these institutions and, if it does, whether tenders have been called, or when they are likely to be called?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This matter has received serious consideration to the extent that conferences have taken place between the Hospitals Department and the Public Buildings Department. Although, in addition, many letters have changed hands, at this stage I cannot give any details. I may be able to give the honourable member information on the matter by Tuesday or Wednesday next, but I assure him that the Government is proceeding with the matter as expeditiously as possible.

SALISBURY INTERSECTION.

Mr. CLARK: Recently another fatal accident occurred in my district at the intersection of Angle Vale and Waterloo Corner Roads, which could well be described as Salisbury's most perilous intersection, that having been the sixth death by accident to occur there in the last five years, in addition to numerous other serious accidents that have occurred. Recently, officers of the Road Traffic Board, at the request of the Salisbury council, examined the situation. The local council had hoped that "stop" signs could be erected at the intersection, but the board suggested that "give way" signs be erected instead, and this has upset local residents. The local council is most concerned about the intersection and, as one councillor put it. "This is just one of those dangerous crossings. We can't really blame the board for its past decision, but life is precious and I feel that the department will take another look into the matter." Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads take up with his colleague (in view of the recent death and of the generally bad record of accidents) the possibility of erecting "stop" signs at the intersection?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

FRUITGROWING INQUIRY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Minister of Lands may recall that some time ago he received a deputation from Upper Murray fruitgrowers in respect of an inquiry into their industry. Can he say whether a decision has been made by Cabinet, and can he give the House any other relevant information on this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Cabinet has referred this matter to the Commonwealth Government for its views. Immediately a decision has been made by the Commonwealth Government it will be considered by Cabinet, when a final answer to the honourable member's question may be given.

CRUSHING PLANTS.

Mr. CASEY: I refer to the construction of two crushing plants in the North-East of the State, one dealing with metal to be used in sealing the Broken Hill Road and the other dealing with standardizing the railway gauge. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, and the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, ascertain from their colleagues when these plants are likely to operate and where they will be located? I point out that the Radium Hill

ballast supplies will be exhausted soon, and that it is essential that ballast be available so that work on the line can proceed below Mannahill, through to Peterborough.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This question will be conveyed to the respective Ministers in another place and a report obtained as soon as possible.

GRAPES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Premier say when the final report of the Royal Commission on the Wine Grape Industry is likely to become available? Also, can he say what action, if any, is being taken in the meantime to ensure that a fair and reasonable price is paid to grapegrowers for grapes from the 1965-66 vintage? Can the Premier say whether a price has been agreed on and, if it has, when that price will be made public?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I discussed the availability of the report of the Royal Commission with its Chairman (Mr. Jeffery) as late as today. He could not say when he expected it to be available, so from that I take it that it has not yet been compiled. With regard to the latter part of the honourable member's question, the Prices Commissioner and two representatives each from the grapegrowers and wine and brandy makers were appointed some time ago to fix prices for all types of grape from the coming harvest, but I have not yet received a report on this matter.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: They had their first meeting yesterday.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: What they have done apart from having this meeting I do not know. They have not furnished a report.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION.

Mrs. STEELE: Both by way of question and during debate I have often directed attention to the deteriorating condition and appearance of the Adelaide railway station, but I regret that my observations have not been effective. Will the Premier ascertain from the Minister of Transport whether, in view of the holding of the Adelaide Festival of Arts (when many thousands of people both from within and without the State will be entering Adelaide through the Adelaide railway station), steps cannot be taken even at this late stage to brighten up this otherwise imposing building by improving its lighting and by applying a generous coat of paint, which would do much to transform this rather dingy public building?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although I am prepared to take up the matter and ascertain what is the position, I assure the honourable member that there has been a decided improvement in some services at the Adelaide railway station, particularly in relation to meals. In fact, the dining room now caters for parties at evening meals. However, I will obtain a report from my colleague to see what else can be done.

ROAD TRANSPORT.

Mr. LAWN: This afternoon the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) presented a petition signed by residents of the Districts of Rocky River and Frome in connection with the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill. At Orroroo the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) recently addressed a meeting of members of the Stockowners Association on this matter. Can he now say whether he formed an opinion of the views of the stockowners at Orroroo at the meeting which he attended?

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Frome wish to reply?

Mr. CASEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I addressed a meeting of the Stockowners Association at Orroroo last Friday evening, and prior to that I addressed a meeting of stockowners at Yunta. I must say that the reaction at these meetings was very favourable indeed.

Mr. Heaslip: How many people were there?

Mr. McKee: How many have you got in Rocky River?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: I understand that I am replying to a question by the member for Adelaide. I can say unhesitatingly that once this whole matter was explained truthfully to these people the reaction of the meeting was one of amazement at the misinterpretation of this legislation by members of the Opposition at past protest meetings. I was only too delighted to tell these people exactly what this legislation meant and how it would effect co-ordination of transport services in this State.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Mr. RODDA: My question concerns soldier settlement and the circumstances in which the department has ordered an inspection of a holding or where an officer of the Agriculture Department has been instructed to investigate the alleged shortcomings of a holding. Can the Minister of Repatriation say whether such reports can be made available to the settler concerned?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the department requires a report on a property, it is for the information of the department and the guidance of the people dealing with the specific problem on that property. Such reports are the property of the department, and it is not the policy generally to release them to anyone else.

TELEVISION NEWS SERVICE.

Mr. HEASLIP: Some time ago I asked a question regarding the change of time of the news service on television channels 1 and 2 from 7 p.m. to 6.30 p.m. This question was originally asked by the member for Victoria, I think in July or August last year. The reply given was that this new time was only for a trial period, but as the change was made six months ago I am wondering just how long the trial period is to last. The people of Rocky River, the people of the Victoria District, and, in fact, all rural people who work until a late hour are hostile about this matter. Will the Premier inquire further why this trial period is still continuing and why this news service cannot be given at 7 p.m. instead of 6.30 p.m.?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I communicated with the Minister in Canberra responsible for this matter, namely, the Postmaster-General. When I know that the appointment of the new Postmaster-General has been finalized, I will communicate with him to see whether I can get any better service than I have got in the past.

SMALL CRAFT.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to a question I asked last year about a survey of small craft?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the deputation in regard to survey fees charged for small fishing craft, I referred the matter to the Minister of Agriculture and asked for his views thereon.

UPPER MURRAY BRIDGE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my previous question about terms of reference to the Public Works Committee in respect of the proposed bridge across the Murray River at Kingston?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague has informed me that investigations for preparing estimates for a bridge at Kingston, or an alternative site, are in hand and that they are expected to be available early this year.

ADELAIDE GAOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the report of the Sheriff's and Gaols and Prisons Department tabled yesterday and particularly to the comments made in that report by Mr. Heairfield (Comptroller of Prisons) about prison accommodation in this State, in which he says that over the past 10 years the rate of increase in prison population has been alarming and that despite constant planning the number of prisoners has been increasing at a rate greater than has the rate of construction of new building projects. We have this statement from Mr. Heairfield on the one hand and on the other hand an announcement made in the middle of July by the Premier that the Adelaide Gaol was to be demolished. Since that announcement was made we have heard nothing further, I think, of this project. In view of Mr. Heairfield's report, will the Premier say whether the Government intends to demolish the Adelaide Gaol; if it does, when; and what plans the Government has to alleviate the situation referred to in that report?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is very difficult for a new Government to catch up quickly a 10-year lag created by a previous Government, and I am merely using the honourable member's own words when I say that. This problem has been created not by this Government but by the previous Government, and it is now a question of how much money there is in the kitty. I am no authority on gaol sentences, but I could perhaps suggest privately to some people that they might consider whether it would be desirable to impose something other than a gaol sentence, because everyone in gaol is a cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you suggesting that the court should fine rather than gaol offenders?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not suggesting that, and I do not want the honourable member to put words in my mouth.

Mr. Millhouse: I cannot think of any other meaning.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not responsible for what the honourable member thinks. We shall not be able to demolish the Adelaide Gaol until another gaol is erected in a northern district.

SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. McANANEY: When the Superannuation Act was amended recently the Premier said that supplementary legislation would be introduced so that a civil servant who retired five years earlier than normal would obtain

a pension. As I have received inquiries on this matter, can the Premier say when the necessary legislation will be introduced?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The question of male persons retiring at some time between their sixtieth birthday and their sixty-fifth birthday, and of females retiring between the ages of 55 and 60, hinges on the appointment of a Public Actuary. Since the death of Mr. Bowden (Public Actuary) the Government has advertised in this State, in other States, and overseas, but has not had a suitable applicant. It was about to engage one, but apparently certain other offers of salary were made, as we lost the most suitable candidate we had at that time. We are still trying to obtain a Public Actuary.

FESTIVAL HALL.

Mr. COUMBE: Toward the end of last year I asked the Premier a question about the festival hall which it is hoped will be built in time for the 1968 Festival of Arts to be held in Adelaide. I understand that since then the Premier has had discussions with the Lord Mayor regarding finance. Can the Premier indicate the outcome of these talks and any likely Government action that will enable this project to proceed without delay?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: At present, certain correspondence is being prepared with a view to obtaining further information from the Lord Mayor about this project. I cannot see any immediate solution to this problem, but I do not want to be accused of saying something that I should not on this occasion. Extensive inquiries will be made, particularly if we take notice of what the Act provides, as much consideration is needed by the Government before a final decision is made. Certain matters are being negotiated and further information is necessary from the Lord Mayor.

PORT PIRIE HARBOUR.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to a question I asked earlier this session concerning the unsatisfactory facilities for mooring small craft in the Pirie River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The request of the fishermen that the existing boat harbour should be enlarged to moor additional boats, and that the arms of the boat harbour jetty be reversed and accommodated on the southern (instead of the northern) side of the main jetty, is under investigation by the Fishing Havens Advisory Committee.

PIKE AND MUNDIC CREEKS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Recently, the Minister of Works visited the Pike and Mundic Creeks area in my district and met some of the settlers. As a proposition was put to him regarding the appointment of a special committee, has the Minister any further information about this scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, I recently visited this area and met people interested in this matter. It was suggested at that conference that a committee be appointed comprising representatives of the Treasury, the Engineering and Water Supply, and the Lands Departments. The committee having been set up, its terms of reference have been referred to it by Cabinet. The committee will start its investigations shortly, but if the honourable member would like to know the terms of reference, I shall be happy to supply him with them.

WILD LIFE RESERVE.

Mr. FERGUSON: Prior to the Christmas adjournment I asked the Minister several questions about the establishment of a fauna and flora reserve at the southern end of Yorke Peninsula. Has the Minister of Lands further information on this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Only yesterday morning Mr. Innes called on me. His company holds a perpetual lease over this area, and as a result of our discussions he will submit certain written proposals. From what he told me, I hope that a substantial part of this lease will eventually be dedicated as a fauna and flora reserve. However, when the matter is finalized, I shall inform the honourable member.

NATIONAL SERVICE TRAINING.

Mr. HALL: I received a query this morning from a young man who, intending to take up teaching, wanted to know how the Education Department viewed the bond period with respect to a call-up for National Service. Can the Minister of Education say whether there is any remission in the bond system for student teachers called up for National Service, and whether the bond period may be taken concurrently with such service? Alternatively, is the bond required to run the full length of time when the person returns from National Service?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The question of conditions under which service trainees will be operating, including those of teachers, have not yet been finally decided by Cabinet. We are awaiting information on the Commonwealth Government's evaluation of board

and other items in respect of the trainees, and the whole question will be decided by Cabinet when that information is received. On the question of bonding, I will endeavour to get the honourable member more information.

STATE HERBARIUM.

Mrs. STEELE: The State herbarium, recently completed at a cost of many thousands of pounds, is now functioning and is capable of giving a most useful service to all the departments and individuals that use it. It houses a wonderful collection of plants and grasses gathered over many years, but its effective operation is seriously handicapped at present by lack of staff. Botanists are usually dedicated to their profession, which is not one that attracts many to its ranks, and the remuneration for which is relatively low. Indeed, I understand that is one of the reasons why the staff is below the establishment at present, another reason being that the salaries being offered in South Australia are below those offered in the other States. Can the Minister of Lands say what steps are being taken to remedy the current situation, whether applications have been called to fill vacancies and, if they have, what the outcome of this campaign has been?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's interest in this matter. As I do not have the facts for which she has asked, I shall obtain a report for her as quickly as possible.

FOOT-ROT.

Mr. RODDA: As the Minister of Agriculture may know, fresh outbreaks of foot-rot have occurred in the South-East. Great concern is being expressed at some outbreaks occurring so soon after the disease had been brought under control. Primary-producing organizations have requested that owners of properties where an outbreak has occurred should notify the department. Will the Minister examine this request?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, I shall be happy to do that. I believe that co-operation is important in this instance, and it is specially desirable between landowners and the Agriculture Department to ensure that this disease is totally eradicated. I have recently read of fresh outbreaks of foot-rot in the South-East, and the department is watching the position closely. I shall take up the matter again with the Chief Inspector of Stock, and obtain the latest report on the matter for the honourable member.

NURIOOTPA ROAD.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: On August 26 last I asked the then Minister of Lands whether he would ascertain from the Minister of Roads what action, if any, the Highways Department intended to take in connection with the suggested re-opening of the road from Tolley's Corner, Nuriootpa, to the Greenock Road, with a view to reducing the traffic hazard on the main road. Has such a report been obtained?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The report is not to hand, but I shall ask my colleague to bring one down as soon as possible.

CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Can the Minister of Agriculture say how many applications on the proper form have been received in respect of the Citrus Industry Organization Committee, and whether the time for lodging such applications has expired?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The applications closed on January 17 and, although I have forgotten exactly how many were received, I believe the number was about 12. The applications were lodged in the proper way, and included the 20 nominators. The matter is still being considered, but I hope to take it to Cabinet on Monday, immediately after which names will be announced.

STANDING ORDER.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will you, Mr. Speaker, say whether Standing Order No. 145 is still in force?

The SPEAKER: The answer is "Yes".

BULK HANDLING.

Mr. FERGUSON: As the Minister of Agriculture, in answer to my last question concerning a committee to inquire into bulk handling terminals, said that he hoped to be able to furnish a report on Parliament's resuming in the new year, can he now give the House that report?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No, I regret that I have not yet received the report, but I shall ascertain what stage the matter has reached, and whether I can expedite it.

THE FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable

to introduce a Bill for an Act for the establishment and incorporation of a university to be known as "The Flinders University of South Australia" and for purposes connected therewith.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to establish and incorporate a new university in South Australia which is to be known as the Flinders University of South Australia. The establishment of a new university in this State is an important milestone in the history of higher education in South Australia and for this reason alone I feel justified in explaining to honourable members in some detail the reasons why the creation of a new university has become necessary.

In 1958 the Council of the University of Adelaide made predictions of student numbers for some years ahead. About 8,000 undergraduate students were predicted for 1965 and 8,500 for 1966. It was clear that the site at North Terrace was not adequate for a student population of more than about 8,000; and the University Council concluded that any further expansion of university activities in South Australia would have to take place on another site. This extension to a second site was foreshadowed in 1959 in the university's submission to the Australian Universities Commission for the 1961-63 triennium. As a result a small sum was included in the university's grant in that triennium for the purpose of preliminary planning of a new site. Early in 1961 the South Australian Government indicated its willingness to make available to the university the site of some 370 acres at Bedford Park. The university commenced preliminary planning in the middle of 1961 when Professor P. H. Karmel was appointed Principal-designate of Bedford Park.

The next 12 months was occupied mainly in formulating a detailed submission to the Australian Universities Commission for the 1964-66 triennium. Towards the end of 1962 the Australian Universities Commission informed the university that it would recommend that the university should go ahead with its planning of Bedford Park. A special grant was made available for 1963 and grants amounting to £3,000,000 for capital expenditure and £1,000,000 for recurrent expenditure were recommended for the three years 1964-66.

The year 1963 was occupied in site planning and in the preparation of detailed drawings for buildings. These works have been carried out during 1964 and 1965; and by January, 1966, all works approved by the Australian Universities Commission, with the exception of the hall of residence which has been delayed, will have been completed. These include buildings for the four academic schools, the library, the union and the administration, and sports fields and changing rooms.

While the physical development of the site was proceeding, academic and other staff were recruited. Sixteen professors and about 40 lecturers, senior lecturers and readers have been appointed, most of whom will have taken up duty by the end of 1965. The librarian was appointed early in the planning period and has now built up a collection of 60,000 volumes, which will have been catalogued and will be available on the shelves when the library opens early in 1966.

In 1966 it is expected that about 450 first year students will enrol at Bedford Park most of whom will be studying for degrees in Arts and Science. There will be a number of first year medical students who will subsequently transfer to the University of Adelaide at North Terrace for the remainder of their medical course. There will be some students pursuing the post-graduate Diploma in Social Administration and some studying for masters' and doctors' degrees. Second and third year undergraduate work will be added in 1967 and 1968 respectively. It is expected that other degrees will be added as the need arises.

In the early stages of the planning for Bedford Park, the Council of the University of Adelaide decided that, subject to the University Council, Bedford Park should operate as an academically autonomous campus of the University of Adelaide. The control of courses and syllabuses would be in the hands of Bedford Park academic staff, who would be encouraged to experiment with new subjects and new courses. The academic work at Bedford Park has been organized in four schools, instead of in the more traditional form of faculties and departments. The four schools are the School of Social Sciences, the School of Language and Literature, the School of Physical Sciences, and the School of Biological Sciences. The structures of the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees at Bedford Park differ appreciably in form and content from the structures of the corresponding degrees at North Terrace.

The academic autonomy which Bedford Park has enjoyed, and the fact that grants to the University of Adelaide for the purpose of Bedford Park have been specified by the Australian Universities Commission separately from other grants to the University of Adelaide, has made the separation of Bedford Park from the University of Adelaide and its conversion into an independent and autonomous university a simple matter. Accordingly, the creation of the Flinders University of South Australia out of the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park will be able to take place rapidly and with no interference to the internal operations at Bedford Park.

The separation of Bedford Park from the University of Adelaide and its conversion into a separate autonomous university has the support of the Council of the University of Adelaide. At a meeting in August of this year, the Council of the University of Adelaide resolved to inform the Minister of Education that in its view Bedford Park should be separated from the University of Adelaide and should become a new university as soon as practicable. The Council of the University of Adelaide envisaged that it would be necessary for the two university councils to co-operate and collaborate in many matters of policy, administration and mutual interest, including, for example, uniformity of salary scales and the avoidance of unnecessary duplication of activities. The Council of the University of Adelaide intends to do its best to promote such co-operation and collaboration.

I wish to place on record the appreciation of the Government of the manner in which the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, council and staff of the University of Adelaide have sponsored the Bedford Park development. Bedford Park has been recognized throughout Australia as an outstanding example of university planning. This has been due to the care with which the development has been nurtured and the wise decision of the University of Adelaide deliberately to plan Bedford Park as a quite separate campus, readily capable of assuming an independent existence. Honourable members will be aware that the Queen Mother will be officiating at the formal opening of the new university in March, 1966, and will therefore appreciate the desirability of ensuring that this non-controversial Bill should pass through Parliament with the minimum of delay. With these introductory comments I now propose to deal with the Bill before honourable members.

Generally speaking, the present Bill is modelled very closely on the University of Adelaide Act, 1935-1964. There have, however, been some significant departures from the University of Adelaide Act, particularly with regard to the constitution of the council of the university, the powers of convocation and the transitional provisions which are necessary to ensure the smooth conversion of the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park to the Flinders University of South Australia. These will be referred to when I come to the explanation of the individual clauses of the Bill, which I now propose to do.

Clause 3 provides for the establishment and incorporation of the Flinders University of South Australia and confers upon this body corporate all the usual powers associated with a body corporate. They are in fact similar to the powers conferred upon the University of Adelaide in section 4 of the University of Adelaide Act. The university will consist of a council and a convocation. Clause 4 deals with the council which is to be the governing authority of the university. The council will consist of not more than 25 members, as follows:

(*a*) the Chancellor *ex officio;*
(*b*) the Vice-Chancellor *ex officio;*
(*c*) the Director of Education *ex officio;*
(*d*) three members elected by the Parliament of South Australia;
(*e*) three members appointed by the Governor;
(*f*) two professors of the university and two members of the academic staff of the university who are not professors elected by the academic staff of the university;
(*g*) the President of the Students' Representative Council *ex officio;*
(*h*) eight members elected by convocation;
(*i*) not more than three members co-opted by the council.

By subclause (4) it will be noted that the President of the Students' Representative Council does not, by virtue of his membership of the council, become entitled to be present at any meeting of the council when matters relating to the appointment, conditions of service and discipline of members of the academic staff, and matters relating to academic courses are being discussed or decided, and the council may order that he is not to be present at any such meeting when these matters are being discussed or considered or may be present subject to such conditions as the council may decide. This provision is necessary because the students' representative is himself a student, and the council must be in a position to ensure that certain matters remain confidential.

By subclause (5) it is provided that those members of the council who are nominated by industry and labour and those elected by the academic staff as well as the President of the Students' Representative Council are not to be regarded as delegates of the bodies by which they are nominated or elected. By comparison with the Council of the University of Adelaide (which, apart from the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor, has five members elected by Parliament and 20 members elected by the University Senate), the Flinders University has, it will be observed, fewer persons in these two categories of membership but on the other hand includes three members appointed by the Governor, of whom two will represent industry and labour, four members elected by the academic staff, and three members co-opted by the council itself. It will be noted that the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Director of Education and President of the Students' Representative Council are *ex officio* members of the council.

Clauses 5 and 6, which deal with the election of members of council by Parliament and their time of appointment and tenure of office, closely follow the pattern of the corresponding provisions in the University of Adelaide Act. Clause 7 provides for the appointment of three members of the council by the Governor, one of whom will be nominated by the Chamber of Commerce and Chamber of Manufactures jointly and one to be nominated by the Trades and Labour Council. The University of Adelaide Act has no provision corresponding to this one. Clause 8 deals with the tenure of office of such members and the filling of vacancies on death, resignations, etc. Clause 9 provides for the election of members of the council by the academic staff. Clause 10 provides for the election of members of the council by convocation. Of the members of the council elected by convocation, four will be members of the academic staff of the university and four will be persons who are not full-time employees of the university whether such persons are members of the academic staff or otherwise.

It should be mentioned at this point that convocation in the Flinders University corresponds to the senate in the University of Adelaide. Convocation will consist of all persons admitted to the degrees of the university and such other graduates as are appointed by the council. This differs from the University of Adelaide in that Bachelors must be of three years' standing before becoming members of the senate. The powers of convocation differ from those of the senate. In the University of Adelaide Act all statutes and regulations made by the council must be approved by the senate before submission to the Governor. It is not considered desirable that such a provision should be inserted in the present Bill. The foregoing matters are covered in clauses 11 and 16 of the Bill. By clause 12 provision is made for convocation to be constituted in accordance with clause 16 of this Act on July 1, 1971, and convocation will make its first election of members of the council to take office in the first instance in 1972. This provision is necessary since it is estimated that it will take about five years from the commencement of the new university to build up a sufficient body of graduates to form a workable convocation.

Clause 13 therefore inserts a transitional provision which provides that until convocation is constituted the powers of convocation to elect members of the council will be exercised by the senate of the University of Adelaide. Clause 14 provides for the co-option of members of the council by the council. Clause 15 deals with the election of the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor. By subclause (2), the Principal of the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park is to be the first Vice-Chancellor of the university. This will be Professor Karmel. Clause 17 deals with the conduct of the business in council and convocation. Clauses 18 and 19 lay down that the council has full power to maintain and superintend the affairs of the university and to make statutes and regulations concerning all the activities of the university. The powers of management are exactly parallel to those of the University of Adelaide which, I may mention in passing, have worked very satisfactorily to date. The only additional power conferred upon the council which is not a specific power that is vested in the council of the University of Adelaide, although it is a power exercised under its general powers, is the power to create boards and committees necessary for the proper functioning of the university. For example, it is possible that the council might wish to create an academic committee and a finance committee to advise it on academic and financial matters. Apart from this addition, the powers of the council are, with some slight variations, exactly the same as those to be found in section 18 of the University of Adelaide Act.

Clause 20 enables the Flinders University to confer degrees upon any person after examination and in accordance with the statutes

and regulations of the university, to admit to degrees persons who have graduated at any other university, and to admit any person *honoris causa* to any degree whether or not such person has graduated at a university. Clause 21 provides for residence of undergraduates and follows closely section 20 of the University of Adelaide Act. Clause 22, which provides that no religious test is to be administered to any person to entitle him to be admitted as a student of the university, etc., and clause 23, which lays down that the Governor shall be the visitor at the university, are similar to sections 21 and 22 respectively of the University of Adelaide Act. Clause 24 provides that in every financial year there shall be paid to the university out of moneys provided by Parliament for the purpose such sums as the Treasurer thinks necessary for the purpose of:

(*a*) formation of grounds, erection of buildings, purchase of equipment and other expenses in relation to the university;

(*b*) maintaining the university;

(*c*) paying the salaries of academic staff, officers and servants of the university;

(*d*) defraying the expenses of fellowships, scholarships, prizes and exhibitions awarded for encouragement of students in the university;

(*e*) providing a library; and

(*f*) discharging all necessary charges connected with the management of the university.

These purposes are similar (apart from the purpose specified in paragraph (*a*) which relates to capital purposes) to the purposes for which grants may be made to the University of Adelaide under section 24 of the University of Adelaide Act. Clause 25 confers upon the council power to borrow money by way of mortgage, bank overdraft or otherwise for the purpose of carrying out or performing any of its powers, authorities, duties, functions and for the repayment or partial repayment of any sum previously borrowed within such limits as the Governor, upon the recommendation of the Treasurer, may from time to time approve, and also to mortgage, charge, etc., any of its property as security for any such loan. This clause also empowers the council to invest any moneys in such investments as are authorized by the council. This clause has no counterpart in the University of Adelaide Act, but it is considered by the Government a desirable additional power to confer upon the council.

Clause 26 provides that the council shall, during the month of June in every year, present to the Governor a report of the proceedings of the university during the previous year. The report shall contain a full account of the income and expenditure of the university audited in such manner as the Governor may direct, and a copy of every report made pursuant to this section and of every statute and regulation of the university allowed by the Governor pursuant to this Act shall be laid every year before Parliament. This provision is similar to that under section 28 of the Adelaide University Act.

Clauses 28 to 33 deal with the transitional provisions that are necessary to ensure the smooth emergence of the Flinders University as a separate academic institution. Clauses 28, 30, 32 and 33 are the usual transitional provisions that one would expect to find in a Bill of this nature. Clause 28 ensures that all real and personal property that was vested in the University of Adelaide and held or used for that university for the purpose of its activities at Bedford Park shall by virtue of this Act vest in the university. To give effect to this section, the Council of the Flinders University will apply to the Registrar-General to make all necessary entries in the register book. The other provisions of this clause relate to the vesting of all rights and liabilities of the University of Adelaide in respect to any property vested in the Flinders University by virtue of this clause and provide that they are to be the rights and liabilities of the Flinders University.

Clause 30 ensures the continuity of employment of salaried employees of the University of Adelaide who have been appointed to their office for the purpose of the activities of the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park. Such employees will become employees of the Flinders University on no less favourable terms than those upon which they have held their appointments.

Clause 32 provides that all contracts entered into before the commencement of this Act by any persons with the University of Adelaide in relation to the property or activities of the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park shall, upon the commencement of this Act, be deemed to have been entered into with the Flinders University. This section shall not apply to any policy of insurance taken out by the University of Adelaide before the commencement of this Act.

Clause 33 lays down that all statutes and regulations in relation to the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park in existence at the commencement of this legislation will remain in force as statutes and regulations of the Flinders University until replaced by statutes and regulations enacted by the council and allowed by the Governor. These transitional provisions that I have referred to are, as I have said, usual transitional provisions, but clauses 29 and 31 are unusual since they are designed to cover the special situations brought about by the creation of the university as a separate entity.

At this stage I should explain to honourable members that it is proposed that this legislation will commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation. It is expected that this date will be not later than July 1, 1966. It is on that day that the property and legal rights and liabilities of the University of Adelaide in relation to its activities at Bedford Park will vest in the Flinders University. This does not present any real problem. But a problem does arise in connection with the rather complex financial settlement that is to be made between the University of Adelaide and the Flinders University. As a means of solving this problem, it is considered essential that a day should be appointed for the financial settlement between the two universities after the commencement of the legislation itself. This approach will afford an opportunity to be given to the two universities to make the necessary financial adjustments.

By clause 29 (1) the appointed day is accordingly defined as the day at the end of the calendar year on which the Act commences (that is, December 31, 1966) or the end of the third month after the commencement, whichever is the later. By subclause (2), the Adelaide university is empowered after the commencement of the Act to receive on account of the Flinders University any revenues or other moneys that may be due to the university and either to pay such moneys to the university or to retain them pending settlement in accordance with subclause (4), and to pay to the Flinders University at its discretion any amount of fees, grants or other moneys which have been received prior to the commencement of this Act for the purpose of its activities at Bedford Park and which may be required to meet the obligations of the university after the commencement of this Act.

As soon as practicable after the appointed day the University of Adelaide will prepare and deliver to the Flinders University a statement of accounts as at that day certified by its auditors showing in respect of its activities at Bedford Park the total of its payment for capital and recurrent purposes, the total amount of moneys from Commonwealth and State grants and fees and other moneys received by the University of Adelaide, and the balance of any moneys received on behalf of the Flinders University. By subclause (4) of this clause, provision is made for a financial adjustment to be made as between the two universities where the total moneys received by either university exceed the total moneys expended. By subclause (6), the Governor has power to resolve any doubt or difficulty with regard to this financial settlement. It is not contemplated that the power conferred by this subclause will need to be invoked, as there is every reason to expect that the financial settlement will proceed smoothly and amicably.

Clause 31 provides that the University of Adelaide will assign to the Flinders University all policies of life assurance, will transfer all funds pursuant to any superannuation scheme in relation to any of the officers who upon transfer from the University of Adelaide becomes an officer of the Flinders University, and will pay to the Flinders University the amount in the invalidity fund of the University of Adelaide existing for the benefit of certain of these officers. By subclause (2), every guarantee given by the University of Adelaide in respect of any liability of any person to whom clause 30 applies is deemed to be a guarantee given by the university.

I may, in closing, add that these transitional provisions have been worked out in consultation with the Under Treasurer, the Vice-Chancellor of Adelaide university and its legal advisers, and Professor Karmel, and are acceptable to all concerned. I commend this important Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUVENILE COURTS BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

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 January 25. Page 3523.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): In case any member has any doubt about where I stand on this measure, I say at the outset that I completely oppose it, I will vote against it, and in due course I will support the amendment. Having said that, I will now say one or two things about the Bill itself, which I oppose because I consider it to be not in the best interests of this State and its people. I firmly believe that a much more equitable, unbiased and reasonable measure could have been devised.

The Bill contains many features that are highly undesirable to those who study the matter deeply. Its author, whoever he may be, has been most adroit, and apparently has a nimble and agile mind. I say this because of the rather bland and ingenious provisions in certain clauses relating to margins. The use of the new 15 per cent margin, which gives a 30 per cent differential, can be twisted to try to fulfil a principle. Incidentally, the Bills introduced by the previous Government contained a 10 per cent provision. This Bill in some way departs from the A.L.P. policy of one vote one value. The Bill is not acceptable to me or to my Party, and I shall point out certain deficiencies so that it may be withdrawn and redrafted in terms of the motion of the Leader of the Opposition. After the Premier introduced the Bill in July, it was spoken to most effectively by the Leader of the Opposition, who fully covered all its implications and pointed out its dangers and its effect on this State. He was followed by the member for Glenelg. As we have found out since, it was one of his few speeches, and he handled the matter rather as an academic exercise. He compared the voting trends between seats and between Commonwealth and State elections, and hardly mentioned any clauses and their possible effects. He was followed by the member for Wallaroo who gave a bit more meat and who threw in a few good, old, shibboleths, so that we were disappointed that he could not continue his comments. Yesterday we had a hate session against the Legislative Council from the member for Barossa.

Let me assure honourable members that the Opposition agrees fully that the present electoral position needs improving and bringing up to date. We introduced a Bill in 1963 to correct the many anomalies that exist today in the electoral system, because population has changed so dramatically that the numbers in some districts have got out of hand and are out of proportion when compared with other districts. In some districts the numbers have increased to 40,000, whereas in the inner suburban Districts of Unley, Torrens, Adelaide, Hindmarsh and Norwood they have decreased. A need exists to correct this position and the Opposition agrees that it should be done. I believe the boundary corrections are long overdue, with the position getting worse every day. In 1963, as a result of our Bill, the Electoral Commission brought down a report that greatly improved this position. It is now history that the Bill was ultimately defeated by the Labor Party in Opposition without its reaching Committee. The Opposition now agrees that there should be an increase in the number of members in the House. In 1963 our Bill suggested a modest increase from 39 to 42 members. I have indicated many times in this House that the number of members should be increased, and we must remember that the Opposition realizes that reform is necessary although we do not agree with this Bill's provisions. It is on the means and method that we differ, not on the need.

This Bill can be divided into four main sections: first, the redistribution of the Assembly districts and the increasing of the number of seats from 39 to 56; secondly, the setting up of an Electoral Commission; thirdly, dealing with the Legislative Council coming on to the House of Assembly roll; and finally, the deadlock provisions between the Houses. This Bill is the avowed policy of the A.L.P. enunciated over many years inside and outside this House. Since I have been a member I have listened with much interest to this matter being expounded almost every session. The member for Norwood (as he was), the member for Adelaide and the member for Enfield were the principal advocates. This was the main plank of the Labor Party's last policy speech, and the one vote one value catch-cry was used extensively in that campaign. It has been suggested that the one vote one value policy attracted many voters at the last election, and was a principal reason for Labor's success at the poll. We on this side of the House naturally expected that the one vote one value type of electoral Bill would be introduced in

the first session of this Parliament, and we were not disappointed. However, we now have a brain child that is nothing like the policy espoused by the Labor Party for so many years, and we are entitled to ask why this is so.

Does the Labor Party find that it is not practical to operate, or is it that now being in office the Party finds that it is expedient to introduce it in its present form? There is a distinct departure in this Bill from the principle to which I have referred. Let us consider the State enrolments as at March 6, 1965, when the State figure was 562,824, with 344,837 in the metropolitan area and 217,987 in country areas. The main feature of this Bill is for a House of 56 seats with 30 seats in the metropolitan area and 26 in country areas. How can we get a one vote one value system with a confined and artificially restricted area such as that defined in the Bill as the metropolitan area? This is an area that is rigidly fixed in area but is rapidly increasing in population, and an area that the present Government has suggested in past years should be extended. I believe the member for Gawler has suggested that the ultimate metropolitan area will include part of his district as well as the city of Elizabeth. To suggest that any person living in Elizabeth, Para Hills or Modbury is not living in the metropolitan area is utter nonsense. Most of those people work in the city or the suburbs, and travel to or through the city daily; in every respect they are suburban dwellers and commuters. By dividing the total population in the State by 56 seats, the quota is just over 10,000, but in the metropolitan area it is about 11,500, because there will be 30 seats, the quota for the remainder of the State being only 8,334. This does not conform to the principle of one vote one value, a principle which is further broken down by the Premier's own statement in his second reading explanation (and in an announcement on television), namely, that he intended (and was forced) to make special provisions for two Northern seats, probably in the Districts of Frome and Eyre. The quota in relation to those two seats is anybody's guess; they could be 6,000. We are reaching the stage of having a quota ratio in respect of those seats of almost two to one, bearing in mind certain city seats. Pursuant to clause 79 (1) (*a*) the commission is directed to divide the State into 56 approximately equal electoral districts for the House of Assembly. Clause 79 (2) states:

> For the purpose of dividing the State into electoral districts for the House of Assembly the commission shall divide the number of electors enrolled for the election of members of the House of Assembly by 56 and the resulting quotient shall be the quota of electors (hereinafter called "the electoral quota") for each electoral district for the House of Assembly within the State.

However, subclause (3) has a rather peculiar qualifying effect, and states:

> For the purposes of subsection (1) of this section electoral districts for the House of Assembly shall be regarded as being approximately equal to each other if no such district contains a number of electors more than 15 per cent above or below the electoral quota.

Therefore, taking those clauses together we find that, in effect, each district in the State shall be regarded as being about equal, even if they vary in quota by up to 30 per cent. In other words, we could find that, with two adjoining districts that were supposed to be about equal, one could be one-third greater in enrolment than its immediate neighbour. Does this provision conform to the enunciated principle of one vote one value, when two adjoining electoral districts can vary by as much as one-third? Pursuant to clause 80 (a) (ii) the country area is to contain 26 electoral districts, being wholly within the country area.

Of course, that is in keeping with the Labor Party's promise at the last election to preserve the number of existing country seats, but that is where I suggest the Government has been caught by trying to be just a little too clever because, having carefully said that the commissioners must divide the whole State into 56 equal seats (and, with a population of 562,824 in March, 1965, that would give a quota of 10,050), the Bill defines the country and metropolitan areas; 344,837 people in the metropolitan area are entitled to vote which, on a quota of 10,050, would give 34 seats in the metropolitan area, leaving a total of 22 for the rest of the State. Therefore, to preserve the 26 country seats, that must be reduced to 30 seats for the metropolitan area, so that by dividing 344,837 by 30, we arrive at a quota, not of 10,050 but of 11,500 for the city seats.

Mr. Clark: What would it be now?

Mr. COUMBE: I have not worked that out, but it would be higher. The honourable member was a member of this House when the 1955 Electoral Bill was introduced, and I can tell him that the 13 city seats were then set at an average quota of 20,000. Since then the number of electors in some of these seats

has risen to 35,000 or 40,000 and in others the number has fallen to about 17,000. However, under the Bill there must be 30 seats in the city and 26 in the country—this is the Labor Party promise and is set out in the Bill. By this means the equal quota for the whole State is completely upset—there will be a quota for the city of 11,500 electors.

The Bill provides as an instruction to the commissioners that they can vary quotas 15 per cent up and 15 per cent down. Therefore, it is possible for the commissioners to have a metropolitan seat with a quota as high as 13,250 compared with the average quota, a theoretical figure of about 10,000. If the metropolitan area has a higher quota then we must obviously get a corresponding drop in the quota for country seats. On the State electoral figure I have given of 562,824, after the metropolitan figure of 344,837 is deducted, in the remainder of the State are left 217,987 voters as at March, 1965. When that figure is divided into 26 seats, which is mandatory, the quota for country seats will be only 8,380.

Mr. Clark: My seat would have over 20,000 voters.

Mr. COUMBE: I think the honourable member would be the first to recommend lower quotas, as he has rightly complained of the disproportionate number of electors in his district. However, using the quota to which I have referred and reducing that figure by 15 per cent it can be seen that the quota in the country could be as low as 7,140. As I have said, the average city quota will be 11,500 and the average country quota 8,380. The maximum city quota after allowing for the 15 per cent, could be 13,250 as against a minimum country quota of 7,140. This is almost a two to one ratio.

Therefore, under the provisions of the Bill as it is spelt out, the case could arise where a normal country seat could have a population quota of about half that of a normal city seat. I know that you, Sir, and others in this place have advocated for years that the principle of one vote one value must be introduced and that we must get away from the two to one ratio. Your Party, Sir, has enunciated that policy not only in this place but on the hustings outside. The Labor Party enunciated it as its policy before the last election and, as I have said, I believe that one of the main reasons why the Labor Party got into power was its advocacy of the principle of one vote one value. However, now the Government in its first session has introduced a Bill under the guise of one vote one value and I have been able to prove that it will be possible to have a two-to-one ratio with a country seat having almost half the electors of a city seat.

Mr. McKee: It was four to one when you were in government.

Mr. COUMBE: I can see that the member for Port Pirie is trying to make some notes and would obviously like the opportunity to refute some of my figures if he were given permission from his Leader to speak on the Bill. I should be most interested to hear him get up and not talk a lot of poppycock as he usually does, but deal with details of the Bill and explain to me where my figures are wrong.

Mr. McKee: I was talking about the principle, not the figures.

Mr. COUMBE: I shall give further figures. I know the catch-cry that figures can lie and that statistics can be twisted, but these are figures dealing with an Electoral Bill that affects the composition of this Parliament and the people of the State. I suggest that these figures cannot be twisted. The city quota of 11,500 less the 15 per cent provided for in the Bill could mean a minimum city seat quota of 9,775 and the maximum quota for the country could be 9,660. These figures do not overlap. If they did there might be some excuse for the deviation from the one vote one value system. However, it cannot be said that they even overlap. I seriously ask: where is this much vaunted one vote one value system of which we have heard so much?

When the Premier introduced the Bill he added a peroration to his speech and said that he was glad to be able to bring in a Bill of this type, after so many years, to give effect to the one vote one value principle. I was interested to listen to the Premier on that occasion because I believed that he was sincere. However, since then I have had the opportunity to sort out these figures and I cannot find this principle in the Bill at all.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You sound as if you are addressing a Labor Party convention.

Mr. COUMBE: One never knows; one has to be versatile in this place. The Labor Party has not kept to its policy, principles or election promises in the Bill. I seriously suggest that expediency has been resorted to in this case. The second reading explanation coated the Bill with sugar, and we heard fine phrases about principles of equality and about how every voter in the State would have an equal vote. However, at the same time the Bill provides for circumstances where we could have

a two to one ratio in voting strengths between some city and country seats.

The figures to which I have referred become even more startling when we look at the latest figures available at the Electoral Department. I obtained these figures yesterday and they are as at December 31, 1965—they are up to date. The Electoral Department was able to get these figures up to date because a referendum was held late last year. These latest figures show that the number of metropolitan electors has risen since last March, and, of course, we expect that. There are now nearly 350,000 metropolitan electors, and this gives us a new quota for the metropolitan area which is even higher than the figure I gave to the House and on which I based by earlier calculations. The figure is now 11,628, so it is seen that in nine months the quota of a district in the city has risen considerably.

Of course, we must realize that this position of the quota in the metropolitan area will get worse as each year goes by. More than 60 per cent of the population today is in the city and suburbs, and as each year goes by we will find that the city quota will go higher and tend to outstrip the corresponding increase in the quota in country areas. Therefore, we will get an even greater disparity as time goes by. Under the Bill, two special seats are to be provided, and in these seats the quota can be even lower than it is for the country areas: it can go considerably below the 15 per cent minimum margin that is provided elsewhere. What is this quota likely to be? As I said before, it is anbody's guess; it could be 6,000 or even less. I understand that at present Frome has 5,061 electors and that Eyre has some 7,285. These two together total about 12,000, so the quota could be 6,000 or it could be less. This makes it difficult to do some arithmetical exercises on the progressions in some of these other districts. However, it seems to me that the quota could be about 6,000 or under, and certainly we do not get any one vote one value there between that figure and the figure of 13,000-odd that we might find in the metropolitan area. In fact, the ratio is more than two to one. These figures are not mine: they are the figures provided by the Party that sits in Government opposite, who shouted from the housetops for years that we must have one vote one value and that every district should have the same number of electors. Some country seats will have a two to one ratio, and now we are to have these two special seats, which have been referred to rather facetiously.

Let us look at it in a different way. We are to have this ratio of 30 city seats to 26 country seats. The Bill provides that there must be 30 seats in the metropolitan area and 26 outside, despite the fact that if we divided the State by 56 we would have 34 seats in the metropolitan area. The Labor Party went to great pains when explaining this measure at the last election to point out that country representation would not be watered down and that it would be at least the same as previously. It said that the country seats would be retained and this, of course, is why in this Bill 26 country seats are provided for, the same number as under the present system. Let us look carefully at what really will happen. At this moment, under the existing Act under which all of us were returned to this House at the last election, Gawler is classed as one country seat. The areas immediately north and north-east of Adelaide can be regarded as metropolitan in everything except address. On the figures last March Gawler had about 27,640 electors, and the subdivision of Highbury, in the district represented by the member for Barossa, had 9,460. The District of Gouger (which takes in of course, Para Hills, Parafield Gardens and those areas) includes the St. Kilda and Two Wells subdivisions. The figure there is 3,409. In March last year there were 40,500 electors in those areas that I have mentioned, and at December 31, 1965, the number had risen to about 45,000. On the quota that has been enumerated (over 8,000) we would find that that area, upon a redivision of the boundaries, would attract some six seats, allowing for the expansion that is taking place. We would find that at one swoop five seats in those areas would be taken away from the country, and we would have an outer fringe area of seats to the north of the metropolitan area, at the expense of the country area seats.

Mr. Quirke: They can be to the south, too.

Mr. COUMBE: I will come to that. The people in the areas I have mentioned can get a bus or train into the city in a very short time. In town planning and commercial circles, the areas I have referred to are called fringe areas. The 1963 Electoral Commission's report set out and illustrated with a map a very realistic metropolitan area. I doubt whether anybody could argue against the definition by the Town Planning Committee of what the metropolitan area should be, and the Electoral Commissioners, in their report, worked on this basis. In addition to the existing metropolitan area, it took in the districts of

Elizabeth, part of Gawler, Para Hills, Parafield Gardens (which areas, as all members know, are all densely populated today), St. Kilda, Tea Treee Gully, Modbury and Highbury to the north and north-east of Adelaide. In the south are Reynella, Morphett Vale, Christies Beach, Port Noarlunga, and O'Halloran Hill. If one travels in this direction one can see the enormous housing development that has occurred in the area. Soon large sections of that land will be completely built on. The advent of the oil refinery and the activities of the Housing Trust and of other industries have been responsible for this development. Soon, there will be a large metropolitan population living in the areas south of Adelaide, mostly in the District of Alexandra. Consequently, another seat will be formed from this southern group, and seven new seats will be huddled around the metropolitan area at the expense of country areas. If these seven seats were taken from the existing 26 country seats, there would be 19 seats representing the outer country areas, including Onkaparinga.

Mr. Shannon: I am in the fringe: O'Halloran Hill is in my district.

Mr. COUMBE: I was not considering this district, but if that is so the position is worse. If the seat of the member for Onkaparinga is added there will be eight seats, so that instead of the present 25 seats representing country areas—

Mr. Hughes: If you had carried your Bill in 1963, you would have reduced this representation.

Mr. COUMBE: Not at all. The Labor Party stated that there would be 26 seats in the country: that is also stated in the Bill, but the effect of this quota system is that there will be 18 seats in the outer country areas and seven or eight huddled around the fringe of the metropolitan area. This is a snide way of sneaking up on country people and taking away their proportional representation.

Mr. Hughes: You would have taken it away in 1963.

Mr. COUMBE: We would not. Is the honourable member supporting the Bill? Apparently he is supporting a Bill that will affect the outer country areas and their proportional representation, and he is supporting a measure that will tend to concentrate many seats from the country into the fringe of the metropolitan area of Adelaide. This was not explained to the electors at the last election.

Mr. Quirke: I explained it.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, but it was not explained by the Labor Party. I suggest that the Electoral Bill, as suggested in the Labor Party's policy speech, was a major point in having that Party returned at the last election, but I also suggest that the Party has not honoured its promises in that regard and has not told the whole story. How will this Bill affect representation in this House? I am not speaking of Party strength. There will be 37 or 38 members out of a proposed total of 56 whose districts are either metropolitan or metropolitan fringe areas.

Mr. Quirke: You could take your dog for a walk around some of these districts in the city.

Mr. COUMBE: Of course. Although other areas are to be extended, which will make it more difficult for the member to do his work, there will be this concentration around the city with 37 members of Parliament representing districts so small that they could drive from this House in a motor car and reach the outer boundaries of their district in half an hour. That is the type of Bill that country and city members opposite are supporting. I suggest that they should reconsider this matter, as I believe that members opposite, who represent country areas particularly, have not considered this aspect and have not realized the real significance of the effect of this Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: They may have thought it out, but Grote Street has told them what to do.

Mr. COUMBE: I was being charitable. With respect to the size of the House and the redistribution of the seats, this Bill has been introduced by the Labor Party as we expected it would be. However, the Party has departed from the election promise of one vote one value, as this Bill is nothing like that, and the Labor Party has deceived country electors in the way the 26 country seats are to be arranged. I now deal with the setting up of the Electoral Commission and its powers and duties. The composition of the commission is on similar lines to those previously set up in this State, comprising three members—a judge of the Supreme Court, the Surveyor-General, and the Assistant Returning Officer of the State. These are highly respected and responsible officers, and we agree with that provision. What amazes me is the provision in clause 84 that the commissioner's report, after going to His Excellency the Governor, shall come into effect by proclamation and publication in the *Gazette*, and shall not be tabled in Parliament as it always has been. Can any member say why such a report should not be tabled in

Parliament? This is the first time this has been attempted, and we are entitled to ask the reason for this sudden change. What has the Government to hide?

Mr. Quirke: It is the Labor Party's conception of democracy.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. I recall that that Party was glad to have the 1963 report of the Electoral Commissioners brought before this House, and to have the opportunity to debate it. Labor members not only spoke to the Bill but defeated it on the second reading, because they said it did not conform to their views. They had that opportunity, after an independent electoral commission had conducted an investigation and furnished a report. But what would have been the position if that report had not come back to Parliament? If this provision had been in that Bill, and the Bill had not come back to Parliament, would not the Labor Party be raising Cain! If it was good enough for the Labor Party it appears not to be good enough for the Liberal Party Opposition.

Mr. Shannon: Of course, we believe in democracy.

Mr. COUMBE: Why is this report not coming back to Parliament for us to consider it, as has been the practice in this place since time immemorial?

Mr. Quirke: That is how all undemocratic people work.

Mr. COUMBE: I vividly remember members of the present Government when in Opposition saying that they wanted more control by Parliament and less Executive control, but I suggest that this clause is the very antithesis of those expressions. The very opposite occurs when the first major Bill is introduced by the Government. We lauded the then Opposition's sentiments, but if this Bill were passed, an electoral commission set up, and a report brought in, the first thing that we as responsible members of Parliament and of Her Majesty's Opposition would hear about the report would not be from the occupant of the Chair but when somebody took the trouble to read the *Government Gazette*. How many people read the *Gazette*? Perhaps we would hear about it on a weekly television programme. The Government could please itself if and when it brought in that report.

Mr. Shannon: Say, for instance, the report didn't suit it.

Mr. COUMBE: Exactly! If the report did not please the Government it could be shelved indefinitely, or brought in at an appropriate time. In clause 84 we find the words "without reference to Parliament". I remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that, when the present Speaker took his place in the Chair of the House at the opening of this Parliament last year, he said that one of his duties was to uphold the rights of the minority. We heartily agreed with those sentiments, but here we have a Bill with a sinister ring to it. It is Executive control at its ultimate. I point out to the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee (Mr. McKee) that even a district council by-law or the regulation of a statutory body which has to be varied must come before his committee and before the House before it can be approved or disallowed, and yet when a measure affects the position of this House and the future of the State, it can be effected without reference to Parliament whatsoever. Where is the justice in this?

Mr. Jennings: It is a joint committee, so how can the member for Port Pirie be the Chairman from this House?

Mr. COUMBE: What a quibble! Both Houses agree that council by-laws and statutory body regulations have to come before Parliament before they can be varied. The Chairman of the committee, himself, agrees with that, yet he supports this Bill. All we as an Opposition are asking for is the right to debate and examine a report from the Electoral Commissioners after their investigation, just as the Labor Party, when in Opposition, debated the electoral report in 1963. The Bill continues with what I should call a nefarious and scurrilous scheme. New section 85 (1) and (2) deal with future redistributions. No objection could or would be taken to having regularly spaced revisions of the electoral boundaries, provided they were properly and constitutionally carried out. However, I draw the attention of members to subsection (1) which provides that the State can be wholly or partly redivided when directed by proclamation, without reference to Parliament. We could be sitting here one fine day in six years' time and, without a word of warning, be confronted with a proclamation to the effect that the State was to be wholly or partly redivided without any reference to Parliament.

Mr. Shannon: That is only copied from Queensland; that's what they do there.

Mr. COUMBE: That is a fine yardstick to use. No member would have the slightest chance to say anything. While there is the six-year gap in time, after the six years the Government of the day, whatever its political complexion, could order a redivision. This

could go on and the report could be prepared by the Commissioners without any knowledge by any member of the Opposition of the day of this action being taken; it would be completely hush-hush.

Mr. Shannon: Even members of the Government Party might not hear about it if they were not members of Cabinet.

Mr. COUMBE: Dicken they wouldn't! The authors of the Bill are trying to circumvent amending the Constitution Act when they want to make some alteration to the electoral boundaries. At present an absolute majority is required in both Houses and that is what the authors of the Bill are trying to get around in a rather curious and devious way. They will not need to amend the Constitution Act because of new section 85 (2) providing that the proclamation to resubdivide the State can be issued by resolution of the House of Assembly. New section 85 (2) sets out the following alternative:

When the Returning Officer for the State reports that the number of electors enrolled in not less than 10 electoral districts for the House of Assembly falls short of or exceeds by 20 per cent the electoral quota.

Therefore, there are two methods of issuing a proclamation to resubdivide the State: either the Parliament of the day or a member of the Public Service can do it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, which means do you think the present Government would use? We are the elected representatives of the people and there could be a decision by us or a decision on the recommendation of a public servant. Which would the present Government use? If it used the alternative it would not have to come to the House at all and members would hear nothing official about it. Members could see in the *Government Gazette* that a proclamation was being issued. This is not Parliamentary equality.

I did not expect quite so soon to see the rights of members taken away so flagrantly as they are being taken away by this Bill, which is designed to get around the provisions of the Constitution. This denies to members the opportunity to debate probably one of the most important measures affecting the life of this Parliament. It certainly affects the life of individual members of the House and also the lives of most of the people who live in South Australia. The Opposition wants an opportunity to debate these matters. We do not expect to win every time but we want the opportunity to debate, to ventilate our views. However, by this means the present Government is stifling this opportunity. There is no doubt that the second alternative to which I have referred places the power fairly and squarely in the hands of the Executive.

Mr. Quirke: There is too much Executive control.

Mr. COUMBE: When it was in Opposition the Labor Party said that it did not want Executive control and that Parliament should control things. However, one of its first major Bills removes Parliamentary control and places control in the hands of the Executive. Despite the derogatory remarks made about the previous Government by members opposite, we always brought down provisions so that Parliament could have the final say. The opportunity was there for members of both the Government and of the Opposition to have an equal say on various measures. These measures could be reported on—ventilated through the press, radio and television—and the people of the State could thus know what was going on. Now this is not to be the case.

We always brought down reports but this will not necessarily be done by the Government under the provisions of new section 85(2). I point out that only the House of Assembly will vote on these matters, if it has the opportunity before a public servant has his say. The Legislative Council will not have the opportunity as it does now, when both Houses have to pass a measure by an absolute majority. To sum up—

Mr. Hudson: Hear, hear!

Mr. COUMBE: I am glad that the member for Glenelg has come in to listen, and that he has expressed his approval.

Mr. Hudson: I was approving only of your statement about summing up.

Mr. COUMBE: One of the Labor Party's major Bills in its first session as a Government strips away from Parliament some of its powers and privileges and takes away from members of Her Majesty's Opposition the opportunity to air and ventilate certain views on a Bill of this nature. In addition to denying the opportunity of debate to Opposition members, the Bill is designed to circumvent the present provisions of the Constitution Act and to reduce future opportunities for free speech on this subject. Thus, future Oppositions, whatever their political complexion, will be denied the opportunity to criticize important changes in the composition of this House. The Star Chamber and the Divine Right of Kings had nothing on this Bill and the Government that has introduced it. The Government is in full flow today.

Finally, and so that there will be no misunderstanding whatever, I say that I completely oppose the Bill because it is a bad Bill. I had hoped that the Government would have brought in a reasonable Bill that had some justification and equity. The word "fraud" has been used recently in the Chamber and I shall use it now: I say that this Bill is a fraud, and I intend to vote against it. Furthermore, I shall support to my utmost the Leader of the Opposition's suggested amendment when the opportunity arises.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This Bill to amend the Constitution was introduced on July 1 last and, except for the speech by the Leader of the Opposition almost immediately afterwards and one or two short periods spent dealing with it, this House has not debated it for more than six months. During that time, many rumours have been flying about in this and other places that there is a fair amount of discontent on the other side of the Chamber in regard to the possible boundaries of country districts, and I consider, especially after what has been said by the member for Torrens this afternoon about the cluster of seats around the metropolitan area (as defined in this Bill), that there is much substance in the rumours and that they merely underline the merit in the motion standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Ryan: Is there more than one rumour?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, the rumours are all to the effect that certain members on the opposite side are not entirely happy about the position as it will be if this Bill is passed. I point out, as other members have pointed out, that this Bill deals with three matters: first, the numbers and electorates for the House of Assembly; secondly, the franchise for the Legislative Council; and thirdly, the resolution of deadlocks between the two places. I should like to give my own personal views on the principles involved in these matters and to deal then with some of the clauses in the Bill.

Regarding the number of members in the House of Assembly and the method of electing them, I emphasize immediately that I have always believed in the principle of one vote one value and have often said so, both in this House and outside. I have never heard an argument against that principle that has appealed to me as having any force. I consider (and I have said so) that all men and women, whoever they are, wherever they live, and whatever they do, are born with, and should retain, certain rights, one of which is to have a voice equal to that of every other person in the government of the community. In a Parliamentary democracy such as ours, people get that equal voice through the ballot box. This is an ideal that every democratic community should set before itself. It is seldom attained, although I admit that in the past the degree to which it has been attained in other places has been nearer to perfect than it has been here. Section 24 of the Commonwealth Constitution provides that this principle should be used in the election of members of the House of Representatives and it has been used since the first Commonwealth Parliament was elected.

Mr. Clark: In the Senate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I say that it has been used in relation to the House of Representatives. The Senate is another case, a States' House, in which each State has equal representation. In my view, that does not detract from the principle which has been in the Commonwealth Constitution since it was drawn up and which I consider is the only principle on which a popular House of Parliament can be elected. Having said that this is the ideal, I must say (and I know every member will agree with me) that there must be exceptions practically. In this State, there must be exceptions to this ideal.

Everyone knows, and the Government has acknowledged it in the Bill, that there is an uneven spread of population in South Australia and that it is not possible precisely, or approximately, apparently, according to the Bill, to attain the ideal of one vote one value. It appears that this is the view of the Government Party as well as my view. I remind members opposite of our platform on this matter. I say much about the A.L.P. platform and shall have more to say about it later. Thee Liberal and Country League principle on this point states:

The practical recognition of the special need for adequate country representation.

I entirely support that principle. It is absolutely correct and unavoidable in a State like South Australia because of the sparseness and spread of our population as well as a number of other factors and it is essential that there should be some departure from the principle of one vote one value. It appeared that the Australian Labor Party, until it got into office, supported the principle of one vote one value without any qualification. Of course, we find now, as the member for Torrens has demonstrated with great effect, that there is to be a 15 per cent tolerance apart from anything else and, beyond that, there is provision

for two exceptional seats. One of them has been referred to as the "Casey relief clause" or the "Casey preservation clause". The Bill does not state where these two seats are to be. They may be down in the South-East for all the Bill provides. There is nothing about their being in the Far North or anywhere else. Apparently, the present Government found it easier to support the pure principle of one vote one value when in Opposition than it has in Government. I was not quite accurate in what I said a moment ago about one vote one value. The platform of the Australian Labor Party provides for a 10 per cent tolerance. Nothing was said in the second reading explanation of the Premier about the blatant departure by the Government, now that it is in office, from its own platform, where a tolerance of 10 per cent is clearly laid down.

Mr. Coumbe: Why do you think that is?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the member for Torrens has already illustrated the reasons for that in his speech this afternoon. This is what the State platform says:

An independent Electoral Boundaries Commission to provide approximately equal voting strength on the principle of one vote one value, in electorates subject to a margin of one-tenth over or under the average.

What does the Bill provide? It does not say one-tenth; it says 15 per cent. Why has the Government chosen to ignore its own policy and say nothing about it? Apparently, it is trying to hide the fact that it has departed from its own policy, because it has found, as many members on this side of the House and I have said, that we must have representation weighted substantially in favour of the country in this House. It ill behoves the Government, after all that has been said over the years since 1955 about "one vote one value", to depart from its own platform within a few months of assuming office.

Mr. Shannon: And in one of its first Bills, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I have taken the Government to task on that. However, I would not quarrel too violently with the proposal of a 15 per cent tolerance. I qualify that immediately by saying a little more about the way in which this is to be put into operation. This is far from satisfactory. I have often tried to work out a system acceptable to all members of this House. I thought at one time that we might have a basis in the Commonwealth electoral system, acknowledging that of the 11 seats six are substantially metropolitan and five are substantially country. I thought we might be able to say, "The six metropolitan seats will each be divided into four, making 24 seats, and each of the five country seats could be divided into five, giving 25 seats in that area." That would be a good scheme, were it not for the fact that the Commonwealth people have dragged their feet so much in respect of their own redistribution that it has been impossible to do anything about it. They have fumbled so much. But something along these lines is possible. I do not want to say anything more for the moment about the principle of electing members.

I return now to the other part of the proposal dealing with the number of members that it is proposed this House should have—56. I agree with what has been said by members opposite, that on pure population figures an increase from 39 to 56 is justified. As all metropolitan members have discovered, it is most difficult to represent adequately a district of over 20,000 electors. My own electoral district has almost 25,000 electors—maybe a few hundred more. I envy members in other electoral districts with 6,000 or 7,000 electors. I know it is possible in a seat of that size to know personally almost every elector, or at any rate to know of him. That is utterly impossible in an electoral district of the size of the one that I and some other members represent.

So I would welcome a small electoral district, because I believe I could represent it far more efficiently than I am able to represent mine at present, simply because of numbers. However, having said that, let me put two other considerations to members on the other side. The first is that it is strange indeed that the Labor Party should advocate a substantial increase in the members of a State Parliament when its Commonwealth platform shows it desires the abolition of the States altogether and their replacement by bodies with powers delegated by the Commonwealth Government. It is an anomaly that the Labor Party should want to strengthen the States when its ultimate policy is the abolition of the States altogether. I come now to something that all people must face, that as time goes on the importance and significance of State Parliaments in the Commonwealth system in this country are declining. There is no doubt about that. Since uniform taxation was introduced in 1943 there has been a gradual decrease in the sphere of influence and the power and authority of the States. For that reason alone, it may not be necessary to increase the size of State Parliaments.

I now come to the Legislative Council, the franchise for it, and its position in our political structure. I believe strongly in the bicameral system of government and am completely sold on the idea of two Houses of Parliament, an Upper House and a Lower House. It may be that members opposite can say it is hard to find theoretical reasons to justify two Houses rather than one. I reply that it is hard to find theoretical reasons to justify only one House. The test is that in the overwhelming majority of Parliamentary democracies it has been found better to have two Houses rather than one.

Mr. McKee: You agree with the restricted franchise?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am coming to that. The Premier in his second reading explanation referred to the two exceptions—Queensland and New Zealand. Those are examples of unicameral legislatures. He did not, however, refer to the many other examples: the other States of the Commonwealth, most of the States of the United States of America (of which there are 50), France, Germany and nearly every Parliamentary democracy one can think of. They all have two Houses of Parliament.

Mr. Casey: Except the African States that became independent.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe, but I am sure the honourable member will agree that the overwhelming number of countries that have a Parliament have two Houses, and in some cases the Constitution is re-drawn every few years.

Mr. Quirke: The United States of America tried it and went back to two Houses.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. It is better to have two Chambers than one. This is a practical test, and I believe it should be used in South Australia. I am glad that the honourable member for Barossa is in the Chamber at the moment. She made a speech yesterday, and spent most of her time damning the Legislative Council. I shall be kind to the honourable member; I think she is a nice girl, and she represents a jolly good district. It is a district in which I sometimes sleep, although when I do it is usually on the slopes of Mount Gawler at an army bivouac. However, the honourable member was absolutely off the beam yesterday, and I should like to tell her a couple of things. I hope she will stay here long enough to hear what I have to say to illustrate that she was rather astray in some of the things she said. She obviously did much work on her speech, and one of the tests she produced was the length of time that the Legislative Council sat. It was strange to hear her passing strictures on the shortness of the time of sitting of that Chamber in view of what we have heard *ad nauseam* from the Premier and other Ministers about how long we are making this Chamber sit. She says that the Legislative Council does not sit long enough and therefore cannot be considering the Bills before it or doing its job, yet her own leaders complain that this House is sitting too long. The two things do not add up. However, I say that only by the way.

I will now give a couple of examples. I have had occasion in the past to be not particularly happy about the way in which the Legislative Council has handled Bills in which I have been interested. In 1962 I introduced a Bill to amend the Road Traffic Act to provide for the compulsory installation of seat belts. That Bill was passed in this Chamber on the voices, with the overwhelming support of members on both sides. But what happened in the Legislative Council? The vital provision was defeated on the casting vote of the President. Then came the usual consultations or exchanges between the two Chambers, and in the Upper House a motion was introduced by one of the supporters of the Bill that the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendments, which were contrary to the view of this Chamber. That motion was lost, and the amendments were insisted upon. I wonder if the honourable member for Barossa knows (she can check this if she likes)—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to the honourable member as the honourable member for Barossa.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: She is a female, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Barossa must be referred to as the honourable member for Barossa just as the honourable member for Burnside must be referred to as the honourable member for Burnside.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member for Barossa can check this at page 862 of the 1963-64 volume of *Hansard*. The interesting thing is that the people who frustrated the measure were the four Labor members of the Legislative Council, who voted against it.

Mr. Rodda: To be consistent with their attitude on this matter, they should have supported it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course they should. The members of my Party in the Legislative Council are not rubber stamps, and neither are

Labor members, as all four of them voted against the measure. In 1964 the then Minister of Agriculture (the member for Alexandra) introduced into this House a Fauna Conservation Bill, which was passed here, and I think it is fair to say that there was not an extensive debate in this House. It went upstairs to the Legislative Council and the Council scrutinized it with great care, made 33 amendments, and returned it to this House. This House, after looking at the Bill and the amendments, accepted without further question 32 amendments and made a slight amendment to the thirty-third. That is a perfect example of the function of the Legislative Council. The honourable member for Barossa, on her own admission yesterday, was not greatly interested in what was going on in this House at that time; she was out winning her seat. She said that she conducted a long campaign, and this was part of it. However, it ill behoves the honourable member for Barossa to reflect on the other Chamber without seeing what has happened.

Mrs. Byrne: They are only isolated cases.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member cares to make a study of these things she will find they are not isolated cases. This is the way in which the Legislature of South Australia works, and I believe it is a good way.

Mr. Shannon: Have we had many conferences between the two Chambers this session?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have.

Mr. Shannon: What does that indicate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It indicates, I believe, the working of the Parliamentary system. It is a good thing to have two sets of minds concentrating on the same question, and that is what we get in our system. There is one feeling in this House and another feeling in another place, and the legislation that comes out of the scrutiny of both Chambers is better than it would be if there were only one scrutiny, by this House.

Having said that and, I hope, having demonstrated my belief in the two-Chamber system of Parliamentary Government, I come to the next point, which is that for this system to work there must be some difference in the method of electing members of the two Houses. Otherwise, we run the danger, which is almost a certainty, that one House will simply be a reflection of the other. At present in this State, the difference between the methods of electing members to the two Houses lies in the difference in franchise. In respect of this House it is the full adult franchise of everyone over 21, and voting is compulsory, whereas in respect of the other Chamber there is a qualified franchise, albeit a wide franchise, and there is a limitation on the age at which a person can be elected. A person has to be 30 years of age before he or she can be elected to the Council. I believe that for a century or more this system of election of members has worked not too badly in South Australia. I say that despite the fact that when I came into this Chamber I personally was neither qualified to vote at elections for members of the Legislative Council nor was I qualified to be a member of that Chamber. I was too young, I had not been to the war, and I did not own any property, nor did I pay any rent, so if anyone could have complained from his personal experience it should have been me. However, I say that I think this system has not worked too badly, and I personally am quite happy and was quite happy to let it continue; but once it has been challenged (and the basis of the franchise of the Legislative Council has been questioned), I admit that in my view there is no justification for any qualification on the franchise of the Upper House. I do not believe that in our day and age we can defend any qualification upon the franchise for any House of Parliament.

Believing as I do that there must be a difference between the two, but admitting that I cannot defend any qualification of the franchise for one or other of the Houses, what is the solution to this? My belief is that the most appropriate solution in South Australia is as follows: The House of Assembly should continue to be elected by a compulsory vote by people who must put their names on the roll; in other words, for this House there is compulsory enrolment and there is compulsory voting. This compulsion in voting is a concept which is almost peculiar to Australia. The other great system in democracies overseas is a voluntary enrolment and voluntary voting. We have it in Great Britain and in the United States of America. I found to my surprise at the time that when I went to America a few years ago I was accused of coming from an undemocratic country because people were forced to vote. This was something that was served up to me at some of the universities in all seriousness. Although I cannot accept that it makes our system undemocratic, the fact is that in other places it is a voluntary enrolment and voluntary vote, and that is, I

believe, as it should be for the Legislative Council. I believe that that, combined with the fact that only half the members of the Council retire at each general election and that they are elected for a six-year term, would be sufficient to reflect a difference of opinion between members of the two Houses, and that is, I believe, the situation to which we should come in South Australia: the compulsory principle for the Lower House, the voluntary principle for the Upper House.

Mr. Hudson: Do you regard as satisfactory the current situation where the Government has only four members in the Legislative Council?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have already said that once the system is questioned I cannot find any way of defending it. I say that, and I have said it before. I come now to the third point—the resolution of deadlocks between the two Houses. There must obviously be some workable method of resolving differences of opinion between the two Houses. It is doubtful whether at the present time in the South Australian Constitution we have any workable system. We do not know, because it has never, in fact, been tried out to the ultimate. I do not, however, agree with the proposals that are embodied in this Bill. The Government in introducing it has said (and it is obvious if we look at it) that it has based its proposals on the arrangements between the House of Commons and the House of Lords in Great Britain. It is ironical that 100 years ago that was the basis in this State for the arrangements between the two Houses. I ask the Government why it should be the basis today, because there is no parallel at all between the situation of the House of Lords and the situation of the Legislative Council in South Australia. I remind honourable members of something that they should know (and I think do know perfectly well), and that is that the House of Lords is not an elected Chamber at all: it is an hereditary Chamber.

Mr. Freebairn: And nominated.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is mainly hereditary and now partly nominated. It is not an elected Chamber at all.

Mr. Freebairn: Only the nominated members, in general, take their seats.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad the honourable member said "in general", because any hereditary peer is entitled to sit. Most of the backwoodsmen, as they are called, do not bother, but they are entitled to do so. In fact, there are many who are entitled to do so. It is a House that, as has often been said, works better because members stay away. Here we have at present a second Chamber that is elected on a qualified franchise, and under this Bill, of course, if it became law, the Legislative Council would be every bit as popular a Chamber as this one is because it would be elected by adult franchise. Therefore, we cannot make any valid comparison or draw on the English system when our system is so different. That, I think, is the answer in principle to the suggestion made by the Government in this Bill.

What, then, should we do? There are two suggestions. The first is that the will of this House should prevail if a measure is carried by an absolute majority twice and a general election for members of this House intervenes between. I think a suggestion along those lines could wash, or else, if that is not acceptable, we could look at section 57 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which provides for the resolution of deadlocks in the Commonwealth Parliament. I do not know whether the member for Frome agrees with what I have said. I should be surprised if he does, but apparently, from the encouraging grins I am getting from him, he is lapping it all up. I think that either one or other of these should be the basis for the resolution of deadlocks between the Houses.

That is all I want to say about principle. Let us now look at the Bill and see how the Government has tried to carry out these proposals in practice. I shall not need, members will be glad to know, to look at all the clauses. The first one I refer to is clause 12 of the Bill, which enacts a new section 41 in the Constitution, and this is the section that will deal with deadlocks between the two Houses. That is a most extraordinary section in the way it has been presented to this House. It has several extraordinary features, which I shall mention. The first is that under this provision, if it went through, the Legislative Council could be abolished in a little over 12 months, because the exceptions are only a money Bill or a Bill containing any provision to extend the maximum continuance of the House of Assembly. If a Bill were passed by this House to amend the Constitution and to abolish the Legislative Council, under this clause the Legislative Council could hold it up for only 12 months. It would then be passed again by this House, and the Legislative Council would be gone. That is the effect, practically, of this provision. We know (the Premier said it in his explanation of the Bill, and it is in the platform of the Labor Party)

that eventual abolition of the Upper House is the aim.

Now this is not a clause to resolve deadlocks between the two Houses: it is a clause to abolish the Legislative Council, and that is how it would be done. If this Bill had been proceeded with with reasonable expedition after it was introduced on July 1, and if by some extreme mischance this clause had gone through, the Legislative Council would have been abolished before the next election. Members opposite know that that is the effect of this clause. That is so obvious. Two other things I point out. The first is that apparently this section, which is to deal with deadlocks between the Houses, does not provide machinery to resolve deadlocks on money Bills or on Bills to extend the maximum continuance of the House of Assembly. I do not know how deadlocks are to be resolved on these matters. Under present section 41 any Bill is subject to those deadlock provisions. I wish the Attorney-General, as the chief law officer of the Crown, were here to give the reasons why no provision is made in this Bill to deal with these matters. Apparently this has been forgotten, as this clause does not refer to it nor does any later clause take care of it. This is a most extraordinary thing and I look for some explanation either from the Attorney-General or from some other Government member as to why it is not proposed to have any provision for a deadlock over these important matters. It is a mistake.

This clause provides that only Bills that have been sent to the Legislative Council at least one month before the end of the session will be covered by these deadlock provisions. I do not understand the words "at the end of each of those sessions", and I am sure that the Government has not given much thought to them. The end of the session occurs when Parliament is prorogued: it is not the last sitting day of Parliament. We complete our session, using the popular term, by ceasing to sit. On that last day the Leader of the Government moves for the adjournment of the House to a date, say, a month or six weeks ahead. Before that date the Governor has issued a proclamation proroguing Parliament, and it is because of that proclamation that we do not meet on the day to which we have adjourned, because the Parliamentary session has been brought to an end by the proclamation. This is necessary because Bills must be assented to while Parliament is in session, and to get all the Bills assented to after we have finished dealing with them takes three or four weeks. The session of Parliament ends three, four or up to six weeks after we cease sitting. This makes a hollow mockery of this provision that Bills have to go to the Legislative Council at least one month before the end of the session. This provision could be literally fulfilled if they went up on the last day of sitting. This is an absurd situation which members opposite have not thought about at all. Why cannot they think out proper provisions? They have had seven months to do it correctly if they wanted to.

Two glaring errors are in this clause apart from the fact that it is a fraud in itself, because it is a clause that will lead to the abolition of the Legislative Council and not to a resolution of deadlocks between the two Houses. This is the sort of thing that makes me cross. Let us consider other clauses. Clause 14 enacts a series of new sections under the Constitution. New section 76 deals with the appointment of the Electoral Commission and in subsection (3) provides that the commissioners shall hold office until the commission has completed its duties under this Act. What does that mean? Let us consider proposed sections 83 and 84. Section 83 deals with the report of the commission being sent to the Governor. Does the commission complete its duties when it sends its report, or when the Governor sees fit to publish the report? This should be made clear. Does the commission cease to exist when it has made its report or does it cease to exist when the report is published? It is important that we should know, because if it is the latter interpretation it means that the Government of the day can send the report back to be reconsidered, but if it is the former, the commission has disappeared and then what happens? We should have a more exact phrase than "until the commission has completed its duties". We should know when it is proposed the commission should cease to exist. Under new section 77 (3) there need be only two commissioners in favour of a proposal for it to be carried. I have dealt with new section 79 (3), providing for a 15 per cent tolerance, which is a contradiction of the express platform of the Australian Labor Party which provides for a 10 per cent tolerance. I have already referred to subsection (4) and pointed out that there are no restrictions at all on this subsection on where the two small districts can be. The Bill merely states:

. . . the Commission may, if it is satisfied that it is desirable for reasons of sparsity and remoteness of population and difficulties of

communication, provide that in not more than two electoral districts the number of electors shall be more than 15 per cent below the electoral quota.

It does not state where they are going to be, and there is no guarantee they will be in the places in which the Government Party hopes they will be, to protect the member for Frome and others. The member for Torrens dealt with new section 80. This is a fraud, and to use the term employed by my revered Leader when he spoke of it, this is crook; it is as crook as it can be to take a definition, which was an appropriate definition of the metropolitan area in 1954, and 12 years later, after a tremendous increase in the population of this State, in the population of the metropolitan area, and in the population of the areas surrounding the metropolitan area, to use that again as the definition. That is no more than a fraud, and is entirely crook. Government members have said much about the Town Planner's report and of the necessity to put it into effect. Why don't they read the first chapter of that report dealing with the extent of the metropolitan area if they are so interested in it? No doubt they have read it, but they choose to ignore it for their own political and expedient ends in this case. These are the things in this wretched Bill to which I object. New section 84 has been referred to, and this is the section that will enable the Government at such time as it shall deem fit to publish the report that is sent to it. There is no obligation at all in this Bill for the report ever to be published if it does not suit the Government in office at the time.

Mr. Coumbe: It could be shelved indefinitely.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. In other words, the Government has two bob each way; if it likes the report it will be published as soon as possible; if it does not like it we shall never see any more of it. This, too, is a trick—an undesirable trick, indeed. It is a blatant attempt by the Government to have it both ways. Finally, I deal with another matter in new section 85 (2) with regard to the subsequent redivision of the districts of this State. I point out that, in addition to the points made by the member for Torrens, under new section 85 (2) (*b*), it could mean a movement of a little over 5 per cent in 10 out of the 56 districts in this State. New section 85 (2) (*b*) states:

. . . when the returning officer for the State reports that the number of electors enrolled in not less than 10 electoral districts for the House of Assembly falls short of or exceeds by 20 per cent the electoral quota:

It is not the original number of electors fixed for that particular district; it is the quota. There is already provision to depart from that quota by up to 15 per cent or down to 15 per cent, and it needs only another 5 per cent—

Mr. Casey: That's not quite right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If it is not, I hope the member for Frome will put me right.

Mr. Jennings: Someone needs to put you right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope the member for Enfield can.

Mr. Jennings: You have issued a challenge which I accept.

Mr. Hudson: Why not move an amendment?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is impossible to amend this botch of a Bill. I have referred to half a dozen points in it, but I bet there are plently more if we like to go through the Bill. It is impossible to do anything with this Bill, other than to throw it out, or to do what the Leader of the Opposition seeks to do. That is why I intend to support the Leader.

Mr. Hudson: You supported it in 1963.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hear the mutterings of the member for Glenelg. He is apparently chiding me, but if he cares to read what I said at the time perhaps he will be a little more charitable. On that occasion I said this was a system that I found a little unusual—so unusual that I knew of it in only one other place, namely in Minnesota, U.S.A. However, I said that I thought we ought to give it a try because it was better than the system we had then and still have now. It is for that reason that I supported it.

Mr. Hudson: In fact it was worse.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This scheme is far worse than any other scheme that has been introduced into the House, because it is dishonest.

Mr. Rodda: Absolutely!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is why I am totally opposed to the provisions of the Bill, in spite of what I have said as to my views on electoral matters. That is also why it is impossible to amend the Bill to make it workable and just. For those reasons I support the Leader of the Opposition in the motion he has moved.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): After listening to the member for Torrens and the member for Mitcham, who made exhaustive analyses of a perfidy embodied in the Bill, it should not be necessary to say anything else, but I find it still necessary to support those people in the vast rural areas of South Australia who will be practically disfranchised. Honourable members opposite constantly use the word "democracy".

I do not know whether they know what the word means, or whether they have their own special meaning, but the word derives from the two Greek words *demos* and *kratos*, the former word meaning people and the latter meaning rule. Therefore, the people rule. If this legislation is passed the principle of democracy is taken away from the people and they no longer rule. In order to prove that, it is necessary only to read the last clauses of the Bill, which place the political destiny of South Australia in the hands of two men. Only two men are required to form the commission to be set up.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They can decide who shall be the Government of the State.

Mr. QUIRKE: They can decide everything. If the Bill is passed, and if it is necessary in their opinion to revise the boundaries, there will be no appeal to the people. The people will have thrust on them something that they may bitterly oppose. Is that not the tragedy of the loss of democracy in the world over the last 30 years? The people of South Australia should rise in their wrath and protest with the utmost vigour at the presentation of a measure such as this.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The member for Frome doesn't worry about it; he has a special privilege.

Mr. QUIRKE: That would apply to the member for Whyalla, too, whose district would embrace a certain section of Eyre.

Mr. Casey: You'd win first prize in a guessing competition.

Mr. QUIRKE: When the population of the district grew beyond 10,000, two members would represent it. Of the 56 seats, 19 would be outside the fringe of the metropolitan area, but it is the Government's design that not more than 15 rural representatives shall enter this House, allowing for, say, Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Wallaroo, and Peterborough. The rest of the vast rural area could gather only 15 representatives. Those 15 seats would be in the Midland area up as far as Peterborough around to Pinnaroo and down to the South-East. Each metropolitan seat would have 10,000 electors in it. Those 10,000 people could be in an area of land around the perimeter of which it would be possible to take the family dog for a walk.

Mr. Coumbe: I have one subdivision of 10,000 voters.

Mr. QUIRKE: For there to be 10,000 voters in the area I represent it would be necessary, on the electoral figures, to have a district of 100 miles by 100 miles, or 10,000 square miles. Therefore, one member would represent 10,000 square miles embracing Yatina in the north, Jamestown, Spalding and Clare, right down to Riverton—probably to Tarlee—and east as far as one can go through Saddleworth, Manoora, Black Springs and Burra. There would be one member only for that area.

In the metropolitan area one member could be planted in two square miles as against one member for 10,000 square miles in the Midland area. On the figures, that cannot be denied. That would be an intolerable position and even a body with such undemocratic ideas as the Government has would surely not inflict that on the people. However, that is what the Bill provides. Assuming this legislation were passed (and I take it that that will be a most difficult process), it could bear in itself the elements of its own destruction, because there would be a vast multiplicity of seats in the metropolitan area. It is assumed that because a district is in the metropolitan area the votes will necessarily go to the Labor Party.

Mr. Clark: I do not think that is so.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Bill is designed with this intention: that the voters in the metropolitan area, after a certain period of Labor Administration, will vote Labor, That would mean the destruction of country interests. I believe that if the Bill came into operation with all these seats in the metropolitan area, it would inevitably lead to the destruction of a Labor Government particularly if such a Government foisted upon the people measures such as the present Government is attempting to foist on the people today.

People in the metropolitan area vote practically on a ticket, whether white or blue, and thousands of them do not even know the names on the tickets. This does not apply only in our metropolitan area; it has grown consequential upon compulsory voting which was the worst thing that ever happened to South Australia politically. When I was elected there was no compulsory vote. In the non-compulsory voting days it was easy to get 500 people at an election meeting in the Clare Town Hall; it was easy to get 200 or 300 people at an election meeting at Jamestown or 100 at a meeting at Riverton or Saddleworth. However, now all the interest has gone, and let me add that it was fast disappearing before the advent of television.

Mr. Freebairn: The honourable member should qualify that by saying that there have been some exciting road transport meetings.

Mr. QUIRKE: That has engendered interest. However, compulsory voting has taken away people's interest because they are compelled to vote. With the effluxion of time I have grown to appreciate that the compulsory vote is a venomous thing militating against political interests in any country, and particularly in South Australia. People going to the polls today know that there are two tickets, one white and the other blue, but I prophesy that, if this Bill passes, there will be another ticket that will split the whole thing open and, with the compulsory voting that operates today, I think that would be a good thing.

It is necessary to protect the interests of country people so that they can have effective Parliamentary representation, and I shall do that to my utmost. If there are 15 districts in that area, a member cannot adequately represent his district, no matter how hard he works. He will have to travel at least 25,000 miles a year by car and almost all his telephone calls to the perimeter of his district will cost 5s. each. A person cannot make a telephone call today to a place more than 100 miles away for less than 5s., and the expenses would be so extraordinary that a member could not meet them if he were to be paid half as much again as his present salary.

My District of Burra is 100 miles across, it is about 60 miles from north to south and is only sparsely populated. A car used fully in that district has travelled an average of 25,000 miles a year. During the two years I served in the Ministry, I used the Ministerial car for my work and the private car was only used for my home. The car travelled 61,000 miles in two years of operative running.

Mr. Ryan: You would be in trouble if you had a bike.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is all that the member for Port Adelaide needs; perhaps he need not go to the expense of a bike. He can get everlasting soles and, if he wears them perpetually, he will not get more than gentle exercise walking around his district. This Bill is the first substantive attack that has been made on democratic represenation in South Australia in the whole history of the bicameral system.

The member for Mitcham has mentioned the Legislative Council, and this Bill blatantly sets out to destory that Chamber. I agree that some reform is necessary in regard to the Legislative Council, and have always said so. Our proposal to provide a vote for the wife of an elector, which I put forward, would have eased the position. I can stand with the member for Mitcham to a large extent in regard to the way he says it ought to be reformed. I would be prepared to have one roll for the two Houses, provided that voting for the Legislative Council was not compulsory. That is because, apart from the reasons given by the member for Mitcham, I do not believe in a compulsory vote in any shape on form, even if it is in regard to lotteries, which is worse because it is a social question.

I suppose I shall be fined £2, because I have been asked why I did not vote at the referendum. I would not vote and, even though I was in favour of a lottery, I did not vote and, in all probability, shall be penalized for the views I hold. I do not object to that, because it is the existing law and, if I break that law and a penalty attaches, I will pay it; but I will not support a compulsory vote for the Legislative Council and a compulsory vote for the House of Assembly. If we have that, we simply make the two Houses even, and the Upper House loses its power of major contribution to the history and destiny of this State.

Mr. Ryan: Do you vote for the House of Assembly on polling day?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. It is the law and I am prepared to concede that for Parliament, but I will not concede it for social questions. The Legislative Council has worked admirably in the interests of this State. Honourable members opposite want to destroy it. Why? What is their objection to it? In what way has it harmed any Labor legislation in this State? I know the objection in the Socialist mind. Its objection to the Upper House is that it regards it as an upper social structure, which it is not. Because the Labor Party is opposed to that, it says, as is often said in other countries, "People like that are self-exalted and are the enemy of the people." They are not. They have worked well. The opposition to the Legislative Council is not because of what it has done; it is because the Labor Party considers that the Legislative Council is associated with an element to which it is opposed, that element that the Attorney-General referred to when putting through another Bill in this place. He said, "We will get it from your wealthy supporters." That epitomized the attitude of the Labor Party to the Upper House. That is the story; that is the opposition to it.

It is about time the Labor Party gave away such juvenile ideas and grew up. Let it take a lesson from the Labour Party in the United Kingdom, where they have no such stupidities

associated with their regime and where they do not have a class motive for the destruction of certain people. The destruction of the Legislative Council is prompted by class distinction. I have no hesitation in saying that. I have been here a long time, and I know that is correct because the Upper House is being condemned without guilt. Time and time again every member in this House must have been pleased at the way the Upper House has reviewed legislation going there from here. It has introduced amendments that we have been pleased to accept. Members of the Legislative Council view things differently from us and, looking at Bills in another way, they have inserted amendments into dozens and hundreds of Bills in my time, which have improved the legislation. In the improving of it they have made it better working legislation in the interests of the people of this State.

I oppose this Bill root and branch, primarily because it will destroy the political representation of the rural districts of South Australia—and with that I couple the Legislative Council. The Bill is designed to do that because it is assumed by members opposite that, if a person lives in the country, he is an enemy of the people because he votes Liberal. I reiterate that I endorse entirely the information coming to this House in those analytical reports given by the members for Torrens and Mitcham and by other honourable members who have preceded me today, and I add my meagre contribution in support thereof. I oppose the measure and will support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I, like many other previous speakers, strongly oppose this Bill, which is obnoxious to me and the people I represent. I believe that if it is carried the people of my district will be disfranchised, that it is not democratic or fair, and that it is bad legislation. The Labor Party, so it says, believes in democracy, but there is nothing democratic about this legislation.

Mr. Freebairn: It is crook!

Mr. HEASLIP: It is definitely crook. We have had much of this type of legislation this session, and unfortunately it is disguised and looks so harmless until one reads further into it. In his second reading explanation the Premier said:

At the election I announced that our policy was for a 56-member Lower House, based on the principle of one vote one value; that in making this provision there would be no decrease in the number of country members;

Mr. Hughes: Isn't that correct?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is definitely incorrect, and I will try in the short time I shall be speaking to demonstrate to the honourable member, who represents a country district, that it is incorrect. I think he is one of the people who will be greatly affected by this measure, as many of his electors will be disfranchised.

Mr. Ryan: They have to vote, so how can they be disfranchised?

Mr. HEASLIP: What I have said applies to all country members.

Mr. Ryan: What is the meaning of "disfranchised"?

Mr. HEASLIP: I went to school for some time and I know that, so I do not think it is necessary to explain it to the honourable member.

Mr. Ryan: If they have to vote, how are they disfranchised?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not intend to explain that, but by the time I have finished my speech I hope the honourable member will understand. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that he believed in one vote one value, but I do not believe in anything that is not practical. What is the good of theory? In theory one vote one value is all right, but how can it be put into operation? How is the Labor Party putting it into operation under this Bill? Is it adhering to its policy of one vote one value? Of course it is not. There is no such thing; it just will not work. It is purely theoretical. It is a lovely thing for members opposite to go to the electors and say that if elected they will introduce one vote one value, which they said in the last election campaign.

Mr. Freebairn: Have you studied the way they endorse their own Parliamentary candidates?

Mr. HEASLIP: I have, but I am talking about what they told the people. They said they believed in one vote one value and that if elected they would see that that principle was put into practice. But are they doing that? Of course they are not. They cannot do it, as it is purely theoretical. It was a lovely thing for them to tell the electors that they would do it, but they have broken their promise, and, when promises are broken, the people remember.

Mr. Langley: That is why they changed the Government.

Mr. HEASLIP: I suggest that the member for Unley talk to his Leader and then go to the people and ask what they think. The Premier, in his second reading explanation,

spoke of one vote one value. However, that is quite impossible and impracticable, and it is not included in this Bill, even though at first glance it seems to be. I maintain that it cannot be done. He goes on to say that there would still be 26 country members. I wonder whether any member opposite has ever thought what the word "country" means. What is now the metropolitan area was country at one time, but I do not think anyone would claim that it is country today. At one time Gawler, Elizabeth, Tea Tree Gully, Modbury and the area to the south of Adelaide was all country. Is it country today?

Mr. Clark: Do you say that the town of Gawler is not a country town?

Mr. HEASLIP: I say it is not country.

Mr. Clark: I assure you it is, and the people of Gawler don't want it called anything else. Gawler would not exist if it were not for the rich country area around it.

Mr. Millhouse: What about Elizabeth?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am glad the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) came in on this. He said the town of Gawler would not exist if it were not for the country around it, and I could not agree more.

Mr. Clark: But you are trying to deny that it is country.

Mr. HEASLIP: What I have said applies to other places as well as Gawler.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You are saying it is not a country town.

Mr. HEASLIP: I did not say that: I said it was not country. The Premier, when he said there would be 26 country members, did not call Gawler a town: he referred to "country members". No-one can tell me today that the former country areas of Elizabeth, Gawler, Modbury, Tea Tree Gully, the area immediately south of Adelaide, and all the fringes around Adelaide are still country, because they are no more country than is King William Street. At one time King William Street was country, but it is not country today, nor are these satellites around the metropolitan area.

Mr. Ryan: When did it change? How much wheat do you grow on North Terrace?

Mr. HEASLIP: According to this Bill those places are country. I consulted the dictionary to find out just what "country" meant. If members examine the Oxford dictionary they will find that "country" means "rural districts as opposed to towns". Now, how can Gawler be country?

Mr. Clark: Under that definition there would be no country towns. Apparently no town is a town at all.

Mr. HEASLIP: It seems difficult to get over to members opposite that I am talking about "country" and not "country towns". I was discussing the definition of "country". Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) BILL.

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1 to 5 and 7 and 8 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, January 27, at 2 p.m.