HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 5, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

COUNCIL FRANCHISE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier will recall that during the last week this House sat it passed a Bill concerning a fundamental constitutional question and that an overwhelming majority of the representatives of this State, including the Premier and most of his Cabinet, voted in favour of it. Since that time public statements have been made by members of another place, including Ministers, outside Parliament that they intend to reject the measure that was so overwhelmingly passed in this place. Will the Premier, as Leader of the Government, assure the people of this State that he will insist on the tradition of Cabinet responsibility being followed in this matter, and that Government members in another place will accept the majority verdict that was agreed to by him and most of his Ministers in supporting the Bill introduced by me in this place?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This matter is before another place and I do not intend in any way to prejudice its consideration of it by entering into an argument about what members of that Chamber may have said publicly. This is not the time for political grandstanding on this matter or for speaking of issues before any decision is made in that Chamber. Therefore, I do not intend to say any more at this stage.

Mr. CASEY: I was rather surprised to hear the Premier of South Australia reply that, because a certain matter was being dealt with in another place, he refused to commit himself. I would say that this measure is one of the most important ever considered by this Parliament, and anything that concerns the Parliament concerns this House. Will the Premier, as Leader of the Liberal and Country League and as Leader of the Government of this State, say whether members of that Party in another place are running this Government? Secondly, will he say whether the people of South Australia are to be denied a statement by the Premier of the State about his stand and that of his Government on this most important matter and, if they are to be so denied, will he say why?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I would think that the honourable member would know what my stand was and has been on this matter. Regarding the other matters that exercise the curiosity of members opposite, I advise those members to be patient: all will be made plain in good time.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My question is addressed to you, Mr. Speaker, and concerns a matter in connection with this House. This afternoon the Premier declined to reply to an extremely important question concerning the unity of Cabinet on a most important matter. Many thousands of schoolchildren have been brought into this House, and it has been explained to them that the bench on the other side of the House has no break in it and that this is a symbol of the unity of Cabinet. Will you, Mr. Speaker, consider having a gap cut in that bench so that the children of this State may no longer be misled?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should understand that it is not a function of the Speaker to be responsible for Cabinet Ministers. Whether I can provide a gap in the bench is another matter. Members of Cabinet may decide whether they wish to answer a question and whether they remain unified. It is not for me to make such decisions.

Mr. RICHES: Can the Premier say whether there is any truth in the press report that he was recently called before an organization outside this Parliament to give an account for his vote cast inside this Parliament and, if there is any truth in that report, will he have it corrected?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I attended the council meeting of the Liberal and Country League last Friday week in my usual capacity, because I attend this meeting if I can. There is no truth in the report that I was called before this meeting.

Mr. HUDSON: It has always been a tradition of the British Constitution, and this tradition has been followed also in Australian States and in the Commonwealth Parliament, that Cabinet should be collectively responsible for any governmental decisions that are taken. The traditional practice in Britain, I understand, has been for any member of Cabinet who disagrees with the majority of his colleagues to resign and, should he not do so, the Prime Minister will call on him to resign. Indeed, this applied in Australia where, only a few years ago, the then Prime Minister (Sir Robert Menzies) called for the resignation of

Mr. Bury in view of the latter's disagreement with the Minister for Trade and Customs on an important matter of Government policy in connection with the European Common Market. In view of the major subject matter of the franchise of the Legislative Council, and as the Minister of Lands in this House voted contrary to the vote of the majority of his colleagues, will the Premier say whether or not he intends to enforce the principle handed down to us from Britain, of the collective responsibility of Cabinet, and to call on the Minister of Lands to resign from Cabinet?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: On first speaking to the Bill introduced in this House by the Leader of the Opposition, I questioned the Opposition's motives for introducing the measure and I said that it perhaps represented a move to embarrass the Government rather than to reform the franchise of the Legislative Council. I do not care whether or not it represented such a move; I have stood up in this House and given an opinion on it. However, at the moment it seems that my contention (that one of the basic purposes of the Bill was to embarrass the Government rather than to bring about any reform) was the reason behind the measure, because the questions that have been asked by members opposite today are not designed in any way to further the Bill now before the Legislative Council.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is debating the answer.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think that fully explains my attitude to the question asked.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We on this side, on the matter of the Legislative Council franchise, are no Johnny-come-lately. All of us have been fighting for this ever since we came into politics and we are very grateful to (and I publicly complimented) those who have joined us in the fight. However, we want to know that the fight is dinkum. Therefore, again I ask the Premier whether he is prepared to indicate to the people of the State that he will do as his predecessor in office did as Leader of the Liberal and Country League and Premier of this State. When Legislative Councillors defied the majority view of Cabinet, his predecessor used the power of his Government in that area to persuade Legislative Councillors of the rightness of the Government's cause. This is what we want to know from the Premier that he will do and I am sure it is what the people of the State want to know.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: What the Leader does not appear to realize is that it is not within his province to say whether or not South Australia will have a reform in the franchise of the Legislative Council: the matter does not rest with him.

Mr. Hudson: Are you ever going to answer a question?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I was under the impression that the question was asked by the Leader.

Mr. Broomhill: We all want to know where you're going.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have already criticized the Leader for antagonizing the Council before the Bill reached that place. I believe that it was the day after the Bill had passed this place that he issued dire threats about the abolition of that place if its members did not accede to the wishes of this House. I do not believe in operating in that way. If the Leader wishes to help in relation to this issue, he will remain silent for the moment (that is my advice to him), and he will not try to take political advantage of the situation. I remind him again that the answer to this question does not rest with him.

Mr. VIRGO: I make the point at the outset that I have no desire to antagonize members of the Upper House but that I do have a desire to obtain information for the public, which is entitled to know about this matter. I realize that the Premier is embarrassed. Following the sitting of the House last Thursday week, the press bent over backwards to conceal the split in his Cabinet. Nevertheless, the public is entitled to know the attitude of Government members in the Legislative Council on matters of importance. Accordingly, can the Premier say whether he is reluctant to say what the Legislative Council will do with the Constitution Act Amendment Bill because he does not know, and whether the public can expect the same disloyalty amongst members of the Ministry on other matters affecting the people's rights as has been shown in relation to this Bill?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As the question is in similar vein to others and deliberately provocative, I do not intend to answer it.

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Premier say whether he intends to hang on the door of that august Chamber, in which his colleagues sit, a notice stating "Please do not disturb"? Will he also say whether his being certain that his colleagues in another place would

reject the Bill that this House passed was the reason for his action in this House a fortnight ago?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I see that the honourable member is smiling and, therefore, I do not take his last remarks as being insulting. I imagine that he has joined in the general fun that Opposition members have been enjoying this afternoon and, if that fun lightens the strain of Parliamentary work, I am happy to join them. However, I say seriously that in no way was I insincere about my approach to this matter in the House. That is the only further thing I intend to say on this matter today.

Mr. RICHES: Although I failed to hear the last portion of the Premier's reply to my previous question, I understood him to say that he was not called on to give to a meeting of his Party an account for the vote he cast here, but that he attended the meeting of the L.C.L. as a matter of course. If the press report was not true (and I judge from the Premier's statement he maintains it was not true), what steps will he take to correct it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although I know that much has been written about my action in this matter and other associated matters in the past several weeks, I am not aware of any particular report, certainly none to which I took personal objection. In fact, I seldom take objection to anything written in the newspapers. Often I feel an emphasis may be put on a word which perhaps in the mind of the writer is good but which does not fit the case. I was not called before the meeting: it was a meeting which I was entitled to attend and which I was expected to attend as an interested member of the L.C.L. The meetings are held regularly and I try to attend when I can, so I went to this one.

Mr. HUDSON: I was unable to get a reply from the Premier when I asked him whether he had written to the Minister of Lands regarding the latter's resignation. In view of the British tradition of the collective responsibility of Cabinet, and as the Premier failed to indicate whether or not he had even written to the Minister about his resignation, will the Minister of Lands say whether or not his resignation has been requested? If it is requested, will he give his resignation? If the answer is "No", will he say whether or not he accepts the tradition of the collective responsibility of Cabinet, or whether this is a principle to be thrown in the garbage can?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The question asked by the honourable member contains at least five or six categories, several of which are hypothetical. Clearly, the question is asked for a most insincere purpose. Clearly, again, it is asked by the member of a Party that takes instructions from an undemocratically elected organization.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member for Glenelg objecting?

Mr. HUDSON: No, definitely not.

The SPEAKER: Then the Minister must be allowed to reply uninterrupted.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I was saying that the question came from the member of a Party which takes instructions from an organization outside this House and which is not elected by the people of the State.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What rubbish you are talking.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This has been proved over and over again in past years.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You proved the contrary last week.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not think there is one bit of sincerity on the part of the honourable member in his search for information. The measure to which he referred was a private member's Bill which was (as is always the case) examined by members of this Party, who decided in their own way how to vote on the matter. I voted one way, and other members of the Government Party voted the other way. Obviously, the honourable member would know the answer to his question before even asking it. However, I do not mind saying, in case it comes as a surprise to anyone, that the answer to the question is "No". The honourable member knew that before he asked the question, although he maintains that he is searching for information. Clearly, it is nothing more than a political stunt to ask such a question. I cannot recall fully the hypotheses contained in the honourable member's question but, if I could recall them, I would not even attempt to answer them. If the honourable member is not satisfied with the information he has been given, I suggest that he put the question on notice, and he will receive a considered reply.

STURT HIGHWAY TREES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Recently, when travelling by motor car from the Barossa Valley to the metropolitan area, I was appalled

to notice that the tree-lined section of the Sturt Highway between Sandy Creek and Tanunda had been interfered with by the Electricity Trust, in that many trees growing along that highway had been decapitated and the aesthetic beauty of that section had been destroyed. The matter was considered by the District Council of Tanunda at a meeting on October 21, members of the council also being of the opinion that the cutting back of the trees had completely spoilt the aesthetic appeal of this section of the highway. Part of a letter that I received today from the council states:

In view of the policies expressed by the Highways Department in regard to trees and tree plantings along main roads, and because these trees . . . are on the side of the highway, the council feels that its concern should be expressed in Parliament, this concern being for the seemingly complete lack of concern by the employees of the Electricity Trust of South Australia who "decapitate" any tree within reach of a power line without any thought whatsoever for the consequences of their actions. Although E.T.S.A. administers a public utility, it is felt that it should display some consideration for natural assets rather than removing them so that their own ugly unnatural installations may be viewed with the distaste they deserve.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to ensure that in future the trust is more hesitant in removing trees along a beautiful highway in this State?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Although I regret I was not in the House when the honourable member began explaining his question, I have been put in the picture, and I shall be happy to discuss the matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport and also with the Minister of Works, as the Electricity Trust is involved.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM

Mr. JENNINGS: Some time ago I took a deputation from the Enfield corporation to the Minister of Lands about the future use of the sewage farm at Islington. The Minister gave his usual courteous and attentive hearing to the deputation but, so far, we have not had any response to our submissions. I understand that a vexed and complicated question is involved, but, to ensure that the people involved are not forgotten in the matter, can the Minister of Lands give the House an interim report?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: True, I met members of the corporation who were introduced by the honourable member. The representations made were and are being fully considered. It is, unfortunately, a fairly complicated matter and many titles are involved, so that the Lands Department has the job of getting these titles under the one head, the disposal of the land for various purposes then having to be finally decided. The use of this land is being considered concurrently with the legal work being done. Although I do not have a report for the honourable member at present stating precisely what is to be done, I point out that the matter, although not finalized, is being expedited.

STRATHALBYN AMBULANCE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I recently asked about free registration of the Strathalbyn civil defence ambulance?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Roads and Transport has supplied the following report from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles:

The vehicle described by the honourable member is an old ambulance converted to a rescue van equipped for a variety of purposes. It is not now an ambulance or a fire-fighting vehicle, nor is the Civil Defence Corps at Strathalbyn registered as a voluntary fire-fighting organization. There is no power to grant relief from the full registration fee in such circumstances.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: I direct the Premier's attention to press reports, one in this morning's *Advertiser* and the other in yesterday's *News,* the article in the *News* stating the following:

Re-examination of some segments of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan is under way following suggestions and criticism by the public in the last two months, the Transport Minister (Mr. Hill) said today. Mr. Hill also said the Government would look closely at the views expressed at an Adelaide University M.A.T.S. seminar at the weekend.

The report in the *Advertiser* of what Mr. Hill said concludes as follows:

It would seem, Mr. Hill said, that only the same ground would be covered if the Government adopted the recommendations of the seminar.

Assuming the Minister of Roads and Transport has been reported correctly on both occasions, will the Premier say what segments are currently being re-examined by the Government and whether they include the rail rapid transit, and, as there is a conflict between the two reports, which of the two is correct?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will obtain a report for the honourable member on the points he has raised. However, I again remind him that all submissions regarding the M.A.T.S. plan will be considered before a decision is made: no decision has yet been made about

the acceptance, rejection or alteration of the M.A.T.S. proposal. Any submission coming from the seminar to which the member referred or from any group or individual will be fully considered.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. GILES: In the past three weeks or so many reports have appeared about the likelihood of bush fires occurring in South Australia during next summer. A couple of days ago a resident of Lenswood (Mr. Ron Collins), who drives his semi-trailer regularly between Adelaide and Sydney, telephoned me, saying that he was perturbed at the number of people who threw lighted cigarettes from their cars. He passed through Springwood the day before three firemen were burned (this was reported in the *Advertiser* on October 30) and saw the driver of a car throw a lighted cigarette on to the side of the road. He immediately thought that there was a chance the cigarette could start a fire and, although perhaps that cigarette did not start the fire, there was a fire on the next day. As section 73 of the Bush Fires Act provides a penalty of $100 for the offence of throwing burning material from a vehicle, will the Premier see that this section is fully enforced during the summer, in view of the dangerous fire situation in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I believe that all authorities will be at their peak in attempting to prevent fires from starting or spreading in this State this year. I should like to think that the publicity of the Minister of Agriculture and those associated with fire prevention has been effective, at least to a degree, in making those who are aware of the problem conscious of the failings of other people in this connection. I hope everyone will take precautions to ensure that the Bush Fires Act and the various supplementary Acts are upheld in an effort to prevent acts of carelessness of the type to which the honourable member referred.

ROAD TAX

Mr. EDWARDS: During the drought last year on Eyre Peninsula, many of my constituents as well as some in the District of Flinders, had to cart water in order to keep stock alive, and for this they used semi-trailers or trucks with trailers attached. Having to cart water is bad enough, but these people have been required to pay road tax in respect of this unenviable task. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport why the tax has been imposed in these circumstances, and will the Attorney also ask his colleague to have this matter cleared up so that people who have been using big units to cart water for stock purposes will be exempt from the payment of road tax?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Certainly.

SWIMMING POOLS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question of October 3 about the provision of safety walls or fences around swimming pools or around the properties on which they are built?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Local Government states that the Building Act Advisory Committee has considered the question and advises that it considers that an amendment to the Building Act, 1923-1965, to provide for fencing around privately-owned swimming pools and private properties containing swimming pools is not advisable. However, the committee points out that, under sections 28 and 101 of the Building Act, councils have the power to control the construction of pools with any conditions they see fit.

KAROONDA-LAMEROO ROAD

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question refers to the Karoonda-Lameroo Road, part of which is in my district and part in your district, Mr. Speaker, and I am concerned about the Kulkami-Lameroo section. At present the council has about 18 miles formed up. The road materials used are difficult ones for road-building purposes. During last winter much difficulty was experienced in trafficking this road, and I understand that a law case may be pending as a result of a car's having left the road and overturned. Although I understand that a road traffic count has been made, I believe that the counter was put out not on the days on which cars were likely to travel on the road, namely, Fridays and at weekends, but on days early in the week. This is done in the case of many of these counts and, therefore, such counts do not record the true movement of local traffic on the roads. As this road is a very busy one, will the Attorney-General ascertain from his colleague the Highways Department's policy regarding this road and whether it intends to reconstruct and reseal it, as it would appear that the only way the road could be made safe would be for it to be bitumen sealed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to do that.

TWO WELLS PROPERTY

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply to my question of October 17 regarding an application to sink a well on a property near Two Wells?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Director of Mines states that Mr. F. Clemente lodged an application to sink a well on his 20-acre allotment in part section 191, hundred of Port Gawler, on April 30, 1968. When interviewed by a departmental officer in May, 1968, he advised that he had purchased the land in September, 1967, to allow him to leave his tailoring business and run a few livestock on a few acres of lucerne. The Advisory Committee on Underground Water Contamination considered this application, when it was referred by the Minister, and recommended that it be refused because of the very serious ground water situation in this area. The Minister endorsed the committee's recommendation, and Mr. Clemente was advised accordingly on June 13, 1968. Mr. Clemente subsequently exercised his right under the Act to appeal against the Minister's decision. This appeal was considered by the appeal board on August 13 and 26 and September 5 and 20, 1968, and the board inspected the property on August 15, 1968. The following facts were stated in evidence:

(1) Mr. Clemente has been operating his own tailoring business for 16 to 17 years. He is married with four children aged 12, eight, six and 1½ years.
(2) He purchased the land in September, 1967, aware that a permit to sink a well would be necessary.
(3) He planned to establish a dairy farm with 20 cows, 20 pigs and two acres of irrigated lucerne.
(4) His reason for purchasing the land was to enable him to dispose of the tailoring business, because he had been unable to take a holiday for many years and he wished to engage in a less demanding occupation.
(5) He had very substantial assets in properties in the metropolitan area.

The decision of the appeal board was that the decision of the Minister should be upheld and the appeal dismissed. Mr. Clemente's case has therefore been very thoroughly examined, without any grounds being found for special consideration in an area where the underground water supplies are causing grave concern. Under the Act, Mr. Clemente cannot reapply for a water well permit for a period of 12 months, unless there is a substantial change in the grounds for application.

GUN LICENCE FEES

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of October 9 about gun licence fees?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that the annual gun licence fee was increased from $2 to $4 on January 1, 1968, and I believe that at the time the then Minister advised certain interested organizations that the extra revenue from this source would permit increased expenditure on the development of game reserves. During the last financial year, the total amount spent on Bool Lagoon and Woolenook Bend game reserves was $20,000, which included initial establishment expenses. Provision is made in the current year's Estimates for the expenditure of $16,000 on the development of these reserves.

HILLS SCHOOLS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the questions I asked about the Echunga and Mylor schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Schools are not classified but heads of schools are, so that the honourable member's question has been interpreted as requesting the number of schools with class 4 head teachers which have not got residences. Three such schools exist, namely, Mylor and Echunga, which the honourable member has already quoted, and, in addition, Smithfield.

GREYHOUND RACING

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked early last month about whether totalizator facilities could be extended to dog racing in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As the reply is not in my bag I will get it tomorrow, because I know this matter has been considered.

YORKE PENINSULA RESERVE

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about dedicating a section of the hundred of Warrenben containing about 2,500 acres as a flora and fauna reserve?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of the Land Board reports:

Section 97, hundred of Warrenben, which will be dedicated as a national park in the near future, contains a range of vegetational units, most of which are not represented in any existing national park. The National Park Commission has not yet had an opportunity to make a survey of the vegetation, so that, at the moment, there is no list of plant species available unless it has been done by a private

individual. I have inspected the area, and it was largely because of the fact that it contained units of vegetation not represented in other parks that the proposal was put forward for the purchase of this land for national park. Generally speaking, the dominant species making up these units are not rare except that, because of extensive clearing operations, the areas within which they occur are becoming increasingly limited.

It could well be, however, that, intermixed with the dominant plants, there are species which are rare and do not occur in other parts of South Australia. Included in these could be a species of fern which grows in some of the small, almost cave-like holes which occur in the outcropping limestone. I have not encountered it elsewhere, and from discussions with the Chairman of the commission (Mr. T. R. N. Lothian) it would seem that it is a rare species.

FESTIVAL HALL

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier any information concerning the festival hall?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I can give only a little more. With two of my Cabinet Ministers I have discussed with three representatives of the City Council a wide range of matters concerning the proposal to build a festival hall in Adelaide. I will write to the City Council this week suggesting certain proposals, which the Lord Mayor will place before the council on Monday next, at the first meeting of the full council able to consider my proposals.

Mr. LAWN: I am mindful of the fact (indeed, I remind the Premier) that Parliament has already made $500,000 available this financial year towards building a festival hall. The Premier told me earlier that he and some Ministers (he did not say "colleagues", because I believe they are in another place) discussed this matter yesterday with the Lord Mayor and representatives of the Adelaide City Council. Will he say whether, during that discussion yesterday, the Government made any proposition regarding the site of the hall and whether it was suggested that the hall would be a single-purpose or a multipurpose hall?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: These matters are still under discussion, and it is my objective to obtain agreement, step by step if possible, on the necessary provision of the hall.

Mr. Lawn: Can't you tell the House?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No; I think that at the moment, before proposals are officially made to the City Council, I cannot say what the council may accept or what the Government may put to the council. There are at least two parties to this agreement (if there is to be an agreement), one being the Government and the other being the council.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member believes that he should know immediately about the matters being unofficially discussed, I think he is going outside the bounds of normal negotiations. It is not reasonable to expect the City Council to enter into talks with the Government on an unofficial basis, as it has this week, if it knows that what it says will be made public immediately. What the City Council would like made public is what it will accept and not its private thoughts on the matter. I will inform the honourable member when, after I have written to it, I have received a reply from the City Council.

SOUTH-EASTERN PORTS

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Marine a progress report on work being carried out at South-Eastern ports by the Marine and Harbors Department?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Three gangs are working in the South-East as follows:

(1) Port MacDonnell, where work will commence on the provision of the concrete dinghy ramp in mid-November, 1968, and then other works will proceed in order. The local council has already completed repairs to the car-parking area at a cost of $220 to the Marine and Harbors Department. When work at Port MacDonnell has been completed, the gang will then move to Robe.

(2) Beachport area—decking of the 105ft. gap between the crane platform and widened section of the jetty, north side, is in progress.

(3) Southend—The Southend project of provision of 150ft. of low-level dinghy mooring platform on the jetty extension (in three separate lengths) should be completed by the middle of November. The camp and gang will then move to Cape Jaffa where a start should be made on the 500ft. extension of the jetty about the end of November, 1968.

GAS

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently on behalf of a constituent concerning the acquisition of land for the construction of the natural gas pipeline?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have a comprehensive report. The authority, through its engineering managers, Bechtel Pacific Corporation, has been at very considerable pains to deal fairly with Mr. and Mrs. Brougham. The report contains a reference to several personal matters which I will leave for the honourable member to read, but the last portion of the report states that the amount offered to the Brougham's for the easement over their land is consistent with the offers made to all other property owners and in fairness to all other property owners, the authority does not propose to make any variation in the case of the Brougham's just because they refuse to co-operate. I have since received a note which, although rather hard to read, states in part that "common sense seems to have prevailed" and that the undertakings of the authority have now been accepted. Although I will pass on the information to the honourable member to read, I point out that the matter has now been settled after experiencing difficulty over a number of months, and I think that no further matter is in dispute.

HOSPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about contributions to hospitals by district councils?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The figures quoted by the honourable member relating to the compulsory rating contribution from the Naracoorte council to the Naracoorte Hospital are not quite correct, although the additional amount he quotes as the increase for 1968-69 of $1,000 is correct. The actual figures are, in fact, $8,500 for 1967-68 which increased to $9,500 for 1968-69. Whilst it is admitted that the determination of the compulsory rating contribution was a little later this year, which was brought about by a critical departmental investigation following receipt of information from all subsidized hospitals into the whole question of assistance given by local government bodies to subsidized hospitals serving their areas, this was not intentional and could not be avoided. In fact, considerable difficulty was experienced in fixing the compulsory rating for 1968-69, particularly in cases such as for Naracoorte Hospital where the hospital board made no recommendation in respect of its rating and left the determination entirely to this department which, as mentioned above, closely investigated all of the circumstances including the capital contributions made by the relevant local government bodies to hospitals in their areas.

It is intended that there should be in the near future a re-organization of the senior administrative staff of the Hospitals Department and, when this eventuates, it is expected that compulsory hospital rating contributions from local government bodies will be able to be determined earlier in future years to assist these bodies with their budgeting.

PORT ADELAIDE STATION

Mr. RYAN: An article recently appeared in an Adelaide publication which stated:

> Some time ago students at the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School made public their opinions on the Commercial Road, Port Adelaide, railway station, which they are forced to use all year round. Now some of the students have approached *Newsbeat* asking the programme to draw attention to the condition of the station. *Newsbeat* found that the station was in a shocking state of disrepair. Students who were interviewed at the station said that the lack of protection caused them to get wet in winter while in summer they sweltered. The girls reported that holes in the platform and in the station's walls had torn uniforms, and the seats are so dirty they are unable to sit down.

I have been asked how will people ever be attracted to use the railways when conditions such as those at Port Adelaide are allowed to exist. Having inspected this station on many occasions, I believe it is an absolute disgrace to South Australia's railway system and to any instrumentality under the control of the Government. In view of this station's shocking state of disrepair, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to have the position remedied and to make the station an attraction to people who use it rather than have the position that exists today?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall, of course, be happy to take up this matter with the present Minister of Roads and Transport, and I hope that he will be able to do something in this matter even though, apparently, his predecessor for the three years he was in office did nothing, in spite of the honourable member's protests, as he has told us of them this afternoon.

CALTOWIE SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: I recently attended at Caltowie, the opening of the Frome school sports. During the day, the Chairman of the school committee took me to the school itself, where we inspected the grounds. He informed me that the school committee had previously contacted the former Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday) regarding improvements to the

schoolgrounds. The following is the reply that my predecessor (Mr. Heaslip) received from the former Minister in reply to a question asked on July 17, 1967:

The Director of the Public Buildings Department advises that improvements to the paving and drainage and also the provision of an asphalt floor in the shelter shed at the Caltowie school are included in a group scheme for similar work to be undertaken at other schools in the area. Tender documents for the overall scheme are now nearing completion. On completion of these documents, the priority of the work will be reviewed to determine whether funds can be allocated to enable tenders to be called.

Will the Minister of Education examine this matter with a view to having the schoolgrounds sealed during the coming Christmas vacation?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

ELECTRICAL REPAIRS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I recently asked about the cost of home appliance repairs compared with that of household electrical repairs?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Prices Commissioner has reported that charges for the mechanical repair of the larger household electrical appliances (such as washing machines, refrigerators and air-conditioners) and the repair and servicing of radio and television receivers are not subject to control under the Prices Act, 1948-67. Service companies fix their own scale of charges, and these include a minimum service call charge in most cases. Charges for the household electrical repairs are, however, subject to control under the Prices Act, and up to September 5, 1968, were fixed by the department on an hourly-rate basis. The department is generally not in favour of minimum service call charges and, while it is concerned at the amount and nature of some service charges and is making inquiries in this regard, higher charges can be justified for these specialized maintenance services because of the higher costs involved, including radio-controlled workshop vehicles and same-day service. Because calls of this nature are usually urgent and the demand is not constant, more servicemen are employed than would otherwise be involved, and in consequence charge rates are fixed to cover any lost time which may result. Electricians normally do not carry out this specialized type of repair work nor could they carry a full range of spare parts or give the prompt attention expected in the case of service calls. The average service call charge is $4.50. This is a flat rate to cover mileage, travelling time, stocking a vehicle with a range of spare parts for the particular appliances to be serviced, and includes an average of 15 minutes free time for the repair of an appliance. This flat rate applies not only to nearby service calls, but also to all calls in an extended metropolitan area with a maximum range extending from Gawler to Willunga and from the coast to the hills towns, as far as Mount Barker in some cases. In the case of household electrical repairs, the maximum fixed rate prior to September 5, 1968, was $2.80 an hour for working time, plus travelling time at the same rate, and plus mileage at 10c a mile. The service-call basis of charging is much higher for close calls than the hourly-rate basis. The two rates break even on calls involving 30 minutes for repairs and 10 miles travelling to and from the job. Having regard to the basic differences in the two types of service, a higher charge for service calls can be justified. However, the minimum charges are considered to be high in many cases and the position will be further examined.

LAMEROO SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Lameroo Area School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Public Buildings Department has advised that, under the revised scheme for general painting and repairs at the school premises, public tenders are expected to be called within two or three weeks. In connection with the drainage and site works, I have been informed that a contract was let in August, 1967, for ground formation works. The contractor carried out part of the work and, despite repeated requests, has not returned to complete it. It has become necessary for the Public Buildings Department to consider alternative methods for completing the work, and I understand that a recommendation is currently being made to formally determine the existing contract. Approval is also being sought by the Public Buildings Department to seek private offers to expedite the completion of this project.

BERRI OFFICE

Mr. ARNOLD: The Berri Chamber of Commerce has informed me that the Aboriginal Affairs Department's district office at Berri is open for only about 25 per cent of normal office hours because the local officer of the

department has a large area to cover. Volunteers try to keep the office open on Friday afternoon and Saturday morning. This branch of the department is somewhat unique and much interest is shown in this centre, particularly in the art displays and in goods displayed for sale, by local people and the travelling public. As the Government is about to undertake further improvements to the building, will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs do everything possible to provide an assistant in that office so that it may remain open at all times for the benefit of the public?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I wish I could say "Yes" to that question, and I would say that certainly if I had enough money. However, as the honourable member will appreciate, it is not easy to find money to pay sufficient staff, either in this or any other department . Certainly I greatly value the work that Mr. Finny, the district officer, does in his district. I know how hard he works, but it is impossible for him to be in the office all the time and, because we are not able at present to afford any office assistance, the office cannot be open all the time. However, in view of the honourable member's request, I will find out whether the priority for an office assistant can be raised.

AMERICAN PROJECTS DIVISION

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently, following a newspaper report, about the effect on South Australian staff of the American Projects Division of the Weapons Research Establishment at Salisbury moving its headquarters to Canberra?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I replied initially that I was not aware of any implications of this change, and the Director of Industrial Promotion, to whom I have referred the question, has reported as follows:

I, too, have not been made aware of any movements in the American Projects Division, but I believe that the general employment situation within the Weapons Research Establishment will become much clearer during the second half of November. In answer to a question in the Commonwealth Parliament, the Minister for Supply said that there was a Ministerial conference of ELDO in Paris early in November and, in the light of its findings, firm indications would be able to be given regarding future employment at Salisbury.

SALVATION JANE

Mr. GILES: Three sections of land in the Gumeracha District, namely, sections 6073, 6067 and 6063, belong to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and are used by the Woods and Forests Department for the planting of pine trees. The area between the outside of the pine plantation and the fence is covered in salvation jane, which is spreading to adjacent properties and, in addition, is creating a fire hazard. Will the Minister of Works find out whether the landholder whose property adjoins the northern side of the three sections and the western side of section 6073 may rent from the E. & W.S. Department a chain of that department's land and fence it in order to run stock on it to reduce the fire hazard and get rid of the salvation jane so that it will not spread to his property?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As I am not fully conversant with each of the sections to which the honourable member has referred, I will obtain a report for him.

VALE PARK HOUSES

Mr. JENNINGS: The Minister of Housing will recall that recently, he, with the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) and me, as well as officers of the Strathmont Progress Association, inspected Housing Trust houses in the Strathmont and Holden Hill area, and the member for Barossa and I greatly appreciated the Minister's comprehensive examination of these houses. I understand that the Minister has a reply regarding the matters dealt with, although I do not know whether it is a final or an interim reply. Will the Minister give to the House whatever information he has?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member has said, in company with him, the member for Barossa and many other people concerned in the matter, I inspected a number of houses, although I forget precisely how many. Not being sure where the geographical boundaries of one suburb end and those of another begin, I have described the area as the Holden Hill and Vale Park area, but I do not claim that that is an absolutely correct description. I found the occupants of the houses extremely reasonable in their approach, and the standard of housekeeping in every case was excellent. Also, the external appearance of almost every house was good and gave evidence of good caretaking. Therefore, I was encouraged to discuss the whole matter with residents amicably and sensibly. I thank the honourable member and his colleague, as well as the people concerned, for the way in which I was received and conducted on the inspection. As a result of the inspection, I have had a discussion with Housing Trust officials, and the following is the report:

As arranged with the deputation, I inspected a number of houses in the Holden Hill and Vale Park area on Monday, October 21, accompanied by Mrs. Byrne, M.P., Mr. Jennings, M.P., and officials of the progress association. I put myself completely in the hands of the association and was taken to approximately 10 houses, some being timber frame and built on studs, others being of brick veneer. Some of the houses had extensive concrete paving surrounding them, either wholly or in part; others did not have this treatment. The general standard of maintenance by the owners was good and the internal housekeeping was almost invariably excellent. Generally, the attitude of the people was reasonable and cordial, though naturally they were very concerned with their problems. From my inspection I could not discover any clear pattern of behaviour between houses of different types and between houses which had concrete surrounds and those which did not. I got the impression, however, that where lawns and gardens had obviously been maintained on a fairly constant moisture basis during summer and winter, this could have lessened the soil movement and the consequent external and internal damage, and assisted soil stability to develop. Obviously, care must be taken to see that roof water is drained well away at all times and that over-watering is avoided to ensure that sectional flooding does not occur. The trust is aware of the degree of soil movement in the area and its effect on both timber frame and brick-veneer construction, and has undertaken to provide constant attention and repairs for an extended period of time or until such time as soil movement becomes tolerable. I have also been assured that the trust recognizes the individual problems involved, and now that the weather is finer it will maintain a substantial work force in the area to make repairs to faults caused by unusual soil movement. The trust is confident that the soil condition in this area, as in others, will become stabilized.

That is as far as I take the matter now. The trust recognizes its responsibilities in the matter, and is doing its utmost to measure up to the responsibility that it accepts. It will maintain the work force in the area for an extended period of time, which could be longer in some places than in others. Every effort will be made to maintain the houses to the best possible condition, in the expectation that the soil movement will eventually stabilize in this area as it has been found to do on other difficult land in the metropolitan area.

LATE SHOPPING NIGHT

Mr. FERGUSON: Recently, it was announced that the Friday evening prior to Christmas would be a late shopping night for business houses in all controlled shopping districts. In most country areas it has been the traditional custom for the late shopping night prior to Christmas to be on Christmas Eve. If the late shopping night were to be the Friday before Christmas, I feel that in some country areas many of the people engaged in harvesting operations would not trouble to engage in late shopping whereas, if it were on Christmas Eve, they would finish work early and go to the local town and participate in the Christmas festivities. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether, if an application is made by a country shopping area, he will grant shopkeepers a late shopping night on Christmas Eve in lieu of the Friday which has already been proclaimed?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: When this question arose recently, it was decided to give prior notice as early as possible for the convenience of the public and the people who manage and work in shops. At that time, speaking from memory, the only country district requesting that shops remain open late on Christmas Eve instead of the Friday prior to Christmas was Mount Gambier, and this request was acceded to. Since then, one or two other applications have been made, and at present some of these districts are being approached to ascertain which night they would prefer—the Friday prior to Christmas, or Christmas Eve. Any suggestions put forward that have the support of the local neighbourhood will be considered.

WHYALLA OCCUPATION CENTRE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education an answer to my question of October 24 regarding the Whyalla Occupation Centre?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: There was some delay in using the new premises as fencing had to be completed. However, this has now been completed and the furniture was moved into the new premises on Saturday, October 26, and children attended for the first time on Monday, October 28.

EYRE PENINSULA ELECTRICITY

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Works an answer to my question regarding electricity problems on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Playford power station cannot be extended, as the present plant can use all of the coal economically available from Leigh Creek. Natural gas will not be used at the power station because it is more expensive than Leigh Creek coal. All of the Electricity Trust's power stations are inter-connected, and power that cannot be obtained from one is obtained from

another. There is therefore no difficulty in coping with any additional power demands on Eyre Peninsula.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of October 24 concerning an improved sewerage scheme for an area near the Tea Tree Gully Council Chambers?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: When sewerage schemes are submitted for approval they are to some extent diagrammatic and are subject to variation when detailed field surveys and designs are made. Until detailed levels are taken it is not possible to state the exact extent of the scheme and it is not known whether certain properties at the extremities can or cannot be served by the scheme. Also, in some cases the routes of the sewers may need to be altered when detailed surveys are made. It is therefore undesirable for plans of schemes to be issued, as they could be easily misconstrued and landowners could be misled as to the department's intentions. Plans are available at the office of the Engineer for Sewerage, and the honourable member is welcome to inspect these. Any particular queries can be answered. Landowners can also have their queries answered by calling or writing to the department.

MEASLES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Health to my recent question about measles vaccine?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Measles vaccine has not yet been supplied for the proposed campaign in Victoria or any other State. However, the Commonwealth Minister for Health has announced that the approved vaccine will be supplied free for use by any State Health Department as soon as arrangements for its importation are completed. The cost of the vaccine is high, and is understood to be about $3 a dose. Special precautions are needed in its use, as it has a very short effective life on being removed from refrigeration. Plans are now being made for limited use of the vaccine by the South Australian Public Health Department. I hope this reply is satisfactory to the member for Stirling and the member for Glenelg.

SCHOOL WATER CHARGES

Mr. CASEY: Before the recent adjournment I asked the Minister of Works a question about the reduction of water charges for private schools in country areas, and asked him to discuss this matter in Cabinet. As I have a prompt reply I guess that it is in the affirmative. Will the Minister give me that reply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The reply is in the affirmative: yes, I have a reply. There is a slight difference in the method of calculation of water rates between State and private schools. Private schools are required to pay an annual rate and are allowed 1,000 gallons without further charge for each 30c of this rate. All water used in excess of this allowance is charged for at a rate of 30c for each 1,000 gallons. State schools are charged 30c for each 1,000 gallons for all water used. This means that, provided that a private school uses all its water allowance for rates paid (and most do), it will be required to pay precisely the same amount as would be required if it were owned by the Education Department. State schools do not enjoy any concessions in charges for water used.

AGENT-GENERAL'S VISIT

Mr. RODDA: As I understand that the Agent-General in England is shortly returning to South Australia on leave, has the Premier details of his coming visit?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Agent-General for South Australia in England will be returning for what is known as mid-term leave on Tuesday, November 12. He will arrive at 5.5 p.m. at the Adelaide Airport and will commence a busy programme, although he will have some free time to investigate economic and other aspects of South Australia that he may wish to study. I am pleased that he will be able to fit this into his programme, because he is extremely busy in London on behalf of this State and I believe he has been very successful. He will arrive on November 12; on November 18 he will see me officially, and also the Leader of the Opposition; on November 20 he will visit the South-East for a comprehensive tour; on November 25 he will visit Whyalla; and on December 2 he will visit the River towns. These activities are highlights of a busy programme in which he will familiarize himself with changes and developments in South Australia that will be useful to him when he returns to London. I believe that members will look forward to meeting him when the opportunity arises.

ELIZABETH INDUSTRY

Mr. CLARK: I was delighted to read this morning about the proposed establishment of a new industry at Elizabeth West, as I am

sure were my constituents in that area. Has the Premier further information concerning this industry?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This industry is coming to South Australia as a result of long and protracted contacts. The first contact was made in 1957, I think, and contacts have continued since then. I visited the firm in Holland in July, and spent most of one day talking to the management and looking over the factory situated at Krommenie. Following that visit, continued contacts have been made, and this morning I announced the programme that has now been confirmed. I cannot add much more. I have two pages of notes, some of which were used in the newspaper release and some of which were not. It will not initially be a large user of labour. This will be a high-investment project involving $1,000,000, and manufacture will be carried out by using the latest machinery and methods in the floor-covering field.

Mr. Hudson: How many employees?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Initially, about 35, but many ancillary benefits will come from this industry. The factory will cost about $250,000, and local suppliers will provide the material used in the manufacture of this high-quality vinyl covering, including large quantities of the needle felt used as a base for viny-carpet.

Mr. Hudson: This is fairly well established on the local market.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I was about to say—

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections when Ministers are replying to questions and when members are asking questions. If there are any more interjections when a Minister is replying to a question I will take them to indicate an objection to the Premier or to the Minister continuing. The Minister must be allowed to reply.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This company has established large sales in Australia over recent years, but it is now entering the manufacturing field of a product that is already selling here, and it will introduce new forms of floor coverings as they are developed by the parent company in Holland. This firm will bring to South Australia an industry that does not exist here at present. It will manufacture goods now imported into Australia and therefore bring about a valuable import saving. It will provide stable employment for its employees, because of the long-term considerations of the company and because of the long-term outlook of its management. It will provide increasing employment as the company's manufactures increase in accordance with the growth of the Australian market and with the entry of new forms of its product into Australia. It will also support employment in industries that provide materials for the manufacture of these floor coverings. A director of this company (Mr. G. W. A. Kaars Sypesteyn) will visit Adelaide this month to initiate or oversee the beginning of this project which, I understand, will go ahead almost forthwith.

PORT ADELAIDE ROADWORKS

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about certain roadworks in Port Adelaide linking up with the Birkenhead bridge?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Programming of this work has been deferred pending confirmation by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study that such a connection is warranted. The study has now included the work as part of its recommendations. When the study is accepted, the work will be programmed.

SILO STORAGE

Mr. McKEE: In view of the record harvest expected this year and the limited silo accommodation, of which the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture are well aware, growers have informed me that they are afraid they may not be able to have any of their crop stored in a silo, and they have suggested that silo storage be brought under control, thereby allowing each grower to store a percentage of his harvest (it would be impossible to store the entire crop on most properties). I fancy that a question has been asked about the zoning of wheat silos, but this suggestion has been put to me and, as the Minister is aware, many silos are in my district. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to examine the suggestion?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although the honourable member's suggestion seems to be fraught with difficulties, I will take up this matter with the Minister of Agriculture and let the honourable member know as soon as I receive a reply.

HENLEY BEACH SEWERAGE

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Works any information about the Engineering and Water Supply Department's intended activities regarding a sewerage scheme in the Grange and Henley Beach area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: A large construction gang will be working continuously in the Grange-Fulham area during the 1968-69 financial year, and an allocation of $350,000 has been made in the Loan funds for the scheme this financial year. The gang working on the scheme will also construct sewers for private subdividers and the South Australian Housing Trust, under agreement, in this area. As the subdividers' requirements have, in some cases, not yet been finalized, the works programme is, in consequence, subject to variation. Sewers are at present being constructed in the northern end of Wright Street and work is commencing in Clarence Street and Tapley Hill Road to enable council stormwater drains and road widening to be undertaken. It is expected that in the 1968-69 financial year all approved reticulation sewers west of Tapley Hill Road will be completed except for a few short lengths that are dependent on sewers being laid through new subdivisions.

PAROLE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has been the traditional view, always acted upon by the Administration previously, that in parole matters the parolee was capable of getting probation at the end of half of his term and, in this, he was not at a disadvantage, because there were normal remissions in the term of his imprisonment. I understand that the view of the relevant section in the Act has been questioned by a Crown law opinion, so that now the view taken is that one must serve the full half of the total sentence and remission is not to be taken into account in reducing the term for applying for his parole. I understand that 19 or 20 prisoners are awaiting parole at the moment as a result of this matter's having been called in question. Can the Attorney-General say what is the present position and how soon these applications in relation to probation can be dealt with? If the view is taken (and with the greatest respect, I disagree to it) that the remissions are not to be taken into account in making the earlier period available for applications for probation, will legislation be introduced promptly to make this possible, because it has been upon that basis, I am sure, that a great many sentences have in fact been based?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As this matter primarily concerns the Chief Secretary, I have discussed it with him. The position is substantially as the Leader has set it out. In 1957, I think, the system for parole was altered and the regulations dealing with this matter were changed. Up to that time (and I am speaking now from my recollection but I think this is the position) prisoners earned days of remission off their sentences and, under the regulations, having earned them, they were entitled to them. In 1957 the system was changed, so that technically prisoners are no longer entitled to the days of remission off sentences, or days to count towards their time of parole. The Act is so drawn as to allow to be taken into account only a period which the prisoner is entitled to have taken into account, and technically he is not entitled to have taken into account now the days of remission which are credited to him. This means that in fact, since 1957 (and certainly during the whole of the Labor Government's term), parole was granted to prisoners on what I have been informed by the Crown Solicitor was a wrong interpretation of the law. At present the matter is being examined but no firm decision has been made by Cabinet.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have waited patiently for members opposite, who usually ask questions about it, to take some interest in gauge standardization. The leader in this morning's *Advertiser* draws attention to a Commonwealth Railways publication showing a 1,500-miles continuous rail link between Perth and Sydney, as well as to the fact that the question of the connection to Adelaide has not in any way been defined. The leader states:

> That the State is now to be penalized by Canberra's failure to give a specific assurance on the conversion of the Port Pirie-Adelaide line will inevitably create dissatisfaction. Hit in the past by Federal economic policy, South Australian industries are now in greater need of the better access to eastern and western markets which a uniform line would provide.

As I realize the Premier's intense interest in establishing industries in South Australia and the need to have an outlet for these industries, can he say what action he intends to take, as Premier of the State, in this matter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Of course, the Government has made submissions to the Commonwealth Government on this matter and placed proposals before it asking it to agree to the standardization of the section of broad gauge line north of Adelaide. The matter was referred to the Commonwealth on June 19, and I have now received a letter from the Prime Minister, dated October 23, which refers to the submissions of June 19 and deals at

some length with the Commonwealth's appreciation of the present situation. The points of interest to the House are contained in the following two paragraphs of the letter:

We propose that a firm of independent expert consultants be appointed to undertake a feasibility study embracing the matters I have mentioned, following which the Commonwealth would be prepared to consider the matter further. The consultants would, of course, need to confer with and obtain detailed information from the South Australian Railways Commissioner, and I would be glad to learn whether you are agreeable to this. If so, our officers could proceed to draw up suitable terms of reference for the study for our consideration. I must stress, however, that we see the study as being confined to the question of the most efficient way of achieving rail standardization between Adelaide and the interstate railway, and while it would embrace the matters I have mentioned (including the question of the most efficient way of dealing with traffic on branch lines), we are not prepared to expand it into a general study of the broad and narrow gauge systems north of Adelaide.

That was the substance of the Prime Minister's letter.

Mr. Casey: That isn't very efficient, is it?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I replied to the Prime Minister on November 1 and the paragraph that will be of interest to the House is as follows:

My Government is agreeable to the engagement of a firm of independent expert consultants to undertake a feasibility study embracing the matters mentioned in your letter of the 22nd inst. It would appear appropriate for your officers to prepare draft terms of reference for consideration of both Governments. Any assistance required in this respect from this State would be readily available.

It would appear that some movement is now taking place in obtaining a standard gauge link between the Adelaide metropolitan area and the standard gauge line that will soon run from Perth to Brisbane. It remains for both Governments to agree to the terms of reference to be given to the independent consultants to guide them in their consideration of a standardization system for northern lines, the matters of whether a new line should be provided and existing lines converted, the problems that will arise regarding through traffic, and so on. Doubtless, all these matters will be considered by the consultants and, therefore, the terms of reference are important. I should like to think that the consideration of these matters by the consultants could be facilitated, particularly as far as South Australia was concerned, to ensure that the submission of the report was not unduly delayed. In my opinion, the appointment of these consultants will be a definite step forward in achieving the provision of this important rail link.

Mr. RICHES: I was interested in the leading article in the *Advertiser* which has been referred to by the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), particularly the statement that South Australia is now to be penalized by Canberra's failure to give a specific assurance on the conversion of the Port Pirie to Adelaide section. The Premier will recall that, in two replies to me earlier this session, he has said that a five-year programme of conversion of the northern and southern lines is contemplated, that the State's attitude has been that it would not consider the line between Adelaide and Port Pirie in isolation but that it placed that line at the bottom of the five-year priority list, and that amongst the considerations was the possibility of alterations to the Adelaide railway station being necessary consequent upon the implementation of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. Can the Premier say whether that order of priority will be insisted upon, or whether it will be changed in the light of the certainty that South Australia will miss out unless this rail connection is provided at the earliest possible date?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government considers a connection with what will soon be an across-the-continent standard line to Sydney and farther on to be extremely important, and in our considerations we have taken advice (as I think probably the Government of which the honourable member was a member last year took advice) that it is necessary to consider the effects on other lines of an isolated standard-gauge line to Port Pirie.

Mr. Riches: I was referring not to an isolated line but to priorities.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I know that, but I decided to start at the beginning of the question. The Railways Commissioner has indicated that a line in isolation would provide a proliferation of break of gauge in some instances rather than a reduction of it, and this has concerned him greatly. Those representations were made to Canberra, with the standardization priorities that would enable the project to be carried out in the most economic form for the South Australian Railways to operate under. Because of this, the Commissioner made certain recommendations which I have made known to the House and which were adopted by the Government.

The honourable member has now referred to these matters. The reply of the Commonwealth Government to our submissions has been essentially as I have read today. At present that Government does not agree to anything other than to consider the proposal to link Adelaide with the standard-gauge system or to consider the report by an independent firm of consultants. I consider this offer fair enough in the context of the need for South Australia to be connected to the system, and I also consider that we would be hard put to find reasons for rejecting the Commonwealth's offer of an independent study.

I think that whoever is selected to carry out this work will obviously be held in high repute by the South Australian Government: otherwise, we would not agree to the appointment. That being so, we should look forward with interest to the findings of the consultants, which surely should not be that South Australia ought to be penalized by some uneconomic method of construction or standardization of this line. In effect, if the terms of reference are agreed to by both Governments, as I hope they will be, the situation will rest while the independent consultants go about their business. When they report, we shall be able to examine that report and reject it or, if it is suitable to both parties, accept it. I hope that that defines the position as it now stands.

Mr. ALLEN: The opening of the Broken Hill road will be held at Yunta on Thursday next and, although I have an invitation to that ceremony, it seems that, because of the sittings of the House, unfortunately I will not be able to attend. I also understand that it is suggested that soon the completion of the standardization of the railway line to Broken Hill will be celebrated at Jamestown, where a golden spike will be driven. Will the Premier arrange to have the date of this function fixed so that it will not coincide with the sittings of this House, to enable members of the Government, particularly me, to attend?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will take the matter up with the Minister of Roads and Transport and find out whether we can oblige.

SOLDIER SETTLERS

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about the availability of carry-on finance to soldier settlers in zone 5, who have experienced difficulty in carrying on because they have not signed their leases, consequent upon a pending court action?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member is aware, this is not an easy matter to overcome. Provided the settler has some equity in the lease, even though it has not been signed, it should be possible for him to obtain assistance either by an extension of credit by business houses, or by a personal loan or a loan, backed by an outside guarantor, from a lending institution. Of course, if he has other collateral, this could be used to overcome the temporary problem. That is about as far as I can take this difficult matter.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about Housing Trust rent increases in the Mansfield Park and Kilburn area, and other areas that may have been affected?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust reports as follows:

There has not been a general rent increase for Housing Trust houses since 1965, and the rents being paid by pensioners have not been reviewed as a result of the recent increase in Commonwealth pensions. The trust regularly reviews the rents of tenants where a reduction in rent has previously been approved, the last review being in September, 1968. In only four cases were aged pensioners' rents increased in the areas mentioned by the honourable member, and these were effected so as to bring them into line with other similar cases.

GOOLWA BARRAGES

Mr. McANANEY: Recently, at a meeting of 60 or 70 fishermen at Goolwa, I was asked whether fishermen could be notified in future when the barrages were to be opened, because water comes out with rubbish and interferes with the fishermen's nets. Another consideration is that there is always considerable argument around the lakes and along the Murray River about whether the barrages are opened when they should not be opened. Will the Minister of Works arrange for notice of the opening of the barrages to be given over the air, together with the river levels, and also in the press?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I appreciate the importance of this question and I will certainly look into this matter to see whether co-operation can be extended to these fishermen in the way the honourable member has suggested.

PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my recent question regarding the number of people who travel on the Adelaide-Grange railway service?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Individual counts of passengers travelling on trains between Woodville and Grange are not maintained. However, based on the survey undertaken by the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study in July, 1965, about 2,000 persons patronized the train service each day. This represents 4,000 passenger journeys; of this number, about 200 passengers travelled as far as General Motors-Holden's.

GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of October 24 concerning the grassing of the Glengowrie High School oval?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Arrangements are in hand for the grassing and reticulation of the schoolgrounds to be undertaken under the existing contract for the new school. It is expected that these works will be completed before Christmas.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Education a further reply to my recent question on agricultural education?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The special fourth and fifth-year course at Urrbrae, begun this year, is proving particularly successful. The Headmaster has already received between 40 and 50 applications for entry to the fourth-year course in 1969. The difficulty is that to provide two classes in fourth year would require additional staff that we may be unable to find. The situation has to be carefully investigated, and we are not yet in a position to indicate whether two classes can be formed. The intention is to establish courses similar to the Urrbrae course in selected country centres as demand reveals itself. By such means the gap referred to by the honourable member, resulting from the change of role of Roseworthy college, should be diminished to some extent. It is understood, however, that this policy is without prejudice to the findings of the special committee taking evidence on and inquiring into the whole question of agricultural education.

HANSARD DISTRIBUTION

Mr. VIRGO: My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker. Have you a reply to my recent question regarding *Hansard* distribution?

The SPEAKER: I am directed by the Chief Secretary that standing authority was given on October 10, 1958, by the Chief Secretary for the Government Printer to supply, free of charge, copies of *Hansard* to all high, technical high, area and higher primary schools under the control of the Education Department. There are 147 departmental secondary schools and 44 area schools at present which should be participating in the scheme, but it has been ascertained that only 109 of these schools are receiving a copy of *Hansard* free of charge. Arrangements have been made to supply the Government Printer with a list of all departmental schools which should be receiving a copy of *Hansard* free of charge. The list will include those schools not receiving a free copy at present. Also, the Government Printer will be asked to add to this list the names of new secondary and area schools opened in the future.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day. The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I move:

That I have leave to introduce a Bill—

Mr. RICHES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it has been the practice of this House in the past that when the business of the day is called on and there is a question on the Notice Paper, the member who has given notice of the question is given the opportunity to ask it. Has that procedure been departed from?

The SPEAKER: Question Time ends at 4 o'clock. I called on the Premier to move a certain motion if he so desired, but he did not respond. It is not too late for the Premier to move to allow the question on the Notice Paper to be answered.

Mr. RICHES: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the ruling you have given necessary? In the past the practice has always been that, when the business of the day was called on, the first business of the day called on was Questions on Notice.

The SPEAKER: No. At 4 o'clock the Clerk rings the bell and the Speaker calls on the business of the day. If there is a Question

on Notice, it must be the right of the House to extend the time to enable the question to be asked. That is why I called on the Premier to move.

Mr. RICHES: I am reluctant to move a motion at this stage. I should like to reserve the right to move later to dissent from the ruling (if it is a ruling), because it is a departure from the practice the House has observed—and it is not a desirable departure.

The SPEAKER: I do not want to deny the honourable member the right to disagree to my ruling. It is clear in Standing Orders that questions are allowed for two hours until 4 o'clock. The Clerk rings the bell and the Speaker calls on the business of the day. Knowing the honourable member's generosity, I appeal to him not to move a motion at this stage. If he approaches me later, I will point out the relevant Standing Order.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I move:

That Notice of Motion (Government Business) be taken into consideration after the Question on Notice.

I move this motion, not with the idea of creating a precedent but to clear up a misunderstanding that may have arisen. I am happy to allow the Question on Notice to come on today. I think I said previously (and I hope my views were conveyed to the Opposition) that the Government viewed with some alarm the failure of the House to deal with the legislation on the Notice Paper.

Mr. Broomhill: Members on both sides have been asking the questions.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I realize that, but I believed they would desist as we got close to 4 o'clock, in order to make room for the Question on Notice within the two hours allocated. I am happy to clear up any misconception that may have arisen. If there is any misconception, I accept some of the blame. In so moving, I hope that, in future on Tuesdays, the House will be able to adjust its mode of operation in order to incorporate Questions on Notice within the two hours, so that we shall be able to spend more time on the urgent matters that are on the Notice Paper.

Mr. RICHES: I am sure that members are grateful to the Premier for his explanation and for the step he has taken. I point out to members that this is a serious matter, because the right to place questions on notice and to have them answered is one of the privileges that members should guard jealously. I emphasize that it would be a simple matter for members to ask questions until 4 o'clock, and a member would be entirely in the hands of the Premier or the Leader of the House as to whether his question on notice was ever answered. If the Premier took the action that he has so generously taken today that would allow a question on notice to be answered but, if he did not, it might never be answered.

This principle is wrong because it interferes with the rights of members. The member who placed the question on notice might not be able to ask it, because other members could exclude him by merely keeping Question Time going until 4 o'clock. Before this principle is laid down as a hard and fast rule I should like more consideration to be given to it. I thank the Premier for the step he has taken today, and I consider that members should co-operate, but if there was an understanding today I knew nothing about it. I suggest that this could be a serious interference with the rights of members.

The SPEAKER: In replying to the point raised by the member for Stuart, I think that this is a matter that could be considered by the Standing Orders Committee. When I discuss the matter I will point out the Standing Order and, if the committee desires to make a new rule on the line suggested by the honourable member (that is, that at 4 o'clock Questions on Notice be called on), it may do so. This matter could be discussed by the Standing Orders Committee with satisfactory results.

Motion carried.

MOONTA RAIL SERVICE

Mr. HUGHES (on notice):

1. What was the total value of tickets issued by stations for all passengers travelling on trains on the Adelaide-Moonta line for each of the months of February, March, April, August, September and October, 1968?

2. What was the total number of parcels carried on the Adelaide-Moonta line passenger trains from all stations for each of the months of February, March, April, August, September and October, 1968?

3. What revenue was received from parcels carried on the Adelaide-Moonta line passenger trains from all stations for each of the months of February, March, April, August, September and October, 1968?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The following table has been supplied by the Railways Commissioner:

PORT WAKEFIELD TO MOONTA LINE

Month	Value of tickets issued $	Number of parcels carried	Revenue received from parcels carried $
1968—February	9,492.60†	6,797	2,451.03
March		6,782	2,540.72
April		6,765	2,559.59
*July	9,075.58†	7,067	2,693.37
August		6,572	2,511.93
September		6,827	2,658.70

* Earnings for the month of October, 1968, are not yet available. The month of July, 1968, has been shown instead.

† Value of tickets is shown for three-monthly periods instead of monthly. Information on this basis is more readily available than on a monthly basis.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1967, Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to continue the operation of the Prices Act for another year from the present expiry date fixed by the amendment to the Act last year at December 31, 1968. The present Act has continued in operation since 1948, and there can be no doubt that it has, in varying degrees, been of substantial benefit to people of South Australia, more especially during those periods when the supply of goods and services was limited and, as a consequence, there were strong pressures for prices to rise to a degree that could have endangered the ability of South Australian industries to compete successfully in markets in other States.

The growth of the State's industries, and the resultant plentiful supply of goods and services, has introduced a strong element of competition into many of the fields in which price control has operated. It is the policy of the Government to remove controls upon people, industry, or commerce, where such controls are not essential in the public interest. Therefore, we have taken action to remove price control upon certain goods. We have also given instructions to the Prices Commissioner that he refrain from fixing prices in respect to other goods and services, on an experimental basis, while retaining a watching brief on price movements in these categories.

We intend, however, to extend the Act for a further year, so as to enable the Government to bring back under control any items where competition does not continue to freely operate, or to again fix prices on those items now held in suspense, if in the public interest it seems necessary. In addition we will retain control over a number of items which constitute basic needs by groups or individuals, some of which are an important part of the household budgets of people who are obliged to carefully plan for their essential needs, and some items of considerable importance to rural industries. We also intend to continue control of petroleum products, for which items the South Australian Prices Commissioner is recognized as the Australian authority.

In addition to these responsibilities, the Prices Commissioner exercises other important functions, for example, he fixes the price of grapes. The industry desires this to continue and, accordingly, the Government has given an undertaking to growers. The Commissioner acts as a complaints investigator and arbitrator in the interest of the public over a wide range of matters, and for the year ended June 30, 1968, the branch investigated 845 complaints of excessive prices or charges. This service is both remedial and deterrent. The Commissioner also undertakes special investigations for the Government, such as suspected rackets, unfair trading practices, and misleading advertising. The extension of the operation of the Act for a further year will enable these services to the public to be continued.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADELAIDE TO GAWLER RAILWAY (ALTERATION OF DRY CREEK TERMINUS) BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.
Its purpose is to make a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Petroleum Act, 1940-1967. The Act was extensively amended in 1967 but further examination of its provisions has disclosed a few areas in which its operation might be improved. The present amendments simplify the procedures existing under the Act and insert provisions designed to improve the liaison between petroleum exploration companies and the Mines Department. These latter amendments therefore ensure that the Minister is kept adequately informed of the activities of exploration companies, so that he can exercise informed co-operation in the search for petroleum in this State. The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is formal; clause 2 removes a possible ambiguity in the definition of "petroleum", and clause 3 makes a drafting amendment to section 4 of the principal Act. Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act. This amendment eliminates the obligation for an application for a licence to be in a prescribed form. The power to obtain all information that may be required by the Minister already exists in subsection (4) of that section and it is felt that a more flexible form of application to suit varying circumstances is desirable. Clause 5 strikes out subsection (4) of section 13 of the principal Act. That subsection provides that a bond must be in a prescribed form. A certain amount of variation in the provisions of bonds is desirable and hence this provision is struck out.

Clause 6 enacts new section 18d in the principal Act. This new section provides that a licensee engaged in petroleum exploration is to furnish the Minister with such statements and accounts relating to his expenditure in connection with petroleum exploration as the Minister may require. Clause 7 amends section 27 of the principal Act by inserting a new subsection (4). This new subsection provides that upon the grant of a petroleum production licence the area comprised in that licence shall be excised from the area comprised in the petroleum exploration licence. This merely clarifies the intention of the Act and obviates the necessity of the licensee surrendering that area under the provisions of the Act. Clause 8 amends section 32 of the principal Act. This amendment also provides for a more flexible form of application, in this case, an application for the renewal of a petroleum production licence. Clause 9 amends section 33 of the principal Act. This amendment is to some extent consequential upon the amendment made by clause 7. Its purpose is merely to make it clear that the holder of a petroleum production licence is entitled to carry out petroleum exploration operations on the area comprised in the production licence.

Clause 10 amends section 35 of the principal Act. It avoids the necessity of prescribing a form upon which the holder of a production licence is to declare the value of petroleum recovered by him. Its purpose therefore is also to increase the flexibility of the Act. Clause 11 makes a drafting amendment to section 38 of the principal Act by striking out "his mining operations", a phraseology which is now obsolete. Clause 12 repeals and re-enacts section 45 of the principal Act. There is no change in substance; the provision is merely expressed in a modified form.

Clause 13 amends section 55 of the principal Act by adding to the records that are to be kept by a licensee and that are to be made available to him upon request. The licensee is required to keep a record of the machinery and equipment used by him in the course of operations conducted by him; a record of the geophysical and geological surveys and examinations undertaken by him in the area comprised in the licence; and a record of the quantity and quality of any petroleum encountered by him in the course of his operations.

Clause 14 repeals section 57 of the principal Act. It is thought that this provision could be inserted in the regulations in a more flexible and comprehensive form. Clause 15 amends section 62 of the principal Act. The licensee is relieved of the necessity of using a prescribed form when reporting accidents and injuries occurring in the course of his operations. Clause 16 amends section 80e of the principal Act. This amendment merely provides for a more flexible method of application for a pipeline licence. Clause 17 enables the Minister specifically to requisition information relating to the construction or operation of a pipeline.

I commend the Bill to the House, knowing that oil exploration is very much in the minds of certain people, including those associated with the Mines Department, and I assure the House that this measure is designed to make the Act work more smoothly.

Mr. BURDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to enable the Veterinary surgeons Board of South Australia to register competent veterinary surgeons, who graduated outside the Commonwealth of Australia, as veterinary surgeons in South Australia. There was in fact a provision inserted to this effect by the amending Act of 1952, but that Act provided that application for registration by a foreign graduate had to be made within three years after the passing of that Act. This Bill revives that provision without, however, imposing any limitation on the time of application for registration. Clause 3 of the Bill therefore amends section 17a of the principal Act, which is the provision dealing with the registration of foreign graduates inserted by the amending Act of 1952. In its amended form it will provide that a person shall be entitled to be registered as a veterinary surgeon if he has attained the age of 21 years and is of good character and—

(*a*) he has passed through a course of veterinary study in a country outside the Commonwealth and has duly graduated in that course of study;

(*b*) the course of study was, if he graduated before the first day of January, 1947, of not less than four years' duration or, if he graduated on or after that day, of not less than five years' duration;

(*c*) he is, by law, qualified to practise as a veterinary surgeon in the country in which he graduated;

(*d*) he has resided in Australia for not less than two years; and

(*e*) he has satisfied the examiners appointed by the board of his competence in veterinary surgery and practice.

The remaining provisions of the Bill merely make decimal currency amendments. Veterinary surgery registration has occupied much attention in this House over many years. I recall many amendments being made to the Act, and it has been a somewhat vexed question concerning who should and should not be allowed to practice. There is no difficulty about someone who practises for no reward at all, but anyone who wishes to practise for reward must be able to do so under the Act. This is a further liberalization of the legislation. As members know, veterinary practitioners are those who are licensed to operate but who have not a degree in veterinary surgery. Many of these men are greatly experienced and have practised for a long time.

Over the years, because of the shortage of veterinary surgeons and in view of the injustice involved in preventing from practising men who had practised in the past, the position of such men has been recognized. We now have a somewhat new situation in that migrants, as has been pointed out in the report, who have been trained competently want a right to practise here. However, just as there is an ethical standard in medicine, the Veterinary Surgeons Board must safeguard the standards in this field. The board is satisfied to alter the conditions as provided, and this will make it easier for relatively new citizens to be licensed to practise. They will probably make a contribution in regard to the severe shortage of veterinary surgeons in Australia. By no means do we simply need veterinary surgeons to cure animal illnesses. The Agriculture Department has many veterinary surgeons undertaking tasks that require a knowledge that is confined to people with such training. In addition, various abattoirs throughout the Commonwealth have to have made ante-mortem inspections because of the hygiene requirements of the United States of America and some other countries. In view of this wide need for veterinary surgeons, it is considered that the Bill will at least contribute towards providing for more veterinary surgeons in South Australia, so I commend it to the House.

Mr. BURDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from October 24. Page 2156.)

Clause 7—"The Metropolitan area"—which the Hon. D. A. Dunstan had moved to amend by inserting in subclause (2) after "1966-67," the words "and the municipality of Gawler".

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I wish to reply to one or two remarks made following my speech last Thursday week. I had said that I was in the company of a group of young people in the Parliamentary refreshment room, and it was then suggested by one member opposite that I had broken the rules by taking into that room a greater number of guests than were allowed.

Mr. Ryan: That has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am replying to what members opposite said. I point out that I, too, was a guest; I was a guest of one of the members representing the Gawler area, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, and it is wrong to say I infringed the rules by being there. Also, the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) said that I was telling deliberate lies when I said that Australian Labor Party members had been instructed to vote for the Bill and that the efforts they were making to amend it were just a veneer. The fact is that everyone knows that Labor Party members in this place take their instructions from the Trades Hall.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must not refer to those matters.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I will not take that any further, but I looked up the constitution of the A.L.P. and it leaves the whole issue in no doubt at all. The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) said that he took some of my remarks as a personal insult. I apologize to him if anything I said could be taken by him in that way, because that is the last thing I intended. I was speaking generally about the Gawler area and not referring to the honourable member.

Mr. Clark: You specifically compared the present member and a possible new member.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: To which member for Gawler is the honourable member referring? Several members represent the Gawler area in the State Parliament.

Mr. Virgo: Only one member represents the Assembly District of Gawler.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am satisfied that no Opposition member who has climbed his way up the trade union ladder, with all the kicks and insults that come to A.L.P. members, is likely to have delicate sensibilities when it comes to a member's passing a reflection on his representation of his seat.

Mr. LAWN: Had it not been for the remarks of the member for Light, I might not have spoken. The difference between the provision in the Bill and the amendment moved by the Leader is a distance of about half a mile. The Bill provides for an area north of the Gawler Racecourse with a boundary within half a mile of Gawler proper. The amendment seeks to include Gawler by extending the boundary half a mile. When it is realized that 80 per cent of the work force of Gawler (and that is the figure given by the member for Gawler, who should know) obtains employment south of that town, the terms of the amendment are not unreasonable. It seems ridiculous to me (particularly in view of the previous attitude of the Liberal and Country League) that a town the size of Gawler should be defined as a country area.

Mr. Broomhill: There is a community of interest.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and that was provided for in previous Bills. Also, the Playford Government, in a Bill passed through this place in 1963 to set up a commission to determine boundaries, stipulated that country industrial centres could be looked at by the commission. In this case Gawler is half a mile outside the proposed boundary. If one has regard to community of interests, there is no doubt where the boundary should be. The remarks made by the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn)—

Mr. Freebairn: What page?

Mr. LAWN: I am reading from the proof.

Mr. Freebairn: You know better than that.

Mr. Broomhill: Before you corrected it.

Mr. LAWN: I have been very busy and have not had time to read the weekly volume but, if there are any corrections, the honourable member can tell me, because I will accept them. The honourable member said:

> I say deliberately that the Leader of the Opposition has insulted the people of Gawler.

In view of what I have said, no insult could have been claimed or alleged against the people of Gawler. The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) acclaimed the amendment, saying that the people of Gawler wanted it, so only people who think as the member for Light does would consider that there was any insult in the amendment.

Mr. Freebairn: How far did you say Gawler was from Elizabeth?

Mr. LAWN: I did not say. The honourable member is childish. A man of his age should be married. Otherwise, such men have a habit of doing things that affect their mentality and physical well-being.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. LAWN: Well, the member for Light should realize that he is really silly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LAWN: He does not seem to appreciate it, although he asked me how far I had said Gawler was from Elizabeth, when I had not mentioned Elizabeth. The honourable member also said:

> I can say with justification that I know the township of Gawler much better than he knows it, and to describe Gawler as being part of metropolitan Adelaide is ridiculous. Undoubtedly, the township of Gawler is part

of the rural area of which it is the centre. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Gawler both know this. Last evening I entertained a party of young people from Gawler, and they were delighted when I told them that if this Bill was passed in its present form—

The honourable member should be responsible. We make the laws that we expect the people to observe, and we should observe them ourselves. The honourable member is also a member of the Joint House Committee, but he breaks the rules. He had 14 people in a place from which we have been banned. We made representations about the matter, in the proper way. However, the member for Light got a couple of colleagues to join him so that he could entertain 14 people. He broke the rule, because the committee allows a member to entertain a specific number. He got two colleagues to come in, and the party took up the whole lounge. No other member could entertain anyone.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member—

Mr. LAWN: I think I have said enough, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member has the audacity to say, as we would expect a childish man to say:

I look forward to the day when the people of Gawler will have a country member representing a country seat.

The present member for Gawler has lived in the district all his life, except when he was absent while he was a schoolteacher, and that honourable member has replied to the member for Light. The member for Light went on to say:

It seems hard to get the message across to members opposite, but I warned them deliberately during the second reading debate that if they interfered too much with this Bill I would vote against it.

I have replied to that and have challenged the honourable member, who went on:

They have had instructions from the Trades Hall to vote for this Bill and if it does not pass they will be in grave trouble.

During the second reading debate and earlier this session I replied to a similar statement to that. In his every speech, the member for Light refers to our getting instructions from the Trades Hall.

Mr. Broomhill: He got a shock last Wednesday week.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, when we said we agreed to certain suggestions by the Premier. The whole Party got a shock, and that is why Government members are in such confusion. This is the third occasion on which I am replying to a similar statement by the honourable member about getting instructions. He believes in the axiom that, if one keeps on making a statement, some mud will stick, or that where there is smoke there is fire and people will, bit by bit, believe some of the things that he says. However, some people in the honourable member's district have caught up with him. I have said previously that he is dead from the neck up, paralysed from the waist down—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LAWN: —and has a growth in between and that, when the people of his district catch up with him, they will make dead sure! The honourable member has said that the people of Gawler would like him to be their member. He also said:

Kapunda does not differ much from Gawler. Those towns are like any other of the most excellent towns in the District of Light and which are so adequately represented in this Chamber.

Represented by himself! Let us see what the people of Kapunda think of their representative. I have a letter written to a newspaper that circulates in the District of Light and, I understand, also in the Districts of Angas and Barossa. The member for Gawler could have referred to this letter, but he was too generous to do so and kept politics out of the matter. This is the letter to the newspaper, headed "L.C.L.—Get out!":

Sir—It would be interesting to know how many thousands who voted L.C.L. at the last State elections now wished they had not. Don Dunstan warned the people what to expect from them—very high taxation and a Minister who should not be in the Government. Most of these have come true. Of course, the L.C.L. says the high taxation is because of the mismanagement by the Labor Government. What about all the L.C.L. States. They are all on the higher taxation—are they mismanaged, too? Now for the railway position. Even now the Adelaide station looks like a morgue, and it will get worse. What are interstate and oversea people going to think when they see a city railway station looking like this? What are the L.C.L. country politicians doing about the country train service? At one protest meeting held in Kapunda, the member for the district was not even there.

Mr. Clark: Who represents that area?

Mr. LAWN: The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), who is complaining about the representation from the District of Gawler and who is looking forward to the day when he will be the member for that district. The letter continues:

If the Railways Commissioner put on good, fast trains instead of talking about underground railways, people would use them.

When the Labor Government was in office, ratepayers did have a say in local affairs but, under the L.C.L. rule, it is no better than the Hitler days . . . and this is the Party that is always crying democracy. There is a saying going around: Hall, Hill, Hell!

This saying has drifted down to Adelaide. The letter concludes:

The Government must surely realize it cannot run this State—so, hand it to those who can.—Yours, etc., M. P. Ryan.

That is what one of his own constituents thinks. The member for Light said:

I hope the day comes when Gawler becomes part of the District of Light, because then the people of Gawler will receive more adequate representation than they do now.

Whenever a meeting is called, it is obvious that the honourable member will not attend it. This is because he cannot face criticism. He continued:

Gawler is part of a country area and should stay in the rural zone. I should like to hear the member for Gawler make representations on behalf of the municipality of Gawler, which he represents, in this Chamber.

Well, the member for Gawler gave adequate replies to the member for Light. There was no politics in the speech by the member for Gawler, whereas there was in the speech by the member for Light, and that is all we are getting from him this session. When Sir Thomas Playford was Premier the present Premier became the rabbit behind the then Premier, and the member for Light is now attempting to be the rabbit behind the Premier. I hope the Committee will include the town of Gawler, because it was included in the previous Bill. The work force comes south from a short distance away at Elizabeth, Salisbury and other parts of the metropolitan area, and their interests are similar to those of the people in the metropolitan area. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. GILES: How will the commissioners determine whether land will be predominantly rural at the end of seven years? We are now talking about including or not including the town of Gawler in the metropolitan area. Gawler is a rural town and should not be included in the metropolitan area. Possibly at the end of seven years the suburban area will extend farther out and nearer to Gawler. However, when a town serves mainly a rural community it is a rural town.

Mr. Casey: Do all the people of Gawler work on the land?

Mr. GILES: Would the member for Frome say that all the people of Maitland or of Mount Gambier work on the land? The honourable member's argument does not hold water. It is obvious that some people living in Gawler have to serve in the shops, garages, and so on, and they serve the people from the country. It is a rural town. Much of the land in the Adelaide Hills, adjacent to the boundary of the proposed metropolitan area, will be predominantly rural at the end of seven years. What will the commissioners' definition of "rural land" be? I hope a Minister will be able to answer that question.

Mr. McANANEY: I will confine my remarks to the Bill, having listened to what has been said in the last half hour or so. The member for Glenelg said, when we were last debating this clause, that the Bureau of Census and Statistics included Gawler in the metropolitan area. That is not correct. The area comprising the metropolitan area does not go within five or six miles of Gawler. At every census the metropolitan area is changed. In 1966, Elizabeth—

Mr. Hudson: I think in 1967 the boundaries were altered to include Gawler.

Mr. McANANEY: The Bureau of Census and Statistics gave me the present figures, and if the honourable member will listen for once he will learn the true facts of life. The boundaries are changed only at every census, and they were changed after the 1966 census. Elizabeth and a part of Tea Tree Gully were then brought into the metropolitan area: but Gawler definitely is not included in that area, in spite of what the member for Glenelg claims. It is worked on the basis that, when there are 500 people to the square mile over a certain area, that area is included in the metropolitan area. Gawler was definitely not included, and probably it will not be included in the metropolitan area for another 15 years, because it is not likely that the population of the area between Elizabeth and Gawler will increase to the necessary numbers in that time. It is not the practice of the Bureau of Census and Statistics to include an area out on its own, completely divorced from the metropolitan area. I notice the member for Glenelg has shot into the blue to check on this. I doubt whether he will return.

He was also dogmatic in stating just where these boundaries would be, where, down to the last mile, commissioners would decide where the boundaries would be. They have some discretion, in this matter. For instance, are Aldgate and Bridgewater predominantly metropolitan or country areas? It is doubtful just where these boundaries are. In my opinion, it would be better if they were defined by Parliament rather than that the

commission should have this much discretion. This Bill gives the commissioners (well-trained men capable of doing this job) power to determine the boundaries. If Gawler is included in the metropolitan area, it is likely that Aldgate and Bridgewater will be, too. However, no member of Parliament can say dogmatically where the boundaries will be, because it is left to the discretion of the Commissioners.

I rose merely to correct the two mis-statements made when we last sat, and to emphasize that Gawler is isolated from the metropolitan area. It should not be included merely for political reasons. Members opposite think it should be included because of the possibility of increasing the number of metropolitan seats. I respect the member for Gawler when he speaks, but I doubt very much whether 80 per cent of the work force of Gawler comes to the city. There are 4,500 voters in that area, 80 per cent of which would be about 3,500, and some of those people would be engaged on home duties. I doubt whether this percentage of the people of Gawler comes to work in the metropolitan area. A wealthy district like that is usually supported by the country surrounding it, as is the case with Strathalbyn, which is only half the size of Gawler, or Murray Bridge, which is bigger than Gawler. Gawler would be maintained mainly by the country around it rather than by its people who work in the metropolitan area, so I think this is a good way to decide it. I would prefer to have the boundaries defined so that Parliament knew where they were. On the other hand, I have great faith in the commissioners, and I believe they will come up with a fair and just interpretation of what Parliament means.

Mr. VIRGO: I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I sympathize with the member for Stirling. It is pleasing that at least he stuck to the Bill and did not lash out, as the member for Light did with his typical form of abuse and without any reference to the Bill. It is his usual form: he lacks common sense and embarks on a tirade of abuse. What has prompted this discussion, of course, is the iniquitous loading of the country against the city. If this loading was not there, we should not be trying to decide whether Gawler was inside or outside the metropolitan area. It is only because the Government has imposed this iniquitous loading of 15 per cent that we have had all this argument. The Government has got away completely from the principle of one vote one value; it does not know what it means. We had the principle of one vote one value in an earlier Bill but, unfortunately, that is history that never materialized. Under that Bill, there would not have been the reduction in country representation that there will be under this Bill, and members opposite—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. VIRGO: It is no good gabbling on, as the member for Stirling is doing. He knows as well as I do that, in its endeavour to justify the reduction in country representation contained in this Bill, the Government is trying to make areas like Gawler into country areas so that they will have a smaller quota. This is caused by this iniquitous loading. It is laughable to read what the Attorney-General said when speaking to this matter. However, the whole Bill is a very serious matter to me. The rights of the people of this State are very near and dear to me, because I believe in the rights of the people. The Attorney-General said (*Hansard*, page 2155):

> In such a redistribution plan we must draw a line somewhere and we have drawn it, as we said we would in our policy speech . .

Of course, that is correct as far as it goes, but the Attorney-General forgot to say what his Leader said. When the Premier was campaigning for his life in the Millicent District, he said, "I will take the decision of the electors of Millicent as a direction. If they support the Liberal and Country League candidate, this will be an endorsement of our policy but if, on the other hand, the electors of Millicent return Des Corcoran as a member I will accept that as an endorsement of the Labor Party's policy." I do not know whether members opposite have forgotten about it: most of them were down there spreading their poison around, as was the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn). The Premier's statement was made publicly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I believe that reference was made to my trundling around the poison cart in Millicent. I take exception to that remark by the member for Edwardstown.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Light has taken exception to the remark.

Mr. VIRGO: I did not say the member for Light was pushing around his poison cart: I said that the member for Light was spreading his usual poison, as he was.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I take strong exception to that remark and I insist that it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has taken exception to the remark. The member for Edwardstown.

Mr. VIRGO: I see nothing whatever to withdraw: it is a truthful statement that has been made here before. It is completely true, and I see no reason to withdraw something that is completely true.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The remark and similar remarks have been used in the House on a number of occasions, and I have not asked for a withdrawal because the member concerned has not taken exception to them.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Mr. Chairman, I will let the member for Edwardstown find his own level.

Mr. VIRGO: I was making an important point about the Premier's statement during the Millicent by-election campaign that a victory for the Labor Party's candidate would be accepted as an endorsement of the Labor Party's policy. Therefore, the Attorney-General has no right to say, with his usual self-righteous attitude, "We are doing what we said we would do in our policy speech", because the Premier completely cancelled that out during the Millicent by-election campaign. The Labor Party's policy was endorsed and the Premier accepted it as an endorsement, and the Labor Party's policy is for one vote one value. There is no reason whatever for this iniquitous 15 per cent loading. If we could get rid of this, we would have no quarrel about whether Gawler should or should not be included. Why are the people of Gawler less important or more important than the people of Smithfield, Elizabeth, Reynella or somewhere else? They are all citizens of this State and equal in value. To try to make first-class and second-class citizens through this Bill or, should I say, to perpetuate a system of first-class and second-class citizens (which we have suffered since 1938) is completely wrong.

Mr. Giles: That is your definition—no-one else's.

Mr. VIRGO: I have never heard so much tripe in all my life. The honourable member was posing a hypothetical question about how the commission would decide what part of the area would be substantially or predominantly used for the business of primary production. In other words, he was saying there should be discrimination. The Leader of the Opposition, when in Government, introduced a Bill based on the principle of one vote one value. A Gallup poll found that 43 per cent of the people interviewed supported the principle of one vote one value, whilst only 35 per cent said there should be country loading, and 20 per cent had no opinion.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I wonder whether they have changed their definition of primary production now.

Mr. VIRGO: We do not know, although I think primary production is defined in the Land Tax Act. No matter which way we look at it, the Government has no mandate to have a loaded country electoral area.

Mrs. Byrne: It has not got a mandate for this Bill.

Mr. VIRGO: No; indeed, it has not got a mandate for anything.

Mr. Lawn: All it has is a Stott-Hall coalition.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) has suggested that Gawler is a rural town. Of course, his statement does not bear examination. He knows that Gawler is no different from Elizabeth, Smithfield or Salisbury. It is almost a continuous run along the Main North Road.

Mr. Freebairn: How far is it from Gawler to Elizabeth?

Mr. VIRGO: Next time the honourable member drives home he should check that himself.

Mr. Allen: Have you ever been to Gawler?

Mr. VIRGO: That question is typical of the questioner. The Attorney-General also made an interesting remark when referring to the town planning report. He said, "That is why the Government is not prepared to accept the amendment." I am not sure whether the Attorney-General has the authority to speak on behalf of the Government, but I have sufficient confidence in some members to believe that they will see the justice of democratic representation and the justice of a person having an equal say in electing and sacking a Government. If there are Government members who believe that, this is their chance to prove it. The Leader's amendment will allow Gawler to be regarded in the same way as the remainder of the metropolitan area, and citizens in Gawler will have a status equal to those in the rest of the State. We should not continue the rotten practice of having first-class and second-class citizens.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Works): I think the problem is that the Opposition did not expect the Government to bring

in such a widespread Bill, which has moved so far from the old Act and from the present boundaries that we agree should be changed. What the member for Edwardstown and his colleagues have been doing is the old exercise of trying to save face. The Government has accepted several Opposition amendments, but it does not intend to accept this one. The Bill, as introduced, is based on a metropolitan area established in 1962 by an independent authority that had nothing to do with any future electoral boundaries. Town planning legislation introduced by the Labor Government in 1966 and 1967 was also based on this plan.

The member for Glenelg adroitly avoided mentioning what the Commonwealth Electoral Commission did. Opposition members have commended the Commonwealth method of determining boundaries, but we find that Gawler is included not in the District of Bonython but in the rural District of Wakefield, which coincides with the present proposal based on the 1966 town planning proposal. I am sure that the member for Gawler would be the first to agree that most of his district's problems come from Elizabeth and not from Gawler, and that he is looking forward to the day when he represents either Elizabeth or Gawler, but not both. The member for Adelaide, since I have been in this House, has always had one theme that he could be relied on to talk about, no matter what the Bill. I refer to our old friend Mr. Gerrymander. This is his catchcry, and one of his ways of life.

Mr. Lawn: I didn't mention a word about it today.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Of course not: the honourable member has not said much about this subject lately, particularly since this Bill was introduced. The Government has introduced a Bill based on an acceptable and fair allocation of boundaries, so the member for Adelaide has completely reversed his position and is the first person in his Party to start juggling and fiddling around with boundaries. He and his Party are the first to move an amendment to fiddle with boundaries, and this is gerrymandering. I have heard the member for Adelaide repeatedly speak about this, and the member for Gawler has quoted Finer and his book on gerrymander. Why are they supporting an amendment that is designed to juggle boundaries? Perhaps to give the Labor Party an advantage in obtaining a certain result.

Mr. Broomhill: Don't you think the commissioners are the best judges of that?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes, and that is why the Government will not accept this amendment; it will work on a defined area that is desirable and necessary. The Government considers that this is a fair Bill with a sound basis, and that this amendment should not be accepted.

Mr. HUDSON: Members on this side usually regard the Minister of Works as a competent Minister; it is not often that we hear a thoroughly incompetent speech from him, but we have heard one this afternoon. All he has said is that he thinks this is a fair Bill. So what? He said we avoided referring to the Commonwealth redistribution, but that redistribution has no direct relevance to the definition of the metropolitan area, because under the Commonwealth proposal the authorities are not required to define metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. However, if we look at the Commonwealth proposals, we notice that much of the new Division of Angas would include areas that are in the metropolitan area as defined by this Bill.

The Commonwealth proposal allows all of the areas of Stirling, Crafers, Bridgewater and Aldgate, which would come into the metropolitan area under this Bill and which came into the metropolitan area as defined by the 1963 State Electoral Commission, to be included in the rural district of Angas. Noarlunga, Port Noarlunga South and Seaford are included in the Division of Barker, basically a rural area, but they were included in the metropolitan area in the 1963 State redistribution, are included in the metropolitan area in this Bill, and are likely to be included in the metropolitan area in any proposal advanced by the commission set up under this Bill. The Commonwealth redistribution does not pay close attention to what is metropolitan and non-metropolitan in determining boundary lines between what are predominantly rural and what are predominantly metropolitan seats, and the authorities have never been required to define a precise boundary.

Mr. Virgo: It's basically one vote one value.

Mr. HUDSON: That is right.

Mr. Clark: Over the years Gawler has moved backwards and forwards between Wakefield and Bonython; this is not the first time.

Mr. HUDSON: No. If the Commonwealth authorities were so concerned, why did they leave Gawler as part of the Commonwealth Division of Bonython for 12 months?

Mr. Clark: It was done only to even up the numbers.

Mr. HUDSON: Quite. Since last year the Adelaide statistical division, for the purposes of calculating population and other statistical information by the Bureau of Census and Statistics, has included Gawler.

Mr. McAnaney: That isn't correct.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling has failed to distinguish between what the bureau calls "metropolitan Adelaide" and what it calls the "Adelaide statistical division". I refer now to the field count statement (No. 9), dealing with the population for local government areas and urban centres for South Australia under the 1966 census. This statement reports as follows:

Population clusters of 1,000 or more persons having a minimum density of 500 persons a square mile shall be designated "urban". Around each principal urban centre with a population of 75,000 or more, two boundaries shall be drawn. The outer boundary shall circumscribe the area which is expected to be in close economic and social contact with the principal urban centre for the next two or three decades. These areas shall be designated "statistical divisions" (for State capital cities).

This is the outer boundary covering not only the metropolitan area but also all those areas which the bureau expects to be in "close economic and social contact with the principal urban centre for the next two or three decades". This statement was published last year and, under the Adelaide statistical division, for the benefit of the member for Stirling I will read as far as the letter "G", as follows: Adelaide, Brighton, Burnside, Campbelltown, Colonel Light Gardens, East Torrens, Elizabeth, Enfield, and Gawler.

Gawler is not part of metropolitan Adelaide (the member for Stirling is correct in that respect), but it is part of the Adelaide statistical division. In fact, the State Planning Office, despite what is contained in the Town Planning Committee's report, in the submissions it made to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study on population forecasts for metropolitan Adelaide, says that metropolitan Adelaide embraces an area from Gawler to Sellick Beach, comprising the statistical metropolitan area and the following local government areas: City of Elizabeth, City of Salisbury, Municipality of Gawler, District Councils of East Torrens, Munno Para, Noarlunga, Stirling and Tea Tree Gully, portion of the District Council of Meadows and portion of the District Council of Willunga. This is based on the Adelaide statistical division, which includes Gawler under a recent change made by the bureau.

The member for Stirling, when he inquired of the bureau, did not distinguish between metropolitan Adelaide proper, which excludes much of the metropolitan area as defined by this Bill, and the Adelaide statistical division. The words "is expected to be" in the bureau's explanatory notes are of some relevance, because, under clause 7, the commission is required to exempt only those areas of the metropolitan area so defined which, at the end of seven years, are likely to be substantially or predominantly used for the business of primary production. Therefore, if the areas are expected to be in close economic and social contact with the principal urban centre, under clause 7 they are to be included in the metropolitan area. As the bureau includes Gawler as part of the Adelaide statistical division, it expects Gawler to be in close economic and social contact with the principal urban centre of Adelaide.

Mr. Clark: As it is.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. It is already urban but it is not urban to a density in excess of 500 people a square mile. I believe that Gawler has been excluded by the Government from this definition because this Bill needs to be a "Freebairn Protection Act", an "Allen Protection Act", a "Venning Protection Act", a "Giles Protection Act", and a "Hall Protection Act". Because his district is too far to the south, the member for Stirling, unless he can conjure up the support of members of his Party (which we hope he will do), will need help. The Government wants Gawler excluded from the metropolitan area to protect the members for Light, Burra, Rocky River, Gouger, and Gumeracha. There has to be sufficient population in the areas north and north-east of the metropolitan area to look after at least four of those five members effectively. The L.C.L. is prepared to lose one of them.

Mr. Virgo: Which one is expendable?

Mr. HUDSON: We do not know but, if Gawler is included in the metropolitan area, the Government might lose two members. Obviously the member for Light sees the danger, realizing he has a chance of being pre-selected if Gawler is out of the metropolitan area but none at all if it is inside. Surely the member for Light is expendable if anyone is. Surely it would be better to include Gawler in the metropolitan area and to have the people in the parts of the district no longer needed by the member for Light to protect the members for Rocky River and Burra, because those people will go to make up the quota in those areas; surely the members for Rocky River and Burra are more valuable than the

member for Light. I plead with the Minister to allow a free vote on this matter, because we are confident we could then get the numbers to include Gawler in the metropolitan area. I have already said that the Commonwealth Commission is not concerned with the distinction between metropolitan and non-metropolitan, the comments of the Minister of Works on that matter being irrelevant. The member for Stirling did not understand what I said about the report of the Bureau of Census and Statistics, and he asked the bureau the wrong questions.

The definition of the metropolitan planning area in the Town Planning Committee's report and the Planning and Development Act last year was an accident. The committee's report was based on writing up in a polite way what was the consequence of approaches made to Sir Thomas Playford. I have been informed about this matter by members of the Town Planning Committee. The terms of reference for the committee included only a narrow definition of the metropolitan area of Adelaide, which did not go beyond Gepps Cross. Realizing it must go beyond that, members of the committee considered what they could hope to get Sir Thomas Playford to agree to in the way of an extended definition. They realized there was no point in asking him about Gawler. However, when the 1963 commission was established, no hard and fast definition was provided: it had to define the metropolitan area in terms of the definition of "primary production" and it included Gawler in the metropolitan area. The district of Gawler it proposed is set out in the schedule between Enfield and Hindmarsh. The 1967 definition of the Adelaide statistical division includes Gawler, as does the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. The recommendations of the State Planning Office to the M.A.T.S. Report also included Gawler as part of the Adelaide statistical division, and a population forecast was made on that basis.

If the amendment is accepted, it is still up to the commission to make the final determination. The area we defined in 1967 is only an area from which the commission must determine the metropolitan area. Under clause 7, the commission is required to exclude any part of this area so defined which, at the end of seven years, is likely to be substantially or predominantly used for the business of primary production. The Government wants to tie the hands of the commission by telling it that it cannot include Gawler in the metropolitan area whether or not it thinks it should be included. This is not justifiable in terms of the history of this matter. The amendment seeks to have Gawler included in the definition, and then the commission will be left to say whether or not it should be included in the metropolitan area. This is an opportunity for the Government to demonstrate its good faith. It is not good enough for the Minister of Works to say that the Government has accepted a couple of amendments and that that demonstrates its good faith, because those were relatively inconsequential amendments. However, in this case the Government has an opportunity to allow the commission to make up its own mind about the metropolitan area.

I should be happy to see the clause rewritten to provide simply that the metropolitan area shall consist of that area within a 30-mile radius of the Adelaide General Post Office which is, in the opinion of the commission, at the end of seven years not likely to be substantially or predominantly used for the business of primary production as defined in the Land Tax Act, 1936-1967. Will the Attorney-General consider that provision, which would be an expression of everyone's good faith in this matter? I plead with the Government not to leave the impression, by insisting on its present definition, that it is protecting the member for Light. I think we will have to consider moving an amendment along the lines I have suggested and really give the Government an opportunity to demonstrate its good faith. I have not been convinced by anything I have heard from members on the Government benches that this amendment should not be accepted.

Mr. McANANEY: I am disappointed, because the member for Glenelg, one of the few members who usually understands figures and does not misinterpret them, has doubted my claim in this instance. A week ago he said that the area shown on a map of the Adelaide statistical district and the Adelaide metropolitan area was part of the metropolitan area, and that the Bureau of Census and Statistics adopted a similar area. I say that that is not correct. I have a map showing the area, as determined in the 1961 census and the 1966 census.

Mr. Hudson: They have been changed.

Mr. McANANEY: The metropolitan area is defined as follows:

Prior to June 30, 1966, the metropolitan area of Adelaide comprised 21 municipalities. From June 30, 1966, new criteria based mainly on population density have been adopted for all

capital cities; the boundary for Adelaide has been extended to embrace new areas, including Elizabeth, Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully.

That area is shown on the map, and the population is 727,916, which is about the population of the area indicated, but the member for Glenelg has become involved with the urban area, note (*b*) in respect of which the bureau states:

Some changes have been made in the definition of "other urban" at previous censuses. From June 30, 1966, it includes each population cluster of 1,000 or more persons which conforms to a minimum density standard, and certain "holiday areas" which may qualify as urban on a dwellings density basis.

It is this area that includes Gawler, Whyalla, and other urban areas. I know the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) does not want to bring his area into the metropolitan district. The population of the urban area is 173,794. The rural population is 188,591, and that number lives in the real country area. I have rarely found the member for Glenelg wrong regarding figures, but he is wrong this time.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to a document issued by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics showing, as at June 30, 1967, the population in local government areas. That document contains a map, part of which is shaded, and shows the metropolitan area proper, which, as the member for Stirling has said, includes Elizabeth. However, the outer boundary, which defines the Adelaide statistical division, includes the municipality of Gawler. In the document I have quoted previously, the metropolitan area proper is surrounded by a capital city statistical division, and in respect of that division the bureau states:

The other boundary shall circumscribe the area which is expected to be in close economic and social contact with the principal urban centre for the next two or three decades.

The Bureau of Census and Statistics has so redefined the Adelaide statistical division in the last year or two as to include the municipality of Gawler.

Mr. CASEY: The whole question is whether Gawler should be in the metropolitan area, or in the country. When this Bill was introduced, I said that the Government would—

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the honourable member that we are in Committee.

Mr. CASEY: The Minister of Works has said that the Government accepted certain amendments that went a long way towards creating harmony in electoral redistribution. I had said what would happen in this regard. The Government has accepted minor amendments. Nevertheless, they are relatively important and they do justice to the Bill. The Minister of Works has implied that the Government has taken, as the metropolitan area, the area set out in the Town Planning Report of 1962, yet the Government claims to be progressive. Why not take the latest report, namely, the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report?

Mr. Broomhill: Or why not leave it to the commission to determine the area? That would be the fairest way.

Mr. CASEY: The Government could do that. I think the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) said that the member for Gawler had quoted a figure of about 3,000 people out of a total of 8,000—

Mr. Clark: I didn't mention the figure.

Mr. CASEY: No, and the honourable member did not even mention percentages. He said that many people who lived in Gawler worked outside that town.

Mr. Clark: Most of the people.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, and the honourable member said they worked in the Elizabeth, Salisbury and Adelaide areas. Members opposite who, like myself, travel once a week from a northerly direction, know that they are inside the built-up area once they reach Gawler. I defy any Government member who lives in the North of the State to come to any other conclusion: once you reach Gawler you are virtually in the metropolitan area. Gawler is even connected to the metropolitan sewerage system. The member for Gumeracha said that Gawler is a rural town, but how does one define a rural town? I would like someone to define what is a rural town.

Mr. Giles: Do you believe that Murray Bridge is a rural town.

Mr. CASEY: Not overall. Murray Bridge has industries and it caters for the rural people in the surrounding districts. What is the member for Gumeracha trying to do—create a rural person and an urban person? This is wrong. If a person who lives in the country areas outside the metropolitan area is considered a rural person, that is stupid. Would anyone call Peterborough a rural town? It is surrounded by rural communities, but the people in the town are mostly railway employees. Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Lincoln are all country towns, but are they rural towns?

Mr. Giles: Are you suggesting we do not have the metropolitan area boundaries?

Mr. CASEY: I am suggesting that Gawler should be included in the metropolitan area, as that is the progressive way of thinking today. The M.A.T.S. Report includes Gawler in the metropolitan area, as does the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics. Contrary to what the Attorney-General said when speaking on this Bill recently, this is a political matter, because once Gawler is included in the metropolitan area it means that 29 seats may come within the metropolitan area. That is the reason the Government wanted it not included. That is the whole basis of the matter.

It is all right for the Minister of Works to say that the Opposition was surprised when the Bill was introduced, but I do not think we were any more surprised than were some of the Government members. The Government had to do something that was more in line with commonsense thinking, because we were getting a shocking press in other States and the South Australian people were almost rebelling against the system in vogue. To say that a measure of this nature is not political is so much humbug. The Minister of Works also said, "What about the Commonwealth?" The Commonwealth drew up its boundaries differently from the way we did in this State or from the way any other State did. Where I live, I have been in about three different Commonwealth districts in the last 20 years, and Gawler, too, has been in and out of Commonwealth electoral boundaries. What has the State done? It has done the same thing: it took away Salisbury and part of Elizabeth from the Gouger District some time ago. If these areas had been left as part of the Gouger District the Premier would have lost his seat years ago, but it suited the Government politically to effect this change. Whether or not Gawler is included in the metropolitan area comes down to a political issue only. It will mean that there will be either 28 or 29 seats in the metropolitan area. The Government does not want 29 seats in the metropolitan area: it wants 28 seats in the metropolitan area, so that it can get the extra one from outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. McAnaney: Isn't it entitled to do that?

Mr. CASEY: No. The Minister of Works also said that the Goverment had tried to do the right thing by the people of the State, but I do not think the Government is doing the right thing by them. The Government has gone a long way since Sir Thomas Playford had the reins of Government and of the L.C.L. in particular. He would not let go in any circumstances. At least, there is some modern thinking today, and the Government is now coming more into line with the Labor Party's thinking. We have stressed for years that the people of this State were getting a raw deal. The Minister of Works has said as much himself. The Government did not expect the Labor Party to go as far as it did with this matter, but I say the Government has not gone far enough. All the debate on the matter of whether or not Gawler should be included in the metropolitan area shows clearly that the Government must include Gawler in the metropolitan area. About 80 per cent of the male work force of Gawler is employed around Elizabeth, Salisbury and in the city of Adelaide. They travel out by train, car or bus every day. On the Gawler road on many occasions early in the morning or late at night there is a big stream of traffic. How can anyone say that Gawler is a rural area? How do you define a rural area? I asked the member for Gumeracha to define what is a rural area, but he could not.

Mr. Giles: Using your argument, Peterborough should be in the metropolitan area.

Mr. CASEY: Of course it should not. If the honourable member looks at the map in the Chamber he will see why the metropolitan area goes as far south as Sellick Beach. However there is more open country in that region than there is in the North. Why take in the Willunga and Sellick Beach area? Because it was defined in the Town Planning Report and, therefore, it must be right.

Mr. Evans: Leave it out.

Mr. CASEY: That cannot be done. The Government has intimated that it will adhere to the Metropolitan Town Planning Report. I agree with the member for Glenelg that this matter should left to the commissioners or, perhaps, we could have an area of 30 miles radius.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Why did the Labor Government put Elizabeth in the previous Bill in 1965?

Mr. CASEY: I cannot think back that far.

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

Mr. CASEY: When this Bill was introduced the Premier said categorically that he was prepared to debate this provision fully. No-one will deny that electoral reform is long overdue, and the Opposition is attempting to ensure that South Australians receive a fair go in this

respect. Gawler should be included in the metropolitan area, first, because it is included in the study area of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, which is the very latest report available in South Australia dealing with transportation.

Secondly, as stated by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark), most of the male people living in Gawler work outside that town: they work in Elizabeth, Salisbury and Adelaide. This is a major reason why Gawler should be included in the metropolitan area. Thirdly, when we read clause 7 and realize that a seven-year period must be taken into consideration in classifying lands as areas for primary production or not, we see that the town of Gawler itself is not connected with primary production, to any great extent. In view of the amount of development going on, there will be an enormous change in seven years' timc.

Mr. Ferguson: It depends partly on rural operations.

Mr. CASEY: Alan Hickinbotham Proprietary Limited and others are developing land in the area. There is a certain amount of primary-producing land in the area, but the percentage is very small, and we should not split hairs on this matter. All I am concerned about is the municipality of Gawler.

Mr. Clark: There are many commercial undertakings in the surrounding areas.

Mr. CASEY: Of course there are. My fourth reason why this municipality should be included in the metropolitan area is that it is included by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, and this is an important consideration. My next reason for its inclusion is the community of interest. Sellick Beach is 33 miles from Adelaide, so Gawler is much closer. Moreover, the population growth in that area is not nearly as extensive as that in and around the municipality of Gawler. All these reasons should be considered.

The amendments that have been accepted by the Government are minor, and I said earlier that the Government would probably accept some. This legislation will determine the electoral boundaries for many years, and the Premier said that the Bill would be debated in order that the people of the State would receive the fairest electoral boundaries. Therefore, the municipality of Gawler must be included in the metropolitan area. For those reasons and because the Leader's amendment is in the interests of the people not only of Gawler but of the whole of the State, I support it.

Mr. BURDON: The position has been put clearly by the member for Glenelg, who adequately answered the points raised by the member for Stirling. As I said previously, the Government has an opportunity to give the people of South Australia a just electoral system. Indeed, I hope that it will accede to the request to allow the commission itself to define what is the metropolitan area and what is the country area. The Government now has the opportunity to obviate the need for any future debate in this Chamber on electoral boundaries and also to remove the gerrymander that has applied for many years. It is merely tying the commissioners' hands to direct what they can and cannot do.

Mr. VIRGO: The Government, by its apparent insistence on the Bill in its present form, is predetermining what the commission shall do. It is completely wrong to set up a commission and tie its hands so tightly that it is not able to fulfil its proper function. Members opposite should compare the terms of reference given to the electoral commission in the 1962 Bill with those proposed in this Bill. Although the subject was approached similarly in both cases, strangely enough a different result has been achieved. The 1962 commission was told to define rural areas; it was told that rural areas meant those parts of the State the income and livelihood of the majority of the inhabitants of which were derived predominantly from primary production or from the supply or processing of goods or services for persons engaged in primary production. Earlier the members for Light, Gumeracha and Stirling said that Gawler was most certainly a rural area. If that is so, since 1962 South Australia has gone backwards because, in that year, the commission found that Gawler was not a rural area. The report of that commission shows clearly that the town of Gawler is included in the metropolitan district called Gawler.

How can members opposite say that, at the end of seven years (which is the term provided in the Bill), Gawler will be a rural area? Unfortunately, I believe the Government is indulging in political skulduggery. The manoeuvring taking place is purely and simply for political expediency, and that is the kind of thing that has happened in South Australia over the past 35 years. In this Bill we have an opportunity to get away from the blemish of gerrymandered districts that we

have suffered for many years. We must be honest in our approach to the Bill, and there is no alternative but to include Gawler as part of the metropolitan areas in the same way as we recognize Elizabeth, Morphett Vale, Port Noarlunga and other places which are reasonably close to the General Post Office and in which the population is increasing.

Mr. Casey: Would you say that Gawler should be part of the metropolitan area more so than Noarlunga?

Mr. VIRGO: Gawler is certainly far more metropolitan than is Noarlunga. Housing Trust activity alone proves that. There is no question but that Gawler is as much a part of the metropolitan area as is any other place, and the only reason for leaving it out is that of political expediency.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Giles.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I record my vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

To strike out subclause (2) and insert the following new subclause:

The metropolitan area shall consist of that contiguous area within a thirty-mile radius of the General Post Office at Adelaide, which, in the opinion of the Commission, is not likely, at the end of seven years after the commencement of this Act, to be predominantly used for the purposes of primary production as defined in the Land Tax Act, 1936-1967.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member's amendment is out of order. A vote has been taken in connection with a portion of clause 7 (2) and this amendment refers also, in part, to the matter on which the vote was taken in the first instance. Erskine May (*The Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament* (17th edition), at page 418) states:

No amendment can be made in the first part of a question, after the latter part has been amended, or has been proposed to be amended, if a question has been proposed from the Chair upon such amendment . . .

The honourable member will see that part of his amendment refers to the metropolitan area. The Committee has already decided as to whether the words "The metropolitan area shall consist of the metropolitan planning area as defined in the Metropolitan Planning Development Area as defined in the Planning and Development Act, 1966-67, and the municipality of Gawler" shall be agreed to and the decision was in the negative. Therefore that matter cannot be dealt with again. A subsequent portion of this clause can be amended subsequent to the figures 1966-67. Portion of the amendment deals with words anterior to that.

Mr. HUDSON: The quote from Erskine May refers to an amendment that proposes to alter the words purely anterior to that part of the question already accepted. My amendment also alters words subsequent to it. I suggest my amendment does not come within the area suggested by Erskine May in the quotation which you, Mr. Speaker, have read out.

The CHAIRMAN: I think this matter has been decided on previous occasions, to my recollection. Erskine May has been referred to, and I have no doubt about it at all. That is my decision.

Mr. HUDSON: Rather than waste the time of the Committee by moving disagreement to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I move:

In subclause (2) after "1966-1967," to insert "and the area within a thirty-mile radius of the General Post Office at Adelaide,".

This amendment will produce a somewhat clumsy subclause, but I think it is quite clear and it does not create any special difficulty. Subclause (2) will then provide:

The metropolitan area shall consist of the metropolitan planning area as defined in the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967, and the area within a thirty-mile radius of the General Post Office at Adelaide, excepting such portions thereof, if any, as in the opinion of the Commission both lie adjacent to the boundaries of that Area and are likely, at the end of seven years after the commencement of this Act, . . .

My amendment produces substantially the effect of the amendment that you, Mr. Chairman, ruled out of order.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Why did you select 30 miles?

Mr. HUDSON: Because the Minister of Works, the Minister of Education, the Attorney-General, the Minister of Lands, the Treasurer and the Premier all voted for the figure of 30 miles in 1962 in the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill of that year. That Bill required the electoral commission at that time

to define a metropolitan urban area which lay within a 30-mile radius and which was not predominantly land used for primary production. What we are testing with this amendment is the genuineness of this Government: if it is genuine it will accept this amendment. We should leave the determination of the metropolitan area to the commission. If the Government objects to this idea, it is not acting in good faith and it is admitting that it has the specific purpose of protecting existing members.

Unfortunately for the Minister of Works, the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) made it absolutely clear that he knew what the meaning of this clause was when he said, "I shall be delighted to represent Gawler, and it will get better representation as a result." If that was not letting the cat out of the bag I do not know what was. Surely that was a case of the member for Light working out that his area plus the Gawler area would make a nice seat. The Opposition is not convinced of the Government's good faith in this matter: if the Government is acting in good faith it will be happy to leave it to the commission, which is an independent commission. This group of highly respected people can determine what is metropolitan and what is in that 30-mile radius. There should be no objection to the commission being given the power to do this. This is what the 1962 commission had to do, and did, and this would remove all possible suggestions that the wording of this Bill had been designed for the benefit of one Government member, or possibly two Government members. The Premier and the Minister of Works this afternoon tried to suggest that the Government's good faith was demonstrated when it accepted a couple of minor amendments. However, if the Government has good faith it will not object to leaving this matter to be determined by the commission.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): The member for Glenelg seems more interested in the good faith of the Government than in the real value of the subject matter.

Mr. Hughes: Don't try to twist it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: We have listened to a speech which for half its length has dealt with the good faith of the Government. The honourable member knows that this was chosen as an impartial selection of an area defined by other than ourselves, looking forward to a period of time long before it was expected that another redistribution would take place. The Town Planning Committee reported on an area, which was supposed to represent the metropolitan area for many years before another redistribution would be necessary.

Mr. Hudson: It is out of date.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If we do not accept this amendment we are accused of acting in bad faith, because we voted for a 30-mile radius in 1962. What is the member for Glenelg's record in relation to the metropolitan definition? How did he vote in 1965, and what did he say then was in the metropolitan area and what was in the country? Does he blush when he remembers that he voted for a Bill that included Elizabeth in the rural areas?

Mr. Hudson: Not at all.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Of course not, because the honourable member thinks he can justify it.

Mr. Hudson: It was for one vote one value.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It was his Government's Bill, and that is the difference. Areas closer than Elizabeth were still in the rural areas. We had long forgotten that Gawler was in the rural area, but apparently Elizabeth and closer areas were. The member for Glenelg accuses us of acting in bad faith for including an area which includes a large area that his Government included in the rural areas. Where is our bad faith?

Mr. Hudson: The member for Light said that Gawler had to be excluded in order to provide him with a seat.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Does the member for Glenelg forget that within the last three years he put up a scheme that was no less than a fix to perpetuate Labor rule for years to come? That was a gerrymander if ever there was a gerrymander.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is no good the member for Glenelg saying that a fair and impartial definition was given then, and now charging the Government with acting in bad faith. This just is not so.

Mr. Hudson: Why don't you leave it to the commission?

Mr. Broomhill: What are you frightened of?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: We do not intend to have this impartial measure wrecked by the honourable member, who is so keen to "fix" his own legislation. Why has he changed so suddenly from having that iron inner-ring

that he drew in 1965 to having this all-embracing metropolitan area? What is his motive?

Mr. Hudson: You are a very stupid man; I know you can't help that, but I wish you'd sit down.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am astounded at the Premier's remarks about the attempt by the member for Glenelg to give effect to something in which we on this side (indeed, most members on the other side) really believe, that is, the inclusion of Gawler in the metropolitan area. It is ridiculous to think that the Premier should challenge a move made in 1965 to create, as he says, a gerrymander, when he has been the member of a Government that has relied on a gerrymander for many years. How on earth can one describe a system based on one vote one value as a gerrymander? We are attempting to give people an equal say in who should govern. The amendment moved by the member for Glenelg represents the logical step to take as a result of the defeat of the previous amendment that was moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I give full marks to the member for Glenelg, who is as determined as we all are on this side to have Gawler included in the metropolitan area.

Although there is no guarantee that the commission would decide in our favour, we desire to give it the opportunity to include Gawler. In fact, I believe that in its good judgment the commission would agree with us on this matter and that Gawler would be rightfully placed in what we consider to be the metropolitan area. Surely it is obvious to anyone who has seen the development taking place in the area concerned that it will not be long before it will be continuous suburban development from Adelaide to Gawler. Surely, too, if Morphett Vale, etc., can be considered as part of the metropolitan area, it is reasonable to assume that Gawler is in a similar category. The basis of the 1965 Bill was entirely different from the basis of this measure, and it was entirely different also from the 1962 Bill, which all members of the then Government supported. Without going into all the previous motives and so on, it is perfectly reasonable at this time to recognize that Gawler is in the metropolitan area, and it should be considered as being in the metropolitan area in any Bill of this type. I am disgusted with the Premier's reply.

Mr. VIRGO: I congratulate the member for Glenelg on moving the amendment. I am rather disappointed, because I thought the Leader's amendment would receive support from members opposite. However, they now have an opportunity to redeem themselves. I am also disappointed that the Premier did not give some concrete facts when speaking on this amendment. Indeed, we had from him a Billy Graham performance. The way he threw his arms around, we thought we were at a crusade. He reminded me of the person who used to hold a fairly high position and who often expressed the view, "When you haven't anything logical to say, yell like hell and you will yell the opposition down." That is the type of thing we got from the Premier, and yet I thought we would get something better. He said the Government was not prepared to budge from the line it was following. He referred to a boundary determined by someone completely impartial: of course, he was referring to the plan of the metropolitan area contained in the Town Planning Committee's report. Surely the Premier knows he is not fooling anyone when he says something like that, because the Town Planning Committee, in preparing that report, was not the least bit concerned with electoral boundaries. Therefore, to cite it as an impartial authority in relation to this matter has no substance whatever.

The Premier also made wild allegations to the effect that the Labor Party's Bill had been designed to perpetuate Labor Party rule. We hear many stupid statements, but that one takes the blue ribbon. The Labor Party Bill was based on the democratic principle of one vote one value for which we have fought wars as a result of which some people have died and others bear scars and other disabilities. All Governments everywhere should have obtained the support of the majority of the people. We now have a ssytem in this State that allows a Party to govern after receiving the support of only 42 per cent of the people.

Mr. McAnaney: We actually received 47 per cent.

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member was hopelessly out in his figures this afternoon when he attempted to discredit the member for Glenelg, and I suggest that he ask that honourable member to explain in simple words how the Government got 42 per cent of the votes. The important principle associated with democratic Government and democratic elections is that the majority support of the people

must result in the formation of a Government, and this amendment would achieve that. The provision for exclusion by the commission of rural areas gives more than enough safeguard against any supposed or alleged fears by the Premier and other Government members.

Although the Premier said that the member for Glenelg would not be satisfied until he had the Bill wrecked (or words to that effect), the reverse is the case. The amendment attempts not to wreck the Bill but to salvage something from the wreckage. The Minister of Works may laugh, but I hope he can still laugh when the electors of Torrens pour scorn on him after he tells them he has voted so that they will have only half as much say in the Government as have the electors in Eyre or some other remote area, and that his electors are only second-class citizens. I support the amendment.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I assure the member for Edwardstown that the majority of people in the District of Torrens support the views I have expressed here. The honourable member disappoints me in some ways. He came here with some reputation, but he has got on the soapbox and bleated at length on this and other measures. The committee decided about 10 minutes ago not to include the town of Gawler in the metropolitan area, and the amendment now being considered is merely another attempt to achieve the same thing, because a distance of 30 miles includes Gawler and other towns.

Mr. Virgo: Such as?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I would say that, give or take a few miles, it would extend to Birdwood, Callington, and those parts.

Mr. Virgo: Would they be rural?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: What does the honourable member think?

Mr. Virgo: Of course they would be, and you know it.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member chided the Government about what had been done in the past. I recall with keen interest, because I had something to say at the time, that in 1965 we were discussing the retention of 26 seats in what was to be called a non-metropolitan area, and the metropolitan area was to be exactly as it is now. The Labor Party did not tell the people at that time that the effect of its measure would be to immediately cluster seven or eight districts around the metropolitan area. These were seats that were regarded by the A.L.P. as non-metropolitan. They included areas such as Modbury, Tea Tree Gully, St. Kilda, Gawler, Christies Beach, and these particular areas. They were not regarded by the A.L.P. as metropolitan seats. The present Bill regards those as metropolitan seats, and any sane and forward-looking member must regard them as metropolitan. This was the effect of that particular Bill, and it was pointed out in the debate that this would happen. This amendment is a second try by the Opposition to achieve something that was defeated on the last division, the effect of which would be to include Gawler. The Government has expressed its opposition to the previous amendment, and the same applies to the proposed amendment.

Mr. HURST: I support the amendment, and I think the Government should also support it. Contrary to what the Minister of Works has said, the facts are clear. One clause in the Bill will virtually hamstring an independent body from taking into consideration the facts regarding boundaries which we have been arguing all the afternoon. A vote has already been taken as to whether Gawler should or should not be included in the definition of "metropolitan area". The amendment does not do what the Minister of Works said it will do, but it will test the sincerity of the Government. Its purpose is not to have two bites of the cherry. If the Government has any faith in the commission's constitution, surely it will not be so blind as to prevent the commission from determining whether or not Gawler should be included in the metropolitan area.

This is an entirely different aspect from what the Minister of Works has stated. This has taken the whole issue beyond the realm of Party politics. Surely, we realize that South Australia has suffered badly as a result of the electoral boundaries that operate in the State. This is something that no honourable member should be proud of, and indeed it has prompted the Government to agree to some change. Let us not mar the changes by hamstringing and dictating politically to a body that is supposed to do a job. We should not tie its hands and restrict it in doing the job. This amendment will raise the prestige of the Government, so the Government should be big enough to accept it. If we do not show faith in the commission, how will this legislation get the support of the people of South Australia? The Bill does not go as far as I should like it to go. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) said that his amendment was based on arguments made in 1962 by members now on the Government side. The very fact that

the present members of Cabinet supported the principle in 1962 shows that they should now give the commission the authority to decide the matter. I support the amendment.

Mr. LAWN: I could not understand the tone of the Premier in speaking to this amendment, for it seemed out of keeping with what he said on a previous occasion. The Minister of Works has made it clear that the Government believes that, if this amendment is carried, the commission will include Gawler in the metropolitan area. The Premier has spoken previously about the possibility of compromise between the Government and the Opposition in regard to the redistribution of electoral boundaries. The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) on another occasion admitted what I have just said. I do not disagree with the idea of compromise. I wish to point out what the Premier said earlier and link it with what he said tonight. He said:

Clause 7 provides that the metropolitan area is to be determined by the commission, but is to consist of the metropolitan planning area except such portions thereof, if any, as in the commission's opinion lie adjacent to the boundaries of that area and are likely, at the end of seven years after the Bill becomes law, to be substantially or predominantly used for the business of primary production.

He said there that the metropolitan and country areas would be determined by an independent commission, yet this evening we have seen him vehemently object to an amendment extending the boundary to 30 miles north. The Bill introduced by the Premier provides for the area to extend to Sellick Hill, which is 33 miles south of Adelaide. The commission can determine what portion of this area should be classed as being in the metropolitan area, in accordance with the formula.

Mr. Hudson: Yet the commission is not allowed to go 30 miles north.

Mr. LAWN: That is the point I am making. What is wrong with a 30-mile projection north of Adelaide? I believe that under the Bill we could go 30 miles east of Adelaide. Apparently, this Bill will include the area 30 miles to the east and to the south, but it will be left to the independent commission to decide. What has the Government to hide? It seems to be afraid of losing one or two members, possibly the member for Light. No doubt he would not be missed here, and the people of his district would lose nothing by having another member in his place. The Government knows that the area south and east within 30 miles of Adelaide will be included, but it is afraid that Gawler will also be included in the metropolitan area and is determined to keep it out. Therefore, it is not compromising and is not prepared to leave the decision to an independent commission: it is predetermining the matter, and this is another attempt to continue the present gerrymander.

Mrs. BYRNE: I support the amendment, although I maintain that we should not be debating this matter because there should not be included in the Bill a definition of a metropolitan or a rural area. There should be one area for the whole of the State, and if we had democracy in this State that would have been provided in the Bill. We on this side realized that we would have to compromise because of the present situation, and decided to pass the second reading so that we could improve the Bill in Committee. If this amendment is passed. that will be done. If this amendment is passed the town of Gawler will be included not exactly in the metropolitan area but in the defined area. It will be left to the commissioners to judge whether Gawler should be included, because it is within a 30-mile radius of the General Post Office. As the District of Barossa borders Gawler, I have visited that town many times.

Nothing could have been more obvious than the 1956 redistribution of boundaries, when the boundaries of the District of Barossa were drawn around Gawler, thus making a safe Liberal seat of the then seat of Barossa by omitting Labor voters who lived in Gawler.

Mr. Clark: Salisbury and Elizabeth were taken out of Gouger and put into Gawler for the same reason.

Mrs. BYRNE: Of course. Political expediency came to the fore in 1956. Government members want the town of Gawler excluded because that would mean one extra seat in the defined rural area. When referring to Gawler, the Attorney-General said:

Gawler is shown on Map No. 1 as outside that area. This is an area which the committee said will become metropolitan not now but in the next 10 or 20 years.

He was referring to the 1962 report on the metropolitan area of Adelaide by the Town Planning Committee. Analysing the words "This is an area which the committee said will become metropolitan not now but in the next 10 or 20 years", I point out that the last redistribution took place in 1956. If this Bill is carried, it means that the next election based on the new boundaries will not be held until 1971, and that will be 15 years after the last redistribution took place. Of course, if it takes 15 years, as it took last time, for a redistribution to occur, even if it is admitted that Gawler is not in the metropolitan area

simply because there is not a continuation of houses right throught to Elizabeth (only houses here and there), it is obvious, from the statement made, that Gawler will certainly be part of the metropolitan area by that time.

However, I do not admit that Gawler is not already part of the metropolitan area. Bearing in mind that the area as far south as Sellick Hill is included in the metropolitan area under this Bill, I point out that there are certainly open spaces between the various towns in this area and that there is therefore no difference between this area and Elizabeth-Gawler. Government members are opposed to the amendment purely for political reasons. I support the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: Last Thursday at lunch time I addressed the Legacy Club of Adelaide on the American presidential elections. During that address I made no reference at all to the Premier of South Australia; nevertheless, I did say that the American system permitted a President to be elected without an absolute majority of the votes, or even without a majority of the votes. I instanced two cases in which a President of the United States had been elected without an absolute majority, namely, Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson, both of whom had a majority but not an absolute majority. I also instanced two cases in which Presidents were elected with a minority of the votes (with fewer votes than another candidate had), namely, Hayes and Benjamin Harrison. The *Advertiser* saw fit next day, through the auspices of Bernard Boucher's column, to say that I had come out with a good precedent for Steele Hall's being Premier of South Australia, namely, Abraham Lincoln's being elected President of the United States without a majority of the votes.

Mr. Clark: Was the *Advertiser* comparing Lincoln with Hall?

Mr. HUDSON: That was the implication. Boucher did not even have his facts correct, because Lincoln at least had a majority even though he did not have an absolute majority. Furthermore, Boucher was putting words into my mouth which I never used. I wished to make that clear in case anyone thought I had gone ga-ga. The relevance of this is that if I had wished to make a comparison between the Premier and some American, it would not have been Abraham Lincoln or Woodrow Wilson. I might have compared the Premier with Harrison or Hayes who, after all, were two of the most undistinguished Presidents the U.S.A. has ever had the misfortune to suffer. However, most probably I would have compared him with the Mayor of New York, Gerry Walker. After what we heard this evening, I suspect that the comparison between the Premier and the former Mayor of New York would have been accurate.

Mr. Clark: What about Al Capone?

Mr. HUDSON: No, I would not compare the Premier with him. Gerry Walker was the person who, when carving up certain districts in New York, in order to achieve certain political purposes, created salamanders, and the term "gerrymander" is derived from the "gerry" in Gerry Walker and salamander. By his attitude to this amendment, the Premier is indicating that he is also willing a tolerate a gerrymander. He is also prepared to provide a particular definition which protects, against the possible loss of his seat, one of his colleagues, and a minor colleague at that. The member for Light let the cat out of the bag, and the Minister of Works, in another unimpressive performance, let it out even further when he said that this amendment would produce the same effect as the previous one, the implication being that this amendment could lead only to the commission's including Gawler in the metropolitan area. If the Minister believes that, then Gawler ought to be in the metropolitan area. If members opposite are not prepared to support the amendment, it indicates that they are not prepared to risk the commission's deciding that Gawler ought to be in the metropolitan area: it indicates that they have drawn up a Bill which involves the protection of certain members of the Government Party and which involves the principles of the gerrymander. After all, the nature of a gerrymander implies the fixing of terms of reference or the fixing of boundaries in order to give a political advantage.

The definition that is implied by this Bill of "metropolitan" as against "non-metropolitan" is designed to give a particular advantage, first, to the member for Light (he can hold his seat only if Gawler is excluded from the metropolitan area) and possibly to one or two other back-bench members. If it is really true that Government members are prepared to stick to matters of principle in this case, then they should be prepared to agree that what is metropolitan and what is non-metropolitan is a complicated matter and should be left to the commission to determine. They should agree to determine the way in which primary production is defined so that the guiding principle for the commission's decision is laid down for it,

but they should not take the commission's decision out of its hands. However, in supporting the clause as it stands, Government members are saying to the commission that, regarding the rest of the metropolitan area, it can have a free hand in determining what is and what is not metropolitan but, regarding Gawler, it cannot have a free hand: Gawler must be excluded from the metropolitan area because above all the Government wants to save the member for Light for posterity. Apparently, the Government simply could not tolerate a situation where the member for Light was no longer a member of Parliament.

Mr. Corcoran: They could unload him.

Mr. HUDSON: If they wanted to do that they would accept the amendment. If they had any principles at all and, if the Premier would think about principle instead of shouting his head off, making false accusations about what happened in 1965, we would all be much better off. It is about time the Premier stopped shouting and telling whoppers as soon as he got into trouble. There is no reason, other than self interest, why the Government should not accept the amendment and I plead with you at least, Sir, to see this principle, or at least with some Government member to see that it is a matter of either self interest to look after a particular member by telling the commission what to do, or of principle and leaving it to the commission to decide what shall be metropolitan and what shall not.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not in favour of the clause as it stands and I wholeheartedly support the amendment. The Government is indicating that it will extend the metropolitan area 33 miles south of the city but it will not extend it that far north, which would automatically bring in Gawler. If the Government is honest, it should include Gawler in the metropolitan area. The Parliament is not doing justice to the commission when it tells it what to do and, as the Bill stands, one knows the report that the commission must submit. I was concerned at the way the Premier replied to the member for Glenelg when he attacked that member and suggested that he was playing politics. Of course, it is only when one is up against a stone wall and has no valid reply that one adopts those tactics, and we are becoming used to seeing the Premier adopt them.

The Premier must be concerned about this measure, particularly this clause, because one member, who spends little time in the Chamber and is not here now, has said that, if the Opposition interferes in any way with the measure in the Committee stage, he will vote against the third reading. I hope that honourable member's colleagues will tell him that the Opposition is interfering very much with the Bill. I issue a challenge to the honourable member, who made the following statement:

> I give members opposite some good, straight advice, that is, not to fiddle about with the Bill in Committee.

He continued:

> Knowing that the Trades Hall has told Labor members to vote for the Bill, I warn them that, if they attempt to interfere too much with the Bill in Committee, I will vote against it on the third reading.

We are interfering quite a deal with the clauses as they are going through Committee. I hope the honourable member will be true to what he has said and, when it comes to the third reading of the Bill, surely he will do what he has said he will do and vote against the measure. He said:

> In so doing I will cause their bluff to be called as they will have to divide, show their true colours, and show that the Trades Hall barons have instructed them how to vote.

Apparently, when the Bill reaches the third reading the member for Light, who was very brave in saying these things and who has absented himself from the Chamber during the rest of the debate on the clause, will call for a division because of the remarks that have been made on this side in the Committee stages. As one who will be vitally affected, I have said from the initial stages that I want justice for the people of South Australia. I am not concerned how the clause will affect me, the member for Light, the member for Rocky River, or the district the Premier represents. If Government members were honest with the electors they represent they, too, would wish to see justice for the people of the State. The Government should not be endeavouring to safeguard seats for certain members. Members opposite know that if they gave the commission a free hand it would bring back a report that could vitally affect one or two Government country members. Some members who will be affected by the Bill have spoken to me freely. They are concerned about their position, but they are not honest enough to say so in this Chamber, because they are afraid of the repercussions of being put on the mat.

Mr. Lawn: Do you think they will be put on the mat?

Mr. HUGHES: It could be that, after the Bill goes through, they will not be in the running for preselection.

Mr. McKee: They will be on the outer.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. One honourable member made a very brave statement in connection with the Bill and this clause in particular. When the time comes, I venture to say he will not be brave enough to call for a division on the third reading. If he is brave enough to do this, I will be the first one to apologize to him. The Government members are fond of making interjections of a quiet nature which they do not want the Opposition to hear because they are frightened we shall be able to reply to them in such a manner that they will be shown up. I offer that challenge to the honourable member I have mentioned, who said that, if the Opposition interfered in the Committee stage with this Bill, he would call for a division and vote against the third reading. I cannot support the clause as it stands, but I support the amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS: I oppose this amendment. I do not know whom members opposite are trying to fool. They seem to think that Government members are trying to fix the boundaries, but the boot is on the other foot: Opposition members are the ones who are trying to fix the boundaries. Members opposite are the ones who are trying to say what the commission shall do. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) said that Government members wanted to classify some people as second-class citizens, but he was not correct in saying this: he is the one who is classifying some people as second-class citizens. I am glad I have not classified people in my electoral district in this way. The honourable member also said that once a person passed Gepps Cross he passed through a built-up area until he reached Gawler. The honourable member should change his glasses! When a person reaches Smithfield he passes through a rural area until he gets to Gawler, which is six miles from Smithfield.

Mr. Hudson: The Bill provides that the commission shall consider what will be rural areas in seven years' time.

Mr. EDWARDS: It will still be rural in seven years' time. This amendment would involve not only Gawler but also towns like Two Wells, which are definitely rural.

Mr. Clark: That would be left to the commission.

Mr. Corcoran: The clause covers that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are too many interjections. They will have to cease or I will name the members responsible for them.

Mr. EDWARDS: Gawler is surrounded by an extensive rural area. I am sure this amendment represents nothing but a gerrymander on the part of the Labor Party, which is always telling us that the Liberal and Country League is responsible for a gerrymander. Such accusations are becoming rather stale and in bad taste. If the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) had his way there would not be a Royal Commission.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EDWARDS: We have compromised a great deal in this Bill, and it is time the Opposition compromised to some extent; instead, it is trying to get everything its own way all the time. The member for Wallaroo should talk about justice: we are more justified in our approach to this matter than are members opposite. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I can only conclude, after listening to the member for Eyre, that he has either not read the Bill or does not understand it. He has accused us of trying to determine what the boundaries will be. If he had read the clause he would know that that is what the Government is doing: it is trying to determine what the commission shall look at in regard to the metropolitan area. Nothing has exposed the weakness of the Government's argument about this clause more than has the amendment moved by the member for Glenelg. It is noticeable that only two Government members on the front bench have spoken to this clause, followed by the member for Eyre, who obviously does not understand the Bill; certainly not this clause. Throughout the debate we have heard much about the necessity for those people engaged in primary production having a vote that is worth about double (under the terms of reference) that of other people who are not engaged in primary production, and this has given rise to the description of people as first and second-class citizens in terms of electoral voting power, and that is an accurate description.

Having adopted that policy the Government is not prepared to allow the commission to determine who shall be first and who shall be second-class citizens in terms of electoral voting power, because it wants to restrict the operation of the commission concerning the definition of the metropolitan area. The Minister of Works said that this amendment was the same as the previous one; it is not the same, because it clearly gives the commission, if it were accepted, complete power to decide

what is the metropolitan area, whereas the Government is not prepared to do that and wants the commission to consider the metropolitan area in terms of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967. We are justified in saying that there is no sincerity in the approach made in the first instance by the Premier when he said that he hoped that this Bill would dismiss for many years all the endless arguments about the gerrymandering of the South Australian electoral districts. We are merely getting a perpetuation of the same thing in another guise.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Eyre said that this was a further attempt at a gerrymander by the Labor Party Government. The *West Coast Sentinel* seems to believe that it has a good member in the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) and in its next issue we may see it advocating that the honourable member be Premier. The honourable member said that we were discussing a further attempt by a Labor Government to have a gerrymander, but everyone in South Australia knows that we have the Stott-Hall Coalition in Government, commonly referred to as the L.C.L. or Hall Government. How can the member for Eyre say that this is an attempt by the Labor Government? I point out that the Bill was introduced by the Premier, the Leader of an L.C.L. Government.

The honourable member said that he would support the Premier's amendment and voted against the measure, but this Bill was introduced by the honourable member's own Party. He said, "We want a Royal Commission," but to what was he referring? There is no reference in the Bill to a Royal Commission; the relevant provision is merely that the commission may apply the Royal Commission oath. Although it has been pointed out that the commission should determine the metropolitan area, the honourable member said, "No, members opposite want to determine it." However, the Bill provides as follows:

> The metropolitan area shall consist of the metropolitan planning area as defined in the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967 . . .

We intend to insert here words to the effect that the commission, for the purposes of determining the metropolitan area, may include an area 30 miles from Adelaide. The provision continues:

> . . . excepting such portions thereof, if any, as in the opinion of the commission both lie adjacent to the boundaries of that area and are likely, at the end of seven years after the commencement of this Act, to be substantially or predominantly used for the business of primary production as defined in in the Land Tax Act, 1936-1967.

Although Two Wells may come within the metropolitan area under the Bill, Gawler does not. Although the metropolitan area, under the Bill, extends 33 miles south and east of Adelaide, it stops half a mile south of Gawler. If the honourable member wishes to enrol in my classes, I shall be happy to teach him a little about what the Bill means. It is not easy, on first becoming a member of Parliament, to understand Bills and, of course, one must know the difference between a commission and a Royal Commission and between a Labor Government and an L.C.L. Government. I suggest that the honourable member will not learn much simply by reading the *West Coast Sentinel;* he would learn more here.

Mr. McANANEY: The area defined by the amendment is larger than that included in the Town Planning Committee's definition; at no point does that defined area go further east than Gawler, and it does not extend 33 miles south. I doubt that the commission will define an area that will go as far south as Gawler is north; therefore, I can see no reason for including the reference to a 30-mile radius. Such a definition would include Mount Barker. The member for Glenelg is confused about urban areas as against the metropolitan area. Under his terms, the commission would have to consider Mount Barker as well as Gawler, and that would make the position more confused than ever. The amendment is designed to provide a backhanded way of including Gawler in the metropolitan area without including similarly located areas.

Mr. EDWARDS: I point out to the member for Adelaide and to other members opposite that I, too, could start a class and teach them a lot. However, as I do not think they would take the trouble to join my class if I started it, it would be useless to do so.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Giles.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): As the remaining amendments to clause 7 in my name are consequential on the passing of an amendment that has been lost, I do not intend to proceed with them.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—"Other functions and duties of the commission."

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: This clause is the kernel of the Bill and I hope to give the Committee the opportunity to consider a new type of voting system. During the second reading debate we heard much about the weakness of the present voting system in South Australia and I contend that, while this Parliament continues to support the principle of single-member districts, it perpetuates the difficulties about which so much criticism has been voiced in the press and elsewhere. I have a table showing the results of the last State election, the seats won by Labor candidates with the votes cast for and against them, and the seats won by Liberal candidates with the votes cast for and against them. So that members may have these details without my reading them in full, I ask leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

TABLE SHOWING VOTES CAST FOR AND AGAINST LABOR AND LIBERAL CANDIDATES AT 1968 ELECTION

District	Successful Party	Votes for	Votes against
Alexandra . . .	L.C.L.	6,349	6,702
Adelaide	A.L.P.	8,315	5,252
Albert	L.C.L.	5,872	1,783
Angas	L.C.L.	4.351	2,045
Barossa	A.L.P.	8,792	7,962
Burnside	L.C.L.	20,609	14,059
Burra	L.C.L.	3,131	2,369
Chaffey	L.C.L.	3,392	3,769
Edwardstown .	A.L.P.	18,055	13,347
Enfield	A.L.P.	28,246	13,760
Eyre	L.C.L.	3,292	3,964
Flinders	L.C.L.	4,285	2,963
Frome	A.L.P.	2,672	1,874
Gawler	A.L.P.	20,573	11,094
Glenelg	A.L.P.	18,711	16,368
Gouger	L.C.L.	6,557	4,979
Gumeracha . . .	L.C.L.	4,740	2,245
Hindmarsh . . .	A.L.P.	14,874	5,741
Light	L.C.L.	3,873	1,749
Millicent	A.L.P.	3,635	3,634
Mitcham	L.C.L.	16,056	8,727
Mount Gambier	A.L.P.	5,567	3,926
Murray	L.C.L.	4,044	4,229
Norwood	A.L.P.	9,981	7,720
Onkaparinga . .	L.C.L.	4,228	3,115
Port Adelaide .	A.L.P.	13,911	6,437
Port Pirie	A.L.P.	4,301	1,925
Rocky River . .	L.C.L.	3,671	1,565
Semaphore . . .	A.L.P.	15,613	6,807
Stirling	L.C.L.	5,124	1,989
Stuart	A.L.P.	6,002	2,124
Torrens	L.C.L.	9,126	8,654
Unley	A.L.P.	8,820	8,541
Victoria	L.C.L.	4,439	2,469
Wallaroo	A.L.P.	2,899	2,679
West Torrens . .	A.L.P.	20,283	16,133
Whyalla	A.L.P.	9,268	3,072
Yorke Peninsula	L.C.L.	4,651	1,563

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The total number of votes gained by winning Labor candidates was 222,086, and the votes cast against those candidates numbered 143,844. The total number of votes gained by winning Liberal candidates was 117,790, and the votes cast against those candidates numbered 78,938. In the District of Ridley I received 2,824 votes for and 4,192 were cast against me. Regarding the anomalies in the present voting system, many of these people may just as well have stayed at home, as they did not want the candidate who was elected because of the single-member district. We use proportional representation for voting for the Senate, and no-one complains about it there. Let me explain what happens in the single-member districts. Under a single-member voting system Governments have often been elected on a minority vote.

Let us consider what happened under the British system. The British electors were let down by first past the post voting system, which did not give them the representation in the House of Commons that they voted for. At one election the Labour Party received 12,205,576 votes, or 44.1 per cent, and won 317 seats. The Conservative Party received 12,002,407 votes, or 43.4 per cent, and won 304 seats. The Liberal Party received 3,093,316 votes, or 11.2 per cent, and won only nine seats. Candidates not in these Parties received 348,914 votes, or 1.3 per cent, and won no seats. The Labour Party in Great Britain secured a seat for every 38,504 votes, the Conservative Party for every 39,481 votes, and the Liberal Party for every 343,707 votes. If each Party had had to obtain the same number of votes to elect a candidate (and why not?) the result would have been as follows: the Labour Party, 278 seats; the Conservative Party, 273 seats; the Liberal Party, 71 seats; and others, eight seats.

As often happens with first past the post voting, the Government was elected on a minority vote instead of a majority vote—3,239,061 more votes were cast against Labour candidates than were cast for them. The

232 seats won on a minority vote were: the Conservative Party, 153 seats; the Labour Party, 72 seats; and the Liberal Party, seven seats. On the other hand, 22 Labour Party candidates and seven Conservative Party candidates in safe seats had majorities exceeding 20,000 votes, and two candidates had majorities exceeding 30,000 votes—a sheer wastage of 600,000 votes, which, with multiple electoral districts and proportional representation voting, could have been used to elect other candidates.

The Labour Party won a seat in Sussex for the first time, but in Surrey with 484,780 votes the Conservative Party won all 20 seats, whereas the other 455,610 votes did not elect one candidate. Wasted votes were more numerous than usual, no less than 44.6 per cent, over 12,000,000 votes, were cast for losing candidates: these votes had no more effect on the result than the effect that would have been achieved if the electors had stayed at home. Is it any wonder that the London correspondent of some continental newspapers declared: "I'm tired of trying to explain to my readers that a British general election makes no sense"? I contend that a single-member system will bring electoral justice to the people of South Australia.

Under the present system people vote against the winning candidates. Members on both sides have said they are interested in giving justice to the people, but I say, "What about giving justice to the people who did not vote for the winning candidates?" The only way we can do this is by introducing multiple electoral districts. I think members know about the Hare-Clark system of voting, whereby people must vote for multiple districts: there would be five-member districts or seven-member districts. It would be necessary to divide the total number of members, plus one, into the total number of votes cast in the electoral district. This would give a quota of votes, and no candidate could be elected unless he received that quota. The surplus votes are distributed under the system until the required number of candidates get the quota and consequently they are elected. It is time that Parliament gave the commission the opportunity to consider whether it would favour an alteration in the present voting system. If we did that and gave the commission a chance to say whether the proportional representation system was satisfactory, evidence could be given to the commission in favour of that system to bring justice to electors in South Australia, or against it, in accordance with whoever wanted to give evidence before the commission.

To illustrate a way in which votes can be wasted under our present system, in the last State election in the Midland District for the Legislative Council 20,017 voted for the No. 1 candidate for the L.C.L., and 1,581 voted for the No. 2 candidate, a total of 21,598 votes for the L.C.L. candidates. The A.L.P. contested that election and recorded 17,795 votes for its No. 1 candidate, and 1,097 for its No. 2 candidate, a total of 18,892 votes, yet the L.C.L. won both seats. That means that 18,892 electors in the Midland District have no say in this Parliament, another illustration that the system is wrong. In other words, those 18,892 people were disfranchised and might just as well have stayed at home. In the District of Murray the L.C.L. winning candidate received 4,157 votes and the A.L.P. candidate 4,116. If 41 more people had voted for the A.L.P. it would have attained office.

Let us consider the same district in the 1965 election. Mr. Bywaters (A.L.P.) received 5,144 votes and Mr. Doecke (L.C.L.) 2,522, giving Mr. Bywaters a majority of 2,622. What happened to this handsome majority? It disappeared, and no-one can tell me that that was a personal vote against Mr. Bywaters. He was considered to be a good-living man and, in my view, he did a good job as Minister of Agriculture, so something must have happened to make this majority disappear. Where did it go?

In the District of Millicent in 1965, Mr. Corcoran received 4,160 votes and Mr. Osborne (L.C.L.) received 2,569, a majority for Mr. Corcoran of 1,591. In the 1968 election he won by one vote. Where did that majority go? At the 1965 election, in Chaffey Mr. Curren received 3,599 votes and Mr. King, the L.C.L. candidate, 3,499, so Mr. Curren was elected with a majority of 100. However, in the 1968 election the winning candidate Mr. Arnold (L.C.L.) received 3,667 votes, whereas Mr. Curren (A.L.P.) candidate received 3,117 votes. Mr. Arnold gained a majority of 550. Taking first preferences only, we find that Mr. Curren received 3,073 and Mr. Arnold, 3,392, giving him a majority on first preferences of 319. How did the 100-vote majority that Mr. Curren received at the 1965 election turn into a 550-vote defeat? I consider that what defeated the Labor Government at that election was the system of having single-member districts. If the Labor Opposition wishes to perpetuate such a system, it will

inevitably reach the stage at which a minority Government will be in power.

I have proved what has happened in Great Britain and I have cited many elections in which one sees a minority Government in office. The Forgan Smith and Hanlon Governments in Queensland kept a Labor Government in power with less than 46 per cent of the votes cast. We have heard much about the criticism of South Australia's system made by the press in the Eastern States at the time of the last election. It was said that it was shocking in South Australia, where a Government was elected on a minority of votes. When such statements appeared in the press, I wrote to those concerned, pointing out that their States should put their own house in order first. Apart from the Queensland position, Victoria, whose Melbourne *Age* was criticizing South Australia, for years and years had the Dunstan Country Party in power with less than 36 per cent of the votes.

After I wrote to the respective newspapers, there was no more criticism of South Australia's voting system. Ours is not so much a bad State: it is the rotten voting system with the single-member districts that causes the trouble. I think it is wrong for members to say that they wish to bring electoral justice to the people of South Australia when they are perpetuating the single-member district. Having listened with much interest to speakers in the second reading debate, I think some of them should be commended for the homework they have done and for the analyses they have made concerning what the commission may do.

Taking the metropolitan area, as defined in the Bill, we find that dividing the total number of electors in the area gives 28 seats in the metropolitan area and consequently 19 in the country area, with 47 seats overall. In this context, taking the last State election figures in the respective areas on the present basis, we find that, of the 28 metropolitan seats, the Australian Labor Party will win a majority. Consequently, if we apply the same relationship of votes in the rural areas and divide every subdivisional vote recorded in the last State election, we find inevitably that the Labor Party, under the 47-seat system, will win at the next election.

However, there will inevitably at some stage be a swing. At the last Commonwealth election, it looked at one stage as though the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Clyde Cameron), who generally wins by thousands, might lose his seat, because of the swing against the A.L.P. in that Commonwealth district. If, under our single-member electoral system, such a swing occurs against Labor in the metropolitan area, the L.C.L. will gain Government by a minority vote.

Members on both sides have said that we should not have minority Governments in power, yet here we are perpetuating the very system that will bring this about again. Single-member seats will bring this about; whereever one looks in the world one can see this anomaly occurring where single-member seats are used. I argue that this commission should examine the possibility of a different voting system that will bring justice to the people of South Australia and will prevent the election of Governments on a minority vote. This could not happen under a proportional representation system of voting. Many members argue against this system. They say it is fair and that there is nothing wrong with it, but they do not like it because they believe in single-member districts for their area as they will be elected the member. To my view that seems to be unadulterated egotism.

I will refer again to the district of Chaffey, which is now represented by the L.C.L. I have given the figures of those who voted against the new member. As members know, that district is in the Legislative Council district of Northern, which is represented by four L.C.L. members. Therefore, people in the district of Chaffey who did not vote for the L.C.L. candidate have no representation at all in this Parliament. What do those people do? They must approach the present member for Chaffey or an L.C.L. member of the Legislative Council to get their work done, and this should not be. If there were a proportional representation system providing for a five-member district or a seven-member district in this area, the districts would be amalgamated into larger districts. If one Party won the majority of votes it would return, for example, three members and the other Party would return two. Therefore, those people who voted for the minority Party could approach a member representing that Party and have their work done. As it is now, they have no member in this House and are consequently disfranchised.

Proportional representation is not a new system. It has been tried with much success in Tasmania since 1907 and there is no argument in that State that the system should be changed: newspapers in Tasmania are all in

favour of it. It eliminates uncontested seats and sham elections. The uncontested return of candidates, though common enough in most single-member systems, is undesirable from the point of view of public welfare. Of course, an immediate consequence is that even the small electoral privilege existing under single-member representation disappears altogether. The problem of citizen apathy, normally serious enough in the best of circumstances, is further aggravated. Only a little less objectionable than uncontested elections is a so-called safe seat, so named because the Party's majority in the district concerned is large enough to make the seat a certainty for that Party. Although this situation means easy comfort for the representative of that district, voters for the opposition Party in the district are virtually disfranchised permanently. Retention of the seat comes to depend less on winning the support of the electors and more on pleasing the small number of Party selectors who determine the endorsement. Elections must be a sham if the results are a foregone conclusion, yet this type of sham election is extremely common, normally accounting for more than two-thirds of the seats in a typical single-member system. Under the Hare-Clark system, of course, no seat is uncontested and none is safe, in the respect that a candidate can expect to be returned to office without working for it or without having earned support from the electors.

Genuine competition always exists, therefore, for seats in the Houses of Assembly. Since this means that Tasmania's members of the House of Assembly must keep on their toes much more than their counterparts under single electorates, more effective representation is given to Tasmanian electors. The Parliamentarian who favours the single-member system primarily for the fact that it gives him a safe seat should remember that the fundamental purpose of a democratic election system is to provide satisfactory representation for the electors, not personal convenience for the elected. All candidates under Hare-Clark must work for their votes to win a seat in Parliament, because there are no walkovers into office via unopposed and safe seats; better service to the electors is one result.

Large districts necessitate a broad point of view and militate against the narrow parochialism characteristic of single-member districts, where parish pump pressures are notorious. When a member is responsible solely to a relatively tiny constituency it becomes difficult, if not at times politically hazardous, to take a broad view when local vested interests are involved. Even in the smallest and most homogeneous of the Hare-Clark electorates, namely, Denison, it is more in the general interest that members speak for all of Denison than represent possible individual single-member subdivisions thereof, such as Sandy Bay or Moonah or Hobart Central. The generalization "the smaller the electorate, the smaller the member" points out an advantage of the Hare-Clark provision for larger electorates.

This results not only from use of large districts which necessitate a broad point of view but also from the greater competitiveness for political survival under Hare-Clark, which, providing no safe seats, also confronts each member with many rival candidates. With competition keen at election time as well as between elections, far heavier demands are made on the members under Hare-Clark than under single-member systems. This heavier responsibility on Tasmanian members of the House of Assembly benefits the public because it results in better service to the electors, and also tends to discourage weaker candidates from standing for Parliament.

Moreover, the large multi-member electorates under Hare-Clark cause all Parliamentarians to confront a much wider set of problems than under one-member electorates. The effect on outlook and knowledge necessarily is broadening. For candidates unable or unwilling to face this challenge of a big Hare-Clark electorate, the appeal of the small single-seat district can, understandably, be strong. In the public interest, however, it is better to have a system like Hare-Clark which leads candidates to concern themselves with broader public policies and the more important needs of their large electorates than concentrating on narrowly local interests. The candidates of limited ability whose success in single-member districts depends heavily on facility at hand-shaking and baby-kissing among a local following will find political life more difficult under Hare-Clark conditions.

Snug security for some and "sudden death" for others is the rule of the single-member system. Not all members of Parliaments chosen from single-member electorates have safe seats. On the contrary, the occupants of "swinging" seats are put under a jeopardy which no member under Hare-Clark needs to fear. A capable, deserving member under the Hare-Clark system has reasonable expectation of being returned. But even a slight swing in public opinion under the single-member system, perhaps caused by reverses in Party

popularity completely beyong the control of individual members can sweep from office those Party members not lucky enough to have safe seats.

I have just shown that in relation to the Districts of Chaffey and Murray. Under a proportional representation system the then member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) and the then member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) would not have been defeated. Let us have a look at the member for Millicent, whom I demonstrated a moment ago was fortunate enough to win by the skin of his teeth by one vote. That could never have happened under a Hare-Clark system. If there had been a five-member district embracing Victoria, Mount Gambier, Millicent and part of Albert returning five or seven members, Mr. Corcoran would have won easily because he would have got the quota as a result of his personal popularity. If he had been defeated it would have been a bad thing, because of his experience as a Cabinet Minister. No-one can tell me that where he lost 1,592 votes it was a personal vote against him; it was not. He lost the seat on other issues to which I have referred. Now we have the opportunity of both major Parties getting together and looking into a proper voting system that will return to the Parliament the men with the greatest ability, irrespective of their Party affiliation.

Snug security for some and "sudden death" for others is the rule of the single-member system. Not all members of Parliaments chosen from single-member electorates have safe seats. On the contrary, the occupants of "swinging" seats are put under a jeopardy which no member under Hare-Clark needs to fear. A capable, deserving member under the Hare-Clark system has reasonable expectation of being returned. But even a slight swing in public opinion under the single-member system, perhaps caused by reverses in Party popularity completely beyond the control of individual members, can sweep from office those Party members not lucky enough to have safe seats. The extremes of unwarranted security for some and unreasonable jeopardy to others do not help to attract worthy prospective candidates into politics under single-member conditions. Moreover, members cannot give their best service if they live always under the disquieting possibility or likelihood of being "tossed out" at the next election—perhaps through no fault of their own. That happened in the District of Chaffey and the District of Murray, and it happened because of policy. Illustrations of drastic fluctuations in Parliamentary membership under single electorates are not difficult to find, for instance, Ceylon. Although the percentage of the total vote received by the United National Party declined from the Parliamentary elections of 1952 to those of 1956, by 16 per cent, its representation fell from 54 seats in 1952 to eight seats in 1956, or from 57 per cent to 8 per cent respectively. While the vagaries of single-member electorates inflated the representation obtained by the U.N.P. in 1952, the electoral gamble severely under-represented it in 1956. Another example of the single-member system causing "sudden death" for sitting members is furnished by the two general elections for the Canadian House of Commons. As a result of the June, 1957, elections Liberal Party membership in Parliament dropped from 171 to 104 and that of the Progressive Conservative Party increased from 50 to 110. The effects of the March, 1958, elections showed even greater fluctuation, as the Progressive Conservatives gained in seats from 110 to 209 and the Liberals fell from 104 to 47. Within a one-year period, therefore, Liberal Party Parliamentary membership dropped from 171 to 47 and that of its chief opponent rose from 50 to 209.

Under the Hare-Clark system the elector makes his selections with fullest freedom, uninfluenced by the numbered type of how-to-vote cards generally used in Senate elections. The heart of the success of the Hare-Clark system could be said to be this unhampered freedom of the electors to pick and choose as they please. If the listing of candidates on the ballot-paper were determined by "mutual consent," as in the Senate elections, and combined with the use of numbered how-to-vote cards, a great measure of the value of Hare-Clark would be destroyed. In contrast, the Hare-Clark system provides for an alphabetical listing of candidates, and no attempt is made by the political Parties to suggest to their supporters any prescribed order for marking preferences. If voting "to order" "down the ticket," as in Senate election style, were followed, the choice of members of Parliament would pass, for all practical purposes, from the voters to political Party management.

As the Hare-Clark system now is, it provides the Tasmanian elector with a more effective vote among a wider range of candidates than any other method of Parliamentary election in the world. The free selection under the Hare-Clark system assures competition among candidates and keeps the elector sovereign. This unequalled privilege of choice

is therefore one of the most significant values of the voters' franchise in Tasmania and sets Hare-Clark in a class apart from the Senate election system, which otherwise follows the Hare-Clark system in most features. May it be hoped that the superior Hare-Clark example will serve as a model and incentive for improving the Australian Senate system. No-one complains about the Senate system, which is proportional representation, and I am suggesting an improvement on it.

Mr. Virgo: Many people complain about it.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have not heard of any move to abolish it. The Hare-Clark system is singularly neutral in its operation. All Parties and all candidates are treated with scrupulous impartiality. Whether candidates are from the Government or the Opposition, or from a major Party or a minor one, or standing as Independents, all must reach the same quota of votes in order to win. Moreover, the fortunes of Hare-Clark have in the past been identified with both parties. It owes its very adoption to the determined efforts by the non-Labor political parties in Tasmania in face of strong Labor Party opposition in 1906. When the Labor Party first came to power under Premier John Earle in 1914, extensive, but unsuccessful, efforts were made to have Hare-Clark replaced by a party list system of proportional representation.

Since then Hare-Clark has been continued by both Parties. In 1951 a Board of Inquiry on Parliamentary Deadlocks, appointed from outside Parliament and headed by Professor T. Hytten, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Tasmania, recommended the continuation of Hare-Clark with a change to seven-member electorates. In 1954 a Bill providing for seven-member electorates was introduced by Mr. L. V. McPartlan, Independent member for Denison. It passed the House of Assembly with the support of the Government, but was lost in the Legislative Council. The House of Assembly Select Committee on Electoral Reform emphatically re-endorsed the Hare-Clark system and urged the adoption of seven-member electorates.

The friends and foes of Hare-Clark have come from both Parties. Although the present Labor Party Government is supporting the Hare-Clark system and recommending its improvement, the chief antagonist to the system is a Labor member, Dr. J. F. Gaha, M.H.A., who acknowledges that he has been "an implacable enemy of the Hare-Clark system for many years and has not changed his views". One of the most ardent supporters of Hare-Clark, on the other hand, has been Mr. J. G. Breheny, M.H.A., a Liberal Party member. When others were attacking Hare-Clark in 1955, Mr. Breheny expressed his convictions without equivocation: "In no circumstances will I support the proposal to abandon the fairest and most democratic electoral system in the world to revert to the malpractice, injustice, and anomalies inseparable from the single electoral system with which electors have been so painfully familiar in the Labor States of New South Wales and Queensland for more than a quarter century".

In the same way that the Hare-Clark system is in itself impartial, so is the change from six to seven members an electorate. The plain fact is that the seventh seat in any electorate will go to whichever Party polls the majority vote in that electorate. The winning of the five additional seats will, therefore, be decided strictly and solely by the electors within the respective five Comomnwealth-State divisions. The swinging nature of all these divisions is shown in a table. The margins between the two Parties are close enough in all electorates for either party to consider that it has a good chance of winning 20-15 or 19-16 at the next election. I do not want members to consider only what I am saying about this present system. In 1943, a Bill was introduced into this House by Mr. Macgillivray. It was supported by me and, at the same time, a motion was moved in the Legislative Council by the Hon. Mr. Anderson and strongly supported by the Hon. Mr. Beerworth, the Labor member for the District of Northern, who, at page 497 of *Hansard* of October 20, 1943, is reported as saying:

> Although proportional representation is on the platform of the Australian Labor Party it is the duty of every Government, irrespective of Party politics, to introduce a system of electoral reform that will afford true representation. To illustrate my point I shall review Federal election results covering the last 30 years.

He then gave a good illustration of the point he was making. Later he said:

> We had as much right to form a Government as the L.C.L.. I do not approach this matter from the point of view of how it affects any Party. My concern is that we should have a Government truly representative of the people. When we speak about minorities, let us admit that they were responsible for the abolition of the slave traffic in America and the corn laws in England.
>
> In dealing with this problem I have to criticize the Labor Party in Queensland. It has occupied the Treasury benches for a number of years and what has happened? On at least two occasions during the last few years the

Labor Government there has altered the system of voting, obviously to suit its own purposes, but apparently it did not work out as expected, because when the other day it held an election for the district of Hamilton an Independent, the present Lord Mayor of Brisbane, won the seat with a majority over the combined figures of the Labor and the Country Party candidates.

Mr. Lawn: You are no different. You kept a gerrymandered Government in office to suit yourself.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The honourable member should have listened to the figures I quoted. Let us consider the District of Ridley. The Labor candidate received 1,568 votes, and 5,448 votes were recorded against the Labor candidate. Surely that speaks for itself.

Mr. Lawn: I said you kept the gerrymandered Government in office to suit your own purpose, but you are criticizing someone else for doing the same thing.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am not criticizing at all: I am quoting what a Labor member said. The quote from *Hansard* of October 20, 1943, continued:

> The Hon. E. Anthoney: How do you account for the fact that Queensland has not adopted proportional representation? It has had a Labor Government for many years.
>
> The Hon. J. M. BEERWORTH: The Labor leaders in Queensland are concerned more with the electoral system that will enable them to keep control of the Treasury benches.

The Hon. Mr. Beerworth then quoted a member in the New South Wales Parliament speaking on a Bill to abolish proportional representation, as follows:

> Mr. Bavin said: Before the Bill finally leaves this House I desire to say that it represents a direct effort on the part of the Government to prevent the people from being represented according to majority. It represents an effort on the part of the Government to twist the electoral machinery in its own interests. Any Government which to secure any political interest seeks to alter the electoral machinery of the country to prevent electors from recording the true position is a traitor to every democratic principle.

This is what was quoted by a Labor member in the Legislative Council when he was supporting proportional representation in 1943. In 1933, when I became a member of Parliament, the Premier (Hon. Richard Butler, as he then was) introduced a Bill for a five-year Parliament which I vigorously opposed. The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) will recall that a Bill was introduced in 1938 to do away with multiple electoral districts. Since then, every attempt to introduce a proportional representation system has been opposed. In 1943 the Labor Opposition voted in favour of a Bill to introduce proportional representation but its members did not make many speeches on it. As honourable members know, there must be an absolute majority for a constitutional Bill to be passed. The then member for Adelaide (Mr. Bardolph), when a vote was taken, did not vote. Altogether, 19 votes were recorded for it. However, had that gentleman voted there would have been the required majority under the Constitution, and the measure would then have gone to the Legislative Council, which Chamber would either have endorsed or rejected it. I think it is a pity that something was not done at the time to alter the voting system. Had it been altered, we would not have seen the present debacle.

Mr. McKee: You have helped create it.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have not; the voting system has.

Mr. Virgo: You perpetuated it.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I did not.

Mr. Lawn: You threw the Government out of office on a casting vote.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I did everything in my power to alter the system, but we did not have the numbers. I make a plea to the Committee to take the opportunity, while a commission is appointed, to examine the voting system as well and not to perpetuate the single-member districts which inevitably bring about a minority Government. I move:

> In subclause (1) before paragraph (*a*) to insert the following new paragraphs:
>
> (*aa*) inquire into and report whether it is desirable to introduce proportional representation for State elections;
>
> (*ab*) if it reports in favour of proportional representation divide the State into such House of Assembly districts and Legislative Council districts as it deems most suitable, and recommend the number of members for each House of Assembly district being five or seven members; and five members for each Legislative Council District;
>
> (*ac*) if it reports that it is not desirable to introduce proportional representation, divide the State and report as hereinafter provided in this Act;

The matter is left entirely in the hands of the commission which, if it thinks an alteration desirable, may take the necessary steps, or otherwise reject such alteration. Surely, while a commission is considering the division of the State into 47 electoral districts, it is not asking too much to have the commission consider an alteration in the voting system as well. I commend the amendment to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I am considering whether the amendment is in order. It appears to me that it would extend the terms of reference of the commission. It would add another subject of inquiry to the inquiry that is to be conducted by the commission; therefore, my own view is that it is out of order. I refer to Erskine May's *The Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament* (17th Edition) at page 417 (relating to amendments) which states:

The Speaker has ruled that to a question declaring the expediency of establishing a tribunal for the purpose of inquiring into a definite matter of urgent public importance, which followed the directions of the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) Act, 1921, an amendment to add another subject for inquiry would not be relevant, but an amendment relating to the constitution of the tribunal has been allowed.

In view of that, I am of the opinion that the amendment would not be in order.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I know the reference you have made, Mr. Chairman, to Erskine May. In framing this amendment I was careful to see that it came within the scope of the Bill, the preamble to which states:

An Act to provide for the appointment of a commission to make, and report upon, a division of the State into proposed electoral districts, and for purposes consequent thereon or incidental thereto.

I think your ruling, Sir, is probably based on the fact that this other matter of looking into the voting system is not provided for, and that is why you are ruling my amendment out of order. I take it that, had I been able to move a contingent notice of motion, I would have been in order. However, I think you will realize, Sir, that it was impossible for me to move a contingent notice of motion. I take it you are ruling my amendment out or order.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I have looked at the procedure in the House of Commons under the heading of "Instructions". I think the honourable member would have been in order had there been an instruction in connection with this matter.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: You can see, Mr. Chairman, the embarrassing situation in which I was placed in that I was unable to move a contingent notice of motion. I do not wish to move to disagree with your ruling. I think it would be most embarrassing and wrong for me, as Speaker, to disagree with a ruling of the Chairman. I readily admit that you, Sir, as a trained legal man, would probably have a better knowledge of legal interpretation than I would, as a layman. I thought I would be in order in moving my amendment. As I knew I would not be able to move a contingent notice of motion, I realized I would have to bring the amendment within the terms of the Bill, and I thought I had worded the amendment in that way. However, as you have ruled the amendment out of order, I bow to that ruling because of your greater legal knowledge of what is right and wrong in this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (1) (*b*) before "re-define" to strike out "subject to subsection (8) of this section, adjust and".

The purpose of this amendment is to provide that the commission can redefine the areas of the Council according to present boundaries: that is, that it merely has to provide parts of subdivisions that will fit into the existing boundaries of the Council. The effect of the proposal is that the Council boundaries should not and need not be redefined at this stage. It is better, until the boundaries for the Lower House have been dealt with clearly, to leave the Council boundaries as they are. There is no reason to alter the Council boundaries until we deal with the whole matter of Council subdivision.

If, in fact, we are redefining Council boundaries in terms of new divisions, then the basis of divisions for the Council can be significantly altered and it seems to me that there is no difficulty in leaving the Council boundaries as they are, because where we at present have them going across Assembly district boundaries, we can nevertheless adjust the rolls sufficiently in terms of the existing boundaries of the Council. I think it ill-advised at this stage to proceed to adjust Council boundaries by a Bill that is designed entirely to deal with Assembly redivision. We are not at present dealing in any detail with the redivision of Council boundaries.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think it is well recognized, as the Leader has said, that we are not attempting to alter the Council boundaries on any matter of principle. This is a Bill to alter Assembly districts and because of this, if it becomes law, we will not have an alteration to the Council boundaries in the sense of any major redistribution or alteration of the principle of distribution, but we would have almost inevitably a situation where council boundaries would not coincide with Assembly boundaries.

The provision of the Bill is purely consequential, to make provision for at least the coincidence of boundaries for the sake of convenience. It is not a means of in any way

drastically altering the principle behind the Council boundaries. I consider that we can accept that there must be a Bill concerning council boundaries, but the situation surely is complicated enough (and I think we have canvassed this previously) to deal with each position at a time. I consider it necessary that the consequential alteration should proceed and, for that reason, the Government cannot accept that the situation should be as the Leader has submitted.

Mr. CORCORAN: Surely the Leader's amendment simplifies matters. At the moment the Constitution defines Council districts as whole Assembly districts. Because whole Assembly districts must alter if the Bill is passed, it invariably follows that there will be an alteration of some description to Council districts.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: It could be only a minor alteration.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. As a result of the redistribution of Assembly districts and because Council districts are defined as whole Assembly districts, this measure will mean an alteration to most Council districts. This could be avoided if the Leader's amendment is accepted, simply by using subdivisions instead of whole Assembly districts, and the subdivisions could be drawn up to suit the Council districts. If new Assembly districts are drawn up, no attention need be paid to Council districts until the creation of subdivisions comes about. The Council districts could be defined in the Constitution by using subdivisions instead of by using whole Assembly districts.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Surely the new Assembly divisions should not have to suit the old Council boundaries?

Mr. CORCORAN: No. The commission would decide on all Assembly districts. In redefining, in accordance with the amendment, the Council areas without alteration on a subdivision basis, the commission would draw up subdivisions where Council districts could be defined without any alteration.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This is being done with Federal redistribution now.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. This is no trick on the Opposition's part. The amendment is designed to leave Council districts as they are at the moment, but in order to define them in accordance with the Constitution it is required that they be whole Assembly districts. This could be altered to subdivisions, without affecting the shape of any new Assembly district decided on by the commission. This is a step in the right direction and one that will simplify the work of the commission and the Electoral Office.

Mr. VIRGO: I join with the Deputy Leader in supporting the Leader's amendment. I was surprised and disappointed to hear the Premier's reaction to it, but I do not think he has gone thoroughly into the amendment's effect. As the Premier has said, the Bill is a consequential alteration to put in a few bumps and to take out a few bumps; in other words, it fiddles around with the existing Council districts. I do not believe that Council districts should be fiddled with: I believe they should be thoroughly reformed. I agree with the Premier that this is something which perhaps could best be dealt with as an item on its own. If we agree on this, surely we can agree not to fiddle around with the Legislative Council at all at this stage.

As the Premier has said, the position is complicated enough: let us deal with these things one at a time. This is exactly what the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition is doing—it is dealing with the House of Assembly, and leaving the Legislative Council boundaries exactly as they are at present. To say that this will create difficulties is merely a figment of the imagination: there are no difficulties in this. The commission would be able very simply to redefine the Council boundaries in terms of subdivisions. There is no holy writ that a House of Assembly district has to be wholly within a Legislative Council district. What difference does it make?

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: How would you print the rolls?

Mr. VIRGO: The rolls do not mean anything. The Premier has built up in his own mind fears about this amendment that do not really exist.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): There is some validity in the argument advanced by the Opposition, but in my view there are stronger reasons against the amendment. I think I am correct in saying that traditionally in South Australia (certainly, it is the position now) Legislative Council districts have been defined in terms of whole House of Assembly districts, and this subclause, as drafted, will preserve that situation by allowing for consequential amendments to the Legislative Council districts so that they conform with the new whole House of Assembly districts until Parliament is able to agree on a redistribution of Legislative Council districts. We are simply preserving the

principle upon which the Legislative Council districts have been defined for a very long time. It has been urged by the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy that we can get over any consequential difficulties by creating new subdivisions, but I point out—and I think I am correct in saying this—that subdivisions have always been defined by reference to House of Assembly and House of Representatives districts—they have never been defined by reference to Legislative Council districts, and the definition has been made by the Commonwealth by arrangement with the State Government. I do not think it is possible to introduce subdivisions based not on the boundaries of two Houses but of three Houses, and that is what we would have to do if we did what the Opposition has suggested.

I do not think it would be possible to reduce confusion in this way, and confusion there will be if we leave the Legislative Council electoral boundaries as they are at present and alter the House of Assembly boundaries, because inevitably they will not coincide with the new Assembly boundaries. If they did so coincide, I would be amazed. So, we would have, in effect, the relics of the old system of boundaries as they now are (based on the 39 House of Assembly districts). The boundaries for the Legislative Council would remain, but we would have a totally new system not corresponding in any way for 47 House of Assembly seats. This would be extremely confusing to electors.

Mr. Virgo: We are going to change the boundaries before the next State election.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Maybe we will, but until we do change them there will be confusion, and we believe that by making consequential alterations we will minimize the confusion that will inevitably follow. I do not think it can be cured by the creation of new subdivisions.

Mr. CORCORAN: I see some merit in the Attorney's argument when comparing Commonwealth and State subdivisions. Under the new redistribution the Commonwealth boundaries are being redrawn at this stage, and I do not see how that affects the existing State Assembly districts. However, whilst it has been traditional and is written into the Constitution that Council districts shall be based on whole Assembly districts, I cannot see any great difficulties in using subdivisions in order to maintain exactly the existing districts. In future, redistribution of Council districts will inevitably be based on whole Assembly districts. I question the desirability of this, because it restricts the flexibility of any commission which has to decide on a new Council district as it will be controlled to a certain extent by whole Assembly districts. It would be desirable if the commission had some flexibility in drawing up new Council districts by having to abide by subdivisions rather than by whole Assembly districts. I think the difficulties described by the Attorney-General in relation to a subdivision of, say, Glenelg or Onkaparinga, being in the Southern District when it has previously been in Central No. 2 District, create no great difficulty. It is no different from a whole Assembly district being there. Perhaps people voting in a subdivision of Onkaparinga would be required to vote in the Southern District, while people in another subdivision would be required to vote in the Central No. 2 District, but polling clerks would be aware of this, as would the people voting. I do not see that this situation presents any problem. The redesigning of the subdivisions into the present Council districts would be a matter of liaison with Commonwealth authorities.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It is easy to say that.

Mr. CORCORAN: If this amendment is accepted, surely the commission would consider this and take the necessary steps to ensure that this could and would be done. I see no difficulties.

Mr. HUDSON: I am surprised at the Government's attitude. I think the difficulties referred to by the Attorney-General just do not exist. Taking Legislative Council boundaries, I point out that whenever there is a redistribution of Assembly districts it inevitably involves the creation of new Assembly subdivisions, and there is no problem with the Commonwealth Government over the creation of these new subdivisions. The only point is that a new subdivision must not cut across a Commonwealth electoral district boundary. In other words, any new subdivision created must lie wholly within a Commonwealth district. If the existing Legislative Council districts are redefined in terms of subdivisions, we are merely requiring that any new subdivision that is created as a result of the redivision of Assembly districts must lie wholly within an existing Legislative Council district. We have five Legislative Council districts, and we are already subject to the restraint that any new subdivision created must not cut across any of the boundaries of the 12 Commonwealth electoral divisions, but that never creates a problem.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It creates some thought: you are adding another restriction.

Mr. HUDSON: But it is only a minor restriction. As against that, the Bill provides for amendments to Legislative Council boundaries and for a clear method of determining how the amendments to those Legislative Council boundaries are to be carried out in the metropolitan area. There is no direction as to how it is to be done in rural districts. The Government is asking us and the Legislative Council to accept a pig in a poke. Adjustments concerning the Legislative Council are of some moment. Concerning the Legislative Council, I point out that adjustments occurring between Northern and Midland, Midland and Southern, or Central No. 2 and Southern, are of some political consequence (an undetermined political consequence); and the situation may well be created in which the report of the electoral commission is prejudiced because of unexpected political consequences in the adjustment of Legislative Council boundaries. Surely, no-one wants to take the risk of prejudicing any reformation with respect to House of Assembly boundaries because we have made unnecessary consequential adjustments to Legislative Council boundaries. After all, why is it that the Legislative Council districts should be adjusted in a particular way within the metropolitan area and no restriction is placed on the commission concerning how Legislative Council districts are to be adjusted in the country areas?

There are 12 restrictions that apply to the creation of new subdivisions at present, because there are 12 Commonwealth electoral boundaries, and they are not the only restrictions: there is also an effective restriction in that there must be a voting place within any new subdivision. There is also a restriction in that one must try to create effective lines of demarcation between subdivisions. As the Attorney-General probably knows, the subdivisional boundary that uses the Eden Hills tunnel is not a satisfactory one.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: The railway line.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, it goes through the tunnel. The railway line near Eden Hills goes through a tunnel, does it not?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Through two tunnels.

Mr. HUDSON: As there is some difficulty in determining where houses on the surface would be situated in relation to that particular boundary line, it is not a good boundary line. I ask the Attorney-General to check with the Electoral Department, which finds some difficulty with a boundary line such as that, and others. The boundary line drawn with respect to Mount Gambier is obviously not sound. As a matter of interest, the 1963 redistribution would have solved that problem. There are other restrictions, multitudinous in character, that apply in relation to the drawing of subdivisional boundaries. As far as possible, in the metropolitan area an effort is made to have them on through roads: dead-ends are avoided. Again, in the near metropolitan area, as far as possible the drawing of boundaries on hundred lines is avoided.

These restrictions are multitudinous compared with restrictions in not crossing over a Commonwealth House of Representatives boundary, and the extra restrictions that would be imposed by requiring that any new subdivision must not cross a Legislative Council boundary would be absolutely minimal, because I think it is absolutely clear that the Commonwealth restrictions of not being able to cross over 12 Commonwealth House of Representatives boundaries are not critical restrictions that apply to a commission in drawing up constitutional boundaries. The critical ones are always related to the defining of a particular line, which will make the electoral officer's administrative work in distinguishing whether someone, for example, in Glencoe should be in the Millicent District or in the Victoria District (the subdivision of Penola). That sort of boundary line is the difficult one and should be made clear. Some adjustments were made, as a result of checking done by L.C.L. canvassers, in relation to people living on that boundary. Some were moved from the Victoria District to the Millicent District because they had been placed on the wrong roll. Honourable members will see that this argument of the Attorney-General about there being an additional restriction placed on the commission, when they examine it carefully and realize the real difficulties in drawing subdivisional boundaries do not relate to this sort of restriction but rather to the problem of defining a clear-cut dividing line, is not appropriate.

I do not think the other argument about this being confusing has much weight either. It should not be beyond the abilities of any returning officer to cope with the possibility that the electors in this House of Assembly district, depending on the subdivision to which they belong, could be voting in more than one Legislative Council district. He always

has to check the subdivision when any application for a vote comes along. If one is in the metropolitan area, one will always be asked to vote in one's subdivision if one is close to it. The poll clerks of the particular subdivisional polling booth would hand the elector the appropriate Legislative Council voting paper. Regarding postal votes, the returning officer should again have no problem in sorting out which applications for Legislative Council postal votes should go to which Legislative Council returning officer. I admit that there is a little more work for each returning officer, but it is not work that should create real difficulty. For example, all electors in the subdivision of Brighton may vote in Southern and all electors in the subdivision of Glenelg may vote in Central No. 2, but on polling day every one votes within his subdivision and the Legislative Council returning officer who handles postal votes has to check against the subdivisional roll, so there again there are no problems.

It seems to me we should not take the risk of antagonizing the Legislative Council. Ministers know that that would be the last thing that I would consider doing. Let us use an argument *ad hominem* and use the Premier's own words. Members know what these Legislative Council members are like. If we send them a Bill that raises doubts about what will happen regarding the boundaries of Midland and Northern, we will have all the members of the Legislative Council from Midland thinking that their position will worsen, and the members for Northern thinking the same.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I have heard everything now.

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister has made ignorant speeches on this Bill, which makes quite clear that if a metropolitan Assembly district falls predominantly in a particular Council district, the whole of that Assembly district is deemed to be in that particular Council district. However, that does not apply to adjustments between the Districts of Northern and Midland, and we could easily get an adjustment between those districts that took two-thirds of one district out of what used to be Northern and put it into Midland. Nothing in the Bill restricts the commission about the adjustment of Legislative Council districts, and I challenge the Minister of Works to prove otherwise. I ask the Committee whether members of the Legislative Council from Midland will look favourably on a commission that may transfer two-thirds of what was previously a safe Liberal district. Would not taking two-thirds of Rocky River out of Northern and putting it in Midland cause a problem with the Legislative Council?

The Hon. R. S. Hall: How could it occur, under this clause?

Mr. HUDSON: Because of the provisions of subclause (8). It will not be "practicable" in respect of the boundary between Midland and Northern, because inevitably Assembly districts in the Mid-North close to the boundary line can be cut up, some going one way and some another. Such districts are the present districts of Chaffey, Burra, Rocky River and Light, all of which cover the band across the Mid-North and will be cut up. It follows that the commission must determine, say, that Rocky River goes partly into the new district of Burra and partly into a new district associated with Stuart or Frome. The commission must decide whether the new whole Assembly District of Frome goes into the Northern District or into the Midland District, and whether the new Assembly District of Burra goes into the Northern District or into the Midland District. That must be decided in respect of four or five areas along the boundary line. If a close look is taken at this, the changes in the boundaries between the Midland District and the Northern District could be substantial and, if that is so, we may be buying trouble.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: It might be more substantial than the adjustment to fix up the boundaries of subdivisions.

Mr. HUDSON: That is not so, because when the commission creates a new subdivision it will automatically tend to cut up an existing subdivision. That subdivision already lies wholly within an existing Legislative Council district and, if it is cut in halves or into one-third and two-thirds, both new subdivisions still lie within the same Legislative Council district. So long as the commission adopts the simple practice, whenever any new subdivision is created, of cutting up an existing one and not creating a new subdivision by joining together a bit of one with a bit of another, it could avoid the problem of Legislative Council boundaries altogether.

I ask the Ministers to check what was done by the 1963 commission. Almost invariably it cut up existing subdivisions and, if it had to allocate these subdivisions among old Legislative Council districts, there was no problem: the two new subdivisions still lay within the same district. The Bill will not create serious

difficulty or a serious problem for the commission. Why risk the problem of antagonizing the Legislative Council? The Bill deals only with House of Assembly districts. We know we must face up to a Legislative Council alteration of boundaries before long, but why buy into that problem, even partially, when we are dealing with a House of Assembly Bill? Surely, if we want the Legislative Council to approach this Bill free of any self-interest it may have in relation to its own Legislative Council seats, it is best to leave the existing Legislative Council boundaries alone so far as this Bill is concerned and, if necessary, when we tackle a Legislative Council redivision, to do it under that Bill. We should confront that problem when we have to, but we should not buy into it unnecessarily.

If this was not the philosophy of what the Premier was trying to argue in relation to adult franchise, I have missed the message. I ask the Government to reconsider this matter, because I think it can be shown that the points I have made can be substantiated.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause."

Mr. HUDSON: We have had no indication of the Government's attitude. I get the impression that there may be further possibilities of consideration by Ministers, and I should not like to see the question put at this stage without these points being properly considered, because they are important and they have been made without a political motive. No-one knows what will happen to the A.L.P.-L.C.L. situation in the Legislative Council: it could go either way. The Bill as it stands requires a particular method of adjustment of Legislative Council boundaries. If a new Assembly district is created that takes in 10,000 electors from the existing subdivisions of St. Kilda and Gawler, and adds on to that a total of 5,000 electors from the existing subdivision of Northfield, under subclause (8), as it stands, the 5,000 from Northfield will go into the Midland District, because it lies predominantly in the Midland District. Consequently, the 5,000 electors previously in Central No. 1 would have to be transferred to the Midland District, and that would suit us; but it might be that the reverse would happen, which would not suit us.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I wish the member for Glenelg had impressed on his Leader how important it was not to antagonize the Legislative Council on another measure. However, either he did not take the trouble or he was unsuccessful. I am therefore not swayed very much by that part of his argument. However, he does raise the question of the convenience of drawing subdivisions in relation to the boundaries of the existing Legislative Council districts, which is an additional argument. For this reason, I shall be happy to examine the position. If the Leader withdraws his amendment I will give an undertaking to reconsider this clause after other amendments to this clause and other clauses have been considered. It would still preserve the Leader's right to move an amendment when the clause was reconsidered. I am saying this without giving any undertaking, except that the Government will consider the matters the Opposition has raised in this regard.

Mr. Hudson: Would you include in that category your own amendments to subclause (8), which also deal with the matter of Legislative Council boundaries?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am happy to reconsider them, because I believe they impinge on the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In view of the Premier's undertaking I seek leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I reserve the right to move my amendments when the clause is reconsidered.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (2) after "thereby" to strike out "(disregarding any fraction)" and insert "(calculated to the nearest integral number)".

We should continue to be consistent throughout the Bill about the way in which we treat fractions. I see no reason why we should disregard fractions: they should be taken to the nearest whole number. Elsewhere in the Bill it is intended to do that and not merely to disregard fractions; so what is done in one place should be done in another. The effect of this provision as it stands is that there could be nearly a whole number achieved but the fraction could be completely disregarded although, in some cases, this fraction could represent a considerable number. For consistency this principle should apply throughout the Bill and we should not disregard fractions but take each number to the next whole.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government believes that the fractions should be disregarded in the interests of convenience. We

have to go one way or another in arriving at a number, and the Government believes that it should be the lower number.

Mr. HUDSON: This is an extraordinary attitude. We have to get to 27 before the number reaches 27; if it is 26 and 999 thousandths the number is still 26. Surely, it is reasonable to have regard to fractions here, and to calculate to the nearest whole number. This is merely a matter of general policy, the kind of thing that any child at school is taught to do; in fact, if when making a calculation he does not take it to the nearest whole number, he will lose marks. I cannot understand why the Premier will not accept the amendment; I do not see anything wrong with it.

Mr. CORCORAN: We are simply trying to improve the Bill, and to pay regard to everyone, disregarding no-one. After all, we are dealing with people, not fractions. As the Leader has said, this amendment will result in consistency in the legislation. I do not think any previous measure of this kind has disregarded fractions.

Mr. VIRGO: It is almost unbelievable that the Premier is adopting a "couldn't care less" attitude on such an important question. Surely it is common sense that we should see that many electors are not virtually disfranchised or not taken into account.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Work out what it means.

Mr. VIRGO: I have, and I hope the Attorney has worked it out, too. I wish he would try to explain it instead of sitting there with a smug look on his face.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: If you sit down, I will do so.

Mr. VIRGO: I waited for a long time, hoping a member opposite would speak. However, I will sit down immediately and speak again after the Attorney-General has explained this matter.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Honourable members know as well as I do that this particular amendment is, in itself, inconsequential, but there is another amendment to be moved later which will try the same thing and which is not inconsequential. All this means is that there will be a fraction of 47 in some thousands. I have worked out a simple example which shows how inconsequential is this amendment. Say there were 200,000 electors in the State. If we divide 47 into 200,000 the result is 4,255 and fifteen-fortysevenths of a person. We say disregard the fifteen-fortysevenths and call it 4,255.

Mr. Hudson: What if it is more than half?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If it was thirty-fortysevenths the Opposition would make it 4,256. In arriving at the State quota, a difference of one either way will mean virtually nothing. As the Premier has said, it is simply a matter of convenience to disregard altogether the fraction, and that is what we intend to do. There is nothing particularly shattering either in doing it this way or in going to the nearest whole number. We have opted for one thing and the Opposition, out of cussedness and with an eye to what is coming later, will want to do the other thing; but we are not going to do it.

Mr. CASEY: I take exception to the Attorney's last statement. Every time he speaks he puts his foot in it. He said that the Opposition had taken this attitude out of cussedness. I have never heard anything so jolly childish in my whole life. In all schools we are taught that when we have a fractional sum we take it to the nearest whole number. This is done in all business transactions, but now the Attorney has said that it does not suit him to do it in this case. I see nothing wrong with this amendment, for it is plain common sense to take the nearest whole number. The Attorney defeated his own argument by saying that if the fraction is fifteen-fortysevenths the fraction is disregarded and that if it is thirtyfive-fortysevenths the fraction is also disregarded. That is crazy. The nearest whole number is taken in everyday business, but it does not suit the Government to do it here. The Government has the numbers on the floor and can do as it likes. It does not even think about the whole purpose of an Opposition. Our argument is perfectly logical, and I do not agree with the cussedness of the Attorney-General. I support the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: I am amazed at the Attorney. In one part of the clause, we disregard any fraction. When we divide the 200,000 electors by 47, we get 4,255 and fifteen-fortysevenths and we disregard the fraction. However, when we want to determine the metropolitan quota we take the 4,255 and add 15 per cent, which is 638.25. The commission is instructed to calculate that to the nearest integral number. I suggest that the Attorney is the one who is being cussed. We have caught him out, because he has not done his homework. He has had this Bill before the Parliament for months, and I am appalled at his carelessness.

Mr. Corcoran: It is a lack of attention to detail.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. When the Attorney-General was a member of the Opposition, he could be heard in the front bar of the South Australian Hotel, or in the back bar of the Gresham Hotel, if he caught the previous Attorney out on a point like this. The Attorney-General will not admit bad draftsmanship and will not agree to a perfectly reasonable amendment, yet he says we are being cussed! I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, to teach the Attorney-General a lesson and make him do his homework. I ask that you give your casting vote for the Opposition.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Giles.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (3) (*b*) to strike out "fifteen" and insert "ten".

In this section it is proposed that the quota in the metropolitan district be compulsorily 15 per cent above the State quota. I do not think that that should in any way be allowed to stand. There is no reason why the metropolitan quota should be 15 per cent above the State quota and why the country quota should be so much below it. This means that the compulsory difference between the average size of a country electoral district and the average size of a metropolitan electoral district would be about 58.5 per cent.

A difference of this magnitude goes completely beyond what would even be an approximation to the principle of one vote one value, and it certainly goes far beyond what has been taken to be a reasonable departure by conservative forces in other States. In Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria the average difference between metropolitan and non-metropolitan seats is 30 per cent. Here, when we depart to such an extent that we go very close to 60 per cent, is a departure of far too great a magnitude from the principle of one vote one value. It would write into our Constitution the principle of minority rule in the State which is completely unjustified and completely opposed to the principles of the Labor Party. The provision of a compulsory 15 per cent above the State quota for all metropolitan seats, with a compulsory provision below the State quota for all country seats, will mean a departure from the quota much greater than is normally recognized as reasonable, convenient or allowable, and it will perpetuate a provision of minority rule, of dictatorship by the minority, and of having the country people of South Australia ruling the city people.

In a thundering editorial in the *West Coast Sentinel*, the Premier and I were called some very uncomplimentary things, and members of the Legislative Council were said to smell like roses. I do not know whether the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) wrote the article, but it pointed out that it was necessary for country people to have much more say in the State than city people, because otherwise we would have the city ruling the country. However, the converse is apparently all right! It is all right for the country to say to the city, "Despite the fact that you are far more numerous, we will tell you how you are to live your lives." As has been pointed out time and again in the Supreme Court of the United States of America and elsewhere, there is no justification whatever for basing electoral rights upon the place where a person lives. It is people who are represented in a Parliament, and nothing else. Legislators represent people, not the space in between the people.

This provision of 15 per cent above the State quota is going much too far. My Party has been prepared to compromise to some degree upon its principles. Even if our amendments were carried, we would not think this Bill was fair. We are supporting the Bill to the extent we are because we think it is an improvement on the present utterly iniquitous system, but 15 per ecnt goes beyond what we can countenance. We believe the difference between metropolitan seats and country seats must be brought within the normal tolerance existing in the Eastern States. It has been suggested that we should look to Western Australia as an example. Only two areas in South Australia have difficulty about representation because of sparse population. The rest of the settled area of South Australia is smaller than Victoria, and there is not the slightest difficulty in bringing our proposals within those that exist in the Eastern States, which are more thickly populated than the

total area of South Australia. We should reduce the 15 per cent above the State quota for metropolitan seats to 10 per cent.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government does not accept this amendment. The situation concerning the results of the calculations based on this figure have been widely canvassed as to the justice or injustice in relation to the weighting given in this Bill to country areas. This difference has been considerable between the Parties, but at present we have come together considerably in our views. The Leader wants 10 per cent instead of 15 per cent, but 15 per cent is the figure that the Government is committed to and it cannot be altered now. In no way has the Government's argument been diffuse. I have said publicly that under the present calculations and with the number of electors in the State the Bill will result in 28 metropolitan and 19 country seats or 29 metropolitan and 18 country seats.

Mr. Hudson: The latter is not true.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That may be the honourable member's opinion. I have given the full facts to the public, and the result will be one or other of those combinations. We will be judged as a Government on either one. The Government has not hidden the results of the calculations, and the use of 15 per cent is the Government's method of arriving at particular quotas. On the question of how much weighting there should be to country areas we reach a point of personal and Party belief that is not uniform throughout the world. I remind members of my conversation in London with two members of the British House of Commons and two members of the House of Lords. Two of these people were members of the British Labor Party and two were members of the Conservative Party. Without any prior build-up, I asked the two Labor members what their idea was about how much weighting there should be for country areas. Their first reply was two to one. I questioned them again, and they then said that perhaps they had gone a bit too far and that they believed it should be 55,000 to 35,000. This is therefore a matter of opinion, which cuts across the consideration of whether one happens to be left or right of centre in politics. In other countries the weighting is not regarded with the extreme distaste with which the Leader apparently views something that I consider to be reasonable for the country. Although I admit there has to be a large departure from the existing system and that there is an urgent need for reform, we must nevertheless preserve some weighting for country areas. I fully subscribe to the 15 per cent weighting now being argued. The Government must oppose the amendment.

Mr. VIRGO: I am bitterly disappointed at the Premier's comments. Although what he said may not have been unexpected, I thought he would try to justify the reason for giving country people this added weighting. My only regret is that the Leader's amendment seeks even to retain a 10 per cent differential. I believe his attitude is that, while we have a chance of getting the 10 per cent, there is just no chance of our obtaining one vote one value. The Premier's remarks are almost identical to the remarks of Mr. H. C. Morphett (President of the Liberal and Country League) who, when recently making submissions to the Commonwealth redistribution commission, said:

> In our view, proper weight given to the factors mentioned would justify the numbers in the rural divisions being below the quota and, in the case of Grey, well below the quota.

The Commonwealth commissioners have authority under the Act and, in a later submission, the L.C.L. virtually told the commissioners that they had failed to carry out the instruction because, disregarding this entirely, they said only a few weeks ago that the votes of people in Australia should be equal wherever they may be. That is all contained in the report that I have, so how can we justify this weighting in South Australia when the Commonwealth redistribution commissioners said they agreed to one vote one value? The Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party Coalition Government has adopted the report of the commission. In Queensland, it was not any fault of the Liberal and Country Party Coalition Government that the report was not adopted: it was the result of action taken by the Australian Labor Party in the Senate and supported on this particular occasion by the Democratic Labor Party Senators, not that I am particularly proud of having that support.

The Premier said that most of the details were given in his second reading explanation. However, before members opposite agree with the Premier in accordance with the obvious instruction he gave (he said all members of his Party agreed to this provision and, as he said it, he looked around, his look implying that no member opposite shall move out of line), they should realize what is happening. Although a definite figure is hard to establish, working on the basis of a total enrolment of

the State of 611,258, with this iniquitous 15 per cent loading, we would finish up with a metropolitan quota of almost 15,000 and a country quota of about 9,500. Of course, when the differential is added, as is provided for in a later clause of the Bill, we can finish up with a metropolitan district of over 16,000 and a country district of 8,000, thus returning to the situation which commenced in 1938 and which provided for country districts with half the number of electors of metropolitan districts.

This afternoon the Minister of Works said that the electors of Torrens agreed that they should have only half as much say in the affairs of this State as the electors in a country district. Frankly, I do not believe him. I believe the electors of Torrens, Burnside and Mitcham (the only three metropolitan districts represented in Cabinet) would expect and demand (if they were given the opportunity) an equal say with electors on Eyre Peninsula, on Yorke Peninsula and in any other part of South Australia. The Leader's amendment attempts to bring together the thinking of the two Parties. The Bill provides for a loading of 15 per cent and the amendment for a loading of 10 per cent. Although the amendment does not go as far as other members on this side and I would like, at least the Government could show its good faith and an attitude of compromise by accepting it.

Mr. HUDSON: I support the remarks of the Leader and the member for Edwardstown. One important thing is that the 15 per cent loading turns out to be a phoney 15 per cent. In fact, the variation above and below the State quota, under the Bill as it stands, will be greater than 15 per cent. To take a simple example, if the State enrolment is 610,000 then under the Bill, the State quota will be 12,978 or, to make it easier, 13,000. A figure of 15 per cent above the quota would give an addition of 1,950 and, therefore, a metropolitan quota of 14,950. With that quota, we would have to get 433,550 in the metropolitan area in order to get 29 districts, and that could not be achieved, even with Gawler included. That means that something fewer than 433,550 will be in the metropolitan area: probably, the figure will be about 428,000, which is about 5,500 fewer than the number necessary to get 29 districts there.

If that is the metropolitan figure, instead of the metropolitan average being the same as the metropolitan quota, we divide by 28 and get 15,286, and this is what the effective metropolitan quota becomes. That is 17½ per cent above the State quota. As the Bill stands, it gives at least 17½ per cent above the State quota for the metropolitan districts, and there will be only 28 such districts. What the Premier says publicly about there being 29 districts is hogwash. It is just not on, as the Premier well knows.

Having determined that there will be 28 metropolitan districts, we are left with 19 non-metropolitan districts for 182,000 electors, giving a country quota of 9,579. That turns out to be not 15 per cent below the State quota but 26.3 per cent below it, so the 15 per cent is a phoney figure. Comparing the average excess of metropolitan districts over country districts, we get 59½ per cent. If we had a fair dinkum tolerance of 15 per cent either way and if all the metropolitan districts ran to exactly 15 per cent above quota, we would have metropolitan districts, on average, running at 35.3 per cent above the average number of electors in country districts. Metropolitan districts would average 14,950 and country districts would average 11,050.

The average excess of metropolitan over country will be 59½ per cent. This is designed to make the people of South Australia think that the Bill is fairer than it is and to think that the Government is moving closer toward one vote one value than it is. If we accept the Opposition's amendment and if the metropolitan average turns out to be something greater than 10 per cent above the State quota, because there are only 19 country seats as against 28 in the metropolitan area, the country districts will turn out, on average, to be 15 per cent, or 17 per cent or 18 per cent below the State quota. We would end up, with the Opposition's amendment, with the number of electors in metropolitan districts being 33 per cent to 35 per cent in excess of the average number of electors in country districts. In other words, we would get close to what I regard as a 15 per cent limit either way from the quota. This is the Opposition's policy, but the peculiar wording of the Bill and the peculiar mathematical tricks in it do not give an effective 15 per cent: they give metropolitan districts of 17½ per cent above the quota and country districts of 26.3 per cent below the quota.

It is possible to demonstrate from the L.C.L.'s own document that in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland the average excess of electors in metropolitan districts over country districts is about 30 per cent to 35 per cent, which is completely in line with what the Opposition is proposing here. Although the Labor Party in Victoria would

describe Sir Henry Bolte's distribution system as a gerrymander, we would be delighted to have it here. As a matter of hard cold facts the Government is proposing here something that is not in line with the systems that apply in the Eastern States, and no-one can argue that the Governments in the Eastern States ignore the country elector. No-one argues that in the Eastern States the country elector is not given sufficient weight. I think the trouble is that Government members do not have enough self confidence: they are not confident enough in the ability of their own representatives from country areas to state their case if they have a basis of representation of one vote one value. They feel confident only if they have a bias in their favour—if they have a special advantage that penalizes their opponents. The Labor Party's handicap in South Australia is equivalent to Galilee's 10st. 1 lb. in the Melbourne Cup. The Labor Party's handicap is the only thing that explains the fact that the current Government is in office.

The present Government does not have a mandate to do anything. To suggest that, having made one compromise, that is as far as it can go is not good enough. The Premier is one of those great democrats who gets up in front of others and says, "Here is a compromise: take it or leave it." The Bill as it stands does not provide for a 15 per cent tolerance: effectively, it means that metropolitan districts will on average be 60 per cent greater in numbers of electors than will country districts. The Opposition's amendment, far from providing a departure from what applies in the Eastern States, in fact provides almost an exact replica. I support the amendment.

[*Midnight*]

Mr. CASEY: I listened attentively to the Premier's reply to the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier referred to his recent trip to England. He said that he spoke to two Labor Party members and two Conservative Party members there. He stressed that the Labor Party members believed that there should be a considerable amount of weighting in favour of country districts. Why does he have to go all the way to England to justify putting into practice something in South Australia, when the Commonwealth Government gives a certain weighting to its electoral districts? It is about 20 per cent.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: It is about six to one in the Senate.

Mr. CASEY: I am talking about the House of Representatives. The Premier has neighbouring States—New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland—whose electoral systems can be guides. I agree that this Bill is a big step forward, because the present electoral set-up is probably the worst in the world, so any reform must be an improvement. I have always said that there must be a weighting in favour of country areas. I represent an electoral district into which the British Isles could be fitted. The electoral system today was drawn up to conform to Liberal Party policy, and Sir Thomas Playford was no mug at rigging boundaries. The Premier claimed that under this Bill there must be some weighting for people living in the country, but this is not being done. Whyalla will be an electoral district of its own, as will the towns of Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Mount Gambier. How can a Government say it is favouring all country people: there is no difference between living in a small country town and living in Whyalla concerning the voting power of any persons.

The Liberal Party is giving the weight of the voting strength not to all country people but only to a small hard core of Liberal voters. The stage will be reached where a country electoral district will have only 8,100 voters while some country districts will have up to 12,000 voters. The Premier cannot say that weighting is being given to all people living in country areas. Certain areas are being weighted in order to gain seats: it is not a question of people but of seats, and I challenge the Premier to say otherwise. The Bill previously introduced by the Labor Party was called by some Liberal members the Casey Protection Bill, but they forgot that another area was to be left the same as mine and that it would have been represented by a Liberal member. The idea was to give a weighting to these areas similar to that given in the Kimberley district of Western Australia, which is a vast area far from the capital, and with a small population. There was nothing sinister about that measure at all: it was evenly balanced. While there might have been a large isolated area in the north-east of the State, there would have been another large area in the north-west. I will always adhere to the view that country areas should be weighted, because they involve greater distances to be travelled and place a greater strain on the member. However it is

hypocritical to say that country people are being given an equal say under this Bill, for nothing of the sort applies.

This Government will always try to place people in one of two categories, one rural and the other urban, but the sooner it gets out of this practice, the better it will be for the State as a whole. It is wrong to split the people in this way. Living in the country, I do not think I have the right to more say in who shall govern than has a person living in the metropolitan area. When I first read clause 8 and the provision relating to the calculation of quotas, I could not understand what was in the Government's mind. Why did it have to go to this extent, when the Commonwealth Government does not? It has been said many times that the position in other States today allows for a greater tolerance than that provided for in this Bill. Although that may be so, I point out that that position has come about only through the shifting and building up of population in certain areas which has occurred subsequent to the passing of the respective measures.

Legislation introduced to this place and passed by it applies over many years. Eventually, in the case of electoral legislation, it must be altered and we must always consider the basis of that legislation when it was first introduced. I consider that the tolerance provided in the Bill is too great. Certain country people will be classified differently from others. When the Premier referred to a certain weighting for country people he did not acknowledge the two types of country people: those living in hard core rural areas and those living in industrial towns. I wholeheartedly agree with a tolerance for country areas, but not to the extent provided in the Bill.

I am sure the Government will not accept the amendment because it would not be in its political interests to do so. Although the Premier has gone some way towards meeting our requirements, he has a long way to go yet. It is a pity he will not consider the arguments of Opposition members. Anything that can be done now to improve the Bill will benefit the people of the State. However, with the loading in the Bill as it stands, I cannot support it in any circumstances.

Mr. HUGHES: I greatly regret that the Premier has said he cannot accept the amendment. Representing a country district, I do not believe people in my district consider their vote is worth twice the value of a metropolitan vote. The member for Glenelg said that metropolitan seats would have 17.5 per cent above the quota. There can also be an average below the State quota in the country of 25.8 per cent and a difference of 58.5 per cent between metropolitan and country seats. As I represent a country district, I favour some loading for country areas, but not 58.5 per cent. Some metropolitan districts could be two to one against country areas. With a 58.5 per cent difference between metropolitan and country, the metropolitan area would contain 28 districts and the country area 19 districts. With 428,000 electors in the metropolitan area, the average for metropolitan districts would be 15,286 and, with 183,000 electors in the country, the average for country districts would be 9,646.

Mr. McAnaney: Are you reading the figures that have been given by the member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUGHES: I am giving my own figures and the member for Stirling will find them to be correct.

Mr. McAnaney: The member for Glenelg is 3,000 out.

Mr. HUGHES: Is he?

Mr. McAnaney: Yes, on present enrolment.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think he is, but the member for Stirling will have an opportunity to prove his statements. My figures give not more than 28 metropolitan districts and 19 country districts. If the Premier would accept the amendment, the quota in metropolitan districts would be 14,300 and, in country districts, 10,000. This would reduce the difference of 58.5 per cent to 43 per cent. The Opposition has been charged with referring to two classes of voters but if there is anything that refers clearly to different classes of voters it is the very clause we are discussing. It makes a difference of as much as two to one in various instances. If that is not saying there are two classes of people in South Australia, then I do not know what is. I defy the member for Stirling to prove that the figures I have quoted are incorrect.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

In subclause (4) to strike out "(disregarding any fraction)" and insert "calculated to the nearest integral number".

This important matter has been fully canvassed in the discussion that took place earlier. Working on the previous figures that were then available and were then applicable would mean that in the metropolitan area there could

be something like 428,500 electors, so that when the figure is divided by the metropolitan quota it would achieve the 28 seats we have spoken of but with 9,900 electors over. This, of course, under the clause as it stands would mean that the actual average number of electors in the metropolitan area would be not 15 per cent greater but much higher as the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) said. If there were only another 5,000 electors in the metropolitan area there would be an additional seat. This is contrary to the principles of redistribution that apply in other areas. It is a basic principle that the calculation should be taken to the nearest integral number.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No argument has been raised that would justify a variation of the clause, and all relevant points have been freely canvassed. The Government believes that this is the fairest way of doing it.

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier has replied that this is a fair clause. He is prepared to get up in this House and defend something that involves a deliberate prejudice, as well as the 15 per cent addition to the State quota, in favour of the country as against the metropolitan area. For example, if the number of people in the metropolitan area gives an answer of 28¾, then under the clause as it stands there would be 28 seats in the metropolitan area and 19 in the country. If the answer came to 28 and nine-tenths, or even 28.999, the numbers of seats would be the same. What sort of fairness is involved in this? What possible reason has the Premier for saying that this is fair? It is completely and utterly prejudicial to the metropolitan voter.

The Premier has already written in a bias in favour of country areas that will give about 60 per cent more electors in a metropolitan seat as against a country seat, yet he is also determined to have in the Bill a provision that means that there cannot be 29 metropolitan seats until the result obtained from dividing the metropolitan quota into the number of electors in the metropolitan area reaches 29. If the answer is anything from 28 up to 28.999, the figure so determined is 28. This is wrong, and the Government cannot justify the statement that it is fair. This is typical of the attitude that underlies the Premier's approach. We have been told that the Government approached this in a spirit of compromise, but in any matter of substance there has been no compromise. As the result of a previous amendment, the provisions of the Bill are not consistent. The Bill is not fair, and it is designed as a sop to country electors.

If the Premier was interested in fairness and in the possibility of compromise he would accept the amendment, which would mean that up to 28½ the number would be 28 and above 28½ the result would be 29 metropolitan seats. This would be consistent with the Bill's other provisions. I charge the Premier with deceiving the public in relation to the figures that have been distributed suggesting that there could be 28 or 29 metropolitan seats. That result would not be possible under this Bill, and the Premier knows that there could be only 28 metropolitan seats. He is refusing to accept this amendment because he wants to ensure that there will be only 28 seats. I shall be interested to hear what the Attorney-General says to justify the Bill's provisions in relation to the stand he takes on one vote one value and as a result of the Committee's accepting other amendments regarding fractions. If he can give a decent reply to those questions, I will be the first to admire him for it.

Mr. Casey: Is it possible to get 29 seats in the metropolitan area if this amendment is accepted?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. The Premier could then legitimately say to the public of South Australia, "Under our proposal, there will be 28 to 29 seats", but at the moment it is completely false for him to say that. There has been only a half-compromise on the part of the Government, because on every occasion on which a substantial matter has been raised the Opposition amendments have been rejected. That is not good enough, and we on this side are simply not satisfied with it.

Mr. VIRGO: I am disappointed that the Government has not had a little more to say on this matter than we have heard from the Premier. On past experience, there is certainly no justification for thinking that a redistribution will take place within a reasonable time. Whether it does or does not, surely the conditions and terms of this Bill, under which the commission has to work, should be fair and designed to produce the best possible result for the majority of the people. However, the Bill does not do this. Why this sudden change of heart by the Government? As the member for Glenelg said, the average metropolitan quota has increased far more than the 15 per cent provided for in the Bill. On the figures we worked out a few weeks ago (and these are subject to correction

because no-one knows exactly how many electors there are in the State or in the metropolitan area at a particular time) there are $28\frac{2}{3}$ quotas within the metropolitan area. Surely it is logical that, if there is two-thirds of a quota, then this should be made a complete district. Of course, it could be 28.99 recurring and these people would still be deprived of the additional district. The number of electors in each district would be increased and, as a result of this, the say those people had in the Parliament of the State would be decreased. I hope the Premier will consider this matter further and bear in mind that the Committee has already accepted the principle of the integral number being applied in subclauses (2) and (3). Surely we must be consistent and have this apply also in subclause (4).

Mr. HUDSON: Surely this Chamber is entitled to hear something more on this matter from the Premier than we have heard so far. Surely some justification must exist for the Government's refusal to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr. HUDSON: In view of the Government's disdain for Parliament, I move:

That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, and Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Giles.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. HUDSON: My reason for moving for progress to be reported was to attempt to get the Government to obtain, if the Premier does not know it, an effective answer to the Opposition's argument about the amendment. That is the least that we are entitled to, but the Government has decided that the Committee is to be treated with contempt. The position that the Premier has taken is not justifiable, and it is not reasonable to say that, for the metropolitan area, not until we get a quotient of 29 do we get 29 districts, that, if the quotient is 28.9 or 28.91, the number of districts is to stay at 28. All we have had from the Premier is that he thinks this is fair.

It is anything but fair, and it makes a complete and utter mockery of the figures put out by the Premier and published in the *Advertiser* suggesting that there could be 29 metropolitan districts under the Bill. If the Premier believed there could be 29 districts and did not really mind whether there were 28 or 29 he would have been prepared to accept the amendment. Someone has done the Government's homework on this measure and knows that as it stands there are 28 districts and that is the finish of the matter, otherwise the Government would be willing to accept the amendment and would adopt a fair attitude and say that if the quotient is between 27 and 28 there will be 28 districts, but if it is between 28 and 29 there will be 29. That would be the fair result. Is the Premier still prepared to say he stands by the statement quoted in the *Advertiser* that the Bill could give rise to 29 districts?

Mr. Corcoran: He has repeated it in this Chamber.

Mr. HUDSON: I know that. The Premier is demonstrating the complete untruth of his statement by the Government's refusal to accept the amendment. The Government knows its position is weak and will not talk about it. Its attitude on this matter is completely inconsistent with what the Committee has done. In subclause (2) we do not disregard any fraction but calculate to the nearest number. In subclause (3), in determining the metropolitan quota we do not disregard any fraction but calculate to the nearest whole number, but in subclause (4) the Premier says we are to disregard any fraction and are not to calculate to the nearest whole number. The Minister of Works and the Attorney-General are prepared to say nothing in these circumstances. They tell us they are democrats and that they believe in one vote one value and that they are prepared to go along at present with their Government's unfair, unjust and undemocratic attitude in relation to this amendment. I suppose they will also tell us they are not under any direction about how they should vote but that they are free to vote as they please.

I suppose this is one matter on which the collective responsibility of Cabinet applies and the Minister of Works and the Attorney-General cannot vote against the Government on this issue, although the Minister of Lands can get away with blue murder and vote against the rest of his colleagues in Cabinet on a major issue of policy and not have to resign. The Minister of Lands has told us in the past of his adherence to conservative principles, but I would have thought that if there was one conservative principle that came down from the conservative tradition of England it was the collective responsibility of Cabinet. If Mr. Balfour, Mr. Baldwin and Sir Neville Chamberlain are not writhing in their graves at the action of the Minister of Lands in not resigning from Cabinet, then I am very surprised. I, for one, am not prepared to stand here and witness an attitude of the Government that is in complete contempt of the Committee. I do not mind what anyone says, least of all do I mind what the Attorney-General says, because he, for one, should be at least prepared to get up and defend this matter—in view of the kind of attitude he took when he was in Opposition.

I do not know how far we have to go to get some sort of argument from the Government to show why the Opposition's amendment should not be accepted. What is wrong with going to 29 districts if the quotient is between 28½ and 29? Are the country people unwilling to accept a fair set-up and a reasonable compromise? Does the Premier think that his standing in the community is that of a knight in shining armour? If this is the Government's attitude on this and subsequent amendments in order to get the Bill through tonight, then I intend to register the strongest possible protest. Does the Government really want to make Parliament a joke? If the Government is not prepared to debate the matter tonight it should be prepared to report progress and come back when it is prepared to debate it.

Mr. HURST: I would be remiss in my duty if I did not rise to support the member for Glenelg. The manner in which Ministers are dealing with this clause is an insult to the people we represent. The Premier's reply is simply not good enough and, if Ministers are not capable of answering the charges that have been justifiably laid by the member for Glenelg, why do they not brief the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) to do the job for them? Because no answers have been given to the logical arguments of my colleague, this shows a contempt for a democratic institution because Ministers have a responsibility to explain the provisions of this Bill.

The Attorney-General, when in Opposition, pressed us for replies to his questions, but now he has set himself up as a bureaucrat and ignores us. Apparently, he cannot give a logical reply to any question asked by the member for Glenelg. Earlier, the Attorney-General tried to justify the Bill but he made an awful *faux pas*. He should familiarize himself with the contents of this Bill. I want a reply given to the member for Glenelg. When the top executives of this State do not reply to questions put to them, I consider that one cannot speak too strongly, too long, and too loudly until they get off their haunches and do something about it. I hope my colleague will receive an answer, because he is entitled to one; so are we, who have been sitting here patiently waiting for a reply, only to become disillusioned. I hope that the Government is not going to sit flat-footed but that it will explain its attitude to the amendment

Mr. BURDON: I, too, hope that the questions put by the member for Glenelg will receive a reply. Why has the Government adopted this attitude to what is a reasonable and just request? It is up to the Attorney-General, in view of his previous attitude to matters being considered in Committee when he was in Opposition, to give us a logical explanation of the Government's attitude to the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo (teller).

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, and Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Hutchens. No—Mr. Giles.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.21 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 6, at 2 p.m.