LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, February 15, 1966.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

RIVER MURRAY WATER.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works a reply to my question of February 1 regarding salinity in the Upper Murray, which was referred to in the *Sunraysia Daily* of January 15?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, the reply is in the nature of a report to my colleague, the Minister of Works, as follows:

The Murray-Darling system drains 414,000 square miles of country and in addition to being the source of irrigaton water the streams in this vast system are the main drainage canals for the whole basin. The more people who, like Councillor A. R. Mansell, M.L.C., express concern at the possibility of excess salt concentrations in the River Murray the better, for such statements promote public interest in a problem which could assume very serious proportions in the absence of effective preventive measures.

Reference was made by Councillor Mansell and others to the possible effect of Chowilla dam on the salinity of the water above Lock No. 11 (Mildura) but the opinions expressed in this regard cannot be accepted. Firstly, the full supply level of Chowilla will be 3 feet below the upper pool at Lock No. 10 which in turn is 12 feet below the upper pool at Lock No. 11. Therefore, the Chowilla full supply level will be 15 feet below the Lock 11 upper pool level and this storage cannot have any effect whatever on the flow at Lock 11 and cannot be "a virtual plug" preventing new water flushing a high degree of salt content out of the Mildura basin.

The statement was also made that the Chowilla dam would virtually end the Murray flow at Lock 11 for the greater part of each year. Although South Australia's requirement during the irrigation season will be supplied by drawing upon Chowilla reservoir, the onus will be on New South Wales and Victoria to release sufficient water down the River Murray to safeguard the interests of towns and irrigation areas in these States in regard to both quantity and quality. Neither of these States would wish to do anything detrimental to the interests of irrigation areas developed by heavy expenditure of public and private capital and providing a livelihood for so many people. The storages in the River Murray and its tributaries (including Chowilla) will be used to increase river flows during the irrigation season and will tend to reduce the height of flood flows. This will have a favourable effect on salinity, for the main cause of salt intrusion is the drain-back into the river following high flows.

Another cause of salt intrusion is drainage from the irrigation areas which is, in part, controllable. It will be necessary for all States to exercise rigid control over these drainage waters and large sums have been spent in South Australia for this purpose. The accepted practice in this State is to impound drainage water in evaporating basins and to release water from these basins only when the river is high and there is ample fresh water for dilution purposes. Similar control is exercised to some extent in New South Wales and Victoria, but it is likely that these States will find it necessary to exercise greater control than hitherto.

Referring to this matter Councillor A. R. Mansell, M.L.C., suggested that salt pans may have to be created to collect drainage water and allow evaporation so that the residual salts could be recovered and perhaps used commercially. I doubt whether concentrations of common salt brought about in this way would have any commercial value, as they would contain considerable quantities of other salts. Although the total amount of dissolved salts in River Murray water is affected by the flow and other circumstances, the water always belongs to the same "family", *i.e.*, the proportions of the various salts remain fairly constant. The approximate proportions (related to 1,000 tons of sodium chloride) are:

	tons.
Sodium Chloride (common salt)	1,000
Calcium carbonate (lime)	233
Magnesium carbonate (magnesia)	145
Magnesium sulphate (epsom salts)	180
Magnesium chloride	9
Traces of other salts	

It is interesting to note that the average quantities of dissolved salts flowing past Renmark each year are approximately:

	tons.
Sodium chloride	800,000
Calcium carbonate	186,000
Magnesium carbonate	116,000
Magnesium sulphate	144,000
Magnesium chloride	7,000
Total	1,253,000

Although the construction of Chowilla dam will not adversely affect any of the irrigation areas, it is pleasing to note that the Australian Dried Fruits Association problems committee is alive to the important salinity problem, for this is a matter which will need careful and skilled attention as diversions from the River Murray progressively decrease the volume of water flowing to the sea and at the same time add to the volume of saline drainage water from the irrigated areas. Public awareness of this problem and the measures necessary to ameliorate the situation is of great importance. One pleasing feature is that, despite the construction of Chowilla dam and other storages which will certainly be constructed on the Murray or its tributaries, complete control of this river is beyond the realms of practicability and floods will still occur from time to time. These will flush out

saline waters in the billabongs and backwaters and wash the salt deposits from the flood plains. The large quantities of high-quality water diverted by the works of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority into the Murray and Murrumbidgee will also have a beneficial effect, particularly as this water will be released from storages during the irrigation season when demands are high and natural flow is low.

GRAPE PRICES.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On two occasions recently I have asked the Chief Secretary questions about grape prices. In view of the urgency of the situation, can he say whether any progress has been made?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Since this matter was referred to on February 9 the Minister of Agriculture has informed me that a further meeting was held yesterday but no finality was reached. At this meeting he arranged for another meeting between winemakers and growers, to be held next Wednesday, February 16. The meeting will be under the chairmanship of the Prices Commissioner and it is hoped that some finality will be reached.

ANGLE VALE BRIDGE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to questions I have asked about the Angle Vale bridge?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. I am informed that some delays were occasioned at the Angle Vale bridge because of unforeseen difficulties encountered during pile-driving. The contractor has also failed to meet his anticipated rate of progress, and for these reasons the completion of the bridge will be delayed by approximately three months. It is still expected that all works will be completed prior to winter.

BUSH FIRES.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris, for the Hon. H. K. KEMP (on notice): Will the Government undertake the safeguarding of Crown lands in the Adelaide Hills by control burning concomitant with the responsibility for the preservation of the native cover in reserve areas?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This matter has been considered and is being referred to the Bushfires Research Committee for report.

ACTS REPUBLICATION BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides authority to enable another reprint of the Acts of South Australia to be carried out. It is nearly 30 years since the Statute law from 1837 to 1936 was reprinted in eight volumes with a ninth volume containing an index and various tables. This reprint proved of great assistance to all concerned with the Statute law, and was generally regarded as a success. At the present time, however, there are 28 volumes of the annual Statutes in addition to the nine volumes of reprinted Acts, and the Government has concluded that the time has come when a further reprint of the Statutes should be made. This Bill, to enable this to be done, is substantially similar to the Acts Republication Act, 1934, which authorized the previous reprint.

Clause 2 provides that the Attorney-General is to cause to be reprinted all the Acts of Parliament of South Australia except private Acts, Acts of limited or local application, which are not of sufficient importance to justify reprinting, and Acts the operation of which has expired or been superseded by Commonwealth legislation. Clause 3 provides that every Act that has been amended will be reprinted with the amendments incorporated in the reprint so that the Act and its amendments will appear as one enactment. This, of course, was the method adopted in the previous reprint. The 1934 Act, for obvious reasons, did not include a provision similar to clause 4. The effect of this clause is to provide that, where any provision of a reprinted Act contains a reference to pounds, shillings, or pence, that reference will be altered to the equivalent amount expressed in dollars and cents. Virtually every Act contains references of this kind as, among other provisions, there are thousands of sections which create offences for which the penalties are fines of various amounts. It will be a great convenience if, within a relatively short time after the change to decimal currency takes place, all references in the Statutes to monetary amounts are expressed in decimal currency.

I point out, in connection with clause 4, that since the Bill was introduced in another place the Decimal Currency Act, 1965, was, as honourable members know, amended recently. The two references to that Act on page 2 of the Bill, in lines 9, 10 and 18, should, therefore, now read, "Decimal Currency Act, 1965-1966".

Clause 5 provides that where all the amendments made by an amending Act are incorporated in its principal Act, the amending Act need not be reprinted. Clause 6 provides for a number of matters. Where an Act has been

amended, the short title is to indicate both the year of its passing and the year of the latest amending Act.

If reference is made in an Act to a provision of any other Act for which another Act has been substituted, then the reference may be altered accordingly. A reference to the name of any place, person or body which has been altered by law may be changed to the altered name. Marginal notes to sections may be altered to accord with the true effect of the sections. The words at the end of an Act indicating the giving of the Royal Assent may be omitted but a reference to the date of the Royal Assent must appear elsewhere in the reprinted Act. Errors in spelling or in numbering of sections or subdivisions of sections may be corrected.

Clause 7 provides that, in any reprinted Act, there shall be a short reference to any amending Act; clause 8 provides that the Amendments Incorporation Act, 1937, is not to apply to the reprint; clause 9 provides that, in future amending Acts, any reference to lines or pages of any reprinted Act shall be construed as a reference to the line or page of the Act as reprinted; and clause 10 provides that the reprinted Acts are to be judicially noticed and are to be deemed to be the Acts of the Parliament of South Australia. As before stated, with the exception of clause 4, all these provisions are substantially similar to those contained in the Acts Republication Act, 1934.

The printing of the reprinted Statutes will be carried out by the Government Printer, whilst the Government intends that the editorial and other incidental work will be carried out by the Law Book Company of Australasia Limited. The previous reprint was carried out under a similar arrangement between the Government of the day and the Law Book Company when the company engaged as joint editors Sir Edgar Bean and Mr. J. P. Cartledge, the then Parliamentary Draftsman and Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman. This reprint was carried out to a high standard and the Government feels confident that the Law Book Company will again carry out its part successfully and satisfactorily. Under arrangements similar to those made for the previous reprint, the company will meet all the costs of the reprint, except the printing and binding, and will, in return and in order to recoup its costs, have the right to sell the completed work. The Government will retain the right to use the sets of Acts necessary for its purposes.

On the editorial side, the company proposes to engage as the editor Mr. J. P. Cartledge, who is obviously well qualified for the task. As with the last reprint, it is proposed to include, as footnotes to the relevant sections, references to all decisions of the Supreme Court, the Industrial Court, and appellate courts relating to the interpretation of provisions of the reprinted Acts. In addition, there will be a full index and tables of a kind included in the previous reprint. Since 1937, many Acts have been passed which have ceased to have operation. It will be a part of the editor's task to prepare for introduction into Parliament one or more Statute Law Revision Bills to repeal these Acts and to make any amendments of a formal nature which, on a close scrutiny of the Acts, appear to be necessary.

As there have been many new legislative topics since 1937, the date of the previous reprint, it is expected that, whereas the previous reprint consisted of eight volumes of Acts and an index volume, the new reprint will probably need 10 volumes of Acts and an index volume.

The compilation and the printing of a new set of Statutes is a big job requiring a high standard of exactitude. It can be expected to take about five years and the rate of progress will depend largely upon the time needed for the printing and binding of the volumes. As opposed to the printing side, the editorial work will not be as extensive as that required for the previous reprint when 100 years of Statute law had to be revised and brought into order. It is expected that the first volume of the new reprint will be ready soon after the end of 1967 with other volumes following at regular intervals. It is intended that the general style and format of the reprint will be similar to the style and format of the previous reprint, which has been found to be generally acceptable.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): As many honourable members know, I have been suggesting ever since I have been in Parliament that this particular work might be undertaken, and I am glad that this has now come about. The work could not be described as being an absolute necessity, but it is extremely desirable that it be done. The reason given to me from time to time by the previous Government for the work not being done was that, although the Government was acquiescent, it did not have sufficient draftsmen available. Now it seems that the present Government has been able to obtain quite a few draftsmen and also an excellent editor, as has been mentioned by the Chief Secretary, and that, therefore, the work can go ahead.

This consolidation will be of great advantage to many people. First, it will be an advantage to members of Parliament, because we are all reliant on the Statute Books to see that the work we are doing is done properly, and the more consolidated the Statutes are the easier the task becomes. As the Chief Secretary has pointed out, at present the work consists of eight volumes and a comprehensive index, making nine volumes of the original work, and no fewer than 29 annual volumes. Therefore, not only are there 38 volumes that honourable members have to consult, but they also have to put these volumes together to look up the amendments and, where the Statutes have not been consolidated, there can be quite a string of amending Acts in various years. The idea of this Bill is that they should be consolidated for us. Therefore, our task will certainly be made considerably simpler.

Every citizen, as we know, is supposed to know the law. Of course, this is an impossible task, even for lawyers, but the easier it can be made for the citizen, the better it is for all concerned. Undoubtedly, this Bill will also enable members of the public more readily to construe the Statutes. The Bill itself follows much the pattern of the previous Act of 1934, as the Chief Secretary has said. All the Acts will be consolidated; that is, all amendments will be consolidated with the principal Acts, and they will appear in one statement as an Act. I do not know what work this Bill entails for the Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills, of which the Chief Secretary and I happen to be members.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No doubt, the three members of the committee will do their work properly.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I shall be happy to have some work for this committee. Reference has been made to the conversion of pounds, shillings and pence to dollars and cents, and this conversion renders the particular reprint even more desirable. The arrangement with the Law Book Company, which is similar to the previous arrangement, seems to be a good business proposition. I know that it worked well last time and have no reason to believe that it will not work again. Certainly, we could not wish for a better editor than the gentleman the Government has been fortunate enough to obtain for that task. Therefore, I think I am in a position to applaud the Government for bringing along this Bill and I give it my complete support. I would think that it could readily have a speedy passage.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support the Bill and the remarks made by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill. This matter received some attention from me during the period I was at the Attorney-General's office and I think that if we were in office a Bill much along these lines would have been introduced. I do not suggest that it would have been introduced in the month of February, but it would have been introduced at some time during the Parliamentary session.

I think Sir Arthur Rymill has covered the main points. The question of changing from pounds, shillings and pence to dollars and cents will be helpful to us all, particularly when we are thinking in dollars and cents rather than in the sterling currency. Clauses 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are virtually similar to the provisions of the 1936 Bill on consolidation and they do not call for any comment.

As Sir Arthur has said, we were fortunate in having Sir Edgar Bean and Mr. Cartledge to do the work in connection with consolidation last time and I am confident that Mr. Cartledge will do an equally satisfactory job on this occosion. I note that, because of the increased amount of legislation, there will be 10 volumes instead of the eight that we had last time, and this is quite understandable. It is also noted that the work is likely to take five years in total but that, as separate volumes become available, they will be released. I think that that is an excellent idea. As Sir Arthur Rymill has said, this is a Bill about which we need have no delay and I do not propose to speak further. I support the Bill.

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

EXCESSIVE RENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The House of Assembly requested a conference, at which it would be represented by five managers, on the Legislative Council's amendments to which it had disagreed.

The Legislative Council granted a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 4 p.m. on Wednesday, February 16, at which it would be represented by the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill, F. J. Potter and A. J. Shard.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal object of this Bill is to provide for further grants and loans to the Renmark Irrigation Trust in connection with its irrigation works. The Bill also makes some other amendments.

Clause 3 of the Bill, which is introduced at the request of the trust, alters the present arrangements in connection with the annual retirement of members of the trust. Section 14 of the principal Act provides for the retirement of half of the members each year, or if the number is uneven, a majority of one. The trust has pointed out that in practice this provision operates unfairly and has proposed that the section should be amended to provide for the retirement of one-half of the members if the number is uneven, but that on each occasion when there is an uneven number of members a minority and majority shall retire alternately. Clause 3 of the Bill accordingly repeals section 14 and enacts a new section to meet the wishes of the trust.

Clause 4a makes a minor amendment to section 123 of the principal Act that provides for the approval of certain works by the Minister of Lands. It has been pointed out that it is the Minister of Irrigation who administers the Act and, accordingly, the words "of Lands" after the word "Minister" have been struck out.

The remaining provisions of the Bill deal with financial arrangements. Certain discussions were held between the trust and the former Government in 1964 and with the present Government in May, 1965. Following these discussions the Government invited the Auditor-General to make an investigation concerning the finances of the trust and, in particular, the financing of a proposed new pumping plant and rising mains and channel rehabilitation. The Auditor-General recommended that the Government finance the pumping station in the first instance up to an amount of $1,120,000, two-sevenths of which should be by way of grant and the remainder by way of loan repayable by the trust with interest at 5 per cent over a period of 40 years. On the assumption that the total cost would be $1,120,000, the amount repayable by the trust would be $800,000. Clause 5 of the Bill enacts new section 123a of the principal Act making the necessary provision in this regard.

The Auditor-General also recommended that the Government provide up to $1,000,000 on a dollar for dollar subsidy basis towards the cost of channel rehabilitation and additional drainage. New section 123b makes the necessary provision in this regard. New section 123c enables the Treasurer to make the necessary arrangements for giving effect to sections 123a and 123b, while new section 123d requires the trust to keep a special bank account for the receipt and disbursement of the moneys granted and lent under the provisions of the Bill. The Auditor-General also recommended that the existing drainage loan of $350,000 be repaid over a period of 40 years instead of 18 years as at present. Clause 4 (*b*) of the Bill so provides.

The Auditor-General has expressed the view that, with careful financial management, the trust will be in a position to meet its commitments under his proposals. Temporary increased charges are considered to be inevitable, an additional sum equal to $4 an acre being required until completion of the scheme.

After careful consideration of all aspects the Government decided to approve the Auditor-General's proposals and the trust informed the Government that it accepted them.

As this Bill is of a hybrid nature it was referred to a Select Committee in another place in accordance with Joint Standing Orders. The committee considered the Bill and recommended its passage in its present form.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the second reading. The scheme mentioned in the Bill is by no means new. The matter has been before both this and other Governments for some time, in an endeavour to get Renmark on to a proper and economic basis for water distribution. It is not necessary for me to reiterate the whole history of this irrigation scheme, which is unique in this State. The Renmark Irrigation Trust, working under its own Act, has over a long period of years financed its own affairs from its own rates. When, however, one compares the operations of this irrigation settlement with those of other pioneer settlements of this type in Australia one appreciates that in the Government-run schemes much money has been written off, and is still being written off, annually. Until recently the Renmark Irrigation Trust had not asked for or needed very much assistance, but the 1956 flood brought into sharp focus the difficulties of that district, arising, one could perhaps say, from the planning that took place 60 to 70 years before. When the Chaffey brothers set up the districts of Renmark and Mildura they had very little mechanical aid and had to use almost primitive instruments. They did a magnificent job in the way in which they surveyed and laid out these places. But 60 years is a long time, and

the application of water to salt flats over long periods leads us to expect a saline build-up. That is precisely what has happened in this area.

The irrigation set-up in the district is closely associated with a creek which, in the early days, I have no doubt in high river ran a good clean stream of water. In times of low river a steam plant was established on the river and acted as an auxiliary to the other pumping stations. But, with the advent of the locks, the level in Lock 5 pool took care, to a large extent, of the making available of water to the pumping stations at No. 3 and other locks. However, with the build-up of salt in this flat area, the water having to traverse it is picking up heavy concentrations of salt at times of both low and high water, which is most injurious to the whole settlement.

Two things had to happen. First, something had to be done about the drainage of the area, which was phase one. This was undertaken from 1959 onwards. Phase one of the scheme is practically completed. Great benefits have manifested themselves as a result of the drainage already completed. Land that was practically useless and had been planted to vines and trees showed definite signs of salt seepage and became almost worthless, but now it has come back to being profitable areas of production. It is little use draining if one does not look at the irrigation set-up itself, because large amounts of water can be lost through broken channels and the yabby, which is always present in irrigation schemes and will always tunnel and allow water to be released from earth channels. Broken concrete channels only aggravate the situation that we are trying to rectify by drainage on separate properties. That, in conjunction with the pumping set-up, which was designed and put there by the Chaffey brothers in 1887, is now due, and overdue, for a complete overhaul and rehabilitation, plus the fact that it is desired to take the water from the main stream of the river, thereby by-passing the salt flats and creeks. To do this, rising mains must be used. Great benefits can accrue from this plan.

One or two difficulties arise, as is natural in this sort of thing. The trust is not an over-financial body: it relies entirely upon its ratepayers for its income. Heavy calls have been made on the ratepayers since 1956, and they have had to meet large expenditures for drainage. The trust has had to repay, or is in the process of repaying, money obtained from the Government, part of which was granted, part of which was a loan. It has recently increased its water rate by $4 an acre, which is not inconsiderable. However, it puts it at the moment at a disadvantage with the Government-owned scheme. I should not like to see this matter continue like this, because after all the produce from all these areas realizes practically the same amount of money on the market when sold. Therefore, it seems not right that one settlement should be paying more, to the tune of perhaps $4 an acre, for water, compared with another settlement that is being subsidized by the Government of the day.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Does the cost of water per acre vary from area to area?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It depends. In some blocks it can be $140 an acre, and then there is a special rate of $2.50 or $3 an acre, and sometimes more. Some people would find it necessary to take five to six special irrigations. Those people on the second lift, where they have to pump their water through sprinklers, are up for a double rate, because they buy their water and do not have to pump it. That is their business, because they have chosen to go into spray irrigation on the two-lift system; but basically the difference between the Government scheme and the irrigation trust is that the trust has now increased its water rate in order to make the repayment that will be necessary over a period of 40 years, as set out in the Bill.

As the Minister has said, one or two things have occurred that made it necessary for the trust to attend to while the Bill was before the House. Clause 3 deals with the constitution and voting powers of the board, which comprises seven members. Over many years there has operated a system under which one of the members each year had to be balloted out. Anyone closely associated with the organization, as I have been over a long time, would know that sometimes the same man has, to speak in the vernacular, "drawn the crow" and has been balloted out each time, which has been rather unfair.

If there should be the death of a board member, close to the time due for an election, there would remain only six members of the trust. Under the old system, four members retired each year. Now it is proposed that the board shall operate with three members coming up for election in the first year. That is the lesser number, and in the next year four members will go before the electors. In the Bill the provision has been put in legal terminology and, as a consequence, it is rather hard to

understand until one has given it some study. It states:

As from the first Saturday in the month of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six, and on every first Saturday in July in each succeeding year, the following provisions shall apply as regards the annual retirement of members:

(*a*) where there is an even number of members, half the number shall retire;

That is where one member has died and the board is left with six members. The provision continues:

(*b*) where there is an uneven number of members, then, when this first occurs, a minority shall retire, but where there is an uneven number of members on any occasion thereafter then—

(i) a majority shall retire if a minority retired on the previous occasion on which there was an uneven number;

(ii) a minority shall retire if a majority retired on the previous occasion on which there was an uneven number.

That is terribly clear! I am sure the average ratepayer in Renmark will understand perfectly what it means! Then the provision goes on to make it even easier for people to understand, and reads:

(2) The members to retire shall be those who have been longest in office without re-election and when the number cannot thus be made up or decided lots shall be drawn between those who have been an equal time in office without re-election to decide which of them shall retire and the retirement shall take place accordingly.

(3) In this section "majority" means the integer nearest to, but more than, half of the total number of members and "minority" means the integer nearest to, but less than, half the total number of members.

I think that simply means that on the first occasion the smaller number of three will go before the electors, and that on the second occasion the number will be four. From then onwards it will rotate. This will help the members, and I cannot imagine why it has not been always in the rules, because many other committees have to function in exactly the same way.

Clause 4 deals with the deletion of the words "of Lands". This is brought about because the Parliamentary Draftsman drafted the provision some time ago. He said that he had been away from the State for a long time and did not realize that we now had a Minister of Irrigation. He assumed that the Minister who would control the Act would be the Minister of Lands. We have had a Commissioner of Irrigation for almost the same time as we have had a Commissioner of Lands, but to make it easy we have deleted the words "of Lands" but have not inserted the word "Irrigation" but simply left it as "the Minister". That is much better, as the Minister concerned can be changed from time to time without difficulty.

I have much to say on this Bill, but as I understand other business needs attention at the moment I ask leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Later:

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not think I could put this matter in such fine words as the Auditor-General, Mr. Jeffery, who was called as a witness before the Select Committee. In answer to a question, he has set out the position of the trust and has also given a comparison between the present scheme and a scheme put forward by the previous Government. I quote from the report of the Auditor-General on this particular matter:

Under the scheme previously discussed, pumping station and rising main—$1,120,000 Loan of $1,120,000 from Government—to be repaid.

Channel rehabilitaion and drainage—Government to provide 65 per cent of total cost —i.e., $1,300,000 by way of grants; the trust to provide the balance of $700,000. At this stage it was visualized that the trust would have to borrow the money to finance this. In addition, there was to be a review by the Auditor-General of the rate of interest charges on the pumping station loan "so that the trust will not be incurring an annual pump cost greater than the amount now being incurred. However, I stress that the arrangement still was not finalized, but it was along these lines.

This evidence refers to the new scheme; the previous one was the scheme put forward by the previous Government. The Auditor-General went on to say:

Under the proposed scheme, the Government will advance $1,120,000, for pumping plant and rising main, making $800,000 repayable. The Government will subsidize dollar for dollar, with maximum of $1,000,000, the cost of channel rehabilitation and additional drainage, the trust also meeting $1,000,000 from its revenue. In addition, the outstanding loan from the previous arrangement will be repayable over 40 years in lieu of 18 years.

In a comparison between the two schemes, the Auditor-General further said:

The cash contribution by the Government is approximately the same in each case, namely, $1,300,000 as against $1,320,000.

That is the Government's contribution—$1,300,000 as against $1,320,000. The evidence continues:

The terms of the original proposals were still to be finalized after review by the Auditor-General but on the assumption that the Government loan would be at 5 per cent, and the private loan of $700,000 at 5¾ per cent, the annual repayments over 40 years would have been:

	Per annum. $
$1,120,000 at 5 per cent over 40 years—interest and principal repayment	65,200
$700,000 at 5¾ per cent (borrowed over 10 years)—interest and principal repayment — repaid over 40 years	45,000
Previous Loan—$350,000 at 5 per cent over 18 years	30,000
	$140,200

Under the existing legislation there is doubt whether the trust could have raised a loan privately in any case, as I mentioned previously. The new scheme is not strictly comparable from the cost viewpoint as the trust is meeting the $1,000,000 out of revenues and increased charges, thus saving interest. It is largely for this reason that the new suggestions were made. The cost to the trust (under the new scheme) of loans will be as follows:

	Per annum. $
$800,000 at 5 per cent repayable over 40 years	46,600
Previous loan—$350,000 at 5 per cent now over 40 years	20,400
	$67,000

In addition, the trust will meet from its revenues $1,000,000 over approximately 13 years an average of $77,000 per annum, but only for 13 years not 40 if financed from loan. It was because of this big interest impost that the proposals were approached from this point of view.

All this means, as I see it, that whatever scheme the irrigation trust is involved in, it will be up for heavy interest charges. As I have already said, the trust has increased by $4 an acre its water rates in order to service this amount. That was obligatory upon it by the terms of the agreement. It had to do this. This is, perhaps, the one advantage of the previous scheme, that the Auditor-General was to look at the interest charges to see that the irrigation trust was at no disadvantage with regard to other services. It is very much like financing one's own business: if one takes it over a 40-year term, one's interest will be much more, but one does not have to pay out quite so much in capital. However, whichever way this goes, it will be a great drain upon the irrigation trust.

I was not at all sure (and I am fortified in my opinion by the evidence of Mr. T. M. Price (the Chairman of the trust), Mr. Tripney (the Secretary of the trust) and Mr. Maddocks (the Engineer-Manager), who were not sure, either) whether this amount of money would be sufficient to get the trust over this difficulty. At this stage I say that we should be prepared to put more money into this scheme if the trust is to go along and remain an entity and solvent, because we cannot load up our costs too much when we are selling the produce derived from the irrigation areas at prices comparable with those in other areas.

The evidence given by Mr. Jeffery (the Auditor-General), Mr. Price, Mr. Tripney and Mr. Maddocks all points to one thing, that this scheme is still in the embryo stage, that they still have not got any further. The trust is faced with the problem that it has not sufficient staff to plan completely this scheme and come up with complete estimates—for, after all, this is only a rough estimate, like those given to the Public Works Committee in the matter of references to it. The estimate is not detailed. The Engineering and Water Supply Department at the moment is charged with the responsibility of being the adviser to the Minister on this matter.

The alternative is for the trust to employ a team of consultants, who would want 10 per cent of the total contract price, which would be a great burden upon the trust. This matter has been with the E. & W. S. Department for some months now, and, so far, that organization has not been able to bring down plans. I very much doubt, in view of some information I have, whether the department will be able to do this work in the short term, because I know it has references before it that it has to get to the Public Works Committee in a short time, which will keep its draughtsmen and engineers fully engaged. Until the trust can come to the Minister with a conclusive plan, it cannot get on with this work, and it is absolutely essential that it gets plans within a short term. This is a matter for the Minister of Irrigation. I suggest he hold a round-table conference with the Renmark Irrigation Trust with the object of finding a solution. If the E. & W. S. Department cannot do this job quickly, the Minister might suggest to the trust that it take on one or two additional engineers (and that this be not a charge against the scheme) because it would work out much more cheaply than attempting to get the services of a group of consultants, which would want 10 per cent of the total price, a sizable amount for the trust to bear. If the department cannot do the job, I do not think the trust ought to be put at a

disadvantage. This cost should be borne by the joint funds of the trust and the Government. The Minister in charge of the Bill will agree with me that this is an urgent matter. We have both inspected the scheme on various occasions. In this type of planning it gets a bit like the dog chasing its tail: it never quite breaks the circle. One group says, "You cannot start until you have approval", and the other group replies, "We have not enough money to get our plans drawn, so we have to wait." This sort of job cannot wait. Speed is the essence of the contract. The trust certainly has a nucleus in the form of its Engineer-Manager, who is a capable man, but it needs more assistance in planning the scheme. I appeal to the Government that the Minister convene a conference of the interested parties to try to break this deadlock. It is at present a deadlock and is likely to remain so until such time as we reach agreement on all sides. The trust has accepted the proposition, and so have the ratepayers. I do not think the trust thinks it has enough money to get on with the job, but I think it has taken some very good advice to spend what it has at the moment, have another look at the matter when it has spent it, and not hold up the scheme because there is not enough to get on with the job. It is essential that the work be proceeded with, and I ask the Minister to bring this matter before his colleague at a round table conference. I have read the evidence of the Select Committee, and this is one of the points raised constantly. I ask him to take up this matter with his colleague so that it can be expedited.

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

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) BILL.

The House of Assembly granted a conference, to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 3.30 p.m.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the sitting of the Council to be continued during the conference with the House of Assembly on the Inheritance (Family Provision) Bill.

A gentlemen's agreement exists between members opposite and the Government to continue the sittings of the Council while the conference is in progress, provided no vote is taken on any matter on the Notice Paper during this period. I think everybody will see the wisdom of such a move and I hope the motion will be carried.

Motion carried.

Later:

The managers proceeded to the conference at 3.30 p.m. They returned at 7.45 p.m.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I have to report that the managers have been to the conference on the Inheritance (Family Provision) Bill, which was managed on behalf of the House of Assembly by the Attorney-General, Mrs. Byrne, Mr. McKee, Mrs. Steele and the Hon. B. H. Teusner, and they there received from the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly the Bill and the following resolution adopted by that House: "That the disagreement to the Legislative Council amendments be insisted on." Thereupon, the managers for the two Houses conferred together but no agreement was reached. I want to add that the conference was conducted in a most amicable manner. Each side put its point of view in a friendly, efficient and clear manner, but, unfortunately, no decision was reached.

The PRESIDENT: In pursuance of Standing Order 338, I point out that, as no recommendation from the conference has been made, the Council must either resolve not to further insist on its requirements, or lay the Bill aside.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I move:

That the Council do not further insist on its amendments.

The matter has been debated fully in this Council. If I set out the amendments again, it would be the third or fourth time. The managers of this Council went right through them this afternoon. I think it is an extremely unfortunate position in which we find ourselves, and I simply ask that the Council do not further insist upon its amendments.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I was very disappointed that the conference between the managers of the two Houses was not able to come to any compromise on the amendments which this Council had made to the Bill. It is true that in reporting to this Council the reasons for disagreeing to the amendments another place said they would nullify the efficacy of essential provisions in the Bill. It may be that this matter is one that could be debated. Various points of view could be expressed as to whether or not this Chamber's amendments to the Bill did, in fact, nullify the efficacy of essential provisions. At the conference it was not said by any of the representatives from the other place that the amendments were bad. If I interpreted it correctly, it was argued by the representatives from the other place that the Council amendments did not go far enough for them. This

seems to me particularly disappointing because the amendments that were accepted in this Council would have had the effect of placing on our Statute Book a measure that was further advanced in its field than any existing in any other State of Australia, and far ahead of existing legislation in England.

It seems to me that this was not actually disputed at the conference. I think that the Government decided that because it could not have the whole cake it was not prepared to take two-thirds, or even three-quarters, of it. We did go a long way when debating this Bill in this place to maintain the principles in the legislation, and to adopt amendments that were a fair and happy compromise, having regard to relevant legislation in the other States, in England and in New Zealand. It is particularly disappointing that the managers from another place were not prepared to take what this Council offered them. The offer was a generous one. It appeared at the conference as though the other place was insisting on its disagreement with the Council on five important and vital amendments but was prepared to concede two, one being of a comparatively minor nature. As the Chief Secretary has reported, the conference failed; but it seems that the reason for the failure was that the Government was not prepared to accept the generous amendments that were put into the Bill by this Council, which would have had the effect, as I have already said, of producing a Bill in advance of any other existing legislation of this sort in Australia.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise only because, as one of the managers, I feel that members of this Council will expect to have an explanation of why we were not able to resolve this matter between the two Houses. I think we all realize that a mistake was made in asking for a conference, unless it was purely for the reason that it could be said that this Bill was laid aside because of the Legislative Council. The Hon. Mr. Potter has explained the matters that were really under discussion. A generous approach has been made to this Bill, in conformity with most advanced thinking in other States in Australia, and even comparable with the position in New Zealand. Indeed, as Mr. Potter has said, this legislation is in advance of anything that has ben introduced into the "old country". It is unfortunate that this Bill as amended is not acceptable to the Government, as it is so much in advance of comparable legislation elsewhere. Apparently, it was decided by the managers from the other place that, rather than make that advance in our legislation, they would sacrifice the whole Bill because of the Standing Orders, which state that with a result like this the Bill must be laid aside. It does not matter whether the managers here interpret what is right and what are the opinions that have been expressed after a considerable amount of homework has been done upon the legislation: it is a matter of deciding how far we should proceed at present.

It was upon those discussions that the conference broke down, because there was no opportunity to compromise. Odds are spoken of popularly at the moment: in this case the odds were against us. It was not possible to reach agreement because, when it was all worked out, in the final analysis it was considerably more than anything that could be considered as a compromise. We agreed to go into conference hoping that a solution could be found, but it was not possible. Therefore, there is no alternative under Standing Orders but that this Bill shall be laid aside, because there was no agreement at the conference.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I shall speak briefly, because other honourable members who were at the conference have covered the ground extensively. I am sorry that the other place did not see fit to accept the constructive amendments approved in this Chamber. The number of amendments under discussion were seven. The other place was prepared to concede two of them, which were of minor importance, but insisted on the five major ones being deleted. This was unfortunate, because the Bill offered some constructive legislation. It was all the better for the discussion it received in this Council and the amendments made here. I believe the attitude adopted by the other place on the five controversial amendments (and not being in any way prepared to compromise) shows clearly that the responsibility for the loss of this Bill must rest on that House. This Council did everything possible to see that this legislation went through in a manner fair to all parties concerned.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I, too, feel it is a pity that the conference could not reach an agreement. As honourable members know, I helped to try to save this Bill—not that I ever thought it was a particularly good one, but I did strive to give the other place an opportunity to save

the major part of it. In that, I was consistent with the policy I have adopted throughout this session of trying to support Government policy wherever I thought it proper and possible to do so.

The conference having been agreed to but not having been successful, I think the responsibility for not passing this Bill lies squarely on the shoulders of the Government Party. One can only think that, as the Government has chosen to throw away the whole of a Bill instead of accepting seven-eighths or fifteen-sixteenths of it, its policy is to try to make people think that this Council is throwing out its Bills. That is the only conclusion I can come to as a result of this conference. This Bill from another place went to such an extent in its terms that I do not think reasonable people in this place could accept the ultimate of its terms. We agreed to all the parts of the Bill except where it got beyond the bounds, as Mr. Potter has said, that anyone else has been prepared to accept so far. It is a great pity that agreement could not be reached, but I feel that it was not just because agreement could not be reached: it was because of propaganda going on behind the scenes.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (4).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Noes (14).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, Sir Lyell McEwin (teller), C. C. D. Octoman, F. J. Potter, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, and C. R. Story.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

The PRESIDENT: There are four Ayes and 14 Noes. I therefore declare the Bill to be laid aside.

THE FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 9. Page 3891.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): As there is some urgency in this matter, my remarks will be reduced to the minimum. However, some general remarks must be made, and it is a pity that a matter of such importance must be carried through without the lengthy consideration that it deserves. It has led to much work in the background, and there should have been much discussion on the Bill because the establishment of the Flinders university is probably one of the most important matters that will come before us this year. The university is so urgently required that the Bill must be accepted. Because we did not have the university earlier we have lost much valuable time that should have been used to train to degree standard persons in most of the faculties.

The amendment proposed by the Hon. Mrs. Cooper, which deals with the definition of the functions of the university, requires the close consideration of honourable members. The Bill, as it stands, neglects the large proportion of the men and women serving the community who have obtained academic degrees in part-time study, and the amendment will enable this university to carry on the tradition.

Over the years many of those associated with the University of Adelaide have been concerned about the difficulty of having lay members of the university and of the community as a whole influence the thinking of the university regarding degree status and degree qualifications. Therefore, there is before the Chamber in my name a number of amendments to vary the number of members on the council of the university so as to ensure that a larger proportion of the lesser qualified people can serve on the council. It must never be forgotten that the university is part of the community and that its only function is to serve the community; it is not the function of the community to serve the university.

The thought that should be in the Government's mind is that the establishment of Flinders university is only a temporary measure that will merely cater for the advanced training of our young people for a short time. At present, while a new university is being formed, the Government should be giving thought to the further extension of tertiary education in South Australia. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): My remarks will be brief, because I know that the honourable members who have amendments to the Bill have conferred with my colleague, the Minister of Education, and I understand that certain agreement has been reached on those amendments. I thank the honourable members who have spoken for the way in which they have dealt with the measure. I, with them, agree that the people concerned are deserving of great commendation for the manner in which the work of establishing the second university has been expedited and I also agree with them that it will be a fine establishment that will be most welcome in the educational field in

South Australia. I do not wish to say any more. I know that it is desired that this Bill pass expeditiously and I thank honourable members for their consideration of the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

New clause 3a—"Functions of the University."

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I move to insert the following new clause:

3a. The functions of the university shall, within the limits of its resources, include—

(*a*) the provision of educational facilities at university standards for persons who being eligible to enrol seek the benefits of such facilities;

(*b*) the establishment of such facilities as the university deems desirable for—

(i) the provision of courses of study, whether within the university or elsewhere, for evening students;

(ii) giving instruction to and the examination of external students;

(iii) providing courses of study or instruction at such levels of attainment as the council deems appropriate to meet the special requirements of industry, commerce or any other section of the community;

(*c*) the dissemination of knowledge and the promotion of scholarship otherwise than as hereinbefore provided.

This amendment merely inserts a provision regarding the functions of the university in accordance with my remarks in my second reading speech.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Government accepts the amendment.

New clause inserted.

Clause 4—"The Council."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

In subclause (3) to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-seven".

This amendment will increase the representation from Parliament on the council from three members to five, three representatives to be from the House of Assembly and two from the Legislative Council. Consequential amendments follow in the next few lines. The amendment will increase the number of members of the laity on the council of the university.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP moved:

In subclause 3 (*d*) to strike out "three" and insert "five".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Election of Members of Council by Parliament."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP moved:

In subclause (1) to strike out "three" and insert "five"; to strike out "one" and insert "two"; to strike out "two" and insert "three".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Time of appointment and tenure of office."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "three" and insert "five".

This is consequential on the amendment to the previous clause.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 7 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Election of members of Council by Convocation."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: There are amendments in the course of preparation to clause 10 and I seek the permission of the Committee to consider these after clause 11 has been dealt with.

Consideration of clause 10 deferred.

Clause 11—"Election by Convocation."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "the member" and insert "two members".

This is in connection with the eight members who will be elected by the convocation to the council of the Flinders university. It will have the effect that, of those eight members, two will retire every year, so that there will always be some experienced members on the council, which is very desirable.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You will need to remove a couple of words in front of that, too, won't you?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Not according to the Draftsman.

The CHAIRMAN: The continuation of the debate is consequent upon certain matters. I think that perhaps progress should be reported at this stage.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the absence of the Hon. Mr. Kemp, I move:

In subclause (1) to strike out "the member" and insert "two members" and to strike out "is a member of the academic staff of the university and who has" and insert "have"; to strike out subclause (2); and to strike out "at meetings duly convened for the purpose" and insert "by postal ballot of all the members".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10—"Election of members of Council by Convocation"—reconsidered.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: On behalf of the Hon. Mr. Kemp I move:

To strike out clause 10 and insert the following new clause:

10. (1) Until such time as convocation is constituted in accordance with sections 12 and 16 of this Act, the members of the council elected by the senate of the University of Adelaide shall consist of four persons who are members of the academic staff of the university and four persons who are not employed by the university elected in accordance with the rules set out in section 11 of this Act.

(2) From the first day of July, 1971, convocation shall elect eight members to the council without any restriction or limitation whatsoever.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: In explaining this amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Kemp, I point out that the convocation of the Flinders university will not be constituted, of course, until six years have passed. In other words, the first graduates will have to be of three years' standing before they become part of convocation. Therefore, subclause (1) covers the period when the convocation of Flinders university is not in existence and when the senate of the University of Adelaide will elect eight persons to the council of Flinders university, viz., four persons from the academic staff and four persons not from the academic staff or employed by the university in accordance with clause 13.

However, subclause (2), which provides that from July 1, 1971, convocation shall elect eight members to the council without any restriction or limitation whatsoever, becomes desirable because all universities that have this second governing body, whatever it is called, whether convocation or the senate, have various ways in which they choose the members they elect to the council. For example, in Victoria there are some stringent rules. The Victorian Act says that the members elected by convocation shall not include any member of the teaching staff or other officer of the university whose sole or principal employment is in connection with his duties as such or the head of an affiliated college.

In Tasmania convocation elects four members to the council but provides that they must not be permanent members of the teaching staff or permanent officers of the university. Western Australia elects six members of convocation to the council and they must not be members of the staff. In other words, convocation is restricted in its choice of members to the council in many States. I believe that convocation should be free to choose exactly the members of council they wish. It was decided then, with the Minister's agreement, that the best way was to provide that, after 1971, convocation should be free to elect eight members to the council, without being restricted either way.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not oppose the amendment, as I understand my colleague the Minister of Education has intimated that he is prepared to accept it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 12 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Power to make Statutes."

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I move to insert the following new subsection (1a):

No new statute or regulation or alteration or repeal of any statute or regulation continued by virtue of section 33 of this Act shall be of any force until approved by the convocation of Flinders university when constituted.

The insertion of this new subsection will bring Flinders university into line with the University of Adelaide and also with universities in other parts of Australia. In practically every university, convocation has certain specific powers apart from the election of so many members to the governing body, the council. In Victoria and in New South Wales, both in the Sydney and Macquarie universities, convocation has a permanent standing committee of convocation, which consists of quite a number of members and a president or a warden and they act on behalf of convocation but, whether it is a standing committee of convocation or convocation as the whole graduate body, certain specific duties are given to it.

In Victoria, the standing committee has two main duties. It may amend any statute or regulation submitted by the council for its approval and many return the same so amended for the further consideration of the council. It shall not originate any statute or regulation. Its second power is that it may submit for consideration of the council such suggestions as it thinks fit with respect to the powers and concern of the university. In Queensland, apart from the election to the council, the members of convocation (it is not a standing committee there) may at meetings held by them consider any matters relating to the university and its affairs and administration and may make recommendations

to the senate in respect of any such consideration.

This is the pattern right throughout Australia. It is also the pattern in other universities. Even Oxford, an old university, has a convocation of many thousands of graduates and it has been necessary to make the stipulation of a master's degree or higher, and that convocation has power of veto over any measure passed by the governing body with less than a two-thirds majority. I consider that the insertion of this subsection will be a great help to the Flinders university when the convocation eventually is constituted.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (20 to 33) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 10. Page 3962.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I oppose the Bill and leave no doubt about where I stand. In his second reading explanation the Minister went to some pains to tell us what was in the Labor Party's policy speech at the last election. There were so many things in that policy speech that the people must have been thoroughly confused, but I am sure that they know more about the policy speech now than they did at the time of the election and, if they had had a little more time to absorb the things that were in the speech, the result would not have been the same. The Labor Party has honoured one of its promises and brought in an electoral Bill. In the policy speech the Labor Party said it would bring in a 56-member Lower House, but that, I think, is where the matter rested.

It has been claimed in various quarters that all sorts of other things were written into the policy speech, but I for one cannot find any record in the speech where Parliament was going to have 26 country members. What we understood from this proposal was that it was a principle of one vote one value, and I think we all understand what one vote one value means. In the absence of anything in the policy speech about the 26 country seats, one can only assume that, to be consistent with the policy speech, we should take the total number of voters in the State and divide it by 56 and so get a certain number of districts with a certain number of electors. If my mental arithmetic is right (and I am quite sure those who follow me on the Opposition side will tell me if it is not), that means something like 10,000 people to a district. It is a peculiar thing that one vote one value does not seem to work this way in this Bill, because the Labor Party proposes to have two classes of one vote one value. They have two seats where the commission, which is to be set up, is given wide discretion (a 15 per cent tolerance as a minimum). That must be disproportionate in relation to other areas of the State.

I have done a little work on this Bill and did not get many thanks either from the Labor Party members, who were cross with me at election time. I tried to explain to the people what I thought of a Bill that we had seen before, a similar Bill that the Labor Party had brought forward. The best I could do under the terms of this Bill and under the terms of the previous one was to get 18 country seats, and that only by stretching it to the very limit. I know that I am not allowed to show exhibits, but if my honourable friends would like to see my exhibit at some time I would be very happy if they would come over and have a look at it. I will show honourable members how I work it out.

Also, we have an amazing clause that sets out to abolish the Legislative Council. Although nothing specific is written into the Bill itself about the 26 country seats and the abolition of the Legislative Council, provision is made for both those things. According to new section 80, the metropolitan area is defined by taking the House of Assembly seats as they are at present and saying, "That is the metropolitan area." The new section provides in paragraph (ii):

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

If we look at the definition, we see much of the area that concerned the Minister of Transport when he was endeavouring to get a Bill through recently. In it reference was made to a radius of 25 miles from the G.P.O., which would be considered metropolitan, I think, by practically all the authorities, including the Town Planner, who has spent much time in defining this area.

Let us look at the electoral districts just "over the fence". We find there is a heavy concentration of population when we get to the other side of Enfield and into new and growing areas. I presume one of these will be a country seat—in fact, that a number of them will be—because they are not in the metropolitan area, and 26 of them "shall be wholly within the country area".

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The people in those areas do not want them included in the metropolitan area for the Early Closing Act. What makes you think they would want them included for this Act?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member has raised an interesting point. Who does not want it defined as the metropolitan area? My experience has always led me to believe that the man in the street wants to be able to buy things at will. Other people have a great interest in this matter and will fight strongly to open the doors to the past and the old system of open trading at all hours. However, I shall not join issue with the honourable member on this matter because this Bill deals with the Constitution of the State, which is a little above the matter of the Early Closing Act.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: We shall see about the metropolitan area when we come to deal with the Town Planning Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The metropolitan area goes from Adelaide to Gawler.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Not according to the Industrial Code.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We are bringing in all these other things that the Party was fighting hard for a little while ago—to have the provisions of the Scaffolding Act and the Industrial Code widened to cover the poor unfortunate people in those areas. But now, because it suits the purpose, we close it right up to a distance of 10 miles.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We want you to be consistent with what you have done in the past.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am being extremely consistent on this matter. If the honourable member likes to check, he will see that I do not leave a banana skin on which to slip at any stage, because this has been in my mind for a long while.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: The Federal Executive of the Labor Party may have something to say about this later.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It would be like a breath of spring for the Federal Executive at the moment to have something like this float in amongst them. Under the Bill we are bringing this down to a small metropolitan area. I ask in all confidence: if members opposite were free to go on to the commission, and were faced with the part that the terms of reference under this Bill must form, how could they do other than start their boundaries from around the metropolitan area? If these districts are to have between 9,000 and 10,000 people in them, it is reasonable for them to have the main bulk of their population very close to the metropolitan area. Undoubtedly, of course, they will run a long way into the country; they will have a rural flavour of association with agriculture, horticulture and things like that, but the point is that they will border on the existing districts as defined.

This is trickery of the worst type, because having these 26 electoral districts "wholly within the country area" simply means that they are electoral districts bordering on or in what I define as the metropolitan area and in what most people outside this building define as the metropolitan area—right on to the hard core of 25 miles from the G.P.O. There will not be 26 seats in the country at all; it will be 26 seats conveniently placed, giving us the worst gerrymander that has ever been set up in this State.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about the one we are under now?

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It would be worse than that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This is interesting. The Labor Party has been talking about a gerrymander for a long time. The first person to get on the perch and cry about it was the member for Adelaide in another place. He started the talking about a gerrymander, but it is strange that the Labor Party won an election under this so-called shocking and dreadful system, and it is in Government now.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Only because we caught you napping by three years; you were three years too late.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: But what is three years in the history of this set-up? This gerrymander has been talked about for years as this "preposterous thing", but the present Government won the last election under the so-called shocking gerrymander.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We shall not mind if we have to go to the country again.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Wild horses could not drag them out now.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why should we drag ourselves out now? We are doing all right.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Once again the Hon. Mr. Banfield has repeated the cry of the Chief Secretary, "We are doing all right", but I am not so sure about that. I think it is fair to say the districts of Chaffey and Barossa put the Government where it is.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Glenelg had a little bit to do with it!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Perhaps Glenelg did have something to do with it, but the country districts I mentioned played an important part in putting the Labor Party where it is. I do not think the people in the districts I mentioned realized just what the Government was up to when it brought down this Bill, because they thought they were genuinely getting 26 country districts situated on the other side of Gawler, but that is not to be.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How many country seats would there be?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Eighteen, on my estimate, as a maximum, and one of those is close to the metropolitan area. However, I have counted it in the 18.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How many would be industrial seats?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is an interesting point. We would have a seat in the South-East that would be completely dominated by the city of Mount Gambier, and there would be two seats below Bordertown, one being an industrial seat. Somewhere in the general area of Tailem Bend would be another seat, with a further seat based on Murray Bridge. In the south, towards Victor Harbour, there would be another, while between Victor Harbour and the metropolitan area there would be a further two seats.

We are now getting quite close to the metropolitan area, but they would be regarded as country seats. South of the River Murray, in the general area of Loxton down to Karoonda and beyond, there would be another seat, and another on the northern side of the river that would take in the whole of Chaffey, portion of Angas and portion of Light. Another country seat would be in the Clare area, while the whole of the Yorke Peninsula area would have to go in with much of the present Wallaroo area. A further seat would be at Port Pirie, and another somewhere about Peterborough, continuing to the border. Other seats would be based on Port Augusta and Whyalla, while Port Lincoln would comprise part of another. An examination of that line-up reveals that one big town dominates each area.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I might have to go to Central No. 1?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The honourable member would have to face the electors, but he would never make it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: At present we have three Legislative Council districts of four members sitting over, as it were, the whole of the State. At present country people have a voice in both Houses, and it is a good and loud voice. If this measure is passed, it will not be long before the Legislative Council is abolished. That is Government policy. I cannot see any Government that abolished the Council, and having a good proportion of the seats under its control, being generous enough to give back a few seats to country people as compensation for losing their representation in the Legislative Council. I cannot imagine it showing that kind of generosity, because people will be nominated for seats because they have given good service to the Party. Such people would live mainly in or around the metropolitan area, or perhaps in a big industrial town in the State. I do not think many of them will have been farmers, or will have run businesses in the country. I think it more likely that they will be people who have worked well and honestly in industrial work of some description. To my mind, that would be an absolute tragedy, because we have seen—and I do not want to be unkind—the type of legislation that has been brought down by a Government comprised of people who have not been actively engaged in commerce, primary production or anything like that in a country area.

I do not want to name anybody particularly at this stage, but of the members of the Cabinet (if my memory serves me correctly) the present Minister of Education would be the only one who had engaged in primary production in his own right. The Minister of Agriculture was a river fisherman at one time. He had a licence, but I do not know if that qualified him as a primary producer. I merely say that most of the people who present legislation at present have not spent much time in the activities of country industries generally. It would be much better in connection with one or two measures that have been presented, particularly the Transport Bill, if the Government had had some of its members who had served in that way, because then they would have had a kinder appreciation of the problems of country areas.

Having said that, I should like now to deal briefly with one or two aspects of the matter, because we read strange things in newspapers from time to time, not the least being an article that appeared in the last *Sunday Mail*. I will not go further with that, however, as I and the author have joined issue before.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He has made a real study of the position.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There is no doubt that he has made a very close study, so it is a source of disappointment to me that he does not put the results of his study in his articles. I give him credit for being a most knowledgeable man.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He was not paying for space, so he could not include everything.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is a pity that when a person is being paid by a semi-State institution he does not give the public the full benefit of his knowledge and understanding.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: He does not believe in one man one job.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He obviously does not, because his article was an inspired one. I have no doubt that someone asked him to write it and that he was pleased to do so.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He obviously had to condense it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He had more space than I have received in my 10 years as a member, and I have endeavoured to put the position clearly to the public when I have had the space to do it. We hear much about this shocking bicameral system that we have, and the Labor Party has always said it wants to abolish the Upper House. However, ever since the days of the Roman Empire there has been some form of second Chamber to give a "morning after" look at legislation. Various honourable members have said how well Queensland has got along without a second Chamber, but I remind them that much legislation has got through the Queensland House which has been passed in the heat of the moment and which the Government has not been able to use. I think every honourable member would agree that the great debacle about Mount Isa was not a normal industrial dispute between owners and workers.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What has this to do with the Upper House?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will tell the Minister, and I am sure he will listen courteously.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Is the present Queensland Government moving to bring back the bicameral system?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not know. I am dealing with South Australia. In Queensland, where the Upper House has been thrown out, some legislation passed from time to time has not worked in the best interests of the State. For instance, legislation was passed before the strike but there was no power to act. It is difficult for a Government in office if it cannot, because of pressure from various quarters, do something to alter legislation to meet a particular situation. The second Chamber in South Australia has never been frightened by any pressures from outside. I do not think it will be unduly worried about anything Mr. Hetherington or any other person writes: I think this has all been done for a purpose. We know that the great democratic countries of the European bloc and America (with the exception of two States, I think) have Upper Houses with very wide powers. It is no use having a second Chamber if it is to be a superimposed dodo; it must have power to do something, and if its members abuse their power or privilege it will not be long before the electors will do something about it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Even though the minority elects them?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Members of this Chamber are elected on a franchise that is different from that for the other House. I do not know if the honourable member has taken the trouble to find out how many people are entitled to vote.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Many more than 36 per cent.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. If he did, he would be surprised at the number who could vote. He would also be equally interested to tell the electors that many more people could have voted if his Party had not refused to allow the spouse of an elector to vote.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: If you go that far you may as well go the whole hog.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If we did, we would have something identical, and what would be the use of having two Chambers exactly the same?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Would not some pressure be brought to bear on the spouse?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Not a Liberal wife.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I said "spouse", not "wife".

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: If a Liberal spouse did not vote the same as her husband

did, her husband must be an Australian Labor Party voter.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will not be sidetracked with nonsense, because the Minister and the Hon. Mr. Banfield in impassioned speeches have told us why women should serve on juries, yet the latter is now asking whether women would be influenced by their spouses.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I was merely asking; I was not telling the honourable member.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The answer is that they would not. I refer honourable members to a book entitled *Our Seventh Political Decade* 1920-1930, written not by a politician but by the Clerk of the Parliament and Parliamentary Historian of Queensland. It is an interesting article on the Legislative Council in Queensland and how it was abolished.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You are not holding that up as an exhibit, are you?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, I am merely referring to a useful document. The abolition of the Legislative Council in Queensland is most interesting. First, it did not have a constitution as we have but took over from the constitution of New South Wales and, as a consequence, the number of members that the Upper House should have had in relation to the membership of the Lower House was never defined. It was upon this frailty that the Government finally nominated 12 members at once and then two, just to make sure that it had the numbers in order to abolish that Chamber. The historian, the Clerk, was not too sure that to have got rid of it was the correct thing to do, and he said so in this book. I shall not worry the Council with a great tirade but offer it to honourable members to read what the Clerk, the permanent custodian of the Parliament, had to say about the abolition of that Legislative Council.

It is also interesting to recall the remarks of Charles Cameron Kingston, to whom one honourable member, probably Sir Lyell McEwin, has referred. Charles Cameron Kingston was the great Labor man of his era, and probably one of the greatest of all time. He did not run under a Labor ticket as we have it in these days, but he was one of the great men of the day. He consistently advocated the abolition of the Legislative Council. In going through the records for many years, I find that, in all the attempts made to abolish the Legislative Council, one of the Kingstons had a hand. I have forgotten the saying about a person not being a Socialist at 20 and being one at 40, but Charles Cameron Kingston said towards the end of his Parliamentary career, when he attained maturity, that in the Legislative Council democracy had nothing to fear and much to be thankful for.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: He said that towards the end of his career, so the Government ought to listen.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. He had been through the mill. He had advocated, as many of our younger members have been advocating today, great social reform. These people today want to do everything in one year. However, that is what this man said towards the end of his career. I live in hopes that other honourable members who have been here a little longer will see the light in the same way as did Charles Cameron Kingston.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: He must have been completely frustrated.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I would not have thought so. A man with his ability would never be frustrated.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: He was never defeated on a Road Transport Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, probably because he did not put one up, if I may say so. I propose to refer to the functions of the Upper House, because I think they are important. Its main purpose is to review legislation passed by the Lower House; in other words, "the next morning look" in the hope of saving the State and the taxpayer all the loss and the other ill effects of hasty legislation. Bills are usually discussed in the Assembly in a strong Party atmosphere rather than on the merits of the measure. I think we all agree with that.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Don't tell me it is in reverse here.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I can remember clearly a tremendous amount of legislation coming to this place and being saved here and then being useful legislation when it was finished with.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: They haven't long memories.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. I think that the Labor Party, in this session of Parliament, has spent quite a time in evening prayers giving thanks for the fact that the Legislative Council has saved them from a couple of great follies. I consider that this Chamber has done e Labor Party a great justice.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We shall all get our rewards in Heaven.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I do not think they do it at evening prayers, but rather in morning prayers, in their waking hours.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: A watchful and efficient Legislative Council is a safeguard of the State's rights. A second Chamber is the only guard against revolutionary legislation on the one hand and reactionary legislation on the other. A Government with a large majority in the Assembly may adopt a policy for which it has no mandate from the electors and such a policy may involve the confiscation of the liberties of the people or their property. I do not think there is any doubt that we would have had complete bank nationalization if we did not have a good, strong Upper House a few years ago. It was only a matter of agreement at that time, and that situation could arise again. This Legislative Council is a bastion against all sorts of things that can be dealt with under the Commonwealth Constitution. If there is nobody here to watch the State's rights, that is not good.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Those watching the States' rights in Canberra are elected on a full franchise, aren't they?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They are elected on an electoral system that is quite like the one the honourable member's Party is trying to inflict upon us.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: A full franchise.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: But on a somewhat different franchise for the two Houses, I would think.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Because everyone gets a vote.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think the honourable member is well aware of the system, as I am. If one of his own Party members has not maligned him too much about being a lazy fellow who does not do his work, I should think he would be trying to get into the new 56-seat House, but I am afraid that the way some people have reflected upon the Minister and the honourable member would probably make them a little suspect with their own Party.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No. We get our fan mail.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am sure the honourable member will be capable of dealing with the honourable member who spoke in that direction in the place where it counts most. The fourth point is that the purpose of the second Chamber is not to confer representation on any section of the community but to provide extra safety and additional security for the rights of the people as a whole. The Legislative Council has powers of revision without powers of control and is amenable to permanent public sentiment but not to hasty Party opinion.

The most important point is the fifth one. The Legislative Council safeguards the independence of judges, the Auditor-General, and the Public Service Commissioner. These officers act as a check on Government and on maladministration. They would be subject to dismissal by any corrupt Government were it not for the fact that the Constitution lays down that they cannot be dismissed except by resolution of both Houses of Parliament. The protection of Parliament enables these people to work without the slightest fear of being removed from office in the way that people have been removed in Ghana and other places in recent times. It is necessary that those people, together with the Commissioner of Police, be not subject to the whim of the Party in power in the Lower House, but that they be protected by both Houses of Parliament.

Sixthly, the Legislative Council ensures that the electors will have the last say, and that is essential. It exercises the discretion of delay with regard to extreme legislation, and if it quarrels with the Assembly, the Council has the remedy of applying to the people for direct authority. The Government's position is clear as to what it does if it believes that it is being obstructed in any way by the Legislative Council. It is laid down clearly in the Constitution and it is only a matter of the Government's acting upon the rights which are conferred upon it by the Constitution. This is why I wonder why the political writers and the political lecturers do not point this out more clearly to the public, as this is one of the things we do not hear very much about.

The record of the Legislative Council in South Australia is a very interesting one. I do not believe that the Council is either reactionary or obstructive. The Bills that this Government has brought down have been given fair consideration, and up to date I think only two measures have been rejected. Those two measures were rejected, but not in accordance with the old catch-cry that I remember from my childhood, "It does not matter if the Labor Party are in office; the Liberals won't give them any money to run the country." The two Bills that were rejected were money Bills and totally new and different in concept, relating to a minority group of people in each case. The Party I belong to has always legislated for the majority, and this is the way it should be. To try to extract more money from one small section of the public is not right. This same thing

applies to this Bill before us: the majority is not being looked after at all.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This is not the argument you used regarding one of these Bills. You said this affected the majority.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The point I am making is that the Minister's Party is quite consistent in that it is not protecting the whole of the people in this Bill. What it is doing is making it extremely difficult for one section to get representation in Parliament, because everything that is written in the Bill would be most beneficial to the Party at present in power.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Are you suggesting a majority of the people want an A.L.P. Government?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am not suggesting anything. It may be interesting for the honourable member to know that his Party was the alternative Government prior to March 10 last year.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But we have not the majority in the Upper House.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We always get people who like a little innovation and a little change. These people say, "They have been there a little too long. Let us see if the other side can do a little better". Labor members are in the opposite position now, where the L.C.L. is the alternative Government, and I believe that many of the people they used to talk about as being the 51 per cent in favour of Labor—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is 56 per cent.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Well, 56 per cent if the honourable member wants it like that. It is often a matter of cooking things up, but he will find that many of the people that he claimed to be supporters of his Party may very well turn out to be supporters of the alternative Party.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This Bill will give them a better chance of getting the Government they want.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have some interesting material on the history of the Legislative Council, particularly on the matter of electoral reform. Nearly every change from Liberal to Labor Government has resulted in a Bill with an abolition clause in it. I think the only time that we had a Bill calling for complete abolition of the Council was in 1930. It was mentioned in the Governor's Speech, but the Bill did not come forward. Governments that have gone to the people on the matter of abolition have always been defeated. The people will take only a certain amount; they are perhaps a little gullible at times, but they like a bet each way, and I think the position is exactly the same today as it was then. I do not think the people would like us very much if we let this sort of legislation go through, because it seems to me that we would not be doing our work very well if we did.

I am a little intrigued by clause 4, which deals with the reconstitution of the Legislative Council. New section 11a states:

As from the day of the first general election of members of the House of Assembly held next after publication in the *Gazette* of a report and recommendations of an Electoral Commission appointed under section 76 or section 85 of this Act, every member of the Legislative Council whose term of office has not then expired shall, for the unexpired portion of his term, be deemed to represent, in lieu of the Council district which he represented immediately before that day, the Council district determined by the Electoral Commission. In making such determination the Commission shall take into account the Council district previously represented by and, if necessary, the place of residence of, each such member.

This is freedom of choice, I suppose, which is a good thing. I do not know how anybody could have the effrontery to put a thing like that in the Bill. The commission and the Government can play around with it. If the commission does not like it, it does not have to bring in a report, anyhow. If it does not like the places where the various people are put, it does not have to bring in a report. It is in the hands of the Government. The commission is set up and Parliament does not even have another look at it. And members are told which particular district they will represent.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: For a period of up to six years.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Maybe; and, what is more, in many cases redistributions have severed people from their original electoral districts, but they have gone on and fought their elections in a nearby electoral district, and the electors have accepted them; but under these provisions a person could be put in because he happened to live in a particular area, which I do not think is very good. In fact, I think it is bad.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It is a shocking provision.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Clause 12 enacts the deadlock provisions. This is very interesting. It states:

If any public Bill other than a money Bill or a Bill containing any provision to extend

the maximum continuance of the House of Assembly is passed by the House of Assembly in two successive sessions whether of the same Parliament or not and having been sent up to the Legislative Council at least one month before the end of each of those sessions is rejected by the Legislative Council in each of those sessions, that Bill shall, on its rejection for the second time by the Legislative Council, unless the House of Assembly direct to the contrary, be presented to the Governor and become an Act of Parliament on Her Majesty's assent being signified thereto, notwithstanding that the Legislative Council has not passed the Bill.

This is significant, of course, because saying "If any public Bill other than a money Bill" gets us right into the net for abolition, because it is obvious that even this Government cannot fiddle around with section 61 or section 63 (I am not sure which it is) of the Constitution, which deals with the powers of the Council in regard to money Bills and clauses. The Government will not fiddle about with that, because it its too red hot, but it introduces it in a subtle way—"If any public Bill other than a money Bill or a Bill containing"—which simply means that an electoral reform Bill put before the Legislative Council and rejected and brought up again and again rejected then becomes law. The Government can get this fiddle of a Bill through without any further worry, and start to put people of its own persuasion in its gerrymandered electoral districts; and in six years the Legislative Counicl would be finished.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: We have it finished immediately, with that clause.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think we have, but we will give the Government the benefit of the doubt for a three-year period, one election.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: They can by-pass you.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: True, and then the country would be in a real predicament. I hope I have not wasted my time this afternon trying to point out, so that I may by speaking long and loudly enough get a little space in the press, the difficulties—

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You will not have any trouble there!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —that the country electoral districts and the country people will be in if this measure is passed and comes into operation. It may be of interest to the Minister to know what I said on a previous occasion so that there will be no misunderstanding about what would happen to the Upper Murray areas in this State if this Bill was passed. I said this about it:

The Labor Party wants one vote one value. This is what that policy can mean to the country electorates.

I have a map with many dots on it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Were those dots used for voting purposes in the country areas before?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. This map had lines drawn on it. The lines were intersecting at areas where approximately 10,000 people lived, taken over the whole State. This is what "one vote one value" means (unless there is a fiddle, as there is in this Bill) with two seats that break down the whole system of one vote one value.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: The lines do not have to be drawn in the same places as you have them.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Not at all, but I hope the Minister will concede this, that he will find that the great conglomeration of dots will be within 30 miles (I am being generous, because most of them will be within 25 miles) of the G.P.O. in Adelaide.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Mostly within 10 miles.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They must be, because we have defined the metropolitan area as being those electoral districts.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What about the amount of decentralization that went on under the previous Government?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If I were the Minister I think I would not raise the question of decentralization at this stage. I do not want to become nasty or personal, but I have not actually seen very much evidence of any decentralization since March 10 of last year. I assure the Minister that the only problem that he is faced with is the fact that we have had tremendous development in this State and that many people enjoying the prosperity of this development are enjoying it because a good rump was laid down for many years in the primary industries section. It formed a good basis for the Government of the day to establish secondary industries. This primary industry set-up (I am not talking so much about primary industry as people in the outback areas where they are prepared to go and be a decentralized community) is getting in this measure no consideration whatsoever, because they will not have either sufficient voices to make any difference against the influence of the Trades Hall in Adelaide—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They are getting their votes equalized.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They are getting them equalized: that is what Mr. Hetherington said about it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Equalitarian!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, he referred to the equalitarian policy of the Government. Do not let us bury our heads in the sand in relation to where the population is located, because if it is economic for industry to go to an area it will go there. That is obvious, because industries have gone to various places without being forced to do so. When the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. Ltd. wanted to exploit raw materials it went to Whyalla.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That was where the raw material was.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Quite so. The raw material processed by Apcel Ltd. and Cellulose (Australia) Ltd. was at Millicent, so that was the logical place for those industries to be established.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: The B.H.P. could have shipped everything to Newcastle.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Quite so.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Not economically.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The B.H.P. would not be as big as it is if it had not worked out the economics of establishing in various places. It was to the advantage of the company and this State that it established itself at Whyalla, close to the source of raw material, just as it was to the advantage of Apcel and Cellulose to establish at Millicent, close to the pine forests.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: The B.H.P. would not be at Whyalla if the Labor Party had its own way. That Party introduced a motion to take it over.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, and it opposed taking water to Whyalla. I have heard so often that the Labor Party brought electricity to South Australia that I am almost beginning to believe it.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: My Party helped your Party.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, but it obstructed us in the other matter. Ancillaries have been established in fruitgrowing areas, and one can think of many other undertakings that have been established in areas because the incentive has been to establish there. Unfortunately, most of our country areas are a long way from the seaboard. In the metropolitan area, which under this Bill will be only an area within a 10-mile radius of the G.P.O., there will be 38 members out of a total of 56, and that does not seem fair to me.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The definition is the same as applied in 1954.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is not. If the honourable member had a good look at this matter he would see that it would not work that way. My Party has clearly defined in its constitution what it wants regarding Constitutional reform, and I do not think anyone has to pay 50c to get a copy of that constitution! If this Bill is passed, country areas will be at a distinct disadvantage. It will be difficult to convince me that this is proportionate or that it even savours of being a fair Bill to give proper representation to the people of this State. It has been said *ad nauseam* that people, not acres or cows, should be represented. If this Bill is passed, it will not be possible for members to represent the large numbers in their districts. I think the Party opposite has blatantly introduced this measure to ensure for all time that it will remain in office, and to abolish the Legislative Council (it will take away 12 country votes) and so reduce country representation to a whisper. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): The Hon. Mr. Story suggests that this Bill is not a fair measure because it gives as near as practicable the same value to each vote. He seems to think that because people live in the city they should not be entitled to as much representation as are people living in the country. The opposite of what he said about people living in the country applied for many years under the previous Government to people living in the city.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Are you supporting the Bill?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not obliged to say at this stage whether I am or am not.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I thought the honourable member was doubtful!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not doubtful, and if the honourable member waits long enough he will know how I intend to vote. The Bill gives the opportunity for people to elect a Government that will truly represent them, and not represent just a few in the country and city. It will give representation to people throughout the whole State. In other words, it will bring to this State a democratic Government, which is something that the people have not had for over 32 years, in which period previous Governments

have had a majority of votes on only one occasion. In saying that I am referring not to districts—lines and dots on the map—but to people, as members should represent people and not the black dots and other things mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Story. The hypocrisy used by people when talking about living in a democracy has to be heard to be believed, as for more than 20 years this State has been governed by a Party that has received less than 46 per cent of the total votes, whereas the Australian Labor Party has received well over 50 per cent. Despite this, the Labor Party has been denied the right to govern. The dictionary defines "democracy" as "Government by the people; the principle that all citizens have equal political rights". Do members of the Opposition believe that the 39,091 people in the Enfield District, which has only one member, have political rights equal to those of people living in the Wallaroo, Light, Frome, Burra, and Rocky River Districts?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do not country districts have from 12,000 down to 6,000 electors?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They may have up to 12,000 and down to 6,000, but they have not up to 39,000 and down to 5,000. At least, this is a step in the right direction and, if the honourable member does not believe in that, perhaps he thinks that 40,000 people are entitled to only one representative, in the same way as 5,000 people are entitled to one member. Irrespective of whether honourable members agree with one vote one value, this Bill goes a long way towards achieving something that has not been attempted in the last 30 years.

At March last the five House of Assembly districts of Frome, Wallaroo, Light, Burra and Rocky River, each with fewer than 6,000 electors, had a total enrolment of 28,671. If Gouger, with 9,120 electors on the roll, is included, we see that 37,791 electors were able to elect six members, while 39,000 people in Enfield could only return one member. Is that democracy at its best?

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That is your Government's fault. You stopped our Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course it is my Government's fault, but the fact is that we are trying to correct the matter, regardless of whose fault it was, and we are giving honourable members opposite the opportunity to correct a mistake that was made more than 30 years ago. In terms of the present Bill, there will be about 11,000 electors in each district. At present, 22 districts have fewer than 10,000 electors. In effect, we are making them all fairly even, and the average person will not have any complaint. Five House of Assembly districts have between 10,000 and 20,000 electors, seven have over 20,000 but fewer than 30,000, and five have more than 30,000. Whatever the size of a district, the people in it have only one member. Why are the other 39,000 people not entitled to the same representation as the people living in a district in which there are 5,000 enrolled? Perhaps what is wrong is that they support a Labor Government.

I would be the last to suggest that that was a gerrymander in any shape or form. As a person who wanted a democratic Government, it did not take me five minutes to make up my mind which way to vote on this Bill. I think it is a step towards getting a democratically-elected Government. I had no hesitation in giving full support to the Bill. I did not have to meet with people to decide whether the Bill should be thrown out, as money Bills have been thrown out. I am right behind the measure.

In order to prove that it is not a real gerrymander, it is significant that, of the 22 districts with fewer than 10,000 electors in each, 13 have Liberal and Country League representation. One district is represented by a so-called Independent. Naturally, honourable members know why I call him a so-called Independent. He assisted in keeping a minority Government in power for three years. Only eight districts are represented by the A.L.P.

The Hon. C. R. Story: He was asked to have a go for the other side, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He was certainly asked to have a go. He had a go all right—he could not go quickly enough to the Chair. Let us face up to it. I say he is a so-called Independent, and he still supports the Opposition on all Bills, not some. Four of the five districts with enrolments of between 10,000 and 20,000 electors are represented by A.L.P. members and one by an L.C.L. member. Of the seven districts with between 20,000 and 30,000 electors on the roll, five are held by A.L.P. members and two by L.C.L. members. Four of the districts with more than 30,000 on the roll are represented by the A.L.P. and one by the L.C.L.

Does the Opposition still claim that all citizens in this State have an equal right? It is no wonder that they do not want an equal number of electors in each district. They can see what the position would be. Further analysis of the position shows that the average

number of electors on the roll for the 17 districts held by L.C.L. members is 10,572. Of those 17 districts, 13 have fewer than 10,000 on the roll, but the other four districts have boosted the figure to 10,572. The average for the 21 districts represented by the A.L.P. is 17,911 and of these districts nine have enrolments of over 20,000, and four districts of that nine have more than 14,000 voters.

The Hon. C. R. Story: How long do you think it would take any one of those electors to consult his member?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It would take exactly the same time as it would take a member living in the farthest corner of the Frome district to communicate with his member either at Parliament House or by telephone at the member's home. The telephone system is fairly good and, consequently, it would not take one minute longer to communicate with him from the farthest part of the district.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Does the honourable member do his private business over the telephone normally, especially on a party line?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My constituents telephone me in the first instance, and if it can be done we fix the matter in that way.

The Hon. C. R. Story: If they had to walk to see you, the one farthest away would take the best part of two hours.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Now we are getting to the stage of taking the dog for a walk, which has been mentioned in another place. It was because of the trees where the dog stopped in the other districts that they got their representation. Do not talk about taking a dog for a walk, because we have had it in another place. In terms of this Bill, which provides for 56 members in the House of Assembly, the average number of electors in each district would be about 11,000. The Bill will apply to all districts whether represented by A.L.P., L.C.L. or Independent members. Surely that is much nearer to having a Government elected democratically than anything we have had in the past.

The Hon. C. R. Story: This matter of democracy is interesting. What do you understand by it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Let us take this example. It is not a democracy where there is 38 per cent of the adult people in the State electing a Legislative Council that has the full right to throw out whatever Bill it likes. In other words, a Government elected by 75 per cent of the electors can have its wishes thrown out by a Legislative Council elected by fewer than 20 per cent of the electors. I do not believe that that is democratic.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I have heard Soekarno say he has a democracy.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I heard the previous Government say it was democratically elected, but on not more than two occasions in the last 30 years has the Party had 50 per cent of the votes. The Bill also provides for adult franchise for the election of the Legislative Council. We all know that this has provoked strong opposition from members opposite, who do not believe in the rights of the individual. I could understand the Opposition's viewpoint if the Council were restricted to reviewing, accepting, amending or rejecting Bills that only affected people with special qualifications. If that was all the Council could do, there would be justification for having a special franchise for election to this place. However, it does not apply, as the Legislative Council has full power to throw out any legislation, whether it affects only people concerned in the restricted franchise or whether it affects every person.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Can you indicate one direction in which the Council has acted detrimentally?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: About a fortnight ago this Council deprived many people of benefits under legislation dealing with succession duties. Surely the honourable member can recall that, as he was one of the members who denied exemptions to some people. I know I am out of order, Mr. President, but I was asked a question as to what this Council had done, and I thought I was justified in answering the question. The position is that this Council can throw out any Government Bill, and not only Bills affecting the people who have the right to vote for the Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Don't you think that is a good thing?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I say the people affected should have the right to say who shall represent them in this Chamber. The Opposition in this place might be justified to a very small degree if the Chamber could introduce only those Bills that affected the people with restricted voting qualifications. However, there is no such restriction, and it means that, with the exception of money Bills, it can deal with Bills in this Chamber that affect every person in the community.

The claim that this Chamber is only a House of Review is far from the truth. If that claim is a correct one, the same could be said about

the other place, because it reviews legislation introduced in this Council. Why this Council can claim it is a House of Review any more than the House of Assembly, I do not know. The franchise for the Assembly is not restricted to people with special qualifications.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What is the good of having adult franchise when the members won't give the opinion of the people in the district?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: What is the advantage of having a Legislative Council where the members have been elected by the vote of about 25 per cent of the people in the district? Can it truly be said that such a member is speaking for the whole of the people in the district? At the most he could have got only 38 per cent of the votes in the district, and at the worst only 17 per cent. When a member claims he is speaking for all the people in his district, I suggest he have another look at the position and ask himself, "Do I truly represent the people in the district?"

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How about the road transport Bill?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That has been thrown out by people who were elected on a minority vote. It was supported in another place where members are elected by the majority of the people. Unsolicited, thousands of people dashed up with pen in hand to put their names on petitions, all of which contained exactly the same prayer. The Hon. Mr. Rowe suggested that the present restricted Legislative Council franchise was the fault of the present Government and not that of the Opposition, which was in Government in the last three years. Mr. Rowe knows that the present Opposition when in Government refused to accept the Labor Party's proposals. They suggested that all restrictions on adult franchise be lifted. Yet, he says it is our fault.

Most members in this place say they look after the interests of primary producers. Let me refer to that matter. There may be a family of a husband, wife and six children over the age of 21 years: five boys and one girl. The boys may have attended college and done very well. On leaving college they may have gone back and stayed on the land with their father, waiting for him to die so that they could get a piece of land to the value of £50 which would entitle them to a vote at Council elections.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not think the honourable member should reflect on people who cannot reply.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not doing that, Sir. I am pointing out the effect of the previous Government's proposal, and there are many members here who have the right of reply. Surely I am at liberty to point out the effect of that Government's legislation.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: How would the succession duties legislation have affected them?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Never mind about succession duties. Apparently it is only myself that is called to order by the Chair. The five male members may have obtained academic qualifications, but there may have been a dizzy blonde in the family who was able to trap a husband. The previous Government wanted to give her the right to vote for the Legislative Council, yet it was not prepared to give that right to the five boys who had academic qualifications. Is that reasonable?

The Hon. C. R. Story: No!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course, and that is what we said at the time. We still say that it is not reasonable. That is why we want to give the franchise to everybody, not only to these dizzy blondes.

The Hon. Mr. Rowe said that he agreed that some amendment was needed but stated further that he felt the Bill could not be amended and that he would vote against the second reading. First, he claims it warrants some amendment; then he states that the Bill cannot be amended and he will vote against it.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: He will do exactly the same as your people did in another place years ago.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We did not have the necessary numbers at any time to do what we wanted to. Mr. Rowe says that the Bill has some merit in it but he is not prepared to support the second reading, which means that it will not go into Committee.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Did you say that you never had the numbers in another place?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We did not have the numbers in the other place when the Bill was before it.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Of course you did!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course we did not!

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You took someone out of the Chamber.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Is that why some honourable members are out of this Chamber now?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Mr. Rowe also said that he opposed the Bill because it affected him personally. I suggest that that was the main reason for his opposition, because it would affect him personally. That is why he was going to oppose it. The difference between a statesman and a politician is that one looks after the interests of the State and not of the individual. I ask Mr. Rowe whether he is more interested in the welfare of the politician than he is in the interests of the State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I suggest you read the rest of his speech.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin has castigated this Government for referring to what has taken place in other States and countries. He implies that we in South Australia are masters of our own destiny. However, Sir Lyell was not too proud to refer to the position in other States when discussing this Bill. He says that we have had 100 years as a House of Review, responsible to the people and elected on a moderate (something down to 20 per cent) franchise, and he intends to keep it that way. As I said earlier, if this was only a House of Review, there might be some degree of merit in that argument, but I point out that this Council does not confine itself to reviewing Bills: it has the right to introduce and to throw out Bills. So he cannot claim that this is purely a House of Review. We cannot justify, in those circumstances, a set-up that has the full right to throw out a Bill when there are only 38 per cent of the adult people of this State on the Legislative Council's roll, when that 38 per cent can frustrate the will of the majority of the people.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: A lot more could get on to it if they liked.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes. As the honourable member says, a lot more could be on the roll. Members opposite say that people on a restricted franchise have a specific stake in the country. How much do they exercise that stake in the country? They will not even enrol on the Legislative Council roll. They have a stake in the country but do not attempt to exercise their power to get rid of the politicians who at present represent a minority. The position has worsened, because the 38 per cent on the roll produce only an 80 per cent vote of the number on the roll, which makes the position even worse, when the majority of the people of South Australia can have their wishes rejected because of the limited franchise.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: But the honourable member is delighted to accept his own seat under that roll.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: An honourable member entering this Council has to come in in a constitutional manner. I offered myself to the electors of Central No. 1 District irrespective of whether there were 10 per cent or 38 per cent of the electors on the roll. I would have been quite happy to offer myself to the electors in Central No. 1 District if there had been 100 per cent of the electors on the roll. I did not come to Central No. 1 simply because I knew only 38 per cent of the people had a vote for the Council. The position is that the previous Government drew up the boundaries and allowed only 38 per cent of the people to be on the roll. In those circumstances I had no choice, if I wanted to stand for Parliament, but to submit my name irrespective of the position. Had there been compulsory voting and a full adult franchise for Central No. 1 District, my name would still have been submitted.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: In what sort of a democratic manner were you chosen?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In the same democratic manner as the honourable member was—by the 38 per cent of the people on the roll. That was the democratic way in which I was elected.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What about your preselection?

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I was referring to preselection.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Who tries to frighten the people? Catch-phrases like "a little bit of crookness", "dishonesty", and so on have been used. The Hon. Mr. Kemp says that this Bill is not honest. I say that this Bill has been introduced in all honesty. We have been telling the people our intentions for years—they have received much publicity. People have been giving us a majority vote for years and we are bringing in this Bill in accordance with their desires. I ask the honourable member whether he thought it was an honest action on the part of the previous Government to cling to office in 1962 when the people of this State again clearly indicated that they no longer desired to be governed by the Playford dictatorship. Was that honesty in 1962?

Members opposite say that the Government cannot claim that it has a mandate for the Bills it has introduced because there were various reasons why the people voted for it;

but at least we had a mandate to form a Government, which is something the Opposition has had on only two occasions over the last 30 years. We are frequently told that in this Council the individual members are free to act politically as they so desire. This is very good in theory. The Hon. Mr. Story and other honourable members opposite have said this over and over again, and are beginning to believe it. If Opposition members continue to say that to themselves long enough, they may even convince themselves; but members opposite cannot convince me that that is the position, because I am sure that through their very membership of a political Party, through their action in this Council and because the Party machine goes into operation to see that L.C.L. members are elected, they have little hope of convincing anyone other than themselves that they are acting independently.

Besides what goes on here, we have only to see what is to happen to legislation already passed in another place. I refer to the proposal to hold a referendum shortly. We find that the outside whips are beginning to crack and the boys are jumping. It appears that the legislation will be pigeon-holed. Are honourable members acting independently? The answer is that they are not, but because an outside influence—

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: I thought the Victorians had brought in a ban on the use of the whip.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Liberal and Country League Party has its own legislation passed, and now it will be shelved.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: What has this to do with the Bill?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It has nothing to do with the Bill, but neither has the comment about the 36 faceless men or the constitution of the Labor Party made by members opposite, so I crave your indulgence, Mr. President, to show that these things happen in the Liberal and Country League. It is significant that in this House of Review there is not one independent member. As members opposite claim that they act independently, they should be quite happy to ask people to elect them as independent members.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We do not sign pledges!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You do not, but you pay your fee and do what you are told.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We pay the fee.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It was said that this Council would become a rubber stamp. Until last March the control of both Houses was in the hands of members of the same political Party, with the same constitution, rules and objectives binding on all members, and it was the same Party machine that got its members elected to both Houses. If its members could act individually, the L.C.L. would not hold plebiscites to see whom it would support; it would support every member of its Party who wanted to stand for Parliament, because it would not matter who he was so long as he was a Party member. He could act independently, and it would not be necessary to assist him.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You have not read *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have, and I have heard members say that in this Chamber, but when there is a by-election a plebiscite is held by the L.C.L. Why is that necessary to get one member? What would it matter who stood for election so long as they were members of the L.C.L.? Why cannot they bring their machine into operation in relation to the policy and not the individual?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: All the members of the L.C.L. do not get a vote, either.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is so.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Do you remember how Mr. Dunn was elected to Parliament?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have done with that aspect of the matter now, so I shall move on.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You are too young to know.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: And others may be too old. Part V provides for the appointment of an electoral commission consisting of three commissioners, one of whom shall be a judge of the Supreme Court, one the Surveyor-General and one the Assistant Returning Officer for the State. However hard one might try, one could not set up a commission comprising people whose honesty, integrity and impartiality was of a higher standard than theirs.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That is the only part of the Bill worth supporting.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Then support it. Set up this commission of honest and impartial men and we will get electoral boundaries that cannot be interfered with in any way. The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin and others have repeatedly said that no man should be placed in the position in which it could be said that he was exercising his position for his

own gain. This provision of the Bill makes it impossible for anyone to say that a certain member has supported or opposed any Bill defining electoral boundaries simply because it may have affected him personally. It has often been said that people should not have temptation placed in their way, but as soon as we attempt to remove any possibility of temptation there is a hue and cry from the Opposition. I am sure that all honourable members will be pleased if temptation is no longer put before them.

Under clause 82, any individual or organization has the right to make written representation to the commission in relation to any redistribution, so it cannot be said that they have no right to make representations if they think they will not be treated fairly. The commission is bound to consider all relevant representations, and may at its discretion hear and consider any evidence, information and argument submitted to it. The commission will then bring forward its well-considered and unbiased decision, which, after certain formalities, shall become effective. I cannot see how any member can complain that in the circumstances any injustice can be done. If the Hon. Mr. Rowe found that he represented Central No. 1 District not only he but the electors would not like it. There would be nothing to stop him from resigning if that happened, so he need not suffer under the Bill.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That is the easy solution.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I cannot see that the honourable member has any cause for complaint. I could imagine there would be plenty of jostling for position and support if the matter were left in the hands of people affected by the Bill to make the final decision. I am a great believer in arbitration, as I believe other members are. This is their opportunity to put their beliefs into operation. Clause 12 provides ways and means to overcome deadlocks between the two Houses. These provisions are exactly the same as those operating between the House of Commons and the House of Lords.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: When did deadlocks occur in South Australia?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They did occur, and the honourable member indicated what happened when there was a deadlock. He said that way back in the early part of the century the Legislative Council refused to pass a Bill and that he thought that it was wrong. He also said that the people at that time said that it was wrong, so this has been put into operation before. The bicameral system in the United Kingdom has been held up to us by members opposite as being of great benefit to that country, so surely they should be able to accept without any qualms the same provisions for South Australia. Under the present set-up the Government could go to the people with only one specific question and receive a mandate of 75 per cent of the people in support of that one question, only to find that when the Bill reached the Chamber it could be rejected out of hand by people who were not even involved in that election. Those people would be seat-warming while members in another place had to go back to the electors. Is that reasonable? I do not think it is.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The deadlock provisions have not been implemented for 84 years.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Not completely.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They were put into motion by members of the Legislative Council, but they did not have to go to the people at the time. They were prepared to send people from another place to the electors while they kept warm their seats in this place. I think honourable members are democrats at heart and, if they act individually on this occasion and in accordance with their beliefs, this measure will pass the second reading. I commend the Bill.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 9. Page 3880.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the Bill. I recognize, by the nature of the amendments brought in, all the problems that the Electricity Trust of South Australia must be having in these modern days in forward planning in regard to the supply of power to meet needs at the right place and the right time, althongh I do not like the application of compulsory acquisition powers in relation to land any more than other honourable members do. I find it interesting to reflect on the history of the supply of electric power in this State from the days of the Electric Light and Motive Power Company, which was formed in this State in 1897 and which, by a private member's Bill, was given the necessary legislative power to enable it to supply electricity, in the first instance, to the city of Adelaide.

From that company came the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, and then came E.T.S.A., as we commonly refer to the trust today. The companies that have supplied power to the State through the years have been able to obtain land largely on their own merits, by planning and by legitimate purchase, but it must be recognized by government today that E.T.S.A. is reaching the stage where it must be able to plan ahead in order to supply power where it is most needed. Therefore, I accept the Minister's explanation about the problem of not being able to purchase land in a good area, an area bounded by South, West Beach and Marion Roads. The trust is able to acquire an area of land comprising five houses, all of which are habitable and some of which are modern but unable to buy vacant land because of the price in the vicinity.

If the trust is to go ahead with its plan to put a substation on this area, the five houses will be demolished and, because of the shortage of houses in the State, five houses will have to be purchased or obtained for the families concerned. One point of criticism is that I cannot find any definition in the various Acts of an explanation of the word "substation", or of "other equipment incidental to the transmission of electricity". I hope that the Minister will give an assurance that these words cannot be so interpreted as to mean that, possibly, houses will be built for officers of the trust or that the areas of land will become storage areas for trust equipment.

In other words, I hope that, when compulsory acquisition of land takes place, the compulsory acquisition will be for substations and not for other purposes. I have always been impressed by the efficiency of E.T.S.A. The way that the trust keeps its equipment and grounds is a credit to them for all to see and something from which example can be taken. I consider that beautification by the planting of trees, shrubs and lawns around some substations and other trust areas would give credit to the name and assist materially by having something less of an eyesore than the bare ground surrounding substations in built-up areas.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

KAPINNIE AND MOUNT HOPE RAILWAY DISCONTINUANCE BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 10. Page 3944.)

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN (Northern): This is purely a machinery Bill, which merely implements decisions and recommendations made by the Transport Control Board and the Public Works Committee. It gives the usual formal statutory authority to take up and remove or otherwise dispose of a section of railway line that has been closed. In this case, it is the section between Kapinnie and Mount Hope, a distance of nine miles. The total length of the spurline from Yeelanna to Mount Hope is about 23 miles and it is intended to retain 14 miles and to close the remaining nine miles.

Personally, I regret the closing of this line, because it had been in operation for many years, during which time development in the area had been slow. However, during the past few years extensive clearing of scrub land has taken place and it could be that, when this land is in full production, the railway line would have played a much greater part in the transport system of the district than was the case in the past. This is especially so with the advent of handling bulk superphosphate and with increased cereal production.

I understand that, even subsequent to the closure of the line, representations had been made to the Minister asking that he reconsider the decision to close this short section. During this last harvest, over 30,000 bags (100 000 bushels) of barley were delivered and stacked at Kiana, a siding on this closed line only five miles from Kapinnie. However, because the line was officially closed, all of that barley has been road carted direct to Port Lincoln, although the closed line from Kiana to Kapinnie is perhaps in better condition than the section from Kapinnie to Yeelanna that is being retained. The Hon. Mr. Banfield would agree with me on that point, because he, as a member of the Public Works Committee, made an inspection of the line.

It was gratifying to producers in this highly-productive district that the section of line from Kapinnie to Yeelanna was retained. It made possible the erection of a 250,000-bushel grain silo at Kapinnie, which is now in the course of construction, and I have no doubt that extensions to this installation will be necessary within a short time. It was reliably estimated that last year more than 750,000 bushels were produced in the Kapinnie-Brimpton Lake area. I support the Bill.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.37 *to* 7.45 *p.m.*]

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I can assure the Chief Secretary and also the Hon. Mr. Banfield that I am going to support the Bill. I was interested in the comments

of the Hon. Mr. Octoman this afternoon, and I agree with what he said about the section of the line that goes to a receival point for grain that, according to him, is in a better condition than the line farther down. When we come to a position where we have to close railways due consideration should be given to these bulk handling points and the line should be left open thus far if possible. I assure the Chamber and the members of the Government, in particular, that I am always sorry to see a railway closed.

I know that the railways have an annual gross deficit of $7,000,000 but that the running deficit is something like $1,936,000, and I also know that some of the lines may have become superfluous because the distance by road transport is shorter, or some other reason. The railways have done a tremendous job in opening up South Australia and that is why I said on a previous occasion that I did not think we should take too much notice of the deficits that the railways incur, as in many areas they cart large quantities of materials, grain, manures and stock into areas that otherwise it would not be possible to service economically. While I support the Bill, I regret that it is necessary to close another railway; on the other hand, we must realize that there are a few railway lines such as this one that have of necessity to be closed.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Transport): I do not think there is very much to answer in what has been said. Most honourable members who spoke supported the Bill. All I can say is that I agree with the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who regrets the necessity to close this line. I, too, regret it.

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

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's amendments Nos. 1 to 8.

(Continued from February 10. Page 3948.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: When progress was reported I was speaking about amendment No. 7, which was to insert certain words in new section 23b (5). I moved this amendment because frequently a promoter desires to obtain, for example, three blocks of land in the same street or, as has happened in relation to the Adelaide airport, to obtain compensation from three different owners in the area. Perhaps owners A and B will accept the amount offered but owner C will prosecute his claim. Not long ago a court held that the amount to be paid as compensation would be less than the amount paid into court. If I interpret the situation correctly, A and B might have thought the matter was finalized and C was eventually awarded less than the amount paid into court. This means that the promoters could go along to the people who accepted a certain figure and require them to refund the difference between the amount paid to them and the amount awarded to C by the court. If people make a bargain and it is accepted, I think it should stand.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I draw the attention of honourable members to the Minister's remarks regarding the compensation sections of the Act when he referred to the notice to treat. Some misunderstanding has arisen about this matter and I have made most careful inquiries, not only privately but also through the Crown Law Office. I think honourable members will be aware (and I hope the Minister will correct me if I am still wrong) that when notice to treat has been served and the person aggrieved agrees upon the price, or when the Land Board agrees upon an increased price, the Government must settle, whereas the Minister's suggestion is that if the land is not wanted for another 12 or 15 years the price still reverts to the time of the notice to treat.

That is quite wrong. Once the Government serves notice to treat, it must pay. If it does not do that, the person on whom notice is served can ask for compensation and costs. There is no question of that, and I should like to be certain while we are still in Committee that the Minister agrees with me on that point.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I completely agree with the view put forward by the Hon. Sir Norman Jude. I was bewildered by the Minister's statement on this matter last week. The intention of the amendment is clear. All it does is provide that the price paid will be the present valuation, and not the valuation 12 months prior. In a case where a notice to treat is served the valuation will be the valuation at the time the notice is served, not 12 months prior.

I realize that there are some arguments in favour of having the value fixed as at 12 months prior, and agree that they are reasonable arguments, but there are also cases where this creates some difficulty. In other parts of the world, notably England, under compulsory acquistion, as I have said, the price

the Government has to pay for land it wishes to acquire is the present value, plus 10 per cent, which I think is a far more reasonable approach than taking it back 12 months.

This particular section was written into the Act in 1918, when conditions were much different from what they are today. At that time, prices were reasonably stable. Then and up until a few years ago it was reasonable to have this condition applying. However, at present, when we have rapidly rising prices of land, particularly suburban land, this provision can create anomalies. In addition, if this amendment is accepted, it will upset land that is in the process of being compulsorily acquired at present.

The amendment would apply to any land that is in the throes of being acquired, or to land in respect of which notice to treat has been served. I realize that there are difficulties but I cannot agree with the Minister's contention and as far as I am concerned the amendment is reasonable, although I realize that there are arguments either way.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I think it would be only a courtesy for the Minister to reply to my request.

The CHAIRMAN: That is up to him.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The position is that I shall please myself whether I reply to a statement made on the floor of the House. It is not for Sir Norman to say I ought to reply. However, as the honourable member desires a reply, I shall give it. I said when we were debating these amendments the other day that difficulties would be created, and I still say that. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has now admitted that he visualizes difficulties. Prior to my speaking the other day, it was suggested there was no difficulty whatever in the matter.

I admit that, after having had further opportunity of looking at the ramifications, perhaps I may have been a little off the track when I spoke last week. That is all honourable members have been wanting me to say. If they want recorded in *Hansard* that I say that I retract, they are not going to be satisfied, because I am not going to say that by any stretch of the imagination. I said the amendment would create difficulties for the Highways Department, and I adhere to that. Sir Norman knows that, too.

Regarding valuations, I appreciate that points are debatable but I thought I gave examples of what happens in the Highways Department in connection with acquistion. In compulsory acquistion the court makes the decision, not the Highways Department or the valuation officers. What happens is that a Land Board valuation is obtained and negotiations take place on it between the Highways Department and the owner of the property in an attempt to make amicable arrangements. This brings me to the point the Hon. Mr. Rowe has made tonight, that the negotiations go on and an admirable arrangement is made between the parties.

When this is done, an agreement is executed. If no agreement can be reached, a notice to treat is served and, if the matter goes to compulsory acquisition, the court makes a determination. That is what I was emphasizing when I spoke on the Bill the other day. I still say it will cause difficulties for the Highways Department.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has admitted tonight that this will be so as soon as the Bill operates. I will say again, if Sir Norman desires me to say it, that when I spoke the other day perhaps I was not absolutely correct in some of my statements.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You are doing very well.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If honourable members like to throw fishing lines about the Chamber, may I say I very often use very good bait, and I get some very good catches. If the Hon. Mr. Rowe thinks he is going to put me in that position tonight, he has another think coming.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall put the motion in the positive form: That amendments Nos. 1 and 7 to which the House of Assembly has disagreed be insisted upon.

The Committee divided on the question:

Ayes (3).—The Hons. R. C. DeGaris, G. J. Gilfillan, and C. R. Rowe (teller).

Noes (15).—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. A. Geddes, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, A. F. Kneebone, Sir Lyell McEwin, C. C. D. Octoman, F. J. Potter, Sir Arthur Rymill, A. J. Shard (teller), and C. R. Story.

Majority of 12 for the Noes.

Question thus negatived.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CONTRACTORS LICENSING BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 10. Page 3954.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill because I support the principle that people

who offer their services as electricians or electrical repair men should be competent in their field and should be licensed if the Government thinks they should be. I see absolutely no harm in this. Apparently, we must presume that the Government feels they should be licensed, because it referred to this matter in the policy speech delivered on behalf of the Australian Labor Party at the last election. It did not say much about it; it said only that it would bring in some legislation "for the licensing of electricians". I emphasize those words, because I support that principle; but I go no further.

When I say that I support the second reading it is not to say that I support all the provisions of this Bill, because it goes much further than the mere licensing of electricians. It is typical of the Government's approach that it always wants to go that extra distance. We have seen this happen in other legislation that has come before this Council this session. The Bill is too restrictive altogether, so much so that the simple jobs that have been done by home handymen for years are now to be prevented.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I think that is the crux of it.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, it is. I will give some illustrations in a few moments when I come to the actual terms of the Bill, because my contention is that this home electrical work that has been undertaken for many years and is now to be stopped does not cause trouble. Most of the troubles arise not in making electrical wiring connections but usually as the result of some ignorant person poking away at some electrical appliance with a piece of metal or something of that kind.

It is interesting to note that the Minister in his second reading explanation said there had been some 19 electrical fatalities in South Australia since 1960, which may be considered not a very large number of fatalities. But he went on to give some illustrations of a workman being killed in a country factory through an appliance not being earthed—a most important consideration. Then in a country town a woman was killed when using a washing machine wrongly connected, and a workman in another country town was killed because a power point had been incorrectly wired. The Minister in giving that information did not say how these faults arose. I guess that they probably all arose in cases where the appliances in question had been installed by somebody who was allegedly a competent workman.

I maintain there is no danger from electrical wiring and appliances if proper fuses are installed. Perhaps I should now do something I do not normally do—leap straight into the actual provisions of the Bill and give honourable members some examples of the sort of restrictions it imposes upon the community. Then I want to return to a general summing-up of the position. Clause 2 is the definition clause. In it "electrical installation" is defined. It goes so far as to say that it means:

> the whole or part of any appliance, wire, system of wiring, conduit pipe, switch, fittings, equipment, motor, apparatus or device wherever situated which (*a*) is intended or designed or adapted for the purpose of using or consuming . . . electricity.

It includes:

> any insulating or protective material or casing thereof.

That is a very wide definition. It also says that it deals with electricity in excess of 40 volts. It seems to me that this was put in for the reason that in country areas there are many units working on 32 volts and also to exclude motor cars, which are predominantly run on 12 volts, and in a few cases on six volts. But it seems to overlook the fact, particularly in connection with motor cars, that, as soon as the current reaches the induction coil, it is of course stepped up to thousands of volts. So, we have the situation that this Bill covers a tremendous amount of electrical work done on a motor car. We get the anomalous situation that a mechanic can play around with the generator, self-starter or voltage regulator (all intricate pieces of equipment) on a car but he cannot connect wires from the coil to the distributor or from the distributor to the spark plugs. That is a fantastic situation, but that is what the Bill restricts.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But it is still only 12 volts.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Who would want to fool around with a spark plug while the engine was running?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Mr. POTTER: I will deal with this later and show that because of this definition and other clauses the Bill will effectively prevent a mechanic from doing that sort of work. The main provision in the Bill is clause 7, which sets out what shall not be done. The main restrictive provision is paragraph (*a*), which provides that no person is to perform or carry out personally any electrical work or offer or

undertake to perform or carry out personally any such work unless he is licensed as an electrical worker in respect of that electrical work. Clause 7 (2) provides that no person shall, except with the consent of an electricity supply undertaking, make any connection with wires or by other means between an electrical installation (which means any appliance) and a source of electrical energy generated or supplied by that undertaking. This makes it perfectly clear that a person cannot even plug in any appliance to any socket: in fact, it goes even as far as saying that one cannot plug in a wireless set to listen to a programme.

Clause 9 sets out certain things declared to be not unlawful. It is interesting to note that it will not be unlawful for a person to replace any lamp or fuse not being a lamp or fuse belonging to an electricity supply undertaking. That is an interesting concession to the householder, but I am wondering whether replacing a fluorescent tube will be prohibited. I do not think that can be covered by the exemption.

There is a funny exemption in clause 9 (7), which provides that it shall not be unlawful for a person who carries on the trade or business of a builder or building contractor or the profession of an architect or any other trade, business or profession, the object of which is the rendering of services (other than electrical work) in connection with the erection, alteration or repairs of any structure, electrically operated machinery or plant to cause or arrange any electrical work to be performed or carried out if the work is performed or carried out by a licensed electrical worker or contractor. I do not know what is meant by "electrically operated machinery". It seems to me that a motor car could not be described as electrically operated machinery and so a master builder could not carry out work on a car; that is a peculiar exemption.

Clause 10 and 11 deal with licensing and provide that an advisory committee shall be set up. This is a nicely restricted committee, because it is not suggested that any of its members will be a representative of consumers. Right throughout the Bill nobody is worried about the consumer, who has no representation on the advisory committee.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: The Bill protects the consumer.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: But it seems to me to be unnecessary to have this committee. What will it do? Surely in this day and age the Electricity Trust and its officers are competent to decide what persons are fit to be licensed as electricians and to be held up to the members of the public as competent to do the work. I do not know if the committee is to be paid for its work or what advice it can possibly tender to a responsible body like the trust. If the committee is to be paid, I presume the cost will be borne not by the Government but by the trust. If we are to have an advisory committee, I can perhaps follow why certain representatives should be on it, but I do not see why the Minister of Education should be represented. Several times I have asked myself why he is to be a member. It seems to me that he is worried only about the training of apprentices, but that does not come within the ambit of this legislation. The funny thing about this committee is that after it has met and advised the trust (and I do not know what sort of advice it can give) it is not necessary for the trust to take any notice of it anyway, as clause 11 (3) provides that the trust shall not be bound to accept any advice given or recommendations made by it. For these reasons, it seems to me to be unnecessary to have this committee set up. The provisions contained in clauses 10 and 11 are unnecessary in a Bill of this nature.

Clause 12, which deals with the regulation-making powers of the Government, is important. In some respects, I should like to see some restriction on the operation of the legislation until the regulations come before Parliament or until we have some idea of what they propose. For instance, it seems to me that under (*d*) there can be provision in the regulations for the inspection and testing of any electrical installation, compulsorily or otherwise. If this were extended, it could be particularly onerous on the householder. Although on the face of it, it may seem all right, the actual provisions in the regulations may be extremely harsh. A person may be required to take appliances for inspection or to pay a fee in respect thereof, or his household privacy may be invaded.

I take into consideration that, in due course, all these regulations will come before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, which is particularly wide awake to look at any restrictive regulations. I have no doubt that that is an adequate safeguard in respect of the regulation-making power under the Bill. If, for instance, no person is permitted to carry out personally any electrical work on any appliance (and it must not be forgotten that this includes the cord or system of wiring or

insulating or protective material or casing) no-one in a house will be able to replace the frayed cord on an iron. An electrical contractor or licensed electrician must be found to do the work. There is nothing difficult about this work. All that is necessary to repair a frayed cord or to connect wires to the plug is to see that the green wire, the earth wire, goes to earth. If we are to restrict this sort of thing and say that we must not let people do it because they may hurt themselves, or because they may not do it properly, we may as well say that people must never change the wheels on their motor cars, because they may not tighten the nuts sufficiently. I think that is a fairly good analogy.

We must allow a little freedom to the ordinary competent householder in this day and age. What happens if a switch working an electric light in a house does not function? Surely any normal person wanting to look at the switch will first turn off the meter. If he does this, nothing he can do to that switch can do any harm. If he fiddles around with it and makes a bad connection, all that happens is that the light will not go on.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: He blows the fuse.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No possible harm can come to him in doing that. Instead of going down the street and buying a new switch for 45c or 50c and putting it in himself, as so many people are capable of doing, under this Bill he will have to employ an electrician to put in a new switch. He will have to pay for the switch and will have to pay about $4 for the services of an electrician, and he will have to wait until he can get an electrician to come.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This is provided that he puts the wires back in the right place.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: If he does not put them back in the right place, the light will not come on. He cannot do any harm to himself. I say that under this Bill the ordinary handyman cannot replace a radiator coil in his house. I am no handyman, but I can do that work. One only has to undo a couple of nuts, slide out the old coil, put a new one in and do up the nuts again. However, this will not be permitted. The law will be so restrictive under this Bill that, if it is passed in its present form, it will be a joke, and I do not think that this Parliament ought to consider legislation which will be a joke and which people will not observe.

I ask the Government what is the real purpose of the Bill. I have puzzled over this matter and it seems to me that, if the Government intends to license electricians, people who are holding themselves out to the public as being competent to perform electrical work, it is all right, but why does it want to go this extra step and provide all these restrictions? The only answer is that it wants to give more work to electricians. Incidentally, there is nothing in the Bill about licensed electricians, people who hold themselves out to the public as such, being required to accept full legal responsibility for their work, and I think there have been instances of people being injured by work performed by so-called competent tradesmen.

The other thing I object to about this restrictive Bill is that, if its purpose is to provide more work for electricians, and if it is necessary to have a licensed electrician to do all the simple jobs that a normal handyman can do, the cost of living in the community will be increased. I have spoken about this on other occasions and it seems to me that the Government is saddling the ordinary family man in our community with extra costs, and I oppose that principle strongly indeed.

I have said nothing about the long delays that can occur, but people have told me that although they have tried to get an electrician to do a job they have had to wait for as long as three weeks sometimes. If the Government wants to be so prohibitive and direct, why does it not stop abuse, if it considers there is any, by preventing shops from selling electrical parts? That seems to me to be the ultimate step. If the Bill had done that it would have got somewhere near the mark and it would have prevented people from doing this type of work in a house. I cannot think of any law on our Statute Book that is so restrictive. In my own profession, provided a fee is not charged, an amateur can make a will for a person. We have freedoms in our community, and we have no law on the Statute Book that is as restrictive as this one. If a man is competent to rewire his house, he is more likely to do a better job than perhaps a licensed electrician; after all, he is the one who has to worry about his life. Anybody who rewires his house and does it poorly will pay for it. No thoughtful person would attempt a job like that if he did not feel thoroughly competent to do it and was able to check his work. If a house is properly wired, I defy anyone to say that there is any harm. In any case, it must pass the Electricity Trust's inspector.

As I said earlier, I support the principle that is embodied in the Bill of licensing all persons who hold themselves out to the public

as being competent to do this work. These people can fairly be licensed, but it is important that we restrict the operation of the Bill to that factor. When we get into Committee I shall move some imporant alterations to provide that the restrictions contained in clause 7 shall be confined to persons who perform or carry out for reward any of this electrical work, and also persons who, for reward, make any permanent connection of wires to the source of an electrical installation. If this is included in the Bill many of the difficulties that have arisen in discussions on this measure, both inside and outside Parliament, will be removed.

Although supporting the Bill in principle, I cannot go along with the foolish and stupid restrictions that it imposes upon work that has been ordinarily done by the competent family handyman for many years. I support the second reading, but will endeavour to correct the position that arises under the restrictive clause 7.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have listened with interest to the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Potter. He touched on a number of points with which I entirely agree, and I am not going to repeat them. I was also interested in the opening remarks of the Minister when he said that this Bill had been introduced as a safety measure.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Does that mean the country people will be able to take risks, whereas the city man will not?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I understand that certain exemptions are proposed. If the Bill was introduced as a safety measure, why make it so restrictive? I do not know whether those automatically registered will be regarded as competent, because some installation work done by so-called electricians has not been efficient. Where does the apprentice come in? He cannot be licensed, as he has not been trained. Are we merely to have people who, on paper, have been declared to be efficient? This seems so inconsistent, with other trades and professions. We license chiropodists, but that doesn't stop me from cutting my own toenails. Surely there is something left for the individual to do. We license physiotherapists, but there is nothing to stop me from buying a bottle of embrocation, rubbing myself and feeling better tomorrow. If I rub down instead of up I do it to myself, and there is nothing to say I will be victimized. If I work the flow of blood away from the heart instead of towards it, and kill myself, I do it to myself. How silly can we get? If we need a safety measure we should have had it about 1920, when we had little knowledge of appliances above a 32-volt plant. Since those days we have spent millions on education, and nowadays people are growing up with electronics. In the field of radio, people have built their own transmission sets and masts and communicate with one another. They know more about electricity than half of the people who are qualified electricians. Under the Bill if a wire falls off a transmitter the people employed in radio cannot put it back but must ring for an electrician who would not be able to find his way around the studio. Honourable members may say that I am being extravagant but, if the position were not so ridiculous, I would not have to be extravagant in my examples.

If this Bill were confined to people doing work that might be dangerous to anybody, well and good. I would not want to get up and wire my house, because I am not competent to do it, but that is not to say that other competent people should not do it, if they comply with the requirements of the Electricity Trust. That body can hand the administrative work over to someone else. We do not know who will administer this legislation.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: If a man is competent he can get a licence under this Bill.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: But when will he be competent? How will an apprentice be competent? An apprentice may be employed in an electrical shop and if I take along a toaster to him (because I do not know how to put in a new element) it is an elementary job for an apprentice but he would not be licensed. Am I protected? When will he be proficient if he is not allowed to touch anything electrical? It is like the boy who is not allowed to go into the water until he can swim.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But this Bill does not do that as far as an apprentice is concerned.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: This Bill is too silly to do anything other than go to extremes. If it was a measure to ensure that when I went into a shop and made a purchase, I could be sure of its efficiency and the earthing and everything necessary in the house wiring was all right so that when I attached a lead to a power point the point would carry the load, that would be all right. However, I do not think this Bill stops me from putting in a fuse, which is probably one of the most dangerous things to do in the field

of electricity. If I put in an extra fuse and instead of having a five-amp fuse wire I have a 10-amp fuse wire on an installation that will not carry it, then it gets overheated and the next thing I know is that my house is on fire or somebody has had a shock.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: But the Bill allows you to do that, of course!

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes; that is how absurd it is. I know something about electricity because I started on 32 volts. I do not play around with 240 volts. I would not mind getting a shock from 32 volts but I would not take it from 240 volts. If I play around and take a risk, surely nobody can stop me? After all, we take risks every day on the highways and elsewhere. We cannot protect people from their own folly. How can the Government expect to police the the Bill? If it becomes law tomorrow, am I to stop putting a new flex into an adapter to plug into the wall to take a hot water jug, or even connecting a wire to a power point because I want a festoon of lights for a party, as people are doing all over the city all the time? I know that if I put over 1,000 watts on that switch, unless it has been specially wired, I am in danger.

I have even done a little projection work with a 16 mm. projector but I know that, if I want to operate two projectors to keep a continuous programme going and I have 750 watts on one machine and 500 watts on the other, if I put both of them on one plug I shall blow a fuse and the people will be left without entertainment and without light; everything will be a flop and I shall make a fool of myself—because often these things are done in a public hall and the caretaker would not be an electrician. That sort of thing can happen, but with no danger to anybody, because I blow a fuse. But, if I borrow a hairpin from one of the ladies present and put it into a fuse, so that everything will be ready for a continuous programme, what happens? I may do some extensive damage, but this Bill will not stop it.

We could not have a police force big enough to police the matter. I want things to be safe when I plug in an appliance—I have no objection to that at all—but, in that case, are there enough qualified people available to do these jobs? Some people who are efficient will be prevented under this legislation from doing the work if they are not licensed. I am all for safety, but not to the extent of there being a completely closed shop so that one cannot even maintain a circuit in one's own house if one is competent to do it. I can cite examples of this. We have enough restrictions under the legislation affecting plumbers. When I go home at the weekend and find something wrong with the plumbing, where can I find a plumber between 10 o'clock on Sunday and Monday morning? How do we function in our homes if the water is cut off? I have actually done the work in an emergency, and left everything open for inspection, and been asked whether I have done a plumber's course. It is too ridiculous to say that nobody can do that sort of job except somebody who is classed by some committee as qualified. The trust can delegate its powers to somebody. This is altogether too indefinite. It is said that other States have this type of legislation but, when I look at the accident figures, I find that South Australia without legislation holds its own very well as regards safety.

Much has been said about this Bill in another place. I should like to refer to radio and television stations, because the public is concerned about what happens there. People do not like to sit down in a room and find they have to sit in the dark, after having decided to spend the night watching television, because somebody cannot do something to television equipment that has gone wrong at the transmitting station and there is no programme.

This is the position as regards installations. Here are comments made by the chief engineers of all radio and television stations in South Australia:

The main power supply to broadcast and T.V. stations is made to a main switchboard. This is supplied by E.T.S.A.

It is all right so far. Then:

Power is then distributed to subsidiary boards in various places about the station. There is no objection to the installation of these subsidiary boards by a registered electrician. Beyond the subsidiary boards stations are required constantly to vary loads and circuits. This is often required on the spur of the moment to meet an emergency to cope with power failures, equipment failures and variations in programmes.

These are competent people with proper qualifications. Then:

We consider that the installation and maintenance of broadcasting and television equipment should be exempt from the provisions of the Bill.

It may be said that exemptions can be given by regulation, but we are often confronted with legislation that is all-embracing and takes in everyone, and we are promised that anyone

who matters will be exempted. I think we can do better than that in drafting, and in saying that I am not blaming the Parliamentary Draftsman, who is obviously drafting according to instructions. Perhaps I am getting unduly suspicious, but I am wondering whether this legislation is to stop the intrusion of electricians from Victoria who tender for contracts in South Australia. I do not suggest that that is so, but it may be. When controls are introduced costs go up immediately because there are closed corporations and only particular people can do certain work. It may be that because of similar legislation in other States interstate people can do so well in their home States that they can cut prices here. Provided that their work is efficient, I do not see that we are the losers, because costs are important to the employment position in this State. I will continue to give the opinions of engineers:

In the operation of a broadcast or television station highly sophisticated equipment is in constant use, the electrical standards of which are controlled by the Commonwealth Government through the instrumentality of the Broadcast Control Board and the Postmaster-General's Department. In order to comply with changing and higher standards of equipment, frequent alterations are required and new equipment is evolved and constructed. The equipment of stations requires constant maintenance. The technicians carrying out this work hold higher qualifications than electricians dealing with house and factory installations. Their basic training includes the above work and goes on to cover the operation, construction and maintenance of highly complex electronic devices. The basic syllabus of their training embraces (*a*) a knowledge of the general principles of electricity and of radio technology and of all the electrical and wireless telephony equipment used by broadcasting stations; (*b*) a practical knowledge of all the working and adjustment of all apparatus normally used by broadcasting stations; and (*c*) the ability to adjust and carry out repairs to the apparatus referred to in paragraph (*b*). On completing this training and passing a theoretical and practical examination set by the Postmaster-General a certificate is issued as a qualification. An employee of the Postmaster-General operating, repairing or maintaining the equipment of an A.B.C. radio or television station is exempted but an employee of commercial radio or television with equal or higher qualifications is not. It is understood that the radio and television technicians in other States are completely or substantially exempted under similar legislation.

That is subject to verification, but it is the information I have been given. Some exemption should apply in relation to the Flying Doctor Service, which has a system for receiving and transmitting radio signals. I suppose we will be told that people using this apparatus will be exempted, but surely it cannot be said that it is all right for people living in the outback to be electrocuted but that people living in the city must be restricted. The whole measure is over-restrictive.

It has been said that the Bill has been introduced for safety purposes, and I favour anything that will bring about safety, but I would not do many of the things that have been suggested. For instance, I would not carry out electrical work in the roof of a house. However, if I cut the flex on an electric lawnmower (which can easily happen) and survived that, I would not want to leave my lawn half cut because I was not permitted to reconnect the flex at a time when no electrician was available. I can see the Chief Secretary shaking his head, but that is what the legislation means. As he keeps me here for all hours of the day and night on three days a week, I can do this sort of work only on Sunday afternoons, when no tradesmen are available. I am not prepared to submit to this, and I will not ask anyone else to do so. If this measure is confined to dangerous installations, I can accept it. Members of the Wireless Institute of Australia should be exempted. The following are the aims of this institute:

The institute is established for the purpose of encouraging the scientific study of wireless telegraphy and telephony in Australasia and to promote the intercourse of those interested in the subject, and to aid them with advice and instruction.

That is a laudable ambition, and I will not do anything to affect adversely these people who have done so much to assist progress in electronics. I do not think they should be restricted. I think this legislation will invite abuse. Nobody will accept it. There will still be as many accidents, as is proved by figures I have. I am not going to weary the Council by reading them, but they show that our results compare favourably and that accidents are not always happening to people who do not know anything about electricity but to qualified people who get a little careless. It is a normal accident risk.

Where licensing is in operation, there is no better result as far as safety is concerned than we have here. Consequently, I am not prepared to accept the limits to which this Bill goes but am prepared to consider anything reasonable.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES AND BUILDING SOCIETIES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 10. Page 3944.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I shall be brief in connection with this Bill, which will enable finance to be made available through friendly societies to enable them to increase loans from £200 to £500 for the purpose of house building. I think everybody would be anxious to support anything that would assist in providing housing for the people. The Minister explained the Bill freely and candidly but there is one thing in it that I regret. The Bill amends two Acts, the Friendly Societies Act and the Building Societies Act, to permit friendly societies to make loans from their funds for building purposes, and the rate mentioned is 4 per cent flat. As far as my inquiries go, 4 per cent flat represents 8 per cent interest.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Less 1 per cent, isn't it? Isn't it double the amount, less 1 per cent?

The Hon Sir LYELL McEWIN: I am told that it is 8 per cent. Anyway, that does not destroy the point that, as far as housing loans are concerned, I think anything over 6 per cent is not an economic rate of interest, and that is confirmed by the many inquiries I have made. The reason why I say that is not merely that it is the opinion expressed by those experienced in house building in this State, but also because the Commonwealth Government, in regard to loans for house building, has made a 1 per cent discount on the bond interest rate. That shows that, in the Commonwealth Government's opinion, cheap money is essential to provide housing for the people.

I go further and point out that the Housing Range Insurance Corporation, which is a new institution created for housing purposes and which is a high-powered insurance company, has provided a maximum of 7¼ per cent interest. I understand that this body guarantees housing loans. A percentage of the mortgage is paid and the organization guarantees money lent for house building. A person can go to the institution and insure a mortgage at a premium. I do not know the rate of premium, but it is certainly not an imposition on the borrower.

This organization, which is composed of people experienced in finance and in dealing with mortgages and loans, will only accept a maximum rate of 7¼ per cent. I understand that the chairman is Sir Ernest Ayers. He was general manager of the Commonwealth Bank in Adelaide and later manager of the Reserve Bank in Melbourne, so this is not an amateur organization. The chairman is a man of experience. This organization has come to the decision I have mentioned in the light of higher rates of interest applicable in the Eastern States than we have here.

For many years South Australia has given a high priority to house building at a minimum of cost. There is no need for me to repeat why. It is only one of the matters that enable South Australia to compete with other States in industry and cost. This 7¼ per cent is not based on interest rates in South Australia, but on higher interest rates in other States. Therefore, I think that the 4 per cent rate provided in this Bill is not a real answer to our housing problem. I point this out because I would not like to be a borrower purchasing a house under these conditions.

I am not opposing the Bill; I am supporting it, because there is nothing better offering, but I am pointing out that whoever is providing the finance is not providing opportunities that we would desire to supply more houses at an economic interest rate. I make those comments because I think they are necessary in the light of experience and practice as far as house building and the provision of housing in South Australia are concerned.

The whole basis of operations of the Housing Trust is to provide the best possible houses at the lowest possible rate and I consider that what is offering under this legislation is not something that will provide good housing at an economic interest rate for the people of South Australia. However, for those who go into it with their eyes open, that is their business, not mine, but I qualify my support for this Bill because I think that the rate of interest is too high.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.21 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, February 16, at 2.15 p.m.