

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Tuesday, February 1, 1966.

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

**PETITIONS: TRANSPORT CONTROL.**

Mr. CURREN presented a petition signed by 245 electors residing in the Chaffey, Light and Ridley 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.

Mr. McANANEY presented a petition signed by 232 electors residing in the Stirling and Alexandra 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.

Petitions received and read.

**QUESTIONS****POLICE CADETS.**

Mr. COUMBE: In this year's Estimates less funds were provided for the training of police cadets than were provided in the previous year. Figures just released show a marked increase in the number of crimes committed in this State, particularly those involving violence. In addition, the traffic duties of the Police Force have increased greatly in recent years. I point out that apparently more young men are now offering and are available for training, if they could be accepted. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to instruct the Police Commissioner to furnish a report indicating whether more police cadets could and should be accepted for training? What steps are being taken to increase the cadet strength to provide greater protection for members of the general public, especially young children, in future?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to take up the matter with my colleague. However, my information discloses that insufficient young men are offering as trainees. Nevertheless, the full position can be investigated and details made available in a later reply.

**AIRPORT DRAINAGE.**

Mr. BROOMHILL: It has been reported to me by residents of Plympton that stagnant pools of water and a drain which at present runs through the Adelaide Airport are breeding grounds for mosquitoes. There seems to be some doubt about whose responsibility it is to clean up these pools. Will the Minister of Works inquire whether the Engineering and

Water Supply Department has that responsibility, as has been claimed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member advised me last Thursday that he would be asking this question today, and I hoped that I could get him a reply today from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief. However, because of the public holiday yesterday, that has not been possible. I would think at first sight that this matter was the responsibility not of the department but of local government. However, I am not definite on that point. As promised, I will investigate the matter and get a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

**CITRUS INDUSTRY COMMITTEE.**

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand the Minister of Agriculture said last week that he would be able to announce this week the names of members of the Citrus Industry Organization Committee. Can he now announce those names?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am not able to announce the names of the members of that committee until next Thursday, because under the Act the Governor makes the appointments. Cabinet has considered the names, and these will be submitted to His Excellency on Thursday, when this matter will be considered. I will then inform the honourable member immediately.

**GRAPE PRICES.**

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Last week I asked the Premier a question regarding prices for grapes to be delivered from this vintage. I understand that at least one winery in the Barossa Valley opened this week to receive grapes, and grapegrowers are naturally concerned that they do not as yet know what prices are likely to be paid for deliveries. Can the Premier say whether the Prices Committee, to which he referred last week, has met, whether any prices have as yet been agreed on and, if they have, when they are likely to be made known?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although the committee has met, no agreement has yet been arrived at. A submission has been made by the winemakers, and in addition there has been certain correspondence which has proved most unsatisfactory. In collaboration with the Minister of Agriculture, I have been trying to arrange a further conference between the wine and brandy makers, the grapegrowers' representatives, and the chairman of the committee (Mr. Baker). I hope these people can meet the Minister next Thursday afternoon. There

seems to be a big divergence between the views of the wine and brandy makers' representatives and those of the growers' representatives. This is not unusual, but this feeling goes back a long time before I undertook the responsibilities of Premier and Treasurer of the State. Last year, because of a buyer resistance, it was necessary to finance an emergency co-operative to handle 3,500 tons. No law exists in this country that can make any organization purchase a commodity at any time if it does not desire to do so. At present, it seems that we are in a most unsatisfactory position. The previous Government placed the grape industry under the jurisdiction of the Prices Commissioner and I inherited this set-up. I know very little about growing grapes and less about drinking wine, and my colleague would know something about the growing but nothing about the drinking.

Mr. Quirke: It's about time you both started.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Honourable members may assume that I have no proprietary interest in any aspect of the industry, but, for the future well-being of the State, there is a great need for a compromise to be reached that will result in a fair and reasonable return to growers for the work they have put into this industry. We are fast approaching the time when, if we cannot get an agreement to give growers a reasonable return for their labour, there will be a great calamity in production and a huge increase in debt as a result of certain matters associated with this industry. I do not need to stress the total investment that has been made in plantings in this industry, and the many ex-servicemen who undertook responsibilities on holdings as a result of guarantees they received, but who have now been affected by the actions of the proprietary wineries of this State. We are doing our level best to reach agreement, and I hope that common sense will prevail and that the representatives of the organizations will meet the Minister of Agriculture next Thursday afternoon.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think honourable members are aware that under Commonwealth legislation the Fruit Industry Sugar Concession Committee gives canners certain concessions on sugar purchases provided that they pay the price fixed by the committee on an Australia-wide basis for the fruit they purchase. Grapes are now being grown in many States, and I have heard that this year one important South Australian buyer has

said that he will buy only a limited quantity of grapes, if any, from South Australian growers because he believes he can obtain them more cheaply from another State. This is a problem facing the Government and growers. On the other hand, the Commonwealth Government gives spirit makers important concessions on the duties paid on various spirits sold within Australia. I believe that, if the Commonwealth Government would recommend to the Commonwealth Agricultural Council that it consider this matter, it might be possible to place the industry on an Australia-wide basis in much the same way as the fruit canning industry has functioned very satisfactorily for many years. Will the Premier ask the Prime Minister to place this matter before the Commonwealth Agricultural Council when it next meets in an endeavour to bring about stability in the industry?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will certainly examine the possibility mentioned by the Leader. However, after discussions last year a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate the matter and, although I thought the report would have been ready last September, I have not yet received it. I assure the Leader that I intended to ask Cabinet its opinion whether the Commonwealth Government should inquire into the matter last year. However, the Royal Commission was appointed and I hoped that a reasonable solution could be arrived at by the growers and the proprietary wineries and that the problems would be ironed out. I do not know all that is involved in the matters raised by the Leader concerning the sugar concession. Whatever may happen concerning grape prices this year I believe that the matter must go before the Commonwealth Government for a decision because of the number of vines alleged to have been planted in the Murrumbidgee area of New South Wales. My information also discloses that prominent grape buyers of this State consider that they are able to purchase from the New South Wales and Queensland markets at 1s. a gallon less than they can purchase in South Australia. Therefore, it suits them to purchase from New South Wales. Many things are militating against the successful operation of the industry in this State. There seems to be an element of doubt about the truth of the statement regarding plantings. I should like these matters cleared up so that a reasonable proposition can be submitted regarding this year's vintage. However, despite whatever comes from this vintage I say deliberately that all angles

will have to be investigated to see whether we can restore sanity to this important industry.

#### QANTAS BASE.

Mr. McKEE: I understand that property officers from the Sydney office of Qantas Empire Airways Limited visited this State recently to locate a suitable site on which to establish a satellite base. Has the Premier a report on this visit?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I was unable to meet these representatives because of other State business, and as the officer in charge of the development of industry in this State has been away on annual leave, I have as yet no first-hand information on this matter. In fact, I believe that the officer concerned is to return to work this week. I understand that West Beach Airport would not be the only site considered, and I believe that the visitors were most impressed with the opportunities offering. However, I have not yet had a chance to discuss the matter with the officer concerned.

#### POLIOMYELITIS.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked earlier regarding poliomyelitis immunization in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A report from the Director-General of Public Health indicates that the fall-off in the demand for poliomyelitis vaccination is not only being experienced locally but is much more widespread. The present publicity programme consists of regular weekly advertisements in the *Advertiser* and some radio announcements over station 5AD. The Public Health Department proposes to embark on a campaign in which the mothers of all babies born will be sent a pamphlet in relation to immunization in general. The department is also planning to have signs relating to immunization in general placed in public transport. One of the points raised by the department in favour of publicity relating to immunization in general as opposed to immunization specifically against poliomyelitis is that such a campaign would distort the concept of immunization against all common preventable diseases, so that equally dangerous diseases would tend to be pushed into the background.

Furthermore, the absence of cases of poliomyelitis from the community (none for two years now in South Australia) does not provide the right climate for success in such a campaign. The other factor to be considered is

that, as 60 per cent of the population has now had three or more injections, the stage of diminishing returns must have been reached, and an expensive campaign may have little result, even if the timing is satisfactory. With the above in mind it would appear that a more effective way to obtain better immunization levels, would be a personal approach made to groups such as kindergartens, schools, places of employment, etc. In this way, it becomes easier for those to whom immunization is offered to accept than it is to refuse. The system already adopted here of visiting such institutions has proved most successful. Extension of this service to areas not already covered, for example, to migrant hostels, would probably be more effective for any given cost than would an intensive campaign directed towards the population as a whole.

#### GOVERNMENT REVENUE.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to my question of last week regarding the Budget?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The 1965-66 Budget estimated a deficit of £1,541,000 to be partly offset by £611,000 of previous surpluses carried forward. In the Budget speech of September last a proposal was foreshadowed to secure a balance over a period of three years. Since then the Government has been faced with increased water pumping costs arising from absence of normal spring rains, and a reduction of Railways Department and Harbors Board revenues brought about by the reduced grain harvest which arose from the same cause. Stamp duties on receipts will be lower than estimated by perhaps £30,000 this year because of amended legislation following a conference between the Houses, and the delay which has already occurred in passing the Succession Duties Act and the Road and Railway Transport Act amendments could reduce 1965-66 revenue about £200,000 below estimate. The main financial benefits from those amendments were anticipated for 1966-67 and subsequent years. The impact of these increased costs and reduced revenues must be met in the immediate future out of other funds in the hands of the Treasurer, as it is obvious there will be no current surplus of Loan funds available for the purpose. Subsequently the Government would propose to cover the deficiency out of increased revenue grants from the Commonwealth Government, revenue increases such as

succession dues and Road and Railway Transport Act amendments, and other appropriate measures which will be disclosed at the proper time.

#### NORTH UNLEY FLOODING.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently the Adelaide City Council has been installing large drainage pipes across the corner of South Terrace and Unley Road. I am sure all suburban members will be happy when a metropolitan drainage commission is appointed. As water from the park lands has caused flooding of the North Unley area, will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Local Government to inquire whether the work of the council will further increase the flow into this area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to refer the question to my colleague and obtain a report.

#### ONKAPARINGA VALLEY WATER SCHEME.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week regarding the augmentation of the Onkaparinga Valley water scheme by linking the Chandler Hill tank and the Heathfield tank?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has furnished me with the following report from the Engineer for Water Supply:

A contract has been let for the manufacture and delivery of the steel pipes for the main between Chandler Hill tank and Heathfield tank. The delivery of pipes is scheduled to commence in July of this year and it is proposed to commence main-laying shortly after delivery commences. The project includes, in addition to the steel main, two pumping stations, two tanks and ancillary works. The rate of progress on the construction of the whole project will be dependent upon the availability of Loan funds, but at this stage it is hoped to complete the main and the tanks by the end of the financial year 1966-67. However, the purchase and installation of the pumping plant may delay the completion of the scheme.

#### PENOLA COURTHOUSE.

Mr. RODDA: Last year I asked the Attorney-General a question concerning a new courthouse at Penola. As I understand that the site has recently been surveyed, can the Minister say whether provision will be made in the forthcoming Estimates for the erection of a courthouse at Penola?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am sorry that I cannot.

#### SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In yesterday's *Australian* appeared an article headed "Text-Books for Today", which was written by the *Australian* education correspondent, Henry Schoenheimer, and part of which states:

When an Australian State Government produces its own textbook, it can market them at anything from one-third to one-half of the price a similar book would cost in the book-stores. Again, there is the huge guaranteed market. The teacher adds unpaid book-selling to his long list of non-professional, time-consuming tasks, thereby saving distribution costs. And there are generally no royalties to be found, since the book was written by a committee (probably anonymous) in departmentally-paid time. On the face of it, departmental publication may seem a reasonable solution to the textbook problem.

Although I realize that he may not be able to answer my question offhand, will the Minister of Education ascertain whether his department has investigated the possibility of publishing its own textbooks?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Although some educational textbooks are published by the Government Printer, the Government Printer at present has his hands full and would probably be unable to extend his operations in this direction. Further, the question of copyright affects the Government Printer's ability to print certain books. I assure the honourable member that the whole question of the purchase and printing of books is now being examined, as the department intends to call tenders soon for books for primary schools, as a result of the very big scheme that will operate early in 1967. I will inquire further on one or two other aspects that have been raised and let the honourable member have further information.

#### UNIVERSITY FEES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the fees concession scheme for university students which was announced by the Minister of Education several weeks ago, and which, I am sure the Minister will agree, is merely a slight extension of the scheme initiated by the previous Government about three years ago. I say "slight" because the only increase seems to be a living allowance subject to a severe means test. I have here the leaflet prepared for the information of intending students, and I notice on the reverse page, under the heading "Form of Assistance", the following:

In general there will be no grant for students entering upon the medical and dental courses; the assistance given in these courses will be wholly by loan.

Then in the second paragraph under that heading the following is laid down:

Unless in special cases the fees concession committee decides otherwise, the assistance given by way of loan will be repayable within two calendar years of the date on which the student completed his course for the degree or diploma to which he proceeded, or on which he ceased to be a student of the University or the Institute in the course for which he was enrolled when the loan was made; and any amount of loan not repaid by the due date will thereafter carry interest compounded monthly at 5 per cent per annum until it has been fully repaid, including interest.

I point out to the Minister that a medical graduate must do at least one year at a hospital, and the present rate of salary at the Royal Adelaide (and I think it is comparable elsewhere) is only £1,352 per annum. The amount advanced to a medical student could well be £500 or more over the whole course, and it seems a heavy burden indeed to ask a medical graduate to repay the loan within two years, bearing in mind that his salary, certainly in the first year and possibly in the second year, is pretty low. Can the Minister say whether (certainly in the case of medical students, if not in the case of other students) he will reconsider the Government's decision to make the loans repayable within two years of graduation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have not seen the form referred to by the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: I will let you have it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be happy to look at the terms of repayment. The honourable member said that this was only a slight extension of the previous Government's scheme, but I remind him that the expenditure probably will be at least double what it was before.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you expect it to be?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: From memory, I think it will be about £35,000, compared with £17,000 previously. The committee will operate on basically the same lines and the same methods of procedure as it did under the previous Government. However, in view of the points raised I shall be pleased to look at the matter. I assure the honourable member that my concern will be to see that when these people are asked for repayment they will have every means of making it in a reasonable manner.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know the Minister quoted figures without reference to any documents, but I think that, on

inquiring, he will find that the amount provided by the previous Government was £30,000, whereas the university committee that was appointed to administer the fund spent only a very limited amount of the funds actually voted by Parliament for the purpose. When the Minister is looking at this matter, will he again examine completely the question of the loan provisions? Those provisions, as announced in the press (and I realize these could be subject to much correction), could have a detrimental effect on the whole set-up in this State. If a medical student was indebted substantially to the Government, that debt obviously could not be collected if the medical student went overseas, for instance. It might be that, because of the repayment features of the loan, highly competent officers whose services were required in South Australia would consider going to an appointment somewhere else. I do not say that people would do that, but I believe there would be an incentive to do it, and in consequence some people who would be necessary for the conduct of our health services might emigrate. Will the Minister, when he examines the other question, also examine the loan provisions to see whether it would not be better to revert to the system of an outright grant, even if the grant were administered perhaps a little more carefully, rather than have a loan provision that could lead to students from the university going overseas?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get a report on the points raised by the Leader and to further consider these matters. However, in discussing this matter with representatives of the committee responsible for this work under the previous Government, I was informed that special cases were always considered and that there was no hard-and-fast rule on these matters. Full cognizance would be taken of the circumstances referred to by the Leader, and the committee would decide accordingly. I shall have the whole matter examined to see whether there is any substance in what the Leader suggests, and shall bring down a report.

#### GRACE DAYS.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about payment for grace days to certain members of the Public Service during the holiday period?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government authorized in July, 1965, under powers in section 75a of the Public Service Act, the granting of three days' special leave to the

persons employed under the terms of that Act. The arrangement is that ordinarily this leave shall be taken in the so-called "grace days" between Christmas Day and New Year's Day when, as a matter of convenience, most public departments are closed. However, where a Public Service officer is required to work during those grace days for the convenience of the public or the department, the three days may be granted at some other convenient time.

Railway officers are not employed under the Public Service Act, and a considerable proportion of them are required for duty throughout the week and throughout holiday periods, as the transport industry requires something more than a five-day week service. The Railways Commissioner, as an act of grace, does where practicable release a proportion of officers who can be spared during the Christmas holiday period, and does this on a rotary basis to ensure the maximum participation. It is however not practicable, for both statutory and operating considerations, to extend the Public Service arrangements fully to railway officers. It is relevant to point out that railway officers in other connections have certain privileges of local and interstate travel not available to public servants. The matter will be kept under review and, when there may be an extension of annual leave entitlements for railway officers or public servants, it is hoped that the question of "grace days" will be regularized by inclusion of that special period in the awarded, agreed, or statutory provision which may be made for annual leave.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that an officer of the Public Service of South Australia has recently been appointed Chairman of the Local Government Act Revision Committee. Concern has been expressed by one municipal council that I represent in Parliament, that this appointment removes the element of independence essential to the success of this committee. Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Local Government on whose recommendation the appointment was made, the name of the officer, and whether he considers this appointment in the best interests of local government in this State?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get a report from my colleague.

#### SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a progress report on work on the drainage from

Beachport to Bool Lagoon and thence to Mosquito Creek, as concern has been expressed in the area because of floodings on land north of Bool Lagoon?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a progress report on the work being done in the Eastern Division of the South-Eastern Drainage Scheme.

#### MENTAL INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last week I asked the Premier a question about the Government's plan concerning the erection of the Strathmont and Elanora Hospitals and Training Centres, in view of the policy that he enunciated last March that something would be done immediately by a Labor Government, if elected. Has the Premier an answer to that question?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I did not know that the Labor Government was involved in the question originally. Approval has been given for the preparation of working drawings, etc., to enable tenders to be called for the new Strathmont Hospital and Training Centre at Hillcrest. Tender documents will also be prepared for Elanora Hospital, which is of similar design to Strathmont. The State Grants (Mental Health Institutions) Act of 1964 provides for Commonwealth support up to one-third of the expenditure on capital projects for mental health institutions in the three-year period July 1, 1964, to June 30, 1967. An approach is being made to the Commonwealth to extend the latter date. The Government will make every effort to push ahead with planning and actual construction as speedily as possible.

#### STATE HERBARIUM.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of January 26 about the staff position at the State Herbarium?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The staff establishment of the State Herbarium comprises the keeper, three botanists and five botanical assistants. In these positions, vacancies at present exist for two botanists, following appointment of one of these officers to the newly created position of Superintendent in the Botanic Garden, and the loss to Western Australia of the other botanist at a salary greatly in excess of the maximum permitted to be paid in South Australia. Steps have been taken to fill these vacancies, including advertising within Australia and by seeking the assistance of the Agent-General for South Australia and the Australian Scientific Liaison Committee in London. Two applications have already been received, but the result will not be known until applications close. Full co-operation is being received

from the Public Service Commissioner in the current campaign to fill these technical positions.

#### FISHING CRAFT.

Mr. McKEE: Last week I asked the Minister of Marine a question regarding the survey of small craft. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Last week I said that I forwarded the request of the deputation to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. He supported the views of the deputation, which were that the length of the vessels subject to survey should be reduced. This would increase the number of vessels and probably reduce the survey charge. I see one or two difficulties regarding this matter. When surveys are required for fishing vessels, they all seem to be required at about the same time and, therefore, whether they can be done more quickly and cheaply is a matter that must be investigated thoroughly. To this end I forwarded the docket to the General Manager of the Harbors Board for consideration and report, and as soon as that is to hand I will take the matter to Cabinet for Government decision.

#### TABLE OF PRECEDENCE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the present South Australian Table of Precedence?
2. When was it last amended?
3. Is it proposed to revise it? If so, when?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. The Table of Precedence is set out in Parliamentary Paper No. 51 of 1900.
2. On January 8, 1963, and November 23, 1965, the precedence of Cabinet Ministers was established by the Governments of the day.
3. This matter will receive consideration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. G. G. PEARSON.

Mr. HALL moved:

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) on account of absence overseas.

Motion carried.

#### SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER: I refer to the question raised on Thursday last by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the tabling of evidence

given before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. As far as I can ascertain, the practice in the past has been that the committee has tabled evidence submitted to it when the evidence referred to a regulation or a by-law which the committee recommended should be disallowed, but it has not generally tabled evidence taken in respect of a regulation or by-law concerning which the committee has recommended that no action should be taken. The present committee's actions in this regard have been in conformity with past practice, and do not lend support to the Leader's suggestion "that a new rule is to be made so that the evidence will be available for the perusal of honourable members only if the committee decides that the evidence shall be available".

Indeed, an innovation this session has been that the committee has reported to the House its recommendations on all regulations or by-laws placed before it, whether or not it recommended they should be disallowed. The Subordinate Legislation Committee derives its powers from the Parliament, and is designed to scrutinize subordinate legislation on behalf of the Parliament. In pursuance of Joint Standing Order No. 31, the procedure of the committee is generally regulated by the Standing Orders of the Legislative Council relating to Select Committees. Legislative Council Standing Order No. 395 provides, *inter alia*, that questions put to witnesses and replies thereto, together with the name of the questioner prefixed, shall be duly noted by the reporter unless the committee otherwise directs, and shall form the minutes of evidence of the committee.

As the committee acts on behalf of the Parliament in relation to the scrutiny of subordinate legislation, it follows that the committee acts on behalf of the Parliament also in taking relevant evidence, and that such evidence cannot be the exclusive property of the committee or its members. Although there is no governing Standing Order, I am of the opinion that it would be in the interests of all members and in accordance with best Parliamentary principles if all evidence recorded by the Subordinate Legislation Committee were tabled at the time the relevant reports were brought up in each House.

#### 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 26. Page 3568.)

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): When previously endeavouring to explain to members opposite the meaning of "country", I said that the *Oxford Dictionary* meaning of the word was "rural districts as opposed to town", and that "country man" meant a person living in rural parts. The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) was trying to say that Gawler was a country town, but I point out that it is merely a town in the country which, like some other towns situated in the country, does not come within the meaning I have quoted.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Apparently every rural district should exclude any towns in it.

Mr. HEASLIP: People living in small rural towns are usually actively engaged in rural affairs, unlike their counterparts living in industrial cities. Therefore, I suggest that cities such as Port Pirie, Gawler, Elizabeth, Whyalla, and Port Augusta, although situated in the country, cannot legitimately be called rural towns. The Bill's interpretation of "country" is different from the strict meaning of the word. New section 80 states that the Electoral Commission—

(a) shall have regard to the following criteria:

- (i) each electoral district shall be of convenient shape and have reasonable means of access between the main centres of population therein;
- (ii) not less than 26 electoral districts shall be wholly within the country area.

The Bill's definition of "country area"—

Mr. Lawn: Is your definition!

Mr. HEASLIP: No, it is the Government's definition.

Mr. Lawn: It is the same as the previous Government's definition.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Bill's definition is contrary to that contained in the *Oxford Dictionary*. When we try to express ourselves in the English language we usually try to follow the dictionary definitions, but the Bill apparently does not.

Mr. Lawn: Do you live in the country, according to the *Oxford Dictionary*?

Mr. HEASLIP: I definitely do.

Mr. Lawn: Down at Glenelg?

Mr. HEASLIP: I live in a purely rural area.

Mr. Ryan: You'd better not tell the people at Crystal Brook that they don't live in the country.

Mr. Lawn: What's your Leader's definition of "fair"? He says it means "blond".

Mr. HEASLIP: At first glance, country members will total 26, but that is absolutely misleading. According to the Bill, a country area means an area outside the areas comprising the House of Assembly electoral districts of Adelaide, Torrens, etc.—the existing metropolitan area, but nobody can tell me that the existing definition of the metropolitan area is correct, for it goes much farther than that. Many country members will be representing districts in the metropolitan area and in industrial towns.

Mr. McKee: Would you agree that some changes in the boundaries should be made?

Mr. HEASLIP: Only recently the previous Playford Government endeavoured to change the boundaries, so that equal representation would exist between metropolitan and rural dwellers.

Mr. Clark: On your terms!

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not in favour of giving major control to people living in the metropolitan area. That is what this Bill means. Of the 563,000 voters in this State, 345,000 live in the small area that constitutes the metropolitan area (excluding Elizabeth, Gawler, Modbury, Tea Tree Gully and some places south of Adelaide) and 218,000 live outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. McKee: How many votes do you think a primary producer should have?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am not arguing that now: I am merely trying to point out what this Bill will mean to rural people. If there is to be one vote one value and there are to be 26 country members, each with a quota of 10,000, there would have to be 260,000 country voters. However, there are only 218,000, so it can be seen that one vote one value is impossible to obtain. This is a promise that the Government has broken, and it is only one of many. The Gawler District has 27,000 voters, Whyalla has 11,000, Mount Gambier has 9,500, Port Pirie has 6,500, Port Augusta has 8,000, Barossa has 12,000, and Alexandra has 10,000. The Barossa District was once a country district, but it is not now. In the last three years there has been an increase of 4,000 voters there, and they are all really metropolitan voters. There has been an increase of 2,000 voters in Alexandra in the last three years. The total of the districts I



have mentioned is 84,000. If this is deducted from the 218,000 so-called country voters it means that only 134,000 is left for 26 country districts. This will not be one vote one value any more than the present position is. Unlike the member for Mitcham, I have never believed in one vote one value: it is impractical, and impossible to obtain. If the Government were honest it would say the same thing: it would not have promised that if elected it would introduce one vote one value, as this Bill is nothing like it.

Mr. Freebairn: Have you ever studied the way in which the Labor Party endorses its own candidates?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not want to go into that. If this Bill were carried there would be only 10 rural seats. Even if one were liberal and provided a rural quota of 16,000 there would be only 15 members from rural areas, not 26, so I say the public has been misinformed about getting 26 country members. This is not possible with these figures. Early in my speech the member for Port Adelaide asked how country people would be disfranchised. If they are not given representation, are they not disfranchised? If anybody is not able to get representation in Parliament he is disfranchised, and if this Bill is passed in its present form all the rural people in this State will be disfranchised. Only the industrial and metropolitan areas will have adequate representation, as there will be only 15 really rural members. The rest will come from cities which, although in the country, are not country areas. The problems of the people in those cities are different from those of rural people, and it cannot be hoped that representatives from these towns will represent the people in country areas. As a result, they will not have proper representation and will therefore be disfranchised. What kind of democracy is that?

Mr. McKee: What is your idea of democracy?

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand the meaning of the word, but disfranchising rural people is not democracy, yet the Government, which boasts about being so democratic, wants to disfranchise them. The Bill deals also with the Legislative Council, and there is only one meaning to these provisions—the abolition of that Chamber. I think it was the member for Barossa who asked how many people in this State had heard or knew of the Legislative Council. No matter how many knew of it six months ago, probably three times as many know about it now, because they have had it there to save them. I believe the Legislative

Council will save them. I oppose the abolition of the Legislative Council. I also oppose the methods of voting for it laid down in the Bill. The Bill contains nothing that I would want to amend. I oppose everything in it. It would be no good trying to improve it because it cannot be improved—it is too bad. I said at the beginning of my speech that I would not speak for long. I oppose the Bill and I believe that 95 per cent of those I represent would oppose it. Other rural members could say the same about the people they represent. I hope that the interpretation of the word "country" is now clear. According to the dictionary it means one thing and in this Bill it means another. I represent rural people and, as their representative, I will oppose this Bill as long as I am their representative.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I oppose the Bill. Looking back, I find that the Bill was introduced into the House as long ago as July 1. At that time the Premier made a speech, the Leader spoke on the Bill, and I believe a couple of Socialist members made speeches on it, too. However, for some reason the Bill has remained dormant for seven long months. Many rumours have been circulating through the lobbies that Labor members themselves, especially country members, are not happy about the legislation. I think—

Mr. Langley: You only think; you are not sure.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I know that the member for Unley was quick to speak up and that the member for Frome is smiling quietly. I do not know about the member for West Torrens—he seems relaxed. However, I believe that two members of the Labor Party will be most distressed that the Trades Hall branch of the Party has forced this Bill onto the Notice Paper at this time. It seems that some of the Socialists opposite are doing their best to delay the passage of the Bill. I think that the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) might not be happy with this legislation.

Mr. Hall: Would his be one of the two privileged seats?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I think it might not be. The legislation is designed to give lower population density to two members, and it is especially designed to protect the member for Frome. The Bill has become known as the Casey Preservation Act—or the Casey Protection Act. In any case, I think the member for Chaffey is gone because there is so much disfavour in his district over the Road and Railway Transport Control Bill.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He introduced a petition today.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: He did not have his heart in it. I hear that he is in such low standing at present that he might even lose his endorsement. Undoubtedly Labor supporters in Chaffey would rather back a new horse than one that is almost beaten before it starts. The basis of the Bill, apart from the Casey protection clause, is to make three major alterations to the Constitution Act. The first and most important change is to alter the electoral boundaries and the number of members of the House of Assembly. The second change is to the franchise for the Legislative Council, and the third major provision in the Bill is to alter the arrangement for deadlocks.

I now wish to speak about one vote one value. Let us get down to grass root levels, and I know the member for Gawler is keen to get down to grass root levels and talk about one vote one value in the Australian Labor Party. Perhaps I could leave this to the member for Gawler.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Have you ever seen the Labor Party's rules?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It costs 5s. to buy a copy.

Mr. Coumbe: It is worth it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is good entertainment value. When the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) spoke she invited me to spend 5s. on a copy. It was a foolish investment but it is worth 5s. just for the fun. The most entertaining part was on the last page, which is headed "How To Organize An A.L.P. Sub-Branch". It is just like Mrs. Beeton's *Cookery Book* and her recipe "How to prepare jugged hare", which states "First catch your hare."

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know what this has to do with the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am replying to an interjection. Under the heading "How To Organize An A.L.P. Sub-Branch", the Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the A.L.P. state:

Talk the matter over with those most likely to co-operate.

There are some interesting things in this publication.

Mr. Ryan: What has that got to do with the Bill?

Mr. Casey: Get on to one vote one value.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: This comes back to one vote one value. This booklet states on the front cover that unity of Labor is the hope of the world. Further on in the book members are

required to produce credentials, pence cards, or membership tickets of the trade union or sub-branch to which they belong. In other words, this business of unity does not mean a thing. They cannot trust their own members to be *bona fide* when they turn up at meetings.

Mr. Clark: Actually we are making sure you don't turn up.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Members opposite are causing me to make a longer speech than I intended. The fundamental tenet of the Liberal and Country League is one vote one value. We have only to turn to the constitution of the L.C.L. to find in clause 76 that every financial member of the L.C.L. has the right to a vote for pre-selection of Parliamentary candidates. If that is not one vote one value I do not know what it could possibly be.

Mr. Casey: Did that happen in Yorke Peninsula?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Members opposite are becoming noisy.

Mr. Casey: Yorke Peninsula was a glaring example of the opposite.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If the member for Frome contains himself he will find that the matter he raises is taken care of in clause 76, under which candidates for each House of Assembly district are selected by a ballot, and under which all members within the district, except in certain circumstances, have a vote. For ordinary Parliamentary elections, for the endorsement of a Parliamentary candidate every member who pays his fee and is a financial member of the L.C.L. has the right to vote. That, Mr. Speaker, is one vote one value. It is only in the case of a by-election, where there is not time to organize a plebiscite, that the district committee may choose a candidate. How different is the position in the Australian Labor Party, where about 20 men choose all the candidates for all the Assembly districts, the Legislative Council districts, the House of Representatives districts, and the Senate team for the whole of the State. On the second page of its constitution it lists all these men, and every one of them is a resident of metropolitan Adelaide.

Mr. Hall: These are the faceless men.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: There are a few others, apart from the faceless men. Apart from a few sitting members of Parliament, the rest, I understand, are all trade union officials, and those officials have a dominant say in choosing all the Parliamentary candidates for every seat in South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: Where do they live?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: They live in the metropolitan area. What a caricature of democracy that is: that the members of the A.L.P., for example, in Chaffey or in Frome, do not get any say in the choice of a candidate.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That is not quite correct.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have the constitution here. If the members of the A.L.P. in Frome had had a chance to choose a candidate for Frome, would they have chosen a member of the Liberal and Country Party as their endorsed candidate?

Mr. Hall: I am sure they wouldn't.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Of course not, yet this city-based committee chose the present member for Frome, although he, I understand, had been a financial member of the L.C.L. for 12 years.

Mr. Coumbe: But he has not paid since.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: He may change Parties soon.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member had better get back to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was talking about one vote one value. I should like to read what the A.L.P. platform has to say about the House of Assembly districts and other matters in its constitution. On page 75 of its constitution it talks about the "State fighting platform". I do not know why that Party has to be belligerent, but that is how the organization is described. It makes an interesting observation on electoral reform in South Australia. Under the heading "Constitution and Electoral", we see that it advocates the abolition of the State Parliament, and, failing that, three-year Parliaments and simultaneous retirement of members. It goes on to say:

Abolition of the Legislative Council and, failing that, adult suffrage for the Legislative Council; failing that, dual voting for husband and wife as a step to securing abolition.

Under section B we see the most startling revelation of all—the reduction of the number of members of the House of Assembly. How can this constitution be reconciled with a measure which seeks to increase the number of members from 39 to 56? That is in the book which I got from the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. Clark: You wouldn't pay a dollar.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, I did. I am quoting from the official copy in the Parliamentary Library.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They alter fairly frequently.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Then there should be a new copy in the Parliamentary Library. Under the Libraries and Institutes Act, the Labor Party is obliged by law to supply the Parliamentary Library with a copy of its constitution, and if it has broken the law it is culpable. I would think the Government, if it did the right thing, would be inclined to take action against the Secretary of the A.L.P. for either his ignorance or his lack of responsibility in carrying out his duties. Perhaps the poor man is so over-worked preparing Bills and other things that he just has not had the time to get around to it. Far from decreasing the number of members of the House of Assembly, as provided by the constitution, we find that this Bill provides for the increase of members to the order of 43 per cent. Why it should be, Mr. Speaker, that we need more metropolitan A.L.P. members I do not know.

The Bill modifies the Act as it applies to the Legislative Council. I would say that this bicameral system, which my colleague the member for Mitcham commented on earlier, is one of our great British heritages. Very few Parliaments in the world are unicameral: they are almost all bicameral. Although I remember that the member for Mitcham said it was rather hard to have to find theoretical reasons for a second Chamber, it was equally difficult to find theoretical reasons to justify its abolition, and he set out examples of the way it has worked for the benefit of the South Australian people. I draw the attention of the House to the very high reputation the Upper Chamber in the American National Legislature enjoys. I rather think that perhaps no other parliamentary body in the world would have as much prestige as has the United States Senate, and I think it is a great pity that our Australian Senate does not enjoy that reputation. I think that is mainly due to the fact that the A.L.P. has an unhappy habit of endorsing trade union hacks as its Senate candidates and not looking around for outstanding young men, as do the American Parties.

Mr. Casey: That is rather a dirty slur on character, isn't it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I made a remark about the member for Frome earlier, and there was no reflection on his character in any way. I am not reflecting on the characters of Australian Senators at all: I merely say that it is to be deplored that the Labor Party does not look around for younger and more able men.

Mr. Langley: How did they go in the elections?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Very poorly. I am sure that many members opposite are keen to contribute to this debate, as are many L.C.L. members. The member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) referred to the relatively shorter time that the Legislative Council sits compared with the sitting time of this Chamber. In last week's Notice Paper the obstructive elements in the other place were two Government members—one a Minister and the other a private member, who were responsible for adjournments.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must not refer to debates in another place.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am sorry, Sir, but I realize I made a mistake. If this Bill is not defeated here certain members opposite realize that their time in this Parliament is fast running out. I shall not go through the list of members again, but it is obvious from a cursory glance who these members will be. I have reservations about compulsory voting: it may or may not be a good thing. Australia and perhaps New Zealand are the only two countries in the English speaking world that have adopted compulsory voting. Some members opposite are keen on regimentation, so compulsory voting appeals to them. The provision in this Bill dealing with resolution of deadlocks is a curious one. The original Constitution Act sets out in detail the method to be followed in the event of a deadlock between the two Houses. Although a Government member went into great detail about the procedure, I shall quickly repeat it. If this Bill passes in the House of Assembly and is rejected by another place, the House of Assembly can go to the people; when returned, if the Bill again passes the Assembly but fails to pass the other place, the Governor may either declare a double dissolution or issue writs for the appointment of two extra Legislative Councillors.

These deadlock provisions have never been tried out since our Constitution was established, and, rather than tamper with the Constitution we now have, I suggest that it would be better for the Government to try out the deadlock provisions that already exist and not attempt to introduce a different system that may not work. Reference was made to Great Britain, where there is a House of Commons and a House of Lords, and the member for Mitcham spoke about the structure of the House of Lords. As it has a bearing on this debate, and as it has been suggested by Government members as some sort of precedent for altering our Constitution, perhaps it is worth while

to compare the structure of the House of Lords with the Parliamentary set-up we know in Australia. The House of Lords is an appointed House rather than an elected House, as we know it. As well as peers who are appointed, there are many hereditary and honorary peers who do not normally take their seats. There are four peers of Royal blood; 20 seats for the archbishop and bishops of the established church; 810 hereditary peers of the realm; 14 law peers; 16 representative peers from Scotland (and, as a descendant of Scottish migrants, I realize the great contribution that these peers make); and, of special interest to the member for Frome, there are 17 representative peers from Ireland.

Mr. Casey: North or South?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It is all Ireland to me.

Mr. Casey: It isn't to me.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: According to my calculations, there are 873 peers from Ireland, Scotland, England, and Wales. The Life Peerage Act of 1958, introduced after a Socialist Administration had been in power, did not abolish the Upper House (as the Socialists in this Chamber may try to suggest the British wanted to abolish the Upper House): it sought to make the House of Lords function better than it did before. Under this Act in 1958, some 60 life peers were appointed, and it is these 60 peers who are responsible for the legislative programme of the House of Lords. There does not seem to be much doubt that these nominated peers are raising the status of the House of Lords. In 1688 there were only 150 members of the House of Lords, but George III created about 150 and the number increased to over 300. In 1830 there were 480 peers, so that when the colony of South Australia was proclaimed a few years later, the House of Lords was a large, well established Chamber with 480 peers. The number has doubled in the past century. Several changes have taken place in the powers of the House of Lords in the 20th century.

In 1911 the delaying power was limited to two years, but in 1948, when the Socialists were in power, the delaying power of the House of Lords was limited to one year. It should be stressed, so that members opposite will be aware of it, that the Socialist Party in Great Britain did not seek to abolish the House of Lords: it sought to make it more representative and to work better than it had before. Prior to 1958 there had been only male life peers in the House of Lords. The Act was altered so that women could take their seats in the House of Lords. Lord Home, a member of

the House of Lords at that time, is recorded as saying that taking women into a Parliamentary embrace would seem to be a modest extension of the normal function of a peer. There is no doubt that prominent Socialist members of the House of Commons who have been promoted to the House of Lords—

The Hon. Frank Walsh: What's this got to do with the Bill?

Mr. FREEBAIN: This is educational material for the Premier, because it will help him to understand the real role of the Upper Chamber. There is no doubt that some of the Socialists who have been appointed from the House of Commons to the House of Lords have greatly added to the prestige of the latter Chamber. I am thinking particularly of Mr. Dalton, Mr. Attlee and Mr. Morrison, who, in Socialist circles, are mighty names. I hope the Premier, when he tries to discount the role of the Upper House, will appreciate the contribution that those great Labor men have made to the House of Lords. On the principle of one vote one value, I should like to read some of the remarks in the House of Commons *Hansard*, dated October 10, 1944, made by Mr. Morrison who, at that time, I understand, was Minister for Home Affairs in the coalition Government. Of course, the House of Commons is the Mother of Parliaments, and the Parliament from which all Parliaments in the English-speaking world have taken their model. In speaking to the House of Commons (Redistribution of Seats) Bill, Mr. Morrison said:

Your Commission, Sir, recommended that the Commissioners shall not be required to modify an existing constituency if its electorate falls short of or exceeds a quota of not more than approximately 25 per cent. That recommendation took a slightly different form when it occurred in the Third Schedule of the House of Commons (Redistribution of Seats) Act, 1944 . . . If we take 100 as the average size of a constituency, no constituency shall be less than 75 or more than 125 in electoral strength.

I quote these figures so that the House will appreciate the wide variation that occurs in House of Commons districts. If members opposite are game to extol the virtues of the British Parliamentary system, they may realize that the House of Commons gives due regard to population densities in the United Kingdom, when the Commissioners draw up electoral boundaries. Although I have not checked, I believe that the smallest constituency in Great Britain is in the centre of London, and is a seat occupied by a Conservative. The biggest constituency is in Northern Ireland, and is occupied by a Socialist member. Per-

haps the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) will substantiate that fact when he speaks to the Bill. Mr. Morrison continued:

In any scheme of distribution, the object to be aimed at is not exact mathematical equality but a reasonable approximation to equality. Substantial margins of toleration are necessary. If we run the doctrine of equal electorates too far, we shall find ourselves divorced from reality and from the particular circumstances of, for example, sparsely populated areas. All we can aim at is an approximate equality, and in doing so we must allow for substantial margins of toleration and recognize that to be so.

Turning to the Australian scene, it is worth quoting the remarks made by the Right Hon. John McEwen, Deputy Prime Minister of Australia, in the House of Representatives on December 4, 1962, when he said:

Let me turn back to the Electoral Act itself. The position today, under the Constitution, is that there is, on the average, one Senator from New South Wales to represent 391,000 people. By contrast each Senator from Tasmania represents 35,000 people. There is no one vote one value in that situation, but to my knowledge not one voice has been raised during the 28 years or more that I have been in this Parliament in criticism of that situation. If we consider average quotas for electorates that send members to the House of Representatives, we find that the average for Australian mainland electorates is 47,839, whilst the average for Tasmania is 37,361 . . . There is no one vote one value in that situation, and, as I have said, Australia has never contemplated a one vote one value system . . . In Western Australia the State law says, in the most simple terms, that when defining the electorates two people in the metropolitan area shall be counted as one, whilst every person outside that area shall be counted as one. There is no one vote one value in that proposition. Then the State law in Western Australia goes further and mentions three electorates in the far north-west for which there shall be three members, no matter what the number of electors is in each of those electorates.

Incidentally, it turns out that those three electorates are represented by Labor members. There has been no proposal, however, to alter that situation, which does not exactly involve a one vote one value proposition. That has been the law under Labor Governments of Western Australia and under non-Labor Governments . . . In New South Wales, where a Labor Government has been in office for so long, 48 members of the Legislative Assembly represent 58 per cent of the population, resident in the Sydney area, whilst 46 members, almost the same number, represent 42 per cent of the population living outside the Sydney area. In Queensland there are 28 seats in the metropolitan area and 50 seats outside it. There is nothing in the Australian scene, Commonwealth or State, in the House of Representatives or the Senate, in Constitutional law, that has ever contemplated one vote one value.

Then there is a reference to America.

Mr. Casey: What has America got to do with it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If the honourable member will contain himself I will read these profound remarks by the Deputy Prime Minister of a Government that has been in power for 17 years unassailed by the Labor Party. Mr. McEwen said:

What is the situation in the United States of America? In the State of New York one Senator represents 7,415,000 electors, whilst in the State of Nevada one Senator represents 80,000 electors.

This is good information for the member for Frome, who is getting himself organized to make a lengthy speech on the Bill.

Mr. Casey: I suggest you get the facts completely right.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not saying that the remarks of the Deputy Prime Minister are right or wrong, but he was followed in this debate by none other than the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Whitlam), and if this statement were incorrect I am sure that the bright boy of the Labor Party would have corrected the speech made by the Right Hon. John McEwen.

Mr. Casey: Did he?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, he spoke on a different tack because the Commonwealth Labor Party is interested in preserving the number of members it has in the Commonwealth Parliament; it is so preoccupied in protecting the members it has that it does not worry much about constitutional reform. It is important for members opposite to study what Mr. McEwen said. He went on to say:

Those Senators have equal voices in the Senate of the United States of America. In Congress, the House of Representatives, in Washington, I have looked at the figure for only one State, and I know that other States could show wider differences. However, I find that in the State of Michigan there is a Congressman who represents 525,334 electors, whilst in the same State there is another Congressman representing 178,251 electors. Nowhere in the English-speaking world is the policy of equal representation followed. In the United Kingdom the law explicitly provides that in urban areas three times as many electors shall be required to send one man to the House of Commons as in the remote areas of Scotland and the Western Isles.

I hope the one vote one value members across the way take note of what Mr. McEwen had to say. I turn now to one or two remarks made by the member for Barossa. It is interesting to note that although this Bill was listed well down a Notice Paper of some 24 items and although the Opposition did not

know that it would be placed at the top of the Notice Paper until the House met on Tuesday last, it was evident that the member for Barossa had been pre-advised of this because she had a lengthy, prepared speech ready.

Mrs. Byrne: I prepared that speech five months ago.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The honourable member would not answer my interjections so I will not reply to her. In her speech, she said:

Our Government is interested in the people—that is interesting when one remembers the small number of Australian Labor Party members who choose the endorsed candidates—the whole of the people—and intends to see that every section of the population is prosperous, knowing full well that any depressed part of the population drags down the standards of the rest. For that reason alone, the principle we must follow is one of giving everyone an equal say in who governs. That is what this Bill seeks to do, namely, by having the House of Assembly of 56 members, based on one vote one value, with no decrease in country representation.

After about 10 minutes of my trying to interject the member for Barossa deigned to listen to one of my interjections. I said:

Is that in accordance with your Party's platform?

The honourable member replied, not by saying "Yes" or "No" but by dismissing me as follows:

The honourable member can go to the Party's office and obtain a copy of our platform for 5s.—the same as anybody else.

I was forced to go to the Labor Party's office to get a copy. I wasted 5s., which was against my Scottish tradition. It is apparent the Prices Commissioner has not woken up to the fact that the Labor Party is charging 5s. for a book on its constitution, which book could be produced for about 6d. I had to buy a copy because the Secretary of the Labor Party did not have the courtesy to keep the Parliamentary Library furnished with a current copy.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you suggesting that this booklet is not freely available?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I certainly am; the price is high and the supply is limited. Just before each election this constitution is right out of print. I was able to get a copy and I shall be pleased to lend it to any of my colleagues who wish to study it.

Mrs. Byrne: It might interest the honourable member to know that we sell these books at a loss.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: This is a tiny booklet and could cost no more than 6d. to produce.

Its circulation is so small that, if the Party cannot make a profit on 5s., I suggest it is time that the Secretary or financing organizer of the Party paid more attention to this important fact. This contrasts with the generous, open-handed attitude adopted by the Liberal and Country League, which is only too happy to give its constitution, free of charge, to anybody who calls at the front office.

Mr. Clark: They should pay you to take it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Although members opposite sometimes offer to provide copies of the Labor Party constitution to us, they have never done so.

Mr. Clark: That is not true. I gave a copy to the member for Alexandra.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Although I have been here for over three years, no member opposite has had the courtesy to give me a copy.

Mr. Nankivell: They always promise to do so.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If they promise to do so then let them give each member on this side a copy.

Mrs. Byrne: Provided that you give us a copy of your constitution.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Barossa also spoke about the ugly picture of democracy as seen in this State. I do not believe that is a good expression of democracy in South Australia. I interjected:

What happened to the Labor Party candidate in Light?

The honourable member did not reply. She said:

I am coming to that.

However, she went on with her speech and made no reference about why the Labor Party did not put up a candidate against me in Light. I had to find out myself by reading the constitution. I found that district committees were responsible for financing their own Parliamentary candidates, and it would seem that the Party district committee in my district was so poor that it could not put up a deposit. The honourable member for Barossa went on to say:

There were 562,824 eligible to vote on March 6 last year in 39 House of Assembly districts, and of the votes cast the A.L.P. received 53.5 per cent.

I have not checked on that figure, but I do not doubt that the honourable member has included the various Labor Parties and not just the A.L.P. Although an honourable member opposite may smile, Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to be funny.

Mr. Clark: You are doing it without trying.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: This is the sort of thing that goes on inside the A.L.P., and if that Party does not care to put its own house in order, it is the job of this Opposition in this Parliament to show it how to do so. The honourable member for Barossa lumped all the votes for all the Labor Parties in South Australia together. The A.L.P. vote was lumped with the Democratic Labor Party vote and the other Party (which I will not mention by name) which recommends its supporters to give second preferences to the A.L.P. candidates.

Mr. Coumbe: It is a nasty word.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, and I did not want to embarrass members opposite by using it. It was most evident from the newspaper report of the Vietnam protest meeting that took place in Adelaide last Sunday week that there is very much dissension among the two major Labor Parties on foreign policy.

Mr. Jennings: Is this relevant?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: According to the newspaper report, the A.L.P. Senator and the A.L.P. member of the House of Representatives present at that meeting got into hots with the D.L.P. representatives there. The point I make is that the member for Barossa has no right to lump in D.L.P. votes with A.L.P. votes and say that they were votes cast for her Party. Although I cannot put my finger on the exact reference, the member for Barossa said something about there being no doubt that the A.L.P. vote at the next election would greatly exceed the vote cast for her Party at the election last March. I point out that her thinking is at variance with the situation as it obtains elsewhere in the Commonwealth, and there is no reason for the honourable member to think that just because her Party is in power in South Australia it is indicative of the situation elsewhere. I should like to quote from an article by James Jupp, a political writer in Canberra who is not noted for his right wing leanings. This person is a responsible Socialist political writer, and in his article in the *Canberra Times*, dated January 21 of this year, he said:

Today Australia is more politically conservative than ever before. Only one person in nine now lives under Labor State Government compared with nine out of 10 in the middle 1940's. Members opposite should think about that, because it is important, especially to the honourable member for Barossa. The writer went on to say:

The recovery of the Australian right in the past 20 years has been steady and unspectacular, but it places the Liberal Party in a firmer position than either of its predecessors. In

the past 10 years, politics in the old sense of polemics, ranting, fighting, has been confined to the various claimants to the inheritance of Australian Labor. The electors have watched the Labor movement tearing itself apart on issues laid down largely by Menzies.

This is a Socialist writer, James Jupp, commenting on the relative strengths of Liberalism and Socialism in Australia. It ill behoves the member for Barossa to forecast that at the next election her Party will receive an even greater share of votes than it received last time, because all the portents are that the reverse will be so.

Mr. Langley: In South Australia?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Barossa would do very well if she did her best to help some of her floundering colleagues. I am very pleased to oppose this Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I am not fortified with the copy of the book to which everybody has been referring. In rising to speak to this Bill, I am not unmindful that there has been some excellent analytical speeches, such as the one we have just heard. Honourable members opposite may laugh, but there was more than the essence of truth in what the honourable member for Light had to say. Last week we were treated to two very worthy analyses of this Bill by my colleagues the members for Torrens and Mitcham. As the former Minister of Lands (Mr. Quirke) said, those members enlarged on the perfidy embodied in this measure. This afternoon we heard from my old friend the honourable member for Rocky River who, on a sticky wicket, set a glorious example to my young friend from Light.

As the 39th member in this House, I find it somewhat difficult to emulate these other members who have spoken. The member for Glenelg has claimed that our speeches on measures such as this are endlessly repetitive and time wasting. Surely, the Government would not expect us, as a responsible Opposition, to accept such a Bill as this with only the experienced members on this side of the House saying something about it. There is a real need for novices like me to put their oar in, to use a colloquialism. I was interested to hear the member for Frome suggest that my colleague may be under a misapprehension. No doubt the member for Frome will tell us why he is here and how he is going to stay here. I give full marks to the Premier who, when answering a question by the Opposition Whip last week about the sittings of the House, said that he was not responsible for the time taken by members speaking and that he hoped they would use their discretion.

That is what they are doing, nothing more or less. The Premier was fair enough to say that if members had something to say he would listen to it. This Bill does three things: First, it increases the number of members of the House of Assembly from 39 to 56 and sets up a commission to define new districts that will eventually be set up by the Bill. Secondly, a major amendment is made to the deadlock provisions between both Houses, and the Premier said that these amendments would be on similar lines to a Bill introduced by the A.L.P. three or four years ago. Thirdly, the Bill provides that all enrolled electors for the House of Assembly shall be qualified electors for the Legislative Council.

The Bill also provides for 30 city and 26 country seats, and as the Premier said, it will provide as nearly as practicable, with two exceptions, for one vote one value, with an electoral quota of 10,000 electors a district and with a tolerance of 15 per cent up or down. At first glance everything in the garden seems to be lovely, but one should examine the matter of country representation and consider new section 80, which states that the Electoral Commission—

(a) Shall have regard to the following criteria:—

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

However, a substantial part of the metropolitan area is excluded in this Bill in the built-up parts of the Districts of Alexandra, Gouger, Gawler and Barossa, and, as my Leader so amply demonstrated, we find country seats being bolstered by a large proportion of city dwellers so that community of interest is going overboard. No doubt the results at the ballot box in these areas have inspired the authors of the Bill to graft this excrescence onto the country seats. These facts are sufficient reason for the Leader's amendment to have the Bill withdrawn and redrafted and to give a realistic definition to the Adelaide metropolitan area.



The towns of Whyalla and Port Pirie and the city of Mount Gambier must almost qualify as city seats, and hardly qualify in the general term of country nomenclature. They are not of rural interests, although, to a degree, they have the isolation of the country.

It is important that rural representation in this House be maintained, and despite what Government members may say, and however verbose or convincing they may try to be, they will never delude any thinking person into believing that this Bill will do anything more than place rural representation in this House in a minority for time immemorial. That is the design of the Bill, and that is why we will oppose it to the last ditch.

The Premier, in his second reading explanation, referred specifically to new section 79 (4), under which the commission shall have regard to the sparsity and remoteness of population and difficulties of communication, and under which it may provide that in not more than two electoral districts the number of electors shall be more than 15 per cent below the electoral quota. In his telecast (I think, "Meet the Press") soon after March 5 last year, in which he gave a slant on this issue, the Premier referred to the Districts of Frome and Eyre. It was obvious that this Bill was then on the production line. We heard of the "Casey Protection Act", and for a nice fellow like the member from Frome, that is laudable. The member for Light has dealt with the member for Frome, and I look forward to the rebuttal by the latter with respect to the "Casey Protection Act." The fact that the Bill recognizes that there may be two such seats amply illustrates the difficulties of one vote one value and, as the member for Mitcham pointed out, how far Labor will depart from its avowed policy of 10 per cent tolerance. Indeed, the A.L.P. recognizes the requirements of the two seats referred to in the Bill which the honourable member correctly states the Bill does not specify. We had to rely on the Premier's telecast for the specificity of the Frome recognition. I have no quarrel with this, but, in addition to what the Premier said about the remoteness or sparsity of population, etc., there is another hazard that exists for some members, and that is accessibility. This varies from district to district. The District of Albert, apart from being worthily represented, has an area bigger than most people would like to think it has. It is fairly sparsely populated and, with due respect to its representative, has much "tiger" country. The mem-

ber for Albert can ride all day over his district and see not more than, say, six constituents, and he covers some fairly rugged countryside. Problems of inaccessibility exist also in my district, as well as in that of the member for Millicent (Hon. J. D. Coreoran). Just before the Christmas adjournment I was attempting to visit a constituent in the hundred of Comaam and, after driving for several miles along a bush track that had been used by heavy scrub-clearing tractors, I became hopelessly bogged in sand. Fortunately, Mr. Ern Gaffney (well known to members of the Land Settlement Committee as one of the spokesmen in respect of South-East drainage proposals) made a quick assessment, and decided that eight miles away as the crow flew a tractor would be available at a certain farm. Fortunately, again, however, he came across a stack of clamps that had been placed at the roadside not far from where I had stopped, and I was thus able to get back to civilization, although I did not see my constituent. In the winter time the situation is reversed.

I agree that a reasonable argument exists for adjusting the boundaries of city districts and, indeed, my Party has advanced proposals in that regard. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that a city member can see many constituents in a built-up area in a short space of time, while many country members are busily digging themselves out of sandhills. Much has been said about the Legislative Council, but I believe in the bicameral system of Government, and agree with the remarks made by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). Among other things, he said that two minds were better than one, and that the Council should be maintained. It is always worth taking the time to have a second look at certain proposals. The Labor Party makes no secret of its cherished desire to abolish the Upper House. In his policy speech made last February, the Premier gave a firm indication that Labor's policy was to provide for a House of 56 members, for the abolition of the Legislative Council, and for one roll for all Parliamentary elections. In the event of forming a Government, he said that early legislation would be introduced for an increase in the number of members of the House of Assembly and for an alteration to the voting franchise of the Legislative Council, which would mean that every person entitled to vote for the Lower House would also receive a vote for the Upper House, pending its

abolition. However, events of the past few months have conclusively proved that South Australians will not allow themselves to be led along by the voice of a handful of Socialists trying to crack the whip. I mention the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill to illustrate that fact. Protest meetings were held throughout the State and, with one exception, no Government member attended those meetings. Their absence is their own business, but—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member has wandered well away from the Bill before the House.

Mr. RODDA: I intend to link my remarks with the role of the Legislative Council. I believe electors were entitled to have the views of their elected representatives on the matter but, in many cases, they had to fall back on the views of members of other districts.

Mr. McKEE: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member is referring to something completely irrelevant to the Bill.

The SPEAKER: I have already asked the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill, and I am sure he will.

Mr. RODDA: Am I in order, Mr. Speaker? I am referring to the role of the Legislative Council.

The SPEAKER: I think I have allowed the honourable member reasonable latitude in referring to a matter not capable of discussion here as it is on the Notice Paper in another place. I ask him not to develop his remarks in that regard.

Mr. RODDA: I think the member for Port Pirie has had a moral victory, but perhaps a defeat is good for us all occasionally. The Legislative Council has never been a Chamber of obstruction. Much opposition has been raised to certain measures that have gone to the Upper House from this place, but I shall say no more about that matter. My friend, the member for Mitcham, expressed much concern about clause 12, which contains the deadlock provisions, and, being a legal man, he was well qualified to do that. He pointed out that the authors of the Bill (if the Bill were passed) could be responsible for wiping out the other Chamber in the space of 12 months. Is it any wonder that people are concerned? The honourable member said that he hoped the Attorney-General (as the chief law officer of the Crown) or some other prominent member of the Government would throw some light on these far-reaching proposals. I assure members on the Government side that the Opposition will

listen to such an explanation with attention. We do not care how long we sit here in order to obtain answers to these vital questions. I assure members of the Government Party that people in my district are greatly concerned about the proposals in the Bill, and they are not all big landholders. Many people have sincerely told me that, although they did not vote for me, they are disappointed and concerned at the new Government's far-reaching proposals.

Mr. Millhouse: They will vote for you next time.

Mr. RODDA: I hope so. I have never made a point of asking anyone to vote for me, but any contribution will be thankfully received. It would appear from the hidden mysteries of clause 12 that what the Premier had to say in his policy speech about the amendment of the Legislative Council electoral roll was a piece of hood-winkery because, if this Bill becomes law, there will be no Legislative Council. However, there will be a good old donnybrook before this important part of the Legislature passes into history. From my new and inexperienced 39th position in the House I do not think the political climate of South Australia at this juncture is anywhere near as favourable towards abolishing one of our bulwarks of freedom as it might have been 10 months ago.

The Bill has been called a fraud and people have said it is dishonest. We have only to look at the so-called 26 country seats to see that. I do not want city people to misunderstand me when I say that, because city and country are, or should be, complementary to one another. We should endeavour to understand one another's point of view. However, this does not in any way give a licence to anyone to declare a metropolitan area excluding a large proportion of the built-up areas in the south and north, to tack them on to country redivisions and then to gleefully rub hands with the invisible soap with which the faceless men wash, thus kidding everybody that all is well with the bush-whackers. I speak for the bush-whackers. I agree with the Leader that the Bill is "crook", and I completely oppose it.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): So far in this debate practically every Bill has been referred to, and at times it has been difficult to find out what Bill is before the House. Because of what the member for Mitcham and one or two other members (not including the member for Victoria) have said, I have reached the conclusion that the Constitution Act Amendment Bill is the Bill before the House. Constitution

Bills have been debated on numerous occasions in the House since I have been a member and I have no doubt they were debated before I entered Parliament. On the occasions they have been debated since I have been a member I have expressed an opinion and I do not intend to alter that opinion one bit today. Most people would agree that the situation that has existed for 30 years has been most undemocratic. The gerrymandered electoral boundaries and the restricted franchise in the Legislative Council have been responsible for many anomalies and have been used by the previous Government for the purpose of imposing a strong discipline on the people of South Australia. They have been used to impose a discipline that has not existed and does not exist in any other State of the Commonwealth; nor does it exist in many other countries throughout the world.

The people of this State are no different from other people in the Commonwealth but for over 30 years they have been controlled by disciplinary legislation. Visitors from overseas claim that this State has unique laws. These people find that they are locked out of hotel bars after 6 o'clock and that they are not allowed to participate in lotteries in other States. They realize that South Australians would never be allowed to have a lottery of their own because that would be putting poison in the hands of children.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You previously drew attention to the fact that members were introducing matters irrelevant to the debate. I draw your attention to what is now being said by the member for Port Pirie.

The SPEAKER: My attention was directed to another matter and I did not hear what the member for Port Pirie said. I ask the honourable member not to refer to irrelevant matters.

Mr. McKEE: I was referring to the gerrymandered system and the restricted franchise for the election of the Legislative Council. After all, if people had been allowed to vote as they should have been under a democratic system, the laws of which I spoke would not have existed because the Playford Government would not have been in power for 30 years. I said that disciplinary legislation was imposed over these people by a system of gerrymander. South Australians are even forbidden to have dog coursing, and I know the honourable member for Victoria is concerned about that.

Mr. Rodda: I did not get a chance to speak about it.

Mr. McKEE: In view of the present set-up the deceased Playford Government—

Mr. Clark: The diseased Playford Government.

Mr. McKEE: At every election but one during the previous Government's term of office the people registered their dissatisfaction by giving a majority vote to the Labor Party. It was well known that the Playford Government remained in power against the will of the people by a system that was definitely crook. I defy the member for Victoria or any of his colleagues to get up and say that the system under which the Playford Government controlled the power in this State was not crook. If the member for Victoria can find anything more crook than the Legislative Council then I will give him a garden party. In Western Australia the people continually voiced their protest at the system that operated there and it was eventually decided that the Legislative Council should be elected by the people on the Assembly roll. I believe that system now exists in Western Australia under a Liberal Government. Members opposite agree that there should be changes. In 1963 they realized that there should be changes.

Mr. Clark: But why?

Mr. McKEE: I did not think I would have to give the reason, but I will, now that the member for Gawler has asked me: the Playford Government wanted to continue in power and they did not care about disregarding the people's opinion or the progress of the State as long as they continued in power.

Mr. Clark: They could see that they were slipping.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, but the situation got out of hand and, of course, we know what took place when they put up a Constitution Bill in 1963. Even the Tory press, which certainly does not support the Labor Party, could not understand it. The headline was "Come off it, Sir Thomas".

Mr. Jennings: He did his best to put it over.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, but public opinion was so strong that Liberal members went down their burrows and forgot all about it. They know there has to be a change now, but apparently it has to suit them. I was surprised to hear the honourable member for Mitcham claiming that the abolition of the Upper House would lead to Executive control.

Mr. Millhouse: I bet you were, because I did not say it.

Mr. McKEE: As I say, I was surprised because it came from a member of the

Opposition who knows full well that during the previous Government's term of office there were plenty of cobwebs here, and the hinges have rusted on the other place. Members of that House only come in for 40 hours a year, yet the honourable member talks about Executive control.

Mr. Millhouse: I bet you I did not use that phrase anywhere.

Mr. McKEE: The honourable member was probably thinking of what would happen if his Party was still in Government. All members now agree that the present system is no good, so there has to be a change. Of course, it has to suit members opposite. None of those members made any suggestions: they were just feeling in the dark, to see how it would go over if they put something up. It would be interesting to know just what type of scheme they have in mind to give the minority a good vote over the majority.

Mr. Clark: They told us some of those things in the previous Bill; they were going to tack Salisbury on to Tea Tree Gully to make Barossa.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. They disregarded the people as long as they stayed in power. Under the present set-up, this House is little short of a mockery, and the other place is a mockery while it uses a disproportion of the gerrymander instead of a fair representation on a democratic electoral procedure. The Opposition claims that its previous system or the system it would like to put up now gives more attention to the country needs than would a one vote one value system, but the truth is that under the previous Government the country vote was being used as a tool, and it would be so used under any system it would put up today. It was used as a tool for the city financial interests that supply the funds for the L.C.L. I believe that an honestly administered dictatorship is far preferable to a dictatorship that hypocritically pretends to have regard for the people's will and the principles of democracy. I understand the honourable member for Rocky River referred to "democracy" today, and that he was looking around to see whether one of his mates could tell us what it meant. The honourable member said that he was a man who believed in fair play and in democracy.

Mr. Clark: He loves the country so much that he lives in the city.

Mr. McKEE: He loves the country so much, particularly the people who work on the farms, that he would not support a 40-hour week or consider giving farm workers a basic

wage. He has opposed awards for rural workers ever since he has been in the House.

Mr. Freebairn: How many rural workers do you know who don't get the basic wage?

Mr. McKEE: I am sure I could pick some out in the honourable member's district. If members opposite are champions of democracy, I cannot see any reason why they should not support the use of the Assembly roll for the election of both Houses. That is a fair enough request. Is it not fair to give everybody a vote in both Houses? Surely the vote of a responsible businessman living in the city is equal to that of, say, a farmer in the country.

Mr. Hudson: Or the other people who live in the city.

Mr. McKEE: If honourable members were honest with the House I think they would say that it was fair enough to accept one roll for both houses. I support the Bill.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I oppose the Bill because I want to express the feelings of most electors in my district and, I think, most electors in country districts throughout South Australia concerning this legislation. If this Bill had any semblance of reasonableness, some consideration might be given to it. I believe that members on this side are prepared to consider some kind of redistribution. However, they will not be prepared to consider a redistribution that is lopsided and unbalanced and so heavily loaded in favour of the Labor Party. I believe this legislation is objectionable to country people. We must be certain that country people understand what would happen if this measure were passed.

I cannot understand how any representative of a rural district can accept the proposal contained in this Bill. Early in this debate the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) claimed that he represented a rural district and that he had been given a mandate to support this measure because not one of his electors had objected personally to it. However, I do not know that the honourable member should feel so secure as all that. I remind him that, although few of his electors may have spoken to him personally, at least 2,300 of them objected to these proposals through the ballot box last March.

Mr. Hudson: And still more of his electors voted Liberal at the Commonwealth election.

Mr. FERGUSON: Only some of his electors were in favour of the proposals that were put before the people last March. I pass through the honourable member's district occasionally, and I assure the House that if he does not hear objections to this legislation, then I do.

I am sure that if the honourable member were to traverse his district today he would hear many objections to this Bill. Reference has been made to the speech made by the honourable member for Barossa. The honourable member said that this Bill provided for a House of 56 members based on one vote one value, with no decrease in country representation. I cannot see how there will not be less country representation if this Bill is passed. The member for Barossa said there were 218,000 country electors, so that if country districts are to be enlarged their representation must be decreased. She referred to the condition of amenities in the country and said that this low standard was brought about because the previous Government had not decentralized industry. Country people have little to look forward to in this regard if the present Government stays in office for any time.

Mr. Casey: You have done absolutely nothing.

Mr. FERGUSON: What is the present Government doing to encourage decentralization?

Mr. Casey: What have you done for 30 years?

Mr. FERGUSON: The member for Barossa said that because no decentralization had taken place in this State that was why there were few amenities in the country. Apparently the present Government cannot attract new industries to this State. The member for Barossa said that one beneficial effect of this legislation would be to increase the number of members giving full-time representation to their districts. I am sure all honourable members do that now. The member for Barossa said that one good effect of this legislation would be a more adequate representation and a better service for those who pay our salaries. If I give full-time service and representation to 6,000 or 7,000 constituents (and I hope I do that), how will I be able to give a better service and representation to 10,000 constituents situated in one district?

Mr. Hudson: What is it like giving service to 35,000 in some districts?

Mr. FERGUSON: If this legislation is passed, some districts may be doubled in size. This will mean double travelling, so much time will be taken by travelling and a member cannot give the same representation to his constituents. An increase in the size of districts will not bring better representation to country people. I believe that much development has taken place in rural districts today, a development that is probably unnoticed by many

people, so that these districts require greater service and representation by the member. Much has been said about the encumbrance that the Legislative Council is to this State and about the franchise for the election of its members. However, we have had examples of the important contribution it has made to this State's legislation in the past, and have had examples of the important part it has played and is playing and its contribution to the State in this present session. The Government is concerned about the restricted franchise for the election of members of the Legislative Council, but this is one of the most important parts of the Government of this State.

The Government has paid little heed to one of the minor forms of government in this State—local government. Perhaps this form of government is so insignificant to the present Government that it does not count for much. I remind members that local government has an important part to play, and that, too, has a restricted franchise, as the election of councillors is on a property qualification. Do we hear members of the Government asking that councillors be elected on the same franchise as that of the Upper House in this State? An equal number of ratepayers is not contained in each council ward, as that would not be practicable or reasonable. By this Bill, the Government plans to inherit power for all time: that is bad, and I cannot support it, but I do support the amendment foreshadowed by the Leader.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): There should not be any need for me to re-stress what every member of the Opposition has already conceded and what every member of Parliament knows: that South Australia needs electoral redistribution. I do so because I oppose this Bill so strongly. In view of the policy speech given by the Premier prior to the last elections members of the public with any political awareness expected that legislation would be introduced on this vital matter during this session, but what legislation it is! Expedient to the point of blatant gerrymander, it is the very sin of which this Opposition, when in Government, was accused by members opposite. In his speech last March, the Premier said that the original L.C.L. proposal in 1963 was nothing less than gerrymandering the present gerrymander. Talk about the pot calling the kettle black! This Bill is a studiously calculated attempt to prop up many Government members who occupy fringe seats; to reduce country influence on the future development and advancement of this State; and, curiously, to flagrantly flout, in the most obvious way, their policy of one vote one

value as it applies to two State districts where the population is scattered and remote.

Those who represent inner metropolitan seats are fully aware that the population they contain has got completely out of hand, making it well nigh impossible for a conscientious member of Parliament to do his or her job properly. The member for Glenelg made that point a few moments ago. Those who represent country seats will agree, too. Like those of every other State in Australia, South Australia's population trends have been towards concentration in and around capital cities, but this is surely no reason why the present so-called metropolitan area should dominate political representation in this House to the detriment of the State as a whole, particularly to the detriment of the country. However great and spectacular has been South Australia's industrial expansion and development in the past 30 years under the direction of successive L.C.I. Governments, we must never forget that we depend on primary production for the State's favourable, direct overseas contribution to the economy of this State. In these figures for 1964-65, I am excluding mining because of doubt about whether it should be classed as a primary or a secondary product. The exports from agriculture, pastoral and dairying, orchards and vineyards, total £143,000,000 compared with £13,000,000 for exports derived from manufacturing industries, a difference of £130,000,000. These up-to-date figures, given me by the Bureau of Census and Statistics only last week, illustrate the importance of the country, and how its value to the economy of the State cannot be over-estimated. It is interesting in passing to realize that in the last 12 months the impetus towards development is slackening, as restrictive legislation forcing increases in costs is discouraging further expansion and development.

Surely before fixing equitable electoral boundaries we must realistically define the metropolitan area. The very fact that changing trends in settlement of population was one of the factors that led to the setting up of the Town Planning Committee by Act of Parliament in 1955 suggests that that committee's definition of the metropolitan area (the result of years of study, and containing all the facets of development considered by the committee) is the one on which this Bill should be based. It is useless for members opposite to say that Gawler is still a rural seat, when it includes Elizabeth which, by any standard, must be considered as part of the metropolitan area. The same must surely be said about Gouger, with its recent

concentration of population in Para Hills and Parafield Gardens; Barossa, with its preponderance of population in Modbury, Highbury, and Tea Tree Gully; and Alexandra, where development is taking place south of the city at Morphett Vale, Reynella, Port Noarlunga, Christies Beach, and O'Halloran Hill.

We must remember that most of the people living around the fringe of Adelaide commute daily to and from the city, not only in pursuit of their daily occupations but also for educational and recreational purposes. We should at least be sensible in regard to the changing concept of the metropolitan area. The Government's unrealistic attitude is illustrated by its acceptance of an outmoded definition of the metropolitan area for the purposes of the Bill, because the Bill stipulates that the number of country seats should remain the same, namely, 26, and further directs that the Electoral Commissioners may have regard to the boundaries of existing districts. The Bill is one of political expediency, "out-gerrymandering any gerrymander the Opposition devised", to use the Premier's words when he made his policy speech last March.

I now refer to that part of the Bill directing the commissioners to present to the Governor their report and recommendations, pursuant to new section 83. I sincerely believed that every honourable member proudly upheld the traditions of Parliament and of Parliamentary practices, but it seems that members of the Government only give lip service to those beliefs. More reprehensible, perhaps, is the fact that the Government itself has flouted its principle of "government of the people for the people by the people". I wonder if the Attorney-General can say what has become of his regard for democracy, he being a leading member of the Government and of the Party to which he belongs. Only a few moments ago the member for Port Pirie sarcastically referred to honourable members on this side of the House as champions of democracy, but I think members of the Government should take a look at themselves before making such statements about the Opposition. In his policy speech, the Premier said:

The Labor Party has always been opposed to Executive control and our reasoning in this matter is that we must give greater opportunities for the voice of the people to be heard in Parliament rather than to be subjected to Executive control by an extra Minister without a substantial increase in the number of members.

Mr. Millhouse: The Government ate those words.

Mrs. STEELE: It did, indeed. The Government referred to increasing the size of Cabinet. However, the fine principles its members voiced are not evident in that part of the Bill directing the Commissioners to return their report direct to the Governor. I wonder how members opposite can reconcile the fine principles and sentiments expressed by the Premier with the implication in the Bill to the effect that Parliament, where the voice of the people can be heard and expressed, should be entirely by-passed and the Executive made the sole arbiter of a matter so vital to the interests of the people of South Australia. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) suggested that the Government was trying to be just a little too clever; many people inside and outside Parliament may be thinking exactly the same thing. I agree that this may be just one more provision in the Bill in respect of which the Government may be hoist with its own petard.

Much has been said about the Legislative Council, especially by the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne), who devoted much of her time to a statistical attempt to show how sinister and useless members of the Legislative Council were. I am sure that we are all indebted to the honourable member for the trouble she took to compile so many tables for the edification of honourable members. In speaking as she did she ran true to the colours of the Party to which she belongs, but some cogent reasons were advanced by members on this side of the House to show how erroneous many of her observations were. Many of her claims were completely refuted by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), who gave a number of examples in refutation of her contentions. I think that if she had studied the Legislative Council's sittings more objectively, and had given the matter as much care as she had given her arithmetical calculations (and in particular the voting figures of divisions), even considering the short period she has been a member of this Parliament, she would have seen that voting is not by any means always along Party lines. Time and time again members of the Opposition have voted with the Government, and that was so on the part of Liberal and Country League members when the present Government was in Opposition. Unlike the member for Barossa—

Mr. McKee: Like the member for Mitcham, do you agree that a change should be made?

Mrs. STEELE: Yes.

Mr. McKee: Let's hear your suggestion.

Mrs. STEELE: I think there is merit in the suggestion that there be one roll for both Houses, but I believe the voting should be voluntary for the Upper House. I can see no point at all in having two Houses exactly the same.

Mr. Lawn: You will have to carry the second reading to get one roll for both Houses.

Mrs. STEELE: I have not done what the member for Barossa did: I have not extracted a list of figures, which I think is a rather fruitless exercise anyway. I do know that session after session this House accepts amendments made by the Legislative Council, which have the effect of improving legislation introduced into Parliament. The member for Barossa complains of the Legislative Council's being Party-political, but this charge is not proved by events in the present session, when many Bills have been accepted in their entirety.

Mrs. Byrne: It will be proved when this Bill goes to the Council.

Mrs. STEELE: Another contention made by the honourable member, although it is not important, I believe needs refuting. She said:

It is well known that when Parliament is not sitting it is the House of Assembly members who have most work referred to them by electors, as the Legislative Council members are unknown. Indeed, most electors do not know of their existence or their names. I have referred to the Council and people have thought that I was referring to the local government authority.

That is interesting. I do not suggest for a moment that everybody knows who the member for Burnside is, but when I have been speaking at meetings in various parts of the State and I have referred to the member for Barossa by name (as she is the first woman member of the South Australian Labor Party in the House of Assembly I believe she is entitled to a mention) I have often been asked, "Who is Mrs. Byrne?" Many people do not know me. Most members will agree that there are thousands of people in South Australia who do not know who are the various members of Parliament and they probably do not know who are the Ministers for this and that. I doubt whether the majority of people in the various districts of South Australia know who is their member of Parliament. To suggest that it is only the members of the House of Assembly who are known and that nobody knows who are the members of the Legislative Council is very wide of the mark.

When Parties get into Government they find it is not as easy sometimes as they thought it might be to put into practice some of the more drastic reforms that have been advocated in

election policy speeches. By superiority of numbers this Government has, of course, steam-rolled legislation through this Chamber, and the extent to which this has been publicly unpopular and unacceptable has been seen, with respect to one contentious Bill, in the number of petitions presented by members not only on this side of the House but by members of the Government Party, as we saw today. The Government's extremist propositions have had to be watered down to make them acceptable, up to a point, in this House and to the electors at large. Even though they know they have the numbers to pass them, the strong attack that the Opposition mounts gets publicity and thus gets through to the people that legislation not in their best interests is being pushed through the Assembly by sheer weight of numbers. Members on both sides of the House know that this has happened on several occasions already this session. One Bill was so amended that in consequence it became well nigh incomprehensible to members and the Government withdrew it and reprinted it before proceeding with the third reading stage. Furthermore, the pressure of the Opposition's attack on legislation has had its effect on the Government when the Bill passes to another place.

Another controversial Bill of great public interest and concern is before that Chamber now, presented in a vastly modified form from the one we considered here. Surely the changes the Government has made point to the value of a House that takes a second look at legislation. It will be a sad and sorry day for the people of South Australia if and when the time ever comes when we no longer have a Legislative Council. I do not believe for a moment that the people would stand for it. If this Government, on another matter, considered it right and proper for the people to express their opinion at a special poll then, if it has the courage of its convictions on this plank of its platform, it will go to the people on this point. We know it is the avowed intention of the Australian Labor Party (and has been for years) to abolish the Legislative Council when it has the opportunity. The Labor Party had the same idea in New South Wales and we all know what happened there. Their representatives were instructed to vote their Chamber out of existence, but they had very different ideas. They obviously liked being members of the Legislative Council even though they were paid a fairly niggardly allowance for the time they spent in their State's interests and for the effort they put into considering legislation.

Some people seem to think that people aspire to Parliament simply for what they are going to get out of it. I remember that on the day before I was elected to Parliament I said to someone that I was the candidate for the Burnside district and I was amused by his reply, which was, "When you get into Parliament how much are you going to get out of it?" When I said that I had no idea at all what a member of Parliament was paid, he asked me whom I thought I was kidding. It does not seem to occur to some people that men and women enter Parliament because they believe they have some contribution to make to the good of the community in which they live. Although I concede that there might be isolated instances of members who are not conscientious in their duties, I certainly do not think that it happens here in South Australia because I have a high regard for members of this Parliament, for I know they are people of integrity who apply themselves to their jobs. I believe this applies to every member of Parliament in South Australia. In fact, I am sure that if they did not apply themselves diligently to their duties, the answer would be in the hands of the people and I am sure such members would not be in Parliament for long and would be defeated when they faced the electors.

I do not believe that any of us make the personal sacrifices that are inherent in serving in Parliament just for the fun of working 24 hours a day, perhaps seven days a week, 12 months of the year, for the time that we remain representatives of our districts. I am not trying to place members of Parliament on a pedestal, nor to invest them with a halo, but I do believe that for the member for Barossa to imply by statistics that members of the Legislative Council are inept and set themselves out to be frustrating to the will of the community shows that she hasn't been in Parliament long enough to know what she's talking about! In this Parliament members of the Legislative Council are paid the same basic salary as are members of this Chamber, and I believe this is rightly so. It was the subject of another Bill that was passed in this place. If one went into statistics of how many times and for how long members opposite have spoken this session, it would be most revealing. I think somebody might do some arithmetical calculations to establish that.

Mr. Lawn: How many speeches did you make on this side? The former Premier was about the only speaker for the last 27 years.



Mrs. STEELE: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, members in the Legislative Council are paid the same salary as are members in this House, and as with New South Wales I could not see the members of the A.L.P. in that House, three of whom are Ministers, meekly submitting to the dictates of their Party and voting themselves out of office, even if and when the time ever comes when they have the numbers to do so. I point out that three of the four Labor members in the Legislative Council are now in Ministerial rank and drawing extra emoluments. Queensland, as we know, is the only Australian State which does not enjoy the privilege of a bicameral system of government with which we here in South Australia feel we are blessed. Its Upper House was abolished many years ago by a ruthless and arrogant Government which put its own Party interests before the interests of the people of the State.

Mr. Clark: But they don't want it back.

Mrs. STEELE: Well, the Labor Party regime came to an end in Queensland, and that end was brought about by the resentment of the people of the tyrannical and one-sided rule that they had to suffer for so long, and contributed to by the restrictive legislation that was put on the Statute Books. The same thing will happen here in South Australia, but, I guarantee, Mr. Speaker, in a much shorter time.

Mr. Clark: The same thing did happen in 1965.

Mrs. STEELE: Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough to indicate how strongly I oppose this Bill, which, even though it will pass this House, I am sure will come up against all kinds of difficulties in another place and will, I imagine, have to be very much modified because of the second look to which it will be subjected before it will be acceptable or passed in that Chamber. I strongly oppose the Bill.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I oppose the Bill. Its principal aims are, first, the reconstruction of the House of Assembly pursuant to clause 9, to raise its membership from 39 to 56 members; secondly, to redistribute the districts as provided for in clause 14; thirdly, to deal with deadlocks between the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, as provided for in clause 12; and, fourthly, to provide for a new franchise in respect of the Legislative Council, as provided for in clause 6. Regarding the provision in the Bill for a membership of 56 in the House of Assembly instead of the 39 as at present, I consider that there is some merit in increasing the membership of this House beyond 39. Indeed, the

previous Government realized that, and it introduced legislation several years ago to provide for an increase from 39 to 42 members. As honourable members know, that legislation did not pass this Chamber. That need was also expressed, I think in 1962, when the then Opposition introduced a Bill to increase the membership from 39 to 56, and on April 18 the *News*, in its leading article, stated:

Labor's Bill, which sought to increase seats from 39 to 56, was, as the Premier himself stated, hastily and not very wisely drafted. A measure that would create some 30 seats within 10 miles of the General Post Office and leave only 26 for the rest of the State could not be described as striking a fair balance between rural and metropolitan representation.

That, I think, is of paramount importance, and that is one of the main reasons why I oppose the present legislation, for it does not adequately provide for rural representation. As to the redistribution of districts provided for in clause 14, new section 79 (1) provides that the Commission shall divide the State into 56 approximately equal electoral districts for the House of Assembly. The Premier in his policy speech, and also in his second reading explanation, stressed his Party's policy of one vote one value. If that actual policy were given effect to, of course, it would be drastically detrimental to the State. I should like to quote an observation made by a former distinguished Labor Premier in the State of Queensland. I refer to Mr. Hanlon, who was Premier of Queensland from 1946 to 1952. He introduced, I think in 1949, legislation into the Queensland Parliament to increase the membership of the only House there to 75. He adopted under his legislation a method of zoning, and if I remember rightly there were four zones: the Brisbane zone, which had a quota of 10,716; the Southern area, with a quota of 9,536; North Queensland, with 7,852; and West Queensland, with 4,783. The Labor Premier in Queensland, referring to one vote one value, said at that time:

The Labor Party's agitation having succeeded in winning the adult franchise, and we, having seen how our cry for the principle of one vote one value was operating—that it was beginning to give complete authority in this great Commonwealth of ours to the industrial cities—we have had to revise that opinion. We have had to realize that it is necessary to see that the development of this country takes place in the interests of the very existence of this country. It is necessary, therefore, for us to modify the opinion that it was essentially right to have a system under which each vote had exactly the same value.

It seems that in 1949 there were more enlightened Labor leaders in parts of the

Commonwealth who realized the detrimental effect that the policy of one vote one value would have on the country's existence. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said:

At that election (1965) I announced that our policy was for a 56-member Lower House based on the principle of one vote one value.

It was not long after that that the electors of South Australia realized that perhaps he had his tongue in his cheek when he made his policy speech. I remember viewing a television programme on a Sunday evening when the Premier was interviewed. He made a statement that made it clear that he realized, too, that it would be necessary to depart from the principle of one vote one value. On that occasion he said that he considered, at least in the District of Frome, that in view of the sparseness of population, there would have to be some other provision made, and that he could not guarantee that such provision would be made in the legislation until he had the approval of his masters in Grote Street.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: What are you talking about? What is this reference to me and to what I said? The honourable member should get the quote correct. I do not object to being quoted correctly.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The Premier said that he could not guarantee legislation embodying his views until he received the approval from somewhere else, and we on this side know to what approval he was referring. Apparently that approval has been given. We know that the Labor policy is for a 10 per cent tolerance in the variation of quotas, but this Bill provides for a 15 per cent tolerance, up or down, from a quota of 10,000. The Premier went on to say that in making these provisions (for 56 members and one vote one value) there would be no decrease in the number of country members. New section 80 provides that the commission—

(a) Shall have regard to the following criteria:

- (i) each electoral district shall be of convenient shape and have reasonable means of access between the main centres of population therein;
- (ii) not less than 26 electoral districts shall be wholly within the country area.

“Country area” is defined as meaning what is actually the outer metropolitan area. It is obvious that if the State under this legislation is to have 26 country members, in four or five districts the majority of the constituents will be living in the outer metropolitan area, as they are at present in some country districts. If the Premier says that “the Government considers that the present basis of 26 country

districts and 13 metropolitan districts is completely unjustified and that the basis of near-equality provided for by the Bill is more in keeping with democratic methods”, then perhaps he is not correct. At present what are known as 26 country seats are actually only 21 or 22, because in four or five of them most of the people live in the outer metropolitan area. That would be the position if this Bill were passed: of the 26 country seats about half a dozen would be clustered around the outer metropolitan area. I emphasize what has been said about the necessity for greater rural representation in any State by the former Premier of Queensland (Mr. Hanlon). Dealing with his legislation in 1949, and when referring to people living in the outback areas, he said:

Those people are entitled to at least the same services as those in the metropolitan area get; as a matter of fact, if there is to be any balance in favour of any section in this respect it should be in favour of the people developing the outback parts of this great State.

He also said:

The population of Brisbane is growing rapidly, but we do not wish to reach the stage in this State when the representation of Brisbane in this Parliament will overshadow country representation. It has not been in the past and it would be very foolish for Parliament to allow that result to take place. It would be a bad thing not only for the country people but in the last analysis a bad thing for the metropolitan area, because on the successful development and expansion of our country areas depend the very life and security of our capital cities. It is not a good thing for a growing population in the metropolitan area to obtain an overwhelming control of representation in Parliament. Therefore, we propose to make a drastic alteration in the method of representation under this Bill. We propose to limit the number of members in the metropolitan area to 24. We propose to increase the total membership of the House by 13, allowing four in the metropolitan area and nine additional representatives of the country. That will keep the balance of the representation of the country.

He also said:

Any representative in this Parliament who faces the situation as it is today cannot find fault with giving greater representation in this Parliament to the country than the country now has.

He also said:

It is a phenomenon throughout the world for industrial cities to grow rapidly—by this measure we are providing that the position will not arise where there will be an overwhelming representation in Parliament of the city of Brisbane. We propose to see, irrespective of population, that the people of Brisbane will have 24 representatives of this House out of a total of 75. That is what is necessary in order to safeguard the interests of the country.

I concur in those remarks of a former Labor Premier of Queensland and consider that this Bill is too drastic in its operation. While it states that there shall be 26 country members, in effect that would not be the position. The metropolitan representation would outnumber greatly the rural representation, which would be to the disadvantage of this State. It is significant that most countries in the world—

Mr. McKee: Have you any idea of the disadvantages it would bring about?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Yes. I have already quoted from a speech by the former Premier of Queensland, who dealt with that matter, but the outlook of the metropolitan area is not always ideal as far as the country is concerned. I need only refer to a statement made by the member for Adelaide at a declaration of the polls years ago. In the *News* of March 13, 1950, a leading article stated:

Criticizing the South Australian electoral system, Mr. Lawn said members of transport unions should refuse to move the harvest from Liberal and Country League districts until the need for electoral reform was admitted. He said, "Let it rot and remain where it is until these people are prepared to admit that we in the metropolitan area are entitled to an equal share of representation."

Mr. Lawn: Isn't that right?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The article continues:

The *News* agrees on the need for electoral reform. There is a marked disbalance between country and metropolitan seats in Parliament. It should be corrected. But the remedy will not be found in the destructive blackmailing methods advocated by Mr. Lawn. There is a feeling amongst many metropolitan people is averse to rural interests and I hope that the member for Adelaide has mellowed since he made those remarks. Since functioning as Chairman of Committees, he has mellowed somewhat, but what guarantee have we that that is the position with every other metropolitan member in this Parliament?

In the United States of America, which has achieved a position of great eminence throughout the world in so many fields of human endeavour, that eminence was attained while the various States of the United States of America had a preponderance of representation from the rural areas in those States. May I refer to a study made two years ago by the University of Virginia, as a result of which, relating to rural representation in the various States of America, a schedule has been drawn up showing the name of each State, the percentage of rural population, the percentage of the Lower House of such rural representation, and the percentage of the Upper House of such

rural representation. "Rural areas" are defined in the schedule as being "counties with fewer than 100,000 residents". I ask leave to have this table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

*Rural Representation.*

The ratios of representation in State capitals are highlighted by a University of Virginia study comparing the rural and small town population of each State with its share of the membership in each branch of the Legislature. Rural areas are here defined as counties with fewer than 100,000 residents.

State.	Per cent of Rural Pop.	Per cent of Lower House.	Per cent of Upper House.
Alabama .. ..	58.9	83.0	85.7
Alaska .. . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0
Arizona .. . . .	28.7	33.8	85.7
Arkansas .. . .	86.4	92.0	91.4
California .. . .	7.4	10.3	42.5
Colorado .. . . .	36.3	53.8	57.2
Connecticut .. .	8.9	24.5	13.9
Delaware .. . . .	31.1	57.1	58.8
Florida .. . . .	27.4	72.6	71.9
Georgia .. . . .	60.7	89.7	88.8
Hawaii .. . . .	20.9	35.3	60.0
Idaho .. . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0
Illinois .. . . .	23.8	28.5	41.1
Indiana .. . . .	50.7	61.7	60.1
Iowa .. . . .	72.7	90.8	90.0
Kansas .. . . .	62.7	88.0	90.0
Kentucky .. . .	71.5	83.0	81.6
Louisiana .. . .	49.4	65.4	62.0
Maine .. . . .	57.1	60.9	69.7
Maryland .. . .	24.6	51.3	65.5
Massachusetts ..	2.6	2.9	2.5
Michigan .. . . .	21.7	30.4	39.7
Minnesota .. . .	56.1	70.2	70.5
Mississippi .. .	86.0	96.0	94.4
Missouri .. . . .	49.0	73.2	55.9
Montana .. . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0
*Nebraska .. . .	64.7	—	76.8
Nevada .. . . .	55.5	80.9	94.1
New Hampshire ..	70.6	72.3	69.7
New Jersey .. . .	4.5	8.3	23.8
New Mexico .. . .	72.4	86.4	96.9
New York .. . . .	11.9	25.3	17.4
North Carolina ..	69.3	80.8	82.0
North Dakota .. .	100.0	100.0	100.0
Ohio .. . . .	32.4	51.8	34.8
Oklahoma .. . . .	66.3	88.4	93.4
Oregon .. . . .	48.0	53.3	56.6
Pennsylvania .. .	14.8	21.0	23.1
Rhode Island .. .	20.7	23.0	40.9
South Carolina ..	67.1	70.2	91.3
South Dakota .. .	100.0	100.0	100.0
Tennessee .. . .	54.4	76.1	74.5
Texas .. . . .	42.2	59.0	64.4
Utah .. . . .	32.5	48.4	60.0
Vermont .. . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0
Virginia .. . . .	67.0	75.5	76.5
Washington .. . .	35.1	40.9	43.2
West Virginia .. .	80.6	84.0	89.1
Wisconsin .. . . .	46.7	53.0	51.5
Wyoming .. . . .	100.0	100.0	100.0

\*Nebraska is the only State in the U.S. with a unicameral legislature.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Let me refer to a few of the States. In Alabama the percentage of rural population is 58.9, and the percentage of the Lower House is 83; in Connecticut the percentage of rural population is 8.9, and the percentage of the Lower House is 24.5. For Delaware the comparable figures are 31.1 and 57.1; for Florida (essentially a primary-producing State) the figures are 27.4 and 72.6; for Maryland the figures are 24.6 and 51.3; for New Jersey they are 4.5 and 8.3; for New York they are 11.9 and 25.3; and for Ohio they are 32.4 and 51.8.

It is vitally important for a State like South Australia, as in the case of Queensland and Western Australia which have large areas of outback country sparsely populated, to have a rural representation which at least is equal to, if not exceeding, the metropolitan representation. That is for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the State and the outback areas, because after all, although it has been often said, it is none the less true that the primary producer is the backbone of the community. Adequate consideration must be given to the protection of the interests of the man on the land and of the rural areas of this State. I associate myself with the remarks of previous speakers on this side of the House dealing with the other provisions of the Bill relating to deadlocks and the provisions for settling deadlocks in the Legislative Council and increasing the franchise thereof. If this Bill was passed and clause 6 subsequently became the law of the land and members of the Legislative Council were elected by the same persons who elected the members for the House of Assembly, the Legislative Council would then be merely a reflex of the Lower House and might not then serve any useful purpose. I think the remarks of the member for Mitcham had some merit: I think there is room for some reform. Indeed, the previous Government introduced legislation to increase the franchise to enable all the spouses of property owners or householders to record a vote, but that measure, too, was defeated.

There is some merit in what the member for Mitcham said about the franchise for the Legislative Council. I consider that the deadlock provisions are too far-reaching. It was in 1910 that the Verran Labor Government introduced a Bill to alter the deadlock provisions of the Legislative Council, but even that legislation was better than the Bill introduced by the present Labor Government, because it provided that, if a measure passed the House of Assembly twice in the course of one Parlia-

ment, was rejected by the Legislative Council, and was a third time passed by the House of Assembly and rejected by the Legislative Council in another Parliament, it should receive the Governor's assent. That is entirely different from the provision in this Bill, because it provides that there has to be an appeal to the electors between the two Parliaments. The Bill would have had to be introduced during two separate Parliaments and, consequently, the electors would have had a right to give judgment on it. However, this Bill does away altogether with the appeal to the electors and simply provides that, if a Bill is passed in two sessions of the Parliament and rejected by the Council, then it shall be submitted for the Governor's assent.

Mr. Lawn: This follows the British system.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Yes.

Mr. Lawn: Do you disown British traditions?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The House of Lords is not an elected House as is the Council in South Australia. Therefore, I oppose the legislation, particularly the clause relating to the resolution of deadlocks, and say definitely that in my opinion the Legislative Council serves and has served a useful purpose. I hope that it remains forever an integral part of the Constitution of this State. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): This Bill has been on the Notice Paper for a long time and has been well debated from this side of the House. We have even managed to get some contributions from the other side. I wish to refer briefly to one or two aspects of it. The Party opposite supports the theory of Fabian Socialism, which requires that every member of the community should accept full responsibility for every decision made. I do not believe this possible but, if members opposite accept that principle, they surely must accept the principle of a voluntary vote.

So far as I am concerned, I am not going to argue about electoral rolls, but I consider that there should be a voluntary vote in one House or in both Houses in order to ensure that some responsibility is exercised and that there is not the regimented vote which we have at present and which we are asked to support in this Bill. I disagree with the principles of fixing the boundaries on which the Bill is based. A question has been placed on Notice Paper by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, as Leader of this Party, and I wholeheartedly support what he has said. We have heard the words "fraud" and "dishonest" too frequently and I shall not use them.

Mr. Lawn: But we haven't heard the last of it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The honourable member has not heard the last of me, either. I have a little thing here that will interest him. I shall give it to him after dinner. I am concerned that we have tried to convince the country people that we are not reducing their representation. Why do we not be honest about this now? Why do we insist that they have to have 26 districts, with the 1954 boundaries being used in order to make this possible? There is no harm in being honest and the fact is that there are only 20 country seats in this arrangement, and another arrangement cannot be made.

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

Mr. NANKIVELL: Before the dinner adjournment I said it was either improper or a fraud (I used a word similar to these) to describe the effect of this Bill as being to retain 26 rural seats. I pointed out that this was not correct, as not more than 20 rural seats are provided for in the Bill, and this is no more than the number provided in the Bill introduced previously by my Party—and we make no bones about that. It is not possible to stretch numbers so that there can be 26 country seats of the size this Government is proposing to have. This is nothing more than a repetition of what we have heard in the past. We have heard all about a gerrymander, but what is a gerrymander? It is any distribution of boundaries that does not suit the Government in office. There is no question about that, and this proposal is nothing more than a gerrymander. Now that the member for Adelaide is here, I will make the point that I was going to make before.

Mr. Lawn: You have it completely in reverse. You say that a gerrymander is something that does not suit the Government in office?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes.

Mr. Lawn: Then don't alter *Hansard*.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not deny that I said that, and I cannot alter *Hansard*. Your Party is the Government in office, the present boundaries do not suit you, and what you are trying to introduce as an alternative is no better. It is just another rig.

Mr. Jennings: What about addressing the Chair.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I believe the word "gerrymander" is one of those pipe dreams of the member for Adelaide. If you can get enough suckers and blowers you can keep

smoke going, and he has been doing that successfully for a long time.

Mr. Lawn: You had many blowers on your side for many years, didn't you? If you could suck as well as you can blow, there would be no shortage of water in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NANKIVELL: As the member for Victoria has told you, I represent a country district. I should like to correct the impression that my district is an area of no man's land and that the people I represent are bush-wackers: I do not have to go to many places in my district on other than a reasonably good road. I admit, however, that a tiger has been sighted in the district. I am a little concerned about this, but I think it came from the Millicent District. Much travelling is involved in representing a country district, as most members realize. Although my district may not be any larger than the Burra District, it is more than 100 miles square, and I have to travel long distances to see the people. There is no doubt that travelling is tiring. In my experience, not many country members have been able to make substantial contributions in this House, although there are some exceptions. Most country members who have long distances to travel suffer considerably from fatigue, and it is embarrassing for them when they have to prepare speeches to make in this House.

Mr. Clark: That is fairly obvious.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Gawler is one of those country members who does not have far to travel and, obviously, it makes no difference to him, because he does not speak.

Mr. Clark: I am always hoping for some persuasion.

Mr. NANKIVELL: We must define the responsibilities of a member of Parliament: are we just somebody here to represent so many people, or do we represent a district?

Mr. Lawn: Broad acres!

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not worried about broad acres. There are people to be represented. The member for Adelaide can telephone constituents quite simply, but in my case it involves a trunk call. City seats have many compensations.

Mr. Lawn: They have a few disabilities, also.

Mrs. Steele: Tell us!

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not decrying the fact that city members have the same responsibilities as we have, but there are limitations to the distances that a country member can travel.

Mr. Lawn: What about the member for Frome?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not excluding him.

Mr. Lawn: Your colleagues have criticized the Bill, regarding him.

Mr. NANKIVELL: If we have a Bill that takes none of these things into account, all we are saying is that we must have representation in this House, not in respect of people or of a district, but in respect of a principle of one vote one value that never exists. We cannot have a principle of one vote one value. Proportional representation gets nearer to that principle than does anything else, but we do not achieve that with this Government.

Mr. Jennings: We never saw the previous Government accepting it, either.

Mr. NANKIVELL: This Government desires to give some equality to city representation in the House. I do not think any honourable member denies that it is improper that one member on this side of the House should represent a district comprising one-eighth or one-seventh the size of the largest seat in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hudson: It's a scandal!

Mr. NANKIVELL: On the side of the member for Glenelg we have two extremes; the scandal relates merely to Parties.

Mr. Jennings: We didn't arrange these boundaries.

Mr. NANKIVELL: You are arranging to perpetuate them. Special exemptions are made in the Bill in respect of two seats, which do not come under the one vote one value principle.

Mr. Hudson: It will not give you a ratio of seven to one as between city and country seats.

Mr. NANKIVELL: But the inequality will still exist, and we shall not get any closer to the one vote one value principle. The Government has gone so far as to allow a 30 per cent differential.

Mr. McKee: Do you agree with one vote one value?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Do you want a proper gerrymander?

Mr. McKee: Do you agree that we should get as near as possible to having one vote one value?

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, I will not agree to that, but I will agree to some adjustment of the present system. I believe that what we have at present is a distinct injustice to city electors, and if we introduce what the Government proposes, it will be just as much an injustice to country electors. I know that Government members have a little map in connection with this Bill because I have heard about it. They

also had a map relating to another Bill, but we did not see it.

Mr. Hudson: How many electors have you got?

Mr. NANKIVELL: About 7,800.

Mr. Hudson: You would have about 8,600 under this proposal.

Mr. NANKIVELL: If the honourable member drew the boundaries he would see what that meant. I am worried not about the extra 800 electors but about the fact that the distribution of these electors becomes sparse, as in the case of the member for Frome. My seat is not looked on as being an outside one. It is not given the same consideration regarding an allowance as an outside seat is given. It is the fourth biggest district in the House and it has a wide distribution of population.

Mr. Hudson: Would you agree to a larger district if you received an increased allowance?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not interested in an allowance. If the boundaries had to be adjusted, as provided in the Bill, to accommodate the seats of Millicent and Victoria, this would become a big district, difficult to represent. It would be all right if the member concerned were not interested in representing people. I do not believe it is a good policy to take into account not people but numbers.

Mr. McKee: Would an additional 800 people put you out?

Mr. NANKIVELL: That does not worry me at all. I am worried about providing for adequate representation for country people. At the same time I believe something should be done to assist city people by correcting the disparity that has grown up since the last adjustments were made to the boundaries.

Mr. McKee: Put up a proposition.

Mr. NANKIVELL: We have put up a proposition. However, the Bill will not improve the position. I believe in a bi-cameral system—I do not believe there should be only one House. I can see what would have happened had some of the legislation brought into this House not been reviewed; I can see what would have happened had it been possible to carry these measures purely by the weight of numbers. There is some balance in having review. The present system will ultimately change but it does not require the abolition of the Upper House as the Government sets out to do in the Bill. There is no justification for doing away with the Council merely because the Party in power thinks the Council is preventing it from going ahead with its legislation. If the position were the other way around the Labor Party would want to retain the

Council. The trouble is that these things go as the Party in power wants them to go. Let us consider what happened in New South Wales and Queensland. They had some beautiful boundaries, and it took a larger percentage of support for the Opposition in New South Wales to change the Government than it would have taken here. Governments always try to stay in power and all the present Government wants to do is to bring in boundaries so that it cannot be shifted out of power.

Mr. Langley: Do you believe that 35 per cent of the people should dictate to the other 65 per cent? Surely 65 per cent should be worth 65 runs out of 100, not 35.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The only boundaries about which the member for Unley seems to know anything are cricket boundaries, but we are talking not about cricket boundaries but electoral boundaries.

Mr. Lawn: You are on a sticky wicket at present.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not worried about batting on a sticky wicket.

Mr. Lawn: You couldn't bat on a good wicket!

Mr. NANKIVELL: That would depend on who was bowling to me. If all I had to worry about was the sort of stuff that the member for Adelaide pitches up, I could hit it over the fence. I completely disagree with certain aspects of the Bill, especially those dealing with the basis on which the redistribution of boundaries has been made and with the intention to abolish the Legislative Council. I cannot agree with these measures. I have no hesitation in supporting the Leader's amendment which provides that the Bill should be withdrawn and redrafted to include a realistic definition of the Adelaide metropolitan area, which is what is needed. All members can realize that the boundaries provided for are cooked up to try to keep faith with country people by hoodwinking them and telling them that their representation is not being reduced. However, the Bill will reduce their representation by diluting country seats with city people in this distribution, and, secondly, by diluting country representation in this House by the substantial increase in size of district.

I believe there should be adequate representation for rural areas. I have pointed out the difficulties involved for some members in this respect. I also accept the fact that we should provide fair representation for the metropolitan area, and as I accept these things in principle I support those amendments. I oppose the **Bill.**

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I support the Bill. I do so with great pleasure, because I have looked forward for 17 years, ever since I first became a member of the Australian Labor Party, to the pleasure of supporting such a Bill as this. One is somewhat at a disadvantage in speaking on a Bill of this nature at this late stage. I took the opportunity this morning to look through some of the earlier speeches that were made, and I noticed that some of the earlier speakers on this side of the House fully put the Government's case. They have put forward the figures that have been recorded for the various political Parties over the last few years, and on that basis I do not intend to weary the House by repetition. One is at another disadvantage in speaking at this stage. I looked forward to the opportunity to answer some of the arguments put forward by members of the Opposition. However, I regret to note that they have treated this debate as something of a joke, a period for comedy, and as a result there are no legitimate arguments for me to answer.

I am strengthened in my support for this Bill, Mr. Speaker, because I am well aware that by expressing support I am putting forward the views of a huge majority of the South Australian community. This is borne out by the support given to the Premier in both the 1962 and the 1965 State elections. As a general rule, matters of a political nature are difficult for the general public to fully understand. However, this question of electoral boundaries in this State is an exception to that rule. In addition to the newspaper coverage given to this question because of the closeness of the seats in this Parliament, the A.L.P. has on all occasions attempted to fully educate the public on the position here in South Australia. The Premier, at the opening of his election campaign at an Unley hall, spent the first 15 minutes of his opening remarks in making a solemn promise to the electors of this State that if he were elected one of his Government's first acts would be to introduce a Bill in the terms that we have before us. Therefore, it is somewhat amusing to find members opposite suggesting that the people in South Australia know nothing about this Bill and that they would, in fact, disapprove of it. The contrary is the true position. The people have been well educated to except that if they provided the additional numbers in this House to the Premier this Bill would become active legislation in this State.

In addition, the Government, prior to the elections, strongly canvassed this question of electoral boundaries in the key seats in this State, and a special pamphlet was issued in the seats of Barossa, Glenelg, Unley and West Torrens pointing out that upon the formation of a Labor Government this Bill would be introduced. The results of this pamphlet and the attitude of the electors in South Australia to it are abundantly clear. No speaker on the other side has denied that this Bill has the effect of providing that whichever political party secures the majority vote of the public in South Australia, will govern. This is the ideal position and is the basis on which democracy works. Therefore, it is surprising to find the opposition from members opposite. Opposition speakers have been particularly disunited in their attitude, and the lack of leadership has been evident.

Mr. Law: They are not used to debating this subject. They did not speak all the years I have been here.

Mr. BROOMHILL: True. The member for Mitcham highlighted the different views because he first pointed out that he was completely in favour of the principle of one vote one value, but then surprised me by saying that he supported the increase in the number of members here from 39 to 56: However, to save himself from expulsion by the 22 unknown members of the Central Executive of the Liberal and Country League he worked himself into a fury over technical terms that he claimed existed in clauses, and, with a typical attitude, managed to find difficulty in interpreting some of the clauses. These 22 unknown men are not known to any person to whom I have spoken and no Opposition member of Parliament holds a position on that executive because he is denied this opportunity. Other speakers on that side of the House have made various remarks that have not been associated with this Bill, but all Opposition members have referred to the problems of country voters with respect to this legislation.

This has been the only consistent argument from members opposite, but it is a red herring used in an attempt to discredit this Bill. I cannot see the basis of the argument that this Bill reduces country representation. Members opposite are trying to suggest that if this Bill operates the needs of country people are likely to be denied. Common sense would tell them that any responsible Government is required to pay close attention to country voters, because if this is not done economic problems may confront the State, and as a

result, the metropolitan voters would react against a Government that did not take this step. The whole basis of this Bill is to ensure that the Party obtaining 50 per cent of the votes will govern. Why do Opposition members find this unacceptable? The truth is that in its present administration and present method of pre-selecting candidates the Liberal and Country League will never poll a majority vote in this State. This is borne out by an article in the *Australian* of July 23, headed "Change Your Tactics, or Face More Defeats—the L.C.L. Warned." It also shows a photograph of the Leader of the Opposition taken about 25 years ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot exhibit anything.

Mr. BROOMHILL: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I will quote from the article:

The problems facing Labor when the next election comes round pale beside those of the Liberal and Country League in their attempts to get back into power. Political observers in South Australia agree the L.C.L. now lacks popular appeal.

Then appear some references by Mr. R. L. Reid, of Adelaide University, and the article concludes:

It would appear that Mr. Reid is right in saying that the L.C.L. can no longer rely on the electoral system to work in the Party's favour. And the Party—if it is to have any hope of gaining power under the present electoral system must revamp its organization and its candidates and make an all-out appeal to these fringe dwellers—even if it means upsetting sitting members.

On the opposite page in the same newspaper there was a comparison of the results of the last two elections held in South Australia, and I have been amazed to find that, when those figures have been quoted by members on this side, members on the opposite side have tried to challenge them. These official figures show the percentages of the votes polled by the A.L.P. and by the L.C.L. and they do not include any other political Party. In 1962 the L.C.L. polled 34.50 per cent as against the A.L.P.'s 54.54 per cent of the votes. In 1965 the L.C.L. polled 35.93 per cent as against the A.L.P.'s 55.04 per cent of votes cast.

Mr. Shannon: How many uncontested seats were there in those elections?

Mr. BROOMHILL: The honourable member for Glenelg answered that question and pointed out that these percentages reacted in favour, taking into account the uncontested seats, of the Opposition; so the honourable member for Onkaparinga had best leave that question well alone. As a result of the figures



quoted it becomes obvious why we find Opposition from members on the other side to a Bill that provides for a majority vote to determine the Government. If all they could poll in 1962 was 34 per cent of the votes and in 1965 only 35 per cent of the votes, what hope would the Opposition have, under a fair electoral system, of attaining to Government? It is only natural that after a period of Labor Administration the stocks of the members of the Opposition will fall even lower and, therefore, a fair proposition on electoral boundaries is totally unacceptable to them. The people of South Australia well aware of this, have clearly indicated in the past that, despite the basis of the Opposition attitude on this, they wanted the Government to introduce this Bill.

I add briefly my support to those members who have presented a case for an increase in this House to 56 members. I was surprised to find the member for Mitcham supporting this provision. I listened carefully to the Leader of the Opposition when he was making his address on this matter, and I noticed that he did not indicate his attitude on it. My reason for paying particular attention was that soon after the State election last March I had the pleasure of seeing the Leader in a television interview, when he was asked what his attitude would be to an increase in the number of members of the House of Assembly. He made no bones about his attitude and said that it would be needless to increase the membership, and that it would be a waste of money to do so. It is interesting to note that, although the Leader remains silent on that, doubtless his view has not met with the approval of the Central Executive of the Liberal and Country League and he has been required to make no further comments. However, we occasionally find members on that side of the House (in this case, the member for Mitcham) coming out openly in support of this proposition.

I think the figures I shall give have already been cited, but they are interesting. In 1890 this House of Assembly had a membership of 54 and at present there are 50 members in the Lower House in Western Australia. When we compare this with the 96 members in New South Wales, we see that these figures alone justify the increases provided for in this Bill. I do not complain to members of my own particular difficulties, but it is important that we consider the individual members of this House. My district of West Torrens has been a source of concern to both this Government and the previous Government, because there has been a rapid growth in the district resulting in many

new housing areas being established for young families. They are constantly faced with various problems and require assistance from their member of Parliament.

With the number of electors rapidly approaching 40,000, I am in the same position as other members who have said that they find much difficulty in becoming familiar with all the problems of the electors in their districts. The previous Government recognized this, and, even though the proposal that it put forward in 1963 was totally unacceptable to the A.L.P., its only redeeming feature was that that Government recognized that West Torrens was too big for one member and proposed to divide it into two districts, West Torrens and Henley Beach.

I have cited my own circumstances in order to justify this increase and I consider it unfair to the people of this State when their member of Parliament is so far away that they are not familiar with him in any respect. Parliament is not properly fulfilling its function when members cannot give the assistance that the general public require.

The situation in the Legislative Council and the Bill before the House affecting the Council were also embodied in the Premier's election policy speech and the public of South Australia is expecting this Bill to pass both Houses. The important feature of the proposals to alter the existing position in the Legislative Council is the provision for the use of identical rolls in both Houses. I consider that this alteration removes the greatest objection to the present method of electing members to that Chamber.

Mr. Shannon: Do you favour the abolition of the Legislative Council?

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes; I have no time for the Legislative Council. In my view, the practices we have noted during the life of this Government justify my stand.

Mr. Shannon: Don't you think it is a Chamber of review?

Mr. BROOMHILL: It has been pointed out by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) that it is not a Chamber of review but a Chamber of privilege. Members opposite have maintained, in support of their ideals about the voluntary vote, that if we have identical rolls we shall be faced with the same sort of Government in both Houses, but that has seemed to work well for the past 30 years, and there was no objection from members opposite that the same Party held power in both Houses. It is surprising to me, therefore, that they now find this to be a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. This position applies

in the Commonwealth field, where there is compulsory voting for both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The answer to this problem of the same line of thought in both Houses appears when we find that the length of office varies, so that any significant change against the Government is felt by reaction in this direction. But it becomes amusing to find members opposite suddenly discovering something objectionable in the Government of the day having a majority in both Houses of Parliament, when this position has obtained for so long.

Mr. Hudson: Their objection is really to having a majority of Labor members in the Legislative Council in any circumstances.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes. The present position is that the great majority of the South Australian people elect a Government. They elect it in the House of Assembly, only to find that the arguments of the Opposition here are used by members of the Legislative Council, so that obviously when the Legislative Council does follow the Party line, as it has done so far, we have a denial of the rights of the electors of this State. A problem that we must all face (and this must concern members opposite) is the present small percentage of people appearing on the electoral roll for the Upper House, and the even smaller percentage of people who actually record their votes. This arises from confusion in the minds of the electors. At the Commonwealth level, they are required to vote for the House of Representatives and the Senate, yet they find a different position at the State level. All members who have spent any time at a polling booth in the past during an election for the Legislative Council have found people arguing that they are on the Legislative Council roll when in fact they believe this simply because they are on the Senate roll. They feel that as a result of this they should automatically have a vote for the Legislative Council of this State. So the lack of understanding by the public does not substantiate the argument put forward by members opposite about voluntary voting.

Over the past 10 years the confusion in the minds of the public about voting for the Legislative Council has worsened with the large numbers of migrants who have settled here. These people have had great difficulty with language problems and find it hard to understand what their rights are. They are starting to form a substantial number of voters in South Australia. This lesson was brought home to me by a person who, recently

naturalized, approached me on problems he had in filling out an application to be placed on the Legislative Council roll. One has only to read the application to realize the difficulties that these people, as well as other members of the public, have. I suggest that many members of the community become so confused over the form that they throw it away. The front of it is fairly straightforward, as it merely seeks details of address, occupation and date of birth. However, on the back of the form the applicant is asked to provide information about the qualification he possesses, and underneath the property qualification item appears the following:

Here state No. of qualification only. See list below.

The new citizen who asked me to assist him had a look at the four property qualifications on the form, and asked my advice. These qualifications are that the person is the owner of a freehold estate, the registered leaseholder in possession of a leasehold estate of the clear annual value of £20, the registered proprietor of a Crown lease, or an inhabitant occupier of a dwellinghouse. For the applicant to discover whether he is an inhabitant occupier of a dwellinghouse (the person who approached me thought it was some sort of animal) he is instructed to see the directions on the envelope, where (e) provides:

No person is entitled to be enrolled by reason of being a joint occupier of a dwellinghouse. For the purpose of this qualification, a dwellinghouse means any structure of a permanent character, being a fixture to the soil, which is ordinarily capable of being used for human habitation. A part of a building may be a dwellinghouse for the purpose of this qualification if it is separately occupied as a dwelling; but when the premises in respect of which the claim is made are only part of a building, and any other part of the building is in the occupation, as a dwelling, of some person other than the claimant, the part occupied by the claimant is not a dwellinghouse, for the purpose of this qualification, unless it is structurally severed from such other part of the building and there is no direct means of access between such parts.

I suggest that the average new citizen who wades through this and tries to work out what it means will soon place the claim in the rubbish bin.

Mr. Hudson: Perhaps that is what he is meant to do.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Yes, perhaps it is. This seems a difficult way to become enrolled. All these difficulties would be overcome if we had the same electoral roll for both Houses, as people would then know what was required of them and there would be no confusion. Then

the people of this State would be able to express their views by way of the polling box. I support the Bill, as I recognize that South Australians as a whole have endorsed the principle it contains. I commend the measure to the House.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (Eyre): As a member representing one of the larger electoral districts of this State, I cannot let this debate pass without protesting against the Bill. The Premier said that country representation would not be reduced, but how can the people of my district believe this? They now have one seat in a House of 39 members; under the Bill they will have one seat out of 56. Even worse than this would be the boundary fixed as the dividing line between the city and country. The rural representation in the House would be so limited that primary producers, who provide so much for the benefit of the State, would scarcely have any representation at all. How will outlying districts be developed without somebody to state their needs?

The statements by Government members to the effect that they are concerned with country interests remind me of their promises in relation to the ton-mile tax introduced last year. My electors can well do without that sort of concern, which, incidentally, was reversed as soon as the Labor Party came into power. Country people are worried about the increasing numbers leaving their districts, and about the fact that more may leave if some of the Government's plans relating to transport as well as other matters are effected. They desire better water supplies, better roads and better education. The Government's plan can only work against the State's development; I register my opposition to it, and hope that a Liberal and Country League Government will soon be restored to power, so that it can legislate effectively for electoral districts such as mine, and so that our great resources can again be developed. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): As a country member, I am not in favour of a Bill that takes representation away from country districts. I find it amusing to hear the Government's views, having listened to many speeches in the House over the years in relation to altering electoral boundaries, for I well remember a powerful speech made some years ago by the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran), who was a most forceful and convincing speaker, in relation to Labor's policy at that time, namely, proportional representation. However, we do not seem to hear much about that proposal these days. Of course, it is

understandable that Government members should be strongly in favour of the Bill and that members of the Liberal and Country League should oppose it. It has been publicly stated that if this Bill is carried in its present form, the L.C.L. will be kept out of Government for 25 years. We have only to read *Hansard* to find that the proposals of the former Government were designed to keep a Labor Government out of Government for a similar period. Therefore, it is a case of Tweedle Dum and Tweedle Dee.

Mr. McKee: Dog eat dog!

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It is understandable that the major political Parties support the type of electoral boundary that suits them most favourably. We witness such a spectacle in relation to this Bill. I cannot support the measure in its present form, although I think a case can justifiably be made out for an increase in the number of House of Assembly members, based on the increased population since the present number (39) was originally fixed. As the member for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) just pointed out, 54 members were in the House many years ago. The problem is not an easy one. I believe that the correct and most democratic way to approach this problem is to appoint a proper commission to make a full inquiry into the necessity for altering the electoral boundaries with a view to giving proper representation to the people and adequate representation in Parliament to rural areas. We must remember that this is a primary-producing State; most of the wealth coming from primary producers. It would be wrong in principle, while that position obtains, to have the electoral boundaries so adjusted that the major representation in Parliament would come from those living within 20 miles of the Adelaide G.P.O. From the rural point of view that position could not be sustained.

I have tested the matter of electoral boundaries for some time in my District of Ridley. Both two years ago and one year ago a proposal to alter the boundaries was made by a commission. Strangely enough many electors of Ridley were opposed to any alteration to its boundaries. I do not know whether that commission brought down the correct finding. However, it probably had no alternative because of the terms of reference which told it to come down with an alteration to the boundaries. Therefore, I believe that the right approach to the problem is to appoint a commission to make a proper inquiry into the question of boundaries bearing in mind the need for adequate representation of rural areas,

as we are a primary-producing State. Attention should also be given to arriving at a proportionate balance with the metropolitan area. It is quite understandable for the present Government to want more representation on its side of the House and to attempt to obtain this by adding strength to the metropolitan area. However, I believe the country versus city aspect has gone too far.

Recent legislation has provided that those living within a 25-mile radius of the metropolitan area are exempted from paying the same tax as country people to travel over roads. Has the pendulum swung the other way and is the metropolitan area to be free of paying some taxes and at the same time to have increased representation? That does not seem justified at all. It is now up to all members to press for proper representation in Parliament and to see that if there are taxes to be paid for a public utility then everyone should pay proportionately. We should see that exemptions are not given to one section of the community where a public utility is provided for the benefit of the State as a whole. That same principle should apply to the representation in Parliament. We should see that adequate representation is given to country districts and to those people who toil long and hard hours in order to provide the revenue for the State so that people in the city can live comfortably and enjoy the amenities they enjoy today.

Country and city people have a special part to play; they all live together in this wonderful State. Consequently I cannot accept an argument from either side of the House to alter the electoral boundaries so that one political way of thought is fostered. That is not the right approach to the question of electoral boundaries. An increase in the number of members in the House of Assembly is justified, but I do not believe the Bill approaches the question in the correct way. Let us have a proper commission that will conduct an adequate inquiry into all these systems such as proportional representation, one vote one value, and all these other things and bring in a proper and well thought out report that will best suit this State.

I am confident that I am expressing the views of most people in my District of Ridley, who oppose any alteration of boundaries at the present time. I hope the Government Party will give some further thought to the policy it had many years ago of proportional representation, and that it will explain why it has abandoned that policy and come up with this

policy of one vote one value. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I draw the attention of some of my friends on the Government benches to what happened in this place in 1954 when we dealt with this sticky problem of rearranging electoral boundaries. The late Mr. M. R. O'Halloran was the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber at the time, and I do not think anybody could have made a better attack on the Bill presented by the Playford Government for a redistribution of boundaries than did the late honourable member. His counterpart in another place, the late Hon. Frank Condon, following in his footsteps, did exactly the same thing: he condemned the proposal out of hand. Do any honourable gentlemen present recall the upshot? The honourable member for West Torrens will be interested in this, because he spoke a moment ago about certain strings being pulled to make the Party members jump. The honourable member is young and he should learn about these things. The late Mr. O'Halloran condemned this redistribution legislation out of hand in 1954, but no division was called. As the honourable member for Glenelg was in his baby suit at the time, he would not know; but I know what happened. The Labor Party members in this Chamber were informed by their outside masters that it looked as though this was an opportunity for them to gain power. They were told, "You vote for this distribution that Playford has brought in; it looks a fair bet to us, so vote for it", and vote for it they did. This is on record in the proceedings of this Parliament. I was a member of the House at the time, and I heard Mr. O'Halloran—

Mr. Hudson: I have read what he said.

Mr. SHANNON: What did he say?

Mr. Hudson: He condemned it but said, in effect, that some improvement was better than the existing situation.

Mr. SHANNON: Wouldn't it make one laugh to hear an honourable member who is a very versatile, well informed and very well educated member trying to tell us that whilst Mr. O'Halloran condemned the Bill he still felt it was an improvement and he would vote for it? In my Parliamentary experience I have never heard anything so puerile. I was present when the Bill was dealt with, but the member for Glenelg was still at school (perhaps he should still be there) and knew nothing about what happened. Those of us who were here saw at first hand what the

pulling of strings can do. This is the so-called gerrymander, which was voted for without division in both Houses of Parliament. If any member wants to argue I shall be pleased to hear from him. The member for West Torrens suggested that the member for Mitcham was told what he should do.

Mr. Hudson: Wasn't he?

Mr. SHANNON: It was suggested that he was told by an organization outside this Chamber.

Mr. Broomhill: I'll bet you are not a member of it!

Mr. SHANNON: I am.

Mr. Hudson: You are one of the faceless men?

Mr. SHANNON: No, my face is well known. The member for Mitcham disclosed, as clearly as can be, that members on this side are free agents and can vote without being told by people outside how to vote. The member for Glenelg has joined a Party a member of which learns that he must do what he is told, or else. A good example of this is my friend, the member for Burra, who suffered because of the rules. He was a member of the Labor Party at that time and I admired him for his outspokenness. However, the Party did not like it and he was quietly dumped because of his individuality. If that is the way we are to govern this country, I suggest it is not in the best interest of anyone. This is the most remarkable and interesting Bill I have read in my long Parliamentary experience. Never did I expect that a Government, of any political colour, would have the courage to present a Bill like this.

Mr. Ryan: You admit the Government has courage.

Mr. SHANNON: Never in my wildest dreams did I think that anyone would have the effrontery to present to decent, honest, working class people, which we all are, a Bill in this form. Its provisions are extraordinary, especially when they come from a Party that will ask the voters of South Australia to support its continuance in office. New section 79 (3) states:

For the purposes of subsection (1) of this section electoral districts of 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.

In season and out of season I have heard Government members say that they believe in one vote one value. It has been said so often that I am almost tired of listening to it. Whether or not this is an indication—I have

some doubts about this, and I do not want to be unfair—apparently the cry of "one vote one value" has been discarded and there can be a modicum of variation in the voting strengths of various districts. I have not heard one member of the Government speak on that matter, but it would be helpful if we could have a statement from the Government benches that the policy of one vote one value has been dropped. They may say that it is unfair and unjust, but I suppose I am asking too much. Perhaps talking is not the only way of looking at this matter. Perhaps if we read what has been prepared for our consideration we can draw our own conclusions, and apparently this peculiar idea of certain members of the Government Party has been, if not dropped, at least shelved, because this Bill does not contain it. Continuing, subsection (4) states:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (1), (2), and (3) of this section 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 numbers of electors shall be more than 15 per cent below the electoral quota. This is one more step away from the idea of one vote one value but only for two districts! I will not, as some honourable members have done, suggest that I know where those two peculiar districts are. I draw my own conclusions as to where the thinking of the Labor Party, which prepared this Bill, really lies. The Party is prepared even to forego the 15 per cent disparity now and not tell the commission what the disparity should be. It could be anything; it is delightfully vague, so vague that no figure is mentioned. It could be 50 per cent if the commission so decided; it could cut the quota in half.

Mr. Lawn: Does the honourable member say that the Bill is vague?

Mr. SHANNON: I am telling the honourable member for Adelaide that I have read the Bill and I understand it.

Mr. Lawn: So the Bill is vague, is it?

Mr. SHANNON: It is so delightfully vague that I am sure that if it is passed in its present form I, as a member of Parliament, shall have no further voice in the redistribution of votes.

Mr. Lawn: It could be called "Shannon's Protection Bill".

Mr. SHANNON: I do not think for a moment that the honourable member for Adelaide is genuine. He was well and truly geared when I recounted former history in which he took part and for which he voted. He voted for it without any compunction. It was a case

of, "I have been told by my masters what I have to do. If I do not do it, I will be like poor Bill Quirke, now on the outer." He did what he was told and voted for the 1954 legislation. I have quoted the subsection that deals with the re-distribution and with those two peculiar districts that need not comply with the 15 per cent margin. It said:

... provided that in not more than two electoral districts the number of electors shall be more than fifteen per cent below the electoral quota.

I have said that there is to be no limit. I should like to hear from any member who can honestly say he is prepared to give an open cheque such as this to anybody outside this Chamber. Will the member for Adelaide agree that two districts can be so subdivided that their numerical strength is anything the commissioners decide? There is no specified number, no specified percentage and no direction of any kind. This is the most unusual type of legislation that I have seen. I have never seen such unusual verbiage in legislation. We have had much talk from the Government benches that the Bill will not deny the country of any of the present 26 seats, but the Government forgets to tell the country interests that it is intended to flood them with metropolitan districts. Despite the peculiar conditions laid down for the re-distribution of districts, the Government intends to so outweigh the country vote that for all time the country will be subservient to people who are close enough to listen to the G.P.O. clock chiming. That is the intention of the legislation. New section 80 (a) (ii) states:

Not less than 26 electoral districts shall be wholly within the country area. In this section "country area" means any area outside the areas comprised in the electoral districts for the House of Assembly of Adelaide, Torrens, Prospect, Thebarton, Hindmarsh, Semaphore, Port Adelaide, Norwood, Burnside, Unley, Mitcham, Goodwood and Glenelg as such electoral districts were defined at the time of the passing of the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act, 1954.

If it is fair to put the clock back in order to achieve an electoral advantage for a Party, it is fair to put the clock back another 50 years. If it is a reasonable proposition to put it back 12 years, obviously it is only a matter of degree. The Government is found guilty of providing an electoral advantage for its Party by putting the clock back 12 years. I suggest that if that is fair successive Parliaments can forget time. It may be appropriate to go back 20, 25 or 30 years. A Government can go back any period at all to define an area in a way that happens to suit it. This cannot be

disputed. As my German friends say, the facts are here for us to read in "black on white". In other words, he who runs may read! It is a plain statement of fact that this Government is prepared to accept a basis for assessing what is and what is not an area by putting the clock back 12 years. The Government is guilty. I hear no comment, so obviously it is guilty of that sin. It is one of the things that I hope members of Parliament will eschew for all time—the endeavour so to rig the districts that they may enjoy an advantage by virtue of defining some area of the State for their own advantage. If this were an honest Bill (I emphasize the word "if") it would have left the definition of "metropolitan area" to the commission. Apparently we cannot even trust it with all these hedgings around. With all the directions we are giving them, we still cannot trust them.

Mr. Lawn: You said earlier—

Mr. SHANNON: I am saying now that the Bill as presented, except in defining the metropolitan area, except in saying that there may be two districts with less votes than any other district, and except in saying that certain other districts may have 15 per cent one way or the other, gives us a fairly clear go. However, we have not finished; we have only just started; we do not trust this Commission! It could possibly do the wrong thing, as it could by mischance bring in a recommendation for redistribution that failed to meet with our approval. I am sorry; when I said "we" I meant members opposite. Neither I nor members opposite on the back benches would have a say on whether it was a fair and reasonable distribution.

Mr. Lawn: Who does not trust the commission now?

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member will not have a say, either.

Mr. Lawn: I trust the commission.

Mr. SHANNON: Unfortunately the honourable member does not, as I will disclose. That is obvious from the wording of the Bill, and after I have read it to the honourable member he will understand that. After the commission has made a survey of the situation and brought in its recommendation for a redistribution, Executive Council will have a look at it. If Executive Council makes a proclamation it becomes law, but if it does not (there is nothing to say it must) the mountain will have brought forth a mouse, and all the commission has done will come to naught because we do not like it. Every member should accept the full responsibility for what he does, but this Bill denies

him that right. It denies him any right to accept responsibility for what happens under it, and because of that I have no hesitation in opposing it. I came into this House without making promises: I came here to represent my people honestly, fairly, and without fear.

Mr. McKee: Put up a proposal and we may accept it. Have you anything in mind?

Mr. SHANNON: Yes, we have something very definite in mind, but the honourable member will probably vote against it, as I have no doubt that he has been told how he must vote. His masters outside this Chamber—people not connected with Parliament—have already said, "Don't you vote for the move of that fool Playford, who wants the Bill withdrawn and redrafted." Members opposite must vote as they are told or they are out, and I believe they will vote on this Bill as they have been told.

Mr. Hudson: How many times did you kick against the previous Premier?

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member is a babe in the woods. Had he been in this Chamber as long as some of my honourable friends, not excluding you, Mr. Speaker, he would have known that on several occasions I was not only allowed to speak against my Government but was allowed to vote against it and still retain my membership of the Party I was sent here to represent. How strange! I am happy to say that during my long Parliamentary life I have always maintained the right to speak and vote as my conscience dictates.

Mr. Hudson: How often have you exercised that right?

Mr. SHANNON: I suggest that the member for Glenelg examine *Hansard*; he need only peruse the division lists.

Mr. Hudson: When was the last time—1915?

Mr. SHANNON: The first time would be more interesting. It was in 1934 when I was exactly as old, Parliamentary-wise, as the member for Glenelg is at present—one poor lean year. I opposed not only my Government but my own Party.

Mr. Hudson: But the boss wasn't Premier then!

Mr. SHANNON: It was the late Sir Richard Butler whom I opposed, as well as the Attorney-General (the late Sir Shirley Jeffries)—

Mr. McKee: He was a fair sort of a boundary rider!

Mr. SHANNON: —the late Hon. R. J. Rudall, the late Mr. C. L. Abbott (later a

judge of the Supreme Court), and Mr. Baden Pattinson, as he then was. At that time we had a poor representation of Labor members in the House. The member for Glenelg may some day wish to do as I have done—and survive (although whether he will survive or not, I make no promise, having seen some unfortunate circumstances, such as those relating to Mr. Cyril Chambers and to my friend the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke).

At the time, a Bill was presented to Parliament to provide for the Bank of Adelaide certain rights additional to those of any other banking institution in the State, which I opposed.

Mr. Hudson: That wouldn't have set the cat among the pigeons.

Mr. SHANNON: I must have been the cat, and the Party to which the honourable member belongs, the pigeons. I gathered to my bosom sufficient of the good, stout, loyal friends of my Party to obtain a majority vote against the Bill. I survived, and still am a member of my Party. If the member for Glenelg desires to know of any other instances—

Mr. Hudson: Tell us one after 1938.

Mr. SHANNON: There was a Bill relating to electricity that I opposed. Apparently, I was often on the wrong leg, but always survived the political vicissitudes of having a mind of my own and the courage to express it. If the member for Glenelg can pluck up sufficient courage to do just that, I shall admire him.

Mr. Hudson: Was that the last time you opposed your Government?

Mr. SHANNON: New section 81 (1) states:

The commission shall also divide the State into five electoral districts for the Legislative Council. Four of such Council districts shall each consist of 11 whole Assembly districts and one of such Council districts shall consist of 12 whole Assembly districts. The commission shall also make the determination specified in section 11a of this Act.

No reference is made in this new subsection to sparsely settled areas, to difficulties of communication or to the many other problems that face small districts of the House of Assembly. On this occasion the commissioners have been adroitly left with an absolutely blank cheque—they can please themselves. If that is the way the Government wants to handle the matter, well and good. I cannot be a party to it; I could never be a party to signing blank cheques.

We now come to the nub of the argument. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) ably

drew attention to new section 84, and unfortunately he received a poor press. I was disappointed because I believed the honourable member put his finger on quite a few gross errors of draftsmanship and gross attempts to lead Parliament into the byways and highways where it cannot have a say about certain things. The honourable member did an excellent job and I compliment him on the speech he made. The marginal note of new section 84 states:

Recommendations to have force of law on promulgation by the Governor.

That note is designed so that one can understand what one is going to read about. New section 84 states:

At such time as the Governor shall deem fit the Governor shall publish the report and recommendations of the Commission in the *Gazette* and upon such publication, notwithstanding anything in this Act to the contrary— which means that I cannot amend this new section because I am not allowed to—

the names and boundaries of the several electoral districts for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council set forth in such report shall, as on and from the day of the first general election of members of the House of Assembly to be held next after such publication, without reference to Parliament—

I do not think I have ever seen the words "without reference to Parliament" in any legislation in all my experience of over 30 years. They are mandatory and unequivocal and no two meanings can be placed on them; they are plain, simple, English words that everyone can understand. Undoubtedly the Government is fearful that there might possibly be some slip or mistake made and that some valued member of that Party could have his seat in jeopardy as a result of recommended redistribution by the commission.

In such an event we do not issue a proclamation. It is just as simple as that. The Executive does not issue a proclamation, and nothing happens. As I said before, it will be a case of, "The mountain brought forth a mouse, and the mouse will be buried." If this is the sort of legislation that this Government is going to present to this House, then I say frankly that the sooner the electors of South Australia can get an opportunity of saying what they think of this type of legislation the better it will be for South Australia.

Mr. McKee: They have given us a mandate for it.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support the Bill. I have the greatest respect for the honourable member for Onkaparinga, who is a very forceful and a very fair debater on most occasions.

However, I think that on this occasion he reminisced a little too much. It reminded me of a talk I had with some people in Scotland about 10 months ago, when I was told: "We in Scotland are not like the Northern Irish; we do not live in the past; we live in the present." I think honourable members should realize that to reminisce is perhaps all right in some circumstances, but in cases like this I think it is best to leave reminiscing alone and get on with the job as we see it at the present time.

I was rather surprised at some things said by honourable members opposite in debating this Bill. I must confess that I agree, strangely enough, with much of what the honourable member for Mitcham, and also the honourable member for Albert, had to say on this matter. However, when we get down to the basis of the contents of the Bill we part company entirely. The member for Mitcham supports the principle of one vote one value, as I do. In fact, I supported that principle in this House when we debated the Electoral Bill presented by the previous Government. On that occasion I said that while I agreed with the principle of one vote one value I did not think it was humanly possible to incorporate it in an electoral system in a State such as ours. I went on to say that we have vast, sparsely populated areas and that it was not humanly possible to have an equal number of voters in each district throughout the State. I made that clear when I spoke on that Electoral Bill in this House several years ago, and I make it clear again now.

All the various factors have to be considered, and they have been considered in this Bill. I heard the honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) say that under this Bill his district would be increased by about 10,000 square miles. If that area were added to his district at present it would still not be half as big as mine is at present, yet under the earlier legislation the previous Government wanted to increase my district by about 5,000 square miles. That would have killed not only me but any member who came after me. I will make no bones about that, because in these sparsely populated areas, as the member for Albert said, there is a big responsibility to the electors the same as there is in the more densely populated areas, but to see these people the member has an enormous task and one that cannot be taken lightly. The former Government did not consider these sparsely populated areas, but we have done this under this Bill. It has always been on the Labor Party's platform that we should divide the State into 56



seats, and that is a good move. The State warrants more members of Parliament because of the increased population. In order to do this we want to retain, as we know it today, the country representation in this House, namely, 26 members, and we are prepared to do that. The remainder will be formed from the nucleus of the existing seats contained in the Bill. Members opposite have openly criticized the policy behind the principle of one vote one value. We heard much about American politics from the member for Mitcham and the member for Light, whom I will attack vigorously in a few moments. The member for Mitcham said that in America they did not believe in the policy of one vote one value, or words to that effect.

Mr. Heaslip: What is the meaning of one vote one value?

Mr. CASEY: I was in the United States of America when this question was before the Supreme Court of America, which ruled that all elections should be on an equal basis, and stated:

Elections are equal when an equal number of citizens in one part of the State choose as many representatives as are chosen by the same number of citizens in another part of the State.

That is the definition.

Mr. Heaslip: You are not doing that.

Mr. CASEY: The member for Rocky River is joking about this, and is not prepared to accept the ruling of these learned gentlemen. Members opposite tell us about American politics and how we should follow their style. Here it is in black and white, and this was passed whilst I was in the States last year.

Mr. Coumbe: Why don't you follow it?

Mr. Heaslip: That is one vote one value, but you are not doing that.

Mr. CASEY: We hear much about the rural production of South Australia. I am a practising farmer and proud to be one, and represent an area that is definitely rural. Also, I live in my district. We have heard much from Opposition members who said that primary producers will not be adequately represented in this Parliament. I think they will be.

Mr. Heaslip: I am sure they won't.

Mr. CASEY: I am sure they will. The context of the Opposition's argument is that the wealth of this State comes from primary production. I think much wealth comes from primary production, but unfortunately for the argument that the overwhelming value is from primary production in South Australia, if one takes commodity production in this State one finds the value of primary production as defined

by members opposite, is only half the value of secondary production. Let me point out to honourable members how the States compare with regard to primary production. In 1963-64 wheat production in other States, as compared with our mighty wheat production, was as follows: New South Wales, 122,472,000 bushels; Victoria, 76,302,000; Western Australia, 72,500,000; and South Australia, 53,971,000. This is the wealth of the State; and comparison can also be made with regard to other cereal crops.

I turn now to figures on cattle production, which read: New South Wales, 4,789,000; Victoria, 3,301,000; South Australia 694,000; and Western Australia, double the production of South Australia. Sheep figures read: New South Wales, 71,764,000; Victoria, 28,413,000; and South Australia, 16,403,000. I do not complain that we are not producing in South Australia; I think we are doing a magnificent job. The State is progressing, but of course it is progressing at a faster rate as regards secondary industry than it is with primary production.

Mr. Quirke: Your figures are highly misleading. You should quote acreages. You talk about the primary production of the State, but you should devote more attention to the acreages planted.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible interjection.

Mr. Jennings: Was it audible, Mr. Speaker? I could not hear a thing.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Enfield is out of order.

Mr. CASEY: Returning to the Bill, I will now speak of the set-up of the Legislative Council. I will go this far and admit that two heads are better than one, and if for some reason or other a second House were permitted I would go along with it, provided that it was what it was constituted to be, and that is a House of Review. That is contrary to the Labor Party's policy, which advocates the abolition of the Upper House. As it is constituted today, the Legislative Council is nothing more than a Party House. Whenever members of the other place are mentioned in the press, the letters "L.C.L." or "A.L.P." appear after their names.

Mr. McKee: They even have a Leader of the Opposition there now.

Mr. CASEY: Yes. I consider that there should not be in another place Ministers representing the Government of the State. All Ministers should be from the Lower House. I repeat that I would go along with the idea of having an Upper House that was definitely a

House of Review and a Lower House elected by the people. It has been proved in the last few years that an Upper House that is a Party House becomes a rubber stamp for a Liberal and Country League Government. The member for Onkaparinga said that an Electoral Bill had been passed by both Houses. That was because the Government had a majority in both Houses. Naturally, the Bill would be passed.

We find today that the Upper House can be the greatest embarrassment to the Government by throwing out legislation dealing with revenue matters. I have heard much said about Socialistic tendencies and have had such things thrown up at me when I was on the other side of the House. It is the policy of the Communist world today to entice the free world to move into situations where the free world can be bled economically. These political tactics are used by country against country, and we are seeing a similar pattern operating in South Australia today.

**Mr. McKee:** At the expense of the progress of the State.

**Mr. CASEY:** There is no doubt about that. On March 6, 1965, the 562,824 electors on the House of Assembly roll were told that it was compulsory for them to vote for the election of members of the House of Assembly. As the member for Burra knows, if they did not vote, they had to pay a fine of £2. I believe in compulsory voting. People should have an interest in the election of members to this Parliament.

I have always been under the impression that this House is the Parliament of South Australia, the seat of Government, not another place. I heard the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Premier of this State, saying exactly the same thing about two o'clock one morning, when he became frustrated on a matter. He told the Legislative Council in no uncertain terms who was the Government of South Australia. The Legislative Council, which is a disfranchised place, had 213,377 electors on its roll at March 6, 1965, and all of them would not have voted, because voting was not compulsory. That meant that 349,447 people did not have a voice in the election of members of the Legislative Council. That is a disgusting state of affairs. A member of Parliament can represent a district in this House and still not be eligible to vote for the Upper House.

**Mr. Quirke:** Where does he live?

**Mr. Hudson:** He lived in Mitcham for a while.

**Mr. CASEY:** There are occasions when the wife of a man who is the occupier of a house can have a dozen degrees from the best university in the world but she is not entitled to vote for the Legislative Council of this State.

**Mr. Quirke:** She could if our Bill had been accepted, but you voted against it.

**Mr. CASEY:** I have nothing to be ashamed of. The member for Light can come out with a statement with no basic truth in it. In fact, it is an untruth; I can define it as a lie. The member for Gouger can laugh, but I expect members opposite to treat us with the same courtesy as we treat them. The member for Light gets up and makes statement after statement having no basic truth. I challenge him on that.

**Mr. Freebairn:** To which statement are you referring?

**Mr. CASEY:** The honourable member knows to what I am referring. I take exception to that type of tactic. This has been the policy of the Opposition all the way along the line as far as I can see. It is high time that the people of South Australia realized the effrontery of another place. It is doing this State and its people immeasurable harm. It is done for a political motive only. I support the Bill.

**The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra):** First, let me say that not everybody on this side of the House supports the opinion of the member for Frome.

**Mr. Casey:** The majority do.

**The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN:** Some of the more recent work done by another place is regarded in South Australia as most responsible in response to irresponsible action by this place. I fully support the principle of the Upper House and believe that most South Australians do, too. While we have often heard members opposite say that the other place—

**Mr. Lawn:** Put them all on the one roll.

**The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN:** —should be abolished, we have not heard them refer frequently to what happened in New South Wales not long ago when every effort was made by the Government to get rid of the Upper House, elected on a completely different and much narrower system than our Upper House. The people of New South Wales, when they got an opportunity to express their opinion, stated unhesitatingly that they wished to retain the Upper House. The New South Wales Upper House has been retained, and I believe South Australians would speak with even more

emphasis. Whatever shallow statements members opposite make, their policy is eventual abolition of the Upper House. That is what they believe in and what they would move for if they were consistent. However, they have introduced a Bill with a peculiar system that erodes the present position of the Upper House without actually putting into effect the policy they are pledged to support.

I favour the bicameral system and having the Upper House as it is, and I do not think the South Australian people have ever suffered one jot from its actions. On the other hand, there are many reasons for saying that the people have security through having an Upper House. I protest against this measure, as I do not think it has even a semblance of fairness about it.

When I first entered this House, and for several years thereafter, there was not a word to be found in *Hansard* about the electoral system. I do not know whether it is a tribute to the present member for Adelaide, but at least I acknowledge that when he entered this House he was seized with the idea that the electoral system was not to his liking. He wanted to see it altered, and he never ceased to mention it. Even when speaking on a measure such as a Bill to amend the Honey Marketing Act he would turn the debate around to show that the electoral system was unfair. However, before he entered this House there was scarcely a mention of it. If honourable members refer to *Hansard* they will see that it was not until the 1950's that the Labor Party started to talk about this matter seriously. Although they said in 1937 or 1938 that they disapproved the system, they submitted to it virtually without protest until the 1950's, and after the present member for Adelaide was elected they began to insist that there was something wrong with it.

Members of my Party acknowledged that the system was getting out of balance and tried to do something about it, but they could not get a constitutional majority to change it. We provided virtually for half the seats to be in the city and half to be in the country, but not one word of acknowledgment has ever been uttered by members opposite about that. They treated it as though it was some cynical approach towards improving our electoral position.

Mr. Hudson: And so it was.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am glad to hear that, because if ever there was a cynical approach to the electoral situation this Bill is a demonstration of it, and I will show

why. Members on this side of the House have acknowledged for some years the need for an alteration to the electoral system, but we were not prepared to go back to the 1954 definition of Adelaide and declare it to be the metropolitan area. How hollow is a Bill introduced in 1965 and based on the definition of the metropolitan area that applied in 1954. It simply demonstrates the real cynicism of the measure, for everybody knows that the metropolitan area has radically changed since 1954. Indeed, members of the Government Party acknowledge that fact in every other respect, but not when dealing with electoral matters, for then it does not suit them. Government members simply wish to ignore the change that has occurred in the metropolitan area since 1954, for their own material benefit. A House of Assembly with 56 members in a State of this size is quite unnecessary.

Mr. McKee: It is for the benefit of the people.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not think the present number is far from wrong, and I think Government members would acknowledge that, too, if it were not for the fact that their ultimate aim is to abolish the Legislative Council. There is another somewhat shallow (yet, I think, cogent) reason why the Labor Party wants 56 members. It wants to say to country people, "You are not losing members of Parliament." It disregards the fact that those 56 members will have less say in Parliament than the 39 members in the House at present have.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It will lose some country seats under these proposals.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. How ridiculous does the Bill become? The member for Frome went to America and came back with some information for his Party, which could be put over in an electoral Bill.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: This Bill does not do what he said America is doing.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No. All sorts of disparities in electoral numbers exist in the American States.

Mr. Hudson: Not from now on! The United States Supreme Court has ruled—

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We know that the member for Glenelg is full of up-to-date information.

Mr. Hudson: I am only trying to assist.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In fact, nearly all the electoral legislation in the world provides for tremendous disparities in relation to numbers of electors. If a person examined the numbers relating to House of Commons

electoral districts he would find one district is two or three times greater in number of electors than another district. We know that the principle of one vote one value does not even start to apply in relation to our Senate; it is deliberately circumvented by the provision that the States shall have equal representation.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What's the position relating to Labor Party conferences?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I thank my Leader for his helpful interjections, but if I started to elaborate on the undemocratic system in respect of Labor conferences I would be repeating only what I have said before. We know the complete unfairness and what might be called the oligarchic influence in the Labor Party Conference, and we also know that although the Labor Party is prepared to talk about democracy in Parliament it takes orders from the Labor Party executive outside this House. Earlier this session I demonstrated occasions when that occurred. I referred to one instance, and quoted chapter and verse about the Long Service Leave Bill introduced some years ago when the Labor Party was told what it should do and what it should oppose. It was given instructions not to move any amendments to the Bill, and it did not move any.

Mr. McKee: Are you talking about the Bill or the Labor Party?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I gave this instance in an earlier debate and the member for Port Pirie can look it up. I think he will find that his own Party is more than undemocratic, although it speaks about democracy in this Chamber. I do not agree with the way in which the Bill has been introduced, or with the comments of those members who have tried to justify it. The member for Frome did nothing more than run down the primary-producing influence in South Australia.

Mr. McKee: At the last election the people demonstrated that they did not agree with your Government's influence.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Frome ironically spoke about our mighty wheat-producing State and set out to prove that we really produced little wheat. He then set out to show that we were really not a very important primary-producing State. I do not know from where he got his information, but if he does not know by now the importance of primary industry to South Australia then he is not well equipped to be a member of this Parliament.

Mr. McKee: You know that is not true.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member set out to show that South Australia is not an important primary-producing State. I believe he has more than an interest in the Bill. He has to support it because it will protect his seat. All members know that if his district were enlarged numerically to meet the requirement for other districts his seat would become vulnerable, and possibly a Liberal seat. The Labor Party was faced with a problem. It had to try to bring in legislation that would not only comply with the principles favoured by the Party but also protect the interests of members of the Party. Therefore, it brought in this most peculiar system whereby the commissioners may provide for two extra seats. In an earlier debate I described this Bill as the Casey Protection Bill, and I think that is a fair comment.

Mr. Freebairn: It is the Casey Preservation Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Casey Protection Bill is good enough. One part of the Bill is designed to protect him. It is possible for the commissioners to create two seats with numbers different from the standard set for the other seats. Obviously there is only one explanation for this. It has been done so that the honourable member for Frome will not lose his seat. That is why honourable members opposite are so keen on this extraordinarily illogical provision for two extra seats. I have a little rhyme, which I think describes this Bill fairly adequately:

Oh Tom Casey tell me true,  
Is the Constitution Bill for you?  
If it is then what a shame  
That it does not bear your name.  
Two special districts in the Act  
Are there to keep your seat intact,  
South Australians will not bide  
Being taken for a ride.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that South Australians will not bide being taken for a ride. I do not think they will swallow this Constitution Bill any more than they are prepared to swallow some of the other iniquitous legislation that has been introduced into this Parliament within the last session. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support the Bill. I make it clear to certain members opposite that I am speaking this evening as the honourable member for Adelaide, representing about 19,000 people. There seems to be a feeling amongst certain members opposite that the Chairman of Committees should not participate in debate, but I make no apology for doing so when you are in the chair, Mr. Speaker, and

I am representing the people of Adelaide in this debate. I know that the Chairman of Committees cannot participate as much as he would sometimes like to do, but whenever I feel called upon to speak on behalf of the people I represent I intend to do so.

I thank the honourable member for Alexandra for his kind words about me. He may not realize it, but he put his finger on the very reason why I nominated to become a member of this House. When the 1948 pre-selection ballots were about to be held within my Party, it was suggested that I should nominate for the Senate.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Do you have a ballot in your Party?

Mr. LAWN: Yes.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What basis?

Mr. LAWN: One vote one value. As I was saying, it was suggested that I nominate for the Senate, but my reply was, "The fight's here in South Australia; before I die I want to see electoral justice in South Australia." That was the reason I nominated in our pre-selection in 1948 and became the member for Adelaide in 1950. As the honourable member for Alexandra has mentioned, I have never missed an opportunity of referring to that blot upon South Australia's history. One day some years ago, I think in 1957, when we celebrated the introduction of responsible Government, I said we were celebrating a day of irresponsible Government, and I made no apology for saying that.

Mr. Coumbe: That's an irresponsible statement.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member, of course, would not know. The honourable member for Alexandra also said that members on this side of the House did not give credit to primary producers in South Australia. That is not correct. We do give those people credit, but we say that the people in the metropolitan area are also important. Years ago I decried this business of pitting one section of the community against another. We are all people of South Australia, and British Parliamentary government, as I know it, means that we represent the people, not, as I have told members opposite before, sheep, cows, and stockyard confetti, or broadacres. Under the Parliamentary system, as we know it in the British Commonwealth of Nations, we are supposed to represent the people. While the honourable member was speaking, the Leader interjected and said that this Bill would take away from

the country some of its 26 members. The Bill provides:

In dividing the State into electoral districts for the House of Assembly the Commission shall have regard to the following criteria:

(ii) not less than 26 electoral districts shall be wholly within the country area. That shows the misrepresentation of members opposite. The Bill does not take away from country people any of the 26 country seats.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The metropolitan area only takes in half of Adelaide.

Mr. LAWN: It is the Leader's metropolitan area. The Labor Party has introduced a Bill to the Parliament of this State. What did the Leader's party do in 1936? It held a secret meeting and decided that it would distribute the seats in South Australia on the basis of two-thirds country and one-third metropolitan, or 26 seats to the country and 13 to the metropolitan area. This present Bill was introduced to Parliament, but the Leader's Party had a map that was analysed by the Electoral Department to see whether it would give 26 country seats and 13 metropolitan seats. The answer was "Yes". Without the knowledge of Parliament, the Leader's Party then obtained Judge Paine (Deputy Returning Officer of the State), the Surveyor-General, and the Attorney-General to analyse and report to the Government whether it could give 26 country seats and 13 metropolitan seats. When that committee said that it could, the Attorney-General (Sir Shirley Jeffries) introduced a Bill to Parliament. However, all that I have described was done without the knowledge of Parliament in 1936.

Opposition members say that this Bill will result in another gerrymander, but it wasn't done behind the public's back without anyone knowing what was going on except the Electoral Department. From 1936 until 1965 that action kept the people's Government out of office, because only once since then has the Liberal Party won an election in this State.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: When is the commission bringing its report before Parliament?

Mr. LAWN: The member for Onkaparinga said that the commission will have the authority to prescribe two districts without any particular number of electors, no minimum and no maximum. He criticized the provisions of the Bill and said that this authority should not be given to the commission. He then asked that when the commission had done its job would we have the opportunity to consider what it had done.

Mr. Shannon: No, the only people who will be able to are on the front bench. They will decide.

Mr. LAWN: In one minute the honourable member wanted to trust the commission and in the next he did not. The commission cannot do what the honourable member said it could do and that is to fix any two districts it likes or fix any quantity of electors without any reason at all. The Bill provides:

Notwithstanding the provision of subsections (1), (2) and (3) of this section the commission may, if it is satisfied that it is desirable for reasons—

It must have reasons, and they are:

of sparsity and remoteness of population and difficulties of communication, provided that, in not more than two electoral districts the number of electors shall be more than 15 per cent below the electoral quota.

They cannot just do it off their own bat.

Mr. Shannon: Why only two electorates?

Mr. LAWN: They must have regard to sparsity and remoteness of population and difficulties of communication. That is exactly what members opposite are belly-aching about all the time. The member for Albert and others have talked about large areas with small numbers of people. We have been twitted by members opposite for not speaking in this debate, but I point out that eight members out of 20 on this side of the House have spoken and it will be nine when the Premier makes his reply. Having regard to the fact that the Government wants this Bill through this session, that is not a bad proportion. I have been here since 1950 with the honourable member of Alexandra and I have participated in every debate of this nature during that period.

Mr. Shannon: Especially in 1954.

Mr. LAWN: On all occasions.

Mr. Shannon: In 1954 all the honourable member did was vote.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member is thinking of 1955.

Mr. Shannon: No, I am speaking of 1954 and the honourable member did vote on that occasion but did not speak.

Mr. LAWN: I think that when the honourable member referred to 1954 he was making reference to the commission's appointment. However, he is thinking of the time when the report came out in 1955 and he said that some outside body directed us to support the Bill.

Mr. Shannon: Why did you vote for it?

Mr. LAWN: The late Leader supported it. The Leader and I discussed that report and we could see that if it was carried, whilst

it was not electoral justice, it would ultimately benefit this Party, and that can be seen tonight.

Mr. Shannon: And that is why you voted for it?

Mr. LAWN: Yes. As to this instruction from some outside body, the member for Gawler (Mr. J. S. Clark) moved and the member for Adelaide seconded at that convention of the Australian Labor Party (to which the honourable member for Onkaparinga refers as an outside party) that the Parliamentary Labor Party do not oppose the Bill. We were not directed by some outside authority to support the Bill, although there was one member who did not support it.

Mr. Jennings: And he was a highly respected member of this Party.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and it was not the late Mr. O'Halloran. The measure was brought in by the Party opposite and, as I have said, we could see that ultimately it would lead to their downfall, and we did not oppose it. The year was 1955, not 1954, as the member for Onkaparinga said.

I was about to say that I participated in all these debates since 1950. I was a member of the Opposition and in all those debates the Premier spoke on the Government side of the House. If it was a Government Bill, he spoke when he introduced and explained it. If the Bill was introduced by the Opposition, he took the adjournment after the Leader had explained it on behalf of the Opposition. No other speakers from the then Government side would discuss the matter, but tonight we have had eight different speakers from the Government side, and we will have had nine when the Premier replies. I used to refer to this lack of speakers from the Government side and would say, "No Government member other than the Premier has spoken and there will be no more speakers tonight".

However, in order to prove that I was wrong, the honourable member for Onkaparinga, the hatchet man, would follow me in the debates. I could always count on that, because every time I referred to the Premier as being the only speaker from the Government side, the member for Onkaparinga would be forced into speaking. That is what we saw happening on the Government side, at first one speaker and then two. Therefore, members opposite cannot twit the Government members for not speaking, because eight out of the 20 Government members have spoken on a Bill that we are trying to hurry through.

In the debate on this Bill, we have seen the result of that lack of speaking in the exhibition by members opposite. I shall refer later to some of the things they have said, but they have not been able to concern themselves with the Bill. In order to make themselves appear knowledgeable, they have put on an air and have tried to make themselves out to be intellectual pygmies, but they have failed miserably.

Mr. Jennings: They have succeeded in making themselves pygmies but not in making themselves appear intellectual.

Mr. LAWN: I hope I have not disgraced the pygmy race.

Mr. Clark: I think it would have been better if you had left out the word "intellectual".

Mr. LAWN: I said they tried to make themselves out to be intellectual pygmies. I do not admit that they have succeeded, because I am about to give the House an example of their exhibition. I remember that, when the member for Mitcham came here, he said he was not old enough to be a member of the Legislative Council, because he was not 30 years of age. He did not even have a vote, because he was single, living at home and probably did not own property. Members know that since he has had a family he has told us that the most intelligent member of his family is his dog Susie. I agree that that is quite possible.

The honourable member does not see anything wrong with our permitting him to have a vote for the Legislative Council on a voluntary basis. In effect, he has changed the attitude that he has had over the years, and on this occasion he will be voting for the second reading because this Bill states that the same roll will be used for this place and for the Legislative Council.

Mr. McKee: You have a shock coming to you.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member now agrees that every person over 21 years of age should have the right to vote for the election of members of both Houses but he considers that voting would be voluntary in the case of the other House and compulsory for this House. In other words, he agrees with the provision of the Bill for one roll.

Mr. Jennings: Why doesn't he support the second reading?

Mr. LAWN: I should like the members for Mitcham and Light to tell me what is compulsory voting. I know of no such thing either here or anywhere else in the world. We cannot compel a person to vote. All that our South Australian laws do is to compel people

on the House of Assembly roll to carry out their obligation as citizens and report to the polling booth on election day to have their names crossed off the roll; but they do not have to vote. That is right.

Mr. Coumbe: The honourable member is quibbling.

Mr. LAWN: That is right, and they do that.

Mr. Coumbe: Some do.

Mr. LAWN: Many people get their ballot papers and put them into the box without writing on them, while others write all sorts of things on them. We cannot compel a person to vote. This is supposed to be a State where we have a responsible Parliamentary Government. A person on election day may say, "I am off to the races", or he may go to Victor Harbour or somewhere else. The principle of our system is that every citizen who partakes of that which is worth while partaking of in the State as a result of responsible Government should carry out his or her duty and go to the polling booth to have his or her name struck off the roll; but there is no compulsion on anyone to vote. The member for Mitcham agrees that one roll should be used for both Houses but he does not feel it should be obligatory on a person to go to the polling booth and vote for the Legislative Council. That is a big change in the attitude he has adopted over the years.

Mr. Jennings: I do not think it is, really.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member is a corporal in the army. Those men who are called up for military service believe they should have the vote at 18 years of age. I agree. If the honourable member agrees with his comrades in arms and subscribes to their belief that they should have the right to vote at that age in life—

Mr. Jennings: He believes in compulsory military training.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, but not in compulsory voting. Let me deal with one or two things said by the member for Light. This is a discussion on a Bill concerning the holding of elections in South Australia, and this is what the honourable member said. He discussed the Constitution of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords. He told us the largest constituency in the House of Commons, the smallest constituency (in the heart of London) and the number of Lords representing Ireland and Scotland.

Mr. Casey: And he got it all mixed up.

Mr. LAWN: But what has all that to do with this Bill? Then the honourable member said, referring to the bicameral system, "This

is our great British heritage." If this (the Legislative Council) is a great British heritage, what is wrong with our copying those places in England?

Mr. Jennings: And limiting its powers?

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. The House of Commons and the House of Lords agreed in the 1920's to a limitation of two years on the House of Lords when dealing with legislation from the House of Commons. During the Attlee Government it was agreed to restrict the powers of the House of Lords to 12 months. What is wrong with our following that procedure of the British Parliament, which I do not deary; it is the Mother of Parliaments, and our Standing Orders and whole procedure follow it. I think our Standing Order No. 1 provides that if anything arises that is not provided for under our Standing Orders we must follow the precedent and the Standing Orders of the House of Commons. I have no argument against the House of Commons. I believe in the democratic right of people to elect their own Government, and I agree with what the House of Commons and the House of Lords have done. However, we should follow this great heritage, so that the Upper House can only delay for 12 months the legislation passed by the Lower House. The honourable member (and he is not the only one) always has to clown about the Labor Party's rules. Members opposite complain because they have to pay 5s. for the rule book, but it must be worth seeing or they would not buy it. Their rule book is priceless.

Mr. Jennings: It is also hopeless.

Mr. LAWN: It is. Every year I go to the L.C.L. office and ask for their rule book and platform. It is priceless. On the front appear the words "Constitution, Principles and State Platform". I have no money to throw around, but I will give a garden party to Susie and every member opposite if they can show me one thing in that rule book about the State platform.

Mr. Ryan: They have not got a platform.

Mr. LAWN: No, they have not. I would complain if I had to pay 5s. for this; I would expect to be able to ask for my money back. The book is full of rules but it has no platform. Members opposite have complained about the metropolitan area and the country area, but this is not of our making; they did it in 1936 with the secret committee, so they cannot blame us for carrying on what they said time and time again was perfectly justified.

The member for Mitcham said that 28,000 people were too many for him to represent.

If he supports this Bill, he will bring the numbers down. I agree that 28,000 is too many, but I think six districts have over 30,000 electors. The member for Burnside represents over 30,000 people. If that is too many to represent, the honourable member should support this Bill so as to bring the numbers down.

Not having a valid argument against the Bill, members opposite have used extravagant language. They have said that the Bill is crook and that it is a fraud, and another term that I did not write down was used by the member for Alexandra. Seeing that the boot is now on the other foot, I say that the Master who ran this State for many years and would not have criticism from his own members or from members opposite just cannot refrain from using this strong language. I remember earlier this session that he referred to another Bill as being poison in the hands of children. The people have told the Leader they dislike being called children; they have told him they dislike a certain measure's being referred to as poison, by voting at a referendum on the matter. What appears as a fraud, crook and as poison to members opposite is different from what appears to the people of the State. I have continually told members opposite that they were out of step with public thinking, and twice in the last 12 months (at the elections on March 6 and at a later referendum) the people have proved me right.

Mr. Ryan: Didn't the Opposition say the electors would be confused about that issue?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, it said all sorts of things. When in Opposition I had the honour to speak to a motion moved by my Party to introduce a Bill to provide South Australians with a fair electoral system. What was the Leader's reply to that? He cited the *Oxford Dictionary* meaning of "fair" as being "blond". He tried to rubbish our motion, just as he has tried to rubbish this legislation by saying it is crook and a fraud. The *Oxford Dictionary* defines "fair" as being a periodical gathering for the sale of goods; it then defines "fair" as meaning "blond, not dark" (the definition the Leader singled out previously). But listen to this meaning: "fair" means "of moderate quality; equal conditions for all". That is what we were asking for then, and are asking for now, namely, that the State be divided into 56 equal (as near as possible) districts, with the exception of two districts in respect of which special reasons shall apply. We also seek to retain the 26 country districts (some of which



the Opposition has told country people will be taken away), and 30 only for the metropolitan area. In speaking to the Bill the Leader said:

That is quite unparalleled in the history of this State, where a commission is to be set up, and where the Leader of the Government—before the commission is ever established—has told it the answers it is expected to give.

At least the Bill is open for everybody to see; if the Premier is telling the commission what to do, that is at least provided for in the Bill, as the Leader, himself, admits. But what has the Leader told us when we have asked for a Royal Commission? He has said, "What's the value of a Royal Commission? Let me assure you that I can write the report of any commission before I appoint it." Is it not a fact that he has written the other electoral gerrymander reports? The Leader says that the commission is being told what to do because it is being told to have two districts with numbers of electors out of proportion to the numbers in other districts. However, the Leader has said time and time again that he could write the report of any commission or committee that he might have appointed before he appointed it.

Mr. Jennings: There are no denials anywhere.

Mr. LAWN: At times the Leader gets on to me and at other times I jump on certain things he has said and then he admits the truth. At page 699 of *Hansard* the Leader is reported to have said:

But of course this Bill will just about cut out rural representation as an effective voice in the deliberations of this Parliament.

At page 706 he is reported to have said:

It is all very well for honourable members to put forward these beautiful ideas but the fact still remains that my Party and I will oppose anything that tends to destroy our rural industries or take away from country people the right to reasonable amenities and a fair voice in the Government of the State.

The gem is at page 747 where the Leader is reported as saying (and this is after challenging the Government that it was taking away the rights of country people and after saying the Bill was a fraud and that it was crook):

My Party does not object to a redistribution at this time: we believe it is desirable.

Whilst he was Premier, the Leader proved to me that he was a most astute man, and he is still astute. The Leader had a couple of things in mind when he prepared his speech. He knows that the people of South Australia want electoral justice, and when I say justice I do not mean that it is just 23 minutes past ten but real justice. By a 53½ per cent vote the

people showed in no uncertain terms that they wanted electoral justice in South Australia.

The Leader knows that many people in Gumeracha want 56 members in this House and want districts each having as near as possible the same number of electors. The Leader also knows that he will find other people who will swallow his tale about the Bill robbing rural districts. He will speak to some people on their properties who will criticize the Bill. For these people he will bring out from his pocket a copy of what he is reported to have said on pages 699 and 706 of *Hansard*, and he will say that he said that the Bill would rob rural districts of amenities. However, at other places he will find people who agree with the Bill and he will produce from his pocket for those people what he is reported to have said on page 747—that his Party does not object to a redistribution, and believes it is desirable. He is having two bob each way and he can satisfy all the electors. He has spoken both ways in the debate. I commend the Bill to the House and I have little doubt that the second reading will be carried because some of the members opposite must support the second reading on what they have said. I shall not have much to say about the Bill during the Committee stages, and I shall trust the Committee to do the right thing. I support the Bill.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend to delay the House for long. There is no doubt in my mind that the Bill does not meet with the pleasure of the Opposition. I recall that on the last occasion the previous Government attempted to alter the boundaries it did not have a constitutional majority. On that occasion it proposed that the metropolitan area should extend from Gawler to Sellick Beach and take in other surrounding areas, and the suggestion that 20 members should represent that area seemed a little out of proportion to us. An even worse suggestion was that the predominantly industrial areas of Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla should have only two seats. There was a tendency for the previous Government to attempt to alter the Constitution Act.

It is intended to hold a referendum in about May this year on the question of altering the Commonwealth Constitution to provide greater representation in the House of Representatives without increasing the numbers in the Senate. At present the Constitution provides that the Senate should comprise, as near as practicable, about half the numbers in the House of Representatives, with equal representation to each State. The thinking of the people in the National Parliament today—and it has been

so for some time—is clear on this matter. Although the Bill now before this House determines the number of electoral districts, it makes an exception in respect of two areas. I make no secret of the fact that it is intended that those districts shall be Frome and Eyre.

This Bill provides for the use of one roll for all elections. That was my party's policy for many years when we were in Opposition, and it is still the Party's policy. If it is good enough to have the House of Assembly roll to elect people to the House of Representatives and to the Senate, then it should be good enough for elections for the Legislative Council. The thinking of the Commonwealth Government is for an increase in the members in the House of Representatives but no increase in the Senate. Labor Party policy provided for the abolition of the Senate, and I see no reason for its being retained. Also, I cannot see any reason why the Legislative Council should be retained, as it represents a Party system in the most vicious form I know. To suggest that the Legislative Council is a House of Review is so ridiculous that it is beyond anyone's comprehension how such a suggestion could be made. The provisions of this Bill are not new to the people of South Australia. We have always advocated a House of 56 members and Bills have been introduced to provide for that, but they have been rejected. This legislation will be carried here, but I do not know whether it will pass in another place. However, we will test it. The only point in the Bill affecting the Legislative Council is the voting franchise, and I hope that there will be some sympathy extended to the people of South Australia.

If a person is old enough to be called upon by lottery to defend his country, surely he is old enough to be entitled to vote. Cases could occur where people are not chosen for call-up by the lottery and do not possess certain property qualifications, so that they will be excluded from voting. Our policy is deliberate. First, we believe there should be one roll for all elections for both Houses, and provision is made for this in the Bill. To suggest that metropolitan Adelaide should extend from Gawler to Sellick Beach is beyond comprehension, and I would not agree to that. I am sure many others would not agree either. If the present Opposition had desired to amend the Constitution it could have done so during its term of office. Elizabeth was never considered as being within the metropolitan area of Adelaide. Under the Industrial Code the metropolitan area was clearly defined without

any particular distance from Adelaide and whether north, south, east or west of it, so that on this occasion we defined the metropolitan area as that contained in the present electoral set-up. We are not going beyond that, and what is defined as country and what is defined as metropolitan is set out in the Constitution today. Are we then to say, "This is country; that is metropolitan"? We have taken exactly what is provided in the Constitution as far as a definition of "country" and "metropolitan" is concerned. If the population has increased to a great extent in certain country areas and in certain metropolitan areas in particular, that is no fault of any particular member of this House. With a view to giving something near equality of representation as far as numbers are concerned, I cannot see why the member for Enfield should have nearly 40,000 electors on the roll, my own electorate about 34,000 and the member for Glenelg even more.

It has been mentioned tonight that six electorates have over 30,000 electors on the roll. I recall that when I was elected to Parliament the number of electors on the roll for my district totalled 15,000. Since that time a subdivision comprising almost 6,000 electors has been taken from my district. Had I maintained the full area as established in 1938 when the first contest was held under the single electorate system, the district of Goodwood (as it was known at that time) would have totalled over 40,000 electors by now. For the benefit of members opposite, I repeat that this Bill is nothing new; it has been the policy of the Labor Party for a number of years. We have endeavoured to implement that policy; we enunciated the same policy—at least I did—during the electoral campaign held 12 months ago.

Mr. Jennings: And it was endorsed by the people.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It was endorsed by the electors of this State on two occasions. First, it was endorsed in the 1962 election, because we took two seats from the then Government but on that occasion we were denied office. If the Party system of Government had been maintained (and it is a system which I consider is in the best interests of any country) we should have formed a Government in 1962. We did not, however, because one member was bought out as an Independent and another sat as an Independent but gave a decision in favour of the Government on every occasion. That is how that Government was

able to carry on. Our policy was again endorsed in the last election. I believe, having been elected by the people of this State, that we are entitled to have our legislation endorsed in the interests of the people who put us here. I hope that this Bill will be carried.

The SPEAKER: The question is:

That this Bill be now read a second time, which the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford has moved to amend by leaving out all the words after the word "That" with a view to inserting the following words 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."

The question is "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question."

Mr. SHANNON: Mr. Speaker—

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will you put the question again, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Does the Leader of the Opposition want the question read again?

Mr. SHANNON: The motion.

The SPEAKER: The motion is "That the Bill be now read a second time," to which the honourable the Leader has moved the amendment that I have read, to leave out certain words. The question before the Chair is that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question. Those in favour say "Aye"—

Mr. SHANNON: I am on my feet.

The SPEAKER: Those against say "No". The Ayes have it.

Mr. SHANNON: I was on my feet. I want to know whether I can speak to the motion.

Mr. Jennings: You should sit down when the Speaker is on his feet.

The SPEAKER: I am putting, as Standing Orders require, the Leader of the Opposition's Amendment to the second reading before the Chair, and I have called for a vote.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Pending the termination of this discussion, I indicate that I desire a division on the question.

The SPEAKER: You may call for a division.

Mr. SHANNON: I wish to speak to the motion. Is it not competent for me to do so?

The SPEAKER: I cannot allow the honourable member to speak. The Premier closed the debate. I have put the question and have declared it carried on the voices.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. I asked for a division.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is the first time you have.

Mr. SHANNON: I was on my feet, raising a point.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Call for a division, I don't care.

The SPEAKER: I will put the question again. Members must be clear. I shall go to the length of reading the whole question again and I ask members to listen and to be careful how they vote. The Premier has moved:

That this Bill be now read a second time, to which the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment to leave out all words after the word "That" with a view to inserting the following words 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.

The question is—

Mr. SHANNON: I ask for your ruling—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order. I ask him to take his seat.

Mr. SHANNON: I ask for your ruling.

The SPEAKER: There is no ruling to be given on this. The question before the Chair is:

That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question.

For the question say "Aye", against the question say "No". The Ayes have it.

The House divided on the question:

Ayes (20).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Question thus passed in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 294, I have counted the House and, there being present more than an absolute majority, I put the question "That this Bill be read a second time."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Speaker, as there is an absolute majority present, I think that under Standing Orders there has to be a division because the House has to pass the second reading by an absolute majority.

Mr. Shannon: You have to give a certificate, Sir.

The SPEAKER: There being present an absolute majority, I put the question.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There were negative voices, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: On a point of order, this being—

The SPEAKER: Order! There being no call for a division—

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Under the Standing Orders, this being a Constitution Bill, there must be a division.

The SPEAKER: I take it that the Leader of the Opposition is a dissentient voice. If there is a dissentient voice, there must be a division.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (20).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: There are 20 Ayes and 17 Noes, a majority of three for the Ayes, so the question passes in the affirmative. I declare that the second reading of this Bill is carried with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the House.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.56 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 2, at 2 p.m.