

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, May 25, 1965.

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

## APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

## QUESTIONS

## SERVICE PAY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In order that the debate on the Supplementary Estimates can be facilitated, can the Premier give me the information on service pay that I requested?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I certainly have some information which I am prepared to submit so long as it is recognized merely as information. However, I was under the impression that this matter would be debated according to the way it is set out in the Supplementary Estimates. I do not wish this matter to involve a long discussion by way of question afterwards, but if my answer can be accepted in the spirit in which I offer it the Leader can have it.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We want the information available: we do not intend to ask questions now.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The following comments are submitted in regard to the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly on Thursday, May 20, 1965, concerning service payments. A separate report has been submitted listing the categories of employees in Government departments to whom the Cabinet decision will apply:

(1) Applications to employees of the Municipal Tramways Trust: (Answer) Cabinet approved the extension of State Government rates of service pay to daily paid employees of the Municipal Tramways Trust.

(2) Service pay applies only to persons employed in mental hospitals to the exclusion of nurses and others employed in general hospitals: (Answer) Cabinet decision applies service payments to all daily and weekly-paid employees in the Hospitals Department in both general and mental hospitals. Nurses in Government general hospitals are salaried officers—they receive an annual salary under the provisions of the Nurses Agreement. That agreement already provides increments for many categories of nursing staff up to and including the classifications of Senior Sister and Tutor

Sister. A copy of the Nurses Agreement is attached hereto.

(3) The service payments have been fixed by Cabinet decision: (Answer) It has been so fixed to ensure uniform service payments applying in all departments and as some industrial tribunals have no power to prescribe service payments. Similar action has been taken for many years in respect of other conditions of employment of Crown employees, *e.g.*, leave conditions and camp allowances, to ensure uniform conditions applying.

(4) Are service payments to be taken into account for sick leave and long service leave? (Answer) It is proposed that service payments shall continue to apply during all periods of leave with pay.

(5) Officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and Highways Department will get 15s. per week less than the amount received by the same grade of officer employed in the Railways Department: (Answer) The previous Government provided 15s. per week for railway employees only, thus creating an anomaly. In order to remove this anomaly Cabinet decided to pay service payments in addition to all other amounts currently received by daily and weekly-paid employees. As Railways employees were previously granted amounts (varying according to the skill of the employee) up to 15s. per week in their awards above the marginal rates applying in other departments they will continue to receive these amounts.

(6) Will those in subsidized and semi-government employment receive these payments? (Answer) The question of the application of service pay to employees in subsidized and semi-government employment is a matter for the employing authorities to consider after the payment is in operation in Government departments.

(7) A skilled person should receive more than an unskilled employee: (Answer) The service payment schemes applying in the Commonwealth, Victoria and New South Wales do differentiate between employees, according to their skill. However, Cabinet decided to make the same service payment to all daily and weekly-paid employees in Crown employment.

(8) Cabinet is aware that the grant of service payments to daily and weekly-paid employees may create anomalies affecting some salaried officers who are excluded from such payments. However, it is of opinion that the consideration of these anomalies is a matter for the appropriate industrial tribunal, and they should be submitted to the tribunal by the officer concerned or his union.

The following details are submitted by the Public Service Commissioner setting out those in Government and semi-government employment, who will receive service payments and those who are excluded from them:

1. Employees who will receive service payments in Government departments: Cabinet approval provides that service payments shall apply to Crown employees (male and female) who are paid at daily or weekly rates. These

employees are: (a) employed in South Australian Railways: all persons whose rates of pay are prescribed on a daily or weekly basis by the following awards and determinations—A.R.U. Traffic, Permanent Way and Signalling Wages Staff Award; A.R.U. Miscellaneous Grades Award; Railways Metal Trades Grades Award; Locomotive Enginemen's Award; Vehicle Builders' Award; Carpenters' and Joiners' Award; Graphic Arts Award; Government Railways Construction and Maintenance Board Determination; Painters' and Decorators' Board Determination; Plumbers' and Gas Fitters' Board Determination; Bakers' Board Determination; and Hairdressers' Board Determination;

(b) employed in other Government departments: all persons employed in accordance with the provisions of the following awards, determinations and agreements at weekly or hourly rates of pay—Carpenters' and Joiners' Award; Enginedrivers' and Firemen's Award; Metal Trades Award; Shipwrights' (Shore) Award; Clerks' (Shipping) Award; Cleaners of Government Offices Award; Bricklayers' Board Determination; Engineering and Water Supply Department Board Determination; Builders' Labourers' Board Determination; Government Drivers' and Shunters' Board Determination; Government General Construction Workers' Board Determination; Government Hospitals, etc., Board Determination; Government Irrigation Maintenance Board Determination; Government Mental Hospitals Board Determination; Government Miscellaneous Employees' Board Determination; Government Storemen and Packers' Board Determination; Harbors Board, etc., Employees' Industrial Board Determination; Painters' and Decorators' Board Determination; Plasterers' and Terrazzo Workers' Board Determination; Plumbers' and Gas Fitters' Board Determination; Foremen's Agreement; Printing Industry Agreement; and Timber Workers' Agreement;

(c) daily or weekly paid employees who are not covered by awards, determinations or agreements, whose rates of pay are determined by administrative decision and who are employed in all departments and the South Australian Railways; (d) all daily paid employees of the Municipal Tramways Trust.

2. Those who will not receive service payments: (a) employed in the South Australian Railways: all salaried officers; this includes officers paid under the following awards—Railway Professional Officers' Award; and Railway Salaried Officers' Award; (b) employed in other Government departments: all salaried officers, i.e., persons whose salary is prescribed on an annual basis and including officers employed under the following awards, etc.—

Category.	Award, etc.
Teachers . . . .	Teachers' Salaries Board Award.
Police Officers .	The Police Award.
Public Service Officers . . . .	Prison Officers' Agreement. Returns of the P.S. Board. Awards of the P.S. Arbitrator.
Nurses in Government General Hospitals	Nurses' Agreement.

Some minor administrative details on the application of service pay have still to be decided and immediately a decision has been made a circular will be issued to all departments concerned. A copy of this instruction could be made available to the Leader of the Opposition when it is issued.

#### GAWLER HOSPITAL.

Mr. CLARK: Recently, in company with the Hon. M. B. Dawkins, I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Health in connection with the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler seeking assistance from the Government for the proposed rebuilding and extension scheme there. Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, a report on this matter?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Cabinet has approved of the Hospital Board's calling tenders for improvements and extensions to the hospital, the work to be spread over the financial years 1965-66 and 1966-67. A Government subsidy of £2 for £1 will be paid.

#### BRENNAN'S JETTY.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Recently, I noticed in the press an announcement by the Minister of Agriculture that Cabinet had considered the provision of facilities at Port Lincoln for the landing of the tuna catch and other fresh fish and that the project had been referred to the Public Works Committee for consideration. I was pleased to see that because this is a much needed facility. A further problem exists concerning the export of meat and fish. This difficulty has occurred from time to time with varying severity when the main jetty at Port Lincoln, known as Brennan's jetty or Railway jetty, is being used by vessels that cause dust nuisance, possibly through the loading of bagged grain, but particularly through the unloading of phosphate rock. The health authorities have placed an embargo on the handling of fresh meat for export on a ship that is occupying a berth contiguous with the vessel discharging phosphate rock. This matter has created problems and it has sometimes been necessary to make special arrangements at considerable cost to the Government, and certainly at some inconvenience to shipping, in order to cope with refrigerated ships calling for export meat. Now that the export of fish has assumed material proportions, in addition to the export of meat, the problem has been accentuated. Can the Minister of Marine say whether the Harbors Board authorities have considered this problem and, if they have, can he say what is the position concerning the matter so that it can be further considered and so that the problem, which is becoming larger, may be overcome?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member was good enough to indicate that he would ask this question today. The matter has been examined, and I have received the following report from the General Manager of the Harbors Board:

It is not intended to extend (or convert) the outer berth at Brennan's jetty, Port Lincoln, to handle export meat. Meat shipments *ex* Port Lincoln for the past six financial years were as follows:

	Tons.
1958-59 . . . . .	1,572
1959-60 . . . . .	1,432
1960-61 . . . . .	605
1961-62 . . . . .	993
1962-63 . . . . .	2,048
1963-64 . . . . .	1,112

These annual amounts are very small indeed (amounting in some instances to a single shipment) and certainly do not justify the construction of a special berth. However, trouble does arise occasionally, with meat and frozen fish, when a vessel arrives at Brennan's jetty to load these commodities and another one is already there on the opposite side unloading phosphate rock, coal or sulphur. The Commonwealth authorities will not allow the loading of meat or fish whilst dusty cargoes are being handled in the adjoining berth and as a result the unloading of phosphate rock, etc., has either to cease or the vessel seeking to load meat and fish has to wait until the unloading of the dusty cargo has been completed.

Generally these troubles have been avoided by manipulating the arrival times of the vessels, or arranging the work alternately between day and evening shifts, although at greater cost to the vessel that has to work the evening shift. On a recent occasion a vessel unloading sulphur was moved over to the bulk grain berth which happened to be vacant and suffered only one day's delay. The problem, such as it is, is being examined in another context, and that is to see if a tuna boat unloading facility can be combined with a frozen tuna and meat loading berth at some isolated place clear of any dust that might be blown from ships discharging phosphate rock, sulphur or coal at Brennan's jetty, but the cost is likely to be of the order of £300,000. Incidentally, the extension of Brennan's jetty would not solve the problem as this would not provide a berth sufficiently far from the present berths at the jetty to obviate the hazard of blown dust.

#### MARTIN REPORT.

Mr. HUDSON: In view of the importance of teacher-training, and in view of Mr. Reid's letter in the *Advertiser* of May 21 criticizing a previous statement of the Minister of Education relating to the Martin Report, will the Minister amplify his remarks on the Martin Report's approach to teacher-training and comment on Mr. Reid's criticism?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, I shall be pleased to do so. The letter to the *Advertiser* was a shallow misinterpretation of

my statement to the press on the implications of the Martin Report with regard to teacher-training. Far from considering that the Martin Report has no foundation, I am impressed with the majority of its recommendations and point out that prior to its publication, South Australia had already in operation more of its recommendations than any other State. However, one recommendation in the report to which I am opposed is the handing over of complete responsibility for teacher-training to autonomous institutions. The quality of teachers, the supply of teachers, the disposition of trainees between courses, reports on the strengths and weaknesses and preferences of student teachers, and some control over content of courses in the public interest are so important to any organized system of education that no Government in Australia should be prepared to lose control of teacher-training.

This is the one recommendation of the Robbins Report that has not been put into effect in the United Kingdom. Those teachers colleges which were under the administrative control of the Local Education Authorities still remain there, and as such the ultimate control is with the Minister in charge of the Department of Education and Science. An autonomous institution such as the university has no responsibility to ensure adequate supply to the professions. The sole responsibility of a university department is to its subject and its furtherance—and this is as it should be. I have no objection to an Advisory Board for Teachers Colleges consisting of the Principals of the colleges and their senior staff, the body of teachers and with wide representation from the university and from the community. The Education Department or any other authority controlling teachers colleges would certainly take notice of such a board, but the responsibility for adequate supply and preparation of teachers and the distribution of finance must remain with the Government of the day through its Minister of Education and its Education Department.

The teachers colleges of South Australia have achieved a pattern of teacher-training different from that in other States of the Commonwealth and different from that in the United Kingdom. This has been achieved with co-operation from the university and with the present administrative control. Indeed our teachers colleges have reached diploma-granting status ahead of any other State and of most countries in the world. If the other recommendations of the Martin Report, particularly

those relating to finance, are implemented, present deficiencies in our teacher-training system can be removed. In the things that matter to academic institutions, teachers colleges in South Australia already have a high degree of autonomy. In the content of courses, they have complete autonomy within a broad general framework, subject only to limitations occasioned by the needs of the schools themselves. There are regular meetings of college principals and, of their own volition, the lecturers maintain standards by frequent consultation about similar courses in the different colleges here and elsewhere. In the appointment of staff, the Principals of teachers colleges have adequate voice in their selection, subject only to the terms of the Education Act. In fact, I am about to place before Parliament a Bill to alter the Education Act so that a joint appointment of Professor of Education and Principal of Bedford Park Teachers College may be made. In submitting this to Parliament I am committed to granting freedom to experiment in the pattern of teacher-training at Bedford Park, in the same way as the university at Bedford Park will be given freedom to vary established patterns of courses and degrees of the University of Adelaide at North Terrace.

#### UPPER MURRAY BRIDGE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Last week the Minister of Education was good enough to undertake to refer a question to the Minister of Roads regarding the proposed bridge across the Upper Murray reaches. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Roads states that a detailed report for submission to the Public Works Standing Committee is being prepared at present. A special aerial survey has been carried out and the route selected, and the centre line is being surveyed at present with a view to carrying out foundation investigations for the bridge and approach roads to enable an estimate to be prepared. It is expected that a report will be submitted to the committee early in the next financial year.

#### HORTICULTURAL SERVICES.

Mr. CURREN: Four years ago a Mr. Mount, an officer of the Horticulture Branch of the Department of Agriculture engaged on tree census and statistics, retired. This officer has not yet been replaced, and as the question of tree statistics is of considerable importance in determining production trends and matters of

vital importance to both canning and drying sections of the fruit industry, will the Minister of Agriculture, as a matter of urgency, endeavour to have this position filled or, alternatively, have an aerial survey made of all producing areas?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member was good enough to tell me last week that he had the thought in mind to ask this question, and I got in ahead of him and obtained a reply from the Chief Horticulturist, Mr. Miller, which reads:

Mr. Mount was appointed as Canning Fruits Survey Officer in August, 1953, and retired May, 1961. His appointment was made on Commonwealth Extension Grant funds specifically to carry out a survey of canning fruit plantings. There was an urgent need for such a survey at that time because of the rapid changes in canning fruit plantings in the post-war years. This rapidly changing canning fruit picture continued until 1960, but since then the plantings have remained fairly stable. At the time of Mr. Mount's retirement in 1961, it was not possible to continue the Commonwealth Extension Grant appointment. The work did not warrant the priority of creating a new position from State funds but the canning fruit survey data has been revised with a check survey by a departmental field officer. The possibility of using aerial photographic surveys for tree census surveys has been investigated, but this technique does not have the usefulness that it has in the more compact areas of the Murrumbidgee irrigation area and the Goulburn Valley. For aerial surveys to be of real value, a routine survey of all plantings—deciduous, citrus and vines—is necessary, carried out every year or at least every two years. Initially, a complete ground survey of all plantings is carried out in conjunction with an aerial survey. Then the annual or biennial aerial survey is used as a quick method of locating changes since the previous ground survey. The nature of the changes and the details of new plantings must still be determined by ground surveys. For example, in the Murrumbidgee irrigation area a team of 10 to 12 ground survey officers is kept fully occupied for 10-12 weeks each year to keep the survey data up to date. In addition, these ground surveyors are serviced by a permanent recording and collating staff. Thus while recognizing the value of aerial surveys in tree census surveys it is not possible to use this technique to replace ground surveys. At present aerial surveys are only used here for specific tasks involving crop health and especially for drainage design work.

#### EAST TERRACE LAND.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the cost of the land purchased by the Housing Trust on East Terrace and eventually resold?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am prepared to give part of the reply, but the remainder is considered absolutely confidential because of

the Housing Trust's activities. I think the honourable member will appreciate that fact. The Housing Trust is constantly in the land market and it is the practice of the trust not to disclose publicly details of its land transactions. It is considered that this would work against the interest of the trust either as a buyer or seller. I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member privately on the remainder of this information.

#### TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have had two letters from the President of the Mitcham Pensioners' Association with reference to concessions for war widows on Municipal Tramways Trust transport. The first of these letters asked me if I were prepared to make representations to the Government on this matter, and the second disclosed what the first did not, that an approach had already been made. However, after what was considered a long time no reply had been received to the first letter but a reply was received from the Premier within a day or so of the first letter to me. That reply, which I have now seen, was signed by the Premier and after pointing out that no other State gives concessions to a war widow irrespective of her income, it concludes:

For these reasons and because of the heavy costs of the pensions already given I regret that it is not practicable to extend the existing arrangements to include war widows not already covered by this scheme.

I suggest to the Government that in view of the tragic circumstances in which war widows lost their husbands they are, perhaps, entitled to particularly sympathetic consideration and, because of that, I ask the Premier whether he will ask Cabinet to reconsider this matter with a view to granting the request made to the Government by the Mitcham Pensioners' Association for travel concessions for war widows on M.T.T. vehicles?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: In view of the long drawn-out statement, yes.

#### SAVINGS BANK HOUSING LOANS.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Premier obtained a report on the deterioration in the last few months of the position concerning the waiting period for loans under the Advances for Homes Act from the Savings Bank of South Australia?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: A brief summary of the Savings Bank's housing policy states:

In the matter of housing, it is the policy of the Savings Bank of South Australia to assist as many South Australians as possible to acquire their own homes. Through the years

the bank has made available many millions of pounds for this purpose—not only by way of direct housing loans to home-seekers, but indirectly also through large advances on favourable terms to the South Australian Housing Trust. The sum outstanding for mortgage loans at present is £54,300,000. Of this total £45,300,000 represents loans for houses, £6,500,000 loans on farming properties and £2,500,000 loans for institutional buildings such as schools, churches, hospitals, etc. In addition, the amount currently on loan to the Housing Trust exceeds £7,000,000. The bank's direct lending for housing is now running at record high levels. Last financial year £9,100,000 was lent on mortgage. Housing loans accounted for £7,400,000 of this total, the remaining £1,700,000 representing rural and institutional mortgages.

During the current year mortgage loan approvals have averaged £860,000 every month. Of this monthly figure £670,000 has been for housing. The demand for housing loans greatly exceeds the available funds and, to spread the benefit of its lending among as many people as possible, the bank limits the maximum amount lent on a new house or one to be erected to £3,750; the maximum loan on any previously-occupied dwelling of solid construction is £4,500. About 200 direct housing loans are made every month, the average amount of each loan being £3,340. Prior to November, 1963, it was the bank's practice to make loans strictly in the order in which applications were received, but it has since become necessary to adopt a more selective lending policy to meet intense competition in the savings bank field and to check a serious drift of depositors to competitor savings banks. It was found that other banks, which apparently were not making loans to people of small means, were granting immediate housing loans to substantial depositors of the Savings Bank of South Australia who could be induced to transfer their savings accounts from this institution. The effect of this was not only to reduce appreciably the flow of deposits to the bank and thereby impair its capacity to lend for housing, but also to create an unsatisfactory investment situation in which too great a proportion of the bank's loans were being made to people with very little equity in the properties they were buying.

Accordingly it was decided that people who were depositors of the Savings Bank of South Australia and who had contributed materially to the funds available for lending were entitled to loans in priority to other applicants who were not in that category. To give effect to that principle the number of loans made each month was increased and 75 aggregating £250,000 are now made available each month to borrowers who are substantial depositors and have supported the bank over a period. The remaining 125 loans aggregating about £420,000 each month are still made to borrowers of small means in strict order of application and include a number made to people whose applications are received at the bank through the South Australian Housing Trust. These measures have proved effective in reducing the drift of accounts and balances to other banks, but they have also had the effect of further extending the waiting time for loans. There

are now more than 4,000 names on the bank's waiting list and it is apparent that if the demand for loans continues unabated many of these inquirers, some of whom were not depositors when they sought their advances, may obtain a loan from this bank in the near future. It is anticipated that the bank will have lent the record annual total of £10,300,000 on mortgage by the end of this current financial year and that included in that figure will be £8,000,000 advanced to South Australian borrowers during the year for the purchase or erection of homes.

#### NURIOOTPA SCHOOL.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last Thursday in relation to erecting a new primary school on a large area of land held by the department at Nuriootpa?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Although the area of the Nuriootpa Primary School consisting of nearly 2½ acres is not as great as the Education Department would wish, the enrolment which reached its peak of 356 in 1960 is now 331. The urgent need for classroom accommodation in rapidly growing areas is still such that it is not possible at this juncture to recommend the building of a new primary school on the 7½-acre site held by the department.

#### TEA TREE GULLY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the purchase of land adjoining the Tea Tree Gully Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The land adjoining the Tea Tree Gully Primary School has not yet been purchased. However, it is intended to purchase it and negotiations are proceeding at present in accordance with the provisions of the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act.

#### SILOS.

Mr. HEASLIP: It would appear (from certain questions that have been asked in the House and from answers given) that certain country towns away from a railway are to be denied wheat silos, in order that the Government can carry out its policy. If this is so, will the Government make sufficient money available to the Port Germein and Laura District Councils to enable them to provide a sealed road from Appila to Laura, which would considerably reduce the cost of farmers' transport?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I believe the House will appreciate that the honourable member would be well advised to consider

within which Minister's ambit his questions come. Last week I informed the House that I did not intend to give further information about silos until I had completely investigated the matter and this applied particularly to Appila. My decision on this matter is the same and I have not yet received the report that I am seeking, although it could be in my office now. I wish to take this opportunity to inform the House that I have not been able to keep pace with the volume of work that is included in the offices I represent in this House.

Mr. Heaslip: What is Government policy?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am only one member of the Cabinet that makes policy. However, I think other members of Cabinet will agree that, whenever I explain policy in the House, Cabinet has agreed to that policy. In reply to the honourable member's question, I will request my staff to obtain information on this matter from my colleague in another place.

#### HAWKER TO QUORN ROAD.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question about the Hawker to Quorn road?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague has informed me that the District Council of Kanyaka is currently engaged on the construction of the Port Augusta to Quorn main road. Although work is nearing completion, it is expected that it will extend into 1965-66. Following completion of the Port Augusta to Quorn road, it is planned that some construction will be carried out by the Kanyaka council on the Quorn to Hawker district road.

#### FLUORIDATION.

Mrs. STEELE: During the last session of the previous Parliament a Select Committee was appointed to consider fluoridation. It did this and made a report to the House. Can the Premier say what is the Government's policy on fluoridation?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: At this stage the Government has no policy on fluoridation.

#### DRAINAGE.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about whether preliminary plans have been made to form a metropolitan drainage board or authority?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: At a conference between the then Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) and the local governing bodies in the metropolitan area,

including those at Salisbury and Elizabeth, the Premier suggested the formation of a Metropolitan Floodwaters Control Board and stated that the proposed board would have the duty of formulating schemes and carrying them into effect, and that every local governing body, including Elizabeth and Salisbury, would be represented upon it. He went on to say that the Government would be prepared to make an outright grant of half the cost of any approved proposal and that the remainder would be shared between the councils concerned. The councils would prepare plans and submit proposals to the proposed control board for approval. The Premier also suggested the establishment of a second and smaller authority to allocate costs. Subsequently, most of the councils said they were in agreement, although some desired clarification of their financial involvement. On September 24, 1964, the then Minister of Works (Hon. G. G. Pearson) stated that, as the project appeared to have received almost unanimous support from the constituent councils of the metropolitan area, Cabinet would consider the matter, and he was fairly confident that legislation would be drafted to give effect to the proposal. He indicated, however, that it was not possible for legislation to be drafted for consideration by Parliament that session. The matter has not been further advanced, but as the honourable member has now drawn my attention to it, I will submit the matter to Cabinet for consideration.

#### THEVENARD CHANNEL.

**Mr. BOCKELBERG:** Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the Thevenard harbour?

**The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS:** The provision of lighted beacons in the Thevenard entrance channel has had the desired effect and vessels have been using the channel at night. The beacons were provided to enable deep-draught vessels to use the higher night tides that occur during the summer months. In winter the higher tides occur during the day time so that from now until December the channel will not be normally used at night. The Public Works Committee did not recommend any deepening of the channel approach in its report dated June 19, 1964. However, it did suggest that the removal of certain high spots in the navigation track, with a view to declaring the channel at 25ft. (instead of the present 24ft.), should be investigated. This investigation was completed a few months ago

and Cabinet authorized the work at a cost of £42,000 on February 15, 1965. This work is now actively in hand and should be completed by July next, depending on the weather.

#### PORTFOLIOS.

**The Hon. F. H. WALSH:** In response to an earlier request, I ask permission to have the following list of portfolios included in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### LIST OF DEPARTMENTS UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE RESPECTIVE MINISTERS.

##### PREMIER:

Premier's Department (In addition to the normal duties associated with the Head of the Government, this Department is also responsible for promotion of industry, and includes the Industries Assistance Branch. The Government Motor Garage is also part of the Department.)

##### TREASURER:

Treasury Department.  
Superannuation Department.  
Motor Vehicles Department.  
Agent General in England Department.  
Land Tax Department.  
Stamp and Succession Duties Department.  
Prices Department.

##### MINISTER OF IMMIGRATION:

Immigration, Publicity and Tourist Bureau Department.

##### MINISTER OF HOUSING:

Government Instrumentality—South Australian Housing Trust.

##### CHIEF SECRETARY:

Chief Secretary's Department.  
Statistical Department.  
Audit Department.  
Printing and Stationery Department.  
Police Department.  
Sheriff's and Gaols and Prisons Department.  
Hospitals Department.  
Public Service Commissioner's Department.  
Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science (not as department of Public Service but some officers are under the Public Service Act).

##### MINISTER OF HEALTH:

Department of Public Health.

##### MINISTER OF WORKS:

Minister of Works Department.  
Engineering and Water Supply Department.  
Public Buildings Department.  
Public Stores Department.

##### MINISTER OF MARINE:

Harbors Board Department.

##### ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

Attorney-General's Department (including Companies and Licensing Branches).  
Parliamentary Draftsman's Department.  
Crown Solicitor's Department.  
Public Trustee Department.  
Supreme Court Department.  
Adelaide Local Court Department.  
Adelaide Police Court Department.  
Country and Suburban Courts Department.

- Registrar General of Deeds Department  
(including Office of the Town Planner).  
Coroner's Department.  
Electoral Department.
- 25/3/65 Following Acts committed to  
Minister of Social Welfare:  
Adoption of Children Act, 1925-  
1943.  
Children's Institutions Sub-  
sidies Act, 1961.  
Children's Protection Act, 1936-  
1961.  
Interstate Destitute Persons  
Relief Act, 1910-1958.  
Maintenance Act, 1926-1963.  
Maintenance Orders (Facilities  
for Enforcement) Act, 1922-  
1955.  
Alcohol and Drug Addicts  
(Treatment) Act, 1961-1964.  
(These were previously under  
the administration of the  
Chief Secretary).
- MINISTER OF ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS:  
Department of Aboriginal Affairs.
- MINISTER OF SOCIAL WELFARE:  
Children's Welfare and Public Relief Depart-  
ment.
- MINISTER OF EDUCATION:  
Minister of Education Department.  
Education Department.  
Libraries Department.  
Museum Department.  
Art Gallery Department.
- MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND MINISTER  
OF ROADS:  
Minister of Local Government and Roads  
Department.  
Highways and Local Government Department.
- 1/4/65 Municipal Tramways Trust Act,  
1935-1952 committed to Minister  
of Transport in lieu of  
Minister of Works.
- MINISTER OF MINES:  
Department of Mines.
- 20/5/65 Civil Aviation (Carrier's Lia-  
bility) Act, 1962, committed to  
Minister of Transport in lieu  
of Minister of Railways.
- MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND MINISTER OF  
TRANSPORT:  
Minister of Transport Department (including  
Transport Control Board as a Branch of  
the Minister's Department).  
South Australian Railways.
- PORT PIRIE OCCUPATION CENTRE.  
Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Edu-  
cation a reply to a question I asked him some  
time ago regarding the erection of a centre  
for retarded children at Port Pirie?  
The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director  
of the Public Buildings Department states that  
the Port Pirie Occupation Centre is to be  
erected departmentally and that work on the  
building is expected to commence at the end  
of next month.
- MINISTER OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY:  
Department of Labour and Industry.
- MINISTER OF LANDS, MINISTER OF REPATRIA-  
TION AND MINISTER OF IRRIGATION:  
Lands Department.  
Botanic Gardens Department.
- MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE:  
Minister of Agriculture Department.  
Agriculture Department.  
Agricultural College Department.  
Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Depart-  
ment.  
Produce Department.  
Chemistry Department.
- MINISTER OF FORESTS:  
Woods and Forests Department.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF ACTS.

Details of proclamations committing the administration of Acts to Ministers are shown in the table of regulations, rules, proclamations etc. published in the annual volume of South Australian Statutes.

Variations made since publication of the 1964 volumes are as follows:—

Date of Proclamation.	Details.
18/3/65	Road and Railway Transport Act, 1939-1964, committed to Minister of Transport in lieu of Minister of Railways.
18/3/65	Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956-1963, to Minister of Transport in lieu of Minister of Local Government.
18/3/65	South Australian Railways Commission's Act, 1936-1957, to the Minister of Transport.

#### REFERENDA.

Mr. HALL: I assure the Premier that the question I am about to ask is within his province, for he spoke on the subject during the election campaign. My question concerns the holding of referenda in this State on social issues. I believe that during the election campaign the then Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier, indicated to the electorate that, on gaining office, he would hold a referendum to ascertain whether the people of this State desired a State lottery. In addition to holding a referendum on the question of a lottery, does the Premier also intend to initiate a referendum to ascertain the people's attitude to 10 o'clock hotel closing in this State?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: No request has been received and no decision has been made concerning the extension of hotel hours.

Mr. Hall: What about a lottery?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: In conformity with the firm and publicized policy of this



Government, representations have already been made to the appropriate authorities to have certain matters ready. All I can indicate at this stage is that such matters as these are being attended to as speedily as possible.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier referred to a State lottery and a referendum therefor, but, although I listened attentively to what he said, I am not sure that I entirely understood the purport of his answer. I think that he said that representations had been made to have certain matters ready. Can the Premier say whether that means matters of an administrative nature concerned with the referendum or whether it means the preparation of the Bill on this subject for introduction into the House?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I shall not go into detail on this matter. My advisers inform me that prior to the introduction of any Bill concerned with the referendum it would be necessary to give certain notice to the Electoral Department. I should have thought that the honourable member would be aware of that fact. Initially there was some hesitancy about this because of the uncertainty over what might occur in the Commonwealth Parliament. There was an indication early in the session that it was likely that a further redivision of Commonwealth districts would apply. However, I now understand that the new redivision will not be used for the next election of the Commonwealth Parliament: it will take effect after that election. The position, as it now stands, is that the Electoral Department will be responsible for having the rolls ready. That is as far as we have gone. Of course, the next step will be the introduction of Bills to give effect to the referendum.

#### BEACHPORT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN: On February 4, I received a letter from the former Minister of Works concerning the Beachport water supply. That letter states:

The latest report from the Engineer-in-Chief advises that arrangements have been completed with the Director of Mines for the drilling of three bores at Beachport to investigate the possibilities of obtaining shallow underground water suitable for township supplies. The Director anticipates carrying out this work during April of this year.

Will the Minister ascertain for me whether in fact these bores were sunk, and if they were, what the result was?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to do that, and I will advise the honourable member as soon as I have a report.

#### PORT PATERSON.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think my question is properly addressed to the Premier, because it concerns encouragement of industry and his department is handling that matter. Can he say whether Cabinet has yet had an opportunity to examine the proposals which the previous Government had drawn up and which had been reported on by the Public Works Committee concerning the establishment of a port to be called Port Paterson for the shipping of salt overseas?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I have an idea that some representation was made by Sir William Bishop, who waited on me about this matter.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He is the Chairman of the company.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I have given authority for him to proceed. I have not had a report since my interview with him, but I recall giving him the green light to go ahead and wishing him every success.

#### WEST BEACH SCHOOL.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Education tell me whether the Education Department has considered the construction of a primary school in the West Beach area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get that information for the honourable member.

#### GILES POINT.

Mr. FERGUSON: Last week I addressed several questions to the Minister of Works concerning the appointment of a committee to be set up to inquire into bulk handling facilities in connection with the construction of deep-sea facilities at Giles Point. As I have been told that the Minister of Agriculture will have some control over this committee, I now ask him whether, if and when the report of the committee is concluded, it will be made available only to Cabinet or tabled in this House?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have taken this matter further. I shall be happy to table the committee's report so that Parliament may know all about it.

#### PORT PIRIE HOUSING.

Mr. McKEE: As the result of the proposed expansion by the Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie, the work force is expected to increase by about 400. Will the Premier obtain from the Housing Trust, a report on whether it intends to build more houses at Port Pirie? Will he also ascertain

whether the trust has purchased more land and, if it has, where that land is situated?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I shall be pleased to obtain a report from the Housing Trust.

#### ST. KILDA FORESHORE.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a further reply to my question of last week concerning development at St. Kilda?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I have looked into this matter and find that the previous Government did not make any promises whatever in connection with this proposal.

In May, 1964, the then District Council of Salisbury and Elizabeth approached the Director of the Tourist Bureau by letter, enclosing its engineer's report and plan of a proposed scheme for continuous small-boat access to the sea and foreshore improvements for St. Kilda. The letter sought aid from the Government "in the carrying out of a comprehensive investigation and towards the provision of financial assistance." The council's engineer estimated the cost of a wide embankment about 4,000ft. long to deeper water as £150,000.

The Harbors Board authorized a technical investigation and check of the estimated cost. This investigation was undertaken by the board's Engineer for Planning and Development, who submitted his report on January 28, 1965. In regard to the council's estimate of cost, the board's engineer stated:

The figure of £150,000 for the total cost is a roughly prepared one which appears to cut everything to the lowest degree and omits many essential items. Rock protection for the outer faces is omitted, paving extent and bridge length are considered inadequate, lighting, drainage, water services are not mentioned and it is doubtful if all the filling can be obtained for the cost allowed. No provision is made for contingencies to cover uncertainties and unforeseen costs or for interest on loan moneys over such a long period of construction.

In the summary of his report, the Engineer for Planning and Development stated:

1. The scheme proposed by the Salisbury District Council is feasible but modifications are desirable.

2. The total estimated cost of a modified scheme is £1,390,000. A useful first stage could be constructed for an estimated cost of £835,000.

3. Further investigations into construction, materials and methods are considered necessary before this work is proceeded with.

This report was forwarded to the Tourist Bureau by the then Minister and the then Premier on March 10 last, and on March 15 the Director of the Tourist Bureau forwarded a copy of the Harbors Board report to the Town Clerk, City of Salisbury. He also sent

a copy of same to the honourable member. On March 17, 1965, the Town Clerk acknowledged receipt of this letter and said:

The cost of the scheme is such that the council will need to give thorough investigation to the proposal to ascertain whether it desires to proceed with this development. Council could feel that the scheme may be entered on a long term basis provided that Government support was possible and that sufficient finance could be obtained.

#### CEMENT SHORTAGE.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Premier an answer to my recent question about the shortage of cement in this State?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: A report from the Adelaide Cement Company Limited states:

The following facts are set out in response to your request for information regarding cement supplies:

A year ago the cement companies had three kilns operating and one kiln idle to deal with any increase in demand.

The fourth kiln was brought into operation but some shortage has developed due substantially to an unprecedented increase of demand over the past twelve months exceeding the productive capacity of the two South Australian companies. It is not correct that large quantities of cement are being exported to other States. Some cement crosses the borders, but a relatively small proportion. The first shipment of 9,000 tons of imported clinker is due to arrive at Outer Harbour on May 27, having been delayed in transit from Japan by extremely adverse weather, with four days lost. A second shipment of 10,000 tons is due early in June. Negotiations are in progress for further supplies to augment the local output until local production suffices. An additional kiln, capable of providing a further 225,000 tons annually, has been under design and construction since April, 1964, at a cost of some £2,250,000.

#### MILLICENT SEWERAGE.

Mr. CORCORAN: I understand that the programme for sewerage in the South-East has been organized so that when work tapers off at Mount Gambier it will commence at Bordertown, and so that when this tapers off, work will commence at Millicent. Because of the development that has taken place since the decision of the advisory committee about the programme, because of the projected development in Millicent, and because of the unsuitability of the land for septic systems in that town, will the Minister of Works ask the advisory committee on sewerage in country areas to reconsider its decision and to place Millicent ahead of Bordertown on the sewerage programme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter has been pursued for a long time by people

in the Millicent area amongst whom the honourable member has been the most persistent. The committee considered the order in which country towns should be sewered, having special regard to health requirements. The honourable member has tendered what I consider to be fresh evidence.

Mr. Corcoran: I can get more.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Because of that, and, because the Housing Trust intends to build more houses in Millicent and has asked that this matter be reconsidered, I shall refer the matter to the advisory committee and ask it to reconsider its decision.

#### AGRICULTURAL SCIENTISTS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand that the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science recently made a survey which showed there is likely to be a shortage of scientists of between 55 and 60 each year until 1971. The survey indicated that the States could provide some trained men and that the number of qualified agricultural scientists from overseas could be increased. Also, men holding diplomas from agricultural colleges could be used on work for which university training was not essential. The subcommittee that undertook the survey stated that Victoria should take early action to increase the number of graduates in agricultural science, and also recommended that similar surveys be made in other States. Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of a shortage of agricultural scientists and, if he is, will he take the necessary action to attract graduates so as to increase the number of agricultural scientists here?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am aware of the report read by the honourable member. I am also aware of the acute shortage in our departments of research officers and skilled personnel. Last week the honourable member for Chaffey asked me a question about a research officer, and I told him (and I say again) that I am considering this matter. I have consulted with the Director of Agriculture and I intend also to consult with the Public Service Commissioner, both of whom are concerned with this shortage. As I am concerned with the situation, I intend to do all I can to overcome the existing shortage.

#### BOOL LAGOON.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the grazing leases at Bool Lagoon, due to expire next year, will be

extended? If they are not to be extended, what is the Government's policy concerning them?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will get a considered reply for the honourable member.

#### TAPEROO HOUSING.

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply to a question I recently asked concerning the number of Housing Trust houses to be erected at Taperoo?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The Housing Trust has erected 550 rental double unit houses in the Taperoo-Osborne area, but no further houses of this kind are now intended; 300 rental-purchase houses have been erected in this area, and in due course a further 143 will be built. At Osborne 12 cottage flats have been erected; 35 are now under construction there. It is intended to erect 15 cottage flats at Taperoo and 20 at Swansea.

#### SCHOOL LIBRARIES.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister of Education a reply dealing with the progress of school libraries and the staffing thereof?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Every primary school has some form of library and many of the larger schools have both a central and a classroom library. Every new school building is provided with a suitable large library room with an adjacent library store and workroom. In most of the older schools a room is made available for use as a central library. The purchase of all library books is fully subsidized. To assist school committees and heads of schools in the selection of suitable books for their library, lists of suggested new acquisitions are published periodically in the *Education Gazette*. In all the larger primary schools where a teacher-librarian is appointed, this teacher-librarian is freed from class teaching for half of each day and from lunch-time supervision duties to enable her to concentrate on library duties.

Three courses for the training of teacher-librarians have already been held or are now in progress and a fourth course is due to begin in July this year. So far 60 teacher-librarians have been trained and appointed to schools and 22 more are likely to complete their course and receive their appointments as teacher-librarians in the next four weeks. In addition, two teachers completed a year's training in Melbourne at the end of 1964 and gained the Trained Teacher-Librarian's Certificate. These two teachers are at present acting as advisory teacher-librarians and are spending up to a

week in each school assisting in the management of the library and in giving lessons in the use of school libraries. Another teacher was sent last year to the University of New South Wales to take a post-graduate course in librarianship. On the successful completion of this course, this teacher was appointed to take charge of a high school library. In order to ensure that teacher-librarians formerly appointed are kept up to date, the Supervisor of School Libraries is at present conducting short regional inservice courses at Port Pirie, at Berri, and in the metropolitan area.

#### MOONTA SCHOOL.

Mr. HUGHES: I recently informed the Minister of Education of the unhealthy condition of the toilets at the Moonta Primary School, and I asked him to have the complaint investigated with a view to erecting new toilets at that school. Has he a report?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been informed by the Public Buildings Department that tenders for the erection of new toilets for the Moonta Primary School will be called in this week's *Government Gazette*. They will close on June 22 and, subject to a satisfactory tender being received, a contract will be let and every effort made to expedite the work.

#### ISLINGTON FARM.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Works any information relating to a question I asked him early in the session about the Government's intentions regarding the future of the Islington sewage farm?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member who has asked the question, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), and I are all interested in this matter. A scheme is being planned in which the Prospect, Hindmarsh and Enfield councils will be involved and, as I believe a meeting is to be held tomorrow night, I have endeavoured to obtain a report. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, who is also chairman of the committee concerned has supplied the following information:

I regret that the committee appointed to consider and submit recommendations in regard to the future use of the sewage farm has not yet been able to submit a final report. The committee has met on several occasions but during the course of its deliberations it has been found necessary to make certain alterations, mainly to accommodate the proposed freeway and a possible future railway line. This has involved considerable detailed design work on the part of the Highways and

Local Government Department. These difficulties are now being ironed out and a full report will be available shortly. Land between the proposed freeway and the existing railways land will be required for railway purposes and an area should be reserved for future use by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. However, I am able to say at this stage that the committee will recommend setting aside an area of approximately 100 acres extending from Days Road to the freeway for recreation purposes.

As soon as a final report comes to hand I will inform the member for Enfield, the member for Torrens, and the three councils concerned, in order that they may be able to make the progress they desire.

#### ACCOMMODATION FOR DISABLED.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to the suggestion I made last week concerning housing for the handicapped?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am informed that the Housing Trust will, in a few weeks, call for tenders for a group of dwellings specially designed to meet the needs of persons confined to wheelchairs. Before the designs were prepared the trust sought and accepted advice as to what was desirable to be provided from officials of the Repatriation General Hospital Rehabilitation Centre, the Red Cross Society, the R.A.H. Paraplegic Centre at Northfield, and the Phoenix Society. The trust is therefore reasonably confident that the houses will achieve the desired purpose.

#### RENMARK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CURREN: In December last year I received, by letter, information from the Minister of Education indicating that approval had been given for the drawing up of plans for the new primary school in solid construction at Renmark. Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the stage that planning for this school has reached? Further, will he ascertain whether provision will be included in the building programme for next year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a reply for the honourable member.

#### HOUSE PAINTING.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently I received complaints regarding the methods used by a painting firm to get customers in Unley and other areas. Has the Attorney-General any knowledge of men canvassing for the work of painting houses, obtaining a deposit for the work and then disappearing? Can he say whether any action has been taken about this racket?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am grateful to the honourable member for raising this matter. A racket in the City of Adelaide has given my department considerable concern. It has happened, as the honourable member said, that certain people, who have traded under business names that have not been registered under the Business Names Act, have gone from house to house giving quotes for the painting of houses (particularly the roofs of houses) at a fairly reasonable figure and obtained deposits. It has then been extremely difficult for the people paying deposits to get any work done or even to find the men concerned. Unfortunately, because of the way these people have gone about their business it has been difficult to prove criminal fraud in these cases despite the suspicions one might have concerning the conduct of these individuals. A certain number of them have been prosecuted for breaches of the Business Names Act and substantial fines have been imposed. However, I urge that publicity be given to this matter to warn householders against paying deposits for the painting of houses because many people who have been caught in this way have complained to my department.

Mr. Jennings: They can afford to be cheap if they don't do it at all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid that that is the case. The deposits have varied from £15 to £30, and the costs of recovering money from these people are of such dimensions that it has been uneconomical for the unfortunate depositors to throw good money after bad. I hope that householders will be warned by my statement today of what is taking place and will not pay deposits without taking the greatest care to find out with whom they are dealing.

#### HACKNEY BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the reconstruction and rebuilding of the Hackney bridge over the Torrens River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states that a contract has been let for the construction of the Hackney bridge over the Torrens River which will be on the downstream side of the existing one. Pile driving for the foundations has commenced. It is expected that the construction will be completed in March, 1966. The contract price for the bridge is £53,666.

#### RENMARK RIVER FRONT.

Mr. CURREN: Recently I had the pleasure of introducing to the Minister of Works a deputation from the Renmark Corporation on the matter of financial assistance for the repair to the damaged section of the river front at Renmark. Has the Minister a report on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage of the Engineering and Water Supply Department has prepared sections, quantities and a rough estimate of cost for stone pitching, and the design and cost are now being checked by the Design Branch. As soon as this has been completed, Mr. Dridan will submit a report to me and I will inform the honourable member.

#### TRANSPORT CONTROL BOARD.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Last week I asked the Premier a question about Government policy on the Transport Control Board. A Minister in another place has said that it is the policy in the department, and the Government's policy, to reinstate the board. When I asked the Premier whether the Government's policy would mean new permits that would affect the primary producers' right to cart their stock, he said he would take up the matter with his colleague and get a report. Has he that report?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: No, not yet.

#### SHEPHERDS HILL ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the reconstruction of Shepherds Hill Road in my district. For many months a section of this road just west of the Five Ways at Blackwood and running down to about Seymour Avenue, which is the entrance to the new Blackwood High School, has been under reconstruction and in a very rough and unsealed condition, making it extremely muddy and bumpy. Suggestions have been made to me that during the time this section of the road, or any other section, is under reconstruction some speed limit should be imposed on the section, apart from the 15 miles per hour limit past works in progress, because in some sections of it no work is in progress at the moment. Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Roads to consider seeking the imposition of a speed limit on those sections of Shepherds Hill Road under reconstruction at present?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to take up that matter with my colleague.

## WEST COAST RAILWAYS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG (on notice):

1. How many miles of railway line between Cummins and Kimba have been reconstructed?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to complete this line to Buckleboo?
3. Is it intended to renew the line from Cummins to Thevenard?
4. When is it anticipated that a start will be made on this work?
5. When will the new line from Thevenard to Kevin be completed?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. Since 1960, 44 miles of track have been relaid between Cummins and Kimba.
2. Relaying will be continued towards Buckleboo.
3. Since 1960, eight miles of track have been relaid between Thevenard and Wandana.
4. Relaying between Cummins and Thevenard will be continued during the next financial year.
5. It is expected that the new railway between Ceduna and Kevin will be opened for traffic before December 31, 1965.

## PREMIER'S ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Did the Commissioner of Police offer the Government accommodation for the Premier and his staff in the new police building, or did the Government request him to provide it?
2. For what purpose was that part of the new police building used, or proposed to be used, prior to its allocation to the Premier and his department?
3. What alternative arrangements for police accommodation, made necessary by this allocation, have been made?
4. What was the cost of preparing this accommodation for the Premier and his department?
5. What was the cost of furnishing it?
6. What was the cost of removal of the Premier and his department from the Treasury to the new police building?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The replies are:

1. The Commissioner of Police was not approached by the Government on this matter. The need for additional accommodation for the Premier's Department was reported to the Public Service Commissioner and he subsequently advised that sufficient space was available in the Police building.
2. That part of the new Police building now occupied by the Premier's Department consisted of:

- (a) The office of the Superintendent in charge of Region D.
  - (b) A waiting room in connection with the examination room.
  - (c) A large room in which it was proposed to conduct police recruiting and other examinations.
3. The alternative arrangements for police accommodation are:
- (a) The Superintendent in charge of Region D has moved to the office set aside for the Officer-in-Charge of Region E, who will remain at Elizabeth.
  - (b) The waiting room has been dispensed with.
  - (c) Recruiting examinations will be conducted at the Police Barracks, Thebarton, as in the past.
4. Cost of preparing accommodation for the Premier and his department was £3,238.
  5. Cost of furnishing was £2,665.
  6. Cost of removal from the Treasury Building to the Police building was £35.

There would not be much difference between the cost of shifting the department to the Police building and the cost of shifting the Minister of Works department in the previous Government.

## GRAPE PRICES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (on notice): Will the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner earlier this year be paid for grapes sold to wine makers during the 1965 vintage?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The Government considers that the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner for the 1965 vintage are fair and reasonable, and the Wine and Brandy Makers Association has been informed accordingly. At the present time there is no legislative authority to enforce payment of these prices.

## PARLIAMENTARY DRAFTSMAN.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That Standing Order No. 85 be so far suspended for the remainder of the session as to enable the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant to be accommodated with seats in the Chamber on the right-hand side of the Speaker.

Motion carried.

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

(Continued from May 20. Page 132.)

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): It is traditional that, if the Opposition has any matters it wishes to bring under the Government's notice, this is the appropriate time to do it. As the Supplementary Estimates give very limited scope for debate, I wish to bring two matters specifically before the Government's notice before we proceed to deal with the Estimates. The first matter is one that did not concern the late Government at all as a principle, but it did have some serious implications which should be considered by the present Government. I hope that the error made in this matter will not be permitted to occur again. I refer to the reversal of the agreement made between the Housing Trust and the Adelaide City Council regarding the erection of a block of flats on East Terrace. I know the history of this matter, which is that the Housing Trust, without any prompting by the Government of the day, suggested to the Government that it would be appropriate to build a block of flats in the central area.

That was a Housing Trust decision. Over a period, the Government did not encourage the trust to undertake the construction of flats. I have often said that a house should be constructed so that spare land is available. The Housing Trust, an authority controlling its own affairs, had the right, if it desired, to build flats, and it built many of them, mainly of two-storey construction. These flats were profitable to the trust and were well received. The question of building multi-storey flats had not arisen but, when the trust asked whether the Government would agree to one series of flats being erected, I said the Government did not object. The trust negotiated with the Adelaide City Council for the provision of £25,000 towards the cost of the land. The Government had no prime interest in this matter; an agreement was entered into by the trust and the Adelaide City Council. Undoubtedly, this was a binding agreement, a consideration was paid by the council, and the proposals were proceeded with by the trust. Plans and specifications were drawn up and at election time the trust had determined the type of building to be erected. I believe that at that stage the trust was ready to call for

tenders for the construction of this building, but a reversal of the agreement occurred. The Government announced that this proposal was against its policy and would not be proceeded with. I have no doubt that the Housing Trust was pressurized in this matter, because I know the preceding negotiations.

Mr. Jennings: You know the procedure too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not concerned whether the block of flats is built or not, but the Government of the day had nothing to do with the negotiations. It is a bad thing when a public authority repudiates an agreement, and worse if a Government incites a public authority to do so. A substantial payment of £25,000 had been made. True, this amount plus interest was repaid by the trust to the council. However, one cannot get out of an agreement merely by paying back the deposit, and it was wrong to repudiate this agreement, which had been freely made by a public authority. I would not be doing my duty as the Leader of the Opposition if I did not oppose the repudiation of a properly negotiated lawful agreement that had been entered into freely by both parties.

I cannot speak too strongly against a decision that savours of repudiation of an agreement. We believe that an error has been made. Although we were told that the matter was going to be deferred, within a short period the Government announced that part of the land had been sold. That decision was confirmed this afternoon by the Premier's reply to a question by the honourable member for Torrens. As a result of this action, the public's confidence to enter agreements with a public authority will be shaken. The Housing Trust has almost autonomous authority in these matters. The original legislation in 1937 did not provide for any Ministerial authority over the trust. The trust was responsible for the work it was undertaking, for paying back to the Treasurer full interest on the money it borrowed from the Treasury, and for performing, without Ministerial control, the duties assigned to it by Parliament. That position was altered at the request of the Chifley Government, because the trust was being charged certain sales tax and import duties on goods imported into this country. When I asked about this, Mr. Chifley (the then Prime Minister) said that the trust would have to pay sales tax and import duty unless it was made a public undertaking.

He did suggest that the public undertaking could be effected by making the Housing Trust answerable to the Government on a number of limited matters, and he appreciated that we desired to keep this outside Ministerial control. That was the policy of the Government of the day. Speaking again from memory, I believe that the things he suggested would have been suitable for, and were in fact passed in, legislation, which provided that each month the Housing Trust should give a report to the Treasurer on land purchases and prices paid, contracts for houses and the money involved in those contracts, and it was also provided that, I think, every three years a report on the workings of the trust should be obtained and submitted to the Minister. In addition, it provided that the trust, by courtesy (and by courtesy only) should give the Treasurer a list of the houses let, to whom they had been let, and the circumstances of the letting. This applied also to houses that had been sold.

First, I say that it was wrong for a public undertaking to repudiate an agreement; secondly, the Government of the day had no authority whatsoever to ask the trust to repudiate the agreement; and thirdly, it is completely wrong for any public undertaking to be anything other than completely scrupulous, and it should see that every legal agreement entered into is scrupulously carried out. In this instance the agreement was repudiated. It was a lawful agreement, and the mere fact that the Adelaide City Council was paid back its contribution pursuant to the agreement did not legally entitle the trust to abrogate this agreement or to repudiate it. That is wrong, and it is a bad basis for public administration.

I noticed a complaint in the press last week which, in fact was not replied to. I realize an anonymous writer of such a complaint might justifiably be regarded with suspicion but, as the complaint coincided with certain information that had been passed on to me, I should like to submit the matter for the Government's consideration. Honourable members in the last Parliament will remember that on, I think, two occasions an attempt was made by honourable members opposite to have a certain section in the Lottery and Gaming Act deleted. That attempt was supported by at least one member on this side. I do not object to an amendment being brought forward for the consideration of the House. For the benefit of honourable members I shall read the relevant section in the Act:

No person standing in any street shall refuse or neglect to move on when requested by a

police constable so to do, or shall loiter (whether such loitering shall cause or tend to cause any obstruction to traffic or not) in any street or public place after a request having been made to him by any police constable not to so loiter.

That section has often been reported on by the Commissioner of Police, who has pointed out that it is a valuable provision as it stops larrikins from congregating. Indeed, the section has been used from time to time. I understand the reason for the particular writer's anonymity, because in this instance inserting his name could have brought about some unpleasantness. The letter states:

According to local shopkeepers, some of whom have appealed for help without obvious result, nothing can be done about these dead-beats until incidents occur. Recently, while two youths were brawling on a footpath, one received a fractured skull. Isn't this sufficient evidence to warrant an investigation?—

and this is the sentence to which I wish to direct the Treasurer's notice—

The Vice Squad cars just appear to sit and watch. Is this considered constructive?

I wish to know categorically whether the Police Force has been instructed not to use section 63 against loitering. Secondly, has the Chief Secretary instructed the Police Force that, notwithstanding the public views that may have been expressed by honourable members opposite, it is to carry out the law until that law is altered?

Mr. Coumbe: That's the point.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If Parliament takes the responsibility of encouraging larrikins to be a nuisance to the community, that is Parliament's own responsibility until it alters certain legislation. Is there, on the part of the police, any doubt whatever as to whether they will have support from the Government on this matter? This is a question fundamental to the carrying out and maintenance of public order in this State. Are the police to be supported in any action they may take under section 63 to order unwanted elements that might be congregating to the annoyance of the general public to move on? If they do move such people on, will they receive the Government's support, or will they be told that the Government views such action with considerable disfavour? If that provision is to be altered, that is all right, provided it is altered in the proper way by this Parliament. On behalf of the Opposition, I say that we do not approve of the laws of the land being altered by administrative act. Let me make that clear: we will not approve and we will



oppose in every way possible any attempt to alter the laws of the land by administrative act. When the Treasurer replies in this debate, I want him to give a categorical assurance that the laws of the land will be administered until Parliament sees fit to alter them. Then of course, it is the responsibility of Parliament, and the Government cannot be held responsible.

Mr. Lawn: Is the Legislative Council responsible?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member is out of order in referring to the Legislative Council. The fact is that it is not proper (and I say this without fear of contradiction) for the Government to try to alter the laws of the land by administrative act. That course can result only in bad administration and lawlessness in our community and in innocent persons being subjected to all types of abuse and vulgar remarks when proceeding along the street lawfully. I do not wish to delay the debate, but this is an occasion when the Opposition has the right to air grievances. I make two points: first, that it is improper for a public undertaking to repudiate a law passed in Parliament; and secondly, that it would be improper to alter the laws of the land by administrative act, particularly in a matter that so closely concerns the safety and welfare of the community.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): My comments will be related to, but not similar to, the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I wish to refer to the principle involved in the second point he made: the suggestion that the laws of the community should be altered by administrative act. I refer to this matter in connection with the questions recently asked in the House about the Appila silo.

Mr. Ryan: Appila silo—it is like a serial.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member knew what I was going to say and I am not surprised that he was so quick to know because this is a matter on which the Government appears to have satisfied itself by saying that Government policy overrides the established Statutes. I am concerned with the principle involved. However, I wish to make it clear at the outset that I am not necessarily advocating that a silo should be built at Appila or anywhere else. I have no particular knowledge of the geography of this area, although I know it reasonably well. I know that it is some distance from Appila to Wirrabara. This is a steep track and it will be costly for those people who use it to carry grain, by heavy haulage, to the railway point. People in this district urgently and ardently desire

that a silo should be provided for their use and I cannot blame them for this as I believe that, if bulk handling of grain is to mean anything worthwhile to a farmer, he should be able to deliver grain to the silo straight off the header and, therefore, he should have in close proximity (where it is financially and practically possible) such facilities as would enable him to do this. I am not taking up the cause of whether it is advisable to build a silo at Appila. However, I understand the desires of those who want a silo in the area and these desires are perfectly natural and proper.

The first indication that I had of the Government's intention on this matter was a statement that appeared in the *Advertiser* of March 24, soon after the Government took over the administration of the State. The Treasurer was reported to have said, at the opening of the biennial conference of the South Australian Division of the Australian Federated Union of the Locomotive Engine-men at the Trades Hall, that not enough was being done to go out and get business for the railways. I agree with this point and I have said in this House often (particularly in my earlier days, when I was a back bench member) that I thought the department officials could do much to help themselves in this matter if they adopted a businessman's approach to railway administration. I said that the Commissioner and his staff could do many things to attract business to the organization if they went about it in the same way as a businessman goes about the job of getting business for his company. Later in this article the Treasurer is reported to have said:

State Cabinet had turned down a proposal for a silo at Appila because it was nowhere near a railway system.

The only reason that the Treasurer is reported to have given on this occasion for declining the request of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to build a silo at Appila was that it was nowhere near a railway. Subsequent questions on this matter have confirmed that this will be Government policy. The Treasurer said in this House unequivocally that the Government would not permit the erection of silos at points where no railway service was provided except (I think this is what he said and I do not wish to misquote him) in certain areas in which grain was produced in quantity and which were remote from a railway system. He said that commonsense would dictate the Government's policy in those cases. I

am not concerned with that either, but I am concerned with the legal implications of this alleged Government decision. I think I know something about the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, for I was in this House when it was framed and took part in the discussions in the Party room before the legislation was introduced. I interested myself in the debates on the Bill, and I subsequently administered the Act for two years as Minister of Agriculture.

In order to establish more fully the ground on which I am standing at the moment, I should like to refer very briefly to what has happened since that Act was passed. The co-operative that was set up as the result of the franchise given to it under that legislation has, in my opinion, a very creditable record in carrying out the terms of the Act and its obligations thereunder. Only the other day in another place the Hon. Mr. Octoman caused to be inserted in *Hansard*, by leave of that Chamber, a schedule which sets out the accomplishments of the co-operative in respect of the provisions of facilities for bulk handling of grain in this State. He showed that in barely ten years since its inauguration the company has built in South Australia 116 silos with a total storage capacity of 38,990,000 bushels of wheat, 5,735,000 bushels of barley, and 1,055,000 bushels of oats, representing a total storage capacity of 45,780,000 bushels. The interesting thing is that the company has been able to finance its operations out of moneys which have been contributed by growers, out of bank overdrafts, and out of receipts for the hire and use of its storage facilities from the Wheat Board to the point now where its overdraft to the bank has been reduced to very modest proportions, and it is able to give to growers an assurance that some of the tolls that they have paid will be repaid according to the original intention stated in the approach to the legislation. I understand that it promised to repay about £12,000,000, and it would appear that it is able to make good its promise, notwithstanding that it has constructed far more storage facilities providing far greater capacity than was ever expected would be necessary at the time this Act was passed. I mention that to show that this co-operative, because of the record of its achievements, deserves the most sympathetic consideration by the Government and the recognition that it has carried out its job faithfully and well and does not need to be wet-nursed by the Government or anyone else in making decisions as to what it shall do.

The section in the Act which refers to the construction of silos at various places is section 14. That section has been read and I do not intend to repeat it. It mentions that there are two matters which the co-operative shall submit to the Minister before it goes ahead with the erection of a storage facility. The two matters required to be referred concern the design and the materials with which it is intended to construct the facilities. At first sight it may seem that these are trivial matters to be referred to the Minister, but for the benefit of those members who were not in this place at the time the Act was framed I should like to mention why that was stipulated. Much investigation was made and much information sought and obtained regarding the type of silo that should be used in South Australia. At that time the Victorian Grain Elevators Board on the one hand had used concrete verticle construction. The Western Australian grain authority had used horizontal type construction and all sorts of somewhat improvised types of construction that I had the opportunity to examine closely in the couple of years during the war when I was posted in Western Australia on Air Force duty. It was a most important point and a matter subject to much debate and consideration at that time as to what sort of silos we should build in South Australia. If any member looks up the evidence given to the Public Works Committee he will see that it was nothing short of voluminous. It was deemed necessary to stipulate in the legislation giving the co-operative the franchise that this requirement should be inserted in the Bill, and that before the company went ahead with the construction of facilities it should refer these matters, which were considered to be of paramount importance, to the Minister.

However, nowhere in the Act does it say that the co-operative shall be governed by the Minister regarding any location at which it should put a bin. Certainly the Act does say that the company shall provide sufficient storage to accommodate the wheat, and that where Government money is involved to serve the facilities and to load the grain from them, it should submit these matters to the Minister for consideration; but it does not at any point say that the co-operative may not construct a silo at any point that it desires: it only says it must construct sufficient of them. In those circumstances, under what authority does the Government, and under what Act does the Treasurer, now blithely say to the railwaymen that the Government has turned down a

silo at Appila? I submit that this is an action that is not in accordance with the legal provisions of the Act. An interesting point is that when the matter was raised in this House several Ministers, with smiles on their faces, simply said, "Oh, it is Government policy." That interjection may not be recorded in *Hansard*, but every member in this Chamber heard it said, and I do not think the Ministers will deny it. I submit that at that stage they had not had sufficient warning that they should have a look at the Act. I can quite understand their saying that it is Government policy, but Government policy cannot run contrary to the legal provisions which govern the matter. I submit that if the Opposition has any role in Parliament at all its first responsibility is to see that the Government lives within its own law.

I was the first Minister to administer this Act in all its implications. The late Mr. Christian set it up and got it going; it was carried on for a time by Sir Thomas Playford in an acting capacity as Minister of Agriculture, and I took it over from there. It became evident very early in the company's operation that one of the chief criticisms levelled at it was its inability to set up sufficient storages everywhere quickly enough to satisfy the demands of farmers. During the whole of its operative career and even up to now, when it has reached a fairly full stage of sufficiency, the criticism has been that it is not able to build silos fast enough and at enough centres. But for the Government or the Minister to be involved in local arguments as to whether a silo should be put at point A before it went to point B was the kind of thing no Government or Minister wanted to be involved in. Governments can get involved in enough unpopular things without buying into this one. I for one never wanted to be involved in this degree of controversy. So for that reason, if for no other, the Government would be wise to keep out of this matter.

The other important point is that during the debate on this legislation in 1955 (and as I point out, ever since so far as the previous Government is concerned) we wished to ensure that the company should be master of its own affairs in every possible way. We did not desire to interfere with the domestic or administrative decisions of the co-operative. Several members in the House then were concerned at certain proposals in the legislation that would involve the co-operative's being subservient to Government administration. We believe that this co-operative should

be autonomous. It was being financed by growers' own money; financial advances necessary to assist it were being repaid and serviced by the growers, and although the Government guaranteed some advances, it was not involved in spending money. The growers were responsible for the repayments, and the co-operative and the growers have met their obligations in full.

It was intended, at one stage, that two Government nominees should be appointed to the board. No-one complained about that, for these men were eminently suited for the task of assisting the board. Mr. Rosevear (of the Railways Department) and Mr. Dean (of the Department of Labour and Industry), rendered signal assistance with engineering and other problems of the co-operative. As Minister, I had frequent conferences with these gentlemen on important matters. Parliament was concerned to see that the co-operative functioned without Ministerial control. An amendment proposed to be inserted in another place intended that the Government nominees on the board would have the power of veto, and be able to veto the board's decision (if they felt it necessary) of the proposed appointment of a co-operative manager. We had a donnybrook in this House on the matter that came to us from the Legislative Council as an amendment to the Act, which made it clear and specific that the Government members on the board should have the right to veto the appointment of a chairman. We debated these amendments at some length and eventually a vote was taken. Prior to that event, the Minister introducing the Bill, when referring to the way in which the grain authorities in other States were under Government control, said:

In other States every individual item has to be scrutinized. We do not propose that here; so long as we are satisfied with the type of installation proposed, the wheatgrowers can go ahead and install the bins at the points where they are required to install them.

In addition to that, during the second reading debate, I said:

I do not agree that the Minister should have such control over the company as would make it subservient to him . . . Having given it a charter, we should allow the company to conduct its business untrammelled as far as possible.

This was in respect to the proposal to control the election of a manager. Later, this House debated the proposed Legislative Council amendment about the veto of the appointment of the chairman. I find that the Government of the day was anxious to accept the

amendment. At the same time several members of my Party were also anxious to accept an amendment to make the appointment of a manager subject to the concurrence of the Government nominees on the board. I warned the Minister that if the Government persisted in its amendment I should vote against it. Those who supported me were the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran), and members of the Opposition Party in the House. The Chairman declared the vote carried in the affirmative, but the House divided on it as follows:

Ayes (13).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian (teller), Geoffrey Clarke, Dunnage, Goldney, Hincks, Sir George Jenkins, Messrs. Jenkins, McIntosh, Pattinson, Playford, Shannon, and Travers.

Noes (17).—Messrs. John Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Fletcher, Heaslip (teller), Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, O'Halloran, Pearson, Quirke, Stephens, Stott, Tapping, Frank Walsh, Fred Walsh, and White.

The Noes had a majority of four and the Legislative Council's amendments were defeated. The people who did most about it were the Labor Party Opposition together with a few rebels such as Mr. Heaslip, myself, and the Hon. T. C. Stott, who was always a rebel and still is.

Our main support in this matter came from the present Premier and such of his Ministers as were in the House at the time. Now we find in this short time, the Government, flexing its muscles and feeling its strength in administration, has, for some blithe reason in order to encourage railwaymen, stated that no more silos will be built away from railway lines. The independence and autonomy, which members supported by their vote at that time when dealing with the amendment as I have outlined, is at present being withdrawn, because of the Government's administrative desires. This is entirely wrong. It is a reversal of form—not the first we have seen by the Government in its short time in office and certainly not the last. Necessity sometimes overcomes mere expedience and the hard realities of administration sometimes point out that it is impossible to put quickly made promises into effect.

I object on the ground that it is the Opposition's proper and essential function in this House to point out where the Government is going astray in legal aspects of its administration. I believe that this is a matter the Government will have to consider carefully, not only from this aspect but on the greater issue that the Government at all times must live

within its own law, and that any abrogation of that principle will be sturdily opposed by members on this side.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I refer to an important matter that can affect the electors of my district and many in other districts in this State. The Government's announcement that it would defer construction of deep-sea loading facilities at Giles Point was received with great disappointment by people living on Yorke Peninsula. Those people were assured that they would receive facilities for bulking their grain on the southern portion of Yorke Peninsula, only to be told later that it would be deferred.

In 1839, Robert Cook, an early explorer of Yorke Peninsula, made a fairly accurate forecast when, having sailed along the coast of Yorke Peninsula on a voyage of discovery, he wrote in his log book:

Landed at Hardwicke Bay; made a circuit of about 16 miles inland, but found no water. The country is fairly level and fairly well wooded.

The most important thing he said was this:

In all probability the peninsula will in time be a great agricultural district.

Since those days, by the sweat of their brows, the early pioneers of Yorke Peninsula have developed their land, so that today it has become one of the biggest cereal-producing parts of the State, particularly the limited area at the southern end of the peninsula. Of course, in the early days shipping difficulties arose, and it was necessary to establish many small outports, so that ketches could carry grain away from this narrow strip of land. The grain trade was developed by the ketches and by the great windjammers which used to come into Port Victoria to load cereal, particularly wheat in those days, for export to other countries.

In the course of time Edithburgh (which was named after Lady Edith Ferguson, the wife of a Governor of South Australia) became the principal port on Yorke Peninsula, situated on its southern end. I believe that, at one time in this State's history, Edithburgh was considered to be the third most important port in the State, for it loaded not only grain produced on the peninsula but also salt and gypsum. If these deep-sea loading facilities were established at Giles Point the salt and gypsum trade might be developed in the future. For many years there has been agitation for a deep-sea port in the south of the peninsula to export grain. Edithburgh at one time was declared a South Australian outport for grain. In 1959, after bulk handling

facilities had been established at Ardrossan, the differential rose overnight from 1d. to 9d., and honourable members will realize what this would mean to primary producers, particularly of cereal, on Yorke Peninsula. Is it any wonder that they have been asking for deep-sea loading facilities in the south of the peninsula? Following the differential rise from 1d. to 9d. a committee was formed to further investigate the possibilities of a grain outlet on the southern part of the peninsula. The then Premier visited Edithburgh in February, 1963, he conferred with this committee, and he told it of the difficulties associated with establishing a facility at Edithburgh.

The Harbors Board had then reported that deeper facilities there would involve not only deepening and strengthening the berth but also providing a swinging and approach channel. The dredging of the channel along the long, shallow approach to this port would have brought about exorbitant costs. In the evidence given to the Public Works Committee, when it investigated the matter of a deep-sea loading facility at Giles Point, I believe the Harbors Board estimated the cost of establishing Edithburgh as a deep-sea port would have been over £1,000,000. The Premier then said that, if investigations proved favourable, the Public Works Committee would be asked to investigate the proposition for recommendation, or otherwise. Investigations confirmed the existence of deep water close to shore, and borings established the fact that, whereas rock existed on the seabed, it was soft and capable of having piles driven into it. Based on the results of these investigations the board prepared alternative schemes for establishing these deep-sea facilities, and proposals were submitted to the Public Works Committee on January 9, 1964. The committee on that occasion made an exhaustive inquiry, and evidence was taken from the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, the Australian Wheat Board, and the Barley Board. The committee visited the peninsula and took evidence at Yorketown from local primary producers interested in the scheme. It also took evidence from the Department of Agriculture. As a result of the evidence submitted to the committee, the Chairman reported to Cabinet on December 14, 1964, that the proposal for Giles Point had been recommended at a cost of £844,000, and that the committee had also recommended that there be a terminal bin constructed at a cost of £500,000. Immediately following that a press statement stated:

The Minister of Marine (Mr. Pearson) announced today that he had advised Mr. J. R. Ferguson (member for Yorke Peninsula) of

the Public Works Committee's recommendation that bulk loading facilities should be constructed at Giles Point at an estimated cost of £844,000. In accordance with the Government's undertaking, steps will now be taken to give effect to this recommendation.

At the same time I made a press statement saying that this was some of the best news that had come to southern Yorke Peninsula in its history. I said that I felt sure that the development of that portion of the State would be much enhanced. The announcement of the present Government of the deferment of the loading facilities at Edithburgh was a great disappointment to me and to the people of Yorke Peninsula. I had been informed by the former Minister that Cabinet had approved this work and that the Harbors Board had been instructed to commence working plans.

There are many good reasons why the establishment and construction of deep-sea loading facilities at Giles Point should be proceeded with immediately and I intend to state some of them. First, I believe these facilities should be constructed because, in evidence presented to the Public Works Committee, it was shown that the Giles Point project would be economically self-sufficient. In all outports where belt-loading facilities are provided for handling grain, it is well known that the charge has been about 2d. a bushel, and I believe that, on the last season's harvest, that sum has been reduced. Growers on the southern portion of Yorke Peninsula were given to understand that unless they were prepared to pay an additional differential to cover the interest of capital outlay they would have little hope of these facilities being provided. Although they were a little concerned because all the other facilities had been placed at outports without this additional charge (and they had indirectly contributed) they ultimately agreed to pay the extra charge. It had been estimated that at a 100,000 ton throughput the charge would be 5d. and this meant that the growers delivering to Giles Point would have to accept a differential of 3d. over and above the 2d. already charged at other outports. It has been estimated that during any normal season grain deliveries would ensure a return of 9 per cent on capital outlay. Production during the harvest just completed would have provided a return of 11 per cent. It is firmly believed, that with new development and the natural increase therefrom because of the advent of manganese spraying on the southern portion of Yorke Peninsula, these figures could be considerably exceeded in future years.

The second reason why I believe that these facilities should be provided is that southern Yorke Peninsula growers should not be denied the opportunity of adopting modern economical bulk handling and modern farming practices. Many of the growers of cereal have been paying tolls to the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. for many years particularly in respect to wheat, but they have not been able to enjoy the use of facilities provided by this company because silos have not been provided within reasonable distance. When the bulk handling company endeavoured to get growers of barley to sign for tolls to be taken from deliveries for the commencement of bulking barley, Yorke Peninsula growers were reluctant. I should say that barley producers and primary producers during the last harvest, on the lower portion of Yorke Peninsula had voluntarily signed up to pay the co-operative tolls in respect of barley in the knowledge that Giles Point had Government approval and that these facilities would be constructed. Therefore, I again ask how long producers on the southern portion of Yorke Peninsula will be denied the right to use the facilities for which they are making some contribution. If the Government intends to adopt the policy in future that has already been invoked then I fear that southern Yorke Peninsula growers will get a raw deal. What has happened already? I believe that the member for Flinders has referred to the fact that the Government has determined that there will not be any bulk handling facilities at Appila because Appila is not situated on a railway siding. If the Government is to proceed with this policy in regard to Yorke Peninsula how can the growers of the southern portion of Yorke Peninsula ever expect to get bulk handling facilities or silos in order that they may enjoy the benefit of bulk handling? Southern Yorke Peninsula growers do not want roadside silos, for they realize that their establishment on Yorke Peninsula would involve much double handling. What the producers and cereal growers in this area desire is a terminal point situated at Giles Point where they will be able to deliver their cereals direct in bulk.

The third reason why the construction of the silos should not be deferred (and this is a good reason) is that there are broad acres in the southern portion of Yorke Peninsula waiting to be developed. I believe that if these deep-sea facilities were constructed it would be some encouragement for the landowners in the area to proceed with development. The evidence presented to the Public Works Committee by Mr. Pearson of the Agriculture

Department proves conclusively that this area has a great future provided that producers are given some encouragement and costs are kept to a bare minimum. One of the means or reducing producers' costs would be the provision of an outlet for their produce, thus enabling the differentiation now charged to be reduced. On being questioned before the Public Works Committee about the development of the southern portion of Yorke Peninsula, Mr. Pearson was asked:

Do you think that the shorter distance for carting would encourage greater cereal production?

He answered:

Yes, I think this is an important factor, particularly in the situation that will probably arise there in that their costs of production, because of necessary supplementation with manganese, will be higher than the costs for average cereal growers. Therefore, anything that reduces another part of their costs helps to keep them in the business of cereal growing. If they have to pay another 6d. a bushel to cart to Wallaroo or Ardrossan, compared with going to Giles Point, that may be the very 6d. that influences them not to grow cereals.

One of the committee members said, "In other words, it may discourage further clearing," to which Mr. Pearson replied:

It may be an essential part of it. The question of further clearing is not tied up with big profits but is linked with cereal-growing being a paying proposition.

I think anybody who has had any practical experience with the production of cereals in this State would agree with that statement. It is well known that for the successful development of southern Yorke Peninsula the application of manganese by the spray method to cereal crops is essential. Questioned as to whether farmers would have to continue to apply manganese to the soil in some form or another if they wished to grow cereals, Mr. Pearson replied, "Yes." Questioned further as to whether it would be an economic proposition, Mr. Pearson said:

Yes, the economic aspect has been implicit in our work during the whole of the experiments.

The area of which we are speaking has an assured rainfall. Summing up in his evidence, Mr. Pearson said:

It is an essential "must" that we use as much as we can of one thing over which we have no control—the incidence of rain.

There are other reasons, too, why the construction of these deep-sea facilities should not be deferred. I put forward as another reason the fact that the establishment of Giles Point, some six miles by road from Edithburgh, will assist in arresting the population drift and the economic decay of this town of Edithburgh. During the last session of Parliament I received

some correspondence from the Treasurer asking me whether anything could be done to assist regarding the drift of people from Edithburgh, and whether anything could be done to assist these people economically. I believe that had the Treasurer been sincere in his request this would have been a golden opportunity for him to do something for the people of Edithburgh. Another good reason exists why this matter should not be deferred. Only several months ago this State had an election. Not only was a candidate selected by the Labor Party to oppose me in that election, but he was endorsed by that Party to contest the elections on Yorke Peninsula. That endorsed candidate for Yorke Peninsula, at the time of the elections, had something to say in respect of the construction of deep-sea facilities at Giles Point. A report at that time stated:

Mr. Kennedy said the A.L.P. would see the completion of the bulk handling and deep-sea loading facilities at Giles Point, rather than it be merely a promise.

This was the endorsed candidate of the Labor Party telling the people of Yorke Peninsula something of the policy of the Labor Party. I remind the House that during that election the Premier in his policy speech made these remarks:

The point I am more concerned to make known to the people of this State is that any public works recommended by the Government which are estimated to cost £100,000 or more must be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee.

What is most important, he said:

Any that are already recommended will be proceeded with under the administration.

I believe that the people of Yorke Peninsula were given an undertaking by the Government that it would proceed with the construction of these deep-sea loading facilities on southern Yorke Peninsula. In making the announcement for the deferment of the construction of these works, the Government has given the reason that it is necessary for a thorough investigation to be made into the whole bulk handling system in South Australia. What nonsense! I believe that this is a vote of no confidence in the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited as it is set up today. Perhaps that is a second vote of no confidence, for I would say that the first vote of no confidence was in the Public Works Committee. This was a properly constituted authority which investigated the question of constructing these facilities. I have always been led to believe that the Public Works Committee was the last word in the authority for the investigation into the establishment of anything that would cost more than £100,000.

Mr. Jennings: I think you might be wrong there.

Mr. Clark: Those recommendations don't have to be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON: I believe that to say that an investigation is needed into the workings of the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is a reflection on the ability of its personnel, and that it discredits the magnificent job it has done in providing bulk handling facilities in this State.

Mr. Casey: Do you know that the brother of the member for Rocky River is its chairman?

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes, I know that. It is considered to be one of the best bulk handling facilities in the world. It sent officers overseas to investigate bulk handling methods, and those officers came back to South Australia and put into operation some of the very latest bulk handling methods. Of course, there are minor defects in bulk handling in this State, but they are only minor defects. I believe that the work the company is doing is most effective, and that it is very much accepted by the primary producers in this State.

Why does the Government not come out in the open and tell the public, and particularly the people of southern Yorke Peninsula, the real reasons for the deferment of this project. We read in the *Advertiser* of May 6 that because of the necessity for an exhaustive inquiry into bulk handling this matter had to be deferred. On May 18, in the Governor's Speech, we read that there was to be an investigation into oil installations at Port Pirie to cost £1,000,000. The Government should be consistent. Port Pirie already has had about £1,500,000 spent on its wharves and port. Good reasons exist for the establishment of deep-sea loading facilities on Yorke Peninsula where primary producers would use them. Whose responsibility is it to approve the project at Giles Point? When the Chairman of the Public Works Committee informed Cabinet it had recommended this project, the Minister of the day informed me that the Government had approved of the work.

I asked the Minister of Works the other day a question about this project and he replied, "When I am asked to approve a project I intend to ensure that it will be in the best interests of all concerned, and will be provided at the right time." Who gives approval for the establishment of deep-sea

loading facilities at Giles Point? I understand that the previous Government had approved these works and that the Harbours Board had been instructed to carry them out. Recently, I asked the Minister of Works whether the primary producers would be fully represented on the committee to be set up for this investigation, but the Minister could not give me that assurance. This indicates the deal that primary producers can expect from the present Government. I hope the Government will reconsider its decision, and trust that in the interest of cereal growers and primary producers on southern Yorke Peninsula, that it will see fit to reverse its decision and establish the facilities.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I have two matters of great importance that I consider necessary to introduce now. The first is the handling of the surplus grape crop. This contract seems to border on the realms of fantasy. No grower I have spoken to knows what he is to receive for his crop, and many growers do not know where it is going. Two firms, Emu Wine Co. Pty. Ltd. and Penfold Wines Ltd. are buying grapes. Emu Wines wants 1,000 tons of muscat gordo for manufacture into sweet wines.

Hon. B. H. Teusner: Is that a firm that exports wine?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and this firm is speaking of 1,000 tons of grapes, which is a good thing for the grower. I have no quibble about wineries taking the grapes, but I want to know, and Parliament should know, what type of contract has been entered into. It seems that the Government has a heavy commitment and that no grower knows what he is going to receive. A committee exists (I know nothing about it) to divert the grapes to various places of processing. There seems to be no pro rata distribution of these grapes and that some growers can sell everything and some nothing. That might be the ultimate exaggeration, but I understand 3,000 tons is to be processed under this co-operative scheme with Penfolds. The 1,000 tons to Emu Wines is under a separate agreement and purely a private one. That firm negotiated with growers, or an organization or a group of organizations, which allowed them 1,000 tons of muscat gordo. No price is known but it is certain that the grower will not receive anything for 12 months. I do not know whether the £5 picking charge, which is being made for the co-operative contract, applies to Emu Wines and neither does any grower.

Hon. B. H. Teusner: According to the Premier, that applies to the 3,000 tons.

Mr. QUIRKE: Two contracts are handling the surplus, which I think is 4,000 tons, although it could be 5,000. No one seems to know. I have good contacts in this industry, particularly with the growers, but I cannot get any information from any grower that he knows what he is going to get. That is a cock-eyed contract. It is one thing to absorb the grapes and for the Government to come into the picture with large sums. That is good and I have no criticism of it. However, it is another thing for one party to the contract not to know what it is doing, where it is going or how much it will receive. What is the basis of the contract with Penfolds? Does that firm pay on a juice extraction basis or does it pay so much a ton? I understand that Penfolds is paying cartage from the various places. The Government is making £5 a ton available, and about £60,000 to £70,000 is being made available to Penfolds for the processing. What does the grower get? He is not being paid on the basis of so much a ton. Some understand that they are to be paid on an extraction basis: for the amount of juice expressed from the grape the grower will receive a price a gallon. I do not know whether that is correct and neither does anyone else. If that is true, it is possibly one of the worst contracts I have known. Who guarantees what is extracted from a ton of grapes?

Muscat gordos are prolific yielders, up to 150 gallons or more to the ton, and if the price of 4s. 7d. an expressed gallon was being paid, that would not be a bad price at all. On these figures 150 gallons would realize £34 a ton, and no grower would object to that. However, I have grave doubts about that being the basis of the problem at all. Who will say how much wine is expressed? What is the basis of payment to the grower? Nobody knows! Will the juice be turned into brandy spirit or into S.V.R.? The two types of spirit are entirely different in their yield, both in quantity and in monetary return. Is the juice to be processed into spirit? Certainly not, if it is Gordo, because that can be processed into S.V.R.; it is not particularly suitable, however, for brandy making. The doradillo is a valuable spirit grape with an entirely different yield in an entirely different way. We do not know how much will be paid for other varieties of grapes. Surely, nobody has entered into a nebulous agreement like this! No grower knows of such an agreement. I personally telephoned people today, who were supplying these grapes, and one man did not even know whether his grapes were going to Emu Wines or to Penfolds.



Mr. Casey: That wouldn't matter so much, as long as he were paid for them.

Mr. QUIRKE: It does matter. I should like to see the honourable member send some of his skinny bullocks away and not get paid for them.

Mr. Casey: But we don't always know who buys them.

Mr. QUIRKE: Country life, that's right!

The Hon. T. C. Stott: They wouldn't be going into spirit, anyway.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have been a practical winemaker, and I have some knowledge of what I am talking about. How will the grower be paid for his grapes? I think this information should be available to the House before the end of this week, so that it can be passed on to the growers. If a juice expression basis is to be considered, what run will be taken? Just the top? After the run-off is taken, during the process of fermentation, all the marc pressings, and leachings are left. Taking the first and last runs, the difference between the two, if it is not in the contract, represents about £7 a ton, and to a grower who has delivered, say, 50 tons that is real money. I had asked the Government to ease the tension in the minds of the people concerned. It is bad enough to have a surplus, and I shall deal with that another time. This problem will become a heavy incubus on the wine industry, including the grower. The surplus of wine grapes today represents about a third of the sultanas taken this year; if there were no sultanas there would be no surplus of wine grapes. We cannot say to the winemaker that he shall not process a dual-purpose grape in wine, because many winemakers today have built a name in particular wines containing the juice extracted from sultanas. Muscat and gordo grapes can be dried and turned into lexias, but should they be dried or made into wine?

There is much room for investigation and improvement in the wine industry, and I hope we shall see some results before next year. Neither the winemaker nor the grower desires this annual stir-up about surplus grapes. As the Minister of Lands knows, and as I well knew, big areas of plantings at Loxton have been abandoned for various reasons, such as bad soil type, nematodes, seepage, etc. Such land has, in many cases, been declared as unsuited to the first type of planting put on it. I am sure that the Minister will be disturbed, as I was, at the number of times that unsuccessful growers of peaches, apricots or oranges have simply said, "Put it under wine grapes." The time to investigate all

this is not next year when the grapes are hanging on the vines, but now. I am certain that the difficulty can be resolved, without hurting or hindering anyone. On a juice basis 100 gallons to a ton would represent £22 18s. 4d. and 150 gallons £34 17s. 6d. On such figures why are the grapes not bought? Not as much would have to be paid under the Prices Commissioner's rulings.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Has Penfolds a first option to purchase juice?

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not know, but I should certainly like to know.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: They've got possession of it.

Mr. QUIRKE: Someone must know; otherwise it would be the most amazing thing I have heard of. I will leave the matter there. I know that I do not have to appeal to the Minister of Lands and Agriculture for his sympathy, as he has had much practical knowledge in these matters, and I always defer to a man with practical knowledge. However, I should like him at once to bring down details of the contracts. If they are satisfactory, well and good, but the grower should be told what they are. I have mentioned wine grapes on the Loxton soldier settlement area. This matter is not entirely in the hands of the Minister, which is perhaps a pity.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It was not in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture before.

Mr. QUIRKE: No, and it was never in the hands of the Minister of Lands; the Commonwealth Government intrudes in the matter to a great extent. I know how difficult it is, but the plea I make, based on my experience, is for something to be done quickly on a massive scale to reconstruct the Loxton irrigation area. There is not the slightest doubt that this is necessary, and if it is not done there will be a major calamity there. The one thing that can alter the position is a much better price for citrus fruit, as well as better marketing.

Mr. Casey: You will not get better prices until you get better marketing.

Mr. QUIRKE: Better marketing is necessary. Last year the grower received 1s. 9d. or 2s. a case for Valencias, which were packed, graded and polished, and packed in cases costing 4s. each. I got into a lot of strife because I refused to accept that that was a payable price, and I still refuse to accept it. The absolute minimum to keep a grower afloat, without having much left over, is 10s. a case. This price will probably only meet his commitments. When the price is only 2s. the grower

is not in the hunt! The grower, mostly through no fault of his own, is building up this massive back lag. I do not mean that all growers are perfect; there is no perfection in any of us. Some growers have contributed towards their own downfall, but others have worked and slaved and done everything according to the book and followed advice, yet have been able to get only 2s. a case. They cannot make a go of it at this price.

Seepage is a tremendous problem. To drain a citrus block can cost £4,000, and sometimes more, and the perfect system has not yet been evolved. It is not much use closing the stable door after the horse has bolted, but the spray pattern and pressures at Loxton are all wrong. They can never give a proper distribution of water. This is recognized now, and it is one of the tragedies of the area. The engineering of the system is no good, as there is not an equal distribution of water or a complete and uniform coverage. Land at Loxton, unlike the deep Barmera and Winkie sands, has a horrible conglomeration of lime and sand underneath that becomes impervious to water penetration. That happens about 2ft. under the surface. If a drain is dug and filled with that material, even if it has a drainpipe in it and is back-filled with impervious matter, within a week water will perch on the top of the drain and it will not work. I have seen that happen at Loxton. Now the idea is to put drainage tiles in coarse sand so that, if there is 1ft. of sand in a trench 1ft. square, there is drainage to the extent of 1ft. because water will drain through the sand, but that water gets a convex surface down to the drain and between one drain and the next, and the system does not function. There are ways to overcome the problem, but they are difficult and tremendously expensive. If the settlement is to be saved (and it is worth saving) a huge sum must be spent, and it must come from the Commonwealth Government. However, that is another matter; being responsible and paying are two different things.

I hope the Minister of Lands does not think that, because I was previously in charge, I am trying to draw his attention to something he does not know. I am not trying to take any advantage, and I think he will agree that my reason for raising this matter on behalf of both the grower and the settler is that I was unable to do anything in the time I had. However, I would have done something, because I knew of the urgency of the matter. I am sure

that the present Minister appreciates the urgency of the matter. I mention these two matters so that there will be no misunderstanding about what I think and because I feel compelled to bring them before the House. Cooltong is in a similar position to Loxton. Regarding wine grape prices, I hope that my request in relation to contracts will be acceded to so that members, who are responsible for making the money available, will know the position and through them the people will know exactly what is before them and what they can expect.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I wish to raise two matters, both of which have already been mentioned today and which I think should be ventilated immediately. The first concerns the series of answers to a question I asked on notice today about new accommodation for the Premier and his department. I do not know whether members, when the Premier replied to my question, took in that this move had cost this State almost £6,000. The costs were these: preparing accommodation for the Premier and his department, £3,238; furnishing that accommodation, £2,665; and then (mere peanuts) the removal from the Treasury building to the Police building, £35: making a total, according to my calculations, of £5,938, which, as the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) is reminding me, is well over the cost of a good house in this State—indeed, almost up to the cost of two houses. That takes no account of the inconvenience caused, obviously from the answers given by the Premier himself, to the Police Department by the move it had to make. The details of that inconvenience (which is not quantified; nor did I ask for it to be quantified) are set out in the early part of the reply.

I asked this series of questions because the removal of the Premier from the Treasury building, where the Treasurer has been housed for a long time, has been given an inordinate amount of publicity. Since the Government took office, it is obvious that the Premier very much enjoyed the move from one place to the other, but there is one interesting and relevant point—that the former Premier and the former Government never even considered a move from the Treasury building for the Treasurer and his staff. This is something that has come out of the blue with the new Government. I believe it is an entirely unnecessary and capricious move on the part of the Government and is a complete and utter waste of money.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How could the new Premier's Department have been accommodated in the existing accommodation at the Treasury building?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be a fruitful source of further questioning—the multiplication of staff, not only for the Premier but for all the new Ministers in this Parliament, both in this House and in another place. Perhaps it would be illuminating for the people of South Australia to find out how many officers, in addition to those that sufficed perfectly well for the former Government, are now being employed by the various Ministers. That would be of interest.

This afternoon, when he had given his reply, the Premier tried in a lame-duck sort of way (I do not know whether the *Hansard* reporters caught it or not) to compare this move with that of the former Minister of Works to Waymouth Street. There is, of course, no comparison because that move was entirely necessary in the interests of the efficiency of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The Minister did not want to make that move, but it was forced on him because of the difficulty of accommodation in Victoria Square.

Members opposite are entitled to deny this if they think I am inaccurate in what I say, but now great difficulty is experienced in communication between the Premier and his Treasury officers: the Premier is at one end of the square and the Treasury is at the other end; it never sees him to transact the necessary business of the State. To cap it all, this is only a temporary change because there will be buildings in Victoria Square to house all the Ministers and their departments: so, for the cost to this State of £6,000-odd, what do we get? We get an unnecessary move by the Premier, inconvenience in the Police Department and inconvenience in the operation of government between the Premier and his Treasury officers. I suspect that this new office and its accommodation is no more than a bauble, a plaything for the Premier during his short term in office. I protest most emphatically at the capricious waste of money that this move has entailed.

I come now to the other matter I desire to mention. This arose originally not out of what has been said today (although I shall refer to that in a moment) but out of a report in the *Advertiser* of last Wednesday of remarks by the Minister of Education relating to the Martin Report on tertiary education. I

had thought before I read these remarks and considered them that the appointment of the honourable member for Whyalla as Minister of Education was one of the better Cabinet appointments.

Mr. Ryan: Aren't you still of the same opinion?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not—or at least I am shaken in that opinion by his comments as reported in the newspaper, because they show a dictatorial (in fact, a rather arrogant) attitude which is becoming all too much the hallmark of this Government. We see it frequently from the Premier in this House—an arrogant and dictatorial attitude, which I should have thought was unworthy of the Minister. I see that the Minister is laughing loudly at the moment.

Mr. Ryan: Who wouldn't, at you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He has described a letter that was in the *Advertiser* as a "shallow misrepresentation", a phrase he used this afternoon in what he said. But let us look at what he did say in his press statement. He has not said that this was inaccurately reported, I notice:

The Minister of Education (Mr. Loveday) said yesterday that he was completely opposed to the establishment of autonomous teacher training colleges in the manner recommended in the Commonwealth Government's Martin Report on education.

Mr. Clark: Who wouldn't be?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The South Australian Institute of Teachers, for one, I notice. The honourable member breaks in boldly.

Mr. Clark: Have you read that carefully?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Have I read what carefully?

Mr. Clark: The opinion of the South Australian Institute of Teachers?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have read a report of it in today's paper and last night's *News*, and I see they are supporting it at the conference next month. If I am wrong I am open to correction, but I challenge the member for Gawler to get up and say that I am wrong.

Mr. Clark: I know more about the attitude of the South Australian Institute of Teachers than you have ever thought of.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; I will willingly acknowledge that and I should like to hear about its attitude from the honourable member during this debate. It would be illuminating if we did hear from him. I ask him to state it. But let me go on now with the remarks of the Minister of Education. He said:

Mr. Loveday said that the Martin committee advocated the development of autonomous teachers colleges, under the control of a board

of education, but outside the control of the State education department. It advanced the astonishing argument that such colleges would be a "welcome means of introducing a greater measure of variety of outlook into Australian education." "This argument appears to have no sound foundation," Mr. Loveday said.

It seems extraordinary that a Minister who has been in office (quite unexpectedly, I understand) for only 10 weeks is prepared so contemptuously to brush aside the considered recommendations of a powerful committee, and not only to brush aside those arguments but, in fact, in the terms which he used, to ridicule the arguments and the suggestions advanced by the Martin Committee.

I know that members opposite will say that the Commonwealth Government has also rejected some parts of the Martin Report. That is so, and I regret that the Commonwealth Government has done so, but I emphasize that it has not rejected those recommendations in the cavalier manner in which the South Australian Minister of Education has done. I strongly suspect (and my suspicions were strengthened by the statement given today in the House by the Minister) that the remarks he made last week were prepared for him by his departmental officers, who are jealous of their own powers and sensitive of any kind of criticism of teacher training in South Australia. I believe that the Minister did not give much thought to the statement he made on the advice of his departmental officers and, as I said, I am confirmed in that belief by the Dorothy Dixier that the honourable member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) asked on the matter today. I did not know that it was the honourable member who would ask the question, but I knew before I came into the House that the Minister intended to answer a Dorothy Dixier on this matter.

Mr. Jennings: Who told you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not intend to disclose my source. I seem to be throwing out a few challenges today, but I challenge the honourable member for Glenelg to deny that this was a Dorothy Dixier. All members could see, by the way the Minister brought out a sheaf of typewritten papers, that he had a prepared answer for the honourable member. His answer was an attempt to escape from the more extreme and perhaps ill-considered remarks on his part that were made last week, and I suggest that he did so because of the adverse comments made by the Institute of Teachers (and we will hear from the honourable member for Gawler on this) on the first remarks of the Minister of Education in which the

institute went so far (according to last night's press) as to say it disagreed with the Minister's views on this matter. However, we shall hear from the honourable member for Gawler, who will give the views of the institute on this matter in due course.

Mr. Clark: I will offer it at the right time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe it was absurd of the Minister to say what he did and to suggest, as he did, that the Martin Committee had no knowledge of conditions in South Australia when preparing its report. I point out to members that the Martin Committee made its report to the Australian Universities Commission and it was that body which handed on the report to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hudson: It sat on the report for six months.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It may have. How that is relevant to my present argument I do not know.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Minister of Education might have adopted that policy and sat on his first statement for six months.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, he might have been well advised to do so. It can be seen in the letter addressed by the commission to Senator the Hon. J. G. Gorton that the commission agrees to the recommendations of the Martin Report. The commission has, as a member, one South Australian, Sir Kenneth Wills, and the Martin Committee had on it two South Australians who are both (and I am sure all members will agree) familiar with South Australian conditions, and I refer to Sir Keith Angas and to Professor Peter Karmel, who is the Professor of Economics at the University of Adelaide and the Principal-Designate of the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park. It is an insult to both those gentlemen and, if we include Sir Kenneth Wills as a member of the Universities Commission, to all three of them to suggest that this report has been drawn up in ignorance of conditions in South Australia. I am sure that the Minister, on reflection, did not mean to say that but, in fact, he did.

I also point out (and I come to the question of teacher training and the recommendations made in the Martin Report) that also included on the committee were two Directors of Education in Australia. If anybody should feel aggrieved and offended by these particular recommendations these men would be the ones. I refer to Mr. A. McDonell (Director of Education in Victoria) and Dr. H. S. Wyndham (Director-General of Education in New South

Wales). Is the Minister suggesting that these people and the other members of the Martin Committee were capricious, ill-informed or foolish in the way in which they went about their job and in the recommendations they brought down? I suggest that to say so is to say that the Minister has not read or certainly has not made a study of the reasoning set out in the body of the report. On the question of teacher training, if the Minister bothers to read chapter 4 of the report, which is headed "The Training of Teachers", he will find that the arguments adduced for the recommendations made are entirely sensible and deserve much consideration which he, apparently, is not prepared to give to them. I shall quote a few of the relevant paragraphs on this matter. Paragraph 76 of the report states:

Before considering the implications of such a policy or the steps by which it might be achieved—

this is, the suggestion for some autonomy in teacher training—

the committee considers that the whole question of the preparation of teachers should be set in a larger frame. The answer is not to be found simply in the granting of autonomy to teachers colleges. In any event, it is unlikely that all teachers colleges in Australia could immediately be granted autonomy. Furthermore, other institutions—chiefly universities but also art schools, technical colleges and conservatoriums of music—contribute to the preparation of teachers. Finally, the committee does not consider it possible, or desirable, to establish precisely the same institutional pattern in every State, and particularly in the more populous States. There is need, therefore, for the establishment in each State of a body which will be competent to consider all matters concerning the preparation of teachers in the light of the circumstances of that State.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that it is one of *Hansard's* standing rules not to take the first half minute after tea, so I shall read again—

Mr. Jennings: It wouldn't matter if they didn't take the next half hour.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member may be right. I am glad to see that he is here to listen to it, anyway. I will read the last sentence that I was reading when I was so rudely interrupted by the bell. The last sentence of paragraph 76, chapter 4, states:

There is need, therefore, for the establishment in each State of a body which will be competent to consider all matters concerning the preparation of teachers in the light of the circumstances of that State.

Before I go on to read paragraph 77, I draw attention to some of the members of this committee with whom the Minister of Education

has disagreed on this matter. The chairman of the committee was Emeritus Professor Sir Leslie Martin, formerly Professor of Physics at the University of Melbourne, and it is he who has given his name to the committee. The next member of the committee listed is Emeritus Professor C. R. McRae, formerly Professor of Education and Deputy Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney. The third member is Sir Keith Angas, a grazier and a wellknown public figure in this State. It is men of this calibre with whom the Minister of Education, after a mere few weeks in office, has decided to disagree on this point. Paragraph 77 of the report goes on to make the proposals which have incurred the Minister's displeasure and criticism in this way:

The committee recommends the establishment by Statute in each State of a body to be known perhaps as the Board of Teacher Education, the purpose of which should be the improvement of the preparation of all teachers within the State. In particular the functions of this board should be:

- (a) To grant teachers certificates to students completing courses approved by the board and such periods of probationary service as the board may require;
- (b) To advise the Government or Governments concerned as to the allocation of funds, both capital and recurrent, for the maintenance of institutions preparing teachers;
- (c) To advise those Governments as to desirable developments in the field of teacher preparation;
- (d) To keep under review the courses and staffing of the institutions concerned;
- (e) To recommend to the Minister of Education the granting of autonomy to such teachers colleges in the State as reach appropriate standard;
- (f) To admit additional teachers colleges to this membership.

The committee considers that at a later stage when the functions of the board in any State and its relationships to institutions preparing teachers are established in practice the board might be authorized to grant professional degrees.

Now while they are certainly positive and in some ways far-reaching proposals, they certainly seem sober and reasonable. I point out that this was a committee appointed in August, 1961, so it had three years in which to think over this matter. Such people as I have mentioned, and also Professor Derham (the Dean of the Faculty of Law, Monash University), Professor Ennor (the Professor of Biochemistry, Institute of Advanced Studies, and Dean of the John Curtin School of Medical Research), and Sir Alexander Fitzgerald, a name we know well in this State because he was formerly Chairman of the Commonwealth Grants

Commission, are the people who have made these recommendations. They made them after a long period of study, yet the Minister in this State, after less than three months in office, is prepared to come out and wipe the ground from under their feet. Paragraph 80 of Chapter 4 states:

The establishment of autonomous teachers colleges should be the next step in developing the plan for the preparation of teachers. In the opinion of the committee, the case for the establishment of autonomous teachers colleges rests on two main considerations—

I wonder whether the Minister considered these matters when he made his comments last week? The report continues:

First, the outlook of a profession is determined to a significant degree by the atmosphere of its training institutions. Secondly, the quality of the staff of an institution largely determines its vitality, and staffs of high quality are more likely to be attracted to autonomous institutions.

That makes good sense to me, and I wonder whether, on reflection, the Minister still disagrees with those considerations. I wonder whether we will hear from the honourable member for Gawler whether he agrees or disagrees. It will be interesting to hear. They are well reasoned considerations of people I have mentioned, and such other members of the committee as Professor Sir Edward Ford (Professor of Preventive Medicine at the University of Sydney), Dr. Gilray (formerly Principal of Scotch College, Melbourne), and Mr. N. E. Jones (Managing Director of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited). The Minister has presumed to disagree with these people and others on this matter after, as I have said, a short time in responsible office in this State. One cannot help but feel that in this matter he has made a common mistake, I suppose, in relying rather too heavily on his departmental officers for advice. One other paragraph I desire to quote for the Minister's edification (and it is now becoming obvious) is paragraph 85, which states:

The committee appreciates the fact that not every teachers college could be considered ready for autonomy in the near future. Some may be too small, or too narrow in their present interests, to warrant it. The granting of autonomy will rest on the quality of the staff, the facilities, and the attainment of certain educational standards acceptable to the board. It will involve problems which may call for a solution over a period. There are, for example, considerable difficulties associated with the conditions of employment in the teaching services of which present teachers college staffs are members. Nevertheless, the committee believes that these difficulties should not be permitted to stand in the way of

achieving the ultimate goal. The committee, therefore, recommends that some teachers colleges in Australia should be granted autonomy as soon as possible on the terms outlined above.

That is an entirely reasonable approach, not suggesting that every teachers college should be given autonomy immediately: sensible and and fair, I should have thought. Yet what did the Minister say in his statement? He said that the committee had advanced an astonishing argument (they were the words he used) for its recommendations and suggestions, and he said that the argument seemed to have no sound foundation. As I have said, this is a report prepared by several people whose names I have given. All are well known people in their own right, people who have been asked to consider this and other matters, not over a period of weeks but over a period of three years or more. I should complete the list of members of the committee so that all members will know whom the Minister has contradicted in his statement. The other members are Professor J. W. Roderick (Professor of Civil Engineering at the University of Sydney), Professor Sir Fred Schonell (Vice Chancellor, and formerly Professor of Education, at the University of Queensland), and Professor Sir Samuel Wadham (formerly Professor of Agriculture at the Melbourne university). Surely, no-one who knows dear old Professor Wadham should suggest that he had been hasty, foolish, or ill-advised in making recommendations—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I suggest you are being very repetitive.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not at all. I am sorry if I am getting under the Attorney-General's skin, but perhaps it would be better if he listened, and gave some counsel to his colleagues when they were making public statements. Also responsible for the report were Mr. W. L. Weickhardt (Technical Director of Imperial Chemical Industries of Australia and New Zealand) and the last man, whom I have already mentioned (himself a departmental officer of an education department), Dr. Wyndham (Director-General of Education in New South Wales). All these people signed this report, whatever their background might be, yet the Minister is prepared simply, as I have said (and here I do apologize for repeating myself) to wipe off their recommendations, and he ridicules them. I am afraid I must say, with due deference to the Minister, that in this matter he has put up a poor show indeed. He has not only made a mistake, I believe, in disagreeing with the broad proposals

for autonomy in this matter but I personally regret, more than anything else, the discourteous way in which he has expressed his disagreement. I have no doubt that, by speaking as he did, he has annoyed and antagonized many people who are vitally interested in what is a matter of great importance in Australia. I hope that the Minister will be prepared to reconsider the decision he has made not to have anything to do with these proposals.

Mr. Clark: Has he made that decision?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: To anybody who can read and understand plain English (and his English was plain—I do not deny that) it is pretty obvious that he did. When a man says that an argument is astonishing he usually means he does not believe in it; when he says the argument appears to have no sound foundation, it usually means he does not agree with it.

Mr. Clark: I was only seeking information; I realize you are well qualified to give it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I make no apology for raising these two matters. The first is the entire waste of money (£6,000) on the Premier's new office, which has already gone down the drain. We cannot do much about that, except regret it. However, in relation to the second matter, which is, I suppose, in the wide context a far more important one, we have not as yet wasted any money, and I hope it is not too late to remedy the mistake that I believe the Minister of Education has made. I hope he will be prepared to reconsider what he said last week and that, even if he is not prepared to reconsider it, his Cabinet colleagues will on this occasion at least overrule him and reconsider it for him.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): Most of the matters I wished to mention were raised this afternoon by the member for Burra, who spoke with much knowledge about wine grape prices and about the Loxton soldier settlement scheme. However, I wish to add a few words on these subjects. Regarding wine grape prices, we are faced with a semi-crisis in the industry. When this first arose, the Loxton branch of the Wine Grapegrowers Association got in touch with me, told me it was arranging a deputation to the Treasurer about wine grape prices, and asked me if I would be prepared to attend. I said that I would, and asked the branch if it would tell me when the deputation was to be held. The secretary of the Loxton branch, Mr. Alan Preece, advised me by letter that the Treasurer had been written to and asked that I be included in the deputation. He then referred

to a meeting of the Loxton branch on April 20.

I waited to be notified about the deputation, and was astonished to read in the morning paper on the following day the whole story about it. Naturally I was concerned that it had taken place without my being notified, so I rang the secretary of the Loxton branch, who told me that the arrangements had been made by the secretary of the Wine Grape Growers' Council of South Australia (Mr. Lucas). Mr. Lucas had informed him that he had asked the Treasurer that I be invited, with other members of grapegrowing constituencies, to the deputation. In reply to a question a few days ago on this matter, when asked by the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) about members of grapegrowing districts not being present at the deputation, the Treasurer said:

I did not intend to ignore any honourable members. I do not recall any representation being made by the growers of any particular area. I was confronted with something that was almost foreign to me, but I did receive advice. I found that grapegrowers were not the easiest people to meet, probably because of their long experience with previous Governments, particularly that of which the honourable member was a Minister.

The Treasurer was replying to the member for Alexandra. He continued:

Difficulties arise because they are not sure of their facts and usually want something more than they originally asked for. This statement is no reflection on growers. I assure the honourable member that there may be ample opportunity for all representatives of grapegrowing areas to submit a case. I do not know when this will occur, but they will not be ignored. I made a decision on the merits of the case after accepting certain advice which I appreciated and which I acknowledge.

In view of this reply, I asked for a copy of the correspondence. The following is a letter from the Wine Grape Growers' Council of South Australia dated April 5 and addressed to the Treasurer:

At a full meeting of this council held yesterday, the matter of the breakdown in grape prices for the present vintage was discussed at length. It was generally felt that the matter should not be allowed to lapse and that some further move should be made by your Government to have the Prices Commissioner's recommendations adopted. With this in view, I was instructed to endeavour to arrange at an early date a conference between representatives of this council and yourself and attended by members of Parliament representing the constituencies affected. It was suggested also that the council proposals for dealing with future price control might be discussed at the same time.

Mr. Hall: Was your constituency vitally affected?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: There would be more surplus grapes in my constituency than in others.

Mr. Hall: And you were not asked!

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: This is the reply from the Premier's Department dated April 6 to Mr. Lucas, the Secretary of the Wine Grape Growers Council of South Australia, 54 Flinders Street, Adelaide:

I am directed by the Premier to acknowledge your letter of the 5th April 1965 in regard to winegrape prices. In accordance with your request the Premier will receive representatives of your council in his office at Treasury Building, Flinders Street, Adelaide, at 10 a.m. on Monday, 12th April, 1965. As requested by you he has also asked the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. G. A. Bywaters, M.P., Mrs. M. Byrne, M.P., and Mr. A. R. Curren, M.P., to be present at the interview together with the Prices Commissioner. Your faithfully, (signed) J. S. White, Secretary.

When the secretary of the branch at Loxton told me about this, I said, "Why wasn't I invited?" He said, "I understood you were to be there and that they would be the only people invited to this deputation." In view of what the Treasurer has said, I am surprised at this attitude. As the Treasurer is new in his job and as it was foreign to him, as he said, and he was seeking advice on wine and grape prices, I should have thought that the persons concerned in the grape-growing constituencies would be the people to be consulted. They could have given advice on the whole problem.

This has led to a very grave position concerning grape prices. Like the honourable member for Burra this afternoon, I cannot ascertain exactly what is the position either from the secretary or the president of the branch at Loxton or from any growers I have interviewed there. I do not know what total price they will receive. As far as I can ascertain (and this is not authentic, because no-one can find out), they will receive a first advance of £5, plus cartage, but that would cover only the cost of picking the grapes, and it is not clear even at this stage whether the amount will be £5 first advance.

In reply to my question the other day, the Treasurer said that the Government had agreed that £67,500 be advanced from the State Bank, which would mean about £5 first advance on about 3,000 tons of grapes. As I pointed out, I received from a meeting of growers at Loxton, which was attended by about 130 growers, a figure of about 3,000 tons of grapes as the quantity the local co-operative and other

private concerns would take. I was anxious to find out whether 3,000 tons at £5 equalled £67,500, or the upper limit of the advance that the Government was prepared to make to solve the surplus grape problem.

The Treasurer has not been able to answer that question but he did say, without being prepared to be committed, that if the figure was 3,000 tons that would be practically final. If that is so, the figure will not be anywhere near £5 a ton. The tonnage of grapes is between 4,000 and 5,000 and, if the upper limit is to be £67,500, the grower will not receive anywhere near £5 a ton as first advance to cover grape picking and cartage.

We in the grape-growing constituencies want to know what will be the final outcome of this position. As we understand it, a portion is to go to Emu Wines (about 1,000 tons which is to be exported) and the other portion is to be stored in Penfolds Winery. What is the position regarding the purchase by Penfolds? Has that company purchased on a delivery-at-store basis? What is the price? What will be the final outcome? When the grapes are distilled into wine or spirits, what will be the sale on a gallonage basis? Will the growers receive anywhere near what the Prices Commissioner has determined as the price for equivalent grapes to the other concerns and not involved in this problem? That is not all. The question now arises that, if the grapes are turned into spirit, and if Penfolds handle it themselves and sell the product from the surplus grapes, that will interfere materially with the co-operatives in the Upper Murray districts and the contracts they already have for selling the spirit to other proprietary concerns. So not only will it mean a lower return, if the facts are right, to the growers with the surplus grapes; it could easily also mean a lower return to those growers who have delivered through normal channels. The position is getting serious.

This problem of surplus grape prices has been with us for two or three years and is becoming a hardy annual. There is no statutory control or any body with Parliamentary authority to take a hand in doing something about this fluctuating grape price structure. It is time that the Government examined this question and either gave the Prices Commissioner more power than he has at present to determine something about the surplus grape problem or looked into the question whether too many grapes are being grown for wine grape purposes. I do not accept now (I have not all the information) that we have



reached the stage of over-production of wine grapes. It appears to me that part of the problem is caused by some growers themselves who deliver, and want to deliver, sultana grapes to the wineries, but these are a drying variety. Consequently, the distilleries that take the sultana grape do not require as many other wine grapes. If they were not able to take the sultana grape, there would be more storage space in the vats for the other types of wine. I do not know the quantity but that problem could be inquired into.

I understand from press reports that the Premier told the wine grape growers that a Royal Commission was wanted to inquire into this industry; but obviously the wine grape growers did not want a Royal Commission at that stage because what on earth would a Royal Commission do with the grapes when they were just beginning to pick them? A Royal Commission would take some months to make investigations and, therefore, at that stage it could not answer that immediate problem of what to do with surplus grapes. But this surplus grape problem has to be resolved. I believe the Government should institute some inquiry from its officers into this whole question so that it will not crop up again next year and Parliament will not once again be in the throes of this urgent problem of trying to do something for these soldier settlers. What I have just said is related to and apropos of what I wish to say now about citrus fruit. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) this afternoon gave an interesting dissertation on the problem. I find myself in total agreement with him. When he was the Minister, naturally he came into contact with many problems that the soldier settlers are facing in those districts.

Not only have the soldier settlers this problem of surplus grapes; they also have the problem of the low prices they are receiving for citrus fruit. They have to face the twin problems of low prices for citrus and the difficulty of disposing of surplus grapes. Many soldier settlers in the Loxton area are faced with a crisis of how they will meet their commitments to the Minister of Lands and the Commonwealth Government, under their agreements. They are just not in the race to meet those commitments. Consequently, something has to be done to relieve the soldier settlers of this problem, for much of it is not of their own making. Admittedly some of them are round pegs in square holes, but not all of them. The majority of the soldier settlers at Loxton have worked

hard and tried to hew a living out of the area and establish themselves. However, they find themselves handicapped and getting further behind each year when they produce a crop of surplus grapes. Much money will be required to rehabilitate the Loxton soldier settlers. The 1948, 1949 and 1950 plantings, which were carried out under departmental instruction, were badly budded stock. It takes seven or eight years before orange trees come into full production. In many of these places oranges as thick as children's footballs were produced; they had thick skins and were of no use for export. No matter how hard a soldier settler works he cannot overcome the problem of badly budded stock. Much of this must be re-budded to give settlers a chance to export.

I agree with the member for Burra that spraying is a problem. Insufficient information is given to growers about the even spread of the spray and this is causing problems. The Minister and his department must also consider whether the right type of fertilizer is being used. It is mixed soil in that area, nowhere near as good as the Winkie sand further up the river, which produces beautiful oranges. Inquiries should be made into the use of nitrogenous fertilizers or something else to bring the trees into full production. In the Mildura area and further up the river from Loxton the trees are producing much more fruit. More information should be made available by officers of the department and the sooner the Minister can do something for the Loxton soldier settlers, the better. If the position is allowed to drift a calamity will arise that will face this Parliament and the Commonwealth Parliament. Much money will be needed and it must come from the Commonwealth Treasury.

This brings me to the point that in the meantime some relief must be given to settlers on account of the payments they have to make to the Lands Department for water and of arrears owing for the purchase of land. They cannot continue with low prices and the surplus grape problem. I make a special plea because a state of extreme urgency now exists. I know that the Minister is anxious to examine this problem but he is involved with two portfolios, those of Agriculture and Lands. The sooner the Government can see fit to separate the two departments from the control of one Minister the sooner the Minister of Agriculture will have time to look into the problems that I have raised. I wish to refer

to drainage, which was mentioned this afternoon by the member for Burra. Although an attempt has been made to deal with the problem in Loxton it has not adequately coped with the difficulties facing settlers. Attempts have been made to put drains in where the worst seepage in water has been found. This has alleviated the problem to some extent but when the seepage walls fail the drains are blocked. Consequently the drains through the various areas that feed into the main are becoming blocked and the water table is rising, causing many of the trees to die. In many areas water tables are showing where there is no drainage at all and it was at first thought that when the settlers were taken off their assistance period some of the cost of the installation of drainage would be a debt that the settlers would have to pay. Honourable members can see that it would be an almost impossible position, with the prices they are at present receiving, to have another debt imposed on them for a comprehensive drainage scheme, which should be installed and paid for by the Commonwealth Government.

We have had some discussion in this House about the question of a wheat silo for Appila, a matter that was raised by the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip). It is perfectly clear that under the Act the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has the power to determine where a silo shall be erected. Section 14 of the Act states that the question of the design and materials must be referred to the Minister of Agriculture for his approval, and that has been done in the case of every country bin since the co-operative started in 1955. A most harmonious relationship existed between the co-operative and the previous Minister of Agriculture, and I hope that it will continue with the new Minister. The last thing the co-operative wants is a lack of co-operation with the present Government over the question of design and materials. The Government has two representatives on the board while the Government guarantee applies, and it is essential that there be a harmonious relationship irrespective of the Government and whoever has the authority as the Minister of Agriculture to approve these designs and materials. The Act should be carried out in its entirety. Under the relationship that has existed hitherto, the Government has had no say regarding the location of sites. That relationship should be continued, and the Minister should merely have the right, as he has now, to determine and

approve only the design and materials for country bins.

I remember when this subject was first introduced into this House. As honourable members know, I was responsible for drafting this Act, with the assistance of the then Parliamentary Draftsman, Sir Edgar Bean. The question of drafting particular clauses came into the discussions regarding the framing of the legislation. A question was raised by the then Minister of Agriculture (the late Mr. Arthur Christian) as to whether the whole question of country bins should be referred to the Public Works Committee. I resisted that and pointed out that the only thing in which the committee should have a say was the question of the establishment of terminal ports, where obviously the Harbors Board would be spending public money. Naturally I raised no objection to that course. However, I did resist the suggestion that the committee should look into the question of the design and materials of the country bins. As not a penny of public money was involved, there was no reason whatever for the committee to investigate that matter; all that money is provided by the wheatgrowers themselves out of their tolls.

The Minister then said that the committee should have a look at the type of terminal bin to be erected by the co-operative, because the Harbors Board would be erecting its installations to dovetail in with the plans and designs specified by the co-operative. That was agreed to. Then the Minister, in order to make a smooth passage for this legislation, said, "Well, it would not hurt for the Minister to approve the design and the materials of the country bins", and that was also agreed to. Honourable members can see perfectly clearly how the legislation was drafted. The idea was that the co-operative itself, which would use the growers' own money obtained by way of tolls, should determine where the sites would be; the co-operative would then write to the Minister in a spirit of co-operation and say, "This is where we are going to put this silo. Will you approve the design and materials?" That was the procedure in the early stages when we erected the first bin at Paskeville (known as a horizontal silo) and subsequently at Bute. The horizontal silo was used in those days because the vertical type of concrete silo was far too expensive. We had made inquiries about prices for the vertical type of concrete silo, but the cost put it out of the question, so to get the co-operative on its way we erected these cheaper horizontal silos. Then a new

design came in, and naturally the Minister of Agriculture at that time, having to be approached under the Act to approve the design and materials, went into the question of a new design of a concrete vertical type of silo. Naturally, the Minister with his officers and engineers would assist the co-operative on the new design and indicate the type of silo and cost, so that a comparison could be made with information supplied by its own engineers. That is how the position arose. The last thing the co-operative wants to do is to get away from that harmonious relationship. It wants to continue the relationship that exists between the co-operative and the Government, because many more silos are to be built. If the Government continues in the same spirit and does not determine sites but only design and materials, I am sure it will continue. I refer now to Road 34 in my district, which runs from Loxton through Maggea to Swan Reach.

Mr. McKee: You will be running out of topics for the Address in Reply debate!

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I shall not run out of anything. This road is in urgent need of repair. Some time ago approval was given for it to be re-sealed from Loxton to Maggea. However, the road from Waikerie to Kingston started to break up, and the Highways Department or the Minister decided that as this was a main highway it should be repaired. Unfortunately, the money spent on this project was taken from that allocated to repair Road 34. This was unfortunate, but I am not criticizing the repairing of the Waikerie-Kingston section, which was broken up mainly by hauliers from other States. Money is being taken from Road 34 in the Loxton District Council area to be spent on a main highway. This is penalizing the council because the main road from Loxton through Maggea to Swan Reach, and thence to Sedan, cannot be re-sealed because of the lack of money. Why should the council be penalized because heavy interstate traffic has broken up the main highway? Money, originally allocated for work on a road in the council area, has been diverted for use on this main highway.

These are urgent matters, and I hope the Minister will note what I have said. This afternoon I led deputations to the Attorney-General, the Minister of Education, and the Minister of Lands, all dealing with urgent problems relating to Waikerie. The deputations received a sympathetic hearing and I hope that the Government will do all it can to accede to the various requests.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I refer to a point raised earlier today by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the multi-storey flat project for East Terrace, Adelaide, and comment briefly on the rather shabby and inept handling of the project by the present Government. I have consistently advocated denser building by means of flats, because in my district, which is almost completely built on, and which takes in a portion of the City of Adelaide, flat building is extremely popular. Indeed, it has many advantages: it makes the best possible use of rather expensive land, provides adequate accommodation at a reasonable cost, and, especially, provides cheap fares for people travelling to and from their place of business, as against the expense involved in travelling to and from outlying communities.

Although I have said that every family should desire its own house on its own block of land, flats are desirable for many people. This project, suggested by the Housing Trust and announced earlier this year, was to be built with the co-operation of the Adelaide City Council to accommodate 140 families. It had advanced to a stage of planning where it was announced last March that tenders would be let by July 1 this year, and that 12 months would be allowed for construction purposes. The Government has passed up a unique opportunity; it repudiated the agreement with the Housing Trust and the Adelaide City Council, and completely abandoned the scheme.

Earlier this afternoon I asked a question of the Treasurer, to which I at least expected a reasonable reply, but I received no information at all. No figures were given when I asked what price was paid by the Housing Trust to the previous owners for the land on East Terrace, and the price paid back by the trust when it abandoned the scheme. The Treasurer made a weak excuse, in my opinion, about land sales figures not being made public. He offered to show the figures to me privately, which he did, and I do not presume to mention them now. However, I vigorously protest at the reception received by a member when he asks a perfectly legitimate question dealing with public funds. This block of land was bought with public funds, some of them voted by this Parliament. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that, as custodian of honourable members' rights, you must agree that every member in this place has the right to seek information on what the Government is doing with public funds. If a member of Parliament cannot stand up in this place and obtain such information, I do not know who can. Everbody

in this House is entitled to know the amounts involved here, and I intend at a future date to obtain the relevant information, not only on my own behalf but on the behalf of all members of this House, as well as the public of South Australia. I do not accept the reasons given to me this afternoon by the Treasurer; I believe they were the weakest of excuses, and I can only assume that there was an absolute repudiation of the agreement made between the Housing Trust and the owners of the land. I believe it was an insult to members of this House for the Treasurer not to make the information available when asked for. If it had been given, that would have been the end of my query, but the natural conclusion one must reach is that the Government has something to hide. Are members opposite ashamed of the Government's decision to repudiate this agreement? I should like to hear later how they feel about the Government's action in this matter, not to mention the feelings of former owners of the land, who sold to the Housing Trust in all good faith. I wonder what other agreements will be broken.

In his policy speech the Leader of the Party opposite said that certain decisions made by the Liberal and County League Government before the election would be honoured. This extremely shabby deal is a remarkably fine start to an Administration! If I were a member of that Administration I would be ashamed of its actions. This project, which incidentally was for a building that would have been the tallest in Adelaide, as it was to be 4ft. higher than the new Reserve Bank building in Victoria Square, had attracted such a wide interest in the community that several couples had indicated, even before it had actually commenced, their intention to take flats. However, all their hopes have been dashed.

The Housing Trust last year decided to enter into an agreement with the Walkerville Council to build 100 flats at Gilberton on a site facing the park lands next to the property where the Television Channel 10 building is being constructed. The council was to help financially in the same way as the Adelaide City Council was to help finance the East Terrace project. Will this project be abandoned, too? People in my district are extremely interested in the matter and are waiting to know whether the agreement will be honoured or repudiated. What confidence will people have in a Government when one of its first administrative acts is to breach an agreement made in all honour? Confidence and fidelity are necessary keystones in any Administration, irrespective of political colour.

I am suggesting that this extremely shabby deal will undermine the confidence of the public and many authorities who must deal with the new Government. I want an assurance from your Government that this agreement in respect of Walkerville will not be broken. I repeat that the agreement to build 100 flats at Walkerville is on all fours with the project on East Terrace, on exactly the same conditions and with local government assistance. In fact, we amended the Local Government Act a year or so ago for the purpose. Will the project go on or will it, too, be repudiated. I should like a categorical statement by a member of the Government that no repudiation will occur.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I seem to remember hearing quite frequently over the last few years from this side of the House something about a one-man band. This afternoon and this evening we have had raised matters of great importance to the welfare of this State, covering flats, law and order, the building of silos, grape prices to grapegrowers, the non-establishment, apparently, of Giles Point deep-sea port, and the Martin Report as outlined by the honourable member for Mitcham. However, we have had no reply from those opposite. I take it that the reply will be given by the Treasurer on behalf of the Government.

At this time it is, indeed, a reversal of the one-man band proposition and we see the one-man band opposite us now. I am sorry that such a short time after the election the grievances voiced on this side of the House have mainly concerned the repudiation of election promises. It is too soon to have to raise this matter in the House. Looking through *Hansard* of last year, I came across an interesting statement by the new Minister of Works. On August 5, 1964, he said:

What is proper to the Opposition and what is proper to the Government are two different things.

Mr. McKee: You would agree with that, wouldn't you?

Mr. HALL: Yes. Honourable members opposite would agree with that statement, because when in Opposition they made promises that were contracted by the people of this State at the election and now, in Government, they have repudiated them. Members opposite are very uneasy about this repudiation. They may laugh now, but am I to understand that they are not uneasy about these repudiations?

Mr. Hughes: Give them a chance!

Mr. HALL: Is this going to be an everyday affair, and will they not be uneasy? We have not heard much since this House has been in

session of the promised exemption of Eyre Peninsula from the ton-mile tax. This was mentioned strongly last year by the then members of the Opposition. Another remark that I happened to come across when looking through last year's *Hansard* was made by the honourable member for Frome, who said:

All members should be indebted to the member for Whyalla for his detailed analysis of the Road Maintenance Act.

On looking through that lengthy exposition by the member for Whyalla, who is now the Minister of Education, I find that he said:

What we are suggesting will rectify what I am sure any court would regard as an anomaly and we are not discriminating between the interstate and the intrastate carrier.

But of course the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan, as he then was) was more explicit in this matter and took up in some detail the argument whether or not the West Coast could be exempted from the Road Maintenance Act. I quote from his remarks about our contention that the West Coast exemption would raise grave doubts as to the validity of the whole legislation. I quote from page 999 of *Hansard*, September 23, 1964:

It is not unknown in South Australia, particularly under this Government, for an opinion to be asked from a public servant. After all, when one is a member of the legal profession and is dealing with a constitutional matter about which arguments can be put forward it is not always terribly difficult to find some arguments on one side and some on the other and one inclines to the side of one's client in trying to put some kind of argument forward. I think that is what has happened in this case. Then later we read:

There is nothing in any way in the High Court judgments that would make this legislation invalid if the amendments were made as moved by the Opposition. The Premier has a habit of putting up all sorts of furbies in the hope that his audiences are ignorant on the subject about which he is talking. That is what has happened here. From the moment this matter was raised in the House honourable members opposite have been uneasy.

Then later:

If all the Premier can put up is the kind of gobbledegook that he saw fit to say on local matters, omitting things in the High Court judgments on these matters, we have little to fear and much to look forward to at those debates.

Those are some pertinent quotations from that detailed analysis of that question. The Party opposite went to the electors with a solemn promise that it would exempt the West Coast from the provisions of this Act. The implications of that promise overflowed into

other electorates. During my election campaign meetings I had to answer questions on that subject because the Labor Party had promised this facility for the West Coast. I answered them in good faith, and thus the election was held. On May 18, 1965, the Minister responsible for the administration of this Act said, in another place:

At the present times those inquiries indicate that to bring forward amendments to exempt Eyre Peninsula would result in the Act as a whole being open to immediate challenge through the courts, with the real likelihood of the legislation being declared invalid.

There is a conflict that could not be of greater proportions between the statement made by the present Attorney-General and that made by a Minister in another place. I should truly have liked to be a fly on the wall when this matter was discussed in Cabinet. We have silence from the Government, from honourable members who say they are not uneasy about this decision.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The district of Frome is involved in this, too.

Mr. HALL: Yes. The honourable member for Frome was most vocal about this. He has a long history of speaking on this matter. He suggested a 4-ton minimum and no doubt he will introduce a private member's motion or even a Bill to implement his ideas. This repudiation is so direct and contrary to what was put before that surely it shows that the Government has admitted, by its actions, that it was only playing a game. What else could it have been playing?

Mr. Heaslip: It won the game.

Mr. HALL: Yes. It made a contract with the people of the State, but it has repudiated that contract. Although they are laughing about this, Government members have every reason to be uneasy because, although anyone can make an honest mistake, this was not an honest mistake, but a deliberate repudiation of what the Attorney-General, as member for Norwood, explained in such a detailed manner last year. He said then that the reasons given by a Minister in another place this year were gobbledegook.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Since the election the Minister of Agriculture has said that it would be done.

Mr. HALL: Yes. There has been such a rush by the Ministers to use television that I believe the waves have collided so that what has come out is distorted. That is one of the two matters to which I wish to refer tonight. I am sure that more will be heard about it

in this House and in country districts. Perhaps it is a result of the small representation in Cabinet of country interests. It could be that Cabinet is not sympathetic towards the country and, if this is so, I feel sorry for the honourable member for Frome because I know he believes himself to be a good country member. The member for Frome is no Socialist and he must feel uneasy despite his protests that he does not. He has my sympathies and will continue to have them.

Mr. Quirke: He has been badly advised.

Mr. HALL: Yes. I wish to refer to the development of beach and foreshore areas to the north of the city. I have raised this matter in Parliament and I do not believe I have received a reply in keeping with the way I asked these questions. I asked them for the purpose of eventually providing extra beach resorts for the people residing in the developing areas north of the city. Of course, we have fine suburban beaches, but they are becoming crowded and much money has been spent on them in rehabilitation after storms, for the provision of amenities, and for general care. People living north of the city at Para Hills, Parafield Gardens, Salisbury and Elizabeth need more beach facilities, the present facilities being limited. At one beach the tide comes in for a long way and goes out a long way. It reminds me a little of the fortunes of the Labor Party, for which the tide is now fully in, but the ebb begins quickly. It might begin soon for the Labor Party and when it does the tide will stay out for a long time.

The need is consequent upon the housing development in these areas. At present we have unattractive beaches. As the Treasurer explained this afternoon in answer to my question, a very expensive scheme was put up by the Engineer of the then Salisbury and Elizabeth council. Since that scheme has been considered, the council, in co-operation with the St. Kilda Progress Association and the St. Kilda Boat Owners' Association, has initiated the construction of an embankment to reach deep boating and swimming water by means of the free dumping of solid material. It is surprising to know that in this rapidly developing area, where there are many building projects and much waste spoil, more than 300 yards of embankment of considerable size has been created in about 15 months. What would otherwise be an expensive scheme, possibly costing hundreds of thousands of pounds, will be achieved for practically nothing, and in a few short years we will find a considerable embankment at St. Kilda which will enable motorists to drive out

and take their trailer boats out and generally make use of deeper water out from the foreshore. Finishing this scheme off properly will require money, although not large amounts.

Mr. Casey: I thought you were going to pull it out of the hat.

Mr. HALL: Members opposite said they would do that. We often heard that money was easy to get, but I think the realities of financing the affairs of this State are now settling upon Government members.

Mr. Curren: It grows on trees!

Mr. HALL: It used to when this Government was in Opposition. Some money is required to finish off this magnificent self-help project, which is creating a facility that will provide a sporting and recreation area for many thousands of people. Following on the Treasurer's reply during question time today, I remind him that about six weeks or so prior to the last elections I had a conversation with him. Over several years I have continually kept this matter before the previous Minister of Marine, both in writing—

Mr. Jennings: You didn't get very far then.

Mr. HALL: Apparently the member for Enfield has not been following this debate, and in that he is most definitely the loser. He is like the tide: he has yet to come in. I have continually acquainted the previous Minister of progress in this direction and, as mentioned by the Treasurer today, the Minister was good enough to have an investigation made, and this cost money. Also, in my continuing contact with the Minister over this matter I said verbally—

Mr. Jennings: I don't know how you say things otherwise.

Mr. HALL: Of course, there is no record of the conversation, but I said to him, "These people are initiating a very great self-help scheme in the development of this beach, and I believe they deserve financial assistance." He said, "Yes, if this scheme is progressing as you say then these people deserve some monetary assistance." Before the recent election my Party stated that greatly increased amounts would be available in the next Budget for the development of beach and foreshore recreation areas.

Mr. Jennings: Obviously the people did not believe you.

Mr. HALL: In his policy speech the Treasurer, after hearing Sir Thomas Playford's policy speech the night before, said that if his Party were elected it would carry out everything that had been promised by the previous Government as well as its own

promises. With two of my colleagues I heard the Treasurer's policy speech and I congratulate him on his effort. It was one of the best speeches of his life. His only real problem is not in the manner in which he delivered it, but in following up the matters it contained. He impressed me.

Mr. Clark: He impressed the general public of South Australia.

Mr. HALL: Yes, he did, with the things I have enumerated, and it behoves him, having made the contract, to fulfil it.

Mr. Clark: He certainly will.

Mr. HALL: This is one of the contracts he made:

I make it clear that the promises that were made by Sir Thomas Playford last night as election bait are mostly administrative decisions which will be honoured by the Labor Government.

I hear that the amount placed on the Estimates for the Tourist Bureau for the next financial year will be the same as last year, which was, I believe, £26,000.

Mr. Clark: Have you inside information?

Mr. HALL: I shall be happy if the amount is more than that, but I have been told it will not be a penny more than last year. How can the Treasurer's promise be honoured? He made a contract in his impressive speech that the member for Gawler spoke about. Where is its fulfilment?

Mr. Clark: You praised the speech, I did not.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member for Gawler agreed with me about the speech.

Mr. Lawn: How can the Treasurer give effect to anything while you are yapping all the afternoon and night?

Mr. HALL: I thought from the answers I have received and those that other members on this side of the House have received, that the Treasurer needed a lead in this matter.

Mr. Lawn: He would not get one from you.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer does not seem to grasp the implications of his promises. I remind him of his promise in this matter and of the ever-growing population that will be served by this area. I urge the Government to make good its specific promise to increase the vote for beach and foreshore development.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I have had numerous requests for information put before me, but I inform the House that the Government has listened to all grievances, and will examine them and reply at the appropriate time.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH.  
Hospitals Department, £59,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the Treasurer for the information he gave me in question time as this enabled me to study the ramifications of this line. I can see nothing in the Supplementary Estimates that calls for a prolonged discussion, except the matter of long service payments, which I raised the other day. We on this side of the House do not object to those payments at the scale provided by the Government. That is a matter of Government policy, and if the Government believes they are justified we do not criticise it. However, when the last Appropriation Act (No. 1) was passed section 6 (b) provided, as, indeed, it usually provides:

The Treasurer may out of the money appropriated by this Act make any payment for which money has been included in the supplementary estimates of expenditure of the Government of South Australia, passed by the House of Assembly for the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four notwithstanding that the payment is—

- (a) in respect of a period prior to the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three; or
- (b) at a rate in excess of the rate which, during the period in respect of which the payment is made, was in force under any return made under the Acts relating to the public service, or pursuant to any regulation or any award, order or determination of a court or other body empowered to fix salaries or wages.

For many years the Crown Solicitor has advised the Government that it is not within the administration's power to make *ex gratia* payments. If honourable members peruse the Estimates that have been introduced over the years they will see that frequently a small sum in respect of a department is included in those Estimates, which the Government believes it should morally pay, but which it is not legally bound to pay. The Crown Solicitor has held, over many years, that *ex gratia* payments are not permitted unless they are specifically approved by Parliament. I fear that, if that is the position, these payments are obviously *ex gratia* payments, and are not provided pursuant to any of the awards or authorities that I have mentioned. That being so, the Treasurer, who stated this afternoon that some categories were to receive supplementary service payments, might be embarrassed with regard to the provision of that money, because the Auditor-General might

well obtain an opinion and come to the conclusion that these sums are *ex gratia* payments, and that, as a result, he cannot issue the necessary warrant for their payment. In the Supplementary Estimates some departments, even though they have only small sums due to them under the Government's proposals, have something provided, and in some respects they have been provided because of what I have said. For instance, only £1,200 is provided for the Mines Department, and £2,600 for the Produce Department, but only £2,100 is provided for the Agriculture Department, which is a big department. I am certain that if it were just a matter of making service payments these departments could make them without the need to have the money provided under the Supplementary Estimates. Other big departments are not mentioned, yet they should have a large provision on these Estimates if the decisions announced by the Treasurer are to be given effect to. For example, he said that Cabinet had considered making service payments available to employees of the Tramways Trust; however, no provision is made for them in these Estimates. I doubt whether the Tramways Trust can finance these payments out of its own resources. I know that it has been hard put to live within its budget from time to time.

Bringing the matter closer to home, I ask the Treasurer to consider the position in the Woods and Forests Department, the funds for which are provided not through the Appropriation Act but through the Loan Act. If there are any individuals in that department who come within the scope of the Government's determination—and I believe there are many—there is no provision in these Estimates for them to get payments this year. I doubt whether there is any way for the Treasurer to make these payments except by an appropriation by Parliament. The fact that some departments have come under these Estimates, and some have not, leads me to believe that this matter needs to be considered by the Treasurer. I suggest that it is sufficiently important to need ironing out speedily because, as the Treasurer has pointed out, there is some difficulty in making payments in any financial year if Supplementary Estimates are delayed or are not sufficiently complete. I have mentioned two types of authority. One is not a Government authority, but is financed by the Government, such as the Tramways Trust. The other is a Government authority that has always got its appropriation under the Public Purposes Loan Act. Many people whom the Government

intends should receive the service payment are not provided for in the Supplementary Estimates. The Treasurer has given me a list of the people who are to get the payment. I have not been able to check everything, because he included people under awards. It is difficult for someone not directly associated with an award to know who is involved.

Let me mention a few people who should be included in the Treasurer's list. So far as I can see, they are not covered. No line is provided for the Legislature, so no payments are to be made to messengers, cooks, etc. I do not believe that they come under any of the awards the Treasurer mentioned this afternoon. They could be, but in any case there is no provision in these Estimates. Also, the Chief Secretary's Department pays certain staff at Government House, but no provision is made for the domestic staff there. Undoubtedly they would be in the category the Treasurer mentioned. No provision is made for storemen, messengers, etc., in the Printing and Stationery Department. In relation to the Police Department, no provision is made for cooks, cleaners, kitchen hands, etc. There is no provision for storemen in the Sheriffs and Gaols and Prisons Department. In the Public Health Department, no provision is made for medical orderlies, drivers or cleaners. In Miscellaneous, no provision is made for subsidized hospital staff, the fire brigades staff, or for the large number of people who come under special Acts. The Treasurer stated that in relation to the latter categories the Cabinet decision is that they have to go to their appropriate tribunals or to their employers in order to obtain an adjustment of their wages and conditions. How many subsidized hospitals are at present in the happy position with finance to be able to make the same provision? If this service pay is to apply, why is it that some people have to get a determination in order to receive it, whereas others get it by a simple Cabinet decision? I have had investigations made into the position in other States, and it appears that Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania make no service payments at all. The authorities making the payments are the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria.

As regards the Commonwealth Government, I have information from its industrial officer that a simple decision has been made that existing employees get certain amounts immediately, and that the service payments apply to all but public servants. It does not pick out some and disregard others: anyone not in the Public Service gets service pay.



The Hon. B. H. Teusner: There is no discrimination?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is so. There is no attempt to make a Cabinet decision that one person shall get it and another shall not. Service pay in the Commonwealth sphere applies to all Commonwealth employees except public servants. New South Wales was in a similar position to South Australia prior to this new decision of our Cabinet. The position then was that service payments were made by an award in the Railways Department, in respect of both South Australia and New South Wales. It was an arbitration award: there was no question of Cabinet picking and choosing particular classes of employee for service payments.

The position in Victoria is more difficult for me to follow, but there some categories have been excluded from service payments. I am not sure of the grounds of the exclusions, except that I know that hospital employees were excluded because they had an award that included a provision for service payments. In those circumstances, they were not provided for again by a Cabinet decision. In Victoria the provision for service payments does not apply to the employees of the gas and fuel corporations or the Electricity Commission, but does apply to the tramways, country road boards, harbours, etc. Under those circumstances I wish to point out some of the other departments for which no provision is made in the Supplementary Estimates. No provision is made in the Agent-General in England Department where there are undoubtedly persons of the category referred to by the Treasurer.

No provision is made for Tourist Bureau employees on reserves, cleaners, cooks, watchmen and all at the Immigration Hostel. No provision is made for drivers and mechanics in the Lands Department or for mechanics, tradesmen or assistants in the Government Motor Garage. I do not believe any provision is made for drivers, nor is provision made in the Public Stores Department for foremen, labourers and drivers. Labourers as required on reserves in the Aboriginal Affairs Department would probably not qualify because they are only casual labourers who would not work for the stipulated period but, if they do, no provision is made for them. Nothing is provided for Museum or Art Gallery attendants in the Education Department and nothing is provided at the Agricultural College for the farm, workshop or domestic staff. Nothing is provided for labourers or cleaners in the Chemistry Department.

I should like some information about certain matters arising from the document supplied to me by the Treasurer today. It was reported to me that nurses at general hospitals are excluded. On looking at the document prepared for me by the Treasurer I find that all persons employed in Government hospitals are excluded; that is stated categorically in the document. This document stated that the categories that would not receive the service pay were:

Category.	Awards, etc.
Teachers . . .	Teachers Salaries Board Award.
Police Officers .	The Police Award.
Public Service Officers . . .	Prison Officers' Agreement. Return of the Public Service Board. Awards of the Public Service Arbitrator.
Nurses in Government general hospitals	Nurses Agreement.

I wish to know the definition of Government general hospitals because I have been informed (and I raised this point the other day to have it clarified) that the nurses in the Government mental hospitals, who are working on the same terms as those in Government hospitals, are to receive service payments. This is rather borne out by the document that the Treasurer gave me this afternoon as they were included in it amongst those getting the service pay under the Government Mental Hospitals Board's Determination. I presume that that applies to all the people under the jurisdiction of the Mental Hospitals Board and, if it does, nurses and other persons in the mental hospitals appear to be eligible for the payment.

Whatever the position regarding mental hospitals, nurses and other people employed in the Government hospitals are clearly not receiving the payment, because it is stated here categorically that nurses in the Government general hospitals are not receiving it, the reason given being that they are under the nurses' agreement. I desire information on two or three points that arise in this matter. The agreement in respect of nurses in the Government general hospitals deals not only with trained nurses but with many other categories of people, and many of the people in these other categories are extremely lowly paid. If the Treasurer's statement is to the effect that many of these categories are excluded, I say advisedly that the Opposition takes the most violent objection to it, because it appears to be a grave discrimination against these employees. In fact, I go further and say that there is no reason whatever why nurses should not be included in their entirety in these payments.

We have the inclusion of many categories and many people who have the right and who have properly exercised the right to apply for wage determinations. Those people have received wage determinations from the appropriate tribunal, yet they are included amongst the people who are to get service payments. I doubt very much whether any member opposite has ever studied the position regarding the fixing of nurses' salaries and wages, and I also doubt very much whether any Government member has given much close attention to this matter, because had they done so I do not believe they could have given the decision set out by the Treasurer this afternoon. The nurses' agreement was entered into between the nurses and a Minister of the Crown. The nurses are not under the Public Service Act, and they have no right to go to the Public Service Board for a determination.

I believe that this is a category of employee of the Crown which might well be considered under the amendment the Government introduced last year to enable certain categories not specifically under the Public Service Act to be brought under the Act by proclamation. Before my Government was defeated, a proclamation was made in respect of at least two classes of people (officers of the Prices Department and certain officers of the Police Force). Nurses in Government hospitals have no industrial rights. The two-year agreement set out to give them certain standards of pay and is on all fours with the agreements and determinations that have been made for the categories that are readily included by the Treasurer for service pay.

To emphasize how widespread the nurses' agreement is, let me say that it deals with the Matron and the Superintendent of Nurses on a salary of just over £2,000 a year; it also deals with a nurse assistant and nurse attendant who receive a commencing salary of £443 a year rising to £474 in the second year; and it also deals with a physiotherapy aide who receives on commencement £430 a year rising to £460 a year. It covers all categories employed in hospitals, from the highest to the lowest. In my opinion they should not be excluded from a service payment, and all people under this award should receive the proper amount. The Opposition insists that this payment be made to them.

Another grave aspect of this matter is that a flat rate is provided for service pay. Incidentally, that practice is peculiar to South Australia, as no other Government has provided

that service pay shall be at a flat rate. All other Governments have provided some discrimination, however small, between a skilled and an unskilled person. At present we are extremely short of skilled people. I instance the figure of 49s. 6d. for fourth-year in the Commonwealth as against 33s. If this proposal is adopted a difficult position will arise in the Railways Department and in every other Government department affected by awards, in that the person in charge of a department, who is on a salary and who does not receive service pay, will receive less than those working under him. The seaman before the mast will be receiving more than the captain controlling the ship, and that is fundamentally unsound, because who will assume responsibility if no reward is to be paid in acknowledgment of that responsibility? The Treasurer this afternoon tried to meet the position by saying that he knew anomalies would arise, but that they would be cleared up in due course. He kindly said that he would let me have the information on what action would be taken in that regard, but the inference is that these anomalies will have to be corrected by an arbitration award. The arbitration courts and wages boards will look at Commonwealth awards, which are not subject, of course, to this provision, and they will study the comparability of awards, as they always do. Indeed, I doubt whether some of them will have the power that the Treasurer suggests they should have.

In summarizing, I regret that the Supplementary Estimates do not provide the small sum necessary to establish the halls of residence at Bedford Park university. I believe the sum required is trifling, and I regret that the Treasurer has not found it possible or has not been willing to provide the £10,000 to enable planning for the halls of residence at Bedford Park to commence. As this planning has been held up, inevitably there will be a serious delay, and a year will be lost in providing this accommodation, which I believe is essential for the successful working of the university, particularly as it will overcome one of our grave deficiencies in relation to country students getting a university education in the city. I ask the Treasurer to reconsider this matter. He would not have to get extra Parliamentary authority for this provision, as I believe the appropriation is already available for it. However, if he wants an appropriation for it, I assure him that this will have the support of the Opposition and a speedy passage through this House.

I think the Government has been ill advised in the way it has approached long service payments. I believe this was not a matter that required a Cabinet decision to be made nearly as promptly as it was made, as the investigation necessary to see that no anomalies were created and that a just decision was made to all employees would undoubtedly take much longer than the time Cabinet had available.

I should like to have information on why Royal Adelaide Hospital nurses have been excluded and whether nurses in mental hospitals under a different award but under similar award conditions have been excluded. I should like to know whether all people under the nurses' agreement are excluded or whether only some are excluded, and whether trainee nurses are excluded. I do not think there is any justification for excluding any of them. The Government should have considered the position in relation to subsidized hospitals and all the ancillary institutions which are carrying out Government functions, which are supported by the Government, but which are not included in these Supplementary Estimates. For example, the Fire Brigades Board is an instrumentality carrying out a public undertaking, and it is supported by the Government to the extent of, I think, £82,000 a year. Why are its employees not included? I was pleased that the Tramways Trust was included. The Children's Hospital, our public hospital for children in this State, which is supported by the Government to a very large extent, has evidently not been considered, and the same applies to the maternity section at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and to the Queen Victoria Hospital. This payment should be made on a basis that is palpably fair to all Government employees and I believe that it would be appropriate for the Government immediately to submit the whole matter to the Public Service Commissioner or, what is probably better still, to Judge Williams, the President of the Industrial Court, to obtain from him a list of persons who should be included.

I know that this will make Government members smile, but we should at least have in our determinations something that is not only fair but that is shown to be fair. Finally, you cannot maintain a position where you have the head of the department receiving less than the persons working under him. That is fundamentally wrong and should be corrected quickly. We have all sorts of anomalies under this proposal. For example, as far as I can make out, clerks in the Railways Departments do not receive any payment under it. It is extremely

hard to follow the wide ramifications and to ascertain the people who are working for the Government and what are their conditions of employment. I have not touched on the Electricity Trust's employees but I believe that there is an agreement by which they receive service pay and I am not in a position to express any opinion in regard to them. In regard to Government hospitals, a decision should be made enabling all those persons not under the Public Service Act to receive this service payment. The nurses working under the nurses agreement are not covered by the Public Service Act, and obviously they should receive this payment from the outset. I hope that it is not too late for the Government to rectify the position.

Mr. COUMBE: This question of service pay appears to be the largest single item in the Estimates. I want to make it quite clear that I am not opposed to the service pay proposals, provided fair and equal treatment is given to all Government employees eligible for it. However, I should like further information on who will receive it. I should appreciate receiving this information so that a true appraisal can be made of the proposals. All I want is fair and equal treatment for all, not for some, and to see that all get a fair go.

Many of my constituents work in the Railways, Highways, and Hospitals Departments. I hope that none is not catered for in these proposals. Service pay has definite merit if properly applied—if it means greater efficiency and loyalty in the Public Service, if it leads to greater output and the easier filling of vacancies and the creating of a greater work force, if it speeds up development programmes and results in greater service to the public. We must remember that at present we have a record low unemployment figure and a record high number of job vacancies. In his policy speech the Premier said this about service pay, which I think is germane to the proposals before us:

Service pay payments retrospective to January 1, 1965, will be made with provision that our service payments will be in addition to any payments at present being received, with a proviso that they will be in agreement with the decisions of our Industrial Advisory Committee.

The Premier promised that, if his Party was elected to govern, service pay would not only be paid but would be in addition to payments already received and would be "in agreement with the decisions of our Industrial Advisory Committee."

What is this committee? Is it a Parliamentary committee? Is it a Public Service committee? Is it a committee of honourable members opposite? Is it a committee of the industrial wing of the Labor Party? I can only assume that the figures before us now were recommended by that Industrial Advisory Committee, whatever it may be. I take it that it is not a Parliamentary committee. Can I be told what this all-powerful committee is? Also, were the Government special industrial officers consulted on this matter? Members opposite know that in the Public Service there are special industrial officers whose sole duty it is to advise the Government on industrial matters, wages boards determinations, conditions and the like. I suggest they were not consulted, because the information we have now does not match that given to us previously on the advice of these industrial officers. Why do some departments not appear in these Supplementary Estimates when others do? Some departments are not mentioned at all. One of our larger departments is the Highways Department, but it is not mentioned in these Estimates. I looked in vain for reference to it in the Treasurer's explanation today but could not find it. It may be there under some other obscure award. It would appear that there is no mention of the Highways Department. Many employees of this department live in my district and naturally I am concerned about their welfare. They are extremely interested to know whether they are to receive service pay. Can the Treasurer say whether provision is made for Highways Department employees to get this service pay allowance in the same way as employees in the other departments mentioned in the Supplementary Estimates? The Tramways Trust has been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition and I shall not cover that ground again, except to say that it is not mentioned in these Estimates. Provision may have been made elsewhere for it, but if it has been forgotten it will have to be included in other Estimates to be brought down later. I should like information on these matters.

In introducing these Estimates the Treasurer said that service pay for these departments would cost about £1,100,000 for a full year, and that about £6,000 would be needed for small and minor departments. I do not know which departments are covered by this £6,000. Perhaps it is for the staff at Parliament House, office cleaners, Government drivers and all types of employees. However, I do not know if these people are covered. Will a tradesman in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, for instance, who is referred to in the Sup-

plementary Estimates, get this service pay while an equivalent tradesman in the Highways Department does not get it? If that is the case it would seem to be extremely unfair, and I do not think it would have been the Government's intention. It could be that a mistake has occurred or that I have been misinformed. Will a fitter and turner in the Railways Department get two lots of service pay and a fitter and turner in the Highways Department none? I should not imagine that this is the case, but there is nothing to contradict it, and I should like some information. No reference is made to the Highways Department in the Supplementary Estimates, the document read by the Treasurer today, or in his reply to a question. It would appear that there is an anomaly.

As a fitter and turner is recognized as a highly trained worker and his position is often used as a yardstick in awards, such as the metal trades award, I shall use this occupation as an example. It could be that a fitter and turner in the Railways Department would get two service pays while a man in the Highways Department would get none. He would then be receiving £2 a week more than the fitter and turner in the Highways Department. If the man in the Highways Department were to be included for service pay he would receive 25s. a week increase, whereas the man in the Railways Department would receive 40s. a week. The same position would apply to an employee in the E. & W.S. Department. This does not seem to be completely fair and it looks like class distinction. It is an anomaly that should be ironed out quickly. If a fitter and turner has been employed in the E. & W.S. Department, for instance, for 40 years, after serving his apprenticeship, and is nearing his retiring age, he will have given long and faithful service, yet under this proposal he will get only 25s. a week extra. The lowest unskilled labourer in the same department after three years' service will get the same 25s. Is that fair? Is it any reward for merit and loyalty? Where is the justice when a man can give his whole life in a department yet get no more than the lowest paid man who has been in the department only two or three years? I suggest that had the Government's industrial officers been consulted on these details they would have pointed out some of the anomalies to Cabinet when it was framing these proposals. If the details were worked out by this rather famous committee that I mentioned, this Industrial Advisory Committee—

Mr. Millhouse: Whoever they may be.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not know who they are. When we get these anomalies it highlights the difference between a Cabinet decision and a tribunal decision. The rate before us is in addition to the rate already received. Overtime was specifically mentioned by the Treasurer in his speech. Here again, it is something that puzzles me, because the retrospectivity of this service pay on a flat rate goes back to January 1 of this year, whereas those who have worked overtime between the last pay day in March and now will get service pay on overtime and penalty rates. I should like to know why that time has been fixed. Overtime is rather an unusual retrospectivity matter; flat rates are often given, but not often overtime. Why has the overtime gone back to the end of March? I should like to know why this date has been plucked out of the hat.

Mr. Jennings: The honourable member needs to know a lot.

Mr. COUMBE: If the member for Enfield listens long enough he might learn one or two things. A flat rate has been offered by the Government; in the second year it will be 10s., in the third year 17s. 6d., and in the fourth year 25s. The Treasurer said today that it will apply to leave with pay. Several Government members, including you, Mr. Chairman, are well versed in these matters, and you, Sir, have long experience as an advocate fighting for margins and conditions of employment. I put it to you, Sir, that in the flat rate proposed there is no margin for skill, which is a fundamental in awards throughout the country. The pattern of Commonwealth awards is the Metal Trades Award, which contains hundreds of classifications with varying margins for skill. If no skill margin is provided, there is no incentive for a person to improve his position. I thought this was a case where the Government could have introduced service pay on a graduated scale to provide a margin for skill, for that certainly would have been to the advantage not only of the employee but also to the Public Service, and certainly to the Government, which employs these persons. A skill margin is definitely a reward for merit, whereas the proposal now before us narrows down the skill margin that presently applies. I maintain that such a procedure reduces incentive. Is it the Government's policy to have a great levelling out, bringing everything down to the lowest common denominator? I hope it is not, because I strongly disagree with that policy. The Minister of Education and the Minister for Labour and Industry

have made strong and frequent appeals to the public, to employer organizations and to others, to take a greater quota of apprentices. More apprentices mean more tradesmen, and the incentive is that a lad, after qualifying, receives a greater margin for skill than does the unskilled person. I should have thought that the two Ministers would support a move to include skill margins in any service pay proposal.

The flat rate now proposed slows down and then stifles the urge for a man to better himself and to seek promotion in his job. How will the skilled tradesman feel after years of study and work to find that his margin has been reduced and that he is not to receive a further reward for his training and skill? Service pay regulations made by the Commonwealth, Victoria and New South Wales are based on classifications giving a reward for skill. For some strange reason South Australia is to be the only State now to depart from that principle. The service pay proposals by the former Liberal and Country League Government to the railway employees contained this principle of a reward for skill. The offer made by the Playford Administration before the election contained a marked reward for skill. For instance, in the fourth year the unskilled person would receive 8s., the semi-skilled 12s. 6d., and the skilled 25s. In Commonwealth regulations there is a margin for the skilled and the unskilled person. In New South Wales it applies to the tradesman and leading hand, and the other classification is for other adult males and females. In Victoria it applies to tradesmen and semi-skilled and unskilled workers. In South Australia there is to be no reward for the tradesman.

This is a bad principle with which to start off a service pay proposal under the new Administration, as it departs from what has been the principle throughout Australia and in this State. It seems that only part of the service is being catered for now. Is there any classification that is not mentioned? I hope the Government will realize that the previous Government's offer was for the whole service, and was to cover everyone who was eligible. Why must we depart from an established principle that applies in other States and did apply in this State? I should like answers to these questions. The presentation of the Supplementary Estimates is unfortunate and clumsy, and possibly genuine mistakes have been made, but I trust that honourable members will receive the information they require, which will enable this matter

to be rectified to the benefit of the whole Public Service. I suggest that the whole matter of service pay, the principle of which everybody seems to be in favour, should go before an appropriate industrial authority, so that the anomalies I have mentioned can be ironed out, and so that those who are eligible will receive what they are justly entitled to receive.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Section 16 of the Highways Act provides *inter alia*:

(1) The wages, salaries, and expenses incurred in connection with carrying out the provisions of this Act shall be payable out of the highways fund without any appropriation other than this Act.

(2) If any question arises as to what sums are properly payable out of the highways fund under this section, that question shall be determined by the Minister, whose decision shall be final.

No provision is made in these Supplementary Estimates for Tramways Trust employees, but provision will be made when the Estimates are brought down.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Would that mean they could not receive their payments at present?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: No provision will be made under the Supplementary Estimates for any service payments to Tramways Trust employees.

Mr. Heaslip: When the payments are made will they be retrospective?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Yes, but not necessarily to the same date as that of the others.

Mr. Millhouse: It would be a cause for grievance if they were not to the same date. Why shouldn't they get the payment to the same date?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: As the honourable member for Mitcham seems so persistent about what should be done for employees of the M.T.T., perhaps I should point out that I do not know how I shall be able to increase the subsidy in the Estimates under the line "Tourist".

Mr. Millhouse: That's blackmail!

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I have given what I think is a reasonable answer. A query was raised about employees of the Electricity Trust. To the best of my knowledge, they have received service payments for many years, and those payments have not been included in any award.

I have not been able to ascertain whether drivers employed in the Government Motor Garage come under the Public Service or whether they are considered to be daily paid

employees, but service payments for them will be attended to as soon as I can obtain an authority on this. I am surprised at the poor conditions under which the garage has operated for many years. I have visited it since I have become responsible for it, but I have not obtained all the information I have wanted. Employees of this garage have had to get underneath passenger buses parked on the roadway, and this has caused me considerable concern. This section has about 470 under its jurisdiction. Apart from other duties, it is responsible for examining school buses, so it can be seen that a great responsibility is thrown on it. I assure members that its employees will not be forgotten in relation to service payments. Discussions are proceeding between the Manager of the garage and representatives of the Public Buildings Department. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that we had made no provision for the nurses, or for the persons employed in the Adelaide Children's Hospital or in subsidized hospitals. However, it is not the responsibility of the Government to interfere on the question of wages or salaries paid in those hospitals, which are not under control of the Government. I do not think any member here would criticize the remarkably good job done by the administration of the Adelaide Children's Hospital. The Governments of the day have subsidized many appeals for funds, whether made through Telethon or any other organization that has raised funds, and the considerable amounts subscribed by the people of the State have saved those Governments a considerable amount of money.

Why should my Government be asked to tell the administration of the Adelaide Children's Hospital, or any other hospital subsidized by the Government, that they should make certain payments? However, if the same people make representations as a result of what the Government has done, the application will be considered. This afternoon I stated that this Government recognized fully the value of skilled persons in industry and we had that in mind when service pay was being considered. I was informed, and was in a position to know, that the industrial tribunals of this State did not approve of the arrangements suggested by the previous Government. Other conferences might have been arranged, but the people changed their Government. Our decision on service pay has not been reached easily. It has been referred to in the policy speech and will, no doubt, be mentioned again many times. When we came to determine the issue, we recognized the payments for margins of

skill and we did not intend to upset what had already been granted in that respect. Also, service pay would be recognized as applying to adult employees in the Government service.

This Government realizes that it has to compete for labour in any walk of life. We want to make positions for people in Government employment career positions so that they will be proud to work for the Government without going from job to job because of financial inducements offered elsewhere. It is important that we provide for employees of the Railways Department. We cannot continue to provide out of revenue about £4,250,000 to balance the budget of the Railways Department, which is now to come under the control of the Minister of Transport. It is anticipated that we shall need more rolling stock to carry greater volumes of freight. Under those conditions it is essential that we retain the skilled artisans in railway employment. We also realize that accidents can occur even in the best railway system ever introduced.

When considering this matter we gave special attention to those employed in the permanent way section. I do not need to remind honourable members of the unfortunate derailments that have taken place. I believe members will appreciate that if the Government were to continue to provide for labour to be engaged in the railway service, particularly on the permanent way, then it had to offer some inducement to those people so that they could be retained in the department. I do not think it is necessary to refer to the hardship associated with the living conditions of some of these workers and to the loneliness suffered by them. Surely it is enough to say that service pay should be provided to these employees who try to ensure safe journeys for the people and thereby safeguard human life. I say again that this service payment is for service that has been given. It is not a question of an incremental payment for skill: it is a margin for adult employees engaged in Government service.

I have reason to believe that the Leader of the Opposition has been able to make great play tonight because I was generous enough to provide him with much information about the many different awards that I had already referred to this afternoon. I do not intend to cover all those matters, but I doubt whether any member in this House has ever heard of some of the tribunals mentioned. For instance, has any member heard of the A.R.U. Traffic, Permanent Way and Signalling Wages Staff

Award, the A.R.U. Miscellaneous Grades Award or the Railways Metal Trades Grades Award? I do not think that these tribunals have been made known to members before, and I do not think many members have ever heard of them. We have all heard of the Locomotive Enginemens' Award, the Vehicle Builders Award, the Carpenters and Joiners Award, the Painters and Dockers Award, and others, but there are others of which we have never heard. I do not take exception to these matters being raised. However, I know the Leader will recognize that we are not attempting to do anything unconstitutional in these matters.

Mr. Millhouse: What about telling us something about the Industrial Advisory Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: As I mentioned this afternoon, those persons who will not receive service payments include all railway salaried officers whose salary is prescribed on an annual basis, and officers paid under various awards. I mentioned those awards this afternoon, and I do not intend going over them again, but included in them are the teachers, certain police officers, certain Public Service officers, and the nurses in Government general hospitals under the Nurses' Agreement. Some minor administrative details on the application of service pay have still to be decided, and immediately a decision has been made a circular will be issued to all departments concerned. I mentioned that a copy of that information would be forwarded to the Leader, who said that he would be pleased to have it. I believe that that covers the situation reasonably well. Provision is made for these service payments to be paid retrospectively from January 1 up to and including June 30 of this year. Additional amounts will be provided for when the Revenue Estimates are presented.

As this matter has been queried by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), as well as by the Leader, I repeat that Cabinet is aware that the grant of service payments to daily and weekly paid employees may create anomalies and affect some salaried officers who are excluded from such payments. However, I am of the opinion that consideration of these anomalies is a matter for the appropriate industrial tribunal, and that they should be submitted to the tribunal by the officer concerned or his union. That is a broad coverage of the matter. The Government is mindful of these matters. By way of illustration, at the Islington workshops besides the employees in the workshops there are clerical workers. It is not

possible to compare the working conditions of the men in the workshops and those engaged in clerical duties. However, because of this 25s. service payment the clerical worker may find himself at a disadvantage compared with the workshop employee. He should approach his organization with the request that it approach a tribunal or a court to get an adjustment. The service payments provided for in these Supplementary Estimates are for daily or weekly adult employees in Government employment, and not for persons receiving salaries. If these latter people are at a disadvantage it is up to the appropriate tribunal to see that the anomaly, if there is one, is removed. I believe I have answered all questions asked by honourable members.

Mr. Millhouse: The Industrial Advisory Committee is the next thing.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: If the honourable member can find anything associated with that in these Estimates—

Mr. Millhouse: I have not found it yet, and that is why I ask about it.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I shall give information about anything that is before the Committee.

Mr. Millhouse: Why cover up on this?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: If there is anything to be said about this matter, it can be left to another day. If there is a question associated with an organization not responsible to this Parliament—

Mr. Millhouse: That is something we know now.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The member for Mitcham should know that a period is set aside each day for questions.

Mrs. Steele: Why are nurses in mental hospitals receiving this service payment, and not nurses in general hospitals?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I think the Supplementary Estimates cover everything that requires to be covered, and these payments, in all cases, are provided as from January 1 to June 30. A query was raised about providing that payments be made retrospective, and March 31 was mentioned. I point out that we did not know until March 6 that we would be forming a Government. This matter was resolved on Wednesday, March 10, when we met in Executive Council, and when His Excellency accepted certain proposals that I had submitted to him. It was then that we undertook to form a Ministry. We had to meet as a Ministry to determine several things. We have many things to do in the next three years, but we were unable to

do everything in the first week. We could not make retrospective payments on all the overtime rates as we did not wish timekeepers in the Railways Department, for instance, to have to work out overtime rates back to January 1.

I thought I made clear the position relating to the £10,000 mentioned in relation to the Bedford Park university, but as it has been raised again I will set out the position. The Universities Commission has recommended to the Commonwealth Government that during the three years from 1964 to 1966 it provide a pound-for-pound grant up to a maximum of £220,000 towards a hall or residence at the Bedford Park university, estimated to cost £440,000. The previous Government, though it had approved a provision for other building work at the university, had not made financial provision for this building in its budgets up to June 30, 1965; that is, it had made no provision for this work during the first 1½ years of the three years concerned. The incoming Government found itself faced on taking office with financial requirements for university purposes for which inadequate Budget provision was made to the extent of £300,000 on account of revised salaries and £50,000 on account of residential colleges. Part only of these costs was recoverable from the Commonwealth. It also felt bound, because of the urgency to provide adequate buildings for the opening of Bedford Park in 1966, to agree to provide over the next six months half of an additional £400,000 needed to complete these buildings. In these circumstances, and as a hall of residence though desirable was not vital to opening the university next year, it was decided to defer a decision thereon until the Government was able to prepare its 1965-66 Budget for presentation to Parliament. At that time this requirement will be considered alongside the other desirable and essential purposes requiring Government finance, and a decision will be made on relative priorities in relation to funds available. My colleague, the Minister of Education, has informed the Principal-Designate of the Bedford Park division of the university accordingly. In case further information should be sought by the Leader, let me refer him to his letter of December 11, 1964, addressed to Sir Leslie Martin, C.B.E., F.R.S., Chairman of the Australian Universities Commission, St. Kilda Road, Melbourne:

I would repeat the indication already given to you that I would be prepared, although reluctantly, to arrange that the university



forego for the present triennium £400,000 of the present allocation approved for a hall of residence, if the Commonwealth should require this as an offset to the expenditure upon the clearly more urgent project. I am, in the circumstances, advising the university I am fully in accord with its proposal to proceed forthwith upon the work. The university will, of course, continue to consult with you and seek your approvals and advice as if the project were one in which the Commonwealth had already agreed fully to participate. Apart entirely from recognizing the reasonable responsibility to consult with you in such fashion, both the Government and the university council appreciate greatly the benefit of your advice and guidance to the university in these matters.

In the meantime, until further advised by you, I shall ask the university not to make irrevocable commitments for expenditure in the present triennium upon the hall of residence. I do not know what the Leader wants us to do concerning this. He suggests that we bring down a further appropriation of £10,000, when I have already indicated what this Government is prepared to do in regard to the university at Bedford Park, with particular reference to the hall of residence. I believe that I have covered most of the points raised in this debate on this important matter and I hope that I have satisfactorily met the requirements of the committee.

Mr. SHANNON: It would be a hard-hearted member who would not have some sympathy with the Government. I, for one, realize that one cannot expect the Government to implement immediately the whole of its pre-election promises. When the Government began to examine the problem of service pay, it no doubt realized immediately that a large sum would be involved. A fair sum is involved in the Supplementary Estimates. I regret that the Treasurer took so long to justify the inclusion of some people under the proposals and spent so short a time dealing with those excluded from this first issue of service pay. We should have been happier had we known that for the time being some people were excluded but that it was intended, when finances permitted, to include them. I do not know whether that is the case but, had we been told that that was so, I should not now be speaking.

Those people who will have to wait for service pay are just as important in our society as the employees of the Railways Department, whom I do not decry because, after all, they are responsible for the safety of an important transport system in this State, but surely the people who treat the sick in our Government hospitals perform an equally important task. The Treasurer has made it clear that there are anomalies in this first issue of service pay.

Obviously, members of the same family may be employed in different Government departments, and one may qualify immediately for service pay while another is at present, unfortunately, debarred from it and is not certain whether he will get it ultimately. This is unsettling. I sympathize with the Government to an extent, because it rushed unnecessarily into this matter. There was no need for such haste without a careful examination of the implications involved so that there would be no heart-burnings between different sections of Government employment.

If the Government discovered that its finances could not stretch to giving the whole of this service pay back to January 1 of this year, it might have been desirable for it to spread whatever funds were available over the whole scheme, even if it meant less service pay for each individual, on the understanding that it would be made up in the next financial year. That approach I could have understood and been satisfied with. I do not know whether the Treasurer has plans for bringing in what would be a supplementary Budget. I do not think he will do that but I see no other course open to him at this stage because I understand that the Government intends to conclude these matters this evening. If that is so, the front benches will have no time to do anything further about it. Some people in my district employed by the Government will be excluded under these proposals, but I hope that ultimately they will benefit from them. I do not deny that the Government has a mandate for this. The Party opposite is in office because it told the people what it would do if appointed to govern. I am not arguing about that. My point (and I think Ministers should consider this) is that some public pronouncement should be made about the Government's ultimate goal with regard to service pay for all Government servants in whatever department they happen to be employed. I cannot see why an institution like the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital should not be included and I do not know whether that is the Government's intention. This hospital provides a public service that I am sure no member would wish to see discarded. If this hospital is not to be included then I think some explanation should be made about it. Generally speaking I think that Government members will find the Opposition reasonable in this problem. I know some of the difficulties that the Government will encounter in putting through the proposals that it made before the election.

The CHAIRMAN: Those matters are not before the Chair. The honourable member must direct his remarks to the Hospitals Department line.

Mr. SHANNON: Are we dealing only with one line?

The CHAIRMAN: The opportunity for general discussion closed some time ago.

Mr. SHANNON: Then I will conclude my remarks by referring to the line on hospitals. It is a pity that, at this stage, some hospitals are included and some excluded. I should not be so concerned if the Treasurer would say which people were included and which were not.

Mr. McKee: You did not worry about them before!

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Port Pirie would suggest that I have never had any worries, but if he were to accompany me on my rounds he would find that I have plenty of them. In this case my worry is small because I am not responsible for who shall and who shall not receive service pay and which hospital shall enjoy its provision and which shall not. That is not my problem, but I suggest that it is the Government's problem because it raised this matter. The Opposition did not raise it when they were seeking election by the people. Perhaps we were foolish because we might have received more votes and still be the Government had we made this offer, but the Opposition beat us to the draw.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I have endeavoured to make the position as clear as possible. I again give a firm indication that we set out on a policy to provide that all daily or weekly paid adult employees in Government service would receive certain service payments. I have already said that nurses are in a different category from most others and, at this stage, I do not know how their arrangements are made up. If any Government employees under the category that I have mentioned have not been included in these Supplementary Estimates I give a firm indication that they will be considered as soon as we can obtain further reports on this matter.

Mr. Shannon: Will that also be retrospective to January 1?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: If any section in Government employment does not come within the category that I have mentioned, then the organization responsible for that section should apply to the industrial tribunal. For example, as I said earlier, if it is the clerical division of the Railways Department or the clerical division of some other organization, it is up to those bodies to come before the industrial

tribunal. I still have to get information about the working arrangements of nurses.

Mr. Shannon: Wouldn't it have been wise to get that first?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I know that up to now we have not been able to ascertain whether they come within the ambit of our policy. I make it quite clear that we will endeavour to do everything possible to assist the nursing profession, because I believe there is room for some improvement there. At this stage I consider that I have provided the information sought by the member for Onkaparinga, and I hope that he will be a little patient and let us get over any possible further difficulties. As I have indicated, we will pay attention to these matters.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: One or two things seem to have been overlooked by the Treasurer. First, I point out that the nurses do not have an industrial tribunal and they are not under the Public Service Act. If the Treasurer looks at the agreement in front of him he will see that it is an agreement between the Minister and the nurses' representatives. I asked earlier whether all the persons subject to the agreement were excluded from service payments or whether it was only the nurses that were excluded. I pointed out that there were many other people involved in the agreement who would be not double-certificated nurses but trainees in various categories. Are those other people to be excluded?

The Treasurer has spoken very broadly about daily paid and weekly paid officers, but in fact there are no daily paid officers. We have people whose rates of pay are determined on a daily basis, but I do not think anyone is paid more frequently than once a fortnight. The hospital agreement states that the hiring shall be considered upon a fortnightly basis. I assure the Treasurer that there is a particular case, and I did not get an answer from him. I do not know whether the Treasurer has this information, but I believe that nurses employed under identical conditions in the State's mental hospitals receive the service payment. If that is so, why is not the nurse at the Port Augusta Hospital, at the Port Pirie Hospital, and at any other hospital, on the same basis? Will the Treasurer specifically examine this matter, because I believe there is a case for this payment to be made.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: All matters will be fully examined, and as I have indicated, we will do all we can to assist in eliminating any anomalies that may exist.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Most girls staffing our public hospitals and all hospitals throughout the State have not reached adult age. I presume they will all be automatically excluded from service payments. The Treasurer's statement tonight, and when he introduced the Supplementary Estimates, clearly implied that only adults would receive the payments. The Treasurer said earlier today, too, that extra costs to be borne by certain government-subsidized hospitals would be examined later.

Several large hospitals in the metropolitan area rely heavily on the Government for annual subsidies to meet running and capital expenses. They will not be able to maintain staff in competition with those hospitals where the staff gets service payments. Therefore, the managements of those hospitals will have to make certain intimations to their staffs at an early stage. I have some knowledge of the difficulties experienced by subsidized hospitals in the country in retaining staff. For many years these hospitals when in dire straits for staff have appealed to the Government for relief, and had it not been for the then Minister of Health, who arranged for relieving matrons on the staff of the Hospitals Department to assist, many country hospitals would have been forced to close down from time to time. Will the Treasurer make a definite promise to those subsidized hospitals that the additional cost of service payments, which would accrue to them in the same way as they would accrue to other institutions, will be considered when the next annual grant is being calculated, so that the managements of the hospitals concerned can give an undertaking to their staffs that they will receive service payments? That would enable the managements to commence paying them, knowing that they will be reimbursed when the next annual grant is made. Managements may well accept the Treasurer's statement that he will look at these things favourably, but if these payments are to be provided in the Estimates for the next financial year the Treasurer should say so now, so that the managements concerned will know exactly where they stand.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The member for Flinders is correct when he says that our policy on this matter concerns only adults in Government employment. I have received no approaches as yet from subsidized hospitals that are meeting competition from other hospitals. I have informed the Committee tonight that all these matters will be examined, but that does not mean that we shall commit ourselves before we make that examination. I

stated our policy during the election campaign, as well as in these Committee proceedings and on other occasions. I announced it after the elections and I have told this Committee what the Government's policy is. I have said that the Government will examine all these matters. If it can meet the requests it will do so. It will let honourable members know if it cannot do so.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer said that service payments would be made only to adult staff. This would preclude a big proportion of the profession from receiving these payments. Some could join the Government service at 16 years of age and receive these payments after one year, whereas some joining at 17 years of age could wait four years before getting a benefit. Will the Treasurer say why the service pay will apply only to adults?

Line passed.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL, MINISTER OF ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF SOCIAL WELFARE.

Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department, £4,000—passed.

MINISTER OF WORKS.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, £20,000.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer did not reply to my previous question, which relates to this line also. Will he say why these payments will apply only to adults?

Line passed.

Public Buildings Department, £19,700—passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Education Department, £116,100.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: For equipment, materials, services, subsidies, general educational expenses, and costs of operation and maintenance at primary schools, £39,000 is provided, and for these things at area schools £12,000 is provided. The Treasurer said that the most marked increase had been in the cost of fuel, gas and electricity, and that payments of subsidies to schools to match funds raised by school committees would be above the provision in the Estimates. Unless more buildings have been equipped with heating and better lighting, I do not know why there should have been a marked increase in these costs, as the unit cost of these things has decreased. In many country areas electricity charges have been substantially reduced. At Cummins, for instance, the price has been reduced by more than 50 per cent. I do not understand the significance of these items, particularly in

view of the Treasurer's statement. I am also concerned about the payment of subsidies. I have been reliably informed by secretaries of school committees that they have been told that there is a rather embarrassing shortage of funds in the department for this purpose and that, therefore, the payment of subsidies has been somewhat delayed. I have heard that the delay has been accumulating in the last two or three months. As a matter of fact, my son has been associated with an area school committee for some time and I understand that it is only recently that the delay has been building up. The committee members are reasonable people and are not complaining seriously, but I hope that with the acceptance of these Estimates the Minister may be able to arrange for subsidy payments to be made. After all, the committees are happy to do much voluntary work for the schools and I hope they will continue to have the opportunity to do it because it maintains enthusiasm and interest.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I must again refer to my earlier remarks on this matter. I said that for the Education Department, excess payments will be incurred for the general operating expenses of primary schools, area schools, technical schools, high schools, and the recruitment and training branch. The increased payments arise from a general increase in the level of expenditure on a variety of items, each of them relatively small, but in aggregate amounting to an estimated £112,000. The most marked increase has been in the cost of fuel, gas and electricity, while rents, rates and taxes, and telephone charges have also risen steadily. Payments of subsidies to schools to match funds raised and expended by school committees will be above the estimate, and the recruitment and training branch will incur additional expenditure on essential equipment, including text books. The member for Flinders will appreciate that I am not the Minister of Education and that the question of subsidy payments would be better dealt with by him. At the moment he is more conversant with the matter than I am. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I request that the Minister of Education be permitted to give the necessary information.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): When I assumed office I was informed by the Director and the Deputy Director of my department that the payment of subsidies had to be stopped for the very good reason that, despite the strictest economy, the department had been unable to keep within

the Estimates and that in the matter of subsidies, the estimate had been exceeded by about £30,000. It was not until we were able to include that amount in the Supplementary Estimates that they could be paid. In other words, when I assumed office it was impossible to do anything about it until the Supplementary Estimates arrived. The department exercised the strictest economy during the year.

As regards the increased costs of light and heating, between 1964 and 1965 there was an increase of nearly 10,000 in the number of pupils, an increase of 4.8 per cent on the previous year, which meant extra light and heating. Also, there has been an improvement in light and heating in almost all the schools, as a result of which naturally costs have risen.

Line passed.

Libraries Department, £1,300; Miscellaneous, £280,000—passed.

#### MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF FORESTS.

Agriculture Department, £2,100; Produce Department, £2,600; Miscellaneous, £70,000—passed.

#### MINISTER OF IRRIGATION.

Department of Lands—Irrigation and Drainage, £3,000—passed.

#### MINISTER OF MINES.

Mines Department, £1,200—passed.

#### MINISTER OF MARINE.

Harbors Board Department, £11,000—passed.

#### MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND MINISTER OF TRANSPORT.

Railways Department, £205,000—passed.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 1).

The Supplementary Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for £795,000 was founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. F. H. Walsh, and read a first time.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It is based upon the Supplementary Estimates which have been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further £795,000 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum and sets out the amount to be provided under each department or activity. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor, and that the receipts

of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made. Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan Funds or other public funds if the moneys received from the Commonwealth Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1964, or at a rate in excess of the rate which was in force under any return, award or determination. Clauses 4, 5 and 6 are standard clauses in an Appropriation Bill. I commend the Bill for the consideration of members.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): The Bill appears to be the usual form of Appropriation Bill and I see nothing in it that would tempt me to delay its passage, except for one point which I mentioned earlier and to which I should like to refer briefly, namely, the question of *ex gratia* payments which may be necessary to give a wider determination to service payments than is provided under the Bill.

As I understand the position, this Bill enables certain service payments to be made; they are, of course, not under any determination or award of any court, and therefore they would be classed as *ex gratia* payments, and to the extent that this Bill appropriates money to pay them I believe that they can be lawfully paid. However, there is an old school of thought which would even say that they could not be paid unless there is an act of Parliament specifically authorizing payments, and that the passing of the Estimates would not in itself give an authority to pay: it gives an authority to pay only in the case of a lawful commitment by the Government.

Be that is it may, I think it can be accepted that the *ex gratia* payments provided by way of service pay can be made on those items which have been specified in the Estimates we have been considering and also in the Bill before us. However, I see nothing in the Bill that would enable the Government to extend service payments to any department not specifically mentioned in the Bill. I referred earlier today to a list of departments which were not men-

tioned but in respect of which undoubtedly service payments were authorized to be paid. Speaking now purely from a technical point of view, I believe that the appropriation which has been passed previously and which may be relied on to meet the service payments that the Government intends to make is not legally possible. In those circumstances I believe that the Auditor-General may hold up the warrant for service payments, because undoubtedly they have not been appropriated by Parliament for that purpose and they are outside any award or determination as provided in clause 6 (b), which reads:

at a rate in excess of the rate which, during the period in respect of which the payment is made, was in force under any return made under the Acts relating to the public service, or pursuant to any regulation or any award, order or determination of a court or other body empowered to fix salaries or wages.

I do not know of any authority for the Government itself to fix salaries and wages, except in limited circumstances. This is a matter the Government should consider, and the Under Treasurer should be asked to consider whether present approvals are sufficient to meet the service payments which have been mentioned by the Treasurer tonight and which are not included in the Estimates. I support the second reading.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): It has never been the intention of the Under Treasurer or the Government to exceed its powers in this matter. There may be one or two items that could be adjusted, for instance, in regard to the Municipal Tramways Trust, but these things cannot be done until the necessary appropriation is brought before this Parliament. I assure the House that if it is necessary under extreme emergency to deal with certain other matters not included, but which are found to be essential, I shall notify the Opposition of our intention and have the matter adjusted.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, May 26, at 2 p.m.