LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, February 9, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

UPPER MURRAY BRIDGE.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Roads any information as to when the Government is likely to refer to the Public Works Committee the project of another bridge over the River Murray in the vicinity of Kingston?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: At this stage I am afraid I cannot give the Council much information. As I have previously reported in answers to questions about a second bridge over the River Murray, the most appropriate site for that bridge is still under investigation and has not finally been determined. Until such time as it has been determined, I am afraid that no reference can be made to the Public Works Committee about it. I am seeking information. I do not know how far advanced the matter is but, as soon as information is available, I will inform the Council.

BUSH FIRES.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: My question arises from yesterday's spectacular bush fire, which started on Government-held land. We have for many years known that it is possible to safeguard scrubland in the Adelaide Hills by controlled burning. There is no danger to either the flora or the native fauna in this as long as it is done in the recognized safe periods of the year; but there seems to be no attempt to apply such well-known methods of bush fire control to any of the large areas of Crown land in the Adelaide Hills. Several departments are involved in this matter, but I think the question should be directed to the Minister of Roads as I believe the fire yesterday started on Highways Department land. This is a patch of land that has been held for some years and has been accumulating inflammable material. Will the Government consider safeguarding all Crown land in the Hills by controlled burning at safe times of the year?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member asks whether the Government will consider this. In the light of that, it would be a matter for the Government to determine and would have to go before Cabinet. In the circumstances, I suggest that the question be put on notice.

GRAPE PRICES.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: With reference to my question of Tuesday of last week relating to grape prices, can the Chief Secretary say whether any progress has been made in negotiations and whether he expects to be able to announce a decision soon?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There have been further negotiations between the grapegrowers and the Government since the question was asked. However, I understand that no finality has been reached. The parties concerned met the Minister of Agriculture last week, when some progress was made, and I know that they are meeting again at the end of this week. I shall supply the honourable member with any information I am able to obtain for him.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CONSTITUTION BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I desire to refer to the debate yesterday on the second reading of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill. During the course of my speech I gave certain information about the position in other States. My explanation regarding Western Australia contained quotations from the Western Australian Year Book for 1962. I have since ascertained that in 1963 two Bills were assented to in that State within a matter of days, and the position there as regards the constitution of the House of Review has been altered. The first provided for the representation to be 10 districts each of three members, followed by an amending Bill providing 15 districts each of two members. This alters the information I gave the Council yesterday. The last thing I want to do is to make misleading statements. I gave the information from the latest year book I had, but since then the position has been altered by the Legislature.

HARBORS ACT REGULATIONS.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the regulations under the Harbors Act, 1936-1962, in respect of wharfage, tonnage rates, pilotage, etc., made on November 10, 1965, and laid on the Table of this Council on November 16, 1965, be disallowed.

I have examined the regulations that have been gazetted. They represent a steep increase in the charges made for harbour dues in connection with a number of industries and I shall address my remarks on the disallowance for which I have moved to the effect of these increased charges upon the general prosperity or economy of the State, inasmuch as the increased charges affect particularly export industries at a time when the Commonwealth Government is trying to build up the economy of Australia by encouraging exports.

The rate applying to timber, one of the essentials for house construction, is increased from 7s. 6d. to 9s., while the inward harbour charge for phosphate rock is increased from 3s. 9d. to 4s. 6d. We know that the prices of superphosphate are increasing and that these increased charges must affect our agricultural output and our primary industries, and their prosperity is essential to the prosperity of the State as a whole. The outward wharfage on salt is increased from 1s. 2d. to 1s. 6d. We have in South Australia a particularly appropriate climate for the production of salt because of the dry heat, and the solar salt industry is a substantial one. The opportunities for the development of that industry depend largely on the price at which we are able to sell the product. We have been trying to promote an industry at Port Augusta for some time on which a considerable amount of money has been lost. There have been changes among the companies concerned—one has gone out and another has taken over, and I think that has happened on a couple of occasions. It is all a question of markets. I believe markets are available, but at a price. If we raise the charges, I point out that there is a neighbouring State that has no outward wharfage. As we require every industry and every export market we can acquire, it is not desirable to prejudice the opportunities of industries, particularly the production of salt, by overcharging on outward wharfage.

Lead charges have been increased from 5s. to 6s. We know lead and zinc concentrates are combined on the same rate and that, of course, affects production at Port Pirie and is a charge against that particular industry. If we seek the prosperity of secondary industries, which are the great consumers of labour, and if our development is to be maintained at a sufficient rate to absorb the increase in population, it is essential to maintain these industries at the highest possible productive and export levels.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What if we do not provide proper facilities at ports for industries to export their goods?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Harbors Board is a service department rather than a revenue-raising department and, in some cases, the wharves were not constructed by the board but were taken over by it. Do not let me create the impression that I wish to disparage the work of the Harbors Board, nor do I say it is not necessary for the board to keep its facilities up to date, but the figures we have up until now do not indicate that the Harbors Board is making a loss. The board has been able to provide some money for revenue, in addition to providing services to shipping. As one who has not always welcomed the idea of the Harbors Board closing every little jetty around the coast, I do not want to be placed in the category that I would oppose the board in fixing charges sufficiently high to maintain its facilities in the interests of the State and of decentralization. Sometimes we have to pull jetties down as they are of no more use, but they are important to isolated areas even if they can help the community only in a social way.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: They provide tourist facilities.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes, and this is similar to our problems yesterday when we were on other business. We have to meet changing circumstances. We have to preserve as much as we can of the old but at the same time we have to keep up with the new, and I think that is the position with regard to the Harbors Board. It is an efficient department and I think the development of the wharves is something of which we can be proud. A large sum of money has been spent at Port Pirie on the wharves. It was necessary to spend it. In other States it is not part of Government administration as it is in South Australia. The operations are in accordance with the conditions provided. In Victoria they do not have outward wharfage. That is where we get into difficulties, particularly as we are an important centre in Australian manufacturing in some industries, particularly the motor industry. The rate on iron and steel has been increased from 9s. 4d. to 10s. from overseas, and on black sheet the increase has been from 6s. to 8s. 6d. interstate, while the rate for other unprocessed steel has been increased from 7s. to 8s. 6d. interstate. This must have an effect on the cost of manufactured goods and affect our exports to other States. Of course, the law of diminishing returns comes

into this matter and we must end up by being a loser.

Chain stores buy and sell in volume, but this prejudices the interests of the small family storekeepers. This applies in connection with interstate trade, and that is why I emphasize the effect of these imposts. I think they will act detrimentally and should be carefully examined before being adopted. I do not have figures to show what the increases represent. I am not so much concerned with the amount in £.s.d. I know that the Government has to function and I know the problems that must be faced. A Government bank account is no different from the bank account of anybody else; there must be money in the bank before it can be spent. However, some people in the community seem to think that the Government is different and has ways of wielding the pen and making money appear. People with those thoughts have to be disillusioned because money in the bank is like water in a reservoir—no more can be drawn out than is in there, and it must be made up from somewhere. Obviously this is one way of doing it, through taxation. The Government must acquire money and it states that this is one means of acquiring it; I suppose we must recognize that fact. We are not here to embarrass the Government.

I point out to the Government that I move this motion because I think the charges have gone too far. Many approaches have been made to me regarding them, and those approaches have convinced me more than ever of the far-reaching effects of the proposed charges. It does not matter what field is examined, there are always repercussions. The charges affect our primary producers and industries; the charge on cereals has gone up from 2s. to 2s. 6d. That represents a cost of so much a bushel, but I am not going to state a figure as it has not been worked out; I believe it would be about a halfpenny a bushel. The increase would mean an increase in the price of wheat for home consumption, which in turn must mean an increase in the prices of flour and bread. Then up will go the price of everything else. I wonder what gain there is to Government when it indulges in charges that are reflected in costs. It is hard to say how much this additional tax will increase costs elsewhere. It is an involved question.

We are living in an era where the dog is chasing its tail all the time. Costs, including wages, go up, and then the same spiral starts again. I do not know how it will be arrested, but it is not going to be arrested by the imposition of these additional taxes. There will be reactions. We are at a disadvantage because most of our manufactured goods have to be exported. Therefore, if we have increased wharfages we shall place industry in South Australia at a disadvantage, compared with other States. In turn, it affects the cost of living and also employment.

I come back to the position in relation to steel. I have some figures that are not mine but have come from a source that gives me every reason to believe they are accurate. They show the effect on the automotive industry. On steel sheet the old rate was 6s. a deadweight ton. That has been increased to 8s. 6d. a deadweight ton, representing an increase of 41.67 per cent. The old rate for steel strip was 7s. a deadweight ton. It has been increased to 8s. 6d., representing a 21.43 per cent increase. In Victoria the rate is 6s. 8d. a deadweight ton for both sheet and strip steel. We are placing an imposition on the motor industry here. We are fortunate in having that industry so well established. In fact, it is the main producer of automobiles in Australia. I think it would be a retrograde step if we did anything to threaten an industry that has been established on such a large scale. Somebody might say "They can afford it; they are making big profits. Why worry about them?" That may be so, and I accept it, but confidence matters in trade and production. What can happen to those people can happen to others. It is a handicap and a risk that we cannot afford to take if we desire to retain our place in the field of secondary industry. I am not going to belabour this matter because there are other matters that perhaps I should mention. We are large exporters of unassembled body sets of material, particularly to New Zealand and South Africa, and in this category the increase in wharfage charges is extensive. The old rate of 2s. a cubic ton, which has been considered for many years a concessional rate, has now been increased to the general cargo rate of 6s. a cubic ton—an increase of 200 per cent, or three times what it was. Although there is no outward wharfage in Victoria, the New South Wales outward wharfage for this type of goods is 4s. a cubic ton. We have an industry that has millions of pounds invested in it, and it is inadvisable to take advantage of it. We cannot afford to do so in the interests of our economy.

Conversely, the charge for complete vehicles (that is, the assembled cargo, which would be deck cargo) has been reduced from 25s. a car to 15s. a car. I do not know why there

should be any reduction. However, I give my opinion. The industry was happy before, so why should there be a reduction on that particular line? I am told that the net effect on wharf rates over a full year to the automotive industry, at the estimated 1966 volume, will be an increase of approximtely 32 per cent. The Government should have another look at the problem.

The cement industry is also affected by these increased charges. On cement shipped to Port Lincoln there has been a substantial increase. That must be reflected in increased costs in the building of houses and the production of bricks, so again we shall get a spiralling upward movement in costs, all because of this imposition. I understand that the cement industry is very competitive. Regarding its future prospects, I understand that bulk shipments of cement are probable. Because cement in South Australia is cheaper than cement anywhere else by about £4 a ton, it means that we have an advantage in our production. This has been gained by volume of production. It is volume that enables any industry to compete successfully. If it can produce volume, it so improves its economy that it can compete. If we are to have wharfage in this industry, which is in competition with a neighbouring State that has no wharfage, we shall find that we are not able to compete with that State. We could easily lose the advantage we have gained and if we lose it, and cannot keep up the volume of production, the benefit of lower local prices must ultimately vanish. In other words, while we can produce at volume for export and the production can be carried by road, it is of great benefit to have the cement carried to the point where it is required. This is one of the main advantages of road transport for the building industry, which has had great assistance from the production of cement in South Australia on a large scale. I suggest to the Government that we avoid doing anything to prejudice the future of an industry that has been built up in recent years efficiently, to the advantage of all wage-earners and everyone in the State.

I come back to the steel industry, and point out that another manufacturing firm depends on adequate supplies of certain steel to manufacture its products. These products have been developed under the urge of the Commonwealth export drive. This industry has established an important market in England, so important that the effect on the operations at home was such that it put a 10 per cent surcharge on its products. In addition, it has had a 6 per cent increase in shipping costs (making 16 per cent altogether), and now these additional charges will increase their costs further. If we impose these additional charges, what will be its future? It is up against the problem of trying to do what it can for Australia by developing an export trade, encouraged by the Commonwealth Government, but we defeat everything by imposing charges that could easily lose a market for us.

I point out to the Government the importance of the incidence of taxation and the repercussions that can occur. It may be that some of these charges can be absorbed, but I stress the point, on the imposition of taxation, that it is important that we preserve what we have gained, both in primary and in secondary production, and do nothing to prejudice the progress of the State by doing anything other than enabling it to remain profitable to produce.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): This is in substance a financial matter, and accordingly, as the Minister representing the Treasurer, as well as being the Leader of the Government in this place, I propose to deal with it. These increased charges by the Harbors Board were announced by the Treasurer with the Budget as part and parcel of the financial proposals for this year. They are necessary in order to contribute towards keeping the Budget deficit to a not unreasonable level. They are the more necessary inasmuch as the Budget has suffered a serious blow from the abnormally dry spring, which has made necessary the expenditure of considerable additional sums for water pumping and which is having an adverse effect on both rail and harbors revenues from the shipment of the reduced grain harvest.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That additional cost of pumping has happened before.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Not as much as this year. I had to put the same argument as the Hon. Mr. Rowe put during the Budget debate on this particular question and I remarked that I hoped he was as far out in his reckoning as I had been in mine. Sir Arthur Rymill will remember that, in the year in which I made the objection, it rained heavily afterwards. We have not for many years pumped water for as long or as consistently as we have this year.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I think the year in question was 1959.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, I took up the question in 1959.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It was dry then.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but I had questioned the matter, just as the Hon. Mr. Rowe did. I was proved wrong, because the rain was later sent from above and the Government at that time did not have to spend much money on pumping. Unfortunately, the same thing did not happen this year, and we are spending the money now. That is something that we have to go along with, because people must have water.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: But they will pay more for it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but I am not one to growl. The Council has heard my views on taxes. The rates are extremely reasonable and if some of us had to look after ourselves in regard to water and sewerage and if we had to pay double there would not be a whimper about that. If we get a dry period, more money has to be paid for pumping, irrespective of the Party in power.

No Government imposes increased charges lightly or, for that matter, unless the revenues are an urgent necessity. No commercial community is happy about increased charges, and I think Sir Lyell McEwin has spoken in that regard. These charges, however, are by and large still favourable in comparison with the charges levied generally by other States and if they were not raised in the manner set out in these regulations, then social services or other vital provisions would have to go short, or the deficit would have to be allowed to run to an unreasonable level. That comes back to what Sir Lyell McEwin has said. There is only a certain pool and, when that has been used, that is the end of it.

Of course, the Government will keep its pressure on the Commonwealth to maintain our financial assistance grant at a proper and favourable level, but it must be obvious that we could not expect the Commonwealth to make good our revenue deficiencies to the extent our charges and taxes may be significantly below those imposed by other States. We have all heard that before.

The Government, however, has had a careful review made of these rates and, following this review and the direct representations by industry as well as in this Chamber and in another place, it is prepared to adjust the wharfage rate for black sheet steel. This product goes very largely to manufacturing industries that in many cases have to export their products to the Eastern States and compete on those markets.

These are pivotal industries in our community. The Government would propose, therefore, that if these regulations are allowed to stand, it would undertake to amend this particular rate to the previous level. This offer is made on the understanding that the Council will not challenge other items on which the charges are generally lower than in other States. When the motion we are discussing was mooted, the regulations were thoroughly examined and discussed by Cabinet. This is a firm undertaking by the Government and I assure honourable members that, if it is accepted, it will be honoured.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I was interested in the Chief Secretary's explanation and the undertaking given by the Government. I have an appreciation of the problems facing the Government at present, because figures presented to the Council yesterday in answer to a question have shown conclusively that the finances of this State are not as healthy as they were some time ago. In fact, they appear to be rapidly getting worse.

In addition, we have had a dry spring, as the Chief Secretary has said, and this has caused increased pumping charges and it will result in less wharf and railways revenue. However, when this regulation was proposed in the Government's Budget speech, there was no indication of a dry year, because the dry conditions of last year became apparent late in the spring. Conditions had looked favourable until then and it is obvious from this report and others that we have received that this extra impost was imposed only to raise additional revenue.

In the last few years there has been substantial profit from the operations of the Harbors Board. In 1963-64 the profit was £470,887 after meeting all capital and interest charges, and this was a return on capital of 6.25 per cent. In 1964-65 the profit was £306,990, showing a return of 5.5 per cent. The Government, in its desire for extra revenue, brought forward this regulation, which was considered very early last year before the dry conditions became apparent, purely as a revenue producing measure to bring in an extra £400,000 to £450,000 a year. This meant an increase in wharfage charges on primary produce of 21 per cent, mining 25 per cent, wheat 43 per cent, barley 43 per cent, motor body parts 200 per cent, bricks 80 per cent and wool 71 per cent.

This, as the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin has said, is a very severe impost on our export industries. Australia is one of the trading nations of the world. We live on our export income, and to keep our secondary industries functioning we have to import a large measure of goods, which means that any increase in shipping charges is a definite handicap to progress. The Minister of Local Government by interjection queried whether we required further improvement to our wharves and harbour facilities. However, I point out that the increase in charges bears no relation whatever to improvements to wharves and harbour facilities, which are financed out of Loan funds. All charges by the Harbors Board go into general revenue and the Harbors Board is allocated a quota for the year's operations, so that any increase in harbour revenue is purely an increase in general revenue. It has never been suggested in these regulations or in the explanation thereto that the extra revenue from these increased charges would be applied to harbour improvements.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is no argument. Where does general revenue come into it? Are these people not supposed to make any contribution to harbour facilities?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: These people are making a contribution to these facilities at a rate of almost £100,000,000 a year under the new regulation. Is this not making a substantial contribution?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: £100,000,000—what are you talking about?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: If the Minister would check it in the Auditor-General's report he would find the Harbors Board's profits have been running at almost £500,000 a year under the old regulations.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You said £100,000,000.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The profits are running at roughly £1,000,000 a year since the introduction of these new regulations.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is different from £100,000,000. That is what you said before.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I apologize for a slip of the tongue. I should have said £1,000,000 but the principle remains the same, that this is a charge on the welfare of the country in order to supply funds for general revenue. The Chief Secretary has said that our charges are lower than those in other States, but that applies only to some States. No charges apply in Victoria, and in Western Australia they are very much less than ours. In Tasmania many of the charges listed do not apply as that State is not an exporter of wheat.

I register my protest against this method of raising revenue, but, although I may not have agreed with the motives of the Government when it first introduced this regulation, I do appreciate that conditions since have altered the financial position of the State. This Chamber, as a responsible Chamber, has to see that this State maintains its financial integrity. I indicate my agreement with the Minister's proposal.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I point out the seriousness of this measure, as I realize that the Government is in difficulty and I accept the Chief Secretary's explanation. I do not agree that the Government can look into a crystal ball and foretell that it is going to be a dry year. No-one knew that it would be other than a most promising year, with one of our biggest sowings of cereals in the history of the State. Everything looked fine and dandy. However, I accept the Chief Secretary's explanation of this regulation. The Government has taken some notice of the Opposition in this matter by doing something about steel which, after all, will help our secondary industries considerably. On the primary industry side, the new regulation has been quite severe. On the produce that I have something to do with (mainly Murray River products) there is a considerable increase imposed. Under the old formula the rate on dried fruit was 5s., whereas under the new regulation it will be 6s., an increase of 20 per cent. On fresh fruit and citrus (and we recently passed legislation to set up a committee to assist in getting us over some of our difficulties on citrus), the increase will be imposed on about 1,000,000 cases of fruit that will be exported. We are trying to pioneer markets, which is not easy, and on fresh fruits, including Murray citrus, we have an increase of 16.6 per cent, or from 3s. to 3s. 6d.

The charges on fruit juices, which is another outlet for our surplus of citrus, have gone up by 9.1 per cent. The charges on canned fruit, which is another important part of the economy of the State, have also increased by 9.1 per cent. Apricot kernels, which is a struggling industry that this State pioneered and which is competing at the moment in world markets with Red China, have been hit by an increase of 9.1 per cent. A report on the wine-grape position in South Australia has just been tabled. Now we have an additional

impost on our wines going out of this State, and goodness knows we are already in enough difficulty with wine without imposing an increase from 4s. 2d. a gallon to 6s., which is a 44 per cent increase. This regulation would have a very marked effect upon the economy of those industries. I realize the Government's predicament, but I must register a protest, as this regulation will have a very bad effect upon industries that at any time are borderline industries. I do not wish to do any more than protest strongly and I accept the undertaking that has been offered.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I accept the Minister's explanation that Harbors Board charges have a direct bearing on the State's finances and that those charges are associated with Government finance. These are facts that cannot be overlooked. In view of the circumstances and the undertaking given by the Chief Secretary, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that leave be granted. I point out that this must be a unanimous vote.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry) I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Section 36 of the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act provides for the management of the trust's undertaking in accordance with the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Acts, 1897 to 1931. Section 37 provides for the application of those Acts to the trust. Among other powers the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Act, 1922, provides by section 7 for the compulsory acquisition of easements with certain limitations, one of them being easements over the site of any building of the value of more than one hundred pounds. This is the only legislation giving the trust power to acquire an interest in land.

It is the trust's policy to acquire easements by voluntary negotiations wherever possible, but occasionally it has been necessary to invoke the 1922 Act to ensure that a necessary transmission line can be built. In the supply of electricity to a community a transmission line is only one part of the necessary facilities. The line must terminate in a substation where the power can be controlled and transformed to a more convenient voltage. A substation houses much valuable equipment and necessarily prevents the site being used for any other purpose. It cannot, therefore, be properly built on an easement and consequently the trust has at present no power to acquire sites for substation purposes. In the past the trust has always been able to acquire substation sites by negotiation. In some cases, however, this is becoming very difficult, particularly in built-up sections of the metropolitan area.

The trust endeavours to plan ahead as far as possible and acquire sites well in advance of future needs where this seems desirable. It is, however, not always possible to determine in advance the pattern of demand for power. For example, industries may spring up in a particular location using large quantities of power which could not have been foreseen. On the other hand, it is essential that substations be located close to the power loads which are to be served. Within limits, it is not only impracticable but impossible to supply power except from an adjacent substation. Furthermore, the actual site of the substation has an important bearing on its costs and capability. Entrances and exits must be provided for incoming and outgoing transmission lines.

To illustrate the difficulty being experienced by the trust in obtaining suitable sites I refer to the need to construct a major substation in an area bounded by the South, West Beach and Marion Roads, where a major substation must be constructed to meet loads in the area where there is already a substantial concentration of industrial establishments with considerable expansion taking place. In all, 15 sites have been examined by trust officers and some of these comprise vacant land which would be suitable for the trust's purposes. However, following protracted negotiations extending over several months, the only site available for purchase (over which options have been taken and which expire within the next few weeks) would involve the demolition of five houses. All of these are habitable and some are modern and of good quality.

The trust recognizes that in special circumstances the location of a particular substation may sometimes require demolition of a house. However, the trust believes that it is not in the best interests of the community for it to be forced to do this as a consistent policy when in some instances vacant land is available within the general area as a suitable alternative. This is particularly so at a time when demands for housing cannot be fully met. To overcome the difficulties of the trust it is

considered desirable to provide powers of compulsory acquisition of sites for the construction of substations with the Governor's approval. Clause 4 of the Bill accordingly adds such a power to the powers of the trust.

With regard to easements, I point out that the limitation in section 7 of the Act of 1922 is out of line with modern conditions and money values. The amount of £100 fixed in 1922 was intended to cover a building of some substance. There have been recent instances where it has been possible for an owner of land to erect a prefabricated garage or glass house, thus precluding the trust from exercising its powers to acquire easements. It is considered that the existing limitation is too restrictive, and clause 3 of the Bill accordingly provides that, in its application to the trust, section 7 of the 1922 Act shall be read as if the limiting words were omitted. I commend the Bill to members.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CONTRACTORS LICENSING BILL.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 8. Page 3827.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): In speaking to this Bill I want to say that I find myself in the same position today as I normally do, namely, that I can wholeheartedly support most of the legislation on the Notice Paper, but there are always exceptions, and as I look at the matter now I am inclined to think that this Bill is one of the exceptions.

I think all members of this Chamber, and the large majority of the public of this State, agree that some adjustment of electoral boundaries is necessary. I think everybody admits that there has developed a certain amount of unbalance, and that the proportion of electors in the close Districts is overdue for adjustment. The previous Government realized that, and introduced a Bill which was eminently fair and reasonable, but which, unfortunately, did not become law. Consequently, we are left with this present unsatisfactory situation.

The first point I want to make is that I agree that something must be done to adjust the boundaries and to get things more into reasonable line. The second point is that the present unbalance is due not to the present Opposition but to the failure of the present Government when in Opposition to support the Bill introduced by the then Government to overcome the difficulty. Thirdly, the present restricted franchise of the Legislative Council is not the responsibility of the Opposition. If we had had our way when we were in Government we would have considerably extended the franchise to enable people to vote for the Legislative Council. We introduced a Bill that provided, in effect, that the spouse of every person entitled to vote for the Legislative Council would have a vote, which meant, in effect, that where the husband had a qualification to vote his wife automatically would be entitled to vote, and *vice versa* that where the wife had a qualification to vote the husband automatically was entitled to vote also. That would have extensively widened the franchise and brought about a franchise that would have been widely understood and accepted by most people of the State. The reason why that is not in force today is that it was opposed by the present Government when in Opposition. I am at a complete loss to understand the basis of its opposition, so with regard to the unbalance of electoral boundaries for both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council the responsibility rests entirely with the present Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We are trying to correct the position now. If everybody could vote, there would be no confusion. How could there be confusion if everybody knew he could vote?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I will deal with the terms of the Bill when we get to it. At present, I am trying to place the blame for the present situation where it belongs—with the present Government. The other thing that is said, not only in regard to this Bill but also in regard to other Bills introduced in this Council, is that the Government has a mandate from the people to introduce and pass this legislation. I refer honourable members to the excellent speech made by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill during the Address in Reply debate on the question of what constitutes a mandate and what does not. I do not want to deal with that speech in detail; it is available and I recommend that honourable members read it. However, I moved around considerably before the last election and found that people intended to vote for the Australian Labor Party for many different reasons. Some voted for it because they were dissatisfied with the Playford Government's attitude

on social questions, and that was the deciding factor in how they voted. Some voted for it because they felt there should be an improvement in our industrial legislation. Some supported the A.L.P. because they were promised that the Road Maintenance (Contributions) Act would be abolished on Eyre Peninsula. If the Government had a mandate on that matter, the time is most opportune for it to implement that mandate. Some people supported the A.L.P. because they felt that something ought to be done about town planning. Some people who voted for the Labor Party on that matter will soon see some town planning legislation, and they will wonder whether they were wise to vote for the A.L.P. on that matter—but that is something that is still in the future.

Some people voted for the A.L.P. on the specious ground that they thought it was time for a change. I discussed the matter with one man, who said, "They have been there for 25 years; it is time for a change." I replied, "How long have you been head of your firm?" He answered, "For 30 years." I said, "You are a bit more due for a change than we are." Other people voted for the A.L.P. because they felt that something should be done about the franchise. People used all these different views and looked at all these different considerations, and one or another of them was the deciding factor in making them support the A.L.P. Therefore, it is completely wrong for the Government to say, "We have a mandate to do this, that or the other thing", because obviously everybody had only one vote; he could vote for only one candidate. We shall forget for the moment the Independents and the smaller Parties. People had an opportunity of voting only for the L.C.L. or the A.L.P.: they did not have an opportunity of recording their vote on all these various questions. So it is stretching things too far to say that the Government had a mandate on all these matters.

Another point I make is that, whatever mandate the Government may have believed it had last March, it has certainly lost it by today, because I have never known in all my experience in politics the fortunes of a Government to decline so rapidly as they have done in the case of the present Government over the last two or three months—and this Bill is evidence of that. It was introduced early in the session. We all expected that, as it was something in the policy speech, it would be proceeded with almost immediately, but it was left at the bottom of the Notice Paper and nothing was done about it. The Government has now realized what has happened to its popularity and that its future is limited. Consequently, it is grasping at this proposal to redistribute boundaries as the last straw to save it from the defeat that will inevitably come to it when it goes to the people. Whatever mandate it may have had at the last election on this matter is now lost.

Before I deal with the Bill, let me say that not only in this State but also in other States of the Commonwealth efforts that have been made to abolish Upper Houses of Parliament have been singularly unsuccessful. I do not want now to deal with all those efforts, but I refer to the effort of the Labor Party in New South Wales. It tried all conceivable means to abolish its Upper House, which has not a restricted franchise as we have: it is a House that has no franchise at all, and is subject to election by ballot by a restricted number of people. They tried to abolish it by political means and by action through the courts. They took the matter to the Privy Council, but all those means failed. Then they launched out on an extensive campaign over a long period to seek to do it by referendum but when they went to the people on the matter they were overwhelmingly defeated.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This Bill does not advocate the abolition of the Legislative Council.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: If the honourable member will take the trouble to read the Minister's second reading explanation, he will see in so many words, "This Bill is to be regarded as a step towards the abolition of the Council."

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There is nothing in the Bill about the abolition of the Council.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The statement of the Minister was that this Bill would lead to the abolition of the Council. There is no argument about that matter.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There is argument as to whether it is in the Bill.

The Hon C. D. ROWE: It is in the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is not.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I will show the honourable member where it is in the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Show me.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: There is no argument about the object of this Bill and the aims and objects of the Government, which are to abolish the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Not by this Bill.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Do you deny it?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I say not by this Bill.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That is splitting hairs.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Wherever people have tried to abolish an Upper House, they have been singularly unsuccessful, and I have not the slightest shadow of doubt that, if this Government went to the people tomorrow and asked them to vote on whether or not this Council should be abolished, the honourable member would find an overwhelming vote for its retention.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: There is no doubt about it.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I do not believe it.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I know the Minister does not want to go to the people tomorrow; I do not disagree with him on that.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I could not agree with you that the people would agree that this Council should not be abolished.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The Minister may disagree, but that is according to his ordinary form; he is in the minority. I am glad, however, to see that he is looking so much better today after the road transport Bill was defeated yesterday. I have just been handed a copy of a document that is becoming important although gradually sliding away into history; but for the time being it is an important document. It is a copy of the A.L.P's policy speech.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I have one, too.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: It states:

I propose to give a very 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.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We have not disputed that. I said that this Bill did not deal with that part of the policy speech.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I thought the honourable member would want to give wide publicity to the policy.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We are, but you are not dealing with the Bill. I have been told frequently that I have not been speaking to the particular Bill before the Council.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: And I will be told that, too, if I get away from the Bill. The policy speech goes on:

In the event of forming a Government, early legislation will be introduced to provide for an increase in the number of members of the House of Assembly and an altered franchise for the Legislative Council, which will mean that every one entitled to vote for the Lower House receives one also for the Upper House, pending its abolition.

If the Government is so confident, let it go to the people by way of referendum.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We got a referendum through the other day.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The people got it through.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Rowe.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The three points I make are, first, that the present unbalance of the boundaries is not our responsibility, but that of the present Government; secondly, that the same applies to the present restricted franchise; and, thirdly, that whenever an effort has been made to abolish the Upper House it has been singularly unsuccessful, and that would be the story as far as South Australia is concerned.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Except Queensland.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: We are not dealing with Queensland, which is a long way away. I am speaking only for myself on this matter and am prepared to support wholeheartedly any reasonable proposal that will maintain an effective bicameral system that will work in the best interests of the State. I realize that there must be some alteration. The next question is whether it is possible to amend or alter the present Bill so as to make it a reasonable and democratic measure, ensuring that it will work properly by maintaining a bicameral system and give the people the Parliamentary representation they desire.

I have carefully examined the Bill with those aspects in view and have concluded that it is of such a biased nature, so loaded against the retention of two Houses of Parliament and the bicameral system and so much against the public interest that it cannot be amended so as to give even a reasonable semblance of democratic Government to the people of this State. Consequently, I have no alternative but to oppose the Bill as it stands at present. However, in doing so, I make it clear that, for my own part, I am not opposed to alterations; I am all in favour of them, provided that they are in the interests of the State and that they maintain an effective bicameral system.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That should salve your conscience!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I come now to the provisions in the Bill, which are rather peculiar.

I shall deal with them seriatim, and the first provision to which I refer is very important as far as I am concerned, because it can adversely affect me or any other member of this Chamber.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is your motive for being against it.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I refer to clause 4, which inserts new section 11 (*a*) in the principal Act, as follows:

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

If this Bill becomes law, we shall not represent the districts for which we were elected; we shall represent the districts that the electoral commission determines. The provision goes on:

In making such determination the Commission shall take into account the Council district previously represented by and, if necessary, the place of residence of, each such member.

I do not know what that means. Does it mean that, in considering what district I am to represent, the commission takes into account the fact that I live in Prospect? In the ordinary course of events, five years of my term remain, but during that five years I am not going to represent Midland district; I am going to represent the district that I am appointed to represent. The commission may even say that I am to represent Central District No. 1. If that is my lucky fate, I shall be happy to work with colleagues in that district. I may be able to help them, in the same way as I help my colleagues in Midland and as they help me.

This provision applies to every honourable member and seems to me to be completely unfair and unreasonable. I can think of other honourable members of this Council who do not live within the boundaries of their own districts and it is conceivable that, under this Bill, the commission will appoint them to represent other districts. If that is so, they will have to represent the other districts for five years and, at the end of that period, endeavour to gain re-election.

I have always thought that it is the right of a member to select the district he desires to serve, and I want to retain that right. I do not want to be told by some commission which district I am to represent. It is my desire to represent the district that I consider myself suited to represent and I am not prepared to pass to a commission the power to make that decision. To take the matter further, any commission appointed under this Bill will report to the Labor Party Government. If the Labor Party thinks the report suits it, the report can be sent to the Governor. It will not come before Parliament, so I shall not have a say in what district I represent.

That is the kind of thing we get from a Socialist Government. On the face of it, that new section is not acceptable to me. The idea that a member should serve in a district not of his own choosing for a period of up to six years is beyond the bounds of reason. Clause 6 amends section 20 of the present Constitution Act and the effect of that provision is to provide full adult franchise for the Legislative Council. This argument for full adult franchise looks well on paper, but I think we have to look at the facts. I believe in a bicameral system and it is a democratic corollary to that belief that there must be a different basis of election for each House of Parliament. There must be a different franchise.

If that were not so, one House would cease to be a House of Review and would lose much of the value of its existence. Consequently, there must be a different franchise for the Legislative Council. I believe that that needs to be a fairly broad franchise, and during my political career I have used everything in my power to extend it so that everybody who has a real stake in the community has a vote on this particular matter.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Do you believe the same circumstances should apply in the Commonwealth?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: As far as the Commonwealth is concerned (and this is my own opinion) I believe that the Senate has lost much of its value because in many respects it has become purely an echo of what has been done in the other place and it has ceased to have its value as a House of Review and, of course, there is a very restricted franchise in one sense of the word. I point out that there is an equal number of Senators for each State of the Commonwealth, so that a Senator from New South Wales represents four or five times the number of electors that a Senator from South Australia does, and the vote of an elector in New South Wales has

therefore only one-fifth of the value of a South Australian elector, and that is a far greater restriction on franchise than was ever written into the Constitution of the Legislative Council in South Australia. If you are talking about the restricted franchise and you are looking at it in its proper perspective, the Senate has—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: But every elector has the right to say who his representative in the Senate is going to be.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: We do not get that under this Bill. I now come to clause 10 of the Bill, which proposes to divide the State into 56 electoral districts. How anybody can make this statement without almost choking is a little beyond my comprehension—there are to be 26 country and 26 city seats. The difficulty with the city area is that it is to remain what is commonly referred to as the old definition of the metropolitan area that stops at the Gepps Cross abattoirs in the north and at Darlington in the south. Anybody in Grade I at primary school knows that the metropolitan area has extended very much beyond those limits. When this boundary was written into the Act in 1954 it may have been a reasonable one, but for anybody to get up and argue that the area of Salisbury, Elizabeth and Tea Tree Gully and areas of development to the south of the city are country areas that are engaged in primary production is ludicrous. I hardly think the Minister of Local Government would try to debate that one.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: These are the areas that you are afraid of in the future.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am not afraid of anything in the future.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Not much!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: In addition to that, we have the cities of Salisbury, Elizabeth, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, and Whyalla that have long since ceased to be country areas in the ordinary sense of the word. I shall be interested to see directly whether the Government is consistent with regard to its views on the metropolitan area. I am waiting to see the Town Planning Act when and if it gets into this Chamber and the idea of what the Government thinks is the metropolitan area when dealing with town planning.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It is a pretty different idea.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: If there is a difference, we want to know what the difference is. If the metropolitan area is to be defined, we want something in the nature of a definition for all purposes. I do not think it is too strong to say that in restricting the Bill to the limits of the existing metropolitan area the Government is not doing justice, as it is trying to establish something which, to every sensible person in the community, does not make sense. I do not accept the proposition that this Bill, in effect, provides for 26 country and 26 city electorates. It is very heavily loaded in favour of the city areas, and nothing will convince me otherwise.

I want now to deal with the deadlock provisions in clause 12 of the Bill, and this brings me back to the references made by way of interjection by the Hon. Mr. Banfield who, I see, has decided to serve the interests of the country better by leaving the Chamber. He said that this Bill does not seek to abolish the Legislative Council. Clause 12 is headed "Deadlock provisions". It reads as follows:

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

That is tantamount to abolishing the Legislative Council. All the Government has to do is send up a Bill in one session of Parliament; if it is defeated here, it sends up a similar Bill in the next session of Parliament, and, if that does not please us, then it becomes law.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: After being assented to! Is that any different from the British Parliament?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am not talking about the British Parliament.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I know you aren't.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: What I am talking about is the position in South Australia. That means that in two sessions of Parliament, without an election falling between the sessions, and without any further expression from the public, the Government can bypass this Chamber; it does not exist for anything except these two matters—the money Bill and the Bill to extend the maximum continuance of the House of Assembly. That clause, in effect, abolishes the power of this Chamber.

If a Bill was sent up to this Chamber and defeated, and then there was a general election and the people had a chance to express their views on the matter and if it then came back to us, there would perhaps be some argument for setting down provisions to resolve these deadlocks. We can get that position in South Australia at the present time. This Parliament has brought up this Bill to do away with the existing provisions as far as the franchise is concerned. The Government may have had a mandate to do that in March of last year, but if this Bill became law this time next year it could bring up another Bill and it would become law, but by that time the people might have ceased to have any confidence whatever in the Government, which might have completely lost the mandate that it had. I do not think it is fair and reasonable that any Government should have power to alter the Constitution unless it has real evidence that the people of the State are behind it. The redrafting of the deadlock provisions goes a long way towards the abolition of the Council because if, without going to the people, the House of Assembly can get legislation through without the consent of this Parliament, what is the value of this Chamber?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is debatable now!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: This Bill goes a long way towards the ultimate abolition of this Chamber, and I am opposed to that because I believe in the bicameral system of Parliament. The other part of the Bill with which I wish to deal, and which is the most obnoxious and unreasonable provision of all, is clause 14, which inserts several new sections after section 75 of the Constitution. New section 84 will be:

At such time as the Governor shall deem fit the Governor shall publish the report and recommendations of the Commission in the *Gazette* and upon such publication, notwithstanding anything in this Act to the contrary, the names and boundaries of the several electoral districts for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council set forth in such report shall, as on and from the day of the first general election of members of the House of Assembly to be held next after such publication, without reference to Parliament, by force of this Act, be substituted for the names and boundaries set forth in the second and third schedules to this Act and shall be as effective as if enacted by Parliament.

The significant words are "without reference to Parliament". This provision is completely obnoxious to me. An electoral commission will be appointed (and I agree entirely with the proposed members, although of course they will be limited) and it will make its decision and submit it to the Government. If the decision is pleasing to the Government it will be passed on to the Governor and become law, and neither I nor any other member will be able to do anything further to determine which area we shall represent or what the boundaries shall be. If the recommendation is not acceptable to the Government it will not be published, so the future electoral provisions of this State for both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council will not be the concern of Parliament but will be decided by the Government of the day. I think that is a bad thing, irrespective of whether it is the present Government or another Government in office. I think Parliament should decide this matter. I think, although I may be wrong, that if the commission made a report that was not satisfactory to the Government the report would be sent back and the commission would be asked to reconsider the matter and submit another proposal. If that proposal was satisfactory, it would be sent to the Governor, be proclaimed and become the law of the State.

The Constitution of this State is an important document that governs the whole of our operations in relation to the control and conduct of Parliament. Any Bill to amend it needs our careful consideration, because in dealing with such a measure we are dealing not only with affairs that affect us today but with the political future of the people of this State. A Bill that suggests that the method of the election of Parliament and the location of House of Assembly and Legislative Council districts shall be at the will of the Government in office is not acceptable. I believe in Parliamentary and Ministerial responsibility, and how any Government that talks about its Ministers being responsible to Parliament can bring in a Bill of this nature, which takes away Parliament's most important power, is beyond my comprehension.

I conclude by saying that I know that improvements and alterations are necessary in this matter and that I am prepared to support any reasonable proposal that will adequately protect our bicameral system and work in the interests of the Government and of the people of the State. I studied the Bill to see if it could be amended to achieve this result (and this would be the desirable way to achieve it), but after considering it in detail, and for the reasons I have given, I have concluded that the Bill is so completely unfair, biased,

and against democratic principles and the interests of the people of the State that I cannot support it.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I have been doing quite a lot of reading and have looked back over similar Bills introduced by the Labor Party every time it has come to office in South Australia. This matter, as we know, is a hardy perennial that has come forward every time the Labor Party has come to power, and it has suffered the fate of being knocked out on every occasion. Surprisingly, the Labor Party has also suffered the same fate after three years of office in almost every case. Mostly, the previous Bills were reasonable measures brought forward with a clear political objective and with no double talk associated with them, and the debates were straightforward and honest. Those Bills were brought forward in a form capable of passing muster. They were a fair and clean approach to the subject, but I think it is important for every member of this Council to look at this Bill closely and consider whether it could possibly have been brought forward seriously by the Labor Party with the expectation that it would pass, for it must pass both the House of Assembly and this Chamber to become law. I think it is obvious that even the most hopeful member of the Labor Party could not have expected this Bill to be acceptable to this Chamber.

I think it is important for us to ask why this Bill was brought forward in this form. If members opposite wanted to obtain somewhere near their objective they would not have put up this unacceptable measure. It seems to have been drafted with the idea that it must be made unacceptable. I do not think it is necessary for me to go through the details of the Bill. This has been done already by the Hon. Mr. Rowe and the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin. The Bill contains many parts that no member who conscientiously represents his district could possibly let pass. It seems to have been designed to be completely and utterly indigestible, and in this form it is different from all of its predecessors.

There has been much talk of a mandate in connection with this Bill. Far more important than any mandate that the Labor Party has is the mandate laid down by law upon members of this Chamber. That mandate, as I understand it, is to restrain hasty and radical legislation until the permanent will of the people has been determined and is known. This mandate is important. It is also laid strictly upon us that we must look after the interests of minorities. With these two points clearly in mind, there is nothing that a conscientious representative of a country electorate can do but turn down this Bill. It is clearly the duty of a country member to do so. I would refer to the comment of one of our legal authorities. He said:

> It is clearly the duty of every member here to resist a change in the electoral system of the State until that change is reasonable, until that change is concomitant with the interests of minorities.

That is the duty laid on us by law. This Bill does nothing practical in establishing the claim made for it as a mandate given to the Labor Party, except the promise to get rid of the Legislative Council. It certainly does not provide for one vote one value that has had so much publicity. It certainly sets up a gerrymander, even more vicious than the gerrymander established in Queensland that enabled that State to get rid of its second House. I don't think there is any question about that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about the one that is in operation in South Australia now, and has been in operation for a number of years?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: It is not a gerrymander, but the result of the tremendous growth of industry in this State. I think if anybody was conscientious the last word he would use in this Chamber would be "gerrymander".

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It would be the first one I would use.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I think this Bill is designed to throw this Chamber into disrepute. It is aimed so that the Labor Party will be able to go back to the people and say "The Legislative Council will not let us get on with the job."

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is a fact, too.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: We have a duty laid on us by law, and it is a duty which the Labor Party is trying to stop us from fulfilling; the duty of looking after minorities, the duty of restraining ill-considered legislation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is certainly looking after a minority.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I do not think there is any point in discussing these points further. The fact is that the Bill is dishonest; it has been dishonestly presented and there is no possible course for any conscientious member of this Chamber to take than to throw it out.

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

THE FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 8. Page 3829.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support this Bill which establishes and incorporates the new Flinders university. In his second reading explanation the Minister spoke of this important milestone in the history of higher education in South Australia. In fact, it should be a matter of pride to all South Australians that in this year 1966, that is, within the second triennium since the Australian Universities Commission began its investigations, South Australia has been able to fulfil so much of its obligation to tertiary education. Credit must go to many people, groups and individuals. First of all credit must go to the Australian Universities Commission itself, which recommended that this new university should be established; secondly, credit should go to the Commonwealth Government for its enormous support and aid; and finally to the past South Australian Government for its vision and enthusiasm in quickly setting up plans for the university.

In the second report of the Australian Universities Commission this statement appears, and it was made at the end of 1963:

The Commission is impressed with the careful planning which has gone into the establishment of Bedford Park. Now that this new university has been established, the University of Adelaide will have a chance of stabilizing its enrolments.

Long before the first triennium of the Australian Universities Commission—that is, 1960-62—it was obvious that a new university would have to come into being in South Australia. Population growth was such that it was evident that more and more people with higher tertiary education would be required for the professions and for industry.

The predicted and actual enrolments of that first triennium are as follows: In 1960, 6,120 were predicted while the actual enrolment was 5,723; in 1961 it was 6,850 against an actual enrolment of 6,250; in 1962 it was 7,325 as against 7,361, and this was the first time that the estimated figure was overtaken by the actual figure. The predicted figure for 1966, published in that second report, was 9,830, an increase of 2,500 at the end of the first triennium. This demand for more and more tertiary education is, of course, common to the whole of Australia. In fact, third metropolitan universities are being established in Sydney and Melbourne. I hope that it will be of interest to members if I mention briefly the distribution of the universities in Australia at the moment. In New South Wales there are four universities, counting the new Macquarie university. The first is the University of Sydney, established in 1850, and it is the oldest in Australia. The second is the University of New South Wales, established in 1949, which has its subsidiary at Newcastle University College, which came into being recently. The third is the University of New England, established as an autonomous university in 1954, but was actually functioning as a university college under the jurisdiction of the Sydney University from 1938 until 1954. The fourth is the new Macquarie university at Ryde.

In Victoria there are two well-established universities, the University of Monash, established in 1953, and now the one at Latrobe. In Queensland there is the one established in 1909, and now the new Townsville University College. Both in Western Australia and Tasmania there is one university, and one in Canberra established in 1946. At one stage in the planning of Flinders university it was considered that the new university might best be part of the University of Adelaide, but the Bill before us establishes a new and separate university. I personally believe that this is the best arrangement. For any university to flourish it is necessary for it to be autonomous. When a university comes into being attached as a sort of offshoot to the mother university, a sense of inferiority inevitably develops. A feeling begins within the university, and even in the community outside, that it is a second-grade university. The students themselves feel that they have not managed to get into a first-grade university; and there have even been a number of refusals when places in the second university have been offered to students who sought enrolment at the senior university. So I am completely in favour of autonomy.

In other States—for example, in New South Wales when Armidale was chosen as a site for a second university in the mid-thirties—a university college was set up. This was largely because in those days the numbers were very small indeed. They started off with 20 students; they were 400 miles from Sydney, and it was felt that some help was required. The Second World War intervened; the numbers did not increase and it was not until after the war that it was necessary for it to be autonomous. In Victoria, Monash, being a

metropolitan university, developed independently and rapidly, and it may well be that Flinders university will prove a parallel case.

Yesterday, the Hon. Mr. Rowe mentioned "convocation" in his speech. I thought that for the benefit of honourable members I would explain what "convocation" is, because it is a very confusing matter. The universities all seem to use different terminologies for the same thing. In the universities of Sydney, Queensland and Western Australia the governing body is called the senate. In all the other universities the governing body is called the council, but there is a second body in every Australian university, with the exception of the University of New South Wales, with a certain amount of responsibility in university government. This body consists mostly of graduates, and it has different names at different universities—just to add to the general confusion. At the universities of Sydney, Melbourne, New England and Western Australia, as well as the Australian National University, the body of graduates is called "convocation". At the Queensland university it is called the council, and at the universities of Adelaide and Tasmania it is called the senate, so there could not be much more confusion. "Convocation" here mentioned corresponds to the senate at the University of Adelaide. I now quote from the Commonwealth Universities Year Book, 1958:

The major function of the graduate body is to elect members to the governing body; but only at the University of Adelaide does the graduate body have a preponderance of representation. In other universities it provides from one-fifth to two-fifths of the membership. Although in none of the universities has the graduate body power to initiate legislation, it occasionally has authority to approve, refer back or delay statutes and similar legislation referred to it by the governing body, and it can sometimes make suggestions regarding university welfare. In exercising its functions it sometimes works through a standing committee.

The governing body, whether council or senate, generally meets at least once a month. It appoints standing committees or committees to deal with finance, investments, buildings, site development, staff and establishments, and so forth.

My point relates to the function of the senate or, in this case, the convocation. Surely the convocation of the new university must be given the same power as the senate of the University of Adelaide? But, according to the Bill before us, this is not so: the senate of the University of Adelaide elects 20 members of the council, the governing body. The convocation of Flinders university will elect eight members—that is 20 down to eight—of whom four must be so-called academics, a term gradually being used to designate persons employed on the teaching staff of universities, the implication being, of course, that everyone else, no matter how superior their degrees or how high their standing in their professions is non-academic. The Hon. Mr. Rowe yesterday very rightly struck a warning note as to the danger of having too many paid servants of the universities also being on the governing bodies of the universities. I strongly agree with him.

An even more serious difference between the senate of the University of Adelaide and the convocation of Flinders university lies in the fact that, under section 18 (2) of the University of Adelaide Act, all statutes and regulations must be assented to pursuant to the Act by the senate of the University of Adelaide before they come into operation. This is the real crux of the whole matter; this is the pattern everywhere, but no such power is being given to the convocation of Flinders university, so the council of this new university is being given complete and utter power. This is an extraordinary departure from university tradition and, I believe, a very wrong step. I, therefore, have placed an amendment on the files that will bring the Flinders university into line with the University of Adelaide, which has worked, as honourable members know, magnificently in this way for very many years.

I have also placed another amendment on honourable members' files. This refers to the functions of this new university. Honourable members will see also that under clause 19 (3) they are being asked to give the council power to deal with matters concerning practically everything under the sun—trespassing on the university grounds, bad driving, where cars can be parked, disorderly conduct, indecent language, consumption of liquor—but nowhere in this Bill is any mention made of the real purpose of this university—its functions. No function indeed is specified.

When the new Macquarie university, the third metropolitan university in Sydney, came into being, very early in the Act there appeared just such a section—the functions of the university. I believe that a similar clause should be inserted in this Bill. As the Minister said, the establishment of Flinders university is a milestone in our history. If we do not want it to become a millstone in later years, we must all think of the great value that this

modern university can be to the whole community. A modern university must play a vital part in the life of the community. It cannot regard itself as something apart from ordinary life. It cannot enjoy an "ivory tower" sort of existence in these modern times. We no longer live in mediaeval times when only the privileged classes could attend universities.

Universities today exist because the State supplies the bulk of the money, and universities therefore should ultimately be responsible to the community. Every person who has attained the educational standard required for matriculation should have the right to participate in their teachings. This, of course, is extremely difficult in the case of young people who are employed in country areas (and I speak particularly of country school teachers in the secondary field) who, though matriculants, may not have been able to complete their degrees before being transferred or, if they are graduates, may wish to attain a higher degree. Why should not country high schools have the benefit of these people, who are distinguished students? They have to wait until they are transferred to the city before they can continue with their degrees. It would be better to make use of external studies, which are being used in many universities.

The same applies absolutely to bank officers and, indeed, in many other professions. A young bank officer in a country town could well go on with his tertiary education if external studies became possible. We could also cater not only for these young matriculants who have their degrees but also teachers who have one degree and wish to obtain a higher degree. It is ridiculous that they cannot have this chance.

The solution, as I have said, is provision for external studies. Outstanding work has been done in this field by several universities. I understand that the University of Adelaide has done it to an extent, but outstanding work has been done by the University of New England. The subjects must at present be limited to ones where practical work is not required; for instance, in the Arts subjects or the humanities. The new Macquarie university is endeavouring to include Science subjects as well as the humanities in external studies, and I consider that this endeavour will be successful. The Macquarie university is also establishing suburban centres for evening students.

I know that it is not easy to organize part-time and external studies, but I cannot accept that it is beyond the inventive brains of the members of the new council. Therefore, I shall be moving to insert a new clause, clause 3A, regarding the functions of the Flinders university. Notwithstanding the vague provisions of clause 19 (14), which provides that the council shall have full power, etc., in general to deal with "all other matters whatsoever" regarding the university, I think the specific mention of functions would be wise.

It is to be hoped that, as first planned, residential colleges will be built very soon at Flinders university for both men and women students. Life within a university cannot be unified or, indeed, responsible without college living. The history of universities over the centuries has shown the ideal way of university life to be universities with residential colleges within their precincts. Until recent years, only a comparatively small number of students was able to enjoy this privilege, in Australia at any rate. These colleges were affiliated to the universities but were not the responsibility of the universities.

Now the tendency has become to establish university colleges that are the responsibility of the universities and under their ultimate control. In order to differentiate, the Martin Report refers to colleges under the control of the universities as halls of residence, which is a rather cumbersome term. In Australia's oldest university, there are no so-called halls of residence. Every residential college was established during the last century under the auspices of the great Christian churches and in this century Wesley has been established under the control of the Methodist Church and Sancta Sophia has been established for Roman Catholic women students.

I have been referring to the Sydney university. The same has been the pattern in South Australia and Queensland, where the residential colleges have not been under the control of the universities. However, the position is different in the newer universities. In the University of New South Wales, Monash University, the University of New England and the Australian National University the residential institutions are under the control of the universities, as are the three most recent colleges set up in Melbourne since 1954. Not only has the administration of residential colleges been changed, but architectural design has of necessity been changed to meet the increased demand. This is true of both the residential colleges and the halls of residence.

Last century saw the building of massive stone buildings that were costly to build and operate. They were almost mediaeval in their

atmosphere. Today, utilitarian but completely adequate design is common. The pattern universally accepted seems to be a number of units, containing a bedroom and study accommodation grouped around central dining and kitchen facilities. This is both practicable and economic.

I, in company with other visiting women graduates, was recently accommodated in one of these new university colleges under the control of the Presbyterian Church at the University of Queensland in Brisbane. It was a fairly Spartan existence, perhaps because it was normally a men's college. There were no mirrors or reading lamps and there was nowhere to hang a dressing gown in the bathrooms, which leads me to suppose that perhaps these were not used normally. However, the accommodation was comfortable, with space provided for recreation and all facilities for privacy and quietness for study.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I take it this had been vacated by the other students?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: No, they were in one unit and we were in another. They were very young! In this field, too, the Commonwealth Government has been generous. In the period 1958-60 the Commonwealth grant to South Australia was £80,000 and in the period 1961-63 it was £114,000 for residential colleges. During the 1961-63 period, the South Australian Government also helped greatly. It provided half of the amount recommended by the Australian Universities Commission as Commonwealth grant for each of the affiliated colleges of St. Marks, St. Anns and Aquinas. This is a magnificent record, and I earnestly hope that the present South Australian Government will take the same interest in this most important facet of university life.

I also draw to the attention of honourable members the fact that there is a great difference between university colleges established by the great religious orders of the Christian world and those established in Australia by university building projects. In the first group, there is recognition of the desirability of providing some Christian background for the young people of a Christian nation. In the second group, provision is rather for eating and sleeping quarters. There are today many forces at work attempting to destroy the Christian background of our nation that has built us to a high level of ethical and social development. This applies more so to Australia than to any other country around us.

This being so, it is essential that among our young people at all times there will be sufficient Christian teaching to fulfil their spiritual needs and defeat the aims of atheists. Students' spiritual needs must be recognized by Australian universities just as much as by other universities. I have seen at the new university of Malaysia at Kuala Lumpur a large exquisitely decorated and designed mosque, which is solely for the use of the students. I hope that in the establishment of this new Flinders university the Government will not overlook the value of residential colleges provided by the churches.

I have been astounded by certain things that have been said recently to the effect that residences for men and women should not be established on the same campus. This is fantastic. Since women were once more admitted to universities in the nineteenth century, women's colleges have become an integral part of university life. I say "once more admitted" in order to remind honourable members that in mediaeval times women were admitted to universities and, indeed, held high academic posts at ancient European universities. Even in newly-developed countries the need for residential colleges for men and women has been accepted. An instance of that is in Malaysia, as I have mentioned. Two years ago I visited the new most beautifully designed university of Malaysia at Petaling Jaya, a few miles from Kuala Lumpur, and was invited to the women's university college. I was amazed, however, to find that, as the men's college being constructed on the next hill had not reached the stage of having a dining hall, the men were dining in the hall with the women, and for this to happen in a Moslem country surely is a great advance and proves the value of modern education. Surely South Australia in general is a little more enlightened than some reports would indicate.

The growth in the community of interest in the activities of university women has been most marked in recent years, and I will briefly tell members something that I think will be of some interest to them. Last August there took place in the University of Queensland an event unique in the history of Australia—the 15th triennial conference of the International Federation of University Women. The federation met at the Brisbane university, and it was the first time that this conference was held in the southern hemisphere. The federation has been in existence since 1920, and the farthest south it had gone previously is Mexico. Altogether 700 delegates were present, including 360

from 30 oversea countries. Many distinguished women graduates, most of whom held high executive and academic posts in their countries, were present. The University of Queensland conferred two honorary degrees—Doctor of Law on Mlle. Jeanne Chaton, a French historian, and Doctor of Science on Professor Douglas, a Canadian astronomer.

As the conference met to discuss world population problems, the leading demographers of the world were present. The cost of such an undertaking would be far beyond the resources of the Australian Federation of University Women, and the Queensland Government is to be congratulated on its gift of £5,000 towards expenses. Although there will not be another international conference in Australia for many years, the Australian conference will be held in Adelaide in January, 1968. The Australian Federation of University Women is now situated in Adelaide for the first time since the last war and is under the distinguished presidency of Miss Jean Gilmore. It will remain here until after the Australian conference. It is to be hoped that the South Australian Government will recognize the importance of this conference and the honour and prestige it will bring to this State.

I wish the new Flinders University of South Australia great success. It has after all, the first requirement—a most beautiful site. A university on a hill has always been regarded as most desirable. I can remember the visit of John Masefield as Poet Laureate to the Sydney University while I was a student there. He spoke of the glorious sight of that university—an old stone mass of architectural beauty outlined in the sunset on a hill overlooking a great city. The Queensland university has been fortunate in moving to a magnificent and spacious site (the gift of a private benefactor, I believe) on a series of hills at St. Lucia. No student there should become sedentary; it is more likely that every student will resemble a mountain goat! Likewise, the University of Malaysia is built picturesquely on the hills outside Kuala Lumpur. I believe that the Flinders university has every chance of becoming one of the most attractive universities in Australia. I support the Bill.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 8. Page 3823.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill, which is to correct a drafting error in a Bill that was dealt with earlier this session, is one that I can support. As the Minister pointed out, an error was made in the figures relating to the remuneration of the Premier and Treasurer in addition to his Parliamentary salary. We can attribute the mistake to the fact that the previous legislation was put through late at night or in the early hours of the morning during the last week of sitting before Christmas, and this shows what can happen when additional pressure is applied and we have no opportunity to give measures the attention that is normally given by this Chamber. As the previous measure repeated a schedule I, and probably other members, would have passed over it, but perhaps it would have been picked up if members had had more time to deal with the matter. Knowing the integrity of the Premier and Treasurer, one would expect him to refuse to take advantage of the error and to ask that it be corrected. In the circumstances, I am happy to support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.45 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, February 10, at 2.15 p.m.