

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, February 2, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

STRUAN FARM.

Mr. SHANNON: I understand that fairly recently an inspection was made of Struan Farm, which is an adjunct of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. Can the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Social Welfare, say whether a report is available on the effectiveness of the training given to the people who I understand are carefully selected for such training? Can he say what percentage of the people trained there finally take up gainful employment on the land, which is the field in which they are trained?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will ask the Minister to bring down a report by tomorrow, if possible. Although this would be only a guess, I imagine that the number of these people who finish up on the land would be very small indeed.

FORESTRY OFFICER.

Mr. CURREN: Some months ago I asked the Minister of Forests whether a permanent forestry officer would be appointed for the Upper Murray area. Can the Minister say what action has been taken in this matter, and whether such an appointment is likely to be made?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Government appointed a committee to inquire into the control and disposal of timber in the Chowilla area. This committee has met, has visited the area concerned, and is active in its inquiries. Out of this will come the method of control of timber in the Chowilla area and possibly in other Upper Murray areas. This being so, I consider it unwise at this stage to appoint a full-time officer of the Woods and Forests Department to the Upper Murray areas, as requested by the honourable member and others interested. However, I assure him the matter will be considered after the committee appointed for this purpose has reported to me.

E.F.S. UNIT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At the beginning of the present summer (I think at the end of October) I suggested to the Minister of Agriculture, by way of question, that, as the

main danger period for bushfires occurred during the university vacation, it would be a good idea to form a university students' emergency fire service unit, available to go wherever and whenever an emergency arose. I thought the Minister received the suggestion with a slight lack of enthusiasm: he certainly did not suggest that he would take the initiative in the matter. Two or three weeks ago I heard on the wireless a report of the success of a similar scheme in Victoria, I think at the University of Melbourne. In view of this report, and as it is too late to do anything this season but not too early to start something to be ready for next season, will the Minister reconsider this matter, and, if he still believes that it is a good idea, will he approach the Students Representative Council at the university concerning it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I regret that I did not show the degree of enthusiasm the honourable member required of me when he asked his question, but I pointed out then that, as the E.F.S. was a voluntary organization, these groups usually got together because of a common interest in a locality. In a country or hills area a group forms a body that becomes the district E.F.S. unit. I shall, however, be happy to consider the honourable member's suggestion and discuss it with Mr. Kerr, the Director, to ascertain what can be done.

STURT DAM.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was pleased to read in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Sturt dam, described as being behind the Flinders university, will be ready to hold back floodwaters this winter. I am pleased about this, because it is a key part of the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. My information, however, is that the scheme is generally well behind schedule, and I was therefore particularly pleased to read the last two sentences of the report:

The new dam will not overcome drainage problems on the eastern side of the Sturt River. This extension of the present programme cannot be undertaken until the river channel is enlarged and possibly concrete lined to accommodate the extra water.

I presume from this that the enlargement and concrete lining is the next step. Will the Minister of Education obtain from the Minister of Local Government a report as to whether work on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme is up to schedule, what work is expected to be undertaken next, and when that work will be done?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from my colleague and to inform the honourable member.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Minister of Works any information on future contracts relating to the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This morning, my colleague the Minister of Health (Hon. A. J. Shard) and I prepared the following joint statement:

Cabinet has accepted tenders from A. W. Baulderstone Proprietary Limited for two major contracts in the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. A contract for £1,100,000 provides for the completion of new buildings for the Dental Department, which will enable that department to produce 50 qualified dentists each year. Facilities for the treatment of dental patients will be increased from 40 to 130 dental units. A second contract for £2,500,000 provides for the building of the new main hospital ward block to be known as the North Wing. The building will have eight storeys, including basement and ground floors, and will consist of a central communication area radiating to three wings. The new ward block will house 570 patients, bringing to 1,075 the total number of beds ultimately to be provided in the new rebuilt hospital.

Work on the rebuilding scheme is proceeding to schedule. The first stage, consisting of medical teaching accommodation, main kitchen and cafeterias and administrative offices, was completed at the end of last year. Buildings under construction will provide new accommodation for the out-patients section and the new theatre tower (£2,500,000). A new boiler house at £270,000 is also under construction. The rebuilding scheme provides for future contracts to be let for a new wing for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, a new nurses home, the remodelling of some existing buildings, and the demolition of others.

CADELL IRRIGATION.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister of Irrigation say when work on the rehabilitation of the irrigation settlement at Cadell will be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Off hand, I do not have that information, but I shall obtain a report for the honourable member either by tomorrow or by next Tuesday.

TOD RIVER MAIN.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week, concerning moneys to be expended on water reticulation on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the honourable member's question, I took this mat-

ter up with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, who reports:

It will be noted that the Tod trunk main will be in a satisfactory condition by October next and, consequently, any expenditure on the main will be made available to commence the Lock-Kimba main. There has been no cut in the expenditure on the replacement of the Tod main and, in fact, the expenditure during the current year will slightly exceed the provision.

MILEAGE ALLOWANCES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked earlier this session regarding mileage allowances paid to public servants who use their own cars to undertake Government business?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not have a specific reply. However, I believe the overall position is that officers of some departments have, on a more or less voluntary basis, used their own cars and received a payment on the basis of a car of under 15 h.p. The Government will have a new policy on the use of motor cars as soon as the new Government garage is erected. We will then ascertain the economics of the matter. Some officers may use a Holden car or another make of similar horsepower, whereas others may use a Jaguar or a make of similar horsepower to that. However, the Government will not pay excessive rates for a Jaguar or other cars of that horsepower. Certain officers have been told that if they do not desire to use their own cars they may travel by public transport, but they hesitate to do that. The general position is that queries have been raised about the regulation that provides for the payment of car mileage, particularly with regard to the use of cars in the metropolitan area. Payment is made on the basis of a car of under 15 h.p., but some officers use cars of a similar horsepower to that of a Jaguar. In fact, I know that at least one officer uses a Jaguar. If any further information is available I shall bring down a report.

PORT PIRIE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning renovations to the Port Pirie Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been told by the Minister of Works that approval has been given for the expenditure of £8,775 for repairs and painting at this school.

NORTH YELTA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HUGHES: Last week the Minister of Works offered to have an investigation carried out into the North Yelta water supply near Moonta. Has he a report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has forwarded me the following report:

An investigation has been made into the complaint regarding poor supply at North Yelta, near Moonta, but no record can be found of a previous complaint at the Adelaide, Crystal Brook or Kadina offices of this department. Mr. Pedler is one of 18 consumers supplied by a 2in. cast iron unlined main which is fed from the Lower Paskeville to Moonta trunk main. It is one of many mains in this area laid to serve houses for the miners and is laid in a mineral lease. With the cessation of mining, many houses have gradually been abandoned and some of the departmental mains are now not required or else have very few services on them. The regional engineer, however, advises that there are 18 houses on the main referred to and an investigation confirms that the supply is poor. The main is a 2in. cast iron unlined main laid in 1896 and 2,450ft. in length, and appears to be badly corroded. Pressures in the trunk main to Moonta are not high during the hot weather and the only way the supply can be improved is by replacement of the main with a new 3in. A.C. main. The position is aggravated at this time of the year, due to the trunk main being fully taxed to meet the demands of holidaymakers at Moonta and Port Hughes, and some improvement should be apparent when the demand eases after the end of January. It is considered that replacement of the main is warranted and an estimate will be made and approval sought for the expenditure with provision being made for the replacement in the 1966-67 Loan Estimates.

LAKE LEVELS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last Thursday I asked the Minister of Works the following very comprehensive question on levels in Lake Albert. First, can he say what effect the Chowilla dam will have on the pool levels of barrages at Lake Alexandrina? Secondly, will this mean that there will be difficulties in maintaining Murray River levels and that Lake Albert will have to be drained? If this is so, what provision will be made to protect the interests of those people who rely on Lake Albert for water for irrigation?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Completion of the Chowilla dam will not adversely affect the maintenance or normal pool level in Lakes Alexandrina and Albert and will, in fact, improve the situation in drought years. Although evaporation losses from Chowilla will reduce the average flow below the dam by about 10 per cent, this will be at the expense of wet year flows. Dry year flows will be improved. In fact, this is the main purpose of Chowilla. Increased use of water in South Australia as development increases will cause a greater fall in lake levels during the summer months. Eventually it may be necessary to

isolate Lake Albert to reduce evaporation losses and, if this were done, a canal would be required to maintain a supply of water along the lake frontage.

The Chowilla dam is scheduled for completion in 1970, its capacity being a little more than 5,000,000 acre feet. The time required to fill Chowilla will depend upon the seasons, but a period of two years is probable. Only surplus water will be used for filling Chowilla and therefore the river below the dam will not be adversely affected. When filling has been completed, the flow will be regulated to provide South Australia's allocation of 1,254,000 acre feet, except in times of overflow, when excess water will flow into the lakes and the sea. Chowilla will ensure the maintenance of full supplies to South Australia, and it will therefore be possible to retain present levels at the commencement of each summer unless a drought of great severity and long duration occurs. There will be sufficient flow to ensure irrigation water in Lake Albert, although the level will fall during the summer months. As mentioned earlier, it may eventually be necessary to isolate Lake Albert to reduce evaporation and, if this were done, it would also be necessary to provide a canal to assure supplies to properties abutting the lake shore. The quantity of Murray water available will always be limited, and before embarking upon any scheme to irrigate the reclaimed Lake Albert it would be necessary to take into consideration the claims of other areas and view the situation as a whole.

CHOWILLA DAM.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Any delay in the completion of the Chowilla dam could have very serious implications. The general agreement for the establishment of Chowilla provided that work would be completed by 1968 so that the dam would be operating and be able to satisfy any demand by 1970, by which time the agreement with New South Wales would have terminated. The reports received by the previous Government showed that by 1970 a dangerous position would exist regarding our water supplies, and that it was necessary that the dam be completed in 1968. Will the Minister obtain a report on what is causing this very serious delay and on whether any action can be taken to overcome that delay so that the original proposals, which involved a contract with the New South Wales Government for the supply of water from the Menindee Lakes, can be implemented to effectively meet the position

in this State? If the delay is unavoidable, what steps can be taken to cover the position that will occur in a dry season if the dam is not operating?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be not only willing but anxious to get a report for the Leader, and as soon as it is to hand I will inform him so that he may ask a further question.

APPRENTICES.

Mr. LANGLEY: As there has been a shortage of skilled tradesmen in most trades in this State for many years, will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Labour and Industry whether there has been an increase in the number of apprentices in most trades this year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will refer the matter to my colleague for investigation, and will inform the honourable member when a reply is to hand.

SOLDIER SETTLERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Repatriation received any further communication from the Commonwealth Government about the appointment of a commission to inquire into the soldier settlement scheme at Loxton?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No further information has been received from the Commonwealth Government. As this matter will have to be considered at great length, and as it was referred to the Commonwealth Government only about a fortnight ago, I hardly think that at this stage I could call for even an interim report. Immediately the information comes to hand I will let the honourable member know.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL).

In Committee.

(Continued from February 1. Page 3688.)

Clauses 4 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Reconstitution of House of Assembly."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): The definition of "metropolitan area", which has been in the Act for many years, does not take into account the tremendous growth of that area and the large centres of population associated with that growth. Consequently, the definition has been severely criticized. I think the Premier will agree that in other legislation

this session the Government itself has not accepted such a definition as is contained in this Bill. For instance, in the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill the metropolitan area is defined as an area having a 25-mile radius. Will the Government consider a definition of the metropolitan area that would be more factual than the one in the Bill, so that the definition would be more in keeping with what is recognized by the Town Planner, with what the Government has introduced in other legislation, and with the present metropolitan area? The present definition is unrealistic with respect to the population growth, and I am sure that that contention would be accepted by the Minister responsible for town planning.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): This Bill is based on the present Constitution and makes no attempt to alter what was in that Act. The 13 metropolitan and 26 country seats under the present Constitution were used as a guide for this legislation. I did not suggest that Elizabeth should be included in the metropolitan area. When that city was established it was recognized as being outside the metropolitan area, and I cannot see why it should be included now. I will not agree to a metropolitan Adelaide as defined by the previous Government last session, stretching from Gawler to Sellick Beach. I cannot accept an amendment to define the metropolitan area under this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the Leader that clause 14 is the appropriate clause under which to discuss the definition of metropolitan area.

Mr. McANANEY: I protest against the proposed increase of the House of Assembly to 56 members. The State does not require it; it will be an unnecessary expense; and no reason exists for 56 members when 48 or 49 can adequately represent the State. Clause passed.

Clauses 10 and 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Deadlock provisions."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As well as decrying the object behind this clause, I have pointed out one or two errors in it. Its real object is to abolish the Legislative Council, because if this clause were passed in its present form the effect would be to give the power of abolition to this House. The two exceptions to the resolution of deadlocks under this proposal do not include matters affecting the Legislative Council. A subsequent Bill could be passed to abolish the Legislative Council and this could be held up for only 12 months. This is

in line with Labor's policy. Two matters in the clause need attention: the clause makes exceptions of a money Bill or a Bill containing any provision to extend the maximum continuance of the House of Assembly. Apparently there is no provision in the Bill to deal with these matters. Under the section of the Constitution Act to be repealed by this clause, some arrangements are provided for the resolution of deadlocks on all matters. This clause which replaces it extends to all matters, with two exceptions, both of which, although of great importance, are not to be dealt with at all. Apparently, we are to have no machinery to resolve deadlocks on money Bills in future. Obviously, a further clause is required to cover those two matters. I do not know why the Attorney-General, as the chief law officer of the State, allowed the Bill to come in without such a clause.

Mr. Shannon: It may be that he assumed the other House would not be there when this came into effect.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe, but I do not think the Attorney-General, in company with a number of other colleagues, checks his work before it comes into the Chamber. There is a provision to the effect that Bills shall go to the Legislative Council at least one month before the end of the session. As I pointed out earlier, the session ends not on the last day of sitting but when the proclamation proroguing Parliament is made a number of weeks after the last day of sitting. This matter also needs attention. My main objection to the clause is that it provides for the abolition of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): As I understood the honourable member's second reading speech, he was originally concerned with the two matters of the removal of the provision for deadlocks arising from money Bills and from Bills extending the life of the House of Assembly. He has apparently later suggested (which I had heard from another honourable member) that this clause provides that the Legislative Council can be abolished without the consent of that Chamber. As to that latter proposal, I must point out to the honourable member that the Constitution Act has to be read as a whole. This clause does not amend section 8 of the Constitution, which stands. Section 8 requires that any Bill altering the constitution of either Chamber shall be passed by an absolute majority at the second and third readings of the members of both Chambers. It cannot *pro tanto* repeal it, because the

original section is left there unamended. The possibility that this clause would do something of that kind was considered when the measure was drafted. In fact, I assure the honourable member that no part of this Bill has been introduced without the greatest care and attention being given to its verbiage.

Mr. Millhouse: I am afraid I cannot accept that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has often said that legislation introduced here has been sloppily drafted; he has not always been supported by his colleagues on this matter, and I have occasionally been provided with reports for the honourable member which, out of kindness to him, I have not read. I can only say that he needed to have paid more attention to the existing sections of the Constitution. True, members on this side believe that the Legislative Council should be abolished, but the way in which we intend that that should be done eventually is that the people should have the opportunity to vote on the matter by the election of a majority in the Legislative Council that will vote for its abolition. That position is preserved under the Bill. The honourable member's other main objection to this clause is that the deadlock provisions relating to money Bills and the extension of the life of this Chamber are removed. As a matter of practice, the existing deadlock provisions of the Constitution relating to money Bills are completely useless. The Lower Chamber must be dissolved, must go to an election, must come back, and put up the same measure to the Upper House; then if the Upper House refuses it, the Government may ask the Governor either for a dissolution of the whole of both Chambers or for an election of the Upper House with double the number of members.

Mr. Jennings: But still with the same franchise.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly. Nobody has ever tried to work the deadlock provisions about a money Bill; it would be impossible to work them. At the moment either the Legislative Council lays money Bills aside if it does not agree to them, or it makes suggestions as to amendments which are then resolved in a conference of managers between the two Chambers. The provisions relating to these arrangements are in the Joint Standing Orders; they obtain, and are not changed by this provision. As to the Bill to alter the life of this Chamber my Party's attitude is that, if such a measure is forthcoming while the

bicameral system obtains, we think it is perfectly proper that it should be passed by both Chambers. We have simply incorporated in this provision the provisions of the Parliament Act. This particular deadlock provision is taken from the British Act with only small changes of verbiage to fit into the Constitution of South Australia. In Great Britain these specific two exceptions to the rights of the House of Commons to legislate without the consent of the House of Lords without the delaying factor are made, and we believe they should be made here because the pledge given by us at the election was that the same deadlock provisions that existed between the two Houses in Great Britain should exist in this State. Opposition members say that this means the abolition of the Legislative Council. In fact, this provision in Great Britain has not meant the abolition of the House of Lords.

Mr. Millhouse: But it could.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far it has not, although the present Labor Government there is not particularly enamoured of the retention of the House of Lords. The way in which the Legislative Council must be abolished in South Australia is made perfectly clear by the Government. We believe that there should be a democratic suffrage for the Upper House, that the people should be given the opportunity to vote for members of the Upper House at a poll where the issue of the abolition of the Upper House would be clear, and that a majority must be elected to the Upper House to abolish it. My Party believes that the voice of the people should be heard and the opportunity given to the people specifically to vote on this issue, and that is what this provision maintains.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General did not mention the third point I made about the end of the session. He apparently accepted what I said about that. As to the abolition of the Legislative Council, as I pointed out by way of interjection, the present arrangement in Great Britain could lead to the abolition of the House of Lords on the vote of the House of Commons if the House of Commons took those steps. The Minister referred to section 8 of the Constitution Act (a section with which I am familiar), but I have little doubt that the new section would *pro tanto* repeal section 8 of the Constitution Act. The Attorney-General knows better than I, as he is a senior counsel, that subsequent enactment does *pro tanto* repeal an earlier enactment even if it does not in terms, and I am sure that, even though

the Minister will not accept that (and in view of his explanation it would be hard for him to accept it now publicly), he will agree with me that this is, at the least, an arguable matter and one that, if it is left in this form, would lead to much disputation and litigation. Although that might not be a bad thing from our point of view personally, it would not be good from the point of view of the State. I believe this would lead to the abolition of the Legislative Council and I am not convinced at all by the arguments the Minister has put forward.

With regard to my second point, whatever the Standing Orders are for the resolution of deadlocks on the matters referred to they must spring from some statutory provision. There must be something like that to give them their force. The only section I can see in the Constitution at present dealing with deadlocks is section 41 which deals with all sorts of Bills, money Bills and the extent of the maximum continuance of the House of Assembly included. That protection will not now apply. In its very terms the new provision does not extend to those two matters, so there is literally nothing at all in the Constitution. If the Attorney-General is relying on the Standing Orders he must admit that there is nothing at all in the Constitution to cover these two matters. Surely if you make exceptions to a provision and take those exceptions out of the purview of that section you must have a separate provision to deal with them. Surely that is so when you are repealing a provision that deals with everything. This matter is so clear that only an obstinate man would refuse to see it, and that is the position here. When he drafted this Bill the Attorney-General should have put in this provision and then had a subsequent provision for some machinery to deal with money Bills and the life of this House, but he forgot about it and now he is trying to justify himself. He cannot do that, so that on the three points I have mentioned I suggest the Bill will lead to the abolition of the Legislative Council, and at the least that is arguable. As to my second point, there is just a mistake or omission in the Bill and by not answering my third point the Minister acknowledged the truth of what I said.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

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

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 13 passed.

Clause 14—“Enactment of Part V of principal Act.”

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): This clause provides that the country shall have 26 seats and the metropolitan area 30, but, as the country will be completely mixed up with the metropolitan area, this will mean that rural industry will have no effective representation. Members know that the definition of “metropolitan area” is completely wrong in relation to expansion there. As a result of this, rural interests would be neglected and we could forget all about expansion. During the second reading debate members pointed out how adverse this clause and the definition could be. I have asked the Premier if he will amend the clause, but he has said that the Government is committed to it. In the circumstances, I ask the Committee to reject it out of hand.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not accept the Leader's statement that there will be no opportunities for industry and no representation for country people. My Party went to the country on this issue and said that it would have to retain the 26 existing country seats because of the Constitution, which now provides for 26 country and 13 metropolitan seats. The last measure introduced on this matter by the Party opposite would have reduced country representation. It has been suggested that this State will become bankrupt because it has a Labor Government, but that is all poppycock, and the Leader of the Opposition is not helping the position. Further capital investment in this State only needs to be encouraged, yet the Leader wants to pour cold water on all our efforts to get more industries into this State. No policy speech has ever received more attention than has the speech I made prior to the last election: members opposite have quoted over and over again to try to find something that is not mentioned. No greater compliment could be paid to any Government on its policy speech than that paid to this Government by the many references to my speech. It is not for me to define the metropolitan area, as that is already defined

so as to give 26 country seats. I hope this clause will be carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This clause contains several new sections. Will we take each new section separately, as we did on the Maintenance Act Amendment Bill? Otherwise, we shall be arguing on this and other important points at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN: I considered this matter earlier. This Bill has been on members' files for about seven months and no amendments have been tabled, so I have taken it for granted that no amendments will be moved. However, as the point has been raised, I will follow the procedure I followed on the previous Bill. I now call on new section 76, “Appointment of Electoral Commission”.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: New section 76 (3) provides that the commissioners shall hold office until the commission has completed its duties under this Act. I point out the significance of coming to a decision on this. If it completes its duties (a very vague phrase) when the report is presented to the Government or the Governor, then it cannot be asked to reconsider it, but if it does not complete its duties until the report is published, if it ever is, then the report could conceivably be referred back to the commission. I ask the Attorney-General what his interpretation is, and what the intention of the Government was, because the way this is drafted is indeterminate and vague. When is it that the commission will have completed its duties?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The commission will have completed its duties at such time as there is a final publication and there is no further conceivable duty for the commission as then constituted.

The CHAIRMAN: New section 77, “Procedure at meetings”; new section 78, “Application of Royal Commissions Act”; new section 79, “Redistribution”.

Mr. SHANNON: I listened with some amusement to the protests of the Premier. As Shakespeare said, “The lady doth protest too much, methinks.” The Premier said the Government was not going to rob the country people of any of its representation, because the 26 districts would remain inviolate, but he must think we are children, for he conveniently omitted to say that the Government would multiply the metropolitan representation by roughly 2½ times. If the present definition of “metropolitan area” had any real merit in this argument, this Government robbed it of any merit it had by subsequently introducing

a Bill containing a very appropriate definition of the metropolitan area. I refer to the Juvenile Courts Bill, which defines the metropolitan area as being that part of the State which is within 10 miles of any part of the City of Adelaide or of the City of Port Adelaide, or any other part of the State declared by proclamation to be included in the metropolitan area for the purposes of that Act.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That was only for administrative purposes.

Mr. SHANNON: I have no doubt at all about that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We could declare Whyalla under the metropolitan area under that provision.

Mr. SHANNON: The Attorney-General cannot slip away under cover here, because the first paragraph of the definition I quoted is in clear language. Anyone who knows anything at all about the geography of the Adelaide Plains will readily understand that that definition takes a very realistic approach to the growth that has taken place around Adelaide during the last decade. The soft approach that we are getting in this Bill, that the Government is not interfering with the existing definition of the metropolitan area, cuts no ice at all with any thinking person, and it cannot do so. South Australia is not going to stand still in the future. We have reports from well qualified people that we can expect a metropolitan population of about 1,000,000 within the next 25 years. This Shibboleth that the Premier is trying to hang on to in the definition of the metropolitan area is too silly for words: it has already changed, and the Government itself has agreed that it has changed. In fact, it has provided elsewhere for that change. We have this sop to the country people that they will lose no member of Parliament as a result of this redistribution, but that is an argument that has all sorts of side issues in this legislation. It gives the opportunity to the commission to include in the fringe country seats certain parts of the metropolitan area proper. It is obvious that we are going to interfere only with that portion of the Constitution Act which in the opinion of the Government has a possible detrimental effect on its future.

Mr. COUMBE: Even if the Government does not accept our point of view on this matter, at least we are putting it forward here as something that should be considered more deeply. The Premier said at the last election that his Party would introduce a Bill to provide for

56 seats and that 26 of them would be in the country. In my second reading speech I said that this matter of electoral reform was one of the principal reasons for the Labor Party being returned. We accept the statement that that Party said there would be 56 seats, 26 of which would be in the country.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And one vote one value.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, and I referred to this in my previous speech, but I said there had been a departure from that principle. In the previous Bill, introduced in 1963, the commissioner's report recommended that the metropolitan area should be extended to take in the fringe areas. According to figures from the Electoral Department, as at December 31 last there were about 45,000 electors in the subdivisions around the fringe of the metropolitan area as defined in this Bill. As a result of the quota and of the proposed cut-up, we would have about seven of the country seats in the fringe areas of Adelaide, with 19 seats outside those areas. Under the provisions of new section 80 (b) (ii) the interests of persons living in the metropolitan area would be regarded by the commission as common with the interests of persons at Tea Tree Gully or Reynella. It is a fallacy to retain the rigidly defined metropolitan area, as that is artificial today, and it will have to be extended to include these areas.

It was suggested that the Bill introduced in 1963 would deplete existing country representation, but it would not have done so. It extended the metropolitan area but there would have been 22 country seats outside that area. With the number of electors in the State at present, in future under the provisions of this Bill, 37 seats will be grouped in and around the metropolitan area, with 19 seats in country areas. I refuse to accept the view that a person living in a fringe area is in a country seat. The Premier said he had promised on behalf of his Party that there would be 56 seats, including 26 in the country. However, he said nothing to prevent the Government from extending the 30 metropolitan seats beyond the rigid definition contained in this Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Premier has often said that the definition of the metropolitan area in this Bill is the definition set out in the present Constitution Act. However, that Act contains no definition of the metropolitan area: the districts are set out but not as districts inside or outside the metropolitan area. The term comes from a much earlier Bill, not from the Constitution Act. Just now

the Premier said that in his policy speech he said there would be 26 country seats but, in fact, he did not say anything about country or city seats in his policy speech. Nor did he say anything about one vote one value or about a dozen things that are contained in the Bill. In his policy speech the Premier said:

Tonight, I propose to give a firm indication that our policy provides for a House of 56 members, the abolition of the Legislative Council and one roll for all Parliamentary elections. In the event of forming a Government, early legislation will be introduced to provide for an increase in the number of members in the House of Assembly and an alteration to the voting franchise in the Legislative Council which will mean that every person who is entitled to a vote for the Lower House receives one also for the Upper House, pending its abolition. I believe you will agree that it is most desirable to have greater numbers in the House of Assembly, particularly if a Government is going to govern without the assistance of some other party.

The original suggestion of the Playford Government to provide a House of 42 members was certainly not acceptable to the Labor Party. This original Liberal and Country League proposal was nothing less than gerrymandering the present gerrymander. Now the Playford party wants to postpone reform further by setting up a Royal Commission, whereas our proposal is reform; it is based on the same principles that exist in the Federal sphere and in other States of Australia. Another Playford proposal was to create another district of four members in the Legislative Council on a restricted franchise. This was opposed and will continue to be opposed by the Labor Party whenever it is submitted to Parliament.

So also will any proposal to increase the Ministry to provide for six Ministers in the House of Assembly and three in the Legislative Council until there is a substantial increase in the number of members in the House of Assembly.

If Sir Thomas Playford desires to establish the office of Premier, this can and should be done by regulation.

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

I cannot see anything there about a definition of the metropolitan area, or about an assurance of 26 country members. Members opposite seem to forget that the rural industries of this State have been and will continue to be the backbone of South Australia's prosperity and economic welfare. We have already seen, this session, legislation directly aimed at rural industries and supported by

members opposite who claim to represent rural districts. Unless we look after our rural industries, this State will not maintain the prosperity and standard of living that everyone desires. Nothing in the Premier's policy speech would prevent the Chamber from considering a proper representation of rural industries, but the Bill does not provide for that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier a few moments ago rather emotionally referred to the way his Party had adhered to its policy this session. I remind him that, although his Party's platform allows for a 10 per cent tolerance to be laid down for districts, a 15 per cent tolerance has been provided in new section 79 (3). Can the Premier say why the Government has seen fit to depart from Labor's platform, and to increase the tolerance from 10 to 15 per cent? Why, with regard to new section 79 (4), is the Premier so certain that the two seats that will have such a low quota will be in the northern and western parts of the State, because there is nothing in the Bill to lay down where they shall be?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is specifically designed for the District of Frome. The Premier said so on television.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not responsible for my Party's not having sent the member for Mitcham a complete summary of what took place at the last convention, but I assure him that our policy is being implemented in the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Much of the discussion on this new section (with some overlap on the next one) seems to be based on the view that there is some basis of representation on rural interests, rural industries, and the metropolitan area and its industries. The Government has no policy to separate citizens one from another and to say that different interests shall be represented in Parliament. The Labor Party has made it clear that the people to be represented in Parliament are the citizens, that there is no basis in justice for saying that people who live here should have greater representation than those who live there, or that those who own more should have more representation than those who own less.

Our Party's policy was for a 56-member Chamber elected on a principle of one vote one value. We provided for substantially equal electoral districts as regards numbers of electors and for a return to the original basis

of the Constitution as contained in the resolution passed unanimously by the elected members of the first Legislative Council of South Australia (the Kingston and Baker resolution). We also gave an undertaking that in making a 56-member House of Assembly there would be no reduction in the effective representation in this place of those areas that were presently called country areas. Those areas were defined not in 1954 but by the Butler Government in 1936. True, we have taken that original definition because that was the existing definition at the time of the last State election. True, too, we have not altered that definition although it is some time since it was last used. It was last used on instructions to a commission in 1954. In 1954 the Playford Government used the same definition as the Butler Government used in 1936.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We asked for a new definition in 1963.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason the previous Government asked for a new definition in 1963 was that it gave away the cherished 1872 principle, the thing on which the Liberal Party had said it nailed its colours to the mast—two country members for every city member.

The reason why that Government gave it away, and why it was not prepared to continue with principles that had been said to be sacred and inviolable in 1954, was that, if it had done so, it would have been out of office. Members opposite know that if they had had a redistribution in 1963 on the same instructions that were given to the commission in 1954 they would have been forced to vacate the Treasury benches. They had to get a principle of rural areas so defined as to limit rural interest. Fisheries and mining and quarries, which were contained in the normal definition of primary production, were to be ruled out and there was to be a reduction of country interests in certain areas and an increase in Parliamentary representation for certain selected areas of the country that would return Liberal Party members. That was the honest, fair and principled suggestion of honourable members at that time! It was a disgraceful and shocking thing and the people of the State rightly rejected it.

Mr. Nankivell: You are doing the same thing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, we are not. We said that we would have a 56-member State based on substantially equal districts but that there would be no reduction whatever in the representation of present country districts.

This was to provide that country people would have the same service from members as they had received before. We provided that country districts would not have larger areas from which to send members back to Parliament. That was the only qualification we made.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You did not explain that clearly before.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, we did. We said it in every election speech; I said it on television. Let the honourable member replay the television programme on electoral reform. What we did in providing a definition of country areas was to ensure that in the division of the State into substantially equal districts as regards numbers of electors the commission would not reduce the existing representation from the 26 seats that had been previously defined. That is all that has been done. There is, in fact, a substantial approximation to the quota. There was only a departure from the quota in any sense beyond that which is used by most writers on the subject of electoral reform (people such as Finer) in those areas of the State that are so sparsely settled that it is impossible to come to the quota and provide a seat that is viable; that is, in which a member can give effective representation. That was allowed in the first set of districts for South Australia upon the carrying of the Baker and Kingston resolution in regard to the original seats of this House. That same principle was allowed then and it is allowed today in Great Britain.

Mr. Nankivell: Do you really believe in one vote one value?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course I do, and in the fixing of these seats this commission is still subject to the overall provision that it must get as near to the quota as it possibly can.

Mr. Nankivell: The quota is not based on one vote one value.

Mr. Shannon: The new section states "shall be more than"; those words are specific.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: New section 79 (4) states:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (1), (2) and (3) of this section the Commission may, if it is satisfied that it is desirable for reasons of sparsity and remoteness of population and difficulties of communication, provide that in not more than two electoral districts the number of electors shall be more than fifteen per cent below the electoral quota.

Mr. Shannon: It states "shall be more than".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The operative word is "may". In fact, the overall provision for the further two seats must be within the terms of the existing Commonwealth Electoral Act and that Act was designed to carry out the principle of one vote one value as the composers of the Act proclaimed, as the colleagues of members opposite in the Commonwealth Parliament proclaimed, and as the debates in the original Commonwealth Conventions made clear. There is no departure from the principle. The Government is specifically doing what it told the electors it would do, and it has an overwhelming mandate. It received the greatest vote given to any State Parliamentary Party in the Commonwealth in the last 50 years because of its policy on electoral reform; and this Bill embodies that policy. We have no reason to apologize for anything in the Bill and members opposite, by putting out red herrings on this clause, are only covering up the sort of thing that they represent to the electors as having any sort of basis in principle.

Mr. HALL: I remind the Attorney-General that he is not now playing the same role as he played last session as member for Norwood in the Opposition, and that he requires a better basis for emotional arguments than he has presented here recently. The basis for his argument, supported by quotations from various sources, was that no effective reduction would occur in country representation. The reason given for this claim is that the same number of members will represent the same area as that previously defined. This argument, however, disregards the projected increase of numbers in this Chamber. We know that a number of Government members have won their seats by currying favour in their districts. The member for Unley boasts that he has knocked on 11,000 doors, or some such fantastic figure. The honourable member is an example of the value put on currying political favour and not on attention to legislation in this place, which is what the people of South Australia will demand in future. This is a real comparison that will emerge to the detriment of the Government. People will demand attention to things that matter and not consider whether members knock on doors and make themselves good fellows. It is about time we got back to true values in political life in South Australia. It ill behoves the Attorney-General to say that no effective reduction will take place.

Mr. McKee: It's got you worried. The writing is on the wall for you.

Mr. HALL: I think that some day the member for Port Pirie will be counted for the number of days and the number of hours he spends on legislation, and his attitude to it, and not just the fact of how he is regarded in his district as a person.

Mr. Jennings: You won't be here to see it.

Mr. HALL: It is clear that the Premier refers only to those parts of his election speech that suit him. He refuses to mention some other points. It is strange that the things he does not mention affect life in the country. The member for Port Pirie knows that the Premier made promises in his election speech that he would not dare mention now, and that most of those things affect country people. I say that this is an anti-country Bill, just as other measures introduced this session are anti-country measures. Does the Premier think that some of the measures introduced this session will enable primary production to continue in areas around Adelaide? We have already argued the facet of how land tax affects these people close to the city. Agriculture is doomed in those areas, and will not now operate economically.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My problem is to reconcile the great variation that exists between new section 79 and the declared platform of the Australian Labor Party. As I said earlier, I foolishly paid 5s. for a brand new copy of the constitution, and this brought me up to date with Labor Party policy to the end of June, 1965. This Bill was placed on the file on July 1 last year. Why, if the Trades Hall branch of the A.L.P. drew up this Bill, is there such a wide variation between the Bill and the declared platform of the Party? At page 38 of that platform, under the heading "Constitutional and Electoral", the following appears:

An independent electoral boundaries commission to provide approximately equal voting strength, on the principle of one vote one value for electorates subject to a margin of one-tenth over or under the average.

Mr. Nankivell: The Labor Party could not make it work.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not know whether the member for Albert is reflecting on the general conference of the A.L.P., which drew up this clause in the constitution. That conference is the governing body that directs policy within the Labor Party, and it is that governing policy that should be reflected in this Bill.

Mr. Rodda: Is it being reflected?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, because new section 79 (1) provides:

Subject as hereinafter mentioned, the Commission shall divide the State into 56 approximately equal electoral districts for the House of Assembly.

Subsection (3) provides:

For the purposes of subsection (1) of this section electoral districts for the House of Assembly shall be regarded as being approximately equal to each other if no such district contains a number of electors more than 15 per cent above or below the electoral quota. When the Premier faces the Labor Party conference next year, I do not doubt that he will be called upon to explain why the Bill he has introduced varies so drastically from the declared policy laid down by his governing body at the conference last year. The people of South Australia, including all the honest folk who make their contribution to A.L.P. funds, will want to know why their elected representatives here have not carried out their wishes. The Premier, if he is an honest Premier, must give good reasons to this Chamber why he has seen fit to override the regulation made by the A.L.P. conference.

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Light shows an abysmal ignorance of the Labor Party's platform, although he has a rule book before him.

Mr. Freebairn: Which rule am I ignorant of?

Mr. JENNINGS: Every one. The honourable member has completely overlooked (he has not accepted the word of the Premier) that a special conference of the Australian Labor Party, held at the request of Parliamentary representatives, resolved that there should be two seats which, because of the sparseness of population, could not be represented adequately unless the policy was altered to the extent that it has been altered to conform to this Bill.

Mr. Freebairn: Get back to the 10 per cent variation.

Mr. JENNINGS: The observations by the member for Light about what he thought was in the rule book are completely irrelevant.

Mr. COUMBE: I agree with the Attorney-General when he said that at the last election he and his Party promoted the idea of one vote one value, and this principle received much support. However, he having said that, why does not this Bill contain that feature? Considering the figures in the last election, and having a definition of the metropolitan area with 30 seats, we now find that the metropolitan area quota will be 11,500, with the other

26 seats having a quota of 8,300. I thought we were getting a Bill based on one vote one value, whereas the 15 per cent tolerance up or down that is specifically referred to in the Bill means that in the metropolitan area it is possible to have an upper limit of 13,225 electors and a lower limit in country districts of 7,140. How can we work out a general quota of 10,050 when 30 seats have to be in a rigidly defined metropolitan area and 26 outside that? The Bill sets out the quotas to be considered by the commission, but on the figures last released there are 345,000 people in the metropolitan area; so, with an equal quota throughout the State, there would be 34 seats in that area. Why has this principle of one vote one value been departed from, when we expected it, and the people apparently voted for it?

Mr. QUIRKE: We have listened to peals of exaltation. Never in the history of human politics has such a mandate been given by so many people to a Party! That is the effect of what the Attorney-General said, but never in the same history have so many people been so disillusioned. The Premier said that members on this side could not produce a policy speech as good as his. He alone could produce it. "I alone can do that; I am the *alpha*." This legislation is purely a hate measure and the result of 30 years' frustration; it is a deliberately and carefully drawn piece of legislation that will completely isolate the rural districts that have supported an L.C.L. Government.

Mr. Casey: That's not true.

Mr. QUIRKE: Will you get up and deny that?

Mr. Casey: I did deny it.

Mr. QUIRKE: Well then, the honourable member's denial fell on deaf ears. We have been accused of gerrymandering, but the Government is gerrymandering South Australia's country areas and building them into a watertight compartment inside a perimeter of people who, it hopes, will perpetually be its supporters. If the Bill is successful (Lord forbid) it will completely render the rural areas of the State politically impotent. It will reduce the number of rural districts to 15. Taking a quota of 9,000 for the fringe seats, there would have to be about 7,000 people in districts comprising built-up residential areas, in order to obtain the other country districts which would be completely swamped. The Premier said nothing about that in his policy speech; he referred to 56 seats having equal representation. The Bill

provides for 56 seats, but it does not provide for 20 rural seats. I assure honourable members opposite that if they were to go to the polls next Saturday they would be out of office; even now the skids are under them. This measure and the other anti-rural Bills that have been introduced are carefully adjusting those skids, so that there will be no mistake when the Government starts to roll. You yourself, Mr. Chairman, have said that a gerrymander previously existed, but efforts were made to remedy that situation. Although it may not have been the complete answer, this certainly is not. For that reason I will not support any part of it.

Mr. McANANEY: With this set-up it would be possible to have a Government without any country representation and that would not be good for the country. The commissioners will have difficulty in interpreting this provision and an almost impossible task in working out the districts. The quota for metropolitan seats will be about 11,560 and it will be difficult to have that number in each of 30 seats. If the population drifts the wrong way it could be impossible. It will be equally difficult to have equal numbers in the country, and with the 15 per cent margin it could mean unwieldy districts. I oppose the provision.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on new section 80, "Matters to be considered"; new section 81, "Redivision of Council districts"; new section 82, "Representations to commission"; new section 83, "Report of commissioners"; and new section 84, "Recommendations to have force of law on promulgation by the Governor."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members on this side who have complained bitterly about this provision could not have more justification for their complaint. The Government is having two bob each way. If, when the report comes in, the Government does not like it we will never see it, whereas if the Government likes the report the proclamation will be published straightaway. This is entirely wrong by all principles of equity and fairness. It is an insult to Parliament that the final decision should be taken out of its hands. It is something that has never been suggested before in any Parliament anywhere. This provision takes control right out of the hands of Parliament and puts it in the hands of the Government of the day. It is being done so that the Government can make up its own mind unfettered by anyone else. It is designed to avoid all the trouble that might

occur if the matter had to be disclosed and debated. This is a bad principle and I oppose it as strongly as I can.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I join with the member for Mitcham in expressing my complete opposition to this new section. The Premier explained it in his policy speech when he said:

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

This provision in itself condemns the Bill as it is designed to further the interests of the Labor Party, not the interests of the community as a whole.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite have said that no provision such as this has been enacted by any Parliament anywhere. However, the provisions of the Bill were taken from the Western Australian Act. Although it is true that the provision was enacted by a Labor Government in Western Australia, the Liberal Party, when it came into office, thought that it could do what members opposite are suggesting can be done, but it found it was wrong: the matter was tested before the courts and it was found that the Government had to proclaim the recommendations. If members look at the decision of the Western Australian Full Court they will see that this is the position, and it is the position under this legislation also. It was found the Governor must publish these proclamations. The provision is that the Governor "shall" publish them. Although he has a discretion as to time, his discretion does not extend unreasonably, and that is clear from the Western Australian decision.

Mr. Millhouse: What is reasonable and what is unreasonable?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member cares to read the decision he will find it most informative.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What is the objection to bringing the report back to Parliament?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The objection is that we do not want this thing to be a political football. We do not want it to suffer the kind of thing that has gone on in the Commonwealth Parliament, where because certain members found it inconvenient to have the kind of redistribution recommended by the commissioners—

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General is reflecting upon Parliament, and it is contrary to the Standing Orders to reflect up Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Rubbish!

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In fact, we do not want the division of electoral districts to be determined other than by an independent commission. We want it enshrined in the Constitution Act that the commission should be able to make up its mind, without political considerations, as to the division of electoral districts.

Mr. Coumbe: You were glad to have the 1963 report come back.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The 1963 report was on the basis of instructions to the commissioners which were contemptible.

Mr. Coumbe: But Parliament had the last say.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it did, because we did not agree to the original instructions. However, on this occasion these instructions will be in accordance with the mandate the Government has from the people to set up an independent electoral commission on the basis of democracy. Again, that was a measure that was foreseen and, unfortunately, never efficiently carried out in the original Kingston and Baker resolution in the Legislative Council, and had it been carried out then we would never have had the gerrymander and the minority Government in this State for so long as we had it under members opposite.

The CHAIRMAN: New section 85, "Future redistributions."

Mr. COUMBE: Members on this side consider that new section 84 is bad, but I believe this new section is even worse. I have no objection to future redistributions if they are properly and constitutionally carried out with the consent of this Parliament. This section deals with the means by which future redistributions can be carried out. After six years, the whole of the State can be resubdivided or only part of the State resubdivided and the rest not. The first knowledge a member on this side of the House would have would be when a proclamation was issued. To find out whether such a proclamation were going to be issued, in some circumstances one would have to read the *Government Gazette*. A proclamation may be issued on a resolution being carried by an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council does not come into this.

You are one of the custodians of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, and I point out that every other alteration to the Constitution demands endorsement by members of both Houses.

We find then that, alternatively, the Returning Officer for the State can decide that a proclamation shall be issued. This means that either Parliament can do it or that a public servant can do it; therefore the Government of the day can completely by-pass Parliament. We heard the catchery at the last election that we should have less Executive control and that Parliament should have more say, but this clause is a complete denial of the rights of Parliament. It immediately denies Her Majesty's Opposition in this place the opportunity of a say as to whether there should be a redistribution. A few moments ago the Attorney-General said that he did not want to make this a political football. Throughout the history of this State, every report has come back to this House. The Labor Party when in Opposition always took the opportunity, as it had the right to do, to debate the Bill very fully.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Even if it unanimously supported it.

Mr. COUMBE: The Labor Party was pleased that the report of the commissioners in 1963 was not a *fait accompli*. Its members were pleased to have the opportunity to speak to it, which they did to such good effect that they defeated it on that occasion. We are asking that we, as members of the Opposition, should have a say in the composition of the Chamber. As I pointed out earlier, every regulation or by-law affecting a local government authority or a statutory body comes before this place for scrutiny, yet a matter affecting everybody in this State is not to be decided by Parliament but can be decided by a public servant.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: On the direction of the Minister.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, and Parliament will have no say whatever because the matter will not be referred to it. This reminds us of the "Star Chamber" period of the Stuarts, whereas today we are, or should be, democratic. The Government is making a serious mistake and should reconsider this aspect with a view to altering this clause.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes,

Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

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

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order No. 291 I have counted the House. There being present an absolute majority of the whole House, I accept the motion. The question before the Chair is "That this Bill be now read a third time." There being a dissentient voice there must be a division.

The House divided on the third reading:

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

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

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

THE FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from January 27. Page 3612.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill, although my remarks may differ from those of the previous two speakers. The need to establish this university is real indeed. We know that the school population has greatly increased since the last war: first, it affected the primary and secondary schools, and then the tertiary section of our educational system a few years ago. In fact, we are now really feeling the pinch. Following discussions between the University of Adelaide and the previous Government in 1959, and the subsequent investigations, the former Government decided in 1961 to make available certain land previously held for hospital purposes at Bedford Park to the University

of Adelaide for expansion purposes. On North Terrace (the site of the present university) the Napier building has been completed, and the Law building, for which excavations are now proceeding, will be the last major building project to take place there. With an estimated upper limit of 8,000 students at the Adelaide university, some of the older low-level buildings would have to be demolished and replaced with multi-storey units (which would be most uneconomic and cause much disorganization while building proceeded) to increase the number of students. It was gratifying to see that the Martin committee recommended that no university's enrolment should exceed 10,000 in any circumstances, and that the maximum should probably be about 8,000.

The latter figure has been established as the ultimate number of students for the Adelaide university. With the decision a few years ago to start another adjunct (and I use that word advisedly) to the Adelaide university, planning was commenced by a special committee set up by the University Council, and submissions made both to the State Government of the day and to the Australian Universities Commission (working under the auspices of the Commonwealth of Australia). We must remember that a little over 10 years ago the Bedford Park project would have been almost impossible, but since then a number of committees have been investigating university and tertiary education in general throughout Australia. These include the original Australian Universities Commission (which became known as the Murray committee); the Martin committee that reported on its investigation into tertiary education (including universities); and the Wall committee on technical education (an offshoot of that committee being what was known as the Simpson committee in this State). Naturally, the planners of the Flinders university have had the full advantage of all this research undertaken by experts.

The planning has also been accompanied by a revolutionary outlook in Australia in relation to education generally, particularly by a change of thinking on the part of the Commonwealth Parliament. We all welcome this change because, whilst, constitutionally, the Commonwealth Government may be restricted in financing many educational projects in this country, it has made many millions of pounds available for tertiary education since aid was originally forthcoming about 10 years ago. Most of this money has been made available on the basis of the States' matching those

grants, and is separate from scholarships and special grants for research. I am at present referring to capital and recurring grants in universities in respect of establishment and running costs. In 1963, £38,000,000 was provided in connection with recurring costs, and this figure is expected to reach £107,000,000 in 1975, on present-day values. In 1963 also, £19,000,000 was made available throughout Australia in relation to capital works, and this figure, in 1975 (on the 1963 values), is expected to reach £52,000,000 a year. There may be a catch here to some extent, because recurring rates are in the ratio of £1 from the Commonwealth Government and £1 10s. from the State Treasuries, whereas the ratio for the capital contribution is pound-for-pound.

The National Parliament has gone further than giving straight-out grants to universities: it has assisted university residential colleges, and that practice has my complete support. In my district, where the four residential colleges are situated, I have been permitted to see the improvements and extensions carried out at St. Mark's, St. Ann's, Lincoln and Aquinas. Previously, in this State (as in other States) we had to do without such aid. The University of Adelaide has a long and honourable history; it is one of the best endowed and best run universities in the whole of Australia. In fact, I believe it was originally commenced by a private endowment. This principle of endowment has continued over the years until today it is recognized (and I believe the Murray committee made this comment) that the Adelaide university is one of the best endowed in Australia. Of course, today finances have reached such a stage that endowments do not go far enough, and this Parliament has had to make capital and recurring grants to the university over the years, although the university has many well-endowed chairs in various disciplines. The difference is that at Bedford Park no such endowments will be available. Therefore, all the money for the university will have to come either from this Parliament or from the Commonwealth Parliament. That is why I said earlier that more than 10 years ago this type of project would have been well nigh impossible for the State to contemplate, let alone finance, because of the heavy financial burden placed on the funds available to the Minister of Education.

The previous Government accepted the fact that the new venture at Bedford Park had to be started because the need was there. Therefore, it took certain steps to get the scheme

started. It also accepted the suggestion (which I believe had the support of the Council of the University of Adelaide) that the new university should be run under the aegis of the University Council. That is why at that stage it was called the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park and that was the official title of this project until recently. I suggest that name made it clear that this was not at once to be a second university but rather an adjunct. The previous Government decided that it was to be run as an extension of the University of Adelaide. However, this Bill, which bears out the fact that the present Government has reversed that decision, provides that it will be a new university right from the start of its academic operations. I have some reservations about this, because I doubt whether that should be done at this stage. Is this new offspring really ready to be launched as a separate entity? Has it enough stability to run itself or should it remain under the wing of the parent body, the University of Adelaide, for one or two years more, which would allow time for settling in? The new university will have no senior undergraduates for some years and the members of the staff, although experienced at other universities, will be new to this set-up. It is contemplated that the university will start off with a fresher year and that all students will be first-year undergraduates.

Until the middle of 1965 all connected bodies and planners looked on this new venture as a development of the University of Adelaide, and expected that it would break away from the parent body perhaps one or two years after its opening and then function as a separate entity. However, the Government and the Minister have decided against this course and this decision is embodied in the Bill. The decision has been made for all time and steps have been taken in planning an administration that cannot now be altered. I trust that members of the Government, and particularly the Minister, are confident that they have made the correct decision in setting up the university at this time as a completely new functioning body. Having expressed my reservation on this point, and realizing that we are now presented with a *fait accompli*, let me say that I entirely support the principle of a second university. I believe that the time is here for a second university and that the fringe of the metropolitan area is the most suitable place for its erection. Also, I believe the new university is the correct size. I point out that it will be many years before we have

a third university. I hope that, when the third university is set up, as much solid thinking goes into its planning as appears to have gone into the planning of this university. I have heard it said that the Institute of Technology should become a university. I hope that will never happen because the institute is not meant to teach at university level in all faculties: it specializes in technological fields. It would be a mistake to have a university functioning only in technological fields, and we have seen what happened at the University of New South Wales.

The upper limit of student enrolment at North Terrace is about 8,000. At the Flinders university the planners have set an upper limit of 6,000 students, mainly because of the undulating site on which it is difficult to build. Submissions to the Australian Universities Commission are made on a triennial basis, and this number of students should be enrolled in 1975. Because of the site and its situation in relation to the centre of Adelaide, special considerations have been given to residential students. It is a fair distance from the four residential colleges at Adelaide to the Flinders university, and after special consideration a decision was made that a hall of residence should be built. This was discussed last year and I shall not deal with the merits of whether a hall of residence should be built. However, I believe that it is absolutely necessary that a hall of residence be built as soon as possible. I trust that the Minister will support this move for a hall of residence. As he said earlier, there was some difficulty in the commencement, but I hope the difficulties will be resolved and that we get to this idea of a hall of residence, which is an integral part of any university worthy of the name.

Because of the new Bedford Park Teachers College, which is to be built next to this university, there will be a preponderance of Arts students, with a fairly heavy enrolment also in the basic sciences. Incidentally, the site provided for that teachers college is certainly not the best, and it seems that the teachers college is the poor relation in the original plan. When I went out there with the Public Works Committee to investigate this site I was at first appalled at what had been left for the teachers college, for it is one of the steepest and most undulating sites on the whole block. However, I believe that the Public Buildings Department has done a magnificent job in planning that teachers college on the site left available to it. Had it not been necessary to have the teachers

college in such close proximity to the university, my vote and possibly the votes of my colleagues on the committee would have been against the project because of the nature of the site and the cost involved in building there.

As I said, there will be a preponderance of Arts students, as well as some science students, at the Flinders university. I have had the opportunity to study the planning concept for this university, and I believe that to a large extent the academic planning has gone along very well. It certainly contains a great deal of flexibility, which is most necessary, in my opinion, to meet the changing demands in the future for education. Education today is changing very quickly. This is something that I think we should support in principle. Let us get down to basic facts, without being trite. The main purpose of any university should be to seek excellence in scholarship, research, and teaching, and I believe there is a wonderful opportunity here for many of these things to be put into operation perhaps differently. Some of the older universities may suffer from a little too much tradition and rigidity. I hasten to assure my friend, the member for Mitcham, that I am not decrying tradition, for I acknowledge that it is a wonderful thing; but sometimes too much rigidity in this regard can hamper new experiments, especially in the field of education. I believe that at Flinders the planners have taken advantage of starting, from what we might say was bare soil, to devise an entirely new and revolutionary organization, because here is an opportunity that is not available at Adelaide to the same extent to experiment with new courses and new methods of teaching. One of the changes that has struck me rather forcibly is that instead of a department headed by its own professor being the unit, as is traditional, the school is to be the main administrative and academic unit. Some schools, of course, will contain more than one professor. I believe that 16 professors have already been appointed, so with the four schools there are plenty of professors in some schools.

Mr. Clark: That is not exactly a new thing.

Mr. COUMBE: I am not saying it is; but here is the opportunity (and the planners are taking full advantage of it) to get away from the rather rigid faculty with its professor or dean at the head. The university will have four major schools initially: the School of Language and Literature, the School of Social

Science, the School of Physical Science, and the School of Biological Science, with the library, the great hall, and the students' facilities and sporting facilities to follow. It is pleasing to note that many of these sporting facilities are there already. When the university opens next month, many of the playing fields will be available immediately for the use of students. Here again, I am pleased to note the co-operation between the authorities of the new university and those at the teachers college, for there will be joint use of some ovals. This is necessary, of course, because of the site. The contours limit the number of ovals and playing areas that can be provided for each institution, so there has to be a joint use of many of the facilities. This is not so with the Adelaide university. Over the river, in my electoral district, we have the university main oval and its other ovals, its tennis courts and its hockey grounds, and then farther on there is the teachers college oval; a new one has just been prepared, and this extends almost to the Hackney bridge.

We hope that the university will be ready to start operating next month, when the Queen Mother will open the university and the first intake will be received. It is intended to have a first-year intake this year and in each subsequent year. Each group of students, when they complete their year, will advance, and after some years a complete university will function. This university will then be able to confer its own degrees. I hope that in the future other schools will be established here (and I have no doubt that they will be established as soon as facilities, buildings and the cash are made available) so that ultimately a true university campus or atmosphere can be created. Medicine and dentistry, of course, cannot go out there in their full range of activities until a hospital is built near the university grounds. This was foreshadowed some time ago by an announcement of the Government that it had purchased land west of the South Road.

While I agree with the broad concept of this university, I point out that some subjects will certainly not be taught there. Part of some subjects may be taught, but not the whole course. For instance, fine arts will not be taught there, except insofar as they are part of the content of a teacher's curriculum. Also, a student taking a degree in music will be taught, I understand, at the Conservatorium of the University of Adelaide. I imagine that it would be no good having two conservatoria.

I regret that there does not seem to be any immediate provision for the applied arts or the applied sciences. We have the physical sciences and the School of Biological Science but there does not seem to be any other applied art or science. It may be that these will be taught at the Flinders university. In the physical sciences in physics, chemistry, and mathematics departments we have what may loosely be termed service departments that may service other faculties. For some years Australia has needed not only scientists but more engineers, and this need was highlighted during the building of the Snowy Mountains hydro-electric scheme. We have to have more engineers if the country is to develop. We are providing for the training of more scientists at this new university and I do not quarrel with that, but there does not seem to be the necessary provisions (at least until 1975) for engineering and its various worlds. Perhaps there is enough room at the Adelaide university but I doubt that. The main four faculties of mechanical, civil, electrical and mining engineering are each under a professor.

Mr. Hudson: One problem at Adelaide is that they cannot get sufficient staff for the engineering faculty unless they offer senior lectureships.

Mr. CUMBE: I was aware of that, and realize it is a problem.

Mr. Hudson: This is the bottleneck, and it precluded the starting of engineering at the Flinders university immediately.

Mr. CUMBE: There are many off-shoots of engineering and I realize there is a real and urgent shortage of highly trained staff at the university because of the shortage of trained engineers and because those with high qualifications are being accepted by industry generally. This aspect has been brought to a head by the demand today in Australia for more development. Unfortunately, we have inherited a shortage of students in many of these faculties, perhaps because some years ago not all facilities that we now enjoy were offered to many students. If we do not get more staff at Adelaide, or offer at the Flinders university a complementary course on these lines, we may have an overflow of students being forced to take a degree at the Institute of Technology. We should consider providing at Flinders the applied sciences and arts so that we can have a full university concept there. In this regard I support, and always have, the concept of honours in higher degrees and the pure research taking place, which is a classical function of any university.

However, we must remember, particularly in South Australia, the need for the graduate who is able and willing to apply his learning and training in a practical way. Today, more and more graduates in the applied sciences and arts are filling administrative and planning positions, and not doing practical work that is so vital and necessary for this country. We must be careful that we do not overload our society with pure theorists. The theorists and applied scientists are complementary, and I hope that at the Flinders university we will provide the correct balance in that regard. When the new university has operated for some time, I hope it develops fully the full range of faculties and influences, unlike the University of New South Wales which started as a technological university but was nothing more than a glorified technological college under the name of a university, with the complete exclusion of the humanities. For some years there must be an interchange of students between the two universities in this State. No doubt medical students will use the facilities of the biological school at Flinders.

Mr. Hudson: That's right. First year medical students will be there this year.

Mr. COUMBE: We should use all the facilities at the new university when there is a crying need for more space in some service departments, especially mathematics. Some students may have to start at the Flinders university and complete their studies at North Terrace, which may create some friction. Students at the new university may find some departments at North Terrace do not have the same quality equipment or facilities, and this may lead to dissension. However, this is the correct decision. There may be some administrative confusion caused because students go to two types of university, and more travelling troubles may be experienced. But these difficulties will soon be resolved when the universities are functioning as separate entities. In the School of Languages, art students and those who will be teachers are not going to be taught Latin, although English, French, and Spanish will be taught. The student who matriculates in languages (say, English, French and Latin) cannot go to the Flinders university to major in Latin.

Mr. Millhouse: Latin is going out of fashion.

Mr. COUMBE: I realize that.

Mr. Millhouse: It is a pity.

Mr. COUMBE: It is used in the medical and legal professions.

Mr. Millhouse: It is not even a prerequisite for the law.

Mr. COUMBE: Classical Greek has almost entirely disappeared from the curriculums of the best high schools and colleges. When I was at school the top form always took Greek, but today there would be three or four students studying this language. The Attorney-General was one of the last handful to study Greek while at school. However, I am not canvassing that point. I know of one student who, when matriculating, received credits in English, French and Latin. She will want to go to the Flinders university but she wants to study Latin, so she cannot go there: she has to go to the University of Adelaide. These are little matters that can be ironed out. I understand that no Latin will be taught at Flinders university.

Mr. Hudson: It does not mean a greater specialization but we are not duplicating facilities unnecessarily in both places.

Mr. COUMBE: I think I said it was a wonderful opportunity to introduce new courses.

Mr. Hudson: Spanish is not taught in the University of Adelaide.

Mr. COUMBE: The student who wants to teach and is enrolled at the University of Adelaide has to go to the other place. There will always be part-time students. It is important that suitable provision is made for them. I do not say it is the most efficient or economical way to pass a course, but it is the only way some students can pass, either because they have not the time as they have to work or because their parents cannot afford to send them there part-time and they have to work. It may be that they are engaged in a Government department and are attending as cadets. Let us always provide for part-time students. In some cases they may not be a very high percentage of the students but in Flinders university I hope that part-time students will be catered for.

Turning to the council, which was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Glenelg, I have looked at the constitution of councils in other universities throughout Australia. I find they comprise all types of representation—members of Parliament, academics, businessmen, trade union representatives, teachers, etc. I am surprised that there are to be only three representatives of this Parliament on the council of Flinders university. There must be some reason for this, because the Minister in his second reading

explanation said that this Bill and the constitution of the Flinders university were largely modelled upon the existing University of Adelaide Act and that to a large extent the provisions made for Flinders university were the same as those for the University of Adelaide, with some variations. So I should like to know why this representation of five members of Parliament on the council of the University of Adelaide is reduced to three in the case of Flinders university, especially as the new council will have about the same number of members, some coming from the convocation.

I think the members of this Parliament would welcome the opportunity to serve on that council. It will not be very big, because many committees will be set up there: the education committee, the board of studies, the finance committee, etc. This will take some time. As this Parliament is providing a great part of the money required to run this university, both in capital and in current expenditure, it would be useful to have the full complement of representation from this House on that council. Perhaps the Minister can answer that for me.

The convocation will not operate in the normal way until 1971, which is understandable as there will not be any graduates for a few years. In the meantime the University of Adelaide will act for it. Why has the rule about Bachelor graduates not being allowed to sit on the convocation until three years after graduation been relaxed? We know that Doctors or Masters from the University of Adelaide or other universities can sit immediately, but Bachelors have to wait for three years. Why is there a variation in this case? There must be some special reason for it.

Mr. Hudson: It would have meant that it would be 1974 before you could establish a convocation.

Mr. CUMBE: I realize that. Between now and 1971 the representatives of the University of Adelaide will act in lieu of the convocation. That could be kept going for some years. I am trying to find out why it cuts out in 1971.

Mr. Hudson: It is not a very satisfactory basis.

Mr. CUMBE: It can be extended later. So far, this point has not been explained to me in the second reading explanation. I have pleasure in supporting this Bill because it is a significant step forward in the educational progress of this State. The only reservation I have about it is the wisdom of starting it off in

1966 rather than in 1968, when for two years it could have existed without any graduates. Why not run it for two years under the aegis or auspices of the University of Adelaide? I hope the university flourishes and satisfies the purpose for which it was set up.

Let me pay a well deserved tribute to Professor Karmel, who was until recently the Principal-Designate of the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park and whose official title will now be Vice-Chancellor of the Flinders University of South Australia. It is a well deserved title, because Professor Karmel has done a magnificent job in the planning and organization, in the selection and placing of staff in the academics—because it is not an easy job. I know the problems that were encountered at Monash University. Compared with that university, the planning for Flinders university has proceeded smoothly. A tribute must be paid to Professor Karmel and his colleagues on the committees who have worked under him. The Minister well knows that this planning has only just started. At the opening of the university next month we can get going because we have so many new buildings. The planning henceforth will be a legacy to be enjoyed in the next 100 years. It is important that the future decisions made are correct. The initial planning was well executed. It displayed much good thinking. I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I, too, support the Bill, in common with the member for Torrens, the member for Glenelg and the Leader of the Opposition, but I do not find it quite as non-controversial as the Minister wanted members to believe it was when he gave his second reading explanation. I desire to mention some matters, two general ones and two springing out of the provisions of the Bill. The first matter I desire to mention concerns the delay (that is the euphemistic term that has been used by the Minister in his explanation) in the erection of the hall of residence at Bedford Park. I believe in a residential system in our universities. As I have said previously, it is not possible to attain that entirely, or even largely at present, but I consider that it is an important matter to keep before us and the sooner we start on it the better.

I think it is a great shame that the delay is occurring in the erection of the hall of residence at the Flinders university. May I say, with due respect to the Minister, that I consider that this delay has been occasioned

by or, at least, is an example of the present Government's financial ineptitude. The facts are that this Government has "done in" a cool £200,000 that would have been available from the Commonwealth Government. This is a serious and most unfortunate thing. The present Government, which has been in office for 11 months, has given much lip service to universities and university people and has expressed much sympathy for them. In this regard, I think it has probably done better than the previous Government, but when it comes to cold, hard cash—

Mr. Hudson: It has given more than your Government gave.

Mr. MILLHOUSE:—this present Government is miles behind the previous Government in its treatment of universities in this State.

Mr. Hudson: Your facts are wrong. Give the figures.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My facts are not wrong and I shall give the figures. When the Leader of the Opposition spoke, he quoted from a letter written by the Commonwealth Minister in charge of education (Senator Gorton) to the member of the House of Representatives for Sturt, Mr. K. C. Wilson as he was then, now Sir Keith Wilson. If the member for Glenelg wants the figures, I shall quote from the letter, which is dated December 1, 1965. I shall give the whole gist of the thing, as the member for Glenelg has interjected in that way. This is the question that Senator Gorton was answering in his letter:

How much of the money offered by the Commonwealth for the purposes of the universities of South Australia during the 1964-66 triennium has been, or will be, accepted and matched by the South Australian Government?

I hope the member for Glenelg agrees that that covers the matters that I have raised. This is what Senator Gorton said:

The Commonwealth offered total grants to the universities of South Australia, during the triennium, of £7,214,900. Of this sum £2,484,500 was for capital expenditure and was offered on condition that the State matched those grants £1 for £1. The remainder of the sum, which totalled £4,730,400 was for recurrent expenditure and was offered on condition that the State supplied £1.85 from State funds and fees for every £1 provided by the Commonwealth.

That was the arrangement. The Senator went on:

The State has provided, for capital works, £1,411,000 and this amount has therefore also been provided by the Commonwealth. Some capital works are at present under construction—

and here we come to Bedford Park— and the only major work which has not yet been begun is the proposed Hall of Residence at Bedford Park.

The next two paragraphs of the letter deal specifically with this. They read:

The Commonwealth's offer for this Hall of Residence during the triennium was £220,000 but the Commonwealth has been informed by the South Australian Government that that Government does not intend to proceed with construction of the Hall during this triennium and that the preliminary work which it will be doing this triennium is not likely to require more than £20,000 as a matching grant from the Commonwealth. This will leave £200,000 of Commonwealth funds which were available to be spent on the Hall but which will now not be available and will be spent elsewhere.

As far as the next triennium is concerned the Hall will no doubt be built during that triennium—

and I hope to goodness that the Senator is right in saying this:

but the finance it will require during the next triennium will not be available, as it otherwise would have been, for some other project at the University which will have to be dropped from that triennium's programme. In other words, money which is not expended during one triennium is not added to money available during the next triennium.

That is a letter on this very matter from the Minister in charge of education in the Commonwealth Government. If that does not show that this Government has, to use a term that is perhaps not Parliamentary, done in or forfeited £200,000 that would have been available, I do not know what it does show.

Mr. Hudson: We have still spent more than the previous Government spent.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not care what we have spent. We have lost £200,000 that could have been spent on university education, £200,000 that could have been spent on this hall of residence at Bedford Park. The amount was lost because the Government was not prepared to match it. It is a great shame that this Government gives such lip service to university education, but does not match an offer such as that.

Mr. Hudson: We provided more than your Government did, and you should give us credit for that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg has been caught out and is trying to change the basis of the argument he was having with me. I said that it was a shame that we had lost £200,000. I still say it and I base what I have said on the letter that I have read. If the member for Glenelg likes to justify the Government in some way, let him do it. The

second point I make springs from the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, when he said that the division between Flinders university and the University of Adelaide was premature and that he doubted whether this was the best time to separate the two and make Bedford Park a separate university.

I cannot altogether agree with the Leader of the Opposition on that. In my view, the separation and independence of Bedford Park had to come sooner or later and, unless it were going to be inconvenient (which apparently it is not, from what we have been told), the sooner it came, the better. I consider that this is a good time to make the separation of the two institutions and to have one independent of the other. I do not deny for a moment that there is force in some of the arguments that have been used against the proposition that there should be a separation, but I think those arguments are outweighed by the advantages to be attained.

Much has been said by the Leader and the member for Glenelg on the possibility of friction between the two institutions. That is obviously there and will be there whether they are independent or not. These two institutions will be in competition. In the very nature of things that must be so and, people being what they are, this will, in some cases, lead to friction between the two. As far as I can see, three main sources of friction exist between universities situated side by side: the first is the question of matriculation requirements, and this, I think, has been the experience in Sydney, where the University of Sydney and the University of New South Wales had differing matriculation requirements, and where students, to be sure of getting into one or other of the universities, had to attain two sets of qualifications, one applying to the University of Sydney, and the other applying to the University of New South Wales. I hope that will not occur in our case; I hope the matriculation requirements of the University of Adelaide and of the Flinders university will be kept the same, so that this possible cause of friction will not arise. The second source relates to status (the recognition of degrees, and so on). I have been told that in New South Wales it took about five years before the medical profession in that State was prepared to recognize the degrees in medicine conferred by the University of New South Wales. That is a bad thing which I hope will not occur in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The University of New South Wales said it would produce many doctors quickly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and the medical profession did not like it; it thought the standard would be lower than the standard most of the profession had attained at the University of Sydney. The third source, which flows from the second, relates to differing standards; obviously, students and staff will be attracted to the university which has or is able to have the higher standards.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There is a report in today's *Advertiser* about that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, that interesting article gives an indication of the sort of thing that can happen. It contains the seeds of competition between the two universities (comparing the facilities available at Bedford Park with those available at Adelaide, and so on, and comparing one very favourably with the other). I hope we shall be able to avoid all these things in South Australia, but all of them (and there may be others) will need to be watched carefully. I am sure the Leader's remarks on this point related to the desirability of establishing a university outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. Clark: There are grave difficulties about that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I wish there were not. Plenty of attractive towns exist in our country, where a university would be admirable, if it could be established. One thinks of Strathalbyn which could easily become another Oxford if not Cambridge in South Australia. Perhaps Murray Bridge, Port Augusta and Mount Gambier would be suitable towns to establish another university. Little doubt exists in my mind that the establishment of a university in a country town is a positive step towards decentralization. The growth of Armidale since the University of New England was established there has been phenomenal. Unfortunately, though, that is an expensive way of achieving decentralization. In my view there is only one country town in South Australia where a university could conceivably be established.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret that I must have ruined dinner for honourable members by keeping them in suspense, as before dinner I was not able to name the one town that I considered was the only real prospect for a country university in this State in the next 10 or 15 years. I have no doubt that all members have been speculating for the last

hour and a half which town I could possibly name. The town the name of which was on my lips when the bell rang at 6 p.m. was Whyalla, and in this I agree with some of the remarks made by the Leader. It seems to me that this is the only town where there is any real possibility that a university can possibly be considered in this State, and it can be considered there only after the prior establishment of a university college, and so on. In Victoria, there are as yet no universities outside Melbourne, but planning is now being carried out for a third university in the metropolitan area, and I think this is a pretty good pointer to South Australia.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I though you were on the right track when you were speaking about Strathalbyn and Murray Bridge.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I saw the Minister sitting over there and thought of suggesting Murray Bridge, which is a delightful town where a university would look very fine, but I do not think we can consider it there now.

Mr. Freebairn: There are other tertiary institutions in Victoria, aren't there?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but there is no university, and no consideration has yet been given to having a university away from Melbourne. The reasons for this are, I think, pretty obvious if one looks at these things in a detached way. The first reason, of course, is that it is far more expensive to establish a university outside the metropolitan area because it is necessary from the start to provide residential accommodation for students, as the town itself will not have a potential student population large enough to support the university and people will have to be housed away from their homes. Although, as I have said, this is desirable as a long-term aim, it is expensive to do it all at once and in the beginning.

Secondly, it has been found harder (I think it is fair to say this) to attract staff outside the main cities. For better or for worse and whether one agrees with people's tastes or not, most university people prefer living in a big city to living in a smaller centre away from the big cities. Thirdly, the area in which the university is situated must have a sufficient potential of students to populate it. These are three reasons why it is exceedingly difficult to set up a university outside a metropolitan area.

That completes the first two points I want to make. I have already said as strongly as I can how much I regret the fact that the Government has let slide £200,000 that it

could have had from the Commonwealth Government, and I have dealt with the independence of the two institutions and with country universities. The other two points which spring directly out of the Bill and to which I desire to address myself now concern the composition of the council and the powers of the convocation of the new university. Dealing first with the council, I agree with the views expressed by the Leader. I strongly disagree with the defence of the arrangements set out in the Bill that was undertaken by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson). I disagree with him on this point and with most of the other things he said in the debate. If I may say so with charity to him, I do not think he made a particularly good speech, and we were not much better informed when he finished than we were at the start of his speech. In fact, he was offensive in his comments on the Leader's speech and on the Leader himself, and I am afraid he failed to conceal that sense of intellectual superiority and of being better informed than other people that he displays from time to time.

Mr. Shannon: He is still young.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Youth is comparative. The member for Onkaparinga would class the member for Glenelg and maybe even me still as being young.

Mr. Shannon: You are well on in Parliamentary experience.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I accept what the honourable member has said. I point out to the member for Glenelg that the Leader laboured under some severe disabilities when he was speaking on this matter. The Bill had been introduced and the second reading explanation given only 24 hours before he was expected to speak on it, even though the jolly speech had obviously been written for months. When he made his explanation, the Minister did not even do the House the courtesy of bringing his explanation up to date. If one reads the explanation one can see that it was written to be delivered in 1965. The Leader had only 24 hours before he was obliged to speak and he did not even have a chance to look at the Bill. Therefore, it ill behoved the member for Glenelg to say what he did. The Leader laboured under a heavy handicap when he was expected to speak on the Bill at such short notice without having seen the Bill at all.

The Leader spoke about the Council of the University of Adelaide. I agree with him that there is no reason at all that I can see to

depart so radically from the arrangements that have worked well at the University of Adelaide. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that the administration and organization of the University of Adelaide had worked well. In the case of the University of Adelaide there are, as there will be at the Flinders university, 25 members of the council, five from Parliament (three I think from this place and two from the other), and the other 20 members elected by the University Senate. There is no qualification at all laid down in the University of Adelaide Act as to the persons who may be elected by the University Senate. In the case of the University of Adelaide we have had an extremely able and effective council over many years, and if one cares to look through the names of those who are members of the University Council at present, one finds that that is so. The council is fairly representative. I have the 1965 university calendar, and I am not certain what changes took place as a result of the senate election last November as it clashed with the sittings of the House, as it normally does, and I was not there. Before that time, on the council were seven members of the university staff, a number of lawyers, a headmaster of an independent school, medical practitioners, the Engineer-in-Chief, and so on. I do not think that any member of either side of the House would have the temerity to suggest that the University Council had not been a good and effective council. It is elected, as I have said, by the University Senate, without any strings attached. But what have we here? We have an attempt to represent interests, apparently, on the council. We have got it laid down that we shall have three *ex officio* members, including the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor. Well, that is the case with the University of Adelaide, and that is as it should be. The third *ex officio* member will be the Director of Education, something which does not obtain now in the case of the University of Adelaide. Then we are to have three members from Parliament and three members appointed by the Governor in the manner prescribed by clauses 7 and 8 of this Bill. Perhaps at this stage I can mention those clauses and point out to the Minister that in clause 7 he has not quite got the correct names of the bodies which he hopes will elect one member. The Minister said:

Of the three members of the Council appointed by the Governor, one shall be nominated by the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures jointly, and one shall be nominated by the Trades and Labor Council.

There are, I point out to the Minister, a number of chambers of Commerce in South Australia. I think he means the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce Incorporated, but he does not say so: he simply says "the Chamber of Commerce", and that is something which no doubt he will want to tidy up. Incidentally, I think the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures is an incorporated body, too, and it would be as well to get correct in the Bill the titles of these bodies; thus, the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce (as I presume he means) and the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures will select one person between them to be a member of the council, and the Trades and Labor Council will select another. The third one is left entirely at large.

Then we have two professors of the university and two members of the academic staff who are not professors elected directly by the academic staff of the university. We then have the President of the Students' Representative Council, who will be a member *ex officio*. I do not quarrel with that, and I think that the qualification on the attendance of the President of the Student' Representative Council at meetings is desirable. However, I thought the Minister was a little clumsy in giving the reason for that when he said that it was, in effect, because a student could not keep his mouth shut. Yet I think it would be undesirable that a student should sit in when members of the academic staff and their position were being discussed.

Finally, we have these eight members elected by convocation in the manner set out—and I will deal with that in a moment—and then not more than three members who shall be co-opted. As I have said, this is an attempt (and not a very good attempt) to pin down the types of people or the classes of people who may serve on the council of the university, and it is something that is absolutely contrary to what has obtained in the case of the University of Adelaide and what has worked very well. Then we get this most extraordinary subclause (5). I cannot for the life of me see that it has any real meaning or that it could ever be acted on at all, for it states:

Any member who is an appointed member, an elected member or an *ex officio* member by virtue of paragraphs (e) (f) (g) of subsection (3) of this section shall not be regarded as a delegate of the organization or body by which he is elected or nominated or in which he holds office.

Now, regarded by whom and for what purpose and how this will be determined, I do not know. This, of course, is mere verbiage which means nothing, because this is something

that depends entirely upon the personality of the particular member of the council, and it could just as well have been left out as put in.

I disagree with the council for that reason. The Leader has already dealt with that aspect. The other reason for my disagreement with the council as it is set out here is because it does provide, in my view, too big a representation for the academic staff of the university. There is now a tendency amongst university people to think that they alone should have the say in university affairs. This tendency should be resisted, as it will be a sorry day for universities if they are run entirely by members of university staffs. The university should be part of the community although it is an independent body, and one of the main links between the university and the rest of the community is the membership of its council. Although I dislike them (and they are much used today) I cannot avoid using the ghastly words "academics" and non-academics'. It is through the non-academic members of the council that the university retains some of its strongest links with the rest of the community.

If the council is dominated by academics a real danger exists of its becoming inward-looking, that is, looking away from the community on which it depends: introspective, as the member for Angas suggests. In this council we must have at least eight members of the university staff, not including the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor. There are two professors of the university and two members of the academic staff, not professors, elected by the academic staff. Convocation must elect of its eight members another four academic staff members, making a total of eight, and there are members co-opted as well. It is easy to see that without much difficulty a majority of members of the council could be members of the academic staff, and this is not desirable. The member for Glenelg tried to support this system and said some remarkable things in the process. At present, only seven members of the academic staff are members of the Council of the University of Adelaide, and there is a good balance on the council.

Convocation in this Bill is another name for the senate at the University of Adelaide. The two bodies are the same although a different name has been chosen, but there is a great difference in the powers of the two bodies. The senate of the University of Adelaide elects 20 members of the council: the convocation at the Flinders university will elect eight members, of whom four must be academics. That is the first difference. The second difference is

that in the University of Adelaide all statutes and regulations must be assented to pursuant to the Act by the senate before they operate. Here, there is no such provision, and section 18 (2) of the University of Adelaide Act has been omitted from this Act. So far as I can see, convocation has no power at all except to elect the eight members of the council, of whom four must be academics. This is an entirely undesirable departure from a practice that has worked well in South Australia. The member for Glenelg tried to justify what is being done and said that the senate at the University of Adelaide was dominated by two groups: the academic staff and the teachers. That is just not so. I do not know whether the honourable member is a senator at the University of Adelaide or, if he is, whether he attends meetings of the senate. I presume he is a senator, and that he has an *ad eundem gradum* degree. I do not think he does attend the meetings or pays much attention to what is going on and who is there—because it is not true to say that the senate is dominated by these two sets of people. What happens? The senate meets at night now. When it met late in the afternoon it gave the academic members of the staff a fairly strong voice in what was going on, and it was for that reason that the meetings of the senate were changed from the late afternoon to an evening when other people (graduates of the university, members of the senate) were able to attend meetings. That has happened for the last half a dozen years or more. If there were voting by post at senate meetings (something not yet introduced into South Australia) perhaps teachers would gain a great influence because of their numbers but, of course, it is personal voting that counts at senate elections: one has to be there to cast his vote, both when electing members of the council and when voting on other matters coming before the senate, such as the consideration of statutes and regulations. If any proof is needed of the fact that teachers do not exercise a disproportionate influence, it is to be found by looking at the record of those who are successful in elections to the University Council. The Director of Education himself has stood unsuccessfully for election to the council. He is one person who would undoubtedly, if the teachers had such a great voice, have gained much support.

The other person whom I mention (I think he was put up for election last year) is Mr. F. H. Davis, a former President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, I

believe, and a deservedly popular and well-known man in the teaching profession and elsewhere. Yet he was not elected to the council of the university. He was defeated on the ballot for election. The academic staff is represented by only seven out of the 25 members of the University Council. What, in fact, happens is that professional bodies tend to turn up when one of their own members is up for election or some question that affects them is to be considered.

Mr. McKee: They lobby, do they?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, they do.

Mr. Coumbe: Particularly the doctors.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is true, when a medical practitioner is up for election to the council. I can remember one celebrated occasion when the dentists turned up for election at a senate meeting: they got their man in and he is still there. That is, of course, the way in which the senate works. It works well and we get a good council out of it. That is my first point. I believe that the convocation of the Flinders university should have about equal power to that of the senate of the University of Adelaide. The Minister has given no reason in his second reading explanation why it should not have that power. Another thing that the convocation of the Flinders university will have no power to do under this Bill is to scrutinize statutes and regulations. Apparently the council of the Flinders university is to be all-powerful. There is to be no fetter on it at all, so this follows the pattern of universities in other States. I think it is the case with the University of Sydney, but it is not the case with the University of Adelaide.

It may be objected by the Minister that, as the senate meets only once a year as a rule and it is exceptional for there to be more meetings than that, we could not wait as long as that. If that is so, I suggest that we give convocation power so that non-academics and people away from the council have some say in what is being done and what is proposed from the university and that the Minister look at the University of Melbourne arrangements, where a standing committee of convocation is elected pursuant to the Act. That committee has delegated to it under the Act the powers of convocation to scrutinize university legislation and to refer it back to the council if it does not approve.

This is a system established under the Act for the University of Melbourne and I understand that it has worked well. In the University of Adelaide, there is no statutory

authority for this, but in the last few years at the behest of the graduates' union of the university, a standing committee of the senate has been formed and, even though that committee has no statutory authority, it performs the same function as the committee of convocation of the University of Melbourne. It scrutinises regulations and makes recommendations to the council, and I am told that those recommendations have always been heeded by the university council.

This is the line on which I consider we should proceed in the case of the Flinders university. At present, as I have said and will repeat for the benefit of our academic friend from Glenelg, the convocation of the Flinders university has almost no power at all. Its only powers are those to elect eight members of the council and, even then, it is bound to elect four members of the academic staff. It has no power to scrutinize the statutes or regulations of the university. In that regard, the council of the university is all-powerful. As I consider this undesirable, I will move at the appropriate time to insert in the Bill a provision similar to section 18 (2) of the University of Adelaide Act, and I hope that that will be accepted.

For some reason, all that the Minister said in his second reading explanation was that it was not desirable that Flinders university should have it. Goodness knows why! He did not tell us. The main points I make are, first, that the personnel of the council of the university is clumsily set out. This is entirely unnecessary, as our experience in Adelaide has shown. Secondly, the convocation should have much greater powers. If the minister thinks it should not, he should tell us why.

There is only one other point I desire to make. I know that the Minister, in drawing this Bill, has copied, where it suited him (and it did in most cases), the University of Adelaide Act. I read in the newspaper only yesterday that he said that courses in the primary schools and so on had been overhauled to make sure that they are absolutely up to date. Unfortunately, the Minister was not so accurate with his own grammar. He has said in clause 3 that the Flinders University of South Australia shall be capable in law "to take, purchase and hold . . .". I think the words "capable to" are used four times in the clause. We do not say "capable to take". When I first saw this I believed it was actually a grammatical error but, on looking in *Murray*, I find it is merely an obsolete expression. We say either "capable of doing something" or

“able to do it”, but the Minister has said, “capable to do it”, and this has been repeated four times. I know the Minister of Education prides himself on being up-to-date on these matters, and I think it is a pity, especially in a university Act, to perpetuate what is now so obsolete as to be an error of grammar. I hope the Minister will allow me (if he does not do it himself) to move amendments to put that right in the Committee stage.

Mr. McKee: Are all the “i’s” dotted?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope they are: that is part of our duty. It ill behoves the Minister of Education (and perhaps his colleagues) to be so far behind with his English grammar as to perpetuate something like this. However, as I have said, I support the second reading, but I hope the Minister will be prepared to consider a number of amendments which honourable members on this side have put on the file, especially the amendments I have mentioned giving the convocation powers equal to those of the senate.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill with some reservations, even though they may not be radical ones. Although I may criticize the Minister later on, I at least express some appreciation of the fact that he has implemented this project in the way he has. I believe the formation of the Flinders university at this stage is a good move, though separating it from the University of Adelaide so soon may have its disadvantages. I point out, too, that when people know that something of this sort is to be implemented, they may have some anticipation (albeit unhealthy anticipation) until action is taken, but I think that those concerned will now be able to go ahead with their work and that the university will progress admirably as a separate institution. On balance, I believe it is better to have separated the universities at this stage, as their separation by a distance of several miles through busy suburbs would render administration difficult; indeed, one of the institutions may tend to be neglected (or believe itself to be neglected) at times. I am not happy about several other matters, either.

Mr. McKee: You don’t even look happy at the moment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No doubt the honourable member would like to commence interjecting; I must say I do not think I have heard him make a speech for several months.

Mr. Langley: He made one yesterday; you heard it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As a matter of fact, I did not, but I shall take the honourable member’s word for it. I point out, though, that if the member for Port Pirie wishes to interject, he will naturally delay this debate. I could not help noticing the unjust attitudes of the Minister of Education and his colleague the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) towards the Leader of the Opposition. This was a fairly dispassionate debate until those two members introduced some heat into it. The Leader of the Opposition gave a reasoned and dispassionate speech, which incidentally was made under some difficulty because he was asked to speak 24 hours after the measure was introduced. I did not know that he had not had a chance to study the Bill completely, but the member for Mitcham said that he had not, and I have no reason to doubt that. He did not persist in asking for further time to study the Bill, yet all he got was a volley of abuse which did not help the debate but which caused the whole of the discussion to deteriorate.

The most outstanding feature of his speech was his own modesty. It was really amazing that a man who was largely responsible for the establishment of this university could make a speech without bragging a little, but he did not brag, yet he got no credit from the Government. The Minister of Education could have added to his own stature by acknowledging the wonderful work that the former Premier did towards establishing this university. It was his imagination and drive that got it going, and he fostered its progress with the Universities Commission as well as in this State. It is worth recording that when he announced the Government’s intention to proceed with the project the only voices in opposition were those of members of the Labor Party. The Leader of the Party at the time (the late Mr. O’Halloran), the present Premier and the member for Norwood took an active part in trying to dissuade him from establishing a university in this locality. Despite this criticism and opposition and all sorts of other difficulties, he proceeded with the work, and I believe that in later years his efforts will be fully acknowledged. One does not get much acknowledgment at a time like this, but he deserved it and will get it eventually.

I was expecting the member for Glenelg, who is a university man, to make a really good contribution to the debate. Instead, we heard a volley of intemperate statements about the Leader, a few of which I wrote down. These

statements include: "the silliest thing for a considerable time"; "the Leader displayed ignorance"; and "playing politics as usual".

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am interested to have the endorsement of members opposite, who back up their university colleague. Another expression used by the honourable member was "asinine display". The honourable member's use of that expression apparently was not so well chosen because my mention of it did not bring any comment from members opposite. Other expressions used by the honourable member were: "How stupid can you be!"; "Complete fabrication"; and "Rat-baggery of the Opposition". These remarks were made about a man who, in the political sphere, did far more than anybody else to establish this new university. Can something good be expected of a member who, on a subject of which he has special knowledge, can think of nothing better to say than to run down a man who has obviously done a good job?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Leader did not do his homework on that occasion.

Mr. Millhouse: He never had a chance.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He had as much chance as we used to have.

Mr. Hudson: Is the member for Alexandra defending what the Leader said?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Glenelg has not been here during the full course of my speech or he would know that I have already disagreed with the Leader on one point.

Mr. Hudson: You will get into trouble.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I took a dim view of the backward-looking speech of the member for Glenelg. However, in spite of himself he paid a tremendous compliment to the former Premier. He did not mean to do this, but what he said could not be taken as being anything else but a compliment to the Leader. He said:

If any member cares to go out to the site he can see what has been done over the last two years and appreciate the magnificent start that this new university will have—a better start than any other university in the history of Australia.

That is a tribute to the Leader and it is a pity that it was not the honourable member's intention to pay the Leader a tribute when he said it.

Mr. Hudson: It is partly a tribute to the previous Government, partly a tribute to the current Government and partly a tribute to the people who planned the university.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Glenelg is fond of lecturing us, interjecting and adding to the speeches of other members.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You never interject, do you?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I frequently interject but I do not make speeches while seated. I think there is a considerable distinction between the two, and the member for Glenelg has not realized that distinction yet. The brilliant success at Bedford Park is the result of the work of a great many people. Possibly one of the first of those people to come to mind is Professor Karmel, the Vice-Chancellor Designate of the new university. All members will acknowledge that Professor Karmel has intelligence far above the ordinary as well as other qualities that are not only necessary but go towards making him so successful as an administrator and planner. He is conscientious, has courage and sincerity, and has done brilliantly in getting the university going. From the beginning everyone has had confidence in Professor Karmel.

I do not know many of the people involved in the Flinders university project and many involved I will probably never know. However, Sir Henry Basten, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, deserves to be singled out for praise. The ordinary work in a growing university such as the University of Adelaide, is large enough, but to preside over the formation of a new university at the same time is a tremendous job for anybody to undertake. As is the case with Professor Karmel, Sir Henry Basten has inspired confidence in everybody who knows him. I believe that the people of South Australia will be very grateful to these two Vice-Chancellors for the work they have done for this new university.

Other people deserve some attention and credit. One should not overlook the work of the Universities Commission. We have had many discussions with that commission, and there have been disagreements and disappointments, but the fact is that the members of that commission, who are capable men, have spent a tremendous amount of their time in capably organizing university grants throughout Australia. Another person who should also be remembered in relation to new universities is Sir Robert Menzies, the former Prime Minister. It was largely Sir Robert's personal interest in university education which got the Universities Commission going and

which has changed the face of university education so radically in the last few years.

I now want to discuss a few matters relating to the council. As I said earlier, although I consider this Bill is not violently controversial there are some aspects that I do not altogether like, and I shall move an amendment in Committee in respect of the number of members appointed by Parliament to the council. I shall explain this when the time comes. I am not doing this because I want to see a large council. In fact, it would have been much more to my own liking if the council had been a great deal smaller. However, constituted as it is in the Bill, the only thing to do is to try to make it as palatable as possible within the framework that is there set out. I believe that 25 or 27 members is in principle too many people to act as a council, for ordinary businesses are run with much smaller boards of directors and Governments are run with much smaller Cabinets. I think it is very difficult indeed to get together 25 people all of whom have enough time to devote to the problems that will arise. The fact is that often groups of people of this size have to split up into subcommittees. What happens then is that one dominating personality can make a great success of the work of a council by tying together the work of subcommittees and, to an extent, the proceedings of the council; but if that dominating personality makes mistakes, or if perhaps there is no dominating personality, then I believe it is found that a council of 25 or more is too large.

I think there is some truth in the Parkinson's law regarding the size of Cabinet: it can be too big and you can lose the attention of the various members. As a matter of fact, probably the larger a committee or board or council is the less is the membership valued by those members. I think the smaller the group the more those members value their membership and the more certain they are to make every effort to get to meetings and to do their preparatory work beforehand. The use of *ex officio* members on a university council is necessary in some cases, but I believe that such membership brings disadvantages with it in that some of these members do not value their membership as much as do elected members. There must always be *ex officio* members, but generally we should appoint a smaller rather than a larger group of them. I am not happy about nominees from the Chambers of Manufacture and Commerce and from the Trades and Labor Council being made *ex officio* members. I think they are

illogical appointments. I see no reason why they should be elected to a university council. In Australia we have a favorite game of seeking anomalies: we try to find anomalies showing that someone is getting more or getting it easier than someone else. In these appointments we could find a whole range of people who could be nominated. Primary producers and the clergy and so on are not represented. There is no reason why they should be, but similarly there is no reason why there should be representatives from the Chambers of Manufacture and Commerce and the Trades and Labor Council. I do not violently disagree with the Bill, but I believe it could be improved by the appointment of a smaller council and the non-appointment of some of the proposed nominees. I do not doubt that the council will operate satisfactorily, but it would operate better if it were smaller in size.

Clause 21 deals with matters that encompass the building of halls of residence. We know one is to be built at this university at some time. The previous Government had arranged for a hall of residence for men students to be built there. I do not approve of a hall of residence adjacent for women students. No doubt some people will say this a square attitude, but I hope such a building will not be constructed. This is not incorporated directly in the Bill but is to be considered in the future, as a matter of policy. However, it is a matter that can be discussed constructively now. Last year all members who visited St. Ann's Women's University College, were impressed with its high standard, and considered it was a great credit to both staff and students. I do not think that a hall of residence for women students is likely to achieve a high standard if it is in close proximity to a hall of residence for men students. If there is to be a hall of residence for women students it will probably be in the same building as that for men students, separated from it perhaps by a kitchen block or something like that. I am convinced that men and women students living in close proximity on a university site is not a good influence. I appreciate that this point is controversial, but am sure that many people with experience of other universities would agree with me on this.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Talk about Mother Grundy!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is the first statement I have heard from a member of the Government about this matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What you are saying is absurd.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask the Attorney-General whether it means that Government policy is for the establishment of a hall of residence for women at Flinders university, or has that matter not yet been discussed?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The point is that nobody has ever alleged that it was improper or frightful.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Nor, incidentally, am I alleging that it is improper or frightful; I do not say that at all.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are implying that it is dangerous.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I believe that women's residences are better run when away from university grounds and not in close proximity to men students. There are good opportunities for the mingling of the sexes at universities and there is no need for this close proximity of halls of residence. If it does happen, what is likely to occur is that social factors will tend to dominate the learning within the university. Many of the women students who would live in the halls of residence would come from country areas. Many country parents would feel more secure about their children (and the children themselves would probably feel more secure) if they were living in residences away from the university grounds. It is not that there may be widespread trouble, but the close proximity of male and female halls of residence would mean that social factors would upset the studies of the students, both men and women. In fact, it would probably be more upsetting to the women students. The atmosphere of a place like St. Ann's College would give much more security and would be more conducive to study than a hall of residence built on the Flinders university site.

Having said that and having been violently disagreed with by the Attorney-General, I leave it. I doubt whether it will ever come before Parliament in the shape of a Bill: it is a matter of university policy. However, I hope that, if the university ever goes ahead with a hall of residence for women students, it will ensure that the social aspects are not allowed to become dominant in the lives of the students. In Committee I shall discuss other matters. I have amendments, some of which have been put on the file by the Leader of the Opposition. I shall be prepared to move them in his absence if the opportunity arises shortly. In conclusion, I congratulate the people mainly associated with the establishment of this univer-

sity. The people who come to mind immediately are the former Premier, the former Minister of Education, the present Premier, the present Minister of Education, the Director of Education, the two Vice-Chancellors of the universities, and those other members of the staffs that have done so much to provide a good start. It is the best start in Australia, as the honourable member for Glenelg has said. It is a credit to them all and apparently, nothing has gone wrong that is apparent to outsiders. I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I, too, support the Bill, and it is a pleasure for me to say that. The criticism I have is minor indeed. I agree with the member for Alexandra that the smaller the committee of management of an organization the more efficient is the management. Perhaps the redeeming feature of this Bill is that a wider section of the people is represented, so perhaps we can accept a larger number on the committee.

I do not necessarily agree with the member for Alexandra regarding residential colleges. I had a daughter at one of these colleges last year and she was fined £4 10s. for having done something. I thought that was fairly steep. The present residential colleges are in close proximity to each other, and I do not think that is a bad thing. If students attend residential colleges they are able to absorb the atmosphere of the university to better advantage. I have seen Oxford, Yale and other universities and I think that the residential colleges provide an advantage to students.

At this stage I put in a plug for Victor Harbour as a site for a future residential college. I do that because all the facilities are available. Victor Harbour is one of the best summer resorts in Australia, but the season is rather short. From the middle of February and through March much accommodation is available. The use of that accommodation by students could be arranged more cheaply.

The cost of accommodation at residential colleges is high. It is £10 a week at St. Ann's, and it is possibly more at the men's colleges. I attended the Adelaide University some years ago and at that time there were many large classes. There is the lecturer who will teach in a parrot fashion with the students making notes if and when they can, which is an unsatisfactory set-up. I do not criticize the whole university structure, but merely draw attention to the importance of the relationship between lecturer and students, especially bearing in mind the large classes to be found in

a university nowadays. With modern innovations (including the popularity of television as a teaching medium) considerable time and effort may be saved, and more efficient ways found to impart knowledge to the rising generation. Incidentally, I recall having a Socialist lecturing me in economics at one time; he practically had me converted to Socialism for a few years but, of course, for anybody who remains a convert after his 23rd birthday there is not much hope in this world. I support the Bill, for it is good legislation. I am sure we all hope that the new university will provide better educational facilities for our rising generation, in which I have much faith and which holds many more prospects than those held by my own generation, or the one preceding it.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I believe that the Government took the right step in making the Flinders university an independent institution but in doing so I believe it has made it too independent, which worries me considerably. Clause 4 of the Bill establishes the council. I believe that it is appropriate that the council should not be too large. The size of this council is similar to the one at the Adelaide university. However, the composition of the proposed council somewhat alarms me. I realize that it is a new university and that it will not be properly constituted for about four or five years, and that as an interim arrangement the Senate of the University of Adelaide will be responsible for electing certain members to the initial council of the Flinders university. There are restrictions, however, on the people who can be elected to that council.

Mr. McKee: That applies in some other places, too.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am talking about a university. There are no politics in this matter, as far as I am concerned. If there are, they are purely local politics. However, I wish to draw attention to the point that the council could be completely dominated by the university staff. We are to have four members elected by the staff itself; the convocation has the right to elect eight, four of whom could be part-time members (they must not be full-time members). This means that 12 people elected to the council could be members of the university staff, in addition to the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and co-opted members. I realize that the new university cannot have a senate similar to the Senate of the University of Adelaide, because it will be a new university, but some provision should have

been made to allow a bigger representation of graduates in relation to the administration of the university. I appreciate that the Senate of the University of Adelaide has about 5,000 members and that when senate is called only about 250 members attend. At the same time, they seem to be able to get a fairly well balanced council representative of all the different faculties. Of course, they are not faculties in this new university; they are schools, which is a new innovation.

Mr. Hudson: Half of the 250 who attend are members of the staff.

Mr. NANKIVELL: But they are not schoolteachers, as the honourable member has claimed they are. He said it would be dominated by schoolteachers and that the Senate of the University of Adelaide would be dictating to the Flinders university.

Mr. Hudson: I said that the two main groups in the Senate of the University of Adelaide were the university staff and schoolteacher graduates and that they were the groups that turned up at meetings.

Mr. NANKIVELL: If that is so, it is extraordinary that Mr. Davis was not successful at the last election. He was past president of the South Australian Institute of Teachers and was highly respected. If the senate of the university is dominated by schoolteachers, it is rather odd that they do not appear on the council. However, I do not wish to carry on a conversation with the member for Glenelg, who had much to say about this and who went out of the Chamber when I read a poem called "Hugh the Hunter". He tried to tear strips off the Leader, but many of the things the Leader said were not as ill-founded as the honourable member claimed. Without considering what the Leader said, the member for Glenelg was unkind and unjust in his criticism. I fear that a university that is just starting and has a reputation to build up may be largely dominated by university staff. I was anxious when I heard the member for Glenelg speak about experiments and innovations. These are dangerous in a new university trying to find its feet. However, I have raised this point as a warning.

Mr. McKee: Which point is that?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Members opposite just do not want to know. They cannot see something even if it is explained to them. I approve of the setting up of this university, and I do not believe that a university can function in the country. The friction referred to by the member for Glenelg was largely associated with colleges which were set up by

another university and which were branches of the university. The university had trouble in keeping staff, as staff do not like being isolated. Trained academics like to be able to mix with people of their own kind and discuss aspects of the work done by people of a similar ilk, but this is not possible when there is isolation. There is already friction between the staffs of the two universities, and I understand there has been considerable movement of staff between them. However, this is something we shall have to accept, and I think it is being provided for. It is a pity some members of the Opposition did not have the opportunity to attend the university. If they had, they would not say some of the woolly things they say.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McKee: Do you want to withdraw that statement?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I will correct my statement. I meant to say that members in opposition to me at present (members of the Government Party) should be a little more cautious in some of their criticism. The Bill is a proper step and I should like the Minister to consider carefully making provision in the future for a wider representation of people outside the university on what will be ultimately the convocation of that university. I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): At the outset I should like to thank honourable members for the consideration they have given to the Bill; but I cannot help saying that to deal with the variety of views expressed would be extremely difficult. It has been most interesting to hear the great variety of points of views expressed by members. I think it was the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) who said that the Leader of the Opposition had made a dispassionate speech on the Bill. I am afraid I cannot agree with that. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that it was unfortunate that the Leader had only 24 hours notice before he had to make a speech on the second reading of the Bill. Of course, when we were in Opposition we were often in that position. If the honourable member wishes to make a point about that matter then I should say that the Leader would have done far better to have confined himself to more moderate remarks than he used, because he made some extreme criticisms of matters that I felt sure he had not examined fully. If he had not had time in that 24 hours to

do his homework on the Bill then surely he should have been a little more moderate in some of his statements. He said that it would be worse than bad sense to oppose the Bill at this stage, but he then went on to damn the Bill, not with faint praise but with a number of arguments which could only be described as extremely strong and which damned many features of the Bill. Therefore, I find it rather hard to accept the proposition that the Leader made a dispassionate speech.

I deplore any suggestion that Party politics enter into this matter. In discussing the Bill tonight, I shall explain to the House precisely how I approached the matter (and it was a difficult matter) as Minister, and to assist honourable members I have prepared a copy of the constitutions of councils and senates of the Australian universities taken from the Martin Report, volume 1, page 83. In addition, I have secured the constitution of the councils of the Macquarie and Latrobe universities. I believe this will help members to follow what I shall say in relation to the preparation of the Bill and in relation to the consideration that I gave to the constitution of the council. The Leader said that we were endeavouring to expropriate an idea. Of course, he was referring to the work that the previous Government had done on this matter. However, there is no question of expropriation. In fact, in a speech covering 12 foolscap pages over one foolscap page was devoted to outlining the work that had been carried out by the previous Government. Let me say now that the work of the previous Government is appreciated, understood and acknowledged by the present Government, which has already demonstrated that it has a progressive policy on educational matters and has no need whatever to expropriate any ideas from the Opposition regarding education. We on this side of the House are not hard up for ideas on education.

Some reference has been made to a university in the country. The Leader made some play on this subject, and he went back to 1960, I think, in order to quote what the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. M. R. O'Halloran) said at that time. When I had the pleasure of introducing a Bill earlier, since we became a Government, in relation to the position of the Principal of the Bedford Park Teachers College, I was rather amazed to find the Leader getting up and opposing a Bill concerning which he had much to do previously, before we became a Government. He even got up and opposed something which he himself had set in train before we became a Government. We

see there another instance of "when things are different they are not quite the same."

We have this attitude that, if we have a university at Bedford Park, it is a second university and it is not a university in the country. Well, I am satisfied that there has been much political play made with this question of a university in the country. Far too seldom have the practical difficulties of having a university in the country in South Australia been told to the people. For example, it does not seem to be recognized that for a university to be established in the country in South Australia, because of the very small number of students that would come from any country town, it would have to be fully residential. I remind honourable members that the cost per residence per student in a fully residential university today would be of the order of £2,500. Therefore, with a university of 5,000 students we would be up for £12,500,000 for the residence alone, and with 8,000 students (which the Flinders university will have, we hope) we would be up for about £20,000,000 for the residence alone. That is quite prohibitive, in view of the State's finances at the present time.

I feel that the question of a university in the country is one to be considered in the distant future. The difficulties of obtaining staff for a university in the country have already been mentioned, and there is no doubt that this also is a grave difficulty. It is highly probable that we would get what could be termed a second rate university as a consequence. We want to look very hard at this question of a university in the country before we start going around pretending that there is some possibility of it in the near future. It has been mentioned, too, in relation to the proposition of a university in the country, that Mount Gambier might be a good site. I think that was mentioned by the Leader. If that were done, of course, many students would be coming from Victoria, and this State would, in effect, be subsidizing Victoria in respect of those students.

Mr. Clark: Most of the students would have to come from far afield, too, wouldn't they?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: True. The thought crossed my mind when the member for Alexandra was speaking that if he were not prepared to have women students in residence at a university I do not know how he would get over the difficulty of a university in the country. I presume he would want that university to be solely for male students or solely for female students.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You understand that I meant in the same building or in close proximity?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In these days of rapid transport I do not think a little distance matters much. The establishment of the university at this juncture has been referred to. The Leader said that this Bill was conceived in haste, was ill-conceived, and that the separation was premature. Different views have been expressed by subsequent speakers, but, as I said in my second reading explanation, what has been done in this matter, in the preparation of the Bill, and the consideration of all questions relating to it, has been done in the closest collaboration with university authorities who were most anxious for an early separation. I received a letter from the Council of the University of Adelaide that set out clearly that it approved and wanted an early separation, and from memory the separation should not be later than July 1, 1966, according to its letter. No-one could imagine that the question of early separation was arrived at lightly or without due consideration with university authorities.

I should imagine that the proper approach for any Minister of Education in this matter should be the fullest discussion with university authorities. If Opposition members think otherwise, I should be glad to hear them, but I have not heard a word on that point. If they care to consider this matter objectively they would say that the university authorities should have been consulted in this matter, and they were, from start to finish. In my second reading explanation I said:

At a meeting in August of this year the Council of the University of Adelaide resolved to inform the Minister of Education that in its view Bedford Park should be separated from the University of Adelaide and should become a new university as soon as practicable.

I want to emphasize this aspect, because it is the clear-cut opinion of the university authorities. I have no doubt that there may be some friction between two establishments, but I am certain that that friction would be far greater if the Flinders university remained an adjunct of the University of Adelaide than if it were separated at the earliest possible time while there was little friction, and while there was good feeling between all concerned, and this is the view taken by university authorities. All experience indicates that considerable friction develops between head office universities and their branches. This was so in the case of the Canberra University College and the University of Melbourne; between the New

England University college and the University of Sydney; and between the Newcastle University college and the University of New South Wales. In these three cases friction was terminated only by the creation of the branch institutions as autonomous universities. The relations between the University of Adelaide and Bedford Park have been unusually harmonious. Those of us who have been involved in the Bedford Park project believe that the best guarantee of future collaboration and co-operation is to bring about a formal separation whilst harmony still prevails. The possibility of friction is unlikely to be affected by the second university's geographical nearness to or distance from the first university. The most likely source of friction between universities in one State lies in competition for State funds. But this source has been eliminated by the existence of the Australian Universities Commission, which makes recommendations on grants for individual universities.

I want to turn now to the composition of the council. I was interested to hear the honourable member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) say that everyone has absolute confidence in Professor Karmel. I endorse that. He went on to say, "Another one who should be singled out for special mention is Sir Henry Basten." Let me say that my conversations about this matter, including the composition of the council, have been with these two gentlemen, so, as honourable members opposite appear to have complete confidence in these two gentlemen, surely they will listen with some respect to what I have to say about the composition of the council. I shall not suggest that every particular detail of the composition of the council was precisely what was suggested in the first place by Professor Karmel and Sir Henry Basten, but I shall point out the differences. I want to ask honourable members to look at the sheets that I have provided this evening and compare the proposed composition of the new university council with that of all the other universities shown on those sheets. I believe that, if honourable members take an objective view of it, they will see that the proposal in this Bill is a proposal for a most balanced council compared with those of other universities in Australia.

In my opening remarks, I called the Bill "non-controversial" but, because the composition of the council of the new university proposed in this Bill differed from the composition of the council of the University of

Adelaide, everybody rushed in and said, "It is controversial because it differs so much from what is maintained at the University of Adelaide." However, if honourable members will look at those sheets, they will see that the University of Adelaide in the composition of its council is the odd man out in Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: So what?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: So what! When we talk about a thing being controversial, we usually mean that it differs very much from current practice, and current practice is not the practice of the University of Adelaide as regards the composition of the council. I suggest that the honourable member compare that council with the councils of all the other Australian universities, as indicated on that sheet, and observe which is the controversial one.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you suggesting that the University of Adelaide is the controversial one?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is, in the sense that it differs so much from all the other universities in Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you suggesting that there is something wrong with it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No, not at all.

Mr. Millhouse: Then why change it?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is the honourable member suggesting that there is something wrong with the other universities?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: We are accused of introducing something controversial because of this difference between the two councils, but the controversy should be around the fact that the University of Adelaide council is so different from the councils of all the other Australian universities, and not the other way round.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you propose to alter that?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No, I do not; I am not criticizing it at all. I am criticizing members opposite for saying that this difference in this Bill as regards the two universities is so controversial, having in mind the usual practice in Australia of all the other universities. What was our object in regard to this matter so far as the composition of this council was concerned? We aimed to do three things. We wanted to meet the requirements established by practice and experience in the universities in Australia—and that is set out on those sheets. We wanted to ensure that the council would be representative of all those involved in the active life and work of the university. The third is to establish good relations and

primary and secondary education, Parliament, communications with the outside world of industry and the community generally. Will any member of the Opposition take exception to those objectives? Surely the university should not be, as has so often been said, a place of long-haired theorists, a place of ivory towers. Surely it should be a place where there are links with the community, with the day-to-day world.

The Leader spoke of the necessity for the education that is obtained in universities being available to the world, and how important this is. One member, I think the member for Albert, said tonight that he thought this was a most important feature. I agree with him, and this is just what we have set out to do. We want these good communications and we want these good feelings between the university and the community generally. May I say that, to achieve these objectives, suggestions were invited from the Council of the University of Adelaide, the Staff Association of the University of Adelaide and the Students' Representative Council.

The constitution of the councils of the other Australian universities, as set out in the Martin Report, was studied carefully. If members care to look at that report, they will see that that in itself substantiates these objectives.

Mr. Nankivell: Will you answer one question in regard to that?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am going to show the truth of what I have been talking about in regard to the Martin Report.

Mr. Nankivell: Is the personnel of the convocation as restricted in other universities as it is here? The Bill provides for eight members, but I do not quibble about the number.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: You have the sheet.

Mr. Nankivell: It does not show that. It shows only the numbers.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I cannot give the details of the convocations in other universities. I have not that information, but surely it is reasonable to take the figures given as a reasonably average situation in regard to the Australian universities. After all, it comes out of the Martin Report, a most authoritative report.

Mr. Nankivell: I believe the numbers to be correct.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I think we can take that as a fair comparison, without going into all the detail. I can see that the honourable member for Mitcham is putting on a

rather cynical grin about that particular statement of mine.

Mr. Millhouse: You have said some funny things about the Martin Report in your time.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I think I said it was a mixture of common sense and something else, but I forget the other word that I used; I criticized it on bonding, I think.

Mr. Millhouse: Now you are relying on it on something else.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member himself does not accept everything. I think that tonight he accepted quite a bit of this Bill, but not all of it, so there is nothing strange about that.

Mr. Millhouse: You are allowing yourself the luxury of picking and choosing, are you?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have seen the honourable member do that himself.

Mr. Nankivell: You said that you do not want ivory towers. I think the method of selecting the personnel would create an ivory tower.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall deal with that. This statement appears on page 83 of the Martin Report:

The most successful Government is that which has the consent of those it governs. In some organizations, however, efficiency may be achieved with little consent and a maximum of direction, whereas, in the pursuit of university aims, common consent and a minimum of direction are almost pre-requisites to success. I think these are quite important words in regard to the constitution of the council:

In most other organizations initiative for change and development comes mainly from the upper layers of the administrative structure, but in universities much of it comes from the departments, which are the smallest administrative units in the organizations, because it is in the departments that the new knowledge which it is the universities' task to capture is first brought "from scent to view".

The Martin Report comments on the constitution of these bodies (the council or the senate) as follows:

The States, and the Commonwealth in the case of the Australian National University, vested the ultimate authority for the universities in governing bodies called the councils or senates. The constitutions of these bodies vary in detail from university to university, but in general their members are drawn from Parliaments, industry and commerce,—

and I hope honourable members will note that—the professions, Government departments, academic staff, graduates and undergraduates.

Turning to page 85, under the heading, "Government of Universities", the report continues:

As a result of the rapid expansion during the last decade, administrative procedures must be strengthened, and attention given to processes of communication, for it is in this area that an over-taxed administration first breaks down.

I think we all agree that the larger an organization becomes the more difficult becomes communication within that organization, and it is most important at those stages that there should be the means of easy communication between all the various people involved in the life of that organization. That is why we have endeavoured in the composition of this council to provide just that. The Martin Report further states:

For their part, members of the teaching staff should recognize that self-government implies other responsibilities: first, that the complex problems of effective teaching should be constantly studied, and, secondly, that in these days of rapid technological and economic change, while their teaching should reflect modern thought, it should also be related to the needs of the community and to its developing resources.

In other words, here again we desire communication with the outside world. Page 89 of the Martin Report states:

Of course, there is no common solution to the administrative problems encountered by universities in self-government. The particular circumstances of each institution, and especially the stage of its development and its size, determine the patterns of administrative arrangement most likely to ensure its smooth operation.

The Government has taken all these things into consideration in endeavouring to bring forward a Bill with the composition of a council that will meet these various needs. I repeat: there are no considerations of Party politics involved, as was suggested by the Leader. The only deviation from the generally accepted pattern of the other Australian universities is the proposal to have two persons appointed by the Governor, one nominated jointly by the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures, and one nominated by the Trades and Labor Council. I have already pointed out that the Martin Report refers to the fact that industrialists are on many councils in the Australian universities but, of course, in those cases I should imagine they would come under the heading of those appointed by the Governor.

Mr. Millhouse: Look at our own council, and you will see that that is not so. There are industrialists on that.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That may also apply to the convocation, but the fact remains that there is nothing against industrialists

being on the council of a university. Moreover, in my opinion, it is a good thing to relate industry and commerce to what is going on in a university. The difference in this case is that instead of these two people being appointed directly by the Governor they are first of all nominated by the organizations concerned and then appointed by the Governor. The only difference is in the nomination by these bodies. The Government believes it will give more satisfaction to these bodies and create more harmony if they are appointed in this manner. I think it was the Leader who made much play about these people being representatives.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: There is no difference between representatives and delegates.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That is where I join issue with the honourable member. I remember a good many years ago reading a statement by the late Archie Cameron that there was a great difference between delegates and representatives. He said he was prepared to be a representative but not to be a delegate. If the honourable member thinks he was wrong, that is his opinion, but I join issue with him.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: If you refer to the dictionary you will see that "delegate" is defined as "someone who is sent as a representative".

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That is right, but in this situation a delegate is a person who receives instructions from his organization to do something whereas a representative is a man who goes along without instructions but is representative of the body. That is the essential difference in this situation, and, what is more, the Bill provides for that, as it makes clear what the distinction is.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Then you had better tell the *Oxford Dictionary*!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It was pointed out to the honourable member only this week that if he looked up "fair" in the dictionary he would find that it meant a place where one went to have a good time on the roundabouts, someone who was blond, and fair play, so it can be seen that the dictionary can give many different meanings for the same word.

Mr. Nankivell: Not for this word.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The interesting thing about this is that the Leader said it was an excellent thing to have members of Parliament appointed to the University Council but he deplored the fact that the Bill provided for only three members of Parliament instead of five, as was the case with the University of

Adelaide. He went on to say that members of Parliament had gone along for years on the Council of the University of Adelaide and had behaved in a completely non-Party political manner. He regards it as simple and practicable for members of this Parliament, who have been steeped in Party politics for years and to whom politics has been their bread and butter and their whole life, to be completely non-Party political on the council, yet he thinks it is impracticable for one person nominated jointly by the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures and another nominated by the Trades and Labour Council to go along as responsible citizens and deal with matters on the council in a non-Party political manner. What an argument to put up! The members of this House are so steeped in Party politics that in relation to nearly everything that they look at they ask themselves, "What do we think of this from a Party political point of view?" but the Leader says they can throw all that to one side immediately they go to the council of the university although the two men from these organizations cannot be responsible citizens; no, not they! This is the sort of argument that has been put up on this matter. Let us have a point of view that is a little rational. What about all the important organizations in the city that have industrialists and trade unionists appointed on their governing bodies? Does any honourable member suggest that they have not acted in a responsible, non-party political way during all the years they have been in office? The previous Government took no steps to remove them from their offices for acting in a political way. In fact, members of the previous Government commented in Parliament from time to time on what a good job these people had done. Let us hear no more of this nonsense. We have made it clear in the Bill that these people are not delegates receiving instructions; they are going as representatives. The Government and I have complete faith that these people will act in a responsible manner when appointed to the council. They should be a good source of communication between the university and the public. They will also bring out from the university to the public just as much as they will put in. Isn't that what we want?

I turn now to the total number of members to be appointed by the Government. Honourable members should notice that the number in the Bill, three, is less than the number in any other university in Australia except the Adelaide University, which has none, and yet

the Leader said there were too many Government appointments. In fact, he even linked me with the Director of Education. He said that we would have the Minister of Education together with the Director of Education. Frankly, I could not follow that at all, but that was the sort of thing we had to listen to. He said he could see that there would be a big Government representation in the new university. There is nothing of the sort. I invite honourable members to compare the position of the new university with what goes on in the other universities. Let them satisfy themselves. Some reference was made tonight to the size of the body. I think that two speakers thought that a large body could be unwieldy. I agree that it could be. I prefer a moderately sized body. Anybody with experience in this sort of thing knows that that is better. I invite honourable members to look at the sheet I have given them and compare the size of the council we are proposing with the size of the councils of other universities. Only two are lower: Tasmania has 19 to 21 members and Macquarie 21; all the rest have a greater number. If the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) will look at the sheet and compare the other universities with our new university, he will see that the measure of academic control is very much the same. In fact, it is greater in some and slightly less in others. Here again we have endeavoured to strike a happy balance with other Australian universities. Surely nobody would say that the people in other universities are fools and do not know what they are talking about.

Mr. Nankivell: I talked about wide representation on the convocation.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The sheet shows that people elected to the convocation may or may not be academics. People are elected by the teaching staff and by the staff association.

Mr. Nankivell: They will all be academics but half of them must be from the staff.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Let the honourable member look at what goes on in other universities and he will find that the position here is similar. In fact, I say again that it has been our aim to strike a happy balance and to get an adequate representation of those engaged in the life and work of the university.

Mr. Nankivell: My fear is that there will be a domination.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I was glad to hear the Leader agree that the Director of

Education should be on the council. This I regard as a very good step indeed. There should be communication between the university and primary and secondary education in the State. This is a most important matter, and I am glad to see that there is no argument on that score.

I come now to the question of representation of members of Parliament. It has been claimed that representation has been taken from the Legislative Council; I think this was the claim made by the Leader when he spoke. Reference has been made to a reduction in the number from five to three, as compared with the number of members of Parliament who are on the Council of the University of Adelaide. I assure honourable members that there was nothing in our minds in considering this particular matter except this: that we have five members of two Houses now on the council of one university. Some members opposite claim that there should be another five members. I remind the House that when members were selected from the Legislative Council for the Council of the University of Adelaide there was a ballot, and one of those selected in the ballot was a Minister—one of the four Government members in that Chamber. I am quite sure that as a Minister he did not want the job, because it would be extremely difficult for him to attend meetings. There are three Ministers in the Legislative Council and one other Government member. Although that member was the nominee of the Government he was not selected in the ballot. Now it is suggested that we should have two more members from the Legislative Council to be members of this university council. This Government is not responsible for the situation in the other place. Let us be a bit practical about this. If there were a third university would we have another five members of Parliament on the council of that university? Where do we stop? Is this not becoming a bit silly?

Mr. Nankivell: Have 22, like New South Wales.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I ask honourable members once against to examine the sheet I have here to see how many members of Parliament are on the councils of other universities in Australia. We are proposing to have three members. Sydney has two members; Adelaide five; Tasmania two; New South Wales two; Australian National University four; Monash three; New England none; Macquarie two; and Latrobe three. Why is it necessary for us to have five? I put it to

you, Mr. Speaker, that this is quite an unnecessary number. There is no question of taking something from the Legislative Council. I think members opposite know what will happen regarding Legislative Council members if three members are appointed; it is perfectly obvious. I might say that one university man who discussed this with me said, "Surely, to elect five would only be putting an unnecessary burden on the members of Parliament."

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is difficult to get five from Parliament to attend regularly now.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am pleased to see there has been very little objection to student representation. As a matter of fact, the size and scope of tertiary education in Australia is rapidly expanding. This in itself makes communications within the university more difficult, and, as I have said before, for this reason alone student representation is very desirable. This has been recognized in other universities both in Australia and overseas. I can quote Denmark, France, Germany, and the United States of America. I believe a report was issued; I think in 1957, about the Tasmanian university, in which the authority who conducted the investigation said, in effect, that it would have been most unlikely that the trouble would have arisen had there been student representation on the council of the university. I have the exact quotation if members want it, but they can take it from me that that is the position. I am pleased to see no opposition to this proposal. We have included certain restrictions on the position of the students' representative, but these are only reasonable and I believe the Students' Representative Council will be particularly pleased with the suggested arrangement, as it will lead to a good understanding in university administration.

The Bill prescribes that accounts of the university shall be audited in a manner directed by the Governor, but I believe there is a suggested amendment that the accounts shall be audited by the Auditor-General and for this to be made specific. Before this Bill was introduced the Leader tried to get the Government to agree that the accounts of the Adelaide university should be audited by the Auditor-General. Perhaps the member for Albert may have originated the idea but it was taken up by the Leader. The manner in which the accounts were audited by the private auditors for the university seems to have been perfectly satisfactory to the previous Government for over 20 years, and I cannot understand the

sudden determination by the Opposition to have the accounts audited by the Auditor-General, particularly since the university has given us a firm undertaking that if we required any sort of information about its accounts it would instruct its auditors to provide it. To overcome that point the Leader said that when the Auditor-General audited Government accounts he made certain comments about what should have been done. It seems that the Auditor-General is getting into the realms of policy. Prior to this the Leader said that there was too much Government representation and I suppose that infers interference in the affairs of the university. He cannot have it both ways. As the Bill stands, assuming the university starts with private auditors, there is nothing to stop the Government, without any amendment to the Act, directing that the Auditor-General shall audit the accounts. At present the Adelaide university finds it particularly convenient to be able to instruct its auditors from time to time to give it certain information and to audit the accounts in a particular way to reveal that information. If the position were reversed, and the Auditor-General did the auditing, the university would not be in that position.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What happens in other States?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I cannot say. After all, the honourable member was a member of a Government that was satisfied with the old arrangement for over 20 years, so why should I look that up at this juncture?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The situation has changed rapidly in the last few years. The amount of public money involved has increased tremendously.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I realize that much public money is involved, but, as I have already said, the Adelaide university has given us a firm undertaking, and I have no doubt that the council of the new university will do the same thing. It would be within the power of the Government, without amending the Act, to put the auditing in the hands of the Auditor-General, if the Government of the day so desired.

Mr. Shannon: They would have to pay an outside auditor.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: They would have to pay an outside auditor.

Mr. Shannon: Which might be cheaper.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: There is one other aspect. When the question arose about the Auditor-General auditing the accounts of the Adelaide university it was immediately

pointed out by officers of the Government that it would require additional staff.

Mr. Shannon: Maybe; I would not doubt that, but it might be cheaper.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That may be so, but the Government at present sees no reason to upset the arrangement, which seems perfectly satisfactory to the university and to the Government if it requires additional information. There the matter rests. As I say, the Act will allow the Government, if it so desires in the future, to change over to the Auditor-General.

I notice, too, that an amendment is foreshadowed with regard to certain university regulations concerning students' fees. It does not select any others. University regulations are concerned mainly with the internal administration of the university and the organization of its courses. It would seem undesirable, therefore, that these should be the subject of public debate, as they are concerned mainly with technical matters rather than matters on a policy level. In this respect the University of Adelaide Act has been followed as closely as possible. This legislation is not precisely the same, but the clause dealing with regulations, although it follows closely the corresponding section of the University of Adelaide Act, has differences that are necessary to suit the needs of the new university, because it is a university of a more modern kind. That is the only reason for the changes in the conditions regarding regulations. I can see no reason why we should amend the Bill as suggested in respect of fees. After all, there does not seem to have been any serious trouble in this regard in the past. Unless I hear some far better reasons than I have heard so far, there seems to be no reason to make a change in this direction.

It was also said that the university should not have power to mortgage its property. No member has raised that point since the Leader spoke. As the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) has said, the present university has had that power for many years. It is a desirable power and there is nothing to cavil at there. One or two other points were raised by honourable members, and if I can answer them I shall be pleased to do so. The member for Mitcham referred to what he called the "bad grammar" in clause 3. Of course, there was bad grammar for a long time under the last Government.

Mr. Millhouse: But you are a new broom sweeping clean.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: And it is open to question whether it is even bad grammar.

I do not profess to be a pundit on grammar, as the honourable member is with his legal training.

Mr. Millhouse: I do not happen to be a pundit, either.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I point out to the honourable member that, if he altered it, he would probably have to add these words "shall be capable in law of receiving, taking, purchasing and holding".

Mr. Millhouse: That is correct idiomatic English.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Would the honourable member agree that that is correct grammatically?

Mr. Millhouse: Yes.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not know that it sounds much better than "shall be capable in law to receive". Any person reading it would understand perfectly what was meant. Of course, if the honourable member is going to be particular about grammar, he can be if he likes it that way, but the main purpose of this is for the people to understand it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is perfectly standard drafting.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member also referred to the different standards of matriculation at neighbouring universities giving rise to difficulties. I do not think this sort of thing is likely to arise in this case, because I drew the attention of the University Council to the desire of the Government that duplicating and overlapping be avoided at all costs. I have it on record that the bodies concerned have agreed that there shall be no duplication or overlapping and I have their assurances that they will avoid unnecessary competition.

I think the honourable member can rest assured that there is a complete understanding between the two bodies in this respect and I do not expect any trouble. In regard to the question of the power of the senate or convocations to have the last word on the decisions of the council, let me point out that, in the University of Adelaide, I understand that the senate meets only once a year and that it is a very unwieldy body to consider council legislation.

I understand that on the last occasion there were not enough nominations to fill the vacancies in the standing committee. This clause is in accordance with the wishes of the university authorities and I am prepared to stand by their views on this in preference to those that may be expressed here. I consider

this to be a good provision and do not consider it necessary to have convocation controlling the activities of council in this manner.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you intend to repeal that provision in the University of Adelaide Act, then?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No. We are discussing a new Bill and, if a thing is working all right, I am not anxious to disturb it. We are looking at something new. We are setting up a different sort of council. It is in accord with the general practice and experience elsewhere in Australia. As Minister, I have taken advice of the university authorities on this matter. There has been the fullest discussion and consideration of the whole matter and I am prepared to act on their advice.

Mr. Nankivell: Who recommended the restriction on convocation nominations?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I think I have said how this was arrived at and I do not intend to elaborate on it.

Mr. Nankivell: You have not answered it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I think I have covered most of the objections and points raised by honourable members opposite, as I have endeavoured to do. I think that, by dealing with this matter and showing the House how we are approaching this question and explaining our objective, members will realize how this came about and I hope they will examine closely what we are doing in relation to what the other Australian universities have done.

I invite members to read the Martin Report on this question. I consider that, when they have done that, they will be satisfied with this Bill. I assure the House that this is an honest and careful approach to make this new university successful in every way. As Minister, I pay a tribute to the work carried out not only by Professor Karmel but also by the other people involved at the University of Adelaide in their co-operative approach to this matter. I do not think the public realizes the tremendous co-operative effort by many people in the university in preparing the plans and in making suggestions in order to get this university off to the best possible start. The people concerned are right up to schedule with their planning; the university buildings are something of which any State could be proud. In fact, I go so far as to say that in my opinion, when completed, it will be the best looking university in Australia. Its facilities are admirable, and all these things are a

tribute to the people in the university who have undertaken the detailed planning.

Mr. Quirke: Will it be better looking than the Sydney university?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. I have the highest admiration for the work these people have done; they are the people who, behind the scenes, have produced what is being erected at Bedford Park. I hope honourable members will give the Bill their fullest support, and not cavil at little details. The Government and I are confident that what is contained in the Bill is good, is carefully considered, and will produce the best possible results.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"The Council."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

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

In speaking on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, who is unfortunately not able to be here at the moment, I point out that the amendment primarily provides for the appointment of the same number of members of Parliament to the council of the new university as the number appointed to the Council of the University of Adelaide.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I am sorry that, for the reasons I gave earlier, I cannot accept this amendment, which I hope will not be pressed. I consider that the Bill as drafted will ensure good communication between this Parliament and the university and that the amendment is necessary.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think I have correctly assessed the numbers in this Committee. Obviously voting will be on Party lines as we have not gained any converts from the Government side. I therefore do not intend to proceed with the other amendments that are consequential on the amendment that was negatived.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

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

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

In subclause (1) after "At" to insert "the commencement of this Act and at".

It is obvious that the council will need to be appointed before the new Parliament meets. In other words, provision will have to be made for the members of Parliament to be appointed to the council at the same time

as the Act commences. The amendment provides that, when the Bill becomes an Act and the council is appointed, three members of Parliament will become members immediately.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7—"Appointment of members of Council by Governor."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out to the Minister that there are many Chambers of Commerce and many Chambers of Manufactures. I presume the clause is meant to refer to the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce Incorporated and to the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY moved:

Before "Chamber of Commerce" to insert "Adelaide"; after "Commerce" to insert "Incorporated"; before "Chamber of Manufactures" to insert "South Australian"; after "Manufactures" to insert "Incorporated"; before "Trades" to insert "United"; and after "Council" second occurring to insert "of South Australia."

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 8 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Power to make Statutes."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(1a) Subject to this Act no new statute or regulation or alteration or repeal of any statute or regulation continued by virtue of section 33 of this Act shall be of any force until approved by the convocation.

I consider that the powers of the convocation as set out in the Bill are negligible and are confined to the election of eight members of the council and, even in that case, they are further confined by the provisions of another clause that four shall be academic members and four shall be persons who are not full-time employees of the university. The convocation of the Flinders university should have powers equal to those of the Senate of the University of Adelaide. The council of any university should not be all-powerful but that is what we are doing by not making the statutes and regulations of the university made by the council subject to scrutiny by anybody. The Minister said that the administration of the University of Adelaide had worked well but he was careful, in his long reply, not to say anything in answer to me on this point.

The Minister has not give any reasons why this power should not be inserted, but I should like to know who are these university authorities from whom he received advice. Obviously one is Professor Karmel and others are people of that nature for whom I have the highest

regard, but they are not people whose advice should necessarily be taken without reserve. The University of Adelaide Senate must agree to all statutes and regulations before they operate. Most important, another set of minds looks at these things and makes recommendations to the council, and that is where the value of the standing committee of the senate comes in: it looks at these things and advises the council on its views and, if it has alterations to suggest, I am informed that in almost every case the recommendations made by the standing committee of the senate are accepted by the council, and alterations are made. At the moment under this Bill, if my amendment is not accepted, the council of the Flinders university will not have the benefit of this advice. Melbourne University provides by statute for a standing committee of its convocation to do just this.

Why does the Minister refuse to entertain my amendment without giving any reasons? If there are good reasons against it, I should like to hear them and I may then be prepared to withdraw my amendment; but the Minister in his second reading explanation did not justify his departure from something that has worked well at the University of Adelaide. Neither did he mention it in his reply. This matter is most important. It goes to the root of the whole concept of the university. What is the university? This Bill says it is the council and the convocation. But what is the convocation? Nothing at present except a body to elect one-third of the council. Yet in the University of Adelaide it has real powers that are a help in the administration of the university. I see no reason for departing from that model, and the Minister has given none. I ask him to accept this amendment or at least tell us why he cannot accept it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I appreciate there are two schools of thought on this matter but I say that I have given this matter careful consideration and I have reasons which it is impossible to give chapter and verse here.

Mr. Millhouse: Why?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member will have to accept that. I have carefully considered this matter in discussions with the people I mentioned earlier. The Government will not accept the honourable member's amendment. At the same time I appreciate the points he has put forward, but it is just that the Government feels that the balance is on the side indicated by the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I had a fairly open mind and had not seriously con-

sidered this amendment until I heard the member for Mitcham speak; and, having heard the Minister's reply, I am in no doubt about supporting the member for Mitcham, because the Minister has not answered him at all. He has simply said, "We are not going to change the Bill, and that is all there is to it." The honourable member has made a reasoned case and none of his arguments has been in any way answered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad that the member for Alexandra has said that. It is unsatisfactory for the Minister to say, "Yes, there is something in what you say but I shall not give you the reason why I am not prepared to accept the amendment." This is where these matters must be discussed. If the Minister is saying that the Senate of the University of Adelaide should not have the power that it has and if he is saying that there is something wrong, we should be told about it and there should be an amendment to the University of Adelaide Act.

I do not consider that that is the case, but apparently there is something in the Minister's mind that justifies him, in his view, in depriving the convocation of the Flinders university of all power; in fact, in making it just a farce. We are a Committee of the Whole House discussing what is best for the university and surely we are entitled to know the Minister's reasons.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Coreoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday (teller), McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Pair.—Aye—Sir Thomas Playford. No—Mr. Hughes.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(2a) Notwithstanding anything contained in this section the following provision shall apply with regard to any Statute or Regulation made pursuant to this section relating to fees to be charged to students—

(a) upon reducing such Statute or Regulation into writing and affixing the common seal of the University thereto it shall—

- (i) be submitted to the Governor to be allowed and countersigned by him;
 - (ii) be published in the *Gazette*;
 - (iii) subject to paragraph (b) hereof take effect from the day of publication or any later day fixed by the Statute or Regulation; and
 - (iv) be laid before each House of Parliament within the first fourteen days of that House after publication;
- (b) if either House of Parliament passes a resolution disallowing any such Statute or Regulation of which resolution notice has been given at any time within fourteen sitting days of that House after the Statute or Regulation has been laid before it the Statute or Regulation shall thereupon cease to have any effect but without affecting the validity or curing the invalidity of anything done or omitted in the meantime. This paragraph shall apply although all the fourteen sitting days or some of them do not occur in the same session of Parliament as that in which the Statute or Regulation is laid before the House; and
- (c) when a resolution has been passed as mentioned in paragraph (b) of this subsection notice of the resolution shall forthwith be published in the *Gazette*.

In the absence of the Leader of the Opposition I point out that the gist of the amendment is to provide that statutes or regulations fixing fees within the university should come before honourable members for scrutiny. I acknowledge that this is not the case in respect of fees charged by the University of Adelaide, but much justification exists for inserting such a provision in the University of Adelaide Act. Nowadays, much of the money paid in the support of the university comes in one way or another from the State. Therefore, it is only right that the State (and in our case the Parliament) has the right to have the oversight of the fees charged students by the university. Furthermore, many of the students themselves are assisted financially by way of scholarship, grant, or loan, which comes from the State, another reason why these matters should come before the Parliament. I cannot believe that there is any real reason to resist the amendment which, as it is drawn, provides that the statute or regulation will come into effect immediately. That statute or amendment, setting out the fees, will simply be subject to disallowance, as any other regulation or by-law made by other bodies now is. The Minister said that these were mainly matters

of detail and did not involve policy, but many other regulations and by-laws that come before this House and are subject to disallowance are in that category, yet we do not make an exception of them and say that simply because they do not involve policy they need not come before Parliament. What applies to other subordinate legislative bodies should apply in relation to the very important matter of the fixation of fees. I therefore hope the Government will accept the amendment.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: If the Government accepted the amendment it would be logical for it to accept amendments to all regulations where money was involved, because the reason put forward for accepting this amendment was that, because the State provided a large sum of money for the university, it should have some oversight of fees. However, a large proportion of the money comes from the Commonwealth Government. I can see no special distinction between this and any other regulation concerning money.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 20 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—"Annual report."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "audited in such manner as the Governor may direct and insert "and shall be audited by the Auditor-General."

The Minister in replying on second reading said that the previous Government was in charge for 20 years and did not insist on this in relation to the University of Adelaide. Although the University of Adelaide Act is not before us at present, if it came before us undoubtedly this aspect would receive attention. University financing has changed greatly in the last few years (which the Minister acknowledges) because of Commonwealth intervention and now much finance for universities comes from Government sources. Therefore, it is only reasonable that the Auditor-General should be the one to audit the books of this new university. The Minister went to some pains to draw a comparison between the universities of other States and the new university with respect to university councils. He said that we would be fools to differ from other States. I suggest he should use that argument in relation to the auditing of the accounts of the new university by the Auditor-General because, as far as I know, the accounts of all other universities are audited by the appropriate Auditor-General. As the Government, when in Opposition, time and time again averred its faith in the

Auditor-General's reports and investigations, I suggest that it should accept my amendment.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The clause now states "audited in such manner as the Governor may direct". At any time after the passing of the Bill the Government may direct that the Auditor-General shall audit the accounts.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That is Executive control, not control by Parliament.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: If the Government desires that the Auditor-General should audit the accounts then the accounts would be available to Parliament. However, if the Government accepts the amendment, in view of what has been said, within a short time it would have to similarly amend the University of Adelaide Act. The Government is not prepared at this juncture to do this without further consideration. We have given our reasons for not wanting to alter the University of Adelaide Act at the present time, but we have included in this Bill a means whereby if the Government wishes to change the situation regarding this new university it can do so, and I suggest it is almost bound to flow from that that the Government would have to do it in regard to the University of Adelaide as well and amend that Act. At the present time we are not prepared to accept the amendment for that reason and the other reasons I have given this evening.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the member for Alexandra. With very great respect, I think the Minister is not putting up a very good show tonight when he says simply, "I have my reasons and I am not going to give them." That is an insult to the House. If there are good reasons, why does he not give them? We are entitled to them. The Minister is being obstinate and is insulting the House by not giving reasons.

Mr. Jennings: He is certainly not being obtuse.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He has not given us anything to be obtuse about. The member for Alexandra has pointed out that in other States university accounts are audited by the Auditor-General. We know that is not the case with the University of Adelaide, but many things about this new university are different. A few moments ago the Minister thought that was a great virtue, but apparently he now finds it a vice. The Minister should at least be consistent about this. I entirely agree with what the member for Alexandra has said. Public money, both from

the Commonwealth and from the State, is supporting this university, so there is every reason why the accounts should be audited by the public authority, the Auditor-General in this case. I think this is an amendment which, based on the arguments the Minister has been using up to this time of the evening, should be accepted.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday (teller), McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Pearson. No—Mr. Hughes.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (27 to 32) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CON-TRACTORS LICENSING BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 17. Page 2912.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I remind honourable members that this Bill was first introduced into the House on October 12 last year, and it was debated sporadically until November 17, which seems to indicate that the Government was not very interested in it. It was only because of the ridicule heaped upon it by the Opposition that the Government soft-pedalled with it. On November 17 last I was given leave to continue my remarks. Since then a copy of the Labor Party's constitution has come into my hands, and I find no reference in it to the shortcomings of the electrical trade, so I can only assume that pressures outside of the Trades Hall or Caucus are forcing the Government to take action on this matter. Perhaps the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst), who was closely associated with the organization concerned with electricians, could tell us something about this or maybe the member for Unley is thinking of his material comfort as he is concerned that the electors will deal with him at the next election, he having been a party to the introduction of this measure.

When I last spoke, I told the story about a neighbour of mine who had occasion to have his house wired by a professional electrician.

When he had finished the work and the Electricity Trust officer (and I pay a tribute to the excellent way in which the officers of the trust supervise the work done by people who wire cottages) came to connect the power, it was found that the light went on in the sitting room at the same time as the hot water service connection was switched on. The member for Frome then said about this professional electrician:

Perhaps he did that for a reason.

I just cannot understand how any electrician would wire a sitting room circuit into a hot water service. Surely it is a reflection on the profession. Serving an apprenticeship does not make a tradesman: it is the professional skill that makes the tradesman. If the member for Semaphore were to give an honest opinion, he would be the first to agree to that. I notice that in the same section of my speech the member for Port Adelaide made an offensive remark about bush electricians. I think it was unbecoming and a grave reflection on tradesmen in the country, who are at least as efficient as tradesmen in the metropolitan area.

If the member for Semaphore or the member for Port Adelaide would go farther into the country than perhaps a race meeting at Gawler, they would be in a better position to contribute to debates. The only reason why the member for Semaphore would go to Gawler would be to attend a race meeting. I do not know whether he would enjoy the beautiful rural aspect there.

Mr. Casey: Can you tell me exactly when I spoke on the Bill?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Frome made a remark, and it is recorded at page 2912 of *Hansard*.

Mr. Casey: You said I spoke on the Bill. Now you say I made a remark.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The honourable member said about a dozen words and I, as a representative of a rural district and one who is very concerned with this legislation, know that he will be pleased to make his contribution to this debate in due course. The member for Frome is not a bushwacker, but has been a member of the Liberal and Country League, and he represents a rural constituency and, as such, he is bound to make a contribution to this debate.

Mr. Casey: You can come up the Birdsville track with me at any time.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I mention to the member for Frome how important this Bill will be to him electorally. Possibly, he has not read

the Bill, but if he reads some of the remarks that have been made on it by Opposition members, he will recognize the danger. In order to refresh members' minds on the Bill, I should like to read from the Minister's explanation in which he sought to justify his introduction of the Bill by citing the accident rate in South Australia from electrical faults. He said:

There have been 19 electrical fatalities in South Australia since 1960, many of them due to faulty wiring.

He cited examples, saying:

These are examples: a workman was killed in a country factory when using an appliance from a power point which had not been earthed; a workman was killed when he came into contact with wire which had not been properly insulated; a woman in a country town was killed when using a washing machine wrongly connected to the supply; a workman in a country town was killed because a power point had been incorrectly wired; and a man was killed in an Adelaide suburb because of a faulty power point.

Mr. McKee: You are supporting the Bill now, are you?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I support it in principle but the detail of the Bill is so absurd and its implementation in its present form would be so disastrous that I certainly could not support it. Because I represent a rural constituency, I study every Bill, giving consideration to the legislation as it affects my own constituents. I know that many of my constituents would be irate if I were to support the Bill in its present form.

Mr. Langley: You haven't seen the local electrician, then.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Even though I represent the local electrician in this place, he is only one of my constituents. Almost every house in my constituency would be affected by this legislation. In referring to the Minister's attempt to justify the Bill purely by quoting accident statistics, I point out that the real statistics would not support his contention. In her second reading speech, the member for Burnside quoted the following figures (which I have not checked, as I believe they came from the Parliamentary Librarian):

They are for 1963 for fatalities from electrical accidents. In that year there were 97 deaths from this source in the whole of Australia—13 females and 84 males. In this connection, it is interesting to note that South Australia is well down the list, with two women and seven men killed. This compares more than favourably with the other States, where five times as many men were killed as a result of electrical accidents and about four times as many women.

The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) analysed the figures for the last four or five years. The fatalities in South Australia were much less in proportion to population than those in the other States. Therefore, on accident statistics alone, the Minister has no justification for introducing the measure. I think most of the credit for this State's low accident figures should go to the excellent policing system carried out by the Electricity Trust.

Mr. Langley: What about people making additions to their houses? Does the trust police that?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It should.

Mr. Hurst: How can it?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Even if this legislation came into force, how could the trust supervise wiring extensions any more than it is doing now? If we make it illegal for people to extend wiring circuits themselves, it will not stop them from doing it; they will not take the trouble to report those extensions to the trust.

Mr. Langley: The trust can go around and make inspections.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Unley is merely being facetious; he knows it is impossible for the trust to supervise every cottage wiring extension. Giving another example of what professional cottage wirers do, another neighbour of mine, a Lebanese poultry farmer who has been in Australia for about seven or eight years (and a battler, who started from the bottom, and is working his way up), even though he thought he could wire his poultry houses himself, decided he should engage a professional electrician. The electrician wired this man's laying and rearing houses, and when the job was completed a trust officer (whose regional headquarters, I think, were at Clare), found that the wiring installed by the professional electrician was insufficient to carry the load. If this man had wired his poultry house himself, he would first have telephoned the trust officer at Clare to find out what type of wiring he should use. Instead, he put his faith in a professional wirer, and he was confounded. I will not give individual names.

Mr. Hurst: You cannot.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Surely the honourable member would not expect me to name tradesmen in this House? I shall be happy to tell him the name afterwards, but I will not give it here. I refer the member for Frome, who unfortunately is out of the Chamber at the moment (the member for Chaffey has run away, too), to clause 9, as they will be interested in and affected by its working. For the benefit

of members opposite, who are making much noise and probably do not understand the Bill, I will read it out.

Mr. Jennings: Have a look at the Party rule book!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: There is nothing in it. Otherwise, I should be delighted to quote it to the House.

Mr. Lawn: The honourable member is a Party member. He is wearing his red ticket!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I think the honourable member is trying to provoke me, Mr. Speaker. Clause 9 provides:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, but subject to any other Act or law, it shall not be unlawful—

(9) for a person, other than an electrical worker, whose trade or occupation normally includes the performance of work on any appliance, plant or machinery driven, or operated by, or incorporating any electrical installation, to perform or carry out that work in the normal course of his trade or occupation or for purposes incidental thereto—

I will read the rest of the clause, the real sting of which is in the tail—

so long as he does not perform or carry out work on any part or circuit which is, or may be, connected to a source of electricity supply.

Let us see what this means.

Mr. Langley: What you think it means!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: What I know it means. I should like the member for Unley, and the member for Frome if he is here, to imagine a shearer in a country shed, perhaps 100 miles from the nearest township, who has a mobile motor generator type shearing gear.

Mr. Langley: What voltage?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Perhaps there is a Ronaldson-Tippett motor outside the shed driving a 240-volt generator. This is the type of plant my own shearing contractor has used for years. Also imagine that inside the shearing shed this contractor has several 240-volt shearing machines. Let us imagine that half way through a shearing run the generator outside breaks down. Perhaps this is a hypothetical case but it serves to illustrate just how ridiculous the Bill is.

Mr. Ferguson: That actually happens.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The shearing contractor would have to take his 240-volt generator (and I harp on the 240 volts because everything over 40 volts is included in the Bill of the member for Unley) perhaps 100 miles to the nearest electrician to be repaired.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: What makes the generator?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Although the Minister has pursued many callings, I do not know whether he has ever been a shearer. I do not know what make the generator would be. Some of the shearers concerned might be loyal trade unionists. I am not sure what union shearers would belong to.

Mr. Coumbe: The Australian Workers Union.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If they were members of the A.W.U. then I think they would be confirmed Liberal voters after such an experience as I have described. Let us imagine a small building contractor who might have a not so small concrete mixer with a $\frac{1}{4}$ h.p. electric motor driving it. If the motor happened to fail the contractor would not be allowed to make a temporary repair. Under the terms of the Bill, if he had a replacement motor he could not slip it into the stand and continue to work the plant. Let us consider the case of a dairy farmer who might have a 240-volt or 415-volt motor driving his milking machine and half way through the milking the motor failed. Under the Bill he would have to telephone his local electrician. I do not think the member for Unley has ever considered these contingencies. I am sorry that the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) is not in the Chamber. He never seems to be in the Chamber when I am speaking.

Mr. Langley: Don't be personal. How many members on your side are in the House?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am making a remark that applies to the member for Chaffey, because it concerns some of my Murray River constituents and me. Quite a few people in this area have underground tanks with electric motors that pump the water from the underground tanks into overhead storages. I do not think these people would be pleased to have to get a licensed electrician to repair underground tank pump motors every time they broke down. The member for Unley is being noisy. A few weeks ago I happened to pass down Park Street, Unley, and it was on the day a certain referendum was held. There I beheld the member for Unley, out in front of the Park Street polling booth, being a great fellow, wheeling people in to vote and being hail fellow well met to everybody who called at the booth. I wonder what those people would have thought if they had known about the legislation the member for Unley was attempting to foist on them. What would all those young fellows who rolled up to the polling booth on their motor bikes

have thought if they had known that under the terms of this Bill they could not even change a spark plug?

Mr. Langley: They are quite happy with the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am sure the information has not got through to them. I am told that there is an excellent exhibition in the windows of the Electricity Trust building in Rundle Street that indicates to passers-by the various dangers that can ensue from various electrical installations. I am told that it is a most excellent stand, but one source of danger the stand does not portray is danger from wiring, for apparently that danger is considered by the trust to be so insignificant that it does not choose to make a display of it.

Mr. Langley: Yes, it does. Do you know whether or not the trust is interested in this Bill?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not know how the trust could be interested either way, but I should be very much surprised if it supported the Bill in its present form. The Bill states that "electrical installation" means:

The whole or part of any appliance, wire, system of wiring, conduit pipe, switch, fittings, equipment, motor, apparatus or device wherever situated which (a) is intended or designed or adapted for the purpose of using or consuming; or (b) is used, intended, designed, or adapted for the purpose of carrying or transmitting.

Something that members opposite have not remembered is that plumbing in South Australia must be done by a licensed plumber, and it is usual for earth connections to be connected to plumbing conduits. Taking this legislation literally, it would mean that a licensed electrician would have to be called to unhitch the earth wires from the metal conduit, and after the plumber had finished his plumbing work the electrician would again need to be summoned to refit the earth wire. I hope the member for Unley is taking notice of this, because I am sure he did not consider this point when he helped bring up the Bill. I do not think the members of the Australian Labor Party in this Chamber are really considering the little people when they bring in legislation such as this. It means that a person who is now able to effect a small electrical repair will be prevented from doing so, and he will have to pay out good money, certainly I would think a minimum of £2 2s. (and I am sure the member for Unley would never answer a call for less than that) for that work.

Mr. Langley: You are wrong.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: How will this affect the pensioner and the retired folk? The member for Unley has a number of them in his district, and I do not think they will be very well pleased.

Mr. Jennings: I think you will be rather sorry you made that speech.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Oh no, I will not be.

Mr. Jennings: I think you will be.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I shall leave the spirit of my remarks to be carried on by other speakers.

Mr. HEASLIP secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.16 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 3, at 2 p.m.