

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, July 30, 1968

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:

FLUORIDATION

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Since the Government came into office it has given detailed consideration to the question of the fluoridation of South Australian water supplies. In my capacity as Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, with the Minister of Works I have brought full information to Cabinet, and Cabinet has decided to approve the addition of fluoride to public water supplies and will proceed forthwith with the necessary planning so as to ensure protection of the dental health of South Australian children. The necessary preparations for the addition of fluoride will take some time and it will probably be all of 12 months before the plan becomes effective. Honourable members will realize that they will, therefore, have the opportunity to ask questions of the Government about this matter or debate it in this Chamber if they so desire.

QUESTIONS

BARLEY

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on July 23 about the possibility of a first advance from the Barley Board?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have the following reply:

Owing to the small volume of exports possible this year and the fact that most income will be derived over an extended period in respect of home consumption sales, the 1967-68 pool is still in overdraft. It is unlikely that funds will be available for a further payment until late November or early December. At this stage it is not possible to forecast the order of the likely first advance on the 1968-69 barley crop. As in past years an announcement in respect of the first advance should be possible during November.

REFLECTORS ON TRUCKS

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: My question relates to a matter that has been raised on

several occasions. I refer to the fitting of reflectors or the application of reflectorized tape to railway freight trucks. This question has been asked on a number of occasions and I find it is constantly being raised by public organizations. In the past, various reasons have been given for not fitting reflectors to freight trucks, among them being the cost, the difficulties that could be associated with shunting operations and the possibility of liability to the Railways Commissioner if these reflectors were not operating. Another reason given is the trouble of soiling. It has been announced in this Chamber that the fitting of warning devices at railway crossings will be proceeded with, but there are many crossings within the State where this will not be a practical proposition. In view of the advances in directional reflectors that would obviate the confusion enginedrivers might experience during shunting operations and in view of other advances, will the Minister consider, as a matter of policy and as an experimental measure, fitting directional or shielded reflectors of suitable type to the sides of new freight vehicles?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As the honourable member has said, this whole question of reflectorized strips, or some other form of reflector, along the sides of railway vehicles has been considered not only in this State but elsewhere for a long time. At the recent meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council the whole question was debated at length. Evidence was produced that overseas practice indicates that fitting reflectors of this kind does not, in fact, reduce the accident rate. At the conference, however, the States agreed to keep the whole subject under review; they were informed that Commissioners of Railways throughout Australia and in New Zealand were opposed to the idea. The whole issue will be debated again at the council's next meeting early next year.

The honourable member's proposal, however, for some kind of reflector to be attached to new vehicles as an experimental measure has a good deal of merit, and I am prepared to take it up with the Commissioner. I shall inform the honourable member in due course whether we can arrange an experiment of this kind. It would enable us to make practical observations in South Australia, so that, when I again meet the other Transport Ministers and this matter comes up for further discussion, I shall be armed with the results of the experiment.

SCHOOL BUS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: My question relates to the school bus service in the Blackford Flat area of the South-East. Will the Minister of Transport ascertain whether there is any proposal to alter the present school bus route, because it leaves many houses untouched and, consequently, many children in the area have to walk considerable distances, or they are transported by private cars considerable distances, in order to reach the school bus route?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Education and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

PARLIAMENTARY DINING ROOM

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of you, Mr. President, in your capacity as Chairman of the Joint House Committee.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In last Friday's *Advertiser* there was an article headed "Hall's Hint on 'V.I.P. Treatment'". Mr. Hall says in the article that it will probably be necessary to give the V.I.P. treatment to overseas visitors when they come to South Australia. I have no objection to this, incidentally. Following this article, the sub-leader in yesterday's *Advertiser*, under the heading "The Red Carpet Treatment", states:

Cabinet, unlike a good many private directorates, has no dining-room of its own. If it wants to entertain anyone it must take them to Parliament House, either formally or informally—and a formal luncheon or dinner can be a rather heavy affair, with menus that are said to have remained unchanged for years:

I take this as a criticism of the facilities provided at Parliament House. Have you, Mr. President, seen this article and, if you have, will you comment on it?

The PRESIDENT: My attention was drawn to the article, as Chairman of the Joint House Committee, of which the honourable member is a member. I was informed of it by officers of the catering department who were incensed by the reflection cast upon the quality of their services, and who had no effective means of reply. In anticipating that this matter might have been raised with other members, I have had prepared one or two notes showing what the true position is.

Any limitation upon the capacity of a very competent caterer and staff is set by the Joint House Committee, which is appointed by Parliament and which is representative of all

Parties in Parliament. The limitation consists of a wholesome meal acceptable to members at a charge which is reasonable to them. I can speak with long experience as a member of a Government which entertained successfully many leading industrial V.I.P.'s who were eulogistic over the privilege of having dined in Parliament House, where a special dining-room has been made available for the purpose and where a prescribed menu is available as requested.

The capacity of our catering staff has been demonstrated on a number of occasions during Royal visits and Parliamentary delegations, when the arrangements and menus provided have been acclaimed by all, and the rarefied atmosphere commended. As members are aware, the type of menu is determined by the host, who is responsible for payment of its cost. It is regretted that such worthy efforts should receive such unwarranted criticism, unfair to the reputation of both the staff and the State.

CLEVE PROPERTY

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Several years ago a property close to Cleve was bequeathed to the Department of Agriculture by the late Mr. Sims who farmed that property successfully during his life. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell me what plans his department has to utilize that property?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will bring down a considered report for the honourable member.

BALAKLAVA COUNCIL

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Following upon a report given to this Council by him last week in relation to the affairs of the Balaklava council, I asked the Minister of Local Government to consider tabling the investigator's report in this Council. Has he given further consideration to tabling that report and, if he has, what is the position?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have considered the request of the honourable member that the report of an investigation at Balaklava be tabled. Although it is my desire to keep the Council fully informed of all matters affecting the State generally I do not think there is any need to place this report before members. When a report is tabled, members of the public, as well as honourable members, will have the right to peruse it. Certain matters reported therein have yet to be resolved and it would not be fair for information to be made public which could influence or prejudice consideration of anything not yet determined.

In any case, I can assure the honourable member that I have the whole matter well in hand and am dealing with it in a proper manner. As a former Minister of Local Government, the honourable member is no doubt well aware of his own reasons for not giving publicity to, or tabling reports of, any previous investigations. I endorse his previous actions, which are in accord with my own.

If the honourable member wishes to peruse the docket on this matter I shall be quite happy to show it to him so that he can be fully informed of its contents. I realize this whole problem arose during his term as Minister and that, consequently, he is very interested in the matter.

CAPE JAFFA ROADWORK

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Has the Minister of Roads an answer to my question of last week regarding Cape Jaffa roadwork?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Funds are available for the construction of the Cape Jaffa road to commence in the current financial year. The actual start of work is subject to arrangements for survey, design and any necessary land acquisition.

K SHIPPING LINE

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Minister of Agriculture give this Council any indication of the future of our communications with South America? Several small but important country export industries will be placed in some difficulty through the decision of the K shipping line to by-pass Adelaide, as these industries are now exporting small seeds, grain products and machinery to South America. Is this by-pass likely to be permanent?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member has referred to the K shipping line, which has for some time developed a very good trade with the Caribbean and South America, and we were perturbed when it was announced that the ship would not be calling in future. The Commonwealth Government has subsidized the K line to come to South Australia, but unfortunately South Australia has been on the end of the run. This State has guaranteed that it will give the shipping line its quota of freight to enable it to continue operating profitably on this run. A number of manufacturers in South Australia, not only those subsidiary to primary industries but a number of quite large manufacturers, have spent a good deal of money visiting South America and the Caribbean area and have established quite good contacts and

arranged quite useful exports, South Australia being an exporting State up to about 80 per cent of its economy. It is most important that we have every outlet for our export. Manufacturers were most upset when it was announced that this ship would not call again. However, through the good offices of Mr. Giles, M.H.R., and Senator Laucke, who did a tremendous amount to convince the Commonwealth Minister of the need to have a reappraisal of this position, the shipping line will call at least once again, in September. This affects quite a number of small country industries connected with oats, other grain and fodders, and small seeds, as well as secondary industry.

My department and the department under the control of the Minister of Marine are constantly in touch with the Commonwealth Minister and are doing everything possible to assist the Commonwealth members in trying to convince the Commonwealth Government to continue the subsidy and to ask the shipping line to continue operating in South Australia, because if this one drops out we could easily see the curtailment of other shipping services. We are most dependent upon shipping to take our goods from South Australia not only to other parts of Australia but to other parts of the world.

COUNTRY RESERVOIRS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Can the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, tell this Council the position regarding storages of country reservoirs in my district? I know honourable members will be gratified that the city reservoirs are full or nearly so. I would appreciate it if the Minister could inform me of the situation regarding the Barossa, Warren and South Para reservoirs, particularly the South Para. Do the Minister's officers consider it likely that the large South Para storage will be filled this year?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will seek a report for the honourable member.

KINGSTON-NARACOORTE PASSENGER SERVICE

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Minister of Transport indicate what services are in mind for Kingston, South-East, and its district if the railway service is terminated?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is proposed to terminate the passenger railway service from Naracoorte to Kingston. The Transport Control Board will investigate the position to see whether there is a need or a demand for passenger services when that takes place. If

there is a need for a road passenger service between Kingston and Naracoorte it will be introduced.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 25. Page 255.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): In rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply I take this opportunity, the first publicly since relinquishing the portfolios, of expressing my appreciation of the great assistance I received from many people while I was Minister of Labour and Industry and Minister of Transport. Only last session in this Chamber, when the Labor Government was endeavouring to improve the working conditions of people employed in the Public Service, I expressed my admiration of the work and dedication of those people. The helpful attitude and unfailing courtesy of those with whom I came in contact in the various departments made a difficult job less difficult. I received the same treatment from the chairmen and members of the various boards, and I extend my thanks to them also.

In the industrial field, I have always believed that good industrial relations can be achieved by a reasonable attitude and sound common sense being displayed by leaders in this field, whether they be Government, employer or union representatives. The attitude of these leaders in this State during the period I speak of was, with very few exceptions, in that category. This has resulted in the good record of industrial relations here being maintained or even improved upon, and I thank the leaders of the industrial field for their efforts in this regard.

Last, but by no means least, I sincerely thank the Secretaries of the two main departments associated with my portfolios—Mr. Lindsay Bowes, of the Department of Labour and Industry, and Mr. Bill Isbell, who became the first Secretary under the Minister of Transport's portfolio. Mr. Isbell was of great assistance in the organizing of the department in the first instance and in the handling of the many problems associated with transport. During the term of the Labor Government a heavy programme of industrial legislation was instituted in an endeavour to bring the industrial laws of this State to a reasonable standard. Because of this, Mr. Bowes had a particularly busy time, and he assisted me

greatly in drafting and interpreting various amendments. Both these officers were unfailing in their application to their duties and in their courteous and helpful attitude to me personally.

I wish to join with previous speakers in expressing regret at the passing of former members, and I extend my sympathy to the relatives of those late members. I knew and appreciated fully the work of only two of them. I refer to the late Frank Walsh and the late Fred Walsh. The former has carved a special niche for himself in the history of this State. To have led the Labor Party into office in South Australia after being 32 years in opposition (and this despite the most inequitable electoral system in modern times) was an achievement indeed. He continued to lead the Government ably and well until the time of his retirement. The late Fred Walsh was my close friend and mentor for many years before I entered Parliament. Indeed, it was he who influenced me in seeking election to this Chamber upon the death of Frank Condon. Fred Walsh, too, carved a special niche in the history of this State. He spent a lifetime working in the industrial field and in Parliament for the betterment of the conditions and remuneration of the worker. His efforts in this regard were not confined to this State. He was associated with the foundation of the Australian Council of Trade Unions and for many years took an active part in the working of that body. In this State he was prominent in the councils of the United Trades and Labor Council and the Australian Labor Party right up to his death. It is certainly to be regretted that these members were not spared longer to enjoy their well-earned retirement.

I find it difficult to congratulate the Government on assuming office in view of its failure to obtain the confidence of the majority of the voters and a majority of members. It had to rely upon the support of an alleged Independent member before assuming office. However, I can congratulate the three honourable members of this Chamber who secured the confidence of the Premier and thus were appointed to the Cabinet. I congratulate them on their appointment and trust that, despite what has been said by one honourable member in this Chamber, they found their portfolios were in as good a condition as I am sure we felt they were previously when we took office.

One matter to which I wish to refer and which is of great importance to this State is that of the standardization of rail gauges.

In the *Advertiser* of last Thursday, July 25, there appeared an article on this matter. That article was not entirely in accordance with the facts, and I was pleased to see that on the following day the present Minister of Transport (Hon. Mr. Hill) replied to the article in an effort to put the record straight. I too would like to comment on some of the statements made in the article. It opened with a statement that at Kalgoorlie on August 3 the Western Australian Premier will ceremoniously close the last link in a standard gauge railway between Port Pirie and Perth. This, the article went on to say, is happening ahead of schedule. The impression is thereby given that this completes the project and that all that is now necessary in Western Australia is to sit and wait for the completion of the projects in South Australia and in New South Wales. I think that, if I quote from the current issue of the *Railways of Australia Network*, this will indicate the true position in Western Australia:

Earthworks for the 125 miles of track between Koolyanobing and Kalgoorlie have been completed and tracklaying is progressing sufficiently to enable the link up with the existing standard gauge railway from Kalgoorlie to Port Pirie to be made within a few weeks. This is happening on Saturday. The report continues:

A standard gauge track is being constructed from the new railway at West Midland to Bassendean from where the existing double narrow gauge tracks are being converted to dual gauge to provide a standard gauge link to a new interstate passenger terminal on the site of the existing locomotive depot at East Perth.

This work involves a new 600ft. steel and concrete bridge over the Swan River at Guildford, alterations and demolition of station buildings, construction of a new subway at Bayswater, and new overhead pedestrian bridges at several localities to serve island platforms and the erection of a new stopping place for suburban trains at Mount Lawley.

This work, and the provision of a passenger platform at East Perth, will be completed in readiness for the operation of standard gauge interstate and Perth-Kalgoorlie passenger trains in 1969.

Work is progressing on the construction of a modern dual gauge all-diesel locomotive depot at Forrestfield and of a suburban diesel railcar depot near East Perth Station.

A railway complex embracing composite gauge marshalling yards, waggon, carriage and freight transfer depots as well as the locomotive depot is being provided at Forrestfield. Some of these facilities will be brought into operation in stages before the end of 1968.

Nearby at Kewdale, six miles south-east of Perth, an up-to-date freight terminal is being established. This will become the principal metropolitan centre for the receipt and delivery

of both narrow and standard gauge traffic. A number of narrow gauge sidings serving industries already in the area have been brought into operation.

Working of this terminal will be introduced by degrees and limited standard gauge operations will begin about January, 1969.

Apparently, there is still much work to be done before the project could be said to be completed.

Another interesting point is that Commonwealth approval for the Western Australian project to begin was given two years prior to that given for the South Australian project between Port Pirie and the South Australian border at Cockburn. Indeed, the South Australian Government had to put much pressure on the Commonwealth Government to get a start even then. The statement was also made in the *Advertiser* article that the South Australian project was lagging behind schedule. The Minister has replied to this statement by saying that the planning of both the Commonwealth and this State was for the section from Port Pirie to Cockburn on the South Australian border to be completed by December of this year. I agree that this is what we worked for during my term of office, during which time, despite procedural delays which often took place in Commonwealth quarters, we were always confident that this section would be completed on schedule, or even earlier if need be.

When I first came to office in 1965, it caused me a deal of concern that at that time no finality had been reached in regard to that short section of the route from the South Australian border to Broken Hill. The Silverton Tramway Company now operates over its own system for this short distance of some 30-odd miles. There were a number of alternatives for the bridging of the distance from the South Australian border, where the currently approved standardization work would end, and the beginning of the standard gauge in New South Wales which starts at Crystal Street station, Broken Hill. These alternatives included the following: the Silverton Tramway Company be requested to standardize its narrow-gauge system; or that the New South Wales Government would take over the system from the Silverton Tramway Company and pay to the company compensation on the formula provided in the New South Wales Act, which provides for these actions to be taken. Another alternative was for action to be taken conjointly by the Governments of the Commonwealth, New South Wales and South Australia for a connection to be built on a

new route, either with South Australia being given running rights over this section or for the section to be vested in and operated by South Australia. I realized at that time that, unless some progress was made very soon in reaching agreement, the completion of this short section could hold up the operation of the whole of the standard gauge transcontinental route and that any delay in its completion would increase costs for the South Australian Railways in the operation of its working from Port Pirie to Cockburn, because it would have to maintain the present narrow gauge line and the standard gauge line until the section between Cockburn and Broken Hill was completed.

I found that, although correspondence had passed between the Premier and the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport on this subject, no meeting of all the interested parties had taken place. It was important, I thought, that the Transport Ministers of the two States mainly concerned and the Commonwealth Minister, with their respective advisers, meet in conference to reach some finality on future action in regard to this section. Following this meeting, it would be necessary, in my opinion at that time, that contact be made with the Silvertown Tramway Company for discussions to be had with it also. This proved to be not an easy task. It took me the best part of 12 months to get the Ministers together to talk about this meeting. A meeting between the Ministers and representatives of the Silvertown Tramway Company was not held until shortly before I relinquished office. The efforts made by me in this direction are surely an indication that South Australia was not the delaying party. Of course, if South Australia had been prepared to give way on every point on which we differed from the Commonwealth point of view once we got them to the conference table, we might have saved a little time but have lost more financially.

It has been mentioned elsewhere that South Australia was concerned about the freight traffic that we now have with Broken Hill. This freight is important to this State, as it is back loading to Broken Hill after the main ore traffic is brought to Port Pirie, and it is worth between \$200,000 and \$300,000 a year. During December last year the Commonwealth Government gave an undertaking that the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments would give the South Australian Government every co-operation in the negotiations that had to be undertaken to resolve the

problems associated with customers of the South Australian Railways situated in the Beryl Street area of Broken Hill, who are at present served by a spur line on the Silvertown Tramway Company's system. I sincerely hope that the present Minister will see that this undertaking is honoured.

A joint announcement was made last December by the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport and the New South Wales and the South Australian Ministers of Transport that a decision had been made to build a new connection between Cockburn and Broken Hill on a shorter route than the present one. The new line would be built and operated by the South Australian Railways. From that time until the time I left the portfolio, I had continually sought a draft copy of the proposed agreement, without success. I should be interested to know whether the Minister has yet seen one.

In an effort to get the work moving, I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister in February (with the approval of the South Australian Government) stating that, if his Government was unable to provide funds before the enactment of legislation, the South Australian Government would then be prepared to act on an exchange of letters between the respective Governments as to the terms of the amended 1949 agreement (this was also to involve the New South Wales Government) to make the requisite funds available. This was on the understanding that the Commonwealth legislation would be completed by June 30 last. The draft did not arrive, and legislation was not introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament. Some work was authorized by the Commonwealth, however, and survey teams were in operation in New South Wales in March of this year. This indicates the good faith of the then Government; I believe this also exists today in regard to the present Government. We are not delaying the completion of this work; rather, we are pushing the other parties along, to ensure that something will be done.

It was stated in the newspaper article to which I have referred that South Australia insisted on making its own rolling stock at Islington for the standardization project. I point out that the Islington railway workshops are so efficient that they have been able to compete on the open market for standardization work. It has done much of this work for the Western Australian project. Members of this Council who accompanied me on an inspection of the workshops a couple of years ago would agree with me

that the standard of the rolling stock turned out by the Islington railway workshops was a credit to those employed there.

Mr. Dunstan, while Premier, last year wrote to the Prime Minister asking what progress was being made regarding a report on further standardization in South Australia following earlier requests for approval for this work to proceed. He pointed out to the Prime Minister that there was an urgent necessity not only for the connection from Adelaide to Port Pirie but also for other associated works in the Peterborough Division and the Wallarco area, which were of great importance to South Australia and should be phased in with the tapering off of the Port Pirie to Cockburn section. I am pleased to see from a recent announcement that the present Minister, too, agrees that these associated works also are important and urgent.

It is important to note that as early as September, 1965, the South Australian Railways Commissioner sent to the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner details of the alternatives possible in the connection by standard rail gauge of Adelaide to Port Pirie and of the various traffic flows. This arose from the Prime Minister's advising the Premier that, as the result of approaches from South Australia, he had asked for a report on this connection. In January, 1966, the South Australian Railways Commissioner supplied the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner with approximate preliminary estimates. Nothing official has been heard since, although I have been told that a draft report by the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner had limited circulation as long ago as March, 1966. Whether this ever reached the Prime Minister I do not know. All I do know is that, although Mr. Dunstan wrote to the Prime Minister a year ago on this urgent matter and although further approaches were made through departmental channels, no reply was received before April 16 this year. Again I urge the present Minister to keep pressing for this work to be approved so that it may be carried out contemporaneously with the tapering off of the Port Pirie to Cockburn standardization project.

Before concluding, Mr. President, I should like to comment on one or two things mentioned by previous speakers. It is not my intention to waste much time on the speech of the Hon. Mr. Kemp, but it is interesting to observe the way he reacts when anyone suggests a reform that could affect the privileged

section that he believes he represents. His whole diatribe against some university professors, students and the Council of Civil Liberties was connected in his confused mind with the fact that some or all of these people dared to criticize a biased electoral system designed to elect him and people like him to the Parliament of South Australia. He reacted in the same way last year when the Labor Government sought to provide that workers employed in this State by people engaged in primary production should have the right to approach a tribunal for just and adequate remuneration and working conditions. It never surprises me when this happens. This is his usual form.

I was surprised to hear the Hon. Mrs. Cooper's reference to what she described as the disloyalty of members of this Parliament who had influenced people in other States to think poorly of our electoral system. About the only newspaper in Australia that did not in its editorials prior to the election criticize the electoral set-up was the *Advertiser*, and it would be asking too much to expect that paper to criticize it at that time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Did they criticize the electoral system of any other State?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I would not know, but I am glad the Chief Secretary has mentioned other systems, because I have a copy of the circular to which he is probably referring, and I cannot find any State in which there is an electoral district like Enfield, with 45,000 constituents, and another with about 5,500 constituents. Western Australia might be the next worst, but South Australia is the worst.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But you cannot blame the Liberal Government for that system, can you?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am not blaming the Liberal Government. I am talking about Mrs. Cooper's support of it, saying that it is a good system, and blaming people for being disloyal when they say it is no good. This is the type of thing we get from the *Advertiser*. The editorial in that paper of March 1, 1968, headed "Ending a Dismal Year", mentions the return of the Labor Government and states:

The risks are too great. There is above all a need in this State for more confidence—confidence that jobs will be secure, that the livelihood of families will have the best of care.

After considering the recently announced increase in the cost of living, the increased

numbers of unemployed and the Premier's statement that he is considering imposing further taxes (I assume along the lines of the Victorian taxes), I believe the dismal years are only just starting. The results of the election only confirmed the opinions expressed throughout Australia regarding the system. It is stretching the long bow to blame Labor members for the opinions expressed by so many newspaper editors generally opposed to the Labor viewpoint. I should think that a person would be demonstrating his loyalty to the State if he were seeking to place the honour of the State above reproach by reforming this blatantly biased system.

I was further surprised to hear the Hon. Mrs. Cooper imply that the system we have is satisfactory, because of the proportions she quoted. Either she is being disloyal to the members of her own sex or she forgets that the electoral system we have denies many of her sex the right to enrol on the Legislative Council roll and thus to have a say in who shall be elected to this Council. I support the motion.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and join with other honourable members in paying my respects to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Mellis Napier, who again opened this session. During the years I have been in this Chamber, His Excellency has opened Parliament on more occasions than has the Governor. We have much for which to be thankful in that we have, in the person of His Excellency, a man who has a sense of dignity of the occasion and of his office. He has rendered long and distinguished service to this State. I am sure all members are glad that he has made such a rapid recovery from his recent illness.

I also congratulate the new Ministers, particularly those in this Chamber, on their appointments. We all agree that they bring their own particular talents to the respective portfolios allotted to them. Acute problems arise when a Cabinet is chosen, and the provisions of our Constitution may hinder rather than help to solve these problems. I believe the Ministers chosen from this Chamber have been carefully selected, and I wish them well.

All members of Parliament, both in this Chamber and in another place, believe that our present Cabinet is too small. It is interesting to note that the New South Wales Cabinet has 16 members, Victoria has 15 members, Queensland has 13, Western Aus-

tralia has 12, and South Australia shares with Tasmania the distinction of having the smallest Cabinet: each has nine members in its Cabinet.

In the light of today's press forecast by the Director of Planning (Mr. Hart) that over 1,000,000 people will reside in the Adelaide metropolitan area within 12 years and that its population is increasing by over 20,000 people each year, it is obvious that the work load for Cabinet will increase, as it is directly related to the State's population. I believe that in the near future there should be at least 11 Cabinet members to handle this kind of increase in our population, because, with the growth, particularly of the metropolitan area, to achieve continuous progress Ministers will need an opportunity to concentrate within a particular field and time to think about the changes before they are implemented. However, no doubt first things will have to come first, and we are now intensely concerned about the foreshadowed electoral changes. I think it is natural to look back at the work of the Government that held office during the last Parliament. Whatever one's political views may be, one must acknowledge that its legislative programme was formidable and, I think, largely successful. Whether the same can be said of some of the administrative and financial policies that were introduced is, quite a different matter, and in this respect I think some of those pigeons are yet to come home to roost. Indeed, I think some of them can be seen on the horizon at present. Things being as they are, certain decisions that are made and certain policies that are instituted can be with us for almost all time. This is some of the price that we pay.

As I said, I think the position regarding the actual legislative programme is different. One has only to glance at the row of Statute Books on our shelves to see some real evidence of the programme that was pushed through in the last three years. Indeed, we all remember the very long sittings we had during the last Parliament. I believe that this Council acted in a very responsible manner during that Parliament, and that it was because of the attitude taken by many members in this Council, and the considerable research done and time spent by all members, that we have had such a reasonably successful set of laws placed on our Statute Books in the last three years.

In saying that, I was a little regretful that His Excellency in his Speech did not mention

one or two measures that I think the Government should have taken up. These measures were let fall by the previous Ministry. I hope that the Government will soon see fit to introduce another draft (or something substantially along the same lines as the Bill which lapsed last time) of the family inheritance legislation. This received a good deal of attention when it was in this Chamber. I will not recall the history of it except to say that honourable members know it was amended in some slight respects by this Chamber, but when it went to a conference of the two Houses the then Attorney-General, I think in a fit of pique when the conference was held, refused to budge on the matter. If ever we threw the baby out with the bathwater it was in that particular Bill, because it contained two very important matters which I think deserve some immediate attention by the present Government. The most important of these is the fact that it extended the provisions of the Testator's Family Maintenance Act to intestacies, whereas at present it is confined to testate estates. I think it was quite unnecessary for that Bill to have ever lapsed because, as Sir Arthur Rymill said at the time, we passed about 97 per cent or 99 per cent of it in the form in which it was introduced in this Chamber.

I think there were one or two quite useful provisions in another Bill that never reached this Chamber last session. I refer to certain amendments to the Evidence Act. Those quite useful provisions were completely overshadowed by other controversial provisions in that Bill and never really received any consideration at all. I think this matter could be looked at again.

Another matter to which I think some attention should be given is a matter that was raised in this Council when we were debating the provisions of the State Government Insurance Commission Bill. At that time we were concentrating on perhaps one of the main issues in the Bill and one which had some political significance. During the debate on that Bill it was mentioned by some speakers that it contained a provision that nullified to some extent the arbitration clauses contained in policies of insurance. I know that both the present Chief Secretary and I referred to that aspect. Reference was made at the time to the very good provisions that have existed in Victoria for many years now under that State's Instruments Act, and I think considera-

tion should be given to having another look at those provisions.

Incidentally, I was rather disturbed recently to have my attention directed to the activities of a company which is apparently endeavouring to sell insurance in this State. From what I can gather, it seems that its activities are largely confined to migrants. I did not know anything about this firm until recently, but when I was asked a question concerning a person's likely benefits under one of its policies I had my attention directed to it. Some years ago we had some trouble in this State with two or three firms that were selling hospital and medical benefits cover, particularly in the country. However, those so-called benefits proved to be of very doubtful value, and the companies concerned went into somewhat ignominious liquidation in a fairly short time.

I now wish to deal with the policy of the company to which I am now referring because it seems to me that this policy is drawn up along somewhat the same lines as the policies of some of these medical and hospital benefit companies that I mentioned before. It is a somewhat formidable document. I will not at this stage name the company concerned, because I have directed this matter to the attention of the Attorney-General and while he is making an investigation I think perhaps the company had better be left unnamed. On the face of the document, the company appears to have some American affiliations. It has no office in this State, but it has a post office box number and address in Sydney. The policy that I have in front of me seems to bear a number getting up towards the 600,000 mark, which is a rather remarkable number. However, one never knows how successful some of the salesmen were.

The company is said to be a limited United States stock company. The policy states that in consideration of the payment of a semi-annual premium (that is a rather unusual expression) the company will insure the owner of a policy against certain diseases, accidents and bodily injuries received while the policy is in force. When one looks at this policy one sees that it is divided into certain sections. The first section says that it will pay these benefits:

If such injuries shall be sustained by the insured and shall within 90 days from the date of the accident causing such injuries be the sole cause of loss by the insured of life, limb, limbs or sight, and provided such injuries sustained by the insured shall occur while actually riding as a fare-paying passenger in a

place regularly provided for the transportation of passengers by a common carrier within a surface or elevated railroad, subway car, street-car, or passenger boat.

Apparently it is nothing at all to do with a bus. It continues:

or while actually riding as a passenger in a passenger elevator used for passenger service . . . or while riding as a fare-paying passenger during a regularly scheduled trip in a licensed passenger aircraft provided by an incorporated common carrier of passengers while operated by a licensed pilot upon a regular passenger route between definitely established airports.

Then we see faintly printed in large red letters across the policy:

This is a limited policy. Read it carefully.

If one reads it carefully, one finds it provides certain benefits if one has a hand or a foot completely severed at or about the wrist or ankle; and it also provides that, if the sole cause of loss of life is:

being struck or knocked down or run over, on a public highway, by any moving vehicle; or while actually driving or riding in any automobile, bus, trolley-bus, taxi-cab or truck; or at the hands of a burglar, highwayman or robber when robbing the insured . . . the company will pay the sum of \$300.

At the end of the policy there is an interesting clause stating that the benefits are reduced by 50 per cent if the insured is under the age of 14 or over the age of 70. On the back there is a formidable list of provisions, of which I shall read only two. The first is:

Conformity with Federal, State and Territorial laws: Any provision of this certificate, which, on its effective date, is in conflict with laws in force in the jurisdiction in which the insured resides on such date is hereby amended to conform to the minimum requirements of such laws.

Also, it is stated:

Each and every condition herein expressed shall be considered precedent to recovery, and in the event that one or more of the said conditions herein expressed are not complied with then no amount or amounts shall be due hereunder.

It concludes by saying:

In witness whereof the company has caused this policy to be executed by its President, Resident Vice-President and Secretary, but the same shall not be binding upon the company until countersigned by an authorized agent of the company.

It is interesting to note that perhaps the best touch of all is on the back of the policy, where it is described as a "combined little giant accident policy".

The company letter that goes with the request for renewal of subscriptions contains this rather interesting advice:

Why is this protection important to you? You know . . . Accidents can happen at any time. Hospital costs are sky high. A hospital bill of \$500, \$700, \$900 is a big bill. It is better to have this extra protection of \$900 and not need it than to need it . . . and not have it.

For the expenditure of a special premium but described as a bonus declared by the company, this company issues a further policy, which is just as restrictive as the one I have read out. I think the activities of this company and of one other that I have had drawn to my attention recently (I hope the people of South Australia will be wary about this type of company) should not be ignored, and I hope we may hear something about it when the Attorney-General has had a chance of looking into the matter.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: When we introduced a Bill to take care of this sort of thing, you opposed it.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No. I prefaced my remarks by saying that there were some aspects of that Bill that we could have taken up, and I think we still can; but I still do not think that the creation of a State Insurance Office is any answer to this kind of thing, which has operated in the past and apparently operates in New South Wales, where there is a State Insurance Office.

I want to conclude my speech by referring to a matter mentioned in the policy speech of the Premier, because certain things have been said in this debate about education and matters pertaining thereto. I remind the Council that in the policy speech the Government undertook to promote the establishment in South Australia of an institute of colleges. In that speech reference was made to the Martin Report on this matter. The immediate point made, which I think is most relevant, was the setting-up in this State of a college of paramedical studies. Paramedical studies are those dealing with the technology of, say, physiotherapy, pharmacy, dietetics, optometry, radiological technology, medical laboratory technology, and one or two others. It seems to me that the setting-up of both an institute of colleges and a particular college of paramedical studies should receive early consideration, as I am sure it will from this Government.

It is interesting to note that the Martin Report, which was issued towards the end of

1964, recommended that each State Government establish what it called an institute of colleges. The basis of this recommendation was the consideration of plans for the expansion of technical and other non-university education. I think it can be said that this type of tertiary education falls largely into three groups—that concerned with commerce, that concerned with industry and that concerned with government. Included in these groups are paramedical studies. The function of the institute of colleges was to co-ordinate the work of the various colleges, which were constituent bodies, as it were, of the institute. The institute in each State was supposed to be autonomous; it was supposed to be a central body co-ordinating the work of the new colleges. It was supposed to do the same kind of work that I think has been, and is being, done by the University of London. Four distinct South Australian organizations were named in the Martin Report as being likely to form the nucleus of this institute of colleges; they were the Institute of Technology, the Roseworthy Agricultural College, the South Australian School of Art and the South Australian Division of the Australian College of Nursing (I am not sure whether we yet have such a division, but I think one is contemplated). The report also stated that a new paramedical studies college should be established.

In connection with the institute of colleges, it is important that we realize that our greatest need today is for increased numbers of technically trained men and women, rather than for a greater number of people turned out by universities with academic qualifications. Criticism was made by the Hon. Mr. Kemp concerning the question of universities' research programmes *versus* the actual teaching ability of university staff members. I think it is usually recognized that the universities do provide an education that is basically oriented towards research and, except for a few faculties, this is one of the prime objectives of a university. A big difficulty of the quota systems enforced by universities, of course, is that they restrict the student's choice of faculty. This will probably be one of the things that we shall have to learn to live with in future; in fact, there will be increasing difficulties in respect to gaining entrance to a particular university faculty.

It is heartening to learn that a system that modifies somewhat the matriculation requirements established by the Public Examinations Board for university entrance has been intro-

duced at the Institute of Technology. Also, I believe that the Flinders University is also experimenting along the same lines. This system, a points system, has been very successfully worked out, and I hope that this kind of test will soon be considered for matriculation purposes. I do not think we can completely solve matriculation problems, because we all know that there are many failures at first-year university level. It may be, as the Hon. Mr. Kemp has said, that the reason for these failures is that the students are not exposed at university level to the strict teaching methods that they experienced whilst they were at school. Personally, I believe that many students who fail at first-year university level either were crammed at school and unable to adjust to the university situation or were not genuinely interested in doing a university course that is essentially training in fundamental thought, which training is not of the same type as that given at school.

A good percentage of first-year university students become bored and disillusioned and, as a result, the failure rate is high. Students who do not make the grade at this level or do not make the grade at the existing matriculation level constitute a large group that would benefit very much from a well organized technical course, and I think this is the kind of thing that the Institute of Technology itself is beginning to develop very well.

I think, therefore, it is important that the Government should give early consideration to setting up this institute of colleges. It is perhaps doubtful whether such an institute can successfully co-ordinate the work of the four organizations I named earlier. A big problem that will face the Government in connection with setting up the proposed college of paramedical studies will be the question of finance. At first sight it may seem that some of the courses mentioned are very closely related, that they all, in fact, deal with medical science in one way or another. In fact, however, in the past they have been taught within the university and within the Institute of Technology as separate courses. If financial considerations are to be important, and I am sure they will be important to this Government, perhaps the best way whereby the new paramedical studies college can be established is to set it up initially as a new department within the Institute of Technology. In due course it can be hived off as a separate college.

In the course of the debate during the last Parliament on the Pharmacy Act Amendment Bill, a serious problem arose in connection

with diplomas granted by the Institute of Technology. A fundamental problem regarding these proposed tertiary colleges is whether they will have power and statutory authority to give degrees instead of diplomas. This may seem to be an unimportant question but, in fact, it is indeed important, because students at these colleges will seek assurances that proper credit will be given for their courses both from outside industry (from potential employers) and from universities, if they wish to further their education at a degree or post-graduate level. Both these questions, in regard to the attitude of outside industry and that of the universities themselves, pose big problems that have to be overcome.

It is interesting to note that the new Victorian legislation dealing with the setting up of the institute of colleges gives specific power to colleges to award degrees. Indeed, the college of pharmacy in Victoria has now decided to issue degrees and has actually done so.

If the Government is to consider setting up an institute of colleges, the legislative authority to award degrees should receive its close attention. Perhaps it will not be done immediately, but it is essential that it should be recognized throughout the community at all levels that the standard of work being done in these non-university tertiary institutions is exactly the same as, and is of equal value to, the work being done for an ordinary bachelor degree at a university.

The question of establishing these colleges, and particularly of expanding the work of the Institute of Technology, will require considerable finance, and I reiterate what I said: that the only way we can get our paramedical college started is to create a new department within the Institute of Technology. It is unfortunate that the Commonwealth Government has left so much of the responsibility to get on with this work to the individual State Governments, more or less saying, "You

have to do the spade work and be prepared to put in matching money with us for the achievement of these results."

With our expanding population there will be a rapid expansion of tertiary education, and it is important that in that expansion we lay the proper foundations, not only for buildings but for the quality of the teaching that is to be done in these institutions. We need people whose ability is more oriented towards teaching than towards research, particularly in the non-university institutions. It may be that we shall finish up with universities being the sole educational institutions undertaking research, and it may be that the other colleges composed within an institute of colleges will handle advanced technologies and turn out a highly skilled graduate by adopting the best teaching methods.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Will they become members of the Civil Liberties Council?

The Hon F. J. POTTER: I do not know that any of them are at the moment. They seem to be confined to the university. Of course, money is the limiting factor in this whole question I am discussing, and the real challenge to any Government, from whichever Party it is constituted, will be to see how far the State can push on with this proposed expansion of tertiary education.

The Commonwealth Government's attitude throughout has been a cautious one rather than a challenging one, and it is unfortunately the role of the State Government to take up the challenge with the limited financial resources at its disposal. I am sure this Government will consider the problem; it promised to do so in its policy speech, and I look forward with confidence to the future expansion of this side of our tertiary education. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.48 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 31, at 2.15 p.m.