

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 6, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

TROTTING.

Mr. RODDA: I have been reliably informed that the Government intends to take action on the control of trotting in this State and, indeed, trotting authorities have informed me that the Premier has obtained a report on this matter. Will the Premier now say what action, if any, the Government intends to take in this respect?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Originally my attention was drawn to certain increases proposed by the trotting league. I referred the matter to the Prices Commissioner, whose report concludes:

(1) The inquiry showed that the increased revenue from the increased fees is required by the trotting league to meet increased costs and make some provision for foreseeable contingencies in the near future.

(2) It became evident throughout the inquiry that, as between the Wayville Trotting Club and the league, the increased fees were a relatively minor matter; the real issue, and one which remains the main objective of the Wayville Trotting Club, is the control of trotting in South Australia.

Under the existing legislation, the full trotting league and the executive committee are so constituted that the Wayville Trotting Club is at a numerical disadvantage and can always be outvoted on any issue. Whether the present system of control is in the best interests of trotting in this State, or whether it is unfair to the Wayville Trotting Club, is beyond the scope of this inquiry, but it would appear that the considerable ill-feeling between the various groups cannot be in the best interests of the sport.

As a result of those conclusions, I reported on the seriousness of the matter to Cabinet, and I considered that, unless we could do something to curb this sort of thing, it would be unfair to the public generally. It is now intended to appoint a committee comprising two representatives of country trotting interests, two of the Wayville club, and an independent chairman. That committee will, of course, report to Cabinet. The terms of reference will be as follows:

To inquire into and report to Cabinet on all aspects of, and matters relevant to, the organization, administration, management and control of the sport of trotting in South Australia, and to make such recommendations for the reform and improvement thereof where necessary by the passing, making or amend-

ment of legislation rules or regulations, or otherwise howsoever, as the committee shall deem proper having regard to the evidence.

It is expected that the committee will make recommendations to Cabinet. Whatever its findings, I will present them to Parliament.

DROUGHT RELIEF.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: During the debate on the Estimates I asked the Minister of Agriculture the extent of drought relief that had been given by the Government. Has he a report?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The total consignments of gift fodder to October 4, 1965, were as follows:

	Bales
Marree	2,914
Oodnadatta	1,328
Lyndhurst	618
Kingoonya	1,250
Stirling North	200
Total	6,310

A further 650 bales of hay for Marree and 350 bales for Oodnadatta are now being obtained by the Stockowners' Association from Mundalla, and the association hopes to be able to obtain a further 1,200 bales from there for transport to Marree. It is estimated that the total cost involved in freight charges will be at least £1,700. Further expenditure from the allocation in respect of transport of gift fodder depends on demand from pastoralists desiring to shift starving stock from drought areas, and the availability of hay donated through the Stockowners' Association. I am informed that there was some delay in the last consignment of hay reaching Marree. After being involved in the rail strike at Taillem Bend, it reached Port Pirie, where there was a big accumulation of trucks. However, supported by my department, the Secretary of the Stockowners' Association, which handles the distribution of this hay, made representations to the railways office at Port Pirie so that the consignment could receive the necessary urgent attention.

GOLDEN GROVE BUS SERVICE.

Mrs. BYRNE: In May this year, I forwarded a petition to the Education Department from Golden Grove parents requesting the provision of a school bus to Modbury, which request was granted. Tenders were called for a bus service to operate over the following seven-mile route:

From north section 5660, hundred of Yatala, via Golden Grove school site and main road to Modbury Primary and High Schools.

No tender was received and no departmental bus was available. I was informed that some departmental buses were being built and that a vehicle was expected to be available early in October. Will the Minister of Education say whether a departmental bus has now been made available?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A departmental bus to transport children living in the Golden Grove area three or more miles from the Modbury Primary and High Schools commenced operation on Monday of this week.

WITERA BASIN.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Following a question I asked yesterday of the Minister of Works concerning the Witera Basin, can the Minister say whether drilling for water has been carried out by Government departments on Eyre Peninsula in any areas other than the Uley, Polda and Witera Basins? If so, what were the results (if any) and where were the tests made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I believe that some work has been done, but to what extent and with what result I am unable to say at the moment. I will obtain a full report for the honourable member by next week.

BAROSSA CANNERIES.

Mr. CURREN: On Thursday, September 29, I asked the Premier whether the Government had investigated the likelihood of further payments being made by Barossa Canneries Limited in respect of fruit supplied by growers during the 1958 season. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is most unlikely that any funds will be available for unsecured creditors from this company.

ELIZABETH OCCUPATION CENTRE.

Mr. HALL: During the debate on the Loan Estimates I asked the Minister of Education a question regarding a new occupation centre for Elizabeth. Several children from my district attend that centre. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Work on the new occupation centre at Elizabeth is expected to commence early in November of this year and to take about four to five months to complete. The centre will be occupied as soon as it is completed.

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY.

Mr. HUGHES: Last week I asked the Premier a question regarding the amalgamation of the motor vehicle manufacturing firms of Rootes (Australia) Limited and Chrysler (Aus-

tralia) Limited. I asked the Premier whether he would inquire about the possibility of a section of this industry being established at Wallaroo. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The information I have here is of little real value to the honourable member. The General Manager of Chrysler (Australia) Limited (Mr. Brown) is at present visiting Detroit, and the Acting General Manager is unable to answer this question. As soon as Mr. Brown returns from overseas, the matter will again be referred to him for consideration.

GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines, a report on the question I asked recently concerning natural gas?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have received the following reply from my colleague:

As reported in the press, the Delhi-Santos Nappacoongee No. 1 well tested over the interval 6165-6225 a flow of 175,000 cub. ft. of gas per day, and recovered 630ft. of gas cut water in the pipe. In the past it has been left to the operators to make prompt press releases of information from wells in progress without public comment from the Government's technical advisers. It is recommended this practice continue, provided, of course, full and reliable information is promptly made public.

PORT RIVER FISH.

Mr. HURST: On September 16 I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding dead fish in the Port River. Has he a reply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The upper reaches of the Port River, and, in particular, the area which contains major port facilities, is an area which supports probably a small population of resident marine fauna. From time to time, estuarine and oceanic fish species find their way to the area. The existing environment in the port area has little relationship to that which existed prior to port development. It is obvious that some fish fauna have adapted themselves to the changed environment. However, fish moving up the river from river flats downstream or from the open sea probably find environmental conditions quite unsuitable. If they cannot easily return downstream then they will die. The waters of a confined port area such as that at Port Adelaide can be subject to considerable chemical and physical changes, for example increased salinity, sharp changes in water temperature, etc. Also even a small amount of pollution in such waters can have a much greater effect

than in expansive waters where tides and stream flow can reduce its effects.

At this stage it would be impossible to determine the actual cause or causes of the deaths referred to by the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst). These occurrences must be accepted in the upper Port River. To investigate the cause of death could involve considerable expenditure and even if a precise cause could be established it would probably be impossible to introduce control measures unless it was demonstrated that the cause of death was pollution in some form or other. The area concerned is of no real significance from a fisheries point of view and, whilst it may be regretted that a number of fish do die from time to time, this must be expected because of the nature of the environment and the fact that the prime use of the river in this area is the provision of port facilities for large ocean-going vessels.

COUNTRY ROADS.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Minister of Education a reply from the Minister of Roads to my question of September 14 about the use of local labour by district councils on roadworks in council areas?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that hire trucks used by bitumen spraying gangs may originate from any town within the northern district, or, for that matter, anywhere within the State. The same trucks are, in general, retained by the works foreman from year to year, as these truck owners have acquired experience in this type of work. They may also have had attachments fitted to their trucks for towing rotary brooms, fitting cockerel spreaders, etc. It is therefore not departmental policy to change truck owner personnel, depending on the district in which they happen to be working at the time. The gang in question is now operating at Terowie where it has some three months' work. Following completion of this work it may be moved anywhere within the northern district.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask you, Sir, a question. I am prompted to ask it by the Tenth Report of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation (listing regulations, etc., on which it recommends that no action be taken), which has just been laid on the table by the Chairman of the committee, the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee). You, Sir, may remember that yesterday you prevented the member for Port Pirie from answering a question I asked him about the Notice Paper and

the marking, on the list of papers, of those about which no recommendation for disallowance was to be made. You, yourself, in answering the question said that our Notice Paper was correct, but you did not explain the disparity between the two Notice Papers. I wonder whether you can now explain the reason for the disparity between the two, and (more important still, because of the confusion that is being caused outside Parliament by this disparity)—

Mr. McKee: You are the only one who is confused, and that is understandable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No I am not. Someone not in Parliament is confused and spoke to me about it. I wonder whether you, Sir, would make representations to the President of the Legislative Council to see whether it would be possible to get some uniformity in this matter.

The SPEAKER: On request, the Subordinate Legislation Committee has agreed to notify the House, as it has been notified today, whenever a decision has been reached to take no action on subordinate legislation referred to it. So that honourable members may be fully informed of the decisions of the committee, in each case where a by-law or regulation has been considered and no action recommended, that is shown by an asterisk on the Notice Paper. I am not quite clear about the situation obtaining in regard to the Notice Paper in another place. That does not come under our jurisdiction, but I understand the procedure in that place is merely to mark papers in respect of which reports have been tabled there. These asterisks are kept up to date, and appear as soon as the table has been informed that a report is being presented to the House, as in the case here this afternoon. I shall draw the honourable member's remarks to the attention of the President of the Legislative Council, but I think the honourable member will find that that is the correct explanation. Again, I assure the honourable member that the House of Assembly Notice Paper is strictly in order, and I take the opportunity at this stage to say that we hope to present recommendations shortly concerning amendments to Standing Orders in respect of this and other matters.

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply from the Minister of Local Government to my recent question concerning the appointment of a metropolitan drainage board?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The question of the setting up of a metropolitan drainage

board has been referred to Cabinet and, as it would necessitate legislative action, Cabinet is now considering the whole matter.

BOTANIC GARDENS ANNEXE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question concerning an annexe to the Botanic Gardens that is being established at Mount Lofty?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The development of the Mount Lofty annexe of the Botanic Gardens is necessarily a long-term project, since it has involved the establishment of a wide variety of plants including trees which naturally take a considerable time to reach a stage at which they will interest the public. In addition, the board of governors plans the establishment of facilities that are required when the public is admitted. Because of these two factors, it is not considered that the Mount Lofty annexe will be ready for opening for some years.

CAMPBELLTOWN SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the Campbelltown Boys Technical High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports:

On August 3, 1965, the Public Works Standing Committee recommended the construction of a boys technical high school at Campbelltown at an estimated cost of £315,000. It is intended that detailed design will proceed during the current year 1965-66. The letting of a contract will depend on the availability of funds and the priority placed on the work in the following year.

SALE OF GOODS LEGISLATION.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: As the Attorney-General knows, each State of the Commonwealth has its own Sale of Goods Act. I believe that last year the Law Council of Australia considered the desirability of seeking uniform legislation in respect of this matter. Can the Attorney-General say whether any conferences of State Attorneys-General have considered this matter and, if they have, whether it is intended to try to achieve uniformity in this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter has been considered by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, which, early this year, was presented with a lengthy paper which had been prepared by research officers in New South Wales and which was designed to show the necessity for a complete revision of the sale of goods legislation to depart from the previously existing standards of *caveat emptor*, which is contained in the legislation in respect

of consumer protection. After that paper had been examined, it was decided that much work needed to be done, and it was arranged that the New South Wales Attorney-General's Department, which has a number of research officers, would proceed with a research project, with a view to preparing a uniform Bill. It is not expected that that proposal will be ready for another 18 months or so. In the meantime, the committee agreed on a questionnaire to be sent to all persons interested in sale of goods legislation. That questionnaire has been prepared, and is currently being sent out.

WATER STORAGEES.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works say how much water is at present held in the reservoirs?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Dealing with metropolitan reservoirs, namely, Mount Bold, Happy Valley, Clarendon Weir, Myponga, Millbrook, Hope Valley, and Thorndon Park, the storage at this time last year was 23,220,000,000 gallons. This week it was 16,477,000,000 gallons. The intake for the week to October 4, 1965, at 8.30 a.m., was 411,000,000 gallons, and consumption was 386,000,000 gallons, including losses by evaporation, 42,000,000 gallons, making a total loss from consumption and other losses of 428,000,000 gallons. Losses by consumption and evaporation slightly exceeded the intake.

Mr. Clark: Over what period was that?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: One week. It was suggested that a panic existed in regard to water storages, but I assure honourable members that there is no need for that panic. We shall be able to continue pumping, although we should appreciate consumers' ensuring that water is not wasted.

TEACHING.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the preface to the booklet *Teaching In South Australia*?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member raised the question of the phrasing in this book, and the extract quoted in Parliament read:

Rapid changes are also taking place within the teaching service itself and there are new opportunities and new changes for the best men and minds to be used to capacity.

I promised to have a look at this matter, and the words that concerned the honourable member were "best men and minds". I point out that, as most people would be aware, "men" is the generic term for the whole of the species

of *homo sapiens* and, of course, no distinction between the sexes was intended or implied, and certainly no affront to women in general or women teachers in particular was intended. My advisers thought that "men and minds" was a good turn of phrase, alliterative and meaningful. If "men" was intended to refer only to the males of the species then, of course, "minds" surely must refer to the female of the species—and this might be construed as an affront to men in general and men teachers in particular.

I should point out that this Government has done much to recognize the work done by women teachers. Our appreciation is at least tangible since we have taken action to institute equal pay for women and men teachers and are taking action to remove the disabilities previously experienced by women teachers on marriage. Although we cannot remove this blemish on our escutcheon on this occasion, I point out that great care has been taken over the photographs in the publication. Discounting the likeness of the Minister and the Director, whose genders are unalterable, there are 13 photographs in the booklet; the fair sex have four of these photographs completely to themselves, and they appear in seven of the 13 photographs—surely a more than even allocation. In addition, it should be noted that, in order to preserve real decorum, of the 28 persons depicted in all the photographs 14 are female and 14 male.

SHEPHERDS HILL ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education, on behalf of the Minister of Roads, a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the Shepherds Hill Road?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the roadway between Melton Street and Viaduct Road is being constructed to a width of 53ft. compared with a width of 55ft. between Brighton Parade and Melton Street. The width of the roadway west of Viaduct Road will be 62ft., where land acquisition makes this possible, thence 48ft. towards the South Road. The slight narrowing between Melton Street and Viaduct Road is to avoid removing a large clump of trees and shrubs.

FESTIVAL OF MUSIC.

Mr. CLARK: This year, because of other engagements, I was unfortunately denied the pleasure of attending the annual Festival of Music presented by students from schools in the metropolitan area and farther out. I have been told by other honourable members

that the festival was just as good as usual, which is very good indeed. I do not know whether it has ever been done, but I am sure that if this beautiful concert were put on television tape there would be no trouble in having one of the television stations telecast it, and it would be of great entertainment value and interest to people who normally cannot attend the concert, particularly many country people. Will the Minister of Education investigate this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall have much pleasure in investigating what I think is an excellent suggestion by the honourable member. I attended one evening of the festival, and I greatly appreciated the tremendous work done by those who trained the students and the excellent performances of the students themselves. I think that this reflects great credit on all concerned. I am sure that country people would be pleased to have an opportunity to see more of this concert if the honourable member's suggestion could be acted on.

ELECTRICITY ACCOUNTS.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding the collection of Electricity Trust accounts at Savings Bank agencies?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Savings Bank of South Australia is authorized to collect accounts on behalf of the trust at all of its branches throughout the State. Because of administrative problems involved, it is not feasible to extend this facility to bank agencies that are not manned by bank officers.

STRATHALBYN ROAD.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question regarding East Terrace, Strathalbyn?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the specification for this job will be typed next week, and that tenders are expected to be called within three weeks.

SIMULTANEOUS DEATH BILL.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make better provision in respect of the devolution of property in cases of simultaneous death. Read a first time.

Mr. SHANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank honourable members for their courtesy in granting me permission to explain the Bill this afternoon. The Bill is of some importance, and will require examination by any member interested. I extend my thanks to the Premier who, I think, was responsible for securing agreement so that I could explain the Bill today. I wish to outline the reasons for such legislation in the times now being enjoyed in our society. Our society has become accustomed to moving with speed, and speed is one of the major killers in practically any form of transport. The faster one travels the more certain one is to have a fatal accident. Unhappily our roads are proving one of the big hazards these days. Although air travel does not appear to be anywhere near as lethal, nevertheless there are occasions when some unfortunate occurrence in air travel brings about the almost certain death of a number of people. The problem that arises in administering the estates of people so killed arises only when there is a doubt as to the time factor in the deaths of certain people. In the case of the deaths of people interested in the same estate the administrators must of necessity have certain knowledge as to which estate should be administered.

This doubt has been resolved for many years in the old country. I do not propose to give a lengthy account of the various stages of this particular form of legislation. I think it was first introduced in England in 1925. I have here a copy of *Halsbury's Laws of England* of 1950, which refers to certain amendments. I do not intend to weary the House with those, but they are available for members' investigations. I have done some research myself in this field, knowing that when we are starting in a new line of law it is wise that we should know all about other peoples' actions in this field. The simple rule, first adopted in England, is that it would be presumed that the younger of the two or more people who were so killed would be assumed to be the survivor. That is a simple rule and one that has been adopted practically everywhere where this law has operated. Its very simplicity, unhappily, has brought about certain complications, for problems arise when people not necessarily related but whose interests are closely allied die simultaneously. The effect in some cases on the administration under the law of the younger surviving could and did create great wrong to certain beneficiaries.

There have been a number of attempts by various authorities in Australia to overcome

this problem. South Australia is a laggard in this field and, as a member of Parliament, I must take my share of the blame for our lagging behind. Each one of our sister States has a law. The law I most favour after an examination from a layman's point virtually follows the law adopted in New Zealand. I point out that it does not exactly follow it. People whose business it is to administer estates and who have a practical approach to the problems that arise in various estates falling for administration have told me that my proposals virtually (although not exactly) follow the law adopted in New Zealand. That country made two fairly recent amendments, one in 1952 and another in 1958. I propose to quote brief extracts from the reports of the New Zealand Parliament of the speeches of the Prime Minister (Mr. Nash), the Attorney-General, and other members. Certain problems still arose after the 1952 amendment.

In the Australian field Queensland had this legislation in operation by amendments dating from 1942 onwards: New South Wales from 1919 onwards: Victoria from 1925 (Victoria made a small amendment in 1958); Tasmania first had this law in 1921; and Western Australia has also had this law on the Statute book for some time and amended it in 1960. I think that is some evidence of the need for South Australia to take action. I do not think any further argument is required on the question of the necessity for a Bill such as this. Of course, this House must take the responsibility for the form of the Bill. Any person who brings legislation forward in a field where the State has not previously ventured must of necessity expect to have it carefully examined, and I expect that to happen. In the course of the debate in New Zealand, Mr. Nash said:

The present and the new proposed provisions as to the devolution of property in a case of simultaneous deaths have been explained by the Attorney-General when the Simultaneous Deaths Bill was debated recently in the House. In order to explain this clause I will briefly again state the position.

He goes on to state what his Attorney-General (Hon. H. G. R. Mason) said. I will summarize this because I do not think any member is interested in reading the full debate. Mr. Mason said that the central principle of the arrangement embodied in the Bill is that the property of each is administered as if the other had died first. That appears to be a more rational arrangement and one that gives rise to less difficulty. This is not confined to husband and wife, but it is easier to consider

the case of a husband and wife, and so, if it could not be said which survived the other, the husband's property is disposed of as though his wife is already dead and the wife's property is disposed of as though her husband is already dead. That is the central theme of the 1958 amendment made in New Zealand. Mr. Harker, an Opposition member, supported the Bill. Speaking of section 27 of the Property Law Act of 1952 (which had been referred to in the debate), he said:

That second undoubtedly overcame a number of difficulties that practical experience had shown to arise, but in the intervening six years it has been found that it did not overcome them all . . . The Opposition supports this Bill, believing that it fills an existing gap in the law pertaining to the estates of deceased persons.

Before the Bill was introduced, it was carefully examined by the Law Revision Committee and later by the Statute Revision Committee of the New Zealand Parliament. Mr. Harker refers to both committees and supports their findings. I adopted the provisions of the New Zealand Act because it was closely examined by two expert committees; so we can be reassured in the light of New Zealand's experience in this field. Other than the provision relating to devolution of property in certain circumstances, for all other purposes the presumption of the survival of the younger applies. Many problems arise, however, as people, associated in a business undertaking and having no blood relationship, could be killed instantaneously by air accident, in which case proof of survival would be difficult to secure. Where proof is obtained that one or the other survived, this law does not apply.

This aspect need not be considered, as it is already covered. In the event of the simultaneous death of a husband and wife, the husband's estate is administered as if his wife had pre-deceased him, and then the wife's estate is administered as if her husband had pre-deceased her. Problems arise in respect of people who fail to make a will. One party may make a will and the other not do so, and the matter then becomes complicated.

It is less complicated if both parties fail to make a will. If one of the deceased has died intestate, this legislation attempts to do justice to the beneficiaries who will finally get their share of the estate, after considering the will that was made and the intestacy on the other side and bringing them together to arrive at a conclusion that is the nearest approach to justice for these people. Some people do not appoint a trustee; others appoint private individuals who pre-decease them so that the

trusteeship becomes invalid. These problems are dealt with in this Bill, which provides for the appropriate appointment of trustees. On the problem of defining "property" and "trustees" I accepted the New Zealand law. The definition of "property" appears in the Trustees Act of 1962 and the Simultaneous Deaths Act of 1960, but I have taken the 1962 definition, which states:

Property includes real and personal estate, and any estate, share and interest in any property real or personal, and in any debt and anything in action and any other rights or interests whether in possession or not.

My advisers inform me that that definition is the best one they have seen. Further, the definition of "trust" in the Trustees Act is a comprehensive and satisfactory one. I have accepted that definition as a guide. For the benefit of honourable members, I point out that the Western Australian Simultaneous Deaths Act is at page 369 of the 1960 volume of that State's Statutes. I have accepted the best legal and trustee advice that I could obtain, and I now leave the Bill to the House in the hope that it will receive favourable consideration and that at the appropriate time it will become law.

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

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for exemption of succession duties in certain cases of simultaneous deaths. Read a first time.

Mr. SHANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I have adopted the New Zealand law in this matter; taking into account the appropriate amendments. The Dominion of New Zealand is in complete command of the whole field of succession duties, whereas South Australia is not so blessed. Certain remissions apply in this State where hardship could be created. A 50 per cent remission applies in certain cases where death occurs within 12 months, and a progressive remission can apply in respect of a period over 12 months. The Bill provides relief in respect of an estate that would be sadly embarrassed by simultaneous deaths. In the event of the passing into law of the Simultaneous Deaths Act, 1965, the Bill will provide for remission of succession duty in multiple simultaneous deaths, so that such duty will be levied once only. In the simple case of a husband and wife dying together it

is reasonable that such a remission should occur.

Where a number of people are concerned, all having an interest in the same property, one could readily appreciate the unhappy lot if succession duty were levied on each in turn. This Bill adopts the present law in New Zealand. In the event of the passing into law of a Bill dealing with simultaneous deaths, it is proper that this corollary to that law should be added to our Statutes, so that justice will be extended to people who experience the sad happening of a number in their family dying simultaneously.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

M.T.T. FARES.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Coumbe:

That the by-law of the Municipal Tramways Trust, in respect of increases of fares, made on August 11, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on August 24, 1965, be disallowed.

(Continued from September 29. Page 1826.)

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): Most of the information that I desired to present to the House has, I think, already been presented. A study of a schedule of fare increases since 1929 shows that only one sectional fare for adults has increased to four times the 1929 fare. The remaining 11 sectional fares have increased to less than this extent, some being as low as 2½ times more than the 1929 fare. In the same period the basic wage has increased from £4 5s. 6d. to £15 3s. a week, that is, it is now almost four times as much as it was in 1929. On relative money values, therefore, the present fares are comparable with those existing in 1929. The last increase in the fare for the third section took place in 1959, when the fare was increased from 9d. to 1s. Later, when other fares were increased the third-section fare was not increased and, therefore, it is now increased to 1s. 6d. The fares for the fourth and fifth sections will remain at 1s. 6d., the same fare as for the third section. The fares for the sixth and seventh sections will rise from 1s. 6d. to 2s. In 1929 the fare for the third section was 4d., and it is now 1s. 6d.; the fare for the fourth section was 5d., which was increased to 1s. 6d. in 1964 (and that is the rate now); the fifth-section fare in 1929 was 6d., which was increased to 1s. 6d. in 1964 (and that is the rate now); the sixth-section fare, which was 7d. in 1929, remained at 1s. 6d. in 1964 and will now be increased to 2s.; and the seventh-section fare, which was 8d. in 1929, and which

was increased to 1s. 6d. in 1959, will now be increased to 2s. Admittedly there have been increases but the children's and pensioner's concession fares will be the same—6d. for the third section.

Service pay for employees of the Tramways Trust has increased. Prior to July 1, 1965, all daily and weekly-paid employees of the trust were in receipt of the service payment included in the appropriate award. After 10 years' service they received 7s. 6d. a week margin and, after each additional five years, the margin was increased by 3s. 6d., with a maximum of 32s. over a period extending for 45 years. From July 1 this year the daily and weekly paid employees of the trust have received a similar service payment to that paid to all Government employees in the same type of employment from January 1 this year. It is 10s. after the completion of the first year, 17s. 6d. after the completion of the second year, and 25s. a week for the third year and subsequent years thereafter. Therefore, trust employees will be on the same basis as similar employees in other fields.

The Government cannot say to any organization that it should continue with an £800,000 deficit, which the trust had. As a result of action by the previous Government, a new board was set up for the management and control of prices. Now the deficit has been reduced to a negligible amount; I believe the provision in this year's Budget was for only £10,000. However, even with these increases there is still doubt whether the trust will show sufficient return over and above actual costs. Therefore, in fairness to the board, the Government has accepted the recommendation on this occasion and the increased fares are now operating. If these increases were not allowed it would mean that many taxpayers in the State would be subsidizing Tramways Trust fares for the third, sixth and seventh sections.

The trust must provide the best service possible in the interests of the travelling public. I hope that it will carry more passengers, and that there will be more intra-city communication. I cannot say where such a service would operate but I am sure that many members of the travelling public would patronize it. The trust has only one form of income and depends entirely for any success on the travelling public patronizing its services. Therefore, the more passengers that the trust can carry the greater advantage it will gain economically. A great many motor cars are left to stand all day within the one-section areas served by the trust. The people who leave their cars there work

in the city. I believe that there is potential for greater patronage of the trust's services. I think that the member for Torrens would admit deep down that the board administering the trust has done an excellent job. I think we should allow the board to continue to do its job and not attempt to knock its efforts over in the manner suggested. The Government opposes the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the motion. The Premier has left me rather amazed by his remarks. I thought the idea of the Labor Party policy of higher wages was to provide a higher living standard for the working people, but now the Premier has tried to prove that, if wages go up, bus fares must go up in the same proportion. We get nothing then except inflation, and as a nation we cannot compete on the world's markets. The member for Semaphore has suggested that now the Labor Government is in charge the working people are working twice as hard. If that were so, however, one would think that possibly the Tramways Trust's costs would come down rather than go up. How much longer are we going to have this perpetual inflation? As the Premier said, wages have risen by almost 300 per cent, but in that time the quantity of goods available to the working people has increased by less than 30 per cent. I think that increase would be caused not by an increase in nominal wages but by better machinery and methods in the factory and on the farm.

I do not think the argument that fares must go up in the same proportion as wages is realistic in the case of the Tramways Trust, because over the years the trust has been reorganized. The trust has stated that diesel buses are much cheaper and more efficient than the electric trams they have displaced. In addition, the trust has been so assisted by the Government that more than £2,000,000 has been written off through the National Debt Redemption Fund, and each year it has been subsidized, by £30,000 in 1964 and by £10,000 this year. If the trust had to increase fares, I maintain that at this stage an increase in the subsidy to the trust would be the better way to do it, without further increasing our inflation. Also, the trust showed that it was going to write off its amortization plan over 50 years. However, last year it decided to reduce that period to 10 years, which meant that it wrote off £37,000 instead of the smaller amount of the year before.

It appears from its accounts that everything has been done to show that the trust

is in a more unfavourable position than it actually is. I belong to a section of the community that believes that, when we are not paying our way (and we do not have much control over what our revenue is), we must hop in and find other methods and ways to balance our budget. To a degree I think the Premier got on to this angle. There are far too many provisions for parking around the State. The city council will not allow parking on the park lands, but just about every road that goes through the park lands has been widened and provision has been made for parking at a cost to the public which has provided the money for the roads, and then the public is given free parking. I think some plan must be evolved whereby the public transport becomes more attractive. Everyone knows now that particularly in the off-peak hours it is necessary to wait 20 minutes for a bus, and people are not prepared to do that these days. It was suggested by one member recently that if time tables were displayed at each stopping place it would be a big help to the people wishing to use the public transport. I think the trust could introduce things such as that in an effort to improve its service. Last year the patronage of the trust's services declined by 3.65 per cent, following the increase in patronage of .92 per cent the previous year. That demonstrates that there is a figure beyond which one cannot go without losing passengers, losing revenue, and increasing the loss to the trust. I consider that the Government has not carried out its electioneering promises about living better with Labor. I think now that it is shown that, in just about every avenue of public usage of various things, costs are going up and it is getting dearer rather than cheaper to live with Labor.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I consider that we are dealing with a much more savage increase in costs than were the Housing Trust's proposed rent increases. These fare increases range from 30 per cent to 50 per cent over all the people who will be within the reach of bus services. I would have expected the Ministry to take similar steps to those it took regarding Housing Trust rents, in an effort to get the Municipal Tramways Trust back to something more reasonable in respect of its fares. There may be some justification for increased fares. The member for Stirling suggested that we should increase our subsidy to the trust rather than increase fares, and there is some justification for that approach. The use of motor transport today has made our city streets congested. This must have an

aggravating effect on people who want to drive their motor cars. Club riding, four to five to a car, is cheaper than paying the increased fares, but the result is that more money has to be spent on widening roads and providing parking facilities in the city. At the same time the trust is losing revenue. With increased fares the number of passengers must obviously be reduced with more motorists buying more fuel. Whereas, formerly 40 to 50 people could be carried in one bus, many cars now have to be used. We should encourage increased patronage of buses by keeping fares stable, and perhaps we could make additional money available to assist the trust in its operations. We have an efficient suburban transport system with buses running frequently.

I am surprised that the Government has permitted this steep increase in fares. Most people who have to pay these increases are employees travelling daily to and from work. These are the people toward whom the Government should have been sympathetic. It should have taken similar steps to those it took with regard to Housing Trust rents. If this by-law is disallowed, the Government will have an opportunity to do something. I hope that it influences the M.T.T. to introduce a scale of fares that is more in keeping with today's costs. Everything seems to be increasing in price, and this 50 per cent increase is steep, indeed. I support the motion and trust that the House will disallow the by-law so that justice can be done to a section of the people that needs it.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I, too, support the motion. These fare increases are not an answer to congestion in the city and to the problem of Tramways Trust costs. If one looks at motor cars entering and leaving the city on an arterial road when people are coming to and going from work, one notices that the greatest percentage of cars contain one person. Cars are parked everywhere in the city: some are left all day for no charge. By increasing the cost of bus fares the trust is forcing several people to travel in one motor vehicle, and this does not benefit the trust. We should consider breaking from established precedent about the cost of bus services. A scheme of charging an overall 6d. for a journey from anywhere to anywhere may help reduce car congestion and increase the trust's receipts. In 1917, one could travel the full length of Broadway for five cents, or travel one block for the same price. Admittedly there were fewer motor cars then than there are today, but that system was adopted.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It is 25 cents now.

Mr. QUIRKE: Perhaps, but it was an overall charge. I am not a traffic expert, but I noticed in today's newspaper that in Tokyo, all parking meters have been removed and cars have been banned from parking in certain areas. However, cheap public transport has been provided. It has been forecast there for a long time. I would envisage at, say, between 7.30 and 9.30 a.m. buses following closely on each other, travelling the full span of the metropolitan area on a circuitous route, and travelling through such city streets as North Terrace, Grenfell and Franklin Streets (excluding Waymouth Street because that is narrower than the others). I would suggest that a charge of 6d. be made for all passengers, regardless of where they board or alight the bus. At the same time, a ban should be placed on all-day parking in city streets, which would not, of course, prevent people from coming into the city in cars to shop. The only way to eliminate the congestion is to remove the cars.

Mr. McKee: How would people get to the pick-up point for the bus?

Mr. QUIRKE: In the same way as they do today. Many people nowadays park their cars at North Adelaide and around the park lands on the outskirts of the city, and walk into town. As the situation exists at present, an intolerable strain is being imposed on transport generally, and on many councils in having to provide for this unnecessary motor traffic. In off-peak periods buses could run at less frequent intervals. Until comparatively recently, Japan's motor vehicle congestion was no greater than ours is today. That country has adopted the practical solution of cheap transport. Indeed, to charge 6d. for public transport would encourage passengers. A friend of mine who was in the habit of parking his car near the city bridge before parking meters were installed walked from that point to Victoria Square, back to the car in the evening, and thence drove home. Twice a week he often attended a function in the city, and he would park his car in the same place and walk to the function. After 6 o'clock when free parking applied he would drive the car into Adelaide and park right alongside the theatre or wherever it was he was attending. He said to me, "What do you think of that?" and I said, "You ought to be certified."

The answer these days seems to be to build great ugly structures in the city to accommodate motor cars but a far cheaper method would be to keep them out of the city. Some structures could remain, but let us not think

for a moment that they could accommodate every motor car that at present travels into the city, often carrying only one passenger (the driver). It is wrong to think that the Tramways Trust can get over its financial difficulties merely by increasing fares, because such an increase will have the effect of reducing the number of people using the trust's vehicles. What I have advocated would mean that people could travel in buses in comfort at a negligible cost.

To travel to town from where I live previously cost 1s., and it now costs 1s. 6d. I admit that 6d. does not mean much to me, but it could mean much more to people on a meagre income, particularly young people who have to take the bus into the city each day for employment. It could mean 5s. a week in their case, and in respect of longer trips it could mean much more. The increases simply contribute to the spiralling of costs, when people find that they do not have sufficient money to meet their ordinary living costs, and when they justifiably ask for more money. I would entirely agree with a suggestion of obtaining experts to investigate the possibility of introducing a circuitous transport system of constantly moving vehicles for, say, two hours in the morning, extending from the farthest suburb on one side of the city to the other side. I do not put this suggestion forward as something infallible but I think something like it should be introduced to keep down the cost to the people and to increase the revenue of the Tramways Trust without increasing the cost to the people. Something like this could help prevent the upward spiral in prices.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PROHIBITION OF PREFERENCE AND DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 22. Page 1694.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill and see little reason why it should not be supported. No member who has opposed it has given any valid reason for his objections to its moderate provisions. It simply provides that any officer, delegate or member of an association shall not, by reason of that membership, enjoy preference when seeking employment. The Bill was introduced because of a Cabinet instruction issued to the Public Service. Its introduction was necessary to bring this matter before Parliament where

it should have been brought in the first place. The method of introducing preference to unionists in the Public Service was most objectionable and brought discredit upon the Government.

By now everybody is familiar with the words the Premier used in his policy speech. He made many statements, a number of which have been belied by events since the Government took office. One statement described the Labor Party's attitude before the election. The Premier said that the Labor Party had always been opposed to executive control and its reasoning was that it must give greater opportunities for the voice of the people to be heard in Parliament. That statement has been belied over and over again by the Government's actions but nowhere has it been belied more blatantly than in this instruction issued from Cabinet. The instruction was anything but the voice of the people speaking in Parliament. Headed "Preference to Unionists", it states:

Heads of departments are informed that Cabinet has decided that preference in obtaining employment shall be given to members of unions. Therefore, a non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to the exclusion of a well conducted unionist if that unionist is adequately experienced in and competent to perform the work. Cabinet also desires that, where possible, present employees who are not unionists be encouraged to join appropriate unions. It is intended that the provision of the instruction shall apply to all persons (other than juniors, graduates, etc., applying for employment on completing studies) seeking employment in any department and to all Government employees. It is not intended that this instruction should apply to the detriment of a person who produces evidence that he is a conscientious objector to union membership on religious grounds.

If ever there has been an example of executive government, that is it. We have often heard in this House members of the Government Party speak in favour of compulsory unionism and preference to unionists but as a rule they have not spoken in favour of introducing this by the back door. Indeed, most of the examples that I know of that provided for preference to unionists have been brought in through Parliament. When New South Wales dealt with this matter a Bill was introduced in the Parliament, and the Labor Government did not try to impose it without a full discussion in the Parliament. I would not have necessarily said that the New South Wales Labor Government was any more conscientious in regard to democratic principles than was the South Australian Government, but by the action to which I have referred the New

South Wales Labor Government showed that it had some regard to the ordinary democratic principles, about which the present South Australian Government was so fond of talking before the election, but which it has been ready to disregard so soon after the election. I consider that this is a most offensive action, and I will oppose it by supporting the Bill in its entirety.

The instruction was a damaging slur on the Public Service. We are happy that many public servants (probably a great majority) are members of either the Public Service Association or of one of many other unions concerned. If they wish to belong to unions we welcome their exercising their right to belong, but we strongly object to any action that compels them to belong. I know members opposite have often said that this principle is not compulsory unionism but only preference to unionists. Actually there is little or no difference. The most prolific writer in Australia on these matters is Foenander, and by no means would he be against the conduct of trade unions. I should say that he is an expert on trade unions and I am sure he would be quoted with acclamation by members opposite. He has said that the line of delimitation between compulsory unionism and absolute preference to unionists in employment is not always clearly distinguishable, and that is a perfectly accurate statement. His statement shows that there is no distinction between compulsory unionism and preference to unionists.

Mr. McKee: Do you support trade unionism?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I hear the member for Port Pirie interjecting. I do not know whether he has been told not to interject, but I presume that at the moment he is allowed to say something.

Mr. McKee: Do you support trade unionism?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I strongly believe that trade unionism is a good thing and that people who wish to join trade unions should be allowed to do so if they wish. If the honourable member asks me whether I support compulsory unionism or preference to unionists, the answer is most decidedly "No". Trade unions have done a magnificent job for the members of unions and in fact for the community generally, and I am an admirer of their work. In saying that, however, I do not believe that everything the trade unions want should be granted. One thing that I have noticed consistently is that trade unions ask for compulsory unionism and preference to unionists, or both, and that is a quarrel I

have with this action of the Government. That is why I support the Bill.

Why should the Public Service have this imposed on it? Our Public Service, as every Government member will admit, has a reputation for honesty and capability second to none in Australia. I have heard Government members make this statement and similar statements over and over again, yet apparently some new condition is to be imposed on a Public Service which has done such a magnificent job in the past and which has such a good record. It is to have imposed on it some rather measly compulsion which will to my mind be taken by many public servants as an insult to their intelligence and character.

Mr. McKee: Members of the Public Service support it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Members of the Public Service have loyally supported any Government in office. No Government member is prepared to get up and say that public servants have not supported this Government since it has been in office. The Public Service is now told that it must give preference to unionists. I think it is a shame that it is being treated in that way, and I think it is a most undeserved restriction. Most public servants would be members of either the association or a trade union, so why is it necessary to insist on this rather miserable restriction? I do not believe it is necessary even for the ends of the trade unions. I believe it will bring the trade union movement into a certain amount of discredit that they, through their Party in Parliament (as they claim so often) are trying to impose this restriction and, in doing so, to avoid a debate in Parliament while they do it.

Mr. Hall: It is class legislation—nothing else.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: They have done it by a backdoor method, and they hope to avoid discussing it. These members of the Government Party that admire public servants so much are willing to sell them down the river if it suits them. I do not say that members of the Housing Trust are members of the Public Service, although probably some of them are or have been. We have seen how quickly those officers have been denied in recent weeks by a Government which has broken new ground in that respect. This Government is prepared to dump its officers if it gets into a corner over any problem, and that is one thing that nobody charged the previous Government with doing: it stuck to its officers, and at the same time the officers of the Public Service gave it loyalty. This present Government is getting that loyalty

but it does not deserve it.—Not only has it sold its own officers down the river over housing rents, but we even had the Minister of Education getting up the other day and saying something about a political plot. The Minister in clear terms stated that, because of the political consciousness of the members of the Housing Trust, they must have connived with the previous Government. He did not use those exact words, but I think the member for Port Pirie, who jumped up just afterwards, used “conniving” or some equally strong word to describe what he suspected. To my mind that shows the hollowness of the attitude of this Government towards the Public Service. It is ready to dump the officers of the Public Service whose job it is to support it as a Government. I consider that is despicable. It is a charge that could not have been levelled at the previous Government. Why is it necessary to put this restriction upon the members of our Public Service?

A point that has not been mentioned in this debate is that preference to unionists applies also in respect of transfers. It would apply, for instance, where one member of the Public Service applied for another job within the Public Service. Under the Public Service Act he has the normal right to apply. His record is taken into consideration, as is his seniority. Of course, seniority is not always followed, although it is taken into account. Under the Public Service Act this officer would have the right of appeal under certain circumstances if he were senior to the person recommended. Are we now to assume that appeals will be disallowed merely because the person who gets the recommendation says, “Well, I am a member of a union, and the instruction to the Public Service is that preference to unionists shall be given”? It could mean that people who had worked in the Public Service for 40 years could be superseded by others who were not necessarily more efficient but who were unionists. I do not know the proportion of unionists within the Public Service or the proportion of people who are members of the Public Service Association, but I assume that it is a tremendously high proportion. On the other hand, although I have seen much of the Public Service I have never heard one claim within the service that preference to unionists should be introduced. This matter has come before Parliament only by the action of the member for Mitcham. The Government tried to introduce its idea by circumvention, but I am against that. Occasionally I have noticed that members of the Labor Party are aber-

rant: they seem to depart from logic and become heated over these matters. The members for Semaphore and Port Pirie made unreasonable statements; they became extremely heated and lost their powers of thought and reasoning. They argued matters on an emotional basis rather than by logic, and could not remove from their thoughts the idea that anyone not a unionist was a scab or a bludger on his mates.

Mr. Hurst: You have never heard that term used here yet.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The non-unionist in the Public Service now has the happy future of joining a union or the association, or failing to get promotion. He will have to run the gauntlet of the taunts that are being made in Parliament at present.

Mr. McKee: Do you agree that a non-unionist should not accept the privileges bought by his union workmates?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think that the honourable member is asking whether a non-unionist should accept benefits that have obviously been gained for him by union members. Anyone in a free society is free to enjoy conditions ruling at the time. Many unionists have never raised a finger for their mates or themselves in industrial matters; they have accepted what has come along. The only difference between them and non-unionists is that the member of the union pays a subscription, whereas the non-unionist does not. Many of them have done nothing. There is a more sinister aspect, particularly about subscriptions. Many unionists subscribe to unions that are affiliated with the Labor Party, and their subscription thereby helps the Labor Party campaign fund at election time. Anyone in the Public Service who is obliged to join—

Mr. Hurst: It does not. Make sure of your facts and do not make irresponsible statements.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: “Inanity corner” has woken up again, but honourable members opposite should wait until I finish the sentence. One is interrupted by eager people who stop one halfway through, and then say that one is wrong.

Mr. Jennings: We are waiting for you to start saying something.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Honourable members opposite are trying to say that the Public Service Association does not contribute to the Labor Party. I noticed the honourable member for Semaphore nod, so I am correct. That honourable member is hedging from the major question. Many members of unions are

employed by the Government and they contribute—

Mr. McKee: And are happy to contribute.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: —to the Labor Party campaign funds.

Mr. Hurst: Voluntarily!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That word is brought in to show that everybody is happy to do it. Members on this side know that this is complete rot: it is not voluntary in all cases. Many members of unions who, in effect, contribute to the Labor Party campaign funds do not vote for the Labor Party.

Mr. Hurst: Name one.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If I wanted to sentence a person to a fate worse than death, I could do so by giving the name and address of a union member who supports not the Labor Party but the Liberal Party. There are many of these people but, for good reasons, they do not give their names and addresses. I should not like to betray them.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you think they would be victimized?

Mr. Jennings: Do you think you are in Moscow?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: One does not have to go to Moscow to see evidence of intimidation. Anyone reading the speeches of Government members in this debate would have ample reason for keeping his name quiet, particularly if he supported the Liberal Party. Although the member for Semaphore would like me to give him a list, I would do nothing so dangerous. Every member on this side has ample evidence that what I have said happens and that many trade unionists support my Party. Yet they are contributing to the Labor Party, through these "voluntary" subscriptions. Does any one believe that this is voluntary? It would take outstanding courage, both moral and physical, to refuse to pay these subscriptions to Labor funds. Not only are people compelled to support the Labor Party financially through the unions (and compelled because they cannot be expected to stand up to the abuse that would come to them if they did not do it), but we know that when the Labor Party gets into Parliament it is still overborne by its masters up the street. Everyone on this side says that, but those on the other side deny it.

Mr. Millhouse: Apparently no-one is denying it now.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Labor Party takes order from outside Parliament. That is anything but democratic. The member

for Enfield knows that what I am saying is true.

Mr. McKee: You are endeavouring to get him to join the Adelaide Club. What chance has he, as a common man, of joining it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When the Opposition was in Government a Bill dealing with long service leave was introduced, and members of the then Opposition were instructed to oppose the Bill uncompromisingly. In rising to speak to the Bill, they were not even allowed to move amendments. They could only oppose every clause in the Bill. In fact, their judgment at times got the better of their instructions, and they even made suggestions, but they could not move amendments. That instruction was issued by the then President of the Labor Party (Mr. R. E. Bannister) who, at the time, announced that he had closely studied Parliamentary procedure before giving his ruling.

He was reported as saying, "In effect, this ruling means that Labor members must oppose the second reading of the Bill, and that in Committee they must not accept, nor must they seek, any amendments that provide for a Bill containing less than Labor's policy on long service leave." The report continued that they must also oppose the third reading. This is the democratic type of Government that we now have ruling this Parliament! When the occasion arises I presume it will take specific orders on whatever is at issue, just as it did previously. This is the Government that says, "We want the voice of the people to be heard through Parliament."

Mr. McKee: Who's responsible for the Legislative Council set-up?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Not only is the Government opposed to executive control but it avoided doing anything about preference to unionism by way of legislation. It brought it in by way of a Public Service circular, which was a Cabinet instruction. As one of my colleagues has said, it was brought in through the back door, and Government members hoped that no-one would know about it. When it was first brought to light by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) the Premier sought to keep the matter from publicity, and I think he said, in effect, "The honourable member would know more about this matter than I do."

Mr. McKee: Before you talk about dictatorial attitudes I suggest you put the Legislative Council system of voting in order.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Government that brags about wanting the voice of

the people heard through Parliament is the same Government which, instead of wishing to be heard by the people, brings in a Cabinet instruction that cuts the ground from under the feet of people in the Public Service who do not wish to join an association or union. To call the Premier's reply evasive is understating the situation. He did say he did not know anything about the matter, and it was only after the member for Mitcham returned to it the following week that a little more information was brought out (and brought out, incidentally, by the member for Mitcham who had to read the photostat circular of the Public Service Commissioner in which the Commissioner properly stated that it was a Cabinet instruction).

That is the famous democratic attitude adopted by the Party now in Government, which is so keen on speaking about democracy. After bragging about wishing to have the voice of the people heard through Parliament, the Government does everything it can to circumvent that procedure. What has been done is a slur against the loyal members who work for the Public Service and for the Government, generally. Those people have a wonderful record of service, about which members of the Government are only too happy to talk at times, and yet those employees are so much in need of correction that they must receive this instruction. Finally, I shall read the last paragraph of a journal well known to every honourable member (*Review of the Institute of Public Affairs of Victoria*). Members opposite are pleased to laugh at it, because they do not like what is written in it, but I think the paragraph that I shall quote is particularly apposite to this matter, and I entirely agree with it. The paragraph states:

The well-established and recognized authority of trade unions in industrial matters does not need the protection of compulsory unionism. The powerful union will derive little direct benefit from it. The interests of union members themselves will not be served. Many Australians will be coerced into providing financial support for a political organization with whose policies and programmes they may not agree. Compulsory unionism amounts, in effect, to an assault upon the freedom of the individual to make his own choice. It is contrary to well-established democratic principles, and has no place in a true democracy.

I support the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): After noticing the heat that was generated amongst some members of the Government by the member for Alexandra, I think it is evident that the Bill is being taken seriously by members

opposite. The Bill prohibits preference and discrimination in employment, and stems mainly from the Public Service Commissioner's industrial instruction No. 118, of July 19, 1965. Headed "Preference to Unionists", it contains the following interesting sentence:

Heads of departments are informed that Cabinet has decided that preference in obtaining employment shall be given to members of unions.

Following the issue of that instruction, the member for Mitcham has introduced a Bill that specifically sets out to ensure that no-one shall be subject to preference in respect of employment merely because he belongs to a union or an association. For the purpose of this Bill, "association" has a broad interpretation: it means any trade or other union, or branch of a union, or any association, society, or body composed of or representative of employees, or for furthering or protecting the interests of employees. "Employee" includes a person employed in any capacity in the Public Service of the State. Although, on the face of it, the industrial instruction does not refer to compulsory unionism, all members know that that interpretation must be placed on it, because people who are not members of a union most certainly will not be able to get employment if this instruction is strictly adhered to. Members opposite have made out cases for workers to join trade unions.

Mr. McKee: Unions look after them.

Mr. Hall: To the exclusion of others.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Members opposite have said that everyone should join a union because of the great benefits that trade unions have brought to workers. I do not cavil at that, and I doubt whether any member would dispute it. However, the Opposition maintains that, although workers should join unions, they should not necessarily be compelled to do so. The member for Ridley is the General Secretary of an active association that has made a great contribution on behalf of a certain class of citizen in South Australia. I am proud to be a member of that association, and I believe that a Minister in this place was an active member of that association at one stage of his career. Although I am a member of that association and appreciate the benefits that it has brought to me, to others of my vocation, and to the State as a whole, I should be the last to say that farmers should be compelled to join it. The whole trend of the argument by members opposite has been that union membership should be compulsory.

Mr. McKee: Would you agree that there is a difference between preference to unionists and compulsory unionism?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: When I commenced speaking, the member for Port Pirie had gone outside the Chamber, presumably to get a glass of water after becoming heated at the remarks of the previous speaker. Therefore, I assume that he did not hear what I said about preference. The South Australian Labor Party has made important departures in respect of compulsion. During the First and Second World Wars, and again during the Korean War, Australians went overseas to fight for Australia, and no-one can deny that what they did benefited all Australians greatly. However, I do not think many members opposite would say that military service overseas should be compulsory. In fact, they would be voluble in their argument against it, despite the great benefits to be derived by all Australians from this service.

Mr. Casey: What has that go to do with this question?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: To me the two are parallel: I cannot see how there can be compulsion for Australians at home but no compulsion to send Australians overseas as servicemen. All members know that there must be some compulsion in certain matters and that citizens cannot be allowed absolute freedom in everything. Some Acts of Parliament, such as the Food and Drugs Act, are framed to protect society, and are accepted as being necessary in society. Article 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states:

Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

Of course, civil society would not be possible if every person were compelled to be a solitary individual. Article 20 continues:

No-one may be compelled to belong to an association.

In this context "association" means a religious sect, a political party or an occupational organization. Although he had passed away when the Declaration of Human Rights was finally prepared, President Roosevelt made a great contribution to its compilation. That great Democrat commanded the allegiance and respect of the American Labor movement. I understand that the American Labor movement was largely responsible for his election as President of the United States. The important philosophy of the President in connection with trade unions was that he opposed compulsory unionism and a closed shop system. Above all,

he supported the principle of freedom, including freedom in trade unions.

I always take a keen interest in American politics, and I remind honourable members that the United States is a great and powerful friend of ours. Nobody appreciated the strength of the United States more than did the Australian Labor Party in the dark days of the Second World War when we were forced to turn to the Americans and ask them to rescue us. I now wish to quote from *Time* magazine of September 17, 1965, from the editorial essay entitled "Union Labour: Less Militant, more Affluent", which states:

In Los Angeles' splendid new music centre, 1,500 members of the Retail Clerks Union sat in red-plush comfort beneath crystal chandeliers.

Of course, that is as it should be. These remarks were made by a prominent trade unionist in the United States of America by the name of De Silva. The report goes on:

Unionism is woven throughout the fabric of present American life, both social and economic. "The Labor movement . . . is really a carbon copy of capitalism. It is more than that: it is capitalism.

I am sure members opposite will be interested to know that unionism is really another form of capitalism.

I now refer to the position in New Zealand, which I understand has had compulsory unionism since 1936. I should like to quote from a small section of the report made by the famous Dr. Hare. His report, published in 1946, is entitled *Report on Industrial Relations in New Zealand*. I do not think I need remind the House that part of Dr. Hare's political philosophy is seen in operation in the Tasmanian electoral system, and if his philosophy were not acceptable to the Australian Labor Party in Tasmania I do not doubt that it would have rejected that particular type of electoral system before now. Regarding compulsory unionism in New Zealand, Dr. Hare comments:

There is no doubt that the union secretary is inevitably deteriorating into a mere collector of dues and has become a hated person in many quarters among the workers, where before he would have been regarded by non-members as a friend and adviser in time of need. There is an extensive and freely expressed hatred of the unions amongst ordinary working men and women, boding ill for the future of unionism.

Mr. McGuire, who was country organizer for a New Zealand clerical union for ten years, and later a member of the Auckland Rubber Workers Union, is quoted as saying:

Many unions became very little else but fee-collecting organizations, and the members

only a herd of cows to be milked. With the coming of the cash many union secretaries became very hard for members to see—in fact, it was more difficult to get an interview with some of them than it was to make an appointment with the head of a big business organization. Some of these silvertail secretaries would not enter their offices before 10 a.m. and always left by 4 p.m. . . . many union secretaries became very arrogant and were known to refer to the members as “the herd” and “the mugs”.

I quote those two extracts to indicate where compulsory unionism can lead. I understand that one or two members opposite earlier in their careers were trade union officials, and I hope those members take to heart these references to the New Zealand position. Members opposite desire compulsory unionism because it will obviously make for easier trade union organization.

I should like to refer briefly to the speech given in the debate by the honourable member for Port Pirie. I tried to elicit from the honourable member his views on the probable award rate for an agricultural worker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Port Pirie spoke for two or three minutes trying to impress the House that it was very desirable that agricultural workers should be given an award. I presume that, if they had an industrial award, they would belong to a certain trade union, although I do not know which trade union it would be.

Mr. McKee: The Australian Workers Union.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I thought that was the reply the honourable member would give. I should now like to quote from a rather well-known book called *The South Australian Elections 1959* by Messrs. Hetherington and Reid, on page 58 of which there is this rather interesting reference to the honourable member for Port Pirie:

On the other hand, some country members of the Party (the Australian Labor Party) distrust Convention selections; they feel that men with local service will be overlooked, visiting the city rarely as they do, and not being well known in Trades Hall circles. There was some discontent in Port Pirie, for example, when the Convention chose, from a field of six aspirants, Mr. D. H. McKee, a member of the A.W.U., who had lived in the town for only two years. Partisans of another candidate asserted that their man had longer service in the local organization, that he was obviously the best candidate at the Convention, and that Mr. McKee had been foisted on Port Pirie by the A.W.U. card-vote . . . the A.W.U. is so strong at Port Pirie that its members would have decided the issue.

If I were less charitable I would suggest that perhaps the member for Port Pirie was rather

keen to force an award on agricultural workers merely to strengthen his own pre-selection position.

Mr. McKee: You are being uncharitable now.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am a charitable man, so I will not accuse the honourable member of promoting his own interests in this matter. I am very pleased indeed to support the Bill.

Mrs. STEELE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

(For wording of motion, see page 717.)

(Continued from August 18. Page 1115.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I last spoke on this matter (and then only briefly) seven weeks ago, and so as not to weary the House by repeating what I said on that occasion I shall merely make a fleeting reference to it and get on to something of greater interest to members.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Rather a unique consideration on your part.

Mr. CUMBE: I am always considerate. The purpose of this motion is to ensure for South Australia in the future adequate supplies of fuel for our industries and our power-generating stations, wherever they may be, and to see that these sources of power supply are of such an economic nature and structure that we can compete effectively with other States in offering power to our industries at competitive rates. This matter, in the opinion of the Opposition, is so important that we are seeking a Royal Commission to inquire into all aspects of it. The motion was introduced as a genuine and sincere attempt to safeguard and provide for the future development of employment and expansion. It is because we consider this matter to be so serious that we have taken this action. Earlier I referred to the need for investigating and preserving our resources, and said that Leigh Creek coal, with only a certain number of years of reserves, was being used at Port Augusta power station at an increasing rate each year. I was about to discuss the importance to South Australia of the discovery of natural gas.

We should ask ourselves what this discovery means to South Australia and what it has to offer to us as a people, to our industries, and to the general economic position of the State. As an alternative source of fuel, it is important because it can relieve at once our dependence on imported liquid and solid fuels. We import New South Wales coal and overseas oils, whether they be oils that come to this country direct or come from overseas into refineries,

thence to the trust's power stations and to other industries as furnace oil. This product, providing us with an alternative source of fuel, is a high value fuel of 1,000 British thermal units, which is twice as high as that required by Statute in the metropolitan area. Having world-wide use and application, this product is at present keenly sought in many parts of the world. Natural gas is recognized throughout the world as the most economical fuel, and 16 per cent of the world's energy consumption today is supplied by natural gas. In the United States, one of the first countries to develop this potential, 31,000,000 houses and 100,000 industrial plants are heated, cooled, or powered by natural gas.

It is in the United States of America, the home of enterprise and strong competition, that it competes strongly on economical grounds with coal, oil, and furnace gas. Incidentally, it does not produce smog. In San Francisco, for some part of the year when smog is so bad, natural gas is used and other fuels are banned in many industrial plants. Natural gas overcomes our problem of unclean air. In the United States, where there is a plentiful supply of natural gas, almost half the total supply of gas is used in industry for power generation and in the chemical industries such as carbon black, plastics and fertilizers. One million cubic feet of natural gas with a calorific value of 1,000 b.t.u. a cubic foot has the same gross energy as 5,712 gallons of 19,000 b.t.u. per lb. furnace oil, and is the equivalent of 41 tons of 11,000 b.t.u. per pound coal. This shows the comparative worth and value of the product. The calorific value of natural gas is twice the value of ordinary coal gas.

The economic use of this in other countries highlights the importance the Opposition places on this motion, particularly in respect of the investigation, research, and general inquiry into the application and discovery of it in South Australia. In both the United States and Canada natural gas pipelines criss-cross the country. A large pipeline passes from Canada to California in the United States, and pipelines in the United States cross several State borders as they pass to their various destinations. This gas will revolutionize the economics of Europe, particularly in the Saar Valley, as a large basin of natural gas has been discovered in Holland, and this will be piped through a large section of Western Europe. Although Great Britain has no resources of its own, it uses natural gas that comes from the Sahara Desert. This is piped to the seaport, refrigerated, and carried in special vessels to Great Britain. Drilling is

currently being carried out off the North Sea. This product has also been discovered in Alaska, and is being carried in liquid form by specially refrigerated vessels to Japan.

Natural gas has already been found at Moonie and Roma, and arrangements are being made to pipe it to Brisbane. Discoveries have been made at Alton and Gilmore in Queensland, at Wapet at Barrow Island in Western Australia, and at Mereenie in the Northern Territory. A world record has been created by discovering natural gas at the first drilling offshore from Gippsland.

The New Zealand Government has been investigating this product for some time. We are aware that, at health resorts there, steam geysers exist, and perhaps special circumstances apply in that country. However, natural gas has been discovered there and the Government believes that it is of such vital importance that it investigated the matter, and produced a special white paper in August, 1965, part of which states:

The benefits from the use of gas are so substantial that the failure to establish a gas pipeline system and convert existing undertakings to the natural gas service would be a great economic loss to New Zealand. These benefits exceed by at least eight times and probably by as much as 12 times, the expenditure required to begin and continue natural gas operations.

The New Zealand Government tabled this white paper in the House of Representatives, and it is to implement this report and to use on the North Island natural gas that comes from a field known as Kapuni, about 15 miles from Wellington. Besides being conducted at the places I have already mentioned, drilling is being conducted at Gidgealpa in South Australia, and across the Northern Territory border at Mereenie, which is about 140 miles west of Alice Springs. Of course, a supply from this field could be connected to Gidgealpa and eventually to Adelaide, Adelaide being the closest city, geographically, to the centre of Australia.

Whilst drilling for gas is proceeding, oil may be discovered because it is sometimes present in these fields. If it were discovered, it would be of great interest to you, personally, Mr. Speaker, because it could mean an oil pipeline being constructed to the closest seaport which is, of course, Port Augusta. When the Torrens Island power station is established we shall require an enormous quantity of fuel to feed the boilers and to generate the electricity output planned from this, the largest station in South Australia. We must remember that we cannot burn Leigh Creek

coal at this station, for the entire output of the Leigh Creek field is going to the Port Augusta power station. The boilers at the new Torrens Island station, of course, are not designed for that fuel. We shall be obliged to rely on the use of an enormous quantity of imported fuel (either oil or coal) unless we can ultimately use natural gas. The use of our own product would not only provide an alternative fuel: it would naturally not make us so utterly dependent on oversea fuels.

In the future we could be held to ransom, as we have been in past years, but more important, in time of war we could be in real difficulty without a source of supply within our own State. Our essential services could be in danger of not being able to carry on effectively in such a period. All that we, as the Opposition, are asking is that all aspects of this important question be fully investigated. Indeed, we are suggesting that a Royal Commission be appointed to consider fully all the aspects I have mentioned. Having established the economics of a main, we must establish the reserves of the field, the possible daily output from the field, and the requirements of industry. We would have to establish a large market. From the information received by the previous Government and given to this House by way of numerous answers to questions, honourable members should be aware of the details planned.

For instance, it was suggested that a main of about 18in. in diameter and about 520 miles long be constructed below the ground (because of temperature), that more compressor stations be constructed along the pipeline, and that pressures of about 1,000 lb. a sq. in. would be required. This would involve a total expenditure of about £20,000,000. About 45,000 tons of high-grade steel would be required to construct a main. It would therefore be essential to have a market that would render this an economic proposal, and the Electricity Trust's Torrens Island power station would be a major user of this product. Indeed, if the trust were not to use the product I suggest that the project of using natural gas would never get off the ground.

However, we have received an assurance from the trust that it is vitally interested in this project, as indeed it should be. The South Australian Gas Company (the present distributor) would be another user, and further down the list the product could be used (by means of branch lines) at Whyalla and Port Pirie. In Adelaide, large organizations such as Imperial

Chemical Industries, the cement, fertilizer companies and brick companies (many of which demand great quantities of heat energy to manufacture their products) could use the product. I believe that the market could consume 100,000,000 cub. ft. a day in about five years' time, and that the capacity of the main would be about 150,000,000 cub. ft. a day. The Opposition believes that an expense of £20,000,000 on a pipeline would be justified, although I hasten to point out that the cost would be £20,000,000 today, and that it could increase in the future. The expenditure would be justified if a guaranteed market of not less than 100,000,000 cub. ft. a day for, say, 20 to 25 years could be found.

An estimate of the future market for gas in South Australia indicates a growth from 84,400,000 cub. ft. a day in, say, 1964 (when the survey was made) to 104,600,000 cub. ft. a day in 1967, and 132,100,000 cub. ft. a day by 1970. Honourable members will appreciate that a fantastic expansion in the use of this product could take place. I suggest that experience throughout the world will show that where a cheap source of heat is available, industries flock to that source, and that it would not be long before South Australia had many industries establishing and using this product. The Director of Mines only last week in his annual report tabled in the House said that Gidgealpa reserves were about 450 trillion cub. ft., or 10 to the ninth power (which is the commonly used term). This reserve represents a usage of about 60,000,000 cub. ft. a day for about 20 years. Therefore, we are already on the way to having the first rich reserve at Gidgealpa; we are almost ready to start. Not only is natural gas used in many countries and in South Australia to generate power and heat energy: it is also useful to manufacture by-products, and is greatly important developmentally and economically because so many of the chemical industries can use this potential electrical energy for heat and other purposes. The most promising of these is the fuel cell which is almost 80 per cent efficient compared with 40 per cent peak efficiency for converted electricity generation. Many of our primary producers will be interested to know that nitrogenous fertilizers, such as urea and ammonium nitrate, are generated from this source of power. Carbon black for the rubber and printing industries, acetylene, plastic for synthetic fibres such as orlon, used in the manufacture of clothing, P.V.C., and methanol for jet engines are some of the by-products that can be obtained.

Bechtel Pacific Corporation Limited has been appointed by the Government to undertake a feasibility study of natural gas in South Australia at a fee that does not appear to have been fixed. Although £20,000 was provided in the Estimates under the allocation for the Minister of Mines, I do not know whether the Government has fixed a fee as yet. The terms of reference for Bechtel Pacific Corporation Limited were outlined to the House yesterday by the Premier in reply to a question by the Leader of the Opposition. Considering the importance of this project, I should have thought that the terms of reference would have been more specific; I believe that they are rather vague. The Premier said:

The feasibility study currently being carried out by Bechtel Pacific Corporation Limited on behalf of the South Australian Government is concerned with the economics of delivering natural gas to Adelaide from Gidgealpa, Gilmore and the Mereenie area, to supply the estimated market requirements. In addition to engineering aspects, such as pipeline routes, pipe diameters, etc., the capital and operating costs will be considered, together with various methods of providing finance. I have no further information available.

However, the work that Bechtel will carry out for £20,000 has already been done. All this work was done last year by the United States consultant and expert in this field who was brought here by the Delhi-Santos group, who are the drillers and developers of the field. Mr. Otto Wetzel, whom I had the pleasure of meeting, undertook this work, and I know that he had interviews with leaders of industry, the major potential user of natural gas in South Australia. He also consulted at some length with officers of the Electricity Trust, and had discussions with the previous Government. His report dealt with the pipeline routes, and two definite routes were delineated on the map.

Mr. Hudson: He did not deal with Mereenie.

Mr. COURCEL: No. The proposal now is to use Mereenie if Gidgealpa needs augmenting, and from Gidgealpa the gas will go direct to Adelaide. It will not come directly from Mereenie to Adelaide. However, the work at Gidgealpa has already been done. I appreciate the point the member for Glenelg is making but this is not the over-riding matter in the whole feasibility survey. In my opinion there are other important matters, one of the most important being the market research to consider the economics of the use of this product. The question of the pipeline diameter, the routes, the market appreciation, the surveys of the cost of the product, and the cost of the

pipeline have already been dealt with. The only new reference for the Bechtel company, apart from looking at the resources of the Mereenie field and the field in Queensland (which I do not think will be feasible), appears to be in relation to the method of financing the new pipeline.

I am a little concerned about the reference in respect of financing in the Premier's reply. Does his report mean that the finance is to be raised privately? That is the inference that can be drawn from the report. I believe that the Government should be the controlling partner in the building of such a pipeline from the viewpoints both of economy and of the future security of the methods of supply of natural gas to this country. The method of financing this pipeline is all-important because, unless the Government is a major participant, I am afraid that the cost of the end product may beat us. I believe that the Government should have a large say in the cost of the end product.

Last year the Liberal Government obtained the services of a leading Canadian expert, who inspected the Gidgealpa field and reported to the Government of the day. He also advised the Mines Department on technical matters and on the training of its officers on gas exploration and gas-line operation. A sum of £3,110 is provided in the Estimates for this service. Is the advice and experience of this highly expert officer also going to be disregarded? I point out that Mr. Wetzel's report was cited by the Government, that the expert from Canada reported to the Government of the day, and that now we are to have a third report. I hasten to say that I have no objection to (in fact I welcome) another inspection, but I point out that there is some urgency about this matter. Much of this work has already been done, and about £23,000 is now involved in the work.

One aspect of the terms of reference, as far as I can see, has been completely overlooked: the selling price to consumers of natural gas when it is delivered to the city gate outside the Adelaide metropolitan area. In my opinion, the main controlling factor in the use of natural gas in the future will be the price at which it can be sold at the city gate, which is the terminal of the main pipeline. The natural gas industry in South Australia (in fact in the whole of Australia) will thrive only if its product can be supplied at prices competitive with those of alternative solid and liquid fuels. Unless this product can be supplied to the Electricity Trust and to

other operators at a highly competitive price, it is doubtful whether this scheme can get off the ground. I believe that all members are gratified that the investigation is taking place. We sincerely trust the present survey will conclusively prove the feasibility of natural gas supply in this State.

However, when this investigation by the Bechtel Corporation is completed, what is to happen? What action is the Government likely to take? Will this Parliament, of which you, Mr. Speaker, are the custodian, have the opportunity to see this report and to discuss it? These are most important aspects. The Opposition on this occasion is moving this motion for a Royal Commission to inquire into all aspects of the supplies and future use of natural gas in South Australia. A Royal Commission could recommend future action. It could inquire into the sources of all fuels, how these sources could be developed and how they could be advantageously used, how reserves could be protected (I believe this is essential), and it could ensure that fuels were provided at economic and competitive rates. It could also ensure that the Electricity Trust of South Australia could obtain adequate supplies of fuel to continue to meet the ever-increasing demand for electrical energy in this State.

We know that its grid system is extending month by month over other parts of the State and that the number of consumers is rising dramatically. A Royal Commission could ensure that the trust could obtain fuel at an economic level that would maintain power charges on a competitive basis with those in other States, and I believe this is terribly important not only for the householder but also for industry, which in many instances has to compete against industry in the other States. We must see that our tariffs are kept at a competitive level.

Further, a Commission could inquire and advise on the method of constructing, operating and financing a gas pipeline if this were to be built. I emphasize those three things—constructing, operating and financing—because they are of major importance. It could also advise and recommend on the necessary legislation to be introduced into this House to control the operations of the pipeline and the distribution. This is a matter which, of course, must come; it has come in Canada and the U.S.A., and in the United Kingdom and parts of Europe, and it is currently being considered in the Queensland Parliament now. The Victorian Premier (Mr. Bolte) has planned to send

officers and, I believe, two of his Ministers abroad to investigate what legislation would have to be introduced into the Victorian Parliament as a result of the discovery of natural gas in the sea off the Gippsland coast. The Director of Mines in his recent report, speaking of natural gas, stated:

The matter is considered urgent for two reasons:

- (1) to see whether this State can attract any of the new industries which will develop around competitively-priced natural gas; and
- (2) to assist in resolving the Electricity Trust of South Australia's dilemma whether it should budget to utilize natural gas at the Torrens Island power station or not.

I submit that the opinion and the recommendation of the Director that it is urgent is very relevant to this argument and germane to the points I am endeavouring to make.

The Opposition has moved this motion for a Royal Commission because we believe that this matter is of prime importance. It is one of the major items in the development of South Australia to come before this House since the advent of the Leigh Creek coalfield. We believe it is of extreme significance and importance that this project be fully investigated immediately, and also that every aspect be fully reviewed, including the source of our power supplies and the alternative sources of fuel. We believe it is essential that our reserves are protected, and that adequate future exploration is carried out. This House should be advised on the best way these objects can be achieved, on the construction and more particularly the financing of a projected pipeline, and on the legislation that should be introduced into this House.

We welcome the investigation that is being made at the moment by the Bechtel Corporation. However, we sincerely promote the idea of a Royal Commission. As our motion was on the Notice Paper long before it was announced in this House that the Government intended to have this further survey made and had engaged the Bechtel Corporation, we cannot be accused of being insincere in this regard. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion so adequately moved by the Leader.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: HUNDRED OF PENOLA.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

ABORIGINAL AND HISTORIC RELIGIOUS PRESERVATION BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS COMMISSIONER'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

WILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

PORT PIRIE RACECOURSE LAND REVESTMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to re-vest in the Crown a portion of certain land vested in the Port Pirie Trotting and Racing Club Incorporated and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Opposition and the House for their co-operation in enabling the Bill to proceed today. There is a degree of urgency, and I appreciated the thought and co-operation of the Leader of the Opposition when I approached him to see whether he would agree to my explaining the Bill today. Its object is to re-vest in the Crown a piece of land comprising 2 acres vested in the Port Pirie Trotting and Racing Club Incorporated under the Port Pirie Racecourse Site Act, 1946, so that the portion so re-vested can be dedicated under the Crown Lands Act for educational purposes and used by the Port Pirie High School as an extension to the school's playing fields. Honourable members may recall that in 1960 a special Act was passed to enable an area to be made available by the Port Pirie Trotting and Racing Club for extension to the Port Pirie High School's playing grounds. The club has indicated that it is willing to make available the additional area, the subject of the present Bill. The Director of Education has reported that the land in question would be a welcome addition to the present playing area. This Bill accordingly provides for the re-vesting of the land in question in the Crown.

Clause 3 contains the appropriate interpretations. Clause 4 provides that on and after the commencement of this Bill the land will cease to be vested in the club, revert to the Crown, and become Crown lands. Clause 5 provides that the principal Act, namely, the Port Pirie Racecourse Site Act, 1946, shall so far as applicable continue to apply to the

remaining portion of the land vested in the club by virtue of that Act. Clause 6 authorizes the Registrar-General to take appropriate steps to give effect to the Bill, and the Schedules comprise a plan and description of the land concerned. When the Bill becomes law, action will be taken under the Crown Lands Act to dedicate the land for educational purposes. The Bill is in substance identical with the Act passed in 1960, and I commend it to honourable members.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): As the Minister referred this matter to me some time ago, I have considered the Bill and the second reading explanation. I have also been able to speak to the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) about this matter, and I understand that nothing is out of place in connection with it. The Bill re-vests in the Crown land from the trotting club, and makes it available for school purposes. This is a good arrangement, as it will increase the area of the playing fields and does not harm the trotting club. I am reliably informed that the trotting club has no objection to the land being vested in the school. In these circumstances, there is no need for further consideration of the Bill, and I support the second reading.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I am sure all honourable members will support this Bill. I thank the Port Pirie Trotting and Racing Club for its generous offer in donating this land to the high school so that the playing fields can be extended. This land will assist the school and enable the children to have an additional area for their activities.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): As Minister, I also thank the Port Pirie Trotting and Racing Club. I thank the Minister of Lands for dealing with this matter so expeditiously. It will be a great advantage to the school.

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

NOXIOUS TRADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 1410.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): This short Bill remedies a defect in section 13 of the Noxious Trades Act. At the moment the Act is restrictive in respect of the carrying out of inspections, and seems to contain a loophole in respect of a nuisance committed frivolously or otherwise by a person operating under the Act. I

have some knowledge of trade carried on pursuant to the Act and, having visited many of the places concerned, and having spoken to representatives of companies who fully realize and do not object to the import of the Bill, I have pleasure in supporting it.

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

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 1411.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I can find no serious objection to the Bill. It simply sets out to improve the standard of practising under the Act and, although it places greater responsibility on the Veterinary Surgeons Board, I believe the board is happy to accept that responsibility. The Bill makes it an offence for an unregistered person to perform certain operations on specific animals. Under this Bill, if a qualified practitioner is granted a permit to practise in a certain district, that permit should not necessarily be cancelled merely because a qualified practitioner appears on the scene. This, of course, cannot apply if the permit has been held for more than five years. It could cause hardship to a permit holder with less than five years' service in the district if his permit were to be withdrawn for, after all, if a qualified veterinary surgeon cannot compete successfully against one of these unqualified persons, the reason may be that he himself is not competent, even though qualified. That is the only point I wish to raise on which I differ; the rest of the Bill is purely machinery legislation that places veterinary surgeons as a profession on the same footing as dentists or doctors. It will improve the standards of the profession, and I support the second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I want to comment briefly on the point raised by the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) regarding the relationship between permit holders and registered veterinary practitioners. True, it is desirable to encourage the qualified registered veterinary surgeon to practise in the country, and to that general premise I have no objection, but I live in a part of the State where the livestock owner has had to depend very largely, except for brief and intermittent periods, upon the services of the permit holder, who has been the only person available to assist over a large area of Eyre Peninsula over a long time. I am concerned to see that the permit holder does not receive any rebuff

as a result of this measure, and I do not think such is intended or provided for. Problems arise where a veterinary surgeon, for example, may come into a district and set up in practise but not be willing to cover the whole field of veterinary services. I will not take the matter any further than that, as I think the Minister is aware of the problem. If a veterinary surgeon comes into a district, as he is fully qualified and registered nobody else can operate there, and owners of stock are penalized because the veterinary surgeon does not render full service.

I mention also a wellknown permit holder who is apparently extremely skilled and who is held in extremely high regard in his district. He has held a permit for a long time and at considerable cost and inconvenience has rendered a service for many years. I mention these two things not as criticism of the legislation but in fairness to the people concerned and to remind the Minister, if he needs reminding, of the problem that exists in my area.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I appreciate the remarks made by both the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) and the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson). I assure both of them that their point is well taken and will receive every consideration. I know the value of the person to whom the member for Flinders has referred. I have met the man personally and I know he has his heart and soul in this activity. I thank honourable members for the way they have responded to this measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Issue of permits."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I wish to express my appreciation to the Minister for the wording of the new subsection. From my understanding of the Minister's second reading explanation the new subsection will enable permits to be issued rather more freely. My district has no town big enough to maintain a permanent veterinary officer but, under the wording of this subsection, I understand that it will be easier for a permit holder to be appointed to attend sick animals where necessary.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I do not know that the clause actually takes things any further than they are now. The situation has always been that where there is no qualified practitioner permits are readily available for people who satisfy the board that they are able to carry out this

work. I do not think the honourable member has any problem in this regard. It is hoped that, in time, more veterinary surgeons will be available to serve areas such as the honourable member represents.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Is not the purpose of this clause to give the board more scope in relation to the conditions of permits, thereby allowing it to issue permits to people without actually committing itself to giving what amounts to a lifetime right to practise?

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We are already short of qualified veterinary surgeons, and the board does not want to make it too difficult for them to set up in practice. I think it is clear that the permit holders in this State have been well considered. I think the board appreciates that many of those men are extremely capable. With the qualifications we now demand for veterinary work, fully graduated veterinary surgeons are what we should aim to have everywhere. The shortage of these officers has been made somewhat more severe by the demands of the American health authorities, who require veterinary surgeons to carry out inspections at abattoirs. This provision is designed to give the board greater freedom by making it possible to get veterinary surgeons into the country areas when they become available. I support the clause.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As the honourable member said, this clause is designed to provide wider discretionary powers for the board in dealing with permit holders. In the past, once a permit holder received permits in five successive years he automatically continued on. This clause will enable the board to overcome that problem. Permits will be issued annually, but the issue of such permits will not go on automatically after five years. Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 15) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE ERADICATION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to extend the application of the principal Act to the diseases of vesicular exanthema and vesicular stomatitis in like manner as it applies to foot and mouth disease. Thus the Foot and Mouth Disease

Eradication Fund, established under the principal Act, may be used to pay compensation to the owners of animals which have been destroyed to prevent the spread of vesicular exanthema or vesicular stomatitis. The Bill gives effect to a recommendation of the Exotic Diseases Committee in April of this year that, owing to the difficulty of distinguishing between foot and mouth disease, vesicular exanthema and vesicular stomatitis, the three diseases be treated in the same manner in the legislation of all the States and of the Commonwealth. The two new diseases were proclaimed under the Stock Diseases Act in August of this year. The required amendment to the principal Act is made by clause 3 which defines "foot and mouth disease" as including the two new diseases. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIDE, SKIN AND WOOL DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 1408.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill, as the provisions are reasonable. It makes a useful contribution towards regulating trade in hides and skins, particularly for sales on farms.

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

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 1409.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support this short Bill, which effects a much needed amendment. There are three Acts: the Registration of Business Names Act, the Companies Act and the Associations Incorporation Act. This amending Bill gives the Attorney-General power to do the same things as he is empowered to do in respect of the Registration of Business Names Act and the Companies Act, where provision is made in the naming of a company for the Attorney-General to have discretionary power in handling the names that are normally prohibited for, or are not usually allowed to be given to, companies. No such power exists in respect of the Associations Incorporation Act.

The need for this Bill is high-lighted by what the Attorney-General said in his second reading explanation. The Southern Division of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to

Animals wanted a separate incorporation, but could not carry the name "Royal" because there was no power under the Associations Incorporation Act for the Minister to use his discretion. I see no objection to this measure. In conclusion, may I say this to the Attorney-General. Some of these Parliamentary Draftsman's second reading explanations are given to me without the proper index word for the Bill. The Bill itself just had "Business Names Act", and I was scrambling through the index under "B" until it dawned on me that it must be under some other name. I then looked under "Registration" and found it.

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

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 3. Page 783.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I had expected that, as the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) had secured the adjournment of the debate when the Bill was last before the House, he would speak on the matter. I have grave misgivings about one or two features of the Bill. Its purpose is to enable a senior officer of the university to become Principal of the new Bedford Park Teachers' College. Under the terms of the Bill, he will hold not only that position but also the position of Professor of Education at the university. This topic has been under discussion for a considerable period, and the former Minister of Education (Sir Baden Pattinson) had been persuaded to examine the matter. First, I have grave doubts whether a necessity exists for this provision or, secondly, whether it is even advisable. The position of Principal of Bedford Park Teachers' College is an important one and I know of no reason for denying officers of the Education Department the opportunity of obtaining such an appointment and the promotion that goes with it.

The Minister has not said in his second reading explanation that this arrangement has been made because there was no suitable person in the Education Department or because no other suitable person was available. However, he has said that it is a good example of the splendid co-operation between the university and the department and that it will enable the Professor of Education to experiment, to use our Bedford Park Teachers' College for experiments in the training of teachers. I doubt, however, that such a costly experiment is justified.

One of the most essential and costly institutions in our State should not be used as an experimental station for a professor of the university. The other teachers training college has operated successfully and I have heard nothing but good reports in other States about the standard of our teachers, particularly those who have had the benefit of the longer course. They are the equal of any in Australia. For many years the university has consistently required a higher matriculation standard than that which could be provided by the Education Department in our high schools.

This is not a criticism of the Minister or of my former colleague; every Education Department in Australia has had difficulty in getting enough trained teachers and sufficient funds to enable them to carry out their functions. This year the matriculation standard will be raised considerably, but more than half of our high schools will not be able to provide that course. This tug-of-war between the university, which has been requiring higher standards, and the Education Department, which has not been able to meet the requirements, has been going on for many years. The policies of the two institutions have not been parallel for a long time, and I think that we (I believe I am speaking for the Government as well as for the Opposition) shall be embarrassed in meeting the matriculation requirements that will shortly become effective. Undoubtedly many students will have to live away from home to be educated to matriculation level, but I do not believe it will be possible to get the completely parallel education that both these institutions desire.

The university is in an entirely different atmosphere from the Education Department; one has only to look at the standard of salaries paid at the university compared with those paid in the Education Department to realize that. Generous study leave is provided by the University. I have no objection to the person involved in this, or to his work, but if he became due for extensive study leave overseas would he take it and leave the teachers training college without a principal or would he forgo the leave in order to remain at the college? To whom is he responsible? Does he take instructions from the Minister of Education or does he take them from the Vice-Chancellor? Someone must be in charge of his duties—or is he going to decide what time he will give to each position? He will certainly make innovations, although I do not know what they are. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

An agreement was reached during those discussions that under this arrangement the Principal of Bedford Park Teachers College would have the same opportunities to experiment with methods of teacher training as he would have as Professor of Education at Adelaide University Bedford Park to experiment with methods of university training.

It is the function of a university to carry out research, whereas the function of a teachers training college is to train teachers. It is not an experimental farm, if I may use that broad expression. I have grave doubts about whether this is a good administrative arrangement, although I do not criticize the person concerned, about whom I know nothing but good. However, I have always understood that it was the principle of the Labor Party that one man should have only one job. I cannot see how this man can give full attention to both institutions. This is not the time to discuss amendments, but in Committee I intend to move an amendment to provide that no arrangement made under the Bill shall operate for more than three years. I think that will provide sufficient time to see whether or not this arrangement is wise. I hope the Minister will agree that that is not an unreasonable request for the Opposition to make. A space of three years would enable a proper appraisal for the position to be made. I believe it is desirable that this line of promotion in the Education Department be maintained. Under these circumstances, I will not oppose the second reading although I have never liked this proposal. I ask the Minister to consider my amendment.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I entirely endorse the Leader's remarks. When the proposal for a new teachers training college to be constructed at Bedford Park was put before the Public Works Committee, the committee, by permission of the Government, visited other States to see the latest innovations in teachers training colleges. We had the opportunity of discussing this matter with Mr. McDonell, the Principal of the Melbourne Teachers College, which is in closer proximity to a university than is any other such college in Australia of which I know. In Melbourne these two institutions work entirely autonomously and harmoniously. Under the Bill I perceive a germ of discontent in the Education Department.

The Adelaide Teachers College has a high status. Dr. Penny has done marvellous work for the department at the college (which, incidentally, is a beautiful building), and has turned out first-class teacher material. Quite obviously, the Adelaide Teachers College will

not enjoy the benefit, if benefit it be, of having a university professor as its principal. Are we to demote the Adelaide Teachers College to second place, bringing the new institution at Bedford Park to the top place by its having the benefit, if benefit it be, of the professor? Who is to decide what amount of his time this man will spend in administering the college and what amount he will spend in his duties as Professor of Education at the university? If the professor himself is to be the arbiter in this matter, one or other of the departments must obviously suffer. I do not think that one man can carry out adequately the duties that will fall on him as Professor of Education and Principal of a large college, which Bedford Park of necessity must become.

Another aspect that does not appeal to me is the lack of opportunity that will be afforded to some excellent people employed in the department. I will not name names, but the Minister knows the people to whom I am referring. These men could and should be in line for promotion to the position of Principal of this college. It seems a pity that some of our highly educated and qualified men in the department are to be passed over in order that we may have a Professor of Education doubling as Principal as well. I think that is bad from the point of view of the morale of the department.

I know the Government has already named the old Adelaide Gaol as a possible site for a new teachers training college, and I have no doubt that we will need another such institution. The Public Works Committee examined closely the question of the number of teachers required in the next decade, and therefore I know that ultimately we will have another major teachers training college. My own view is that the department should now be selecting men with some administrative gifts from within the department (and it has them, I have no doubt). Administrative ability is perhaps more important in a training college than academic qualifications. After all, the ability to administer a big institution is important to the success of that institution. The Professor of Education may not have those gifts, although, on the other hand, he may have them. It is most important from the department's point of view that the man to whom it gives this important task should have some administrative ability. I do not doubt for a moment that there are men in the department with this ability who are looking for an opportunity for promotion in their own selected walk of life.

The Leader suggested that perhaps the appointment could be made for a trial period. I am a little worried even about giving it a three-year run, because I think the principle involved in this is entirely wrong. I do not approve of the set-up at all. Our talks with the Principal of the Melbourne Teachers College confirmed me in my belief that an institution run by the Education Department with a very close liaison with the university was the ideal set-up.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: When did you have those talks?

Mr. SHANNON: Some time last year. I think the department's own people are competent to do what is required in the way of keeping up with the latest moves in teacher training. I know the department sends its leading men overseas periodically, and they usually come back with some very good ideas. That is an excellent thing. The committee and I were impressed with what we saw in Victoria. The University of Melbourne and the teachers training college there share certain recreational and social facilities, and I hope that this will be done at Bedford Park so that students at the university will be able to mix with those from the college. I am sure that if the Minister considers the evidence tendered to the Public Works Committee, it may be helpful. Also, I should be happy to discuss with him Mr. McDonell's approach to this matter. I think, in the light of the committee's experience, we are taking a retrograde step. We are dividing the loyalties of one man between the university and the teachers training college, and no doubt his first loyalty must be to the university, because he is to be Professor of Education. He cannot serve two masters, and perhaps there may be some lack of drive and direction to what should become one of our leading teachers training colleges. Another important aspect is that two men in the Education Department eventually reach the position where they could be the principal of a training college. Each of them, during his career in the department, has set his sights on the top job.

Mr. Clark: They could still apply for this job.

Mr. SHANNON: Neither of them is going to get it.

Mr. Clark: I would not be too sure about it.

Mr. SHANNON: Then why introduce this Bill? If what the honourable member is saying is true, this Bill is not needed. Each man may be able to apply, but this Bill sets up machinery that will deny him the right of appointment. I am sure the Minister does not

suggest that it is window dressing: it is definite policy. From my knowledge of what has taken place I am of opinion that he has inherited this situation. I may be wrong about that but it is my opinion, for what it is worth.

I think the member for Gawler will agree with me when I say this: a healthy rivalry between two such institutions is excellent for everybody concerned. Is there likely to be that healthy rivalry between our two major teachers training colleges if one enjoys, by way of status at least, the benefit of a Professor of Education as its principal? He may almost be called our curly-headed boy; he is our choice. In effect, that is what we are saying. To ask the Adelaide Teachers Training College to compete is to put it behind scratch for a start. I am certain it is not good for the Education Department. I doubt whether it will improve the quality of the teachers coming from the new Bedford Park training college. I doubt whether we shall improve their teaching abilities. In fact, on the contrary, professorial work is a little different from the actual work of imparting knowledge to other people. It is perhaps a shade of difference not easy to define, but the professor in any Chair has a totally different task from the man who is actually doing the teaching.

Mr. Clark: You are saying there is a difference between a lecturer and a teacher?

Mr. SHANNON: I think the administrator of a teachers training college has a different approach to his trainees from that of a professor to his students.

Mr. Clark: We are going to combine them in one man.

Mr. SHANNON: No doubt that is what this Bill suggests.

Mr. Clark: Surely the advantages are obvious?

Mr. SHANNON: I think the advantages are greatly outweighed by the disadvantages. That is my view. I may be wrong but my talks with people in the education world suggest that I am not far wrong. I have been convinced for a long time now that there are great advantages, first in encouraging people in the department to excel and merit advancement and, secondly, in having friendly rivalry in the department so that new ideas will come along. I do not think the Professor of Education comes into the field of trial and error. There may be qualifications for a trainee teacher as regards his ability to impart knowledge to others. Many trainees will get their scholastic qualifications, without doubt, but the imparting

of knowledge to others is the mark of their professional ability. I do not think we want a professor to do this.

I am not a bit happy about this Bill. If criticism lies at the door of the present Minister of Education, I am not criticizing him. In fact, I do not know whether or not there is much work going on behind the scenes to bring about this arrangement. These things do happen. If that is so, I hope the Minister will have a good look at it. I think he will. I have some faith in the Minister as a man who wants to do the right thing. I suggest that this question be thoroughly examined by him, from the department's point of view, and that he take guidance from some people in his department, upon whom I know he can rely. The advice he will get from people in his own department will be sound. That is all I ask him to do.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I think it is important to recognize that, largely, the idea behind this particular Bill has grown out of the difficulty that has arisen at the University of Adelaide in respect of the Education Department, within the university, the Adelaide Teachers Training College and the Education Department itself. For some years now the relationship has not been good, and it has meant that, although there is a good physical situation at Adelaide for integration between the teachers college and the university, that integration has not taken place. Teachers college and university students, by and large, do not mix with each other, either socially or at a sporting level and, indeed, they are not encouraged to do so. Generally speaking, the siting of the Adelaide Teachers College at the university provides little advantage to teacher trainees. The member for Onkaparinga said an ideal set-up for integration existed at Bedford Park, but I suggest it is no better and no worse than the one that exists physically at the University of Adelaide, as between the university and the teachers college. If the experience at Adelaide is anything to go on, we shall not obtain that integration.

I support the Bill, because I think it is aimed at trying to achieve a greater degree of integration and co-operation between the teachers college and the university. Many teacher trainees will be undertaking the same sort of course as university students will be, and the kind of course and the way it ties in with their teacher-trainee work can, I think, be co-ordinated much more satisfactorily if this sort of arrangement is adopted. I remember that earlier this year the Minister of

Education was taken to task by the member for Mitcham for daring to doubt the wisdom of some conclusions of the Martin Report, in particular conclusions with respect to teachers colleges that suggested that they should be fully autonomous institutions. The Minister of Education, when replying during the Address in Reply debate, made it clear that he was in favour of some sort of move in the direction of autonomy and of a move to enable some experimentation to take place. The Leader of the Opposition tonight is virtually suggesting that in this Bill the Minister (and therefore the Government) is trying to create an experimental farm at Bedford Park. First, I do not believe that that is true at all but, one way or the other, it does not seem that the Minister can win. If he does not have some experimentation, or some move towards autonomy that will give a greater freedom for new ideas or experiments to take place in relation to teacher training, then he will be criticized by the member for Mitcham, and if he does have that experimentation, he will be criticized by the Leader of Opposition. The remarks of the Minister, when introducing the Bill, appear at page 657 of *Hansard* as follows:

An agreement was reached during those discussions that under this arrangement the Principal of Bedford Park Teachers College would have the same opportunities to experiment with methods of teacher training as he would have as Professor of Education at Adelaide University Bedford Park to experiment with methods of university training.

I do not think that suggests that the Bedford Park Teachers College is going to become an experimental farm. It implies that one of the objects of making this a joint appointment is to provide a greater opportunity for experimentation as far as students are concerned, both teacher trainees and students at the university, in a much more workable way than exists at present in relation to the Adelaide Teachers College and the University of Adelaide.

I think that to suggest that the Minister intended by those remarks that there would be wholesale experimentation and wholesale throwing over of previous techniques of teacher training is incorrect. I think the point is simply that we need to encourage at both the university level within the Department of Education and at the Teachers Training College a greater degree of experimentation than has been the case previously.

I should also like to refer to the statement made in this House that no officer within the

Education Department or within the existing teachers college would be able to take this appointment. If any officer within the department had the necessary qualifications for the position of Professor of Education, he would be completely eligible for appointment. I think it is only fair to admit that, as it is a joint appointment (he will be both Professor of Education at the university and Principal of the teachers college), the field has been somewhat restricted, but it is not correct to say that all officers of the Education Department would be debarred from this position.

A question was asked regarding to whom this man will be responsible. I suggest that he will have a joint responsibility to the university and to the Education Department. But, within the university, most professors have a high degree of independence in the conduct of their departments. It is true that the establishment of any particular course structure has to be approved by the university itself, but the way the courses are conducted within that structure is largely up to the professor. The idea of a joint appointment is that in the capacity of Principal of the Bedford Park Teachers College he will have some higher degree of independence from the Education Department than might otherwise have been the case and there will be some move towards giving him a high degree of autonomy and towards the kind of situation envisaged in the Martin Report.

A man holding such an appointment, possessing the necessary qualifications for the job and knowing that within the university, at least, he will have a high degree of independence, will not find it too difficult to manage the situation, in relation to his dealings with the university and the Education Department and the Minister. The honourable member for Onkaparinga has spoken about the need to encourage the development of new ideas by giving every possible opportunity of gaining promotion to officers of the Education Department and it may well be that the arrangement we are discussing will give that encouragement.

Mr. Shannon: The Government went to the expense of sending a high-ranking officer overseas.

Mr. HUDSON: What was the object of that trip? For investigation into primary or secondary education?

Mr. Shannon: I would not imagine it would be in relation to infants schools.

Mr. HUDSON: What were the objectives of the oversea visit?

Mr. Shannon: Educational.

Mr. HUDSON: What field—primary, secondary, or teacher-training?

Mr. Shannon: I should not imagine that it would be infants' education. Obviously a high-ranking officer is not sent overseas for anything other than higher education.

Mr. HUDSON: But who is being asked to investigate teacher training relevant to this Bill? The honourable member said that he thought the encouragement of new ideas was important. I believe the arrangement envisaged in this Bill will give much greater encouragement to the development of new ideas, both in the field of teacher training within the teachers college and in the way in which teachers tackle university courses as part of their overall training. This greater integration between the university training that a teacher gets and the teachers college training could be extremely valuable.

Mr. Freebairn: Teachers get full credit for their university studies.

Mr. HUDSON: But surely it is not just a question of their getting credit; it is a question of what those studies mean in making them better teachers. I do not advocate the set-up that tends to exist in several States, where university training is almost entirely divorced from the teachers college course. With that system a trainee teacher studies geography, for instance, because he thinks he may take on teaching geography.

Mr. Clark: He usually does it because he wants the extra unit.

Mr. HUDSON: That is so. The relationship that exists between teacher trainees at the university and those within the teachers college is usually very poor, and this experience has been repeated in different States. Furthermore, the division between the two institutions goes right down the scale. This is particularly evident in Adelaide, where there is very little mixing between teachers college students (even those doing university courses) and university students. That is one of the most unsatisfactory features that exist in the current set-up on North Terrace. I support the Bill, which I think may provide a very valuable change and may produce results at Bedford Park that will make us very proud of that institution.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I strongly support this Bill. It has been suggested, I think by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) and perhaps by the Leader of the Opposition, that this move could well have been inherited from the former Minister of Education. I go farther than that: I think it was inherited

from the former Minister, and that it was inherited with the complete agreement of the present Minister. I am the first to admit that all the things that we inherited from the previous Government were not bad, and I believe that this is a good thing that we inherited. The member for Onkaparinga spoke about the time when members of the Public Works Committee spoke to Mr. McDonell, the Principal of the Melbourne Teachers College. I, too, was most impressed by this gentleman and with the details that he could give us of the obvious close liaison between that teachers college and the university. I returned to South Australia more firmly convinced that I had been before (and I think some members of the Public Works Committee will know this because I have expressed my opinion fairly freely) that the liaison between our teachers college and the university was not the best, to put it mildly. My opinion was strongly confirmed by what I heard in Melbourne from the Principal there. I received even greater confirmation from listening to what the member for Glenelg said, because he worked and taught at the university and has knowledge of these matters. I believe that the plan to have the Principal and the Professor of Education one and the same man will do more than anything else I know of to bring about a close liaison between Bedford Park Teachers College and the university.

Honourable members should not make the mistake of thinking that a dual appointment such as this is a completely new idea. Dual appointments have been tried in many other educational institutions, and I am informed that they have operated and are operating successfully. I am sure the Minister of Education will agree with me when I say that I am certain that this position will be completely open to members of the teaching profession in South Australia if they have the necessary qualifications. I know of some men here who have those qualifications. My knowledge of teachers college matters goes back a long way. My first experience of the college was not as a member of Parliament but as an inmate of the college, and if honourable members had seen the sort of teachers college to which I went they would realize that one felt like an inmate there. It was situated in the old police barracks at the back of the Public Library. I believe it is now used in connection with the country lending service. It was a dingy old place, almost ready to fall

down, and our ties with the university then were practically non-existent.

When I first went to the college few of us had an opportunity to do university work at all. If we were lucky we had one year at the teachers college and then did university work after we had left. Dr. Adolf Schulz was at the college in those days (and I thought more of him when I left the college than while I was attending it because, as a student, I detested him). He was a Doctor of Philosophy and a learned man, and I have no doubt that if he were alive today he would be an ideal man for the position with which we are dealing, even if his students did not love him. With regard to this position being filled by a teacher, I should like honourable members to ask themselves how it was that Dr. Penny, the Principal of the Adelaide Teachers College, and a man for whom I have the highest regard, obtained his appointment. Most honourable members know he obtained his appointment because he had qualifications held by nobody else in the Education Department. Those qualifications have been confirmed by his work not only in producing excellent teachers but the experimental work done in the college as well. I believe the position we are talking about (and I am in entire agreement with it) requires personal qualities, as well as very high academic qualifications. I believe we will have no difficulty in finding the right man to combine the two positions. I am sure that the combination of these two positions will give us that closer relationship and liaison that has been missing between the teachers college and the University of Adelaide, no matter how much the Principal of the Adelaide Teachers College desired it.

The duties of the position we are discussing will not be easy to discharge. However, I think it could well be the most rewarding appointment made in this State for many years. There is one thing I am sure will happen (and here again I hope the Minister will tell me whether I am right or wrong): I am certain that the bread-and-butter work at the Bedford Park Teachers College will be done by the Vice-Principal. I hope that is the case, because it will give the man who will be Professor of Education, and also Principal of the teachers college, the opportunity to do the very experimenting that was condemned by one member. I believe that one of the most important things in teacher training is the experimentation, not experimentation so much in the methods adopted to impart knowledge to the young men and women at the college, but

the experimentation—that-is—conducted by a man who knows what he is doing in actual teacher-training methods: the methods of imparting the knowledge not to the students at the college but to the students when they leave the college and go out into the wider world of teaching.

I have been worried for a long time (and the Chairman of the Public Works Committee and my colleagues on that committee will know this because I have expressed it to Dr. Penny and others when we have been speaking about the new teachers college) about the fact that nowadays it is much harder to complete a degree or degrees after a person has left the teachers college than it used to be. When I attended the teachers college students had practically no opportunity of doing degree work at all. Most teachers who obtained diplomas, bachelor degrees and so on, did practically all their work at night; they burned the midnight oil. They studied by correspondence, they obtained exemptions from lectures fairly easily, and they completed diplomas and degrees, certainly by the sweat of their brows, but they were given permission to do it. I regret to say that it is now nowhere near so easy for a teacher once he goes out into the country from the teachers college to obtain exemptions from lectures and to go on completing his degree by correspondence or by study in his own time.

Nowadays it is virtually impossible for a teacher who has come out of the teachers college to complete a degree or diploma unless he is teaching in Adelaide, or unless he is fortunate enough to be able to obtain study leave. I know the opportunities for this study leave have been increased in the last two or three years. It is much more difficult for a teacher to study and obtain the degrees than it used to be, and I deplore it. I know hundreds of teachers who were excellent teachers, even though their academic qualifications were not particularly high. I have also known many who learned things through the discipline of study in what was supposed to be their leisure time, and I am certain that it made them better teachers. I hope that the close liaison that this dual appointment will bring will help the Professor of Education at the university (who will also be the Principal of the teachers college) to realize the wants of country teachers. As a former teacher, I appreciate the remarks made by the member for Flinders and the tribute he paid to the work of teachers in country schools. I am pleased that he referred not only to the academic work at the school

but to the wider work and the assistance the teachers have given to committees and social activities in country towns. This move will give the teachers every opportunity to complete degrees, and will instil new life into the university and the teachers college. It is deplorable if a university and teachers college doing the same work are not united. This move will unite them as has not been done in any other place in Australia.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I believe that when anything new is introduced it should be carefully examined. If one decides against something because it is new, one has reached the age when it is not worth while taking an active part in life. That is not my idea of things. However, I have some doubt about this move, as dual jobs usually do not work out in practice. I have said that members of the Agriculture Department should not be the chairmen of marketing boards, because they lack training and aptitude for the positions. The failure rate amongst students has been too high, but it is difficult to pinpoint the cause, without criticizing the university staff generally. Many lecturers and tutors have not had any training in teaching, and this aspect should be considered. Perhaps experimentation with teaching methods should be carried out at the university. Recently a lecturer told his students to study certain books before the next lecture. Apparently this was a new idea, but good students profited by the move, although it was not satisfactory for the poorer students. There should be experimentation in all aspects of teaching. If a university professor is head of the training college it may be his idea that secondary students are being trained for the university, whereas probably only 20 per cent go on to the university. We should like a higher percentage than that. We should experiment with the American idea, which is to keep children longer at school and give them a sound general education to fit in with future business and other requirements of adult life. If an academic man is at the head, he will concentrate on producing teachers who will train students in one direction only. I feel that possibly members should support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I, too, have my doubts about this Bill and wonder why it is necessary to pass it so hurriedly through Parliament. So far, we have not a university at Bedford Park. Building continues and it will not be until March of next year that students will be admitted to the Bedford Park university.

Mr. Hudson: But we must appoint staff in advance for the students.

Mr. HEASLIP: The teachers training college, on which the Public Works Committee has reported and which will be adjacent to the university at Bedford Park, has not even started to be built. A trial period of three years has been suggested but we still may not have a teachers training college at the end of three years. Certainly, it will not be functioning within two years. In Melbourne, a teachers training college and the university are practically on the same ground, with only a footpath dividing them. The students from the university and the teachers training college intermingle, going from one building to another and working together. That is a good idea. I think that is what the Minister of Education and the authorities here would like to see happen at Bedford Park.

The set-up at Bedford Park is ideal, for both sets of students will, to a certain extent, be mixing at the same level. The buildings will be close together. The Adelaide Teachers Training College and the University of Adelaide do not co-operate as they should, but at Bedford Park co-operation should be easy, and better results should be achieved all round. The Minister said that these arrangements had been made about 18 months ago. They came about as a result of discussions with the Director of Education, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, and Professor Karmel about 18 months ago. Even in that 18 months much has happened in relation to the Bedford Park university, and it has changed from what was planned at that stage.

Mr. Hudson: In what respect?

Mr. HEASLIP: I think the honourable member knows as well as I that it was originally to be an extension of the University of Adelaide, but it will not be that now. The teachers training college in the Melbourne university is not administered by a person holding a dual office. How we shall have one man as Professor of Education in the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park and Principal of the teachers college, I do not know. If the person concerned relinquishes his post as Professor of the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park, does he automatically cease to be Principal of the teachers college? By giving his full time to the activities of the teachers training college a person would be better able to perform his duties than he would be if he held the dual position. We should wait for

another twelve months before considering this legislation.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): New section 28ze provides that the Minister may make an arrangement, so it is a permissive authority, despite the fact that, when explaining the Bill, the Minister had obviously received and taken the advice of the Vice-Chancellor of the university and of the Director of Education in coming to this decision. We know, of course, that this idea was mooted about 18 months ago during discussions with the previous Minister of Education. I am not happy about one person's occupying the two positions, each of which, in its own right, is a colossal task for one man to tackle. This applies especially in a new university when all the organizing work has still to be planned, quite apart from the administration in respect of the Education Department and the college when they begin to function. It appears to me that the status of the new university and the size and importance of the two sections merit one man for each job. Although this had been discussed previously and the Minister of Education at the time had been somewhat sold on this idea, in the light of events and of the history of members of the Party now in Government it is odd that the Government has now agreed to one man holding these two high appointments.

The Bill provides that, if the occupant of this joint position ceases to hold one of the appointments, then he also ceases to hold the other and it seems to me that, as a result of this, he either rises or falls on his ability to integrate both departments and both positions. From reading the Bill and hearing the Minister's explanation and the speeches that followed, it almost seems to be suggested that we would not be able to obtain two men who could hold these positions separately and, therefore, it has been found necessary to put them together.

It also seems that, if there is an insistence on obtaining the services of a man who has outstanding qualifications and who will be sought not only in Australia but also overseas, he will merit an extremely high salary. I know that part of the idea of integrating these two positions is to try to bring about a relationship between the two that is not enjoyed at the Adelaide Teachers College and the university at present, and I was interested to hear the honourable member for Glenelg make a point about how difficult the relationships had been between the Adelaide Teachers College and the university, that the students in each just do not

mix, either academically or in sport. To me, it seems almost wishful thinking on his part that this sort of thing should succeed at Bedford Park when it has not succeeded in the University of Adelaide.

As far as I can remember, nothing has been said by the Leader of the Opposition about orthodox teaching methods being thrown overboard or about indulging in wholesale experimentation. I think it is only reasonable to expect that, in a time of great advances in teaching techniques and in research in universities, the Adelaide University at Bedford Park and the teachers college, if they are integrated, should provide a great opportunity for research into teaching methods. I think the idea of having this sort of atmosphere or climate for experimentation is most commendable. Those of us who went through the new building at the Adelaide Teachers College when it was opened were amazed and most impressed by the facilities offered for young people for experimentation in all media.

Mr. Clark: It is the best in Australia.

Mrs. STEELE: It is a wonderful college and in almost every subject that students or student teachers study they are provided with wonderful facilities with which to work, and no expense has been spared in providing equipment, such as laboratory facilities for the requirements of the science subjects and for art in all its forms. I was interested the other day to hear a young university student interviewed in the television programme *Meet the Press*. I do not know whether any other member saw the telecast, but it was a most interesting discussion, and I was impressed by it. I think this student, who was a fifth-year medical student, was the President of the Student Council. Although he is a constituent of mine, he obviously does not vote for me, as he is a member of the Adelaide University Labor Club.

Mr. Clark: He's a very good fellow!

Mrs. STEELE: Did the honourable member see the telecast?

Mr. Clark: I did.

Mrs. STEELE: Then he could not help being impressed at the way this young man stood up to the questioning of two seasoned questioners, Noel Adams and John Temple, and was able to answer their questions very well indeed. However, I did not agree with the attitude he took regarding national planning on an Australia-wide basis, although I thought some of his arguments had merit. His chief complaint was about the amount of money being spent on education. He was most critical of this, and was put on the

spot two or three times by these two men to justify his criticism of the amount of money being spent in Australia generally and South Australia in particular on education. I do not know what other members think, but I am appalled to think that university students next year intend to have a "work-out" or a strike. This student did not like it to be referred to as a strike, but students intend to have a "work-out" to focus attention on the lack of money for, and planning of, education. These days young people are, generally speaking, unappreciative of the amount of money spent on education. I do not think they realize the sacrifices their parents and other sections of the community make to finance our educational institutions.

Mr. Casey: That applies to many young people, not only to university students.

Mrs. STEELE: I agree. I said that young people generally were most unappreciative; they expect to have the world. Although I have the greatest admiration for young people as a whole and for the responsibility they adopt in respect of their studies, I do not think they give much deep thought to what it costs the community to provide the facilities for them to further their education.

The last point I want to make harks back to the experiment that will be undertaken in education at Bedford Park. At this stage I make a plea for a particular kind of research. I think South Australia probably leads many of the States in what it does for exceptional children. South Australia pioneered the idea of opportunity classes, as I think the Minister realizes. All of us are familiar with the great success of the occupation centres which have been established in the metropolitan area and which are now being established in several country districts. The fact that so many members are seeking occupation centres for their districts proves, I think, that they have made a tremendous contribution to the education of mentally retarded children. Occupation centres and opportunity classes are only two in this field, and in recent years tremendous strides have been made in the provision of classes for children who suffer from all kinds of disabilities.

At present, the teachers who have to be provided for the training of these children have to be sent either to other States or overseas to undertake special training before they can come back and teach the children. I know that in the occupation centres much of the training of teachers of these classes is in the form of in-service training and, as a result, some magnificent teachers are being turned out. As one of the purposes of the integration of the Department of Education and the teachers training

college at Bedford Park is to enable a spread of experimentation, I make the plea to the Minister that consideration be given to making it possible for these types of different training to be established within our own State, because he knows as well as I do how expensive it is to send special teachers overseas to do a course lasting for a year, 18 months or two years. I am thinking of the deaf and blind classes, in particular.

I know of a teacher who was sent to the Perkins Institute in the United States. She came back and is coping with these children but at the same time she will no doubt be expected to train some of her assistants. If, and when this integration of posts and departments comes about at Bedford Park I hope that some consideration will be given to doing in South Australia our own research into this kind of teacher training so that eventually our own teachers will be trained within the confines of the university. I support the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I should appreciate further information from the Minister on the functions of and the main reasons for this suggested joint appointment. I have some doubts as to the wisdom of this move, and similar doubts have been expressed by honourable members on this side. I am sure the Minister will appreciate that this discussion has been engendered by a genuine desire to obtain the best in educational facilities for students who will attend the proposed Bedford Park Teachers College. In view of the doubts that have been expressed, I wonder whether the Minister would agree to adjourning the debate so that he would have an opportunity to give further consideration to these matters. I should like to know what is actually wrong with the system at the University of Adelaide and the Adelaide Teachers College, which was referred to by the honourable member for Glenelg. I recall that when the inquiry was being held by the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, Dr. Penny mentioned that there was some reciprocity of facilities between the Adelaide Teachers College at Kintore Avenue and the University of Adelaide; he said some facilities were shared. In fact, I believe he said that, on occasions, the teachers college undertook some of the examination work on behalf of the university.

Mr. Clark: It does nearly all the tutorials.

Mr. CUMBE: Yes. Therefore, there is much reciprocity between the two institutions, and I shall be interested to know what is behind the suggestion made by the honourable member

for Glenelg about some difficulty and differences between the two organizations. Does this position also apply in regard to the other two teachers colleges (Western and Wattle Park), which I realize do not teach secondary school trainees? It has been suggested that this joint appointment may impose too heavy a load upon the appointee, who is to be both the Professor of Education and the Principal. I wonder really why this is to be done, whether it is just for the first few years while the university is becoming established at Bedford Park when the Professor, if he had only the one job at the university, would perhaps find his job too light to occupy his time fully. I do not know. I know that both the university and the teachers college there will have a progressive intake year by year. In the early stages only a few subjects will be taught, and it may be that the teaching load would be rather light for the Professor if he only undertook his normal duties at the university.

Perhaps the Minister could tell us also whether this proposed joint appointment system is adopted in universities in other parts of Australia or in other parts of the world. I think such information might tend to allay some of the concern being expressed by members on this side of the House. Frankly, I do not know whether this proposed system operates in other parts of the world, and perhaps the Minister could explain whether we in this State are adopting a tried and proven system or whether we are trying out something that has not been attempted before. I am reminded that the Principals of the three existing teachers colleges have a great deal of administrative work. Whilst they cannot, of course, know all the students under their care, I think it is important that they should know many of them, certainly the senior students, and I think it is important to the students that they should have ready access to the Principal at times when they have important subjects or matters to discuss with the Principal. I know that the Principal's personal knowledge of the students is important, and that this is an important aspect of student life.

The report that was mentioned this evening by the Chairman of the Public Works Committee was placed on members' files on May 13 this year. As far as I can recollect, the committee's visit to Melbourne was late last year (in fact, the project was referred to the committee only in July of last year), so the

comments made by the Chairman (the honourable member for Onkaparinga) are of fairly recent origin. I would imagine that those comments were made within the period of 18 months that the Minister of Education mentioned in his explanation of this Bill, and that appears to be the period covered by the initial talks between the university and the Director and, I presume, the former Minister of Education. That is why I am suggesting that the Minister may agree to having a further look at this matter. I appreciate that the report stated that certain facilities would be common, that they would be shared by students attending both institutions. We must remember that this Bedford Park Teachers College is expected to accommodate 1,200 students by 1970, and that those would be predominantly secondary students. That means that most of these students would be attending the university for part of their time.

In the schedule of accommodation we have an office for the Principal and offices for two Vice-Principals, presumably for one male and one female, quite apart from the Warden. This, of course, means that these two officers would have a greater load than would normally be thrust upon them, almost exceeding the load thrust upon the Principals of the other colleges. In the other three colleges where the Principals have a full-time job, the enrolment at Adelaide is 1,260, at Western it is 1,040 and at Wattle Park about 800. It appears that it will be a solid teaching and administrative load for the Principal at Bedford Park. He may find it difficult to do both jobs, especially if he has other administrative work, probably as Dean at the university. I hope the Minister will be able to answer my queries.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): This is a measure that could be good or bad, but I think that the odds are against its being a success. It presupposes that because a man is Professor of Education he must necessarily be a good principal of a teachers training college. That might not be a fair or correct assumption, but it could be. If this man leaves his professorial office does he cease to be the Principal of the teachers college? Does the next appointee to the Chair of Education automatically take over the position, and will he be qualified to be a Principal of the teachers training college? It is possible that because of the dual position the Professor of Education could learn something from the training college that might be of advantage. It may be a good idea to infuse

new ideas into the seat of academic learning, the university.

The salary of a professor at the university is probably about £5,000, and that of a principal of a teachers training college about £4,500. Will this appointee receive both salaries? It will be unfair if he does, but if he is not to receive them, we are getting something on the cheap, which is an unfair attitude to people aspiring to the office of principal of a teachers training college. I do not know sufficient about this situation; I have to rely upon what analysis I can make of it. I am not well versed in university matters or matters educational but I do know that, if what I said (particularly about salaries) is correct, it will sow seeds of dissension that will militate against any likelihood of this dual position being a success. I am prepared to support the second reading and listen to any amendments that may be proposed in the Committee stages, but I am not prepared to damp down the whole scheme just because of my fears.

I once made a forecast in this House when the Potato Board was put into operation. I voted for the legislation because the growers had to have a vote whether or not they were in favour of the board, so I could not deprive them of a vote; but I said then, "If you do vote for the Potato Board, you will vote potatoes out of existence." What is the price of potatoes today? Here, if the position is that one man receives two salaries for the two positions, it will breed utter discontent. On the other hand, if he gets his full professorial salary and only a part-time rate of pay as the Principal of the Bedford Park Teachers Training College, that, too, will cause dissension. The whole question is fraught with danger, yet I am broad-minded enough to see that I could be entirely wrong—but I just don't think I am!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): In view of what occurred earlier this session when I was attacked for daring to disagree with the people who formulated the Martin Report on teacher training, I find the remarks made this evening most illuminating and surprising. I was interested to hear the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) assure me that the interest of the members of the Opposition was entirely that they wanted to be quite sure that we were doing the right thing in making this change, that we were doing something that was really for the benefit of education. Well, I accept that but I must

confess that I find the intense interest of honourable members opposite at this stage most belated, because, as has been stated, I did inherit this Bill from my predecessor and, what is more, the members of the Opposition must surely have known all about it as my predecessor made a public statement about it in 1964.

Mr. Quirke: They did not necessarily agree on it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The former Minister proclaimed it in a public statement. The then Premier approved of this matter in the docket, so it is somewhat belated that we should now have this doubt about the desirability of this Bill. I agree entirely that we should be most careful about a measure of this sort but, when this Bill first came into the House, the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) said that he did not intend to offer any substantial opposition to its passage through this House. He made a speech in which he drew attention to a number of things. He paid a great tribute to the officers of the Education Department, but he also said:

I would like the Minister to indicate what steps, if any, have been considered, and what steps will be taken to ensure that the person appointed to this office is ably and actively supported by those immediately beneath him, so that he can give due attention to the two tasks that he is required to perform under this legislation.

Of course, the member for Flinders was right on the ball there, because this is one of the most important aspects of the suggestion. If honourable members opposite had thought about the question of administration in a situation of this character, surely they would have recognized that, where the Principal of the college was acting in this dual capacity, the administrative problems would have been carefully examined to see that the person who held the post was in a position to carry out his duties adequately. Surely it is under-rating the intelligence of the people who have been considering this matter for at least the last 18 months to suggest that the administrative problems of this sort of position have not been carefully canvassed.

As a matter of fact, dual appointments of this sort have operated in other universities, and it is not considered that the major difficulty will be one of over-work. Rather, it will relate to the building up of a close relationship between the work of the teachers college and that of the university, which will require special personal qualities as well as high academic qualifications. It will not be an easy task, but it will be a rewarding one,

and the Professor, as Principal, will be relieved of most of the day-to-day administration of the teachers college by the appointment of the second Vice-Principal. He will also be given adequate supporting staff for his university functions. In these functions he will be a member of the School of Social Sciences. At Bedford Park there will not be university departments in the North Terrace sense. The administrative unit will be the school, and the Professor will not be burdened by the usual administrative responsibilities as head of the university department.

These problems of administration have been most carefully considered with a view to ensuring that this arrangement will function satisfactorily. Surely, honourable members opposite will not suggest that the people who came together from the university and the Education Department in the first instance will blindly proceed without considering the difficulties raised tonight. I am surprised that honourable members opposite did not think of all these things before, when their own Government was dealing with the matter. For example, in the docket there is the announcement by my predecessor in 1964. I think it is worth reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister quotes from the docket, I shall ask that it be tabled.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am quite happy to have the docket tabled.

The SPEAKER: Can the Minister inform me whether what he proposes to quote is a public statement or a statement obtainable only from the docket?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The matter I was about to quote from is headed "Press Statement". Am I in order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The Minister is in order in quoting from a press statement, but if he is quoting from a statement that is in the docket only, then the docket must be tabled.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This press statement reads as follows:

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: When was it published?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Unfortunately, there is no date on the press statement.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Was it published?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Presumably. However, if there is any great objection, I will not quote it. The point is that it makes it clear that my predecessor was entirely in favour of this proposal and praised it in no

uncertain terms from every angle. He had nothing but praise for it. He was fully in favour of it but, if there is any great sensitivity on the part of honourable members opposite about it, I shall not bother to read it. After all, I have given the text of it, and the House can be assured that I am not in the habit of misleading on matters like this. That is why I said I did not mind anybody reading the docket.

Other matters raised by honourable members dealt with a number of phases of the subject. For example, the question of the field of applications for appointment has been canvassed. It has been agreed that applications shall be invited in the same way as for other professorial appointments, namely, by advertisement in the press and journals in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the United Kingdom. Members of the State Education Department would, of course, be eligible to apply in the ordinary way.

It has been agreed that the successful candidate will in all respects be a professor at the university, that his salary will be at the professorial rate, that he will have the usual study leave and superannuation right, and that payment of his salary will be shared equally by the Education Department and the university.

Mr. Quirke: Is that only a professorial salary?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That is the information I have.

Mr. Quirke: In other words, he has an unpaid job?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: If the honourable member would listen to my explanation of the way the administrative duties are to be divided I think he would appreciate the position regarding the salary. The Leader raised some queries about matriculation; I believe he was concerned about the introduction of the new matriculation arrangements. I emphasize that an increasing number of students has been entering the university with Leaving Honours, and I have figures that show the greatly increased numbers in recent years in that category compared with the numbers years ago, when so many entered university with the Leaving certificate only. The new matriculation standard is approximately that of the old Leaving Honours; there is no need for me to go into details on that. I have the figures for each year 1958 to 1965, but I will quote just two years to show the tremendous change that has taken place in the standard of

students entering the University of Adelaide. The following table shows the position:

	1958.	1965.	
Leaving only:			
Full-time . . .	127	171	
Part-time . . .	152	198	
Total	—	—	369
Leaving and			
Leaving			
Honours:			
Full-time . . .	424	1,300	
Part-time . . .	74	289	
Total	—	—	1,589
Total students	777	1,958	

Honourable members will see from the figures that there has been a tremendous trend towards an increasing number of students with Leaving Honours. It has been suggested that because of the change in the matriculation standard we will reach a point where very few students will enter the university in any one year. However, the figures I have given show that that is obviously not so. There could be a diminution in the numbers, but it will be only slight because of the natural trend over the years towards a far greater number of students having Leaving Honours when entering the university.

The Leader referred to this matter as being a costly experiment in one of the most costly institutions in the State. I cannot see how this can be a particularly costly experiment. With regard to his phrase "an experimental farm", I think that this was introduced more as a statement of ridicule than anything else, because obviously no analogy exists between an experimental farm and experimenting with teacher training. As a matter of fact, the Martin Report emphasizes greatly the importance of experimenting with teaching training, and the criticism by the people who prepared the Martin Report was to the effect that there was far too little experimentation in teacher training. They suggested that the teachers colleges should be autonomous and not under the bureaucratic domination of the Education Department, or words to that effect.

Mr. Millhouse: You did not think much of that?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No, I did not because I thought it was ridiculous. At the time I said there was a high degree of autonomy in our teachers colleges, and that I had the highest regard for their efficiency. However, that does not mean that no need exists for experiments in teacher training. In fact, the Director of Education will shortly be leaving on a visit to Western Germany, the United States of America, and Great Britain, and one of the questions he will examine while

away will be that of experiments in teacher training in those countries.

Mr. Clark: Will the Minister make the Director's report public on his return?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will certainly do that, because the Director is a particularly competent man in regard to this question. I am sure his report will be of considerable value to the State. It is interesting that in this age the thing that is striking all educationists is the rate of change. It is far greater than has ever been the case in past decades. No matter what article or book on education one cares to read the question always raised by educationists is that we need more experimentation in all phases of education in order to ensure that, in our education processes, we are keeping pace with the rapid changes. It is not only because of this that we think this is an excellent idea, but it is also because the relationship between the Education Department, our teachers colleges, and the University of Adelaide has not been what it should have been in the past.

I had the good fortune to get an invitation to address the university students on any subject that I liked. It was most interesting that I should have received, before going to the university, a letter from a man who had just arrived from New South Wales, and who is a lecturer at the university. He wrote to the Education Department saying that his interest in our education system was not merely academic but personal, as he had children to educate. He said that he had been told at the university about the shortcomings of our education system, and he listed a number of items. I called for a report on those items and was able to show that the information he had received was completely wrong. I instanced this at the luncheon address I gave at the university to the students and many of the lecturers. I pointed out that it was obvious that this sort of so-called information was being disseminated, and that there was much misconception about the Education Department in South Australia.

I am satisfied that the relations between the department and, in particular, our teachers colleges can be greatly improved as a result of the suggested experiment. I do not have the slightest doubt that with improved communications people of different groups will understand one another much better. It is desirable that there should be a better understanding in South Australia between all phases of the Education Department and the university. I think it was the member for Burnside (Mrs.

Steele) who suggested that it was wishful thinking to imagine that this would come about as a result of this particular experiment. I think the honourable member instanced the fact that there had been (according, I think, to the member for Glenelg) not the best of relations between the Adelaide Teachers College and the university. The fact of the matter is that there has not been the close liaison between the Adelaide Teachers College and the university that there will be under this arrangement at Bedford Park.

Mr. Hudson: This is exactly the point.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. I am sure that, if we establish this sort of arrangement at Bedford Park, out of this we will not only have a better understanding as between the people in the university and the people in the teachers college at Bedford Park but, as a result of that liaison and the interchange of ideas, the ideas that have been so paramount at the university and possibly elsewhere in this State regarding the Education Department and its teachers colleges will be changed also as a consequence because the ideas will be bruited around and exchanged.

Mr. Heaslip: Can you give us details of these dual appointments elsewhere?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not have the particulars about where those appointments have been made, but I am assured on the very best of authority that this sort of dual authority exists in other universities, and if the honourable member desires the details I shall endeavour to obtain them. I assure the honourable member that that information comes from the most reliable source in Adelaide.

I think it was the member for Onkaparinga who said that by doing this we would be demoting the Adelaide Teachers College. Really, I cannot follow this suggestion at all. I do not think the Adelaide Teachers College comes into this matter at all; there is no relationship, so any question of demoting simply does not arise. I think he also raised the question of what percentage of his time the new Principal would have allotted to each of his duties. Surely, in view of my explanation regarding the administrative set-up, this question does not arise, because I have shown that the administrative details are amply provided for in the suggested arrangements I outlined. It is not a question of the Principal having to say, "Well, I will devote from 9 a.m. to 12 noon to the university and from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. to the teachers college." When one speaks of it in that manner one would imagine that the

Principal in this instance was the only administrative officer in control of these two sections at Bedford Park, but that is not the case. Therefore, I cannot accept that analogy.

Then again we had the member for Stirling saying he was afraid that the Principal, who would probably be an academic, would teach the students along a single line. I do not think the Principal will be teaching students at all. We will have people in charge of the college who are expert in the question of teacher training. They will be competent people. The experiments in teacher training will naturally be gradual ones. We are experimenting in the Education Department in various directions, and they are all gradual experiments. What is more, the proposed arrangement is that the administration of the college will be a matter of the utmost and closest liaison between the Director of Education and the university people at Bedford Park. It is not as though there will be no contact between the organizations.

I was interested to hear the loud praise by the member for Flinders for the officers of the department, praise that was echoed this evening in a large degree by members opposite. They have praised the officers in the teachers colleges and the excellent officers we have in the department. I accept that and agree with it. Members opposite would be interested to know that the Director of Education is most enthusiastic about this proposition. He is also much opposed to our teachers training colleges being autonomous, and agreed with my remarks about the Martin Report. On this appointment he has spent much time and thought, and he has nothing but praise for the suggested arrangements. If the officers are as good as honourable members opposite have said, surely we should take notice of what they think about this matter. The original discussions on this matter were between one of the highest professors of the university and one of the highest officers of the Education Department. Negotiations went on between officers at the highest level, and the matter was fully examined. As I cannot read from the file, I am unable to read the actual words of the Director, but members can take my word for it—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Minister can read it if he is prepared to make the file available. I suggest he read it and then table it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director had the utmost praise for the suggestion, and I suggest to honourable members opposite that,

if the Director and the officers of my department had any mental reservations about it, surely when I came into office that was a golden opportunity for them to say, "For goodness sake don't let this Bill go on." Instead of that the first thing I received was a reminder that this was a most urgent matter, and that a Bill should be prepared at the first opportunity as Bedford Park would open in 1966. Therefore, it was important that this dual position should be filled soon.

Mr. Heaslip: Whose request was that?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Mr. Speaker, may I say whose request it was?

The SPEAKER: The Minister knows that he is at liberty to quote anything that is a public statement but, if he desires to quote from a docket that information which is contained only within that docket, he is required to lay the docket on the table. He also realizes that, if he does so, it becomes the property of the House and not of the department.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director and another important officer of the department drew my attention to this, and that important officer suggested to me this morning that it was most urgent that this Bill be passed at the earliest opportunity. I assure honourable members opposite that they can take my word for that.

Mr. Heaslip: The teachers college at Bedford Park will not be available for a couple of years!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This is a dual appointment and the university is to open in 1966. Therefore, if we are going on with the measure, it is essential that an appointment be made now. After all, if the appointment is to be a dual one surely the honourable member would not suggest that we call for applications for an appointment of a different character for an interval of two or three years from what will eventually be the case when the teachers college starts?

Mr. Heaslip: I am suggesting that he will be Principal of a college that does not exist.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member will realize that, if we do that and he is appointed to this position, he should surely be made aware that in the course of, say, two or three years' time at the outside when the teaching college is operating, he will be expected to occupy the dual position. If the honourable member cares to give the matter a little thought, he will appreciate the logic of having this matter treated as urgent in view of what we intend to do.

Mr. Clark: How can you call for applications without telling people the true facts?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It has been suggested that there has been a change in the 18 months since this proposal arose and that therefore we should view this differently. If there has been any change, I can only say that whatever changes have occurred in 18 months have been in the nature of making this proposal even more necessary and important, for the very good reason, as I said earlier, that the rate of change today is faster than ever before. So that, if the honourable member wishes to canvass the point that there has been a change, then the need today is greater than it was 18 months ago.

I want to emphasize that, when the Martin committee dealt with questions of tertiary education, teacher training was one of the most important subjects that it discussed. Why did it make it so? Obviously, it thought it was something requiring urgent attention. Although I have the highest regard for the work of our teaching colleges, I am sure that their Principals will agree with me when I say that we should be examining every aspect of our teacher-training methods, that we should be experimenting and finding out what improvements we can make to teacher training.

So I have no hesitation in saying that this is a Bill that can safely be accepted by honourable members. I appreciate that they want to get the best for education in this State and that we should examine this question thoroughly, but I remind them that this is not something new and that this matter has been considered carefully. Its effects have been examined both by my officers and by the officers of the university. It received the consideration of the previous Government for a considerable time and the blessing of my predecessor. The then Premier himself approved

of the proposition. Surely, in the light of all that I have said this evening we should go forward with confidence with this Bill, realizing that a good relationship between the university and the Education Department in general can only benefit all concerned, realizing too that arrangements are being made in such a way that there will be the closest liaison between the Education Department and the university in running the teachers college, and that only good can come from careful experimentation with teacher training. I commend this Bill to the House and hope that it will receive the full support of honourable members. In regard to the amendment foreshadowed by the Leader, I am prepared to give some consideration to his suggestion, but I make it plain that I think that the period he mentioned is too short. It is obvious that if there is to be a limiting factor we should at least take time to assess the results of what we are doing, and not impose a limit that will prevent us from making a reasonable assessment.

I am not opposed to a reasonable time being allowed for a proper assessment of the success or otherwise of this sort of proposal, but we should approach it with that end in view. I have the utmost confidence in the people who have put this proposal forward and who still support it. I hope that honourable members opposite will carefully think about what I have said, and give this measure the support it deserves.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 7, at 2 p.m.