

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, June 29, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

PULP INDUSTRY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Prior to the last election, the Government was negotiating with a firm to establish a pulp industry in the South-East. It was agreed that an extension of six months be given to the firm to enable it to undertake investigations and to formulate a programme. Can the Minister of Forests say whether the Forestry Board has continued negotiations with this firm and, if it has, whether those negotiations have been successful? If an agreement has been reached, where will the industry be located?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I prefer to get a considered reply for the Leader as soon as possible.

ELECTORAL ROLL.

Mr. LAWN: At naturalization ceremonies, candidates are given enrolment forms for the Senate, House of Representatives and House of Assembly. Will the Attorney-General consider ensuring that eligible persons receive an enrolment form for the Legislative Council at these ceremonies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will consider the matter; it is a good idea.

MALLALA SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: I was telephoned at the weekend about the transfer of a junior teacher from the Mallala school to the Peterborough school. The enrolment at Mallala school is 68 children and, until last Friday, there were three teachers. However, the teacher of, I think, grades 3 and 4, was transferred at short notice to Peterborough on Monday, leaving two teachers to handle 68 children in seven grades at Mallala. I am told that 41 students will be in grades 4 to 7. The school committee fears that this is too many children for one person to handle in four mixed grades. I understand that teaching staff is short at present, and the committee is afraid that a replacement may not be available. Although an average of 41 students is enrolled in these four grades, I point out that they are mixed grades. In view of the circumstances, will the Minister of Education have a replacement appointed to that school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to have the matter examined and to see whether the position can be rectified.

HOUSING FINANCE.

Mr. JENNINGS: As I understand the South Australian Superannuation Fund invests part of its funds in housing loans, will the Premier ascertain what sum the fund expects to be able to make available for housing loans next financial year, and whether it is able to satisfy all applications for housing loans received from contributors to the fund?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I hope to have that information for the honourable member tomorrow.

ELIZABETH COURT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although I direct my question to the Minister of Works, the Attorney-General may interest himself in this matter. Yesterday I was engaged in the court at Elizabeth. It was juvenile court day, which meant that only the people immediately concerned in the case being heard were allowed in the courtroom, and that everybody else had to wait outside. That is laid down as the procedure for juvenile courts, and it meant that there was a great crush of people in the vestibule outside the courtroom, causing Mr. K. H. Kirkman, S.M., the presiding magistrate, to make some fairly terse remarks about the accommodation for the public and parties at the court.

I have been told (although His Honour did not say this) that the position is worse on unsatisfied judgment summons days, when people cannot even get into the vestibule. Obviously, the volume of the work at the court has increased out of all proportion to what was expected when the courtroom was built. Will the Minister of Works say whether consideration has been given to increasing the accommodation available at the Elizabeth courthouse by extending the building and, if it has been given, when extensions are likely to be made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member will realize that the court to which he refers was built prior to the present Government's entering office. The Attorney-General has been looking at this matter and, if my memory serves me correctly, he has referred the question to me; I, in turn, have referred it to the Public Buildings Department for a report. When that report is to hand I shall be happy to inform the honourable member of the outcome.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked on June 22 regarding personnel to conciliate in disputes concerning over-award payments?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The report of the President of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission was made for presentation to the Commonwealth Parliament. It is not proper for a State Minister to comment on suggestions made by the President in relation to the Commonwealth jurisdiction. However, it should be pointed out that the President merely stated that he would not rule out as inappropriate that the Commission should offer its assistance in certain circumstances. He did not make any specific suggestion that the Commission should provide personnel to conciliate in disputes regarding over-award payments. As regards matters which are not subject to Commonwealth Awards, the President of the Industrial Court of South Australia has power to act as mediator to deal with industrial matters in cases in which it appears to him that his mediation is desirable in the public interests. This power is exercised as and when the President considers it desirable. In practice the power is frequently exercised and conferences are often convened before any differences of opinion between the employer and his employees have resulted in a stoppage of work. Indeed, it is expressly provided in the Industrial Code that the jurisdiction of the President in an industrial matter does not depend upon the existence of a dispute and matters dealt with under the above power are not limited to the subject matters of the awards concerned. In addition, apart from his stated powers under the Industrial Code, the President has on various occasions acted as a private arbitrator to decide matters of disagreement between employer and employees. The terms of such arbitrations are not, of course, limited by the terms of the Industrial Code.

FAUNA AND FLORA RESERVE.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of June 24 regarding a fauna and flora reserve on southern Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: At present there are no firm plans for a fauna and flora reserve in the Pandalowie area, but it is considered highly desirable that a fairly extensive area in this vicinity should be preserved for these purposes. Some unofficial approaches

are believed to have been made to Waratah Gypsum Pty. Ltd. which holds extensive areas under lease in this district.

SERVICE PAY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I believe that the Premier has an answer to my question of June 23 about whether tribunals have the necessary jurisdiction to deal with retrospectivity of service payments.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member indicated his belief that some industrial tribunals had no jurisdiction to deal with claims for service pay. The tribunals which at present prescribe annual salaries for officers of the Government are the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, the Industrial Court, the Public Service Arbitrator, the Public Service Board, and the Teachers Salaries Board. Each of these tribunals has for many years prescribed salaries which have included annual increments based on service.

FREE MILK.

Mr. CURREN: On Tuesday of last week I addressed a question to the Minister of Education requesting information on free milk for schools. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Funds for the purchase of the milk and drinking straws are supplied by the Commonwealth. The State is required to pay 50 per cent of expenditure of a capital nature, *e.g.*, the provision of drinking buckets for rinsing bottles and receptacles for the disposal of empty cartons, and 50 per cent of the administrative costs such as salaries, pay-roll tax, stationery, etc. The total cost of milk supplied in 1962-63 was £349,936 and in 1963-64 it was £361,895. The cost to the Education Department in these two years was £1,280 and £1,358 respectively. The average daily consumption of milk during the year April, 1964, to March, 1965, was 5,158 gallons—1,057,342 gallons on 205 school days. In March 1965, 859 schools (500 departmental, 163 private and 196 kindergartens and child minding centres, etc.) were receiving the free milk issue. At these schools there are about 165,000 children eligible to receive the milk, and about 130,000 drinking it. At that time only 104 departmental schools in various parts of the State were not being supplied. The majority of these are rural schools with an average daily attendance of below 20. The total number of children attending these schools is 3,860. The arrangements for supplies of fresh

milk to some of these schools are almost completed, but in other cases it is not possible to transport milk to the schools at a price within the limits permitted by the Commonwealth. However, powdered or liquid evaporated milk are allowable substitutes under the Act, and all schools are eligible, on application to the Education Department, for supplies of this nature.

SOUTH-EASTERN CROWN LAND.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands an answer to the question I asked on Thursday last relating to surplus Crown land in the Lucindale district?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: At present the Lands Department is preparing to dispose of those lands which are surplus to the requirements of the war service land settlement scheme, but details have not yet been finalized.

NUCLEAR POWER.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works an answer to my question of June 23 about the use of nuclear power at the Torrens Island power station?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The General Manager of the Electricity Trust has reported that the trust keeps itself continually informed of progress in the nuclear power field, and is aware of developments in the advanced-gas-cooled reactor for Dungeness power station. Two reactors will be installed in this station, each having a capacity of 600,000 kilowatts. This is far too large for the size of the trust's power station and compares with 120,000 kilowatt turbo-alternator and boilers which are on order for Torrens Island power station. A smaller nuclear station would have a markedly higher cost of production and such a station could not yet compete with the cost of conventional power in South Australia.

PORT PIRIE HOUSING.

Mr. McKEE: Will the Premier discuss the question of the shortage of Housing Trust houses at Port Pirie with officers of the trust, and ascertain its intention to alleviate this position?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall consult with the Chairman and General Manager of the trust to see what can be done, and inform the honourable member.

EVANSTON PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: Recently, it has come to my notice that because of the increased enrolments at the Evanston Primary School—

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member wish leave of the House to make a statement about his question?

Mr. CLARK: Yes, Sir, I ask for that permission. My statement is so brief that I omitted to ask for it. Because of the increased enrolments, the school has been forced to use the library, which was well equipped and often used, as a classroom. Will the Minister of Education see whether additional accommodation can be provided soon?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do so.

PORT LINCOLN SCHOOLS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Education, by letter, has informed me that it is intended soon to build two additional rooms at the infants school at Port Lincoln in solid construction. I thank him for that information. Meanwhile, I am informed by the Chairman of the school committee that the infants mistress is faced with 56 new pupils at the half-yearly intake in July, and, in effect, has nowhere to put them. Workmen at present are building a double unit at the primary school across the road, but accommodation available at the primary school cannot be used by the infants school because of the busy thoroughfare between the schools. While the Public Buildings Department gang is at Port Lincoln, will the Minister of Education consider the immediate provision of a temporary classroom at the infants school to overcome the problem until the solid construction buildings are erected?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to investigate the position to see whether it can be alleviated.

NURSES' CAR PARKING.

Mr. COUNBE: Is the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Local Government, aware of the public interest that has been created through the press and other media in the car-parking problem for nurses in Frome Road? I understand that some nurses have been molested at night because of their inability to park their cars near the nurses' home. The footpath area is restricted because cars park over the kerbside. Nurses often need transport to get to and from work because of shift-work. Will the Minister ask his colleague to consider not only nurses' car parking but parking for other members of the hospital staff and, with the Adelaide City Council (which has jurisdiction over these roads), see whether the position can be

alleviated? Will he also consult the Minister of Health to see whether more parking space can be made available within the hospital ground, either now or when the reconstruction programme is completed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

MOONTA MINING.

Mr. HUGHES: Recently, the Minister of Mines visited Moonta and inspected the mining field under survey by the Western Mining Corporation. Will the Minister of Lands ask his colleague for a report on the future prospect of that field?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

EUDUNDA-MORGAN RAILWAY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Premier an answer to my recent question about Government policy on the future of the Eudunda-Morgan railway line?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Commissioner of Railways reports that at present there is no intention of discontinuing freight services on the Eudunda-Morgan railway line.

SEAT BELTS.

Mr. HURST: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the manufacture of seat belts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: According to the Prices Department, there seems to be only one company manufacturing seat belts in South Australia: Tudor Accessories (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. The directors are Eric R. Rainsford, Gwenda B. Rainsford, Fred S. Worms, and Lawrence Lowenthal. The two last-named reside in England.

EGGS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the new egg-marketing legislation as it applies to commercial poultry keepers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am informed by the Attorney-General that the question asked by the Leader involves the interpretation of the Commonwealth Act. The Act contains no definition of "commercial purposes", which is therefore to be given its ordinary usage. The Act does, however, contain power to make exemptions by regulation, and these exemptions could impliedly define the phrase more narrowly when they are made. The Minister of Agriculture is taking this matter up with the Commonwealth authorities and expects that a decision can shortly be made public.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Premier said that it would be necessary to obtain advice from Commonwealth authorities on the obligation of egg producers to file returns in the future. At present, about 28,000 people have small numbers of poultry and many do not sell eggs, but if the definition by the Minister, as given by the Premier, is correct, these people will be obliged to file a fortnightly return and pay levies. The document forwarded by the Minister to poultry producers does not clear up this point; in fact, it leaves it more ambiguous than if the document had not been sent. Pending the advice from the Commonwealth Government as to who are the commercial producers obligated to file a return, will the Minister of Agriculture direct that prosecutions in marginal cases should not be proceeded with until a public announcement has been made about these obligations?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I appreciate the Leader's concern, as I have had a few letters from people about this matter. Those mainly concerned are show bird owners not contributing to any surplus of eggs for export. Others who are not selling or bartering eggs have written to me, particularly charitable organizations that keep a few fowls for their own needs. These cases will be specifically referred to the Commonwealth authority for consideration. I wholeheartedly sympathize with these people, and I shall be happy to inform inspectors and the South Australian Egg Board that it is my desire that there shall be no prosecutions of people in these doubtful categories.

ATTRIBUTE BLOCKS.

Mr. CORCORAN: Recently I was approached by a constituent in my district concerning a new mathematics course to be introduced into primary schools by the Education Department on July 5, involving the use of equipment known as "attribute blocks". I contacted the Minister subsequently, and he promised to obtain a report on this matter. Can he say whether a report is now to hand?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have received from the Director of Education (Mr. Mander-Jones) a report fully explaining this matter, which reads as follows:

It is perfectly true that we have extensively revised the course in the teaching of mathematics in our primary schools. This work has been in progress for about 18 months, and was brought to completion early this year. The course embodies many new ideas in the teaching of mathematics in primary schools and is, I believe, fully up to date. The use of what

are called "attribute blocks" is suggested as a useful aid in this course, in order to introduce the children to ideas such as size, shape and weight. Any blocks of wood of assorted shapes and sizes (for example squares, diamonds, triangles and circles) in varying thicknesses and painted in different colours for ease of recognition, are quite suitable. There is no need for these blocks to be bought and they can be made easily by any handyman on a bench from scrap timber.

On the other hand, some commercial firms have naturally produced sets of these blocks made in factories for the purpose. These sets retail at from £3 2s. 6d. to £3 5s. a set, and a suitable container for them may cost an additional 10s. It is certainly unnecessary for these "attribute blocks" to be provided for every child. A set for every six to eight children is quite sufficient. This would mean from five to seven sets for a class. There is also no need for every class in the school to have them as all classes do not do mathematics at the same time. In a large primary school such as Millicent with some 700 pupils and 20 classes it would be quite sufficient if there were sufficient sets for four or five classes to be used concurrently. If sets are purchased from a shop, subsidy may of course be claimed on them but as mentioned above, there is no need for these sets to be purchased and they can be made easily from scrap material. In any case they are not essential. They are merely a useful aid.

WINE INDUSTRY.

Mr. QUIRKE: It was noticed with some gratification in the wine industry, particularly by the growers, that a Royal Commission had been set up to investigate the problems in that industry. However, the only access I have had to the terms of reference is what has been published in the newspapers. In my opinion (and in the opinion of others) the terms do not extend far enough, for they mainly concern the grapegrowers and refer to the contracts between the growers and the organizations processing their grapes. Can the Premier say whether the Government is prepared to consider extending those terms of reference to embrace the whole of the industry, particularly the manufacturing and selling of wine, as well as the growing and marketing of grapes?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Certain matters associated with this question have to go before Executive Council next Thursday, and after they have been approved I shall be pleased to give the full terms of reference to the House.

MEAT INSPECTORS.

Mr. JENNINGS: My question relates to the imminent transfer (on July 1) of meat

inspectors, at present in the employ of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, to the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry. I recently asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture about this matter, and he assured me that he would take up the alleged grievances of the inspectors with the Chairman of the Abattoirs Board, with whom so many matters have been left. However, the Chairman is ill in hospital at present, and he cannot be contacted for several weeks. I have privately discussed this matter with the Minister on several occasions and I have no doubt that his investigations and discussions with the General Manager of the abattoirs would now enable him to give some general information to the House about this matter, to allay the fears (whether real or only imaginary) of the meat inspectors. Will the Minister of Agriculture now make that information available to the House?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I appreciate the honourable member's concern, and also the concern of people affected by the change-over. Often, when such occasions as this arise, however, the cause for concern is a result of people not being fully aware of what is taking place. As the honourable member stated, I have had a talk with the General Manager of the Abattoirs Board, who has assured me that everything is proceeding as expeditiously as possible and that the men involved were acquainted with the implications of the change-over in the early stages. I believe that they were happy about the matter and that it has taken place with their full knowledge and approval. The change-over had been proceeding for a considerable time before I became Minister of Agriculture. At the moment I understand that negotiations are taking place between the meat inspectors concerned and the Abattoirs Board which, I have no doubt, in conjunction with the Commonwealth authorities will arrive at a satisfactory decision soon. I believe the cause for concern stems mainly from the fact that time is running out, but that fear is probably unjustified, because negotiations will continue until finality is reached on this matter. The fact that meat inspectors will be changing over to the Commonwealth department on July 1 will not prejudice their case in any way. I understand that strong representations have been made on behalf of the people concerned; I believe that those representations are continuing; and I trust that the results will be to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I, too, have been approached by a meat inspector concerning sick leave which has been accrued by meat inspectors and in respect of which a payment would have been made by the Abattoirs Board had they left its service. I think I am correct in saying that one meat inspector who recently left the board's service was paid in respect of this sick leave. I also understand that the sick pay is not being paid by the board to those transferring to the Commonwealth Public Service and that this type of arrangement will not be carried on in the Commonwealth Public Service. I am informed that the result is that many inspectors will suffer a loss of several hundred pounds. Whether or not this is well known to the Minister I do not know, but apparently the question was not raised by the inspectors at the time they agreed to the transfer. Will the Minister look at this aspect and ascertain whether there is a case for an emolument to be paid by the Abattoirs Board to these meat inspectors?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This was the subject that I was referring to when I replied to the honourable member for Enfield. The honourable member had brought this to my notice, and although I did not make this specific in my reply, this was the substance of it. The request the honourable member made is identical with the one now made by the honourable member for Alexandra. When we were in conference, Mr. Wharton assured me that legal representations had been made from two sources on behalf of the meat inspectors, and that negotiations were still proceeding. Any future satisfactory arrangements will be a matter of agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the Abattoirs Board. This matter is under discussion and will not be jeopardized in any way by the fact that these inspectors will change their mode of employment on July 1. Even though the matter is not finalized at this stage, negotiations will continue, and any agreement will still apply in the future even though the inspectors have transferred to the Commonwealth Public Service.

COMPUTER.

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of June 22 about computers in the Public Service?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The equipment for the digital computing system ordered by the South Australian Government has been delivered in Adelaide by the contracting organization. The preparation of suitable

accommodation, including air conditioning, is nearing completion and it is anticipated that the equipment will be installed ready for testing during July. After undergoing acceptance tests for about one month, the installation will be available for operator training, programme testing and development, and non-recurring tasks (such as engineering design work). The large scale data processing activities will be introduced progressively with the first task scheduled for commencement at the end of this year. Expenditure from Loan funds for 1964-65 will be £12,191, and it is expected that a further provision of £350,000 will be needed for the next year. Staff has been recruited for this project both from within and outside of the Public Service and training has been proceeding in association with the suppliers of the equipment and with the co-operation and assistance of the University of Adelaide and the South Australian Institute of Technology.

FOYS BUILDING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On October 20, 1964, the predecessor of the Minister of Works gave me an answer to a question that I had asked about the condition of the Government building in Rundle Street (the old Foys building), which stated:

I have a report from the Director of the Public Buildings Department which states that, with reference to the Ministerial inquiry on the repairs and painting of the Government offices, Rundle Street, an estimate is being prepared for the work. The estimate of costs is expected to be about £10,000, and, if approved, the work will be put in hand in March, 1965.

When walking past the building yesterday, I noticed that nothing had in fact been done. The building is getting shabbier and shabbier as time goes by. Can the Minister of Works say whether it is intended to do any of this work and, if it is, when it is likely to be done?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not able to give an immediate answer to the honourable member, but I shall call for a report and inform him in due course.

BORDERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of June 16 as to whether further necessary additions to the Bordertown High School could be extensions of the present solid construction building?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The present enrolment of the Bordertown High School is 273. This is expected to increase to 290 in 1966 and then rise slowly to 305 in 1972. It

is intended to erect two wooden classrooms by February, 1966, which will give the school adequate and comfortable accommodation to house its pupils. The school has about 20 acres of land and it is not expected that there will be any undue difficulty in finding space for the rooms. Solid additions for the school were mentioned in the Loan Estimates for 1961-62, but the item had to be deferred because of the greater need for solid construction accommodation in other places, particularly in new residential areas where no high school existed. This urgent need for new high schools will continue during the next few years and therefore it is unlikely that solid additions will be erected at schools like Bordertown High School which have adequate accommodation.

PARA HILLS PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: I have been informed that yesterday the mid-year intake at the Para Hills Primary School was 108 and that it is expected to be about 120 by the end of this week. I believe that the total enrolment there is now 1,475. The children are accommodated in temporary wooden buildings, and there are six or eight classes attending Pooraka Primary School. Nearing completion is a double-storey infants school, which is a magnificent building, but unfortunately it has only eight classrooms whereas there are 16 infants classes at the school. From this, the Minister of Education will gather that classroom accommodation at the school, as it has been since the inception of Para Hills, is now in a desperate state, and that an urgent need exists for the commencement of the new primary school, which has been recommended by the Public Works Committee. If he can, will the Minister of Education speed up the commencement of the building of the new Para Hills Primary School, and will he say when the work is likely to commence?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will have this matter examined and see whether anything can be done to speed up the commencement of the school as requested by the honourable member. At the moment I cannot give him a date but I shall endeavour to ascertain this from the department.

FULLARTON ROAD INTERSECTION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns the intersection of Cross Road and Fullarton Road in my district—a very nasty intersection at which there have been over the years many accidents, some of them fatal. Some time ago I took up with the Minister of Roads the

question of the installation of traffic lights at the intersection, and on May 19 I had a reply from the Minister which read, in part, as follows:

As the intersection lies within the Mitcham council area as well as Unley, the former council was asked to investigate the matter and to arrange for the necessary drainage works to be carried out. It is understood, however, that before this work can be undertaken it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive study of the catchment areas to the east of the intersection to enable a decision to be made regarding the size of the pipe to be used across the intersection. The present pipe is obsolete and inadequate to cater for the surface water in the area. The Mitcham council has intimated, however, that a decision regarding the drainage is not likely to be reached within the next six months.

The rest of the letter elucidated why it was not possible to do the work at present, and suggested that conversations were going on between the Highways Department and the councils to see whether things could be speeded up. I duly sent a copy of that letter to the Secretary of the Highgate Primary School Committee, who had been in touch with me about it. He apparently also got in touch with the Mitcham council and has now had a reply, a copy of which he has sent to me. That reply states:

Thank you for your letter dated June 16 concerning the erection of traffic lights at the intersection of Cross Road and Fullarton Road, Netherby. This council approved the installation of these lights many months back, and it does not accept the explanation given by the Highways Department for the delay in erection. This council has made it quite clear that the drainage has not and is not holding up the installation of these lights. The road-widening works at the corners, the small amount of drainage works required, and the installation of the lights should be carried out as one job, and this council has been prepared at all times to carry out its responsibilities in full without delay.

The rest of the letter, although in slightly stronger terms, is in the same vein, and I think I need not read it; but it shows that the council and the Highways Department may be at cross purposes. In the meantime the lights are not being installed and the dangerous situation at the intersection remains. I therefore ask the Minister of Education whether he will take up with his colleague my request that the Minister investigate this matter personally with a view to resolving the apparent mix-up between the council and his department so that this work may be put in hand without further delay?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to convey that information to my colleague.

UPPER MURRAY BRIDGE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Works received a reply from the Minister of Local Government to the question I asked last week about the terms of reference to the Public Works Committee concerning the proposed bridge across the Upper Murray reaches?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Minister of Local Government states that, although well under consideration, this matter has not progressed sufficiently to determine the date for reference to the Public Works Committee.

HAIRDRESSERS TRADE SCHOOL.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked last week about the hairdressing trade school at North Adelaide?

The Hon. R. E. LOVEDAY: The Education Department does own a block of land at Barton Terrace, North Adelaide which is being held as a possible site for a future hairdressers trade school. While there is a definite need for the provision of such a school, other schools have had to be given a higher priority. The Education Department has no immediate plans for the building of a hairdressers trade school, and it is therefore not possible at present to give a likely date for its erection.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier an answer to a question I asked him last week regarding pensioner travel concessions?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The position now is that all pensioners holding a medical entitlement card will be entitled to concession travel, to or from any part of the State, as from July 1, 1965. The only restriction in travel in the metropolitan area will be at peak hours, and in the country during the Easter and Christmas periods. Any pensioner holding a medical entitlement card, whether living in the country or the city, will be able to travel in the country or the city at concession fares as often as he or she may wish, subject to the small restriction stated above. Under the previous arrangement the entitlement to concession fares for city pensioners was not tied to the medical entitlement card, and city pensioners already receiving concession fares, but not holding a medical entitlement card, will not be deprived of that concession. I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition that there was a substantial anomaly in the previous scheme, whereby all

metropolitan pensioners received concession fares in the city, but the only country pensioners entitled to concessions were those holding a medical entitlement card. These pensioners were allowed two journeys a year at concession fares. With the new arrangement all future entitlements will be based on holding a medical entitlement card, with a country pensioner now being on equal terms with the city pensioner.

The Leader of the Opposition knows only too well that these concessions cost the Government money, and the concessions have been amended to provide the best possible benefit for those most in need of assistance. The pensioners who under the new arrangements may not qualify for the concession, though they may have qualified under the old arrangements, will all be people with other income of at least £2 per person per week beyond the ordinary pension and most of them will have considerably more. Many will own their own homes and motor cars. In many cases they will be people who from the point of view of income and obligations will be clearly better off than many wage earners with modest earnings, who have families to support, house-purchase or rental to pay, and full fares to meet for regular travel to work.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I listened with great interest to the outline of the new scheme of concession fares given by the Premier, particularly to his reference to an anomaly in the old scheme. The new scheme obviously contains a serious anomaly, as pensioners without a medical entitlement card who will become pensioners after this time will not receive concessions. I am informed that up to 20 per cent of pensioners at present do not have a medical entitlement card and, so far as I am aware, that percentage is likely to be maintained. These people will now be deprived of concessions that other pensioners will get simply because they have been on a pension a little longer. That seems to be unjust. Can the Premier say whether the Government will reconsider this matter and so avoid from the beginning what would be a serious injustice to about one in five of those who will receive pensions in the future?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: At this stage I say that, Cabinet having considered the matter and having made exhaustive inquiries, the Government does not intend to further review the matter until the Budget has been presented.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Attorney-General make available the documents and all

papers relating to the appointment of the Public Relations Officer in his department, and can he say whether the appointment was considered by the Public Service Commissioner?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly ask the Chief Secretary for the docket if the honourable member wishes to have it. There were, I think, 16 applicants for the position. Of these, only three met the qualifications that had been set by the Public Service Commissioner, and they were interviewed. Thereafter the Public Service Board gave a certificate that the recommended appointee was superior in qualifications and aptitude to all the other applicants, and the recommendation for his appointment was made. I shall be happy to let the honourable member have the docket and to see everything in relation to it.

PROCLAMATIONS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I notice that frequently the name of the county is omitted from proclamations, and this greatly inconveniences people wishing to check on the proclamation, as only the hundred is referred to. Will the Minister of Lands instruct the Surveyor-General, when drawing up the definition in the proclamation, to state the name of the county in addition to the name of the hundred?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Although I am not aware of this problem, I will refer it to the Surveyor-General and obtain a report for the Leader.

ROAD MAINTENANCE FUND.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Last year special sums were made available from the road maintenance tax to certain councils. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads secure from his colleague a statement showing what sums will be made available to councils this year as special grants under the road maintenance legislation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD.

Mr. RODDA (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation this session for a totalizator agency board system of betting in South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No decision has yet been taken on this matter.

TAILEM BEND TO KEITH MAIN.

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. What is the present estimated cost of completing the Tailem Bend to Keith trunk main, pumping stations and storages?

2. Is this more or less than the original estimate?

3. Is the Minister aware of the urgent need for water in the area to be served by the scheme?

4. As the previous Government had budgeted to complete this work during 1968, why has this important project been slowed down?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The replies are:

1. and 2. The original estimated cost of the Tailem Bend to Keith main was £4,000,000 and while it is difficult to forecast the final cost of an undertaking extending over some years present indications are that the work will be completed within the estimate.

3. I am aware that the scheme will be of great benefit to those it serves and that some people are anxious to obtain water as early as possible. It is a matter of relative urgency as there are still a number of people in various parts of the State who need water urgently to improve their livelihood or living conditions.

4. This project has not been slowed down, as evidenced by the fact that the actual expenditure in the present financial year has been £669,000, compared with the budgeted figure of £509,000. There appears to be no evidence of any undertaking to complete this work by 1968. In fact, as the honourable member is aware the Government is not in a position to know the extent of the funds which will be available for capital works several years ahead. Next year's capital Budget cannot be anticipated and the sums available for various works, including the Tailem Bend to Keith main, will not be known until the Loan programme has been approved.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE ACT.

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. What amount has been guaranteed under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act?

2. How many applications have been approved?

3. How many of these applications have required a guarantee in excess of £15,000?

4. Has the State Bank now placed an upper limit of £15,000 on the amount that it will advance under this Act?

5. Does the Savings Bank of South Australia have a similar limit?

6. Is it intended to restrict the application of this Act, either to the purchase of small properties or to persons possessing considerable capital?

7. If so, is it the intention of the Government to seek to have this limit lifted?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. Guarantees approved, including those awaiting execution total £838,304.

2. 68.

3. 17.

4. Yes. The State Bank has recently adopted a policy of general limitation of long term farm advances to £15,000. This limitation applies whether the loan is sought under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act or otherwise. The aim of the bank is to give financial assistance in the maximum number of deserving cases within the capacity of its available funds. The bank will, however, deviate from this policy where the board is satisfied that the circumstances warrant it.

5. Yes.

6. No.

7. No.

DRIVING LICENCES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present session, legislation to raise to 18 years the minimum age for obtaining a driving licence?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No.

HOSPITALS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice):

1. Has a start been made in preparing plans for the proposed new hospitals in the Modbury and Bedford Park areas?

2. If so, when will these proposals be referred to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Plans are under consideration. It must be obvious to the honourable member that no day can be fixed.

HOUSING FINANCE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice):

1. What are the factors which determine a reduced waiting time for certain applicants seeking loans under the Homes Act from the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. How much must this class of applicant have on deposit with the bank?

3. For how long must this sum have been deposited?

4. What is the waiting period for this class of applicant?

5. How much must applicants who are not granted such a reduction in waiting time have on deposit?

6. What is the minimum income which the latter type of applicant is required to have?

7. What is the waiting period for this class of applicant?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. Primarily the amount of deposit and the length of time it has been deposited at the bank. It is assumed in answering this question that the words "under the Homes Act" were included in error.

2 and 3. The general rule applied is:

(a) £1,000 or more held on deposit by the applicant or his immediate family for at least six months; or

(b) £700 at least for 12 months or more.

4. Including the time taken for processing, an applicant on the special list may expect to receive his approval about six months from application.

5. They must be depositors, but the amount and period of deposit may be quite nominal.

6. No inflexible income test is made and individual circumstances are considered by the trustees, but ordinarily an applicant would be expected to have about £15 a week clear after meeting his obligations on the proposed home, including equipment, etc., on hire-purchase.

7. Loans are presently being approved for which applications were made between 18 and 20 months ago.

I believe that, on behalf of the bank's management, I should be expressing its concern at making details of the bank's business available to its competitors. Indeed, it appears that the bank will have to consider seriously whether it is able to continue to supply so much detailed information.

HOUSING TRUST HOUSES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice):

1. What was the average accepted tender price per square for all types of Housing Trust houses, for each of the last five three-monthly periods, ending May, 1965?

2. For the same periods what was the average sale price for all types of Housing Trust houses?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust reports:

1. It is not the practice of the Housing Trust to keep records of costs per square of its houses as it is considered that, as the square cost is affected considerably by the cost of fittings and the like, the square cost serves no useful purpose for the trust. To obtain the information sought would take considerable work by the trust's accounting staff.

2. March 3, 1964, to May 26, 1964, £4,059 13s. 5d.; June 2, 1964, to August 25, 1964,

£4,261 12s.; September 1, 1964, to November 24, 1964, £4,162 18s.; December 1, 1964, to February 23, 1965, £4,358 6s.; March 2, 1965, to May 25, 1965, £4,784 13s. 7d.

SAVINGS BANK ADVANCES.

Mr. McANANEY (on notice):

1. What percentage of its valuation does the Savings Bank of South Australia advance against urban property?

2. Is this valuation on a liberal basis?

3. What percentage of its valuation does the Savings Bank of South Australia advance against rural property?

4. On what basis is this valuation made?

5. What is the total of advances made by the Savings Bank of South Australia against urban property?

6. What is the total advances made against rural property?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. Up to 85 per cent of urban house property with a maximum of £3,750 on new houses, and with a somewhat higher limit on older houses in special cases. Up to 95 per cent with a limit of £3,000 if qualified under the Homes Act.

2. The valuation would ordinarily be of the order of 90 per cent of the building cost of a new house by an efficient builder, and within much the same proportion of a normal sale price of an older house in good condition and location. It is pointed out that the valuations are made specifically for loan purposes and by fully qualified members of the Institute of Valuers.

3. The advance ordinarily is a maximum of 75 per cent of valuation on rural properties.

4. Ordinarily based on an appraisal of long term productive value checked against records of comparable sales. See also answer to 2.

5. About £45,500,000 on urban house property plus a further £3,000,000 in respect of buildings such as schools, churches, hospitals, etc.

6. About £6,500,000 on rural properties.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 24. Page 552.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): Last Thursday, when the House adjourned, I was expanding the argument that, whilst His Excellency's Speech promised a lot, it set out very little of developmental and public works to be undertaken in the State, and very few facts about

the State's economy. I said then that it was extremely fortunate for South Australia that the former Liberal and Country League Government had put in progress such a large and imaginative programme of public works. I sincerely hope that none of these public works will be curtailed at the expense of fulfilling so many promises of social and socialistic projects made by the new Government. I believe that the new Government's problem will be an economic one. The Governor's Speech definitely promised higher taxation and charges. It was specifically mentioned therein that succession duties would be increased and that freights are likely to go up. Also an extra week's annual leave, although not mentioned in the Speech, was announced as Labor policy and items like this will add to charges.

In the last week we have already seen water and sewerage rates increased considerably in certain directions. Service pay has been implemented and with these other items to which I have referred it appears that some of the social proposals in the Speech will definitely increase expenditure and charges. This will mean that the worker in South Australia will have to pay more for the very doubtful privilege of having in office a Labor Government. The slogan that we heard so much during the election, "Live better with Labor", could well turn out to really mean "Live dearer with Labor". Of course, the people will be judging the performance of the Labor Government and will be watching its economic policies. They will see how they work out and they will be extremely interested to see whether they have been led up the garden path by Labor's election promises. One thing is certain from the Governor's Speech, apart from increased charges and costs, and that is that this session will certainly be one of the busiest for both Parties for many years past.

Mr. Millhouse: Especially considering what the Attorney-General has announced he will do.

Mr. CUMBE: He seems to be working around the clock. The Government has announced a formidable number of Bills and many private members' Bills have also been announced.

Mr. McKee: This will give the honourable member some idea of how far his Party got behind when it was the Government.

Mr. CUMBE: Not at all; we did many good things. Now the people will judge how the new Labor Government's activities compare with that programme. I shall refer

briefly to some district problems. It is interesting to see the size of some of the projects under way in the Torrens district. I trust that those under way will be completed soon and that those announced to start soon will not be delayed unduly.

The Hackney bridge is an important project and it is proceeding. It will overcome a bad bottleneck of traffic in that locality. The festival hall to be built in North Adelaide is a new departure in this State. It was approved by Parliament last year in the form of a special Bill and it will be carried out in conjunction with the Adelaide City Council. This project is dear to my heart and I trust to the hearts of many other members. I hope that it will come about in the next year or so and I hope that the new Government will support it financially, as it is obliged to do. The Morphett Street bridge reconstruction is for a totally new bridge that will provide new access roads from North Adelaide to Adelaide, and a new outlet from the city. This is another major project. The former L.C.L. Government promised that there would be a large flat construction programme initiated in Gilberton. It was to contain something like 100 flats and I hope (and I make this plea) that this project will not be dropped suddenly by the new Labor administration like the East Terrace flat project. I hope that the Prospect floodwater scheme (in conjunction with other councils) will proceed in the next two years. I also hope that the Islington farm development work and the River Torrens improvement scheme will be carried out soon.

I trust that the swimming pool project for the north park lands between Barton Terrace and Fitzroy Terrace will be proceeded with soon. This was first announced last year when the Lord Mayor of Adelaide consulted with the then Premier and an announcement was made that the Government would make a substantial contribution to this work. Following this, the Adelaide City Council (it was understood) would give a quarter of the financial backing and the local councils to the north would give another quarter. As a result of that undertaking the Prospect council promised £25,000, which I believe was a magnificent sum to be promised by a council of that size. The Walkerville council promised a further £2,000. The other councils have not yet announced what they will do. I point out that the impression gained was that the former Government would make a substantial contribution to the order of 50 per cent. The present Premier announced last week that his Administration

would contribute about one-third of the total cost. I point out that this is not an ordinary swimming pool project, but that it is to be the swimming headquarters of South Australia. The present facilities at the Adelaide City Baths are inadequate: so inadequate, in fact, that the Australian Swimming Carnival bypasses Adelaide as it cannot be held here because of the inadequate facilities available. This project is to provide once and for all the major swimming headquarters of the State.

I sincerely submit that this project is important and it should require a financial contribution from the Government of nothing less than 50 per cent of the total cost. If that were made, then the Adelaide City Council (and I point out that very few of the city council's ratepayers would be using this pool but it would be for the use of all suburban and country people) would be contributing 25 per cent of the finance and the councils to the north-east and north-west of the city would contribute the other 25 per cent. I suggest to the Government that it consider making at least a 50 per cent contribution to this scheme, for I fear that if it does not the whole thing will fall through and we will miss an opportunity to establish once and for all a wonderful major facility for swimming in this State.

Mr. Shannon: What about Burnside?

Mr. CUMBE: This will be something bigger. The member for Burnside can promote her own swimming pool; I am promoting the one which I hope will be in my district. The member for Onkaparinga can talk about the muddy pool he has at Loftia Park.

Mr. Shannon: No, the mountain pool at Mount Barker; don't make a mistake about that.

Mr. CUMBE: I now wish to refer to an educational matter which I know interests the Minister of Education very much. I refer to the Martin Report. In my opinion, this is one of the most far-reaching and significant reports on tertiary education ever to be made in Australia. It was, of course, made by an extremely expert committee under the auspices of the Australian Universities Commission, set up by the Commonwealth Parliament, and it was certainly long awaited and eagerly received. It touches on many aspects of tertiary education that have been badly neglected in the past or at least have not received the support that they deserved. This report made certain recommendations as to actions to be taken to implement its provision, and it is particularly with regard to the technical

sections of the report that I wish to deal, because it is in that sector that I am particularly interested. Several members in this debate have touched upon portions of the report. The members for Gawler, Mitcham and Burnside referred to it, and the Minister of Education has made public statements on it both outside and inside this House. The questions that were raised by the Minister of Education, the member for Mitcham and, I believe, the member for Gawler on teacher training have been touched on, and I do not want to delve into that field. However, I will deal specifically with the proposed new framework of administration and the colleges to be set up, the financing and the growth of tertiary education generally, and especially the technological aspect, all of which certainly require urgent consideration.

I emphasize again that this is probably the most important report ever to come from Canberra on tertiary education. In my view the most significant and far-reaching of the Martin committee's many recommendations is that during the next decade Australia should develop advanced education in virtually new types of college. This matter was referred to by the Prime Minister when he was presenting this report to Parliament, and Senator Gorton also referred to it. It was hoped that this was the heart of the report, that it would provide a much needed diversification in the fields of tertiary education, that it would ease the heavy pressure on the universities and, most importantly, that it would reduce the inordinate number of failures that we have at the moment. I believe that these are most important aspects of the recommendations of the Martin committee. The development of these new colleges is expected to proceed at a very much faster rate than that of the universities. I have a table here taken from the Martin Report, and although I do not wish to weary members I will highlight certain figures from it to emphasize the estimated growth of student numbers from 1963 to 1975. This shows the massive developmental programme that faces new tertiary institutions today. In 1963 there were at the University of Adelaide some 6,800 students, and at the South Australian Institute of Technology there were 2,860 students, all doing tertiary work. Compare that with 1975, when the estimated enrolments at the university will be 12,200 students, while the institute's enrolment will have risen to 9,550. The significant thing in this is not only the numbers but the percentage increase.

We will see that in 12 years the university enrolments will have increased by 180 per cent, whereas in the same time the institute enrolment will have increased by 334 per cent. This remarkable increase, Mr. Speaker, as all members will agree, highlights the absolute necessity for increasing the facilities and the provisions for teaching of students, even with the fields that we touch on now, without allowing for the increase and the development of new aspects of tertiary education that always seem to come along year after year. One point I emphasize in this regard is that the aspects of education discussed in the Martin Report are ones for which the State has constitutional responsibilities. Therefore, although it is necessary for the Commonwealth Government to determine its attitude and to announce what it is going to do, it is also necessary for each State Government to decide what it is prepared to do regarding consultation with the Commonwealth and the implementation of the report.

There is a new concept which is the heart of the report, and it is this aspect I now wish to discuss. The report states that Australia during the next decade should develop advanced education in virtually new types of college, and these colleges, which are to be called collectively an Institute of Colleges, will provide for those students who, though qualified, do not wish to undertake a full university course, either because their family cannot afford it, because they are working and have to take a part-time course, or because their chosen course does not work in with the university curriculum. These are to be specifically set up for these types of person. There is also the person whose level of matriculation does not indicate that he might pass all his university subjects. The recommendation for the development of these colleges and the recommendation that new universities should not be established, taken together with the other recommendations of the committee, indicate the belief of the committee that universities should grant entrance in future only to those matriculants whose standard of pass was good enough to indicate a reasonable likelihood of graduation in a minimum time or a minimum time plus one year. This, of course, has been brought about by the very high failure rate in our universities over recent years which rate, unfortunately, seems to be rising rather rapidly.

The committee, bearing this aspect in mind, made that comment. The committee has suggested that the new colleges to give advanced education should be developed from and around the existing tertiary set-up of the technical

colleges. What is envisaged is clearly not merely a bigger and better college for teaching, but that technology should be only one of the fields in which these colleges should provide advanced instruction. The committee says that in these colleges there should be appropriate courses in the liberal arts for young men and women taking up administrative positions in commerce, industry, agriculture, and government. There should be a common core of studies at tertiary level aimed at all students attending the college; a "breadth in education" and the development of "critical imagination and creative abilities" is one to be fostered. Students engaged in such common studies would major in technological courses or other courses provided by the college to fit them for particular careers after gaining their diplomas. The committee states that these colleges should be provided with funds for capital expenditure and recurring purposes sufficient to permit expansion and improvement in buildings, in equipment, in teaching staff, and in the general educational facilities. The capital funds are recommended to be provided half by the Commonwealth and half by the State, while recurring expenses are to be provided in the ratio of £1 by the Commonwealth to £1.85 by the State. This report was tabled by the Prime Minister in the House of Representatives and the Commonwealth Government accepted most of its points, rejected some, and reserved its decision on others.

The report recommended the establishment of a system of tertiary colleges mainly technological but with non-technical subjects to be an integral part of the course. This was agreed to by the Commonwealth Government. Another recommendation was for an institute of colleges to be set up in each State to govern development of the new colleges, and this was endorsed although the Commonwealth Government stated that it was up to the States to decide whether they wanted to do this or not. The report recommended that a tertiary education commission be set up to advise the Government on universities, new colleges and teachers colleges, replacing the universities commission. The Commonwealth Government rejected this idea as it wanted to set up a separate advisory committee for the new colleges. It also rejected a suggestion about the reorganization of teacher training and Commonwealth assistance for it. This was a State field, and it was on this matter that the Minister of Education made public statements a few weeks ago that were the subject of some controversy in this House.

The report suggested more Commonwealth scholarships for universities and allocation of scholarships for new colleges and for teachers colleges. The Prime Minister agreed to this in all aspects, except for teacher-training scholarships which come into the State fields. The report recommended the elimination of part-time and external students at universities, and this was rejected. I agree, because it would be a hardship to deny part-time students the right to attend a university. The report makes other recommendations, most of which were accepted.

In regard to the technological advances, the financial support would be available for diploma and certificate courses. It is important to remember this, as the report defines the diploma course as being of three years' duration (on a full-time basis or the equivalent in part-time) with matriculation or its equivalent being the entry standard. The degree courses would not qualify for support under the Martin Report, because they are already provided for under the Australian Universities Commission. The decisions I have referred to were supported by the Prime Minister, but they are clearly the responsibility of State Governments. I trust the present Minister of Education will induce Cabinet to make a favourable report shortly on this matter.

New diploma colleges to be set up are to provide for those students who, although qualifying, do not wish to undertake a full university course, or whose chosen course is not considered appropriate for a university, or whose level at matriculation indicated a small chance of graduation from a university in the minimum time (or minimum plus one year). They are to be developed from and around the existing tertiary segments of existing technical colleges, and are to offer advanced instruction in the liberal arts as well. Commonwealth financial aid will, at first, be confined to assistance for strengthening, expanding and introducing diploma courses. If this aid is matched by the States, some £24,000,000 for capital and £34,000,000 for recurring expenses will be available over the triennium 1967-69 for Australia as a whole. The most interesting aspect of the report is the setting up in each State of what is to be called an "institute of colleges" to consist of diploma colleges. The institute of colleges in each State would consider the plans for expansion of tertiary non-university education; make triennial submissions of financial requirements; supervise standards of curricula, teachings and examinations; co-ordinate the work of the constituent

colleges; and arrange for transfer of students between colleges.

An institute of colleges would be autonomous, with its own governing council, established by its own Act of Parliament. Constituent colleges would not only be existing technical colleges, which offer approved tertiary courses, but agricultural colleges which offer suitable technologically based tertiary courses. There will be specialist instructions which offer suitable testing courses, *e.g.*, nursing and para-medical studies, and they will include new tertiary institutions. This is a matter for the State Governments to make their decisions. The Martin Report recommends that technological diplomas be awarded for courses in technical colleges and institutes of technology. These are to be of three years' duration and based on an entry standard equivalent to the matriculation examination of the university in the State. The Prime Minister clearly stated that this type of course would be supported by massive Commonwealth funds, and such courses have the wholehearted support of industry and commerce and would be acceptable to the various professional institutions and chapters. The technological progress of any nation, particularly Australia, depends essentially on the combined efforts of craftsmen, technicians and technologists, and the Education Department is catering for the tradesmen, the craftsmen and the technicians. However, we are principally concerned with the technologist as the demand for them is increasing rapidly. The number of students at the Institute of Technology has increased by 380 per cent in 12 years and I believe concentration on this aspect is all-important. The technological facilities of the universities are being expanded as a result of recommendations of the Australian Universities Commission, and those facilities are better able to cope today than ever before with this type of under-graduate teaching. However, technical colleges have not always received the adequate financial support they should have received, and I know the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) and the Minister of Education would agree with me here. Those colleges should have had more support in the past, but I believe there has been a general awakening to this overdue need for support. They have been hamstrung in the technical contribution they have been able to make to the nation's progress, because of this lack of recognition, lack of support and lack of funds. The committee in its report is convinced of the need to expand these colleges and to provide a

well-defined organizational structure for their operation.

The principal work of the technological college I have mentioned is to equip men and women for the practical world of industry, and the committee holds the view that the education provided by these institutions has been under-valued. It therefore strongly recommended that efforts be made to strengthen and raise the status of these technical colleges. I firmly believe that the present system of tertiary education in Australia tends to place undue emphasis on university education, and I do not say that derogatorily to those fortunate enough to have a university education. The weakness of non-university tertiary institutions prevents the latent abilities of many men and women from being fully developed. Obviously, the successful growth of technical colleges depends on the appointment of well-qualified staff and on the maintenance of high academic standards. The Martin committee in its report believed that this might best be done by bringing diploma-awarding colleges of an appropriate standard within an institute of colleges that has been suggested, and to assist in this development it is suggested that in each State the Government establish an institute of colleges. Subject to the approval of each State institute of colleges and of the Australian Universities Commission, the constituent members in such institute of colleges could well be the existing technical colleges, the agricultural colleges, the specialist institutions (such as the School of Art), and any others that may be appointed in the near future.

We should then have the position that the institute of colleges would conduct all the tertiary education of this State (outside the university, and the State Education Department which touches on tertiary education in regard to trade training). There is no doubt that many specialist courses in this field are being offered today, and I believe the South Australian Government is at present considering transferring all the remaining trade courses at the South Australian Institute of Technology over to the State Education Department. The domestic economy section would then remain, but I understand the Government is seriously considering transferring that away from the institute and creating an independent institution, similar to the Emily McPherson School of Domestic Economy in Melbourne. Of course, such an organization could become a member of the intended institute of colleges, as also could the School of Art which I have just mentioned. The South Australian Government

has not officially declared its policy with regard to the report, except that the Minister of Education has issued a statement on teacher training in this House, on which certain comments were made, and I should welcome a public statement by the Minister on behalf of the Government as to its attitude to the Martin Report generally.

I understand that the Australian Universities Commission will be visiting Adelaide within the next couple of weeks to take evidence and to have discussions with the Government. A formal statement might well be made after that visit, for I am sure it would be in the interests of the public generally, and especially of those interested in tertiary education. I believe that, in essence, the Minister approves the basis of the report, with the exception of teacher training, from which I have kept well away. Believing this report is of paramount importance, I earnestly request the Government (and the Minister of Education particularly) to implement provisions recommended in the report, as a matter of policy, not only to benefit our students as a whole but also to attract the Commonwealth Government subsidies that are offered. If many facets of this report are not accepted by the State Government and implemented by it then, of course, it will not attract these fairly healthy Government subsidies being offered by the Commonwealth, and this is all-important. As a member of the Opposition, a position new to me and also to my colleagues, I say that it is our intention wherever possible to be constructive rather than destructive, because I believe more good can be achieved in that way.

However, I do not want the present Government to believe for a moment that the Opposition will sit here quietly, but to realize that we shall be taking every opportunity to harass the new Government, to keep it on its toes and to see that it works properly, because this attitude will benefit South Australians generally. Once again I say that I was disappointed that more reference was not made to developmental works in the Governor's Speech, and I trust that such projects will not be delayed at the expense of introducing many of the socialistic promises that have been made. I also trust and promise that the people who voted on this occasion for Labor—many of them voting Labor for the first time—will be watching with much interest to see how the new Government performs. Many of those voters have not been in this State for long and have not had the benefit of judging the countless

benefits derived from many years of the Playford L.C.L. Government's term of office. They will be watching extremely closely to see how many promises are fulfilled and, more important, how much it will cost them in the long run. Those people will be the judge, jury and perhaps (in three years' time) the executioners of the Labor Party and the promises it made. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, so ably moved by my colleague the new member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne). The presence of the new member for Barossa in this House indicates to all honourable members the further support given to the Labor Party in South Australia and also the disfavour into which the Liberal and Country League has fallen in the last few years. I wish to commend the seconder of the motion, the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), on his ably delivered maiden speech. Both the mover and the seconder of the motion showed a good grasp of the subjects on which they chose to speak and delivered their speeches ably. I wish to congratulate the new member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) on his maiden speech and to his election to this Parliament where he takes the place of one of the most able members that I had the pleasure to be associated with during the last three years. I congratulate the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) on his election to this House and on his maiden speech.

I take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to His Excellency the Governor for his well delivered and thoughtful Speech at the opening of Parliament. No doubt his task was made much easier by the sound proposals put before him by his advisers, and he did a remarkably good job. During his term as Governor of South Australia, with his lady, he has made a great contribution to public life. Both Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan have endeared themselves to all sections of the community. Recently the Upper Murray districts had the pleasure of a visit from Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan. They captured the hearts of Upper Murray residents, and I am sure I speak for all these people when I express my pleasure at the recent announcement that His Excellency's term as Governor of South Australia has been extended for a further two years. I know that all members join with me when I express that pleasure and that the people of Chaffey will also support what I have said. I wish to

congratulate the Premier on the excellent job that he has done since assuming office and the Ministers, who have performed so well. I am sure that their term of office on the Treasury benches will be long and happy.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your high office. This is a well deserved honour and I am sure you will carry out your duties ably and with distinction. I congratulate the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), who is well known to all members for his wit and jolly nature, on assuming the important office of Chairman of Committees. All honourable members know that he will carry out his duties with justice and impartiality. I wish him well and a long term of office. I join with previous speakers in this debate in expressing my sorrow and regret at the passing of two stalwarts of the Labor Party, James Corcoran and the Hon. Ken Bardolph. Both men served the Labor Party and the Parliament well for many years. I join with other members in expressing my deep condolences to those mourning their loss.

I wish to refer to several matters affecting the district of Chaffey. I have asked numerous questions in the House about the Renmark Primary School and the need for new buildings. During this session I asked the Minister of Education about the progress of plans for the new building at that school. On arriving at the House this afternoon I saw that a set of the proposed plans had been placed on my desk for my perusal, and I am pleased to see that the plans have reached this stage. I sincerely hope that a beginning will soon be made on the new school at Renmark. At the Berri Primary School, which now has about 500 pupils, many prefabricated buildings are clustered together. I believe that they represent a grave fire risk because they are so close together, and the situation in Berri now calls for the erection of an infants school for which additional land was obtained about three or four years ago.

At the Berri school special occupational and remedial classes, which were established several years ago, have been doing remarkably well in bringing up to standard these children who are slightly behind others or cannot learn quickly enough in normal classes on particular subjects. These classes help the children, and the teachers are dedicated to their task. They volunteer for duty in this branch of the Education Department and do a remarkably good job. The wine industry has been the subject of many questions and statements during the past two or three weeks. I believe

that many of the questions asked have been based on a false premise in that they did not deal with the true facts of the situation. As all members know, the vintage starts about the middle of February and a series of meetings have been held, as in past years, between representatives of the Grapegrowers Association, the Prices Commissioner, and the Wine and Brandy Producers Association. The Premier has also attended some of these meetings. I will give the correct sequence of the meetings for honourable members. According to my information, the first approaches that were made in respect of the current vintage were on December 1, 1964, when representatives of the Grapegrowers Association met the Premier and Mr. Murphy, the Prices Commissioner. General discussion took place regarding the coming vintage, and the grapegrowers' representatives made certain submissions to the Premier and to the Prices Commissioner on their ideas of prices for that coming vintage.

On February 3 a meeting was held in the morning between the Grapegrowers Association representatives and the Prices Commissioner, and in the afternoon there was a meeting between the representatives of the Grapegrowers Association and representatives of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association. At that afternoon meeting with the Wine and Brandy Producers Association, the grapegrowers' representatives put to their immediate opponents (if I may call them that) their ideas of what the prices should be for the 1965 vintage. No final decision was reached at that meeting, but on February 16 (13 days later) the Grapegrowers Association Secretary received a letter from the Wine and Brandy Producers Association rejecting the submissions made by the Grapegrowers Association at that previous meeting. On February 22, the Grapegrowers Association representatives met the Prices Commissioner and presented further submissions to him on the prices which they desired for the coming vintage.

On February 25 there happened to be a meeting at Berri during the course of the recent election campaign. That meeting was addressed by the then Premier, now the Leader of the Opposition. At that meeting, the prices which had been recommended by Mr. Murphy as being fair and reasonable for the 1965 vintage were released to the public. This caused quite a deal of resentment and ill feeling amongst all sections of the industry, both winemakers and grapegrowers, because the then Premier had omitted to carry out the minor formality of notifying the Grapegrowers

Association and the Wine and Brandy Producers Association of these prices before he released them to the public. The practice in the past has been for these recommended prices to be the subject of discussion and agreement if possible between these two bodies, and I consider that this publicizing of the prices before the parties had any chance to discuss them or come to any agreement on them was most detrimental to the situation which developed afterwards.

On March 1 the Grapegrowers Association representatives and the Wine and Brandy Producers Association met to discuss these recommended prices. After considerable discussion, lasting several hours, the negotiations broke down. The Wine and Brandy Producers Association representatives refused point-blank to come up to the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner. On March 2, the Wine and Brandy Producers Association published in the *Advertiser* a list of prices that it would pay for grapes during the 1965 vintage, and as a result it did not appear to anybody that there was any likelihood of agreement between the parties. This action ruled out any further negotiations between the parties, and to my mind it was the end of negotiations for that year. However, the representatives of the Grapegrowers Association contacted the then Premier, who I believe was in Peterborough on that night of March 2, and he arranged a meeting for March 8, which I believe was the earliest date that he could meet the representatives.

There was the small matter of an election which intervened on March 6, and although Sir Thomas Playford was still acting as the caretaker Premier he did not meet the Wine and Brandy Producers Association representatives but left it to the incoming Premier to meet them. That meeting between the representatives of the Grapegrowers Association and the Premier took place on March 11, when I believe the situation was reviewed and the Premier was brought up to date with the thinking of the Wine Grapegrowers Association. On March 15 the Premier met representatives of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association, and considerable discussion took place over a period of two hours. Here again, the Wine and Brandy Producers Association refused to come up to the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner.

Three days later, the Premier again met the representatives, but they still had not changed their attitude and they refused to alter their prices. During this period I was in constant

touch with the Premier and the representatives of the Wine Grapegrowers Association, and it was on the advice of the Grapegrowers Association, expressed officially through its President and Secretary, that the Premier refused to agree to any prices below those recommended by the Prices Commissioner. The Premier has been kicked around considerably since that date. I have had a search made of all the press statements that were issued from early in March until about May 26, but I cannot find one reference in the press releases (and they were taken from both the *Advertiser* and the *News*) to any statement by the Premier that he would see that the grapegrowers received the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner. I believe that is a misconception that has caused a great deal of ill feeling and harm to the industry. It was not I but the Parliamentary Librarian and his staff who searched through the newspapers and took out these press cuttings. That should be sufficient proof that there has never been a report in the press.

Mr. Quirke: I never saw one.

Mr. CURREN: I know that the honourable member for Burra did not see one, because the statement was never made and was never printed.

Mr. Quirke: The one on the Friday prior to the election implied that if you voted for Playford you would lose the price but, if you voted for Labor, you would get it.

Mr. CURREN: I am referring to press statements that the Premier is alleged to have made.

Mr. Quirke: I never charged him with that. I charge him with the one prior to the Saturday. That was a bad one.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: I understand that it was in the *Wine Grapegrowers Journal*.

Mr. CURREN: It has been denied that the Premier made the statement, and I am prepared to believe him, although there seems to be some doubt in the minds of some honourable members and of some people outside this House. On Monday, March 19, the prices committee of the Wine Grapegrowers Council of South Australia met at Nuriootpa, and Mr. Murphy (the Prices Commissioner) and two of his staff, and Mrs. Byrne (honourable member for Barossa) and I, were present. The honourable member for Ridley had been invited but apparently was not available because of a prior engagement.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Why wasn't the member for Angas invited?

The Hon. T. C. Stott: I was not notified of the date.

Mr. CURREN: The honourable members for Angas and Ridley are confusing the meetings.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It was in the heart of my district.

Mr. CURREN: This meeting was called by the Grapegrowers Association at Nuriootpa and the prices committee of that association, and had nothing to do with the Premier or me. We did not issue any invitations. I received an invitation from the Grapegrowers Association. I believe that the meeting about which honourable members are complaining was held on April 12. I did not attend all the meetings, but I received the results, as they were relayed to me by a reliable source. Following the meeting at Nuriootpa on March 19, it was decided that a further approach would be made to the Wine and Brandy Producers Association in a last effort to reach agreement with it. A meeting between the Grapegrowers Association and the Wine and Brandy Producers Association was held on March 26, but there was no alteration to the *status quo* and the prices remained the same.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: You say that I got an invitation for that meeting at Nuriootpa?

Mr. CURREN: I was informed that the honourable member was given one for the meeting on March 19.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: I never received an invitation.

Mr. CURREN: I would not say that the honourable member received an invitation, but an apology was made for you at that meeting.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: I never received an invitation.

Mr. CURREN: The honourable member cannot blame me for that. Following the meeting of March 26 between the Grapegrowers Association and the Wine and Brandy Producers Association, there were no changes. A further meeting of the State Council of the Grapegrowers Association was held at Nuriootpa on April 4. At this meeting, it was decided that a further approach be made to the Premier to intervene. I received an invitation from the Premier to be present in his office on April 12. I think it was a Monday. At that meeting the Premier, representatives of the Grapegrowers Association (Mr. Dyer, Mr. Tonkin, Mr. Preece, and Mr. Lucas); Mr. Murphy (Prices Commissioner), and I were present. I believe that is the meeting about which honourable members opposite are concerned at not being invited to be present. I was asked by one gentleman after the meeting why other Parliamentarians representing

grapegrowing districts were not present. I said that as Government policy, or the Government's attitude to the surplus grapes, was to be discussed at the meeting, I considered it was the prerogative of the Premier to invite those whom he desired to attend the meeting. I still maintain that was the correct attitude.

Mr. Ryan: Did you have an invitation from the previous Government to discuss this matter.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: He does not represent Ridley, Barossa, or Angas. We were not invited by those people to come to the meeting. The door was slammed in my face.

Mr. CURREN: The answer to the honourable member for Port Adelaide is "No". I was never consulted during the negotiations that took place last year about the surplus wine grapes. I do not think honourable members opposite should complain about similar treatment this year. That meeting of April 12 was held in the Premier's office and not, as mentioned in public statements, at Nuriootpa. The Premier, at that meeting, said that the surplus wine grapes (which at that time totalled 2,755 tons) should be handled through normal outlets. The grapegrowers' representatives were in favour of that suggestion as in the previous year they had dealt with the surplus grapes through an emergency pool and saw the danger in the situation continuing year after year as the surplus could reach astronomical proportions. It was 1,600 tons last year, and the 1965 surplus trebled that figure. At that rate, in two or three years' time, all the grapes will be a surplus, for the processing of which the Government will be held responsible! The processors are very much alive to the danger of handling surplus grapes other than through the normal channels. The Premier and I are also alive to that danger.

As the Premier had expressed the desire that surplus grapes be handled through the normal outlets, he requested the prices Commissioner to make a survey of the storages available in the river districts, where most of these surplus grapes were located. That survey revealed that the river district co-operative wineries had either filled their storages or committed them to be filled with the remainder of the vintage yet to come in (with the later varieties of grapes, such as doradillos). As no space was available in the co-operatives, the Premier informed the delegation concerned that if it could find space in any other wineries he would see that finance was made available through the State Bank. That finance was

accordingly made available when the grape-growers returned with the statement that Penfolds had space to process 3,000 tons, and was prepared to undertake that processing at a price. The Premier, I think in a Ministerial statement last Thursday, said his good offices had been instrumental in reducing the figure quoted by Penfolds for processing those grapes, and I know that was the case. The original figures supplied by Penfolds were exorbitant, to say the least, and it was only after a letter had been forwarded by the Premier to Penfolds that the latter organization reduced its price to what anybody would regard as a normal price for processing grapes.

Mr. Quirke: That was the ride it was taking them for.

Mr. CURREN: In making this deal, Penfolds not only attempted to take the Government for a ride but to take the whole industry for a ride, too.

Mr. Quirke: It was the only one available wasn't it?

Mr. CURREN: Yes, it was the only one that said it had space available at the time. When the 3,000 tons was processed it was found that a further 500 tons remained on the vines, and once again an approach was made to the Premier for finance (in this case, £11,000), which also was granted. In the period between the completion of the original contract and the announcement that further funds were available some interesting moves were witnessed, concerning the price that winemakers were prepared to pay for grapes. Indeed, some winemakers were still chasing grapes at that period but, instead of their offering the price of £18 a ton in that period, the price dropped to £12—and that was offered by winemakers who had no space! If the grapes were available at that figure, the winemakers could find space for them!

Mr. Quirke: They would have had the lot at that price.

Mr. CURREN: The Government's action in providing funds for processing the surplus grapes has met with the grapegrowers' approval. As to the executives in charge of the emergency pool, I do not regard them as quite the fools some other honourable members would imply they are. They are a fine body of men, well able to look after the interests of the grapegrowers they represent. A few weeks ago in the *Murray Pioneer* a story appeared about statements made by another "Story". Some of the allegations made by this gentleman are to say the least rather misleading.

Mr. Hudson: Did he check his facts?

Mr. CURREN: If he did, he made some rather unintelligent statements after he had checked them. The article reads:

I refer to what Mr. Curren, the member for Chaffey, said on the hustings when he was with the new Premier at Renmark. He was talking of grape prices, and was quoted in the press as follows: Referring to the annual haggle over wine grape prices, Mr. Curren said there were many aspects of wine grape growing and marketing that had a serious effect on the economic structure of the industry. I believe that the inquiry rejected by the Government several years ago should be undertaken at the earliest possible time. It would not impair the work of the Prices Commissioner in any way.

At a public meeting in Renmark about ten days prior to the election, I expressed the view that a Royal Commission should be set up to investigate the wine grape industry, and I still stand by what I said at that meeting.

Mr. Jennings: Before your majority was increased in Chaffey!

Mr. CURREN: Yes, and increased by over six times, too. As I have expressed my view that there should be a Royal Commission, I now express great pleasure, following the announcement last Wednesday night that there is to be a Royal Commission, that the Government has decided on this course. I believe that within its terms of reference the Commission will be able to obtain valuable information.

Mr. Quirke: The terms of reference should be extended if full value is to be obtained.

Mr. CURREN: No doubt if the Commissioners feel that the terms of reference are not broad enough for them to hold a sufficiently wide examination of the subject under review, they will ask that the terms be extended.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I do not think the Government would deny that the terms could be extended.

Mr. CURREN: In reply to a question from the honourable member for Burra this afternoon, the Premier said that the matter of the extension of the terms of reference would be considered at the Executive Council meeting on Thursday. I trust that, in its wisdom, the Executive Council will see fit to extend the terms of reference. I have dealt with the famous meeting that the grapegrowers were supposed to have called at Nuriootpa. The public statement made by the Hon. C. R. Story is also misleading. It reads as follows:

Just after the election a meeting of growers in the Barossa Valley was called—at very short notice I am told—which the Premier was asked to attend and explain various aspects of his policy on surplus grapes. The grapegrowers

council had said on April 14 that it would like to have this meeting and that it would like the members of Parliament for the grape-growing districts to be invited to attend.

I have never seen such a hash-up of anything as is that statement. The meeting to which the honourable gentleman referred was held in the Premier's office on April 12; it was not called by the Grapegrowers Association and was not in the Barossa Valley. Therefore, I am sure that the honourable gentleman was really off beam in that statement.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That must have been a bedtime story.

Mr. CURREN: Yes. A few minutes ago, in reply to an interjection by the honourable member for Port Adelaide, I referred to the fact that I had not been consulted during the negotiations 12 months ago on surplus wine grapes. The Hon. Mr. Story, in a howl of anguish and with much beating of his ample breast, said:

I think that this was a deliberate attempt to keep us out of negotiations. I have played politics reasonably hard, but I think Government members will agree that in the relationships with them in many industries in which we are jointly interested we did not exclude members of the Labor Party in any way.

I have already told honourable members that I was excluded from certain negotiations last year; I was not included in any way. The Hon. Mr. Story is howling that he was excluded from talks this year. All I can say is that when things are different they are not the same. Referring to the surplus grape situation and to wine grapes, the honourable gentleman said:

This year nothing of a positive nature has been done and we again have a surplus.

I point out to honourable members that that is a very unfair comment. The election was held on March 6 and the Labor Government took office on, I think, March 11. The vintage had then been in progress for about one month and for this gentleman to say that nothing positive had been done was very unfair. I throw this right back into the lap of the previous Government. It should have seen as far back as 12 months ago that there was a surplus then and that there was every likelihood (unless great weather damage took place) of there being a surplus in the 1965 vintage.

If there were a need for legislation or regulations to do something about surplus grapes, why did not the previous Government do it last year when there was ample time? I do not think that Labor members would have objected to returning to Parliament for a couple of days to deal with legislation of such an important nature to overcome one of the problems in the

grapegrowing industry. In fact, we had a considerable amount of time off last year and I think that we sat for only 40 days. The Opposition had ample time to do something when it was the Government, and it is no good its howling now, after the change of Government and blaming the Government, because we took over in the middle of the vintage.

Mr. Corcoran: Has the Opposition given any good reason why it did not pass legislation?

Mr. CURREN: No, it is blaming us. Opposition members say that we have done nothing positive with regard to legislation, but the vintage had been in progress for about one month when we took office. However, meetings have been held with the Grapegrowers Association and the Wine and Brandy Producers Association and arrangements have been made for the processing of 3,500 tons. If that is not positive action what is it?

Mr. Ryan: Negotiations should have taken place before the election.

Mr. CURREN: I agree with that, and I have said that on previous occasions. I have questioned the previous Premier on the timing of the release of the Prices Commissioner's report. I have advocated on many occasions that the report should have been tabled at least one month before the commencement of the vintage to give the grapegrowers and winemakers ample time to negotiate, and, particularly from the grapegrowers' point of view, to give them time to negotiate without the pressure of the vintage on them. Then growers are worried and uncertain about prices.

Mr. Quirke: Has the honourable member got any ideas on how the matter could be handled?

Mr. Corcoran: We have a Royal Commission to sort that out.

Mr. Quirke: Let us hear from those members who are so vocal about the matter now.

Mr. Ryan: Why doesn't the honourable member give evidence before the Royal Commission?

Mr. Quirke: I probably will.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Lawn): Order!

Mr. Hughes: The honourable member does not need anybody to come to his aid; he is doing all right by himself.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I am not coming to the honourable member's aid. The honourable member has the right to answer interjections if he wishes, but other honourable members cannot answer them.

Mr. CURREN: This is a further quotation from the published statement to which I have been referring:

I am worried by the attitude of the present Government, because the Hon. G. A. Bywaters made two statements on this particular subject. I believe he was referring to wine grape marketing.

Mr. Coreoran: Whom are you quoting?

Mr. CURREN: The Hon. C. R. Story. The statement continues:

He was asked by the Wine Grapegrowers Council whether he would be prepared to look at the matter of the establishment of a grape board, and, he said he would. He was perfectly frank and said he thought this was the solution. He was reported as follows: The Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Bywaters, has assured representatives of the growers' organization that the State Government would assist in every way possible the establishment of a board. Within two or three days, this gentleman changed his mind completely, or somebody changed it for him. He then said it should be on the basis of a Commonwealth board.

The true story of what led up to that misconception by the Hon. Mr. Story is that two members of the Grapegrowers Council met the Minister of Agriculture in his office on March 26 and, following that meeting, a statement was made to the press by the Secretary of the Grapegrowers Association. The report, which I think appeared in the *Advertiser* on March 29, did not quote the Minister: it was a quoted statement by the Secretary of the Grapegrowers' Association (Mr. Lucas) and it was not in accordance with the facts as the Minister knew them. The Minister was most annoyed and disturbed by the statement in the press and contacted the Grapegrowers Association Secretary and let him know that. After that, the Minister made a statement which appeared in the press on March 30 and which corrected the situation. It was not a matter of the Minister's changing his mind; he put the matter right by telling the press the truth. A further remark by the Hon. Mr. Story, some of which I agree with, reads as follows:

I suggest that the co-operatives should take charge of these surplus grapes and thereby the whole matter could be placed under expert boards and salesmen so that the whole industry would not be upset when the products were sold. Some very conscientious and well-meaning growers have had to act as board members for these emergency pools. They are not trained in this particular field, and when they are negotiating with proprietary wineries, which they have had to do recently, I am fearful that the job may be a little too big for them. It is heart-warming to know that he is fearful. However, as I stated earlier, the co-operatives were canvassed on whether they could handle

these grapes. The space was not available, and once again the honourable gentleman is way off beam in his statements. His remarks on the ability of the men who have been handling this co-operative are most derogatory and not in the best interests of the industry as a whole. To further support the argument I have been putting forward regarding the Government's view on where these grapes should have been treated can be found in *Hansard* in the following reply by the Premier to a question asked by the honourable member for Angas:

The Government takes the view that it is much more desirable that the grapes be absorbed through the regular channels than through an emergency co-operative. In fact, the Government regards the latter procedure as a potentially dangerous one, likely to act in the longer run contrary to the interests of the growers generally, the regular co-operatives and the industry.

Mr. Hughes: All marketing should be done through normal channels.

Mr. CURREN: Yes, all marketing should be, but it is the processing that we are worried about. I now come to the most remarkable feat of gymnastics that a body of the Hon. Mr. Story's size could ever perform, when he said:

I think we have reached the stage where this industry has to hang together. If it does not, it will hang separately. I personally do not see any way out of this, unless all these groups can be brought together under the leadership of somebody who is prepared to be patient and who will get them organized up to the point of agreeing to the principle of orderly marketing and to the point of agreeing to the appointment of a commission or an inquiry. I do not know that a Royal Commission is needed, but an inquiry into the whole industry certainly is called for, so that we may know which way to go. I think this ought to be done at the highest level at which we can possibly do it.

My reference to a feat of gymnastics comes about because on many occasions in the past few years, when I have felt a little down in the dumps on Tuesdays, I used to listen to radio station 5RM where there was a Liberal and Country League programme at 12.15 p.m.

Mr. Ryan: A tonic programme?

Mr. CURREN: I only switched it on when I was feeling down in the dumps. This gentleman was often the spokesman and I have repeatedly heard him say that the intervention of the Prices Commissioner was the answer to the whole problem, and that there was no need for a Royal Commission. He said that dozens of times, yet what I just read is his present opinion.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Would that be in line with the general thinking of the Government of that time?

Mr. CURREN: That is all they were allowed to think in those days.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That is all they were allowed to say. There's a difference.

Mr. CURREN: They were not allowed to say what they really thought. They had been told there would not be a Royal Commission, and there was not one while there was a Liberal and Country League Government. The report also stated:

These co-operatives are funded mainly from money under the Loans to Producers Act. Just before this vintage several wine co-operatives endeavoured to get more finance through that legislation, but money was scarce. Now we are suddenly faced with £67,000 being made available from that source, and I do not think this is the purpose for which that money was originally provided.

He was endeavouring to imply that it was the present Government that rejected applications from Upper Murray co-operatives for financial accommodation, but I understood from his remarks that the applications were made prior to the commencement of the vintage, which was in the middle of February. His attempt to smear the present Government was not a very good attempt, and anyone with any knowledge of when the vintage started and of the wine industry could see that he was barking up the wrong tree again.

A few weeks ago in this House, I think on a motion for adjournment that was well described by the Premier as a "grizzle session", some remarks were made by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) and the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott). I think I will not include the member for Angas, as I am not sure that he took part in it.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I did not speak on it.

Mr. CURREN: The other two honourable members had much to say about the wine grape situation, and complained that they could not get any information on the terms and conditions under which surplus grapes were to be handled. As recorded in *Hansard*, they said that they had been in touch with representatives in the Upper Murray. If they had gone to a very reliable source of information—the growers' organization—they would have been able to find out the terms and conditions under which the surplus grapes were to be handled. I am a close personal friend of the President of the Grapegrowers Council of South Australia. He and several other men

in the organization who handled the emergency operations informed me that every grower who was supplying grapes to the emergency pool or to the Emu Wine Company was told exactly what the terms and conditions were, what they were likely to receive for their grapes, when they were likely to receive payment, and every other matter relevant to terms and conditions. The claim by these two honourable members that they could not get any information from any source does not stand up to scrutiny. Obviously the source from which they were seeking information did not have the faintest idea of the situation. If they had been dealing with growers who were putting grapes into the emergency co-operative they would have obtained correct information. I assure them that the Grapegrowers Council of South Australia is composed of some of the most intelligent and capable growers who are quite capable of shouldering the responsibility of running the affairs of the council and the emergency co-operative pool. I have every confidence in their ability, and will support them fully in their efforts to find an answer to the problems of the industry. The Hon. Mr. Story also said:

In this industry the big bulk suppliers—the River co-operatives—must get together on policy.

I wholeheartedly agree that they must get together and do their best to eliminate price cutting.

Mr. Quirke: They should have done it 15 years ago.

Mr. CURREN: I go much further than saying that the co-operatives should get together; I suggest that all sections of the wine grape-growing and winemaking industries—grape-growers, winemakers, hoteliers, other retailers and merchants—should get together and work out a formula so that all sections of the industry would share in its prosperity.

Mr. Quirke: How long do you think that would last?

Mr. CURREN: At least from the merchants to the consumer.

Mr. Quirke: Then it breaks down.

Mr. CURREN: We must do away with constant fighting between different sections, and the only way to do that is to get them together so that they can come to some agreement and share up the cake in equitably sized slices. Further, before grapegrowers can get together with all other sections of the industry they have a little tidying up to do, as there are competing organizations of growers, and this is not good. They can, if necessary, change the

name of either organization, but they should get together and present a united front. In that way they would possibly have a much better chance of getting a fair slice of the cake than they have now.

In addition to the negotiations I have suggested to overcome the present surplus situation, some coercion by regulation or legislation may be required to keep dual-purpose grapes out of the wine industry. That line of thought is occupying the minds of the grapegrowers' executive at present, and they greatly favour a marketing board. I am prepared to await the findings of the Royal Commission, which will tell us in some authoritative way what it considers to be the best method of overcoming the present unsettled state of the industry. But, in addition to the coercion, there is at present a strong economic argument for the drying of sultanas. I have been told over the weekend that the final realization for the 1964 sultana crop is likely to be about £115 a ton to the grower plus a £10 pay-in to the stabilization fund. Honourable members would not know the details of the stabilization plan but it works on a maximum pay-in of £10 when the price is above a certain figure and a pay-out by the fund when the price is below a certain figure. There is for sultanas a ceiling figure of £2,000,000 pay-in to the fund by the growers and, once that figure has been reached, whether it takes two, three or five years, there are no further pay-ins by them. Their realization can go to £130 a ton after the figure of £2,000,000 has been reached in the stabilization fund, and the whole amount is paid out to the growers.

Mr. Quirke: Is that sufficient?

Mr. CURREN: That stabilization plan and the international agreement on the floor price were the most significant factors in stabilizing the dried vine fruit industry. That agreement was negotiated after several years of negotiation by the Australian Dried Fruits Export Control Board (as it is commonly known) and it has proved of immense benefit to the dried vine fruit industry as well as to the smooth working of the stabilization plan. I have dealt fairly well with the wine grape situation but questions have been asked during the past few weeks about the form of agreement between the emergency co-operative and the firm processing the wine, Penfolds Wines Pty. Ltd. That agreement is a business document between two companies and is available for perusal at the registered office of the emergency co-operative, at 54 Flinders Street.

Mr. Quirke: I have a summary of it.

Mr. CURREN: I have here, as the honourable member has, a summary of the agreement. A few misconceptions have arisen but, if honourable members peruse that document, they will see that all the points raised by the member for Burra in his remarks have been covered. It is an agreement properly drawn up by the legal representatives of both companies, covering all angles. It is not an agreement between the Government and Penfolds so I do not think this House can demand that it be tabled.

The matter of the Renmark Irrigation Trust and its need for financial assistance was raised during the recent election campaign. I agree that it is unable to meet its commitments from its own resources, but some misunderstanding has arisen about the attitude of the present Government towards giving financial help, not to the trust as a body but to those who find the money for the payment of water rates. During the course of the election campaign I made a statement on the platform at Renmark. I was accompanied by the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Frank Walsh), who supported me when I stated that the matter of financial assistance to the Renmark Irrigation Trust from public funds was not a political issue. We in the Labor Party fully agree that financial assistance is necessary and should be provided. I refer now to a statement made during the campaign by a member of the trust's board who knew the full facts of the agreement that had been submitted to the board by the former Treasurer and the former Minister of Irrigation and (as they have since told us) that that proposal, if the trust agreed to it, would seriously embarrass them during the repayment period of that loan, in that during a certain 10-year period they would be repaying some £53,000 per annum and, in their view which they have since expressed to others and to me, it would have been impossible for them to meet those repayments.

I now quote from an issue of the *Murray Pioneer* dated March 4 last, three days before the election. The passage is as follows:

Mr. H. J. Katekar in submitting a question to the Minister said that from Renmark's point of view the help offered by the Playford Government was of a generous nature and was intended to be implemented without delay. Even if a Labor Government assumed office and eventually was prepared to help Renmark, it was obvious that a delay in the performance of any programme must occur. Any delay could imperil the district's security and the Renmark Irrigation Trust could not afford to finance the necessary rehabilitation programme except on terms as generous as those offered by the Government.

Since the election I have had it said to me many times by prominent citizens in Renmark that Harry Katekar should hang his head in shame for the rest of his life for having made that statement, knowing what he did at the time. The true situation is as follows: following the advent of the Labor Party, and in accord with what we had promised to the people of Renmark during the course of the campaign, the Premier and the Minister of Lands visited Renmark on May 8 and had a long discussion with the board of the Renmark Irrigation Trust. They also made an inspection of the area where it was proposed that a new pumping station and rising main would be installed. At that meeting, the Premier told the board that the Auditor-General would be made available to examine the affairs of the trust and work out its ability to pay any loans, after which he would submit a proposal to the Government for assisting the trust. Discussions have been held, examinations have been made by the Auditor-General into the affairs of the trust, and the report is currently being examined. I am sure that within the current session of Parliament (in accordance with what was set out in His Excellency's Speech) legislation will be introduced with the object of providing financial assistance to the Renmark Irrigation Trust.

Mr. Speaker, I have dealt at some length with the wine grape situation and with various other matters that affect my district. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): In rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I join with other members in congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion and also the other new members of this Chamber on the excellence of their maiden speeches. I should also like to associate myself with the remarks of members of this Chamber when they paid respects to former members of this House who had passed away since the last Parliament was prorogued, and I think it would be quite fitting for the public of South Australia to express its sincere appreciation of the services unstintingly rendered by them in the conscientious discharge of their duties while they were members of Parliament in this State and when they gave service in the interests of the State.

May I also, Mr. Speaker, express my own satisfaction (and, I am certain, the satisfaction of the people of South Australia) in the extension of the term of office of His Excellency the Governor. I read with a great

deal of pleasure in this morning's *Advertiser* that His Excellency's term of office had been extended for a further period of two years, and I think the people of South Australia will be very grateful that His Excellency has agreed to remain with us for a further period of two years from April next. We know that during his term of office His Excellency travelled far and wide (as did his good lady) to acquaint himself with all the conditions in this State and to meet as many people as possible. His Excellency and Lady Bastyan have rendered sterling service during their term of office. I also express my congratulations to the Premier on leading his Party to victory in this State at the last election. Unlike the Israelites of old, the Opposition members were not in the wilderness for quite 40 years, but it can be said that its members have eventually reached the promised land, that delectable land of milk and honey and full employment with salutary economic climatic conditions in no small measure brought about by the Playford Government during its term of office in this State.

May I also at this stage, Sir, express to you my very sincere congratulations upon your elevation to the office of Speaker. I consider that in your long term in this Parliament (over 30 years, I believe) you have acquired a knowledge which has well fitted you for the high office which you now hold. You have gained experience not only in the Parliament of South Australia but also through your long association with local government and as Mayor of Port Augusta in this State. I am certain that that experience will stand you in good stead in the Chair which you now occupy. I think it was Sir William Harcourt, a former Chancellor of the Exchequer, who in 1895 stated in the House of Commons what he considered were the qualities of a good Speaker. He said:

We expect dignity and authority, tempered with urbanity and kindness; firmness to control and persuasiveness to counsel; promptitude of decision and justice of judgment; tact, patience and firmness, and natural superiority combined with an inbred courtesy so as to give by his own bearing and example a model to those over whom he presides; an impartial mind, a tolerant temper, and a reconciling disposition accessible to all in public and private as a kind and prudent counsellor.

I know that these are the attributes or the qualifications of the ideal Speaker, and it is, of course, impossible for any person to possess all those attributes. However, I consider that you possess many of them, and I can assure you, Sir, that so long as you discharge your duties with impartiality we on the Opposition

side of the House will have no complaint to make. I trust, Sir, that the time might not come when your duties will be as light or as easy as those of the Speaker who occupies the Chair of the Parliament in Tanzania.

As you are aware, Sir, I represented the South Australian branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association at the Tenth Conference of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Kingston, Jamaica, last November, and one of the subjects that came up for discussion was the role of the Speaker in Parliament. It was during the course of that debate that the leader of the Tanzania delegation to that conference (Miss B. C. Johansson, M.P.) asked what the role of Speaker should be in a one-Party Parliament. She pointed out that in her own country only one Party was returned at the last general election four years ago; there were 71 seats in the House, and 58 of them were filled unopposed on nomination by the members of the Tanganyika African National Union. The remaining 13 seats contested were won by the T.A.N.U. and all its opponents lost deposits. There was one exception when an independent candidate defeated the ruling Party's candidate, but he subsequently crossed the floor of the House, thus making the Parliament a 100 per cent one-Party House. Miss Johansson said that the experience she had had of this one-Party Parliament in the past four years, was that there were few interruptions from the floor, few points of order or of explanation, only little competition to catch the Speaker's eye, and no division when the question was put to the vote. The Speaker was seldom required to give a ruling. In those circumstances, she continued, the Speaker did not have to be the impartial judge he was expected to be in multi-Party Parliaments, and did not necessarily have to remove himself from the active Party politics in the House. She said it was desirable to depart from tradition and allow the Speaker to take part in debates in the House when he wanted to do so.

However, her submission fell on deaf ears and one of the first to express a difference of opinion was the Speaker of the National Assembly of Malawi in Africa, while the Hon. S. K. E. Okurut, who came from Uganda, said that in his country to reinforce impartiality, the Speaker did not vote, nor did he take part in the debate or have a casting vote.

I congratulate the Chairman of Committees on having been appointed to that high office. Previous members have congratulated him and have referred to him as the inimitable member for

Adelaide. I am sure that times will arise, (they may even have arisen) when he will find it difficult to restrain himself from interjecting from the Chair.

Much has been said today, and also in recent weeks, about that ancient industry, the wine industry. This industry existed at least 6,000 years ago in Egypt, and we know that the Old Testament has referred to corn, wine and oil as being the principal gifts of the soil. I recall a remark addressed by St. Paul to Timothy—'Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities.'

When I was in England a few months ago during the winter, experiencing the rigours of the climate, I could not but think of something that was written in a book by Horace A. Vachell, *The Hill*, a best seller in 1905, which referred to wine as health-giving and contributing to the longevity of those drinking it in moderation. This author's recipe for good health was to drink claret to fight the English climate; burgundy to fight the chill; champagne for the depression, and two glasses of good port a day in any weather.

Some of the finest and most cultural rural settlements in this State are in the areas where the vine is grown. Members are acquainted with the districts represented by the honourable member for Chaffey (the Murray River settlements); by the honourable member for Ridley; the Barossa Valley, in the District of Angas, represented by me; and the Clare district, represented by the honourable member for Burra. All members will agree that those areas of closer settlement have made a valuable contribution to the economy of this State, and are the finest examples of closer settlement in South Australia. About my district, it may be of some interest to place on record the comment made in a letter by Menge, who in later years was known as the father of South Australian mineralogy, and who, on March 9, 1840, wrote to a friend in England. He was referring to a portion of my district in the Barossa Valley which was known as New Silesia, because it had been settled by persons who came from Silesia. He wrote:

I should like to see valleys filled with corn, and the hills with vineyards and browsing cattle. I am satisfied that New Silesia will furnish the Province with such a quantity of wine that we shall drink it as cheap as in Cape Town.

This prophecy has been fulfilled, and in the last century or so the area to which he referred has become one of the principal grapegrowing

and wine-producing areas in this State, and the industry is of significant importance. Prior to the turn of the century, Victoria held pride of place, but in the 1890's the dreaded vine disease phylloxera devastated thousands of vineyards in Victoria, as it did in France in the 1870's. As a result, Victoria lost pride of place, and South Australia became the premier grape and wine-producing State. At present, there are about 45,000 acres of vine in this State, the produce of which is used to make wine. During the last five years the average annual production in South Australia has been 137,700 tons of grapes and 24,886,000 gallons, including wine for distillation.

During the same period, the State has exported 1,648,000 gallons of wine and 93,600 gallons of brandy on the average annually. Last night's *News* stated that the estimate for the last vintage was 27,762,000 gallons, that is, within a few million gallons of a record production. According to the *Commonwealth Year Book*, there are 72 wineries and distilleries in this State, employing 1,393 persons with an annual salary and wages bill of £1,401,000, and with a total output value of £9,942,000. These production figures are considerably larger than they are in any other State in the Commonwealth, the industry having contributed much to the economy of this State. It has also been responsible for promoting decentralization of industry, and the relevant industries situated in the rural areas of South Australia provide much employment. From time to time there has been a condition bordering on chaos in the industry, and the first occasion when such a situation arose was after the First World War, when grape production was increasing amongst soldier settlers along the Murray River. Honourable members will recall that many soldier settlers began producing grapes in that locality after the cessation of hostilities in 1918-19. In those areas in 1924 grape surplus production was mainly of the doradillo variety, but the industry was in a state of dilemma and, at the time, some questions were asked in this Chamber concerning the position in which the industry found itself. The late Sir Malcolm McIntosh who then represented some of the river areas producing grapes was one persistent member on this question. The Government of the day took the matter up with the Commonwealth Government, which offered a subsidy that would have enabled a greater price to be paid to the producer than what he was being offered and paid by the winemakers at the time. It was as a result

of the action taken at the time by the Government, and of the clamour in the industry itself, that the Commonwealth Government introduced in 1924 the Wine Export Bounty Act, the first reason for this measure being to protect growers' interests by fixing a minimum price for grapes; and, secondly, to encourage export trade in wine by paying a bounty of 4s. a gallon for fortified wine.

That bounty progressively decreased over subsequent years, but it will be realized that the effect of the 1924 Act was to provide a considerable fillip to the export trade, because in 1924-25 Australia exported 142,000 gallons of wine (that being the gallonage qualifying for bounty); in the following year the export trade had risen to 1,085,500 gallons; in 1932-33 it had risen to 2,628,900 gallons, while in 1939-40 the export trade had increased as a result of the bounty being paid by the Commonwealth Government to 3,619,000 gallons. The Second World War interrupted the export trade, and from 1940 a marked decrease occurred. It was feared at the time that the industry would suffer a severe setback because of the loss of oversea markets, but, fortunately, the predicted disaster did not eventuate, because of increased sales of wine in Australia, which had not been foreseen. In 1939-40, 3,960,000 gallons of wine was withdrawn from bond for consumption within Australia; in 1944-45 the withdrawal of wine from bond for home consumption was 8,350,000 gallons, which rose in 1963-64 to 9,500,000 gallons. (These figures do not include table wines.) As I have said, the increasing consumption within Australia itself saved the industry after 1939-40, because that consumption increased by more than twice the figure applying to the pre-war period.

In July, 1946, the Commonwealth authorities considered the future of the Wine Export Bounty Act, and the matter was referred to the Tariff Board for investigation and report. The board subsequently reported that it could see no justification for continuing the bounty (I suppose in view of the healthy state of the industry), with the result that in 1947 Commonwealth legislation was passed, discontinuing the bounty. We have a period of 20 years (from 1927 to 1947) when, by reason of the Wine Export Bounty Act, the Minister for Trade and Customs fixed the prices to be paid for grapes each year by winemakers who wished to qualify for the export bounty. All claimants for such bounty were required to give an undertaking to the Minister, under the Act, that they would

pay the fixed prices for grapes purchased. Until 1933 winemakers who operated on the local market and also on the export market, and who had claimed bounty on the wine exported, paid the fixed price (determined by the Minister) for grapes purchased by them, but in April, 1933, one prominent winemaker notified the department concerned that, up to a certain date, he would purchase grapes for manufacture into wine to be exported, and that after that particular date the purchases of grapes that he made would be used for manufacturing wine to be sold only on the Australian market. He considered that, if the wine made for the export market were separated from the wine made for the home market, he would be under no obligation to pay the price (fixed by the Minister for Trade and Customs) for grapes used for manufacturing wine to be consumed on the home market. It was realized then by the Commonwealth that it had no power to control the price paid for grapes which were used for wine for sale on the Australian market. However, fortunately most of the winemakers continued to pay the prices which the Minister for Trade and Customs had fixed. There were some instances when they did not pay that price but most of them paid it, and they certainly had to pay the fixed price for grapes which were used for the manufacture of wine for the export market up until 1947. Conferences were held with a view to co-ordinating State and Commonwealth powers relating to the wine industry, and I understand that South Australia even prepared draft legislation at that time to meet the situation but that New South Wales was not agreeable and consequently the matter was not proceeded with.

A situation again arose after the Second World War when the position in South Australia became acute because of over-production of grapes here. Such over-production, I consider, was because of six factors. First, between the years 1948 and 1958 there were considerable additional plantings in South Australia. Secondly, viticulturists had been practising better viticultural methods resulting in higher yields of grapes in South Australia. Thirdly, they had replaced older uneconomic vineyards by new ones. Fourthly, there had been plantings and replantings of better bearing varieties of grapes. Fifthly, there has been a diversion over the years of dual-purpose grapes, which could be used for drying purposes, to wineries. I wish to refer here to the 1964 Prices Commissioner's report relating to wine

grape prices and their effect on the wine industry. This report was ordered to be printed on February 18, 1964. In it, the Prices Commissioner set out the number of tons of dual-purpose varieties of grapes which were diverted to the manufacture of wine during each of the years 1959-63 inclusive. I shall refer to the years 1961 and 1962 because the tonnages were considerable. The total tonnage of grapes of dual-purpose varieties that was diverted to wineries from the irrigated areas of South Australia during the year 1961 was 59,222 tons, and during the year 1962, 74,272 tons. Indeed, Sir, in the year 1963 it was down to 38,679 tons, but that was the year of a very light vintage. The Prices Commissioner states in his report:

It will be seen from the above that the quantity of dual-purpose grapes sold by growers to wineries has a significant effect on the total quantity of grapes taken. The drying proportion of dual-purpose grapes each year would be of considerable assistance in balancing winemakers' requirements against wine grapes available.

On page 4 of his report, in dealing with dual-purpose grapes, the Commissioner said:

In the interests of growers, it appears most desirable that for the coming vintage they dry a large proportion of their dual-purpose varieties. On current export prices for dried vine fruits, there are worthwhile premiums to be gained by drying sultanas and gordos and these premiums should be sought by growers. Furthermore, growers who do not dry at least a proportion of their dual-purpose varieties tend to add to the difficulty of obtaining higher prices for their industry on pure wine grape varieties.

The diversion of these dual-purpose grapes to the wineries over the years has been an important factor in producing the condition in which the industry finds itself. I believe that considerable notice should be taken of the exhortation of the Prices Commissioner in his report by those persons who grow grapes in the irrigated areas of the State that could be dried and sold on a different market.

The sixth reason for the over-production is the record vintages of the years 1962 and 1964. South Australia had its record vintage in 1962 when it produced 171,200 tons of grapes. The tonnage for the entire Commonwealth during that year was 230,800 tons. In South Australia in 1964, 148,800 tons were produced while the tonnage in the entire Commonwealth was 210,000 tons. Of course, that is considerably above the average which I quoted earlier in my remarks. These increases have taken place despite the fact that in recent years there have been no considerable increases in the total acreage of vines in South Australia. In parts

of the State many acres have gone out of production, particularly in areas near the metropolis and because of subdivision many acres of vines have been put out of production. I know large areas that have been out of production in the Barossa Valley for many years, one of the reasons being that the vineyards now out of production were uneconomic and should never have been planted in the areas where they were planted because of the soil conditions in these particular localities. However, as I said, despite the fact that there have been no increases in the acreage (or only slight increases), there has been a considerable increase in the quantity of grapes produced in this State. This increase, as I said earlier, has been because of the fact that better viticultural methods have been observed in South Australia and also better bearing varieties have been planted here.

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

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: During the five-year period from 1960 to 1964 the average processed each year by wineries and distilleries throughout the Commonwealth was 188,450 tons of grapes compared with the yearly average of 156,950 tons in the five years from 1955 to 1959. From the information I gave the House earlier it is clear that the greatest proportion of the production of the Commonwealth came from South Australia. Since 1947, when the Wine Export Bounty Act ceased to operate, there was for many years an annual wrangle between the winemakers' and grapegrowers' representatives regarding prices to be paid for grapes. This wrangle continued until 1959, when the Prices Commissioner in this State was appointed to investigate the industry and, since 1960, he has recommended what he considered a fair and reasonable price to be paid for grapes as a result of his investigation. I say without hesitation that the Prices Commissioner did an excellent job during the time he made investigations into the wine industry and into the position of grapegrowers generally, and in fixing what he considered were fair and reasonable prices.

I think it can be said that for a period of four years until last year a considerable degree of stability in the industry was achieved as a result of the action taken by the Playford Government in appointing the Prices Commissioner to handle this matter. Indeed, in 1962 South Australia had a record harvest of grapes of 171,200 tons, and every ton was processed. The prices determined by the Prices Commissioner were paid. In 1964, when we had

the second highest harvest on record in South Australia, 148,800 tons, again most of the grapes were processed. Indeed, throughout the Commonwealth, winemakers purchased 17,000 tons above their actual requirements, leaving in this State a surplus of only 1,600 tons, which were processed in what has been referred to as the No. 1 pool by the growers forming a co-operative. Thirdly, the stability was achieved because the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner were paid by the winemakers.

We come now to the 1965 vintage, the one we have just passed. A near-chaotic position arose. The prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner on this occasion were not paid—or, I gather, will not be paid. Most winemakers have not yet paid for the grapes delivered to them, but I understand that payment in most cases will be made by June 30, or at least a considerable amount of the money owing will be paid by that date. The viticulturists concerned are, naturally, disappointed that the recommendations made by the Prices Commissioner in past years and honoured by the wine industry are not being honoured this year. Reference was made earlier in this Chamber to the meetings that took place at Nuriootpa and other places, attended by the winemakers' organizations, the grapegrowers' organizations and the Prices Commissioner, in connection with the statement of the winemakers that they would not be prepared to pay the recommended prices. One of those meetings took place at Nuriootpa, the heart of the viticulture industry in my district.

As the member of Parliament for the district, I regret that neither I nor other honourable members on this side of the House representing viticultural areas were invited to attend that meeting. From what he said this afternoon, I understand that the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) was present, and also the newly-elected member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne). The member for Chaffey stated that he attended a further meeting, which I think took place in the Premier's office on Monday, April 12. Again, I know of no other honourable member representing a viticultural district who was invited to be present at that meeting. I am somewhat surprised that nobody else was invited, because a report from the Wine and Grapegrowers' Council of South Australia Incorporated, dated April 14, 1965, which went out to the council members, states:

Following the council meeting at Nuriootpa on Sunday, April 4, 1965, a meeting with the Premier was arranged for Monday, April 12.

It had been suggested that M.P.'s from grapegrowing districts be asked to attend. Mr. Walsh in his reply said that he had invited the Prices Commissioner, the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Curren and Mrs. Byrne.

I deplore the fact that others who represent very important viticultural areas in South Australia—members on this side of the House—were not invited to be present at that meeting. The member for Chaffey, in his remarks this afternoon, stated that he could see no reason why we should receive an invitation to that meeting when he had never received an invitation to a meeting of that nature when the Playford Government was in office and the then Premier had negotiated with the representatives of the industry. However, I say most definitely that on no occasion during the time when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier of South Australia and negotiated with the representatives of the industry were we who represent viticultural areas invited to be present at those conferences; at least I was not, and I do not know of any other member on this side of the House who was invited. Therefore I suggest that the reason advanced by the honourable member for Chaffey why we should be excluded from the conference which he attended is a very lame one. How could we expect him to be present at such a conference when we ourselves were not invited?

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It was not a valid objection.

Mr. Curren: Were you invited to the negotiations that formed the emergency pool in 1964?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: No.

Mr. Curren: You should have been.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I come to another point, and this is a matter concerning which the viticulturists in my own district (and I can also say in the adjoining district) are very irate, as has already been mentioned. A day or two before the election there appeared in the *Advertiser* an advertisement headed "Election Advertisement". There was also a cartoon depicting the then Premier. In that advertisement there appeared these words:

Grapegrowers Beware. The Prices Commissioner has fixed recommended wine grape prices for this year's vintage, and this decision must not be interfered with by the Premier. If Playford is still Premier on Monday when he meets the Wine and Brandy Producers Association, he could deal a death blow to growers. Safeguard the livelihood of growers by voting A.L.P. Live better with Labor.

Growers in my district are saying that the words "Live Better With Labor", in view of the events that happened, should read "Labour

Better to Live". I want to say that the implication in this advertisement is that a promise was made to pay the prices fixed by the Prices Commissioner if the then Opposition was elected to office. Numerous grapegrowers in my district have understood it that way. They brought this particular cartoon and this advertisement to me and said, "Now, what is going to happen about this; will we be paid the prices which have been recommended by the Prices Commissioner; is the new Government going to honour the promise that is implied in this advertisement?" They see now that that will not be the position, and naturally they are very irate about the whole matter. I know that the Premier has disowned that advertisement; he said he knew nothing about it until his attention was drawn to it the other day in the Chamber. I see that the advertisement is authorized by G. T. Virgo. Is that gentleman going to disown this advertisement also? If so, I suggest that it is of doubtful virginity. As the result of the 1965 vintage we were faced with a surplus at one stage of between 4,500 and 5,000 tons of grapes, but because a winery south of Adelaide took another 1,000 tons this surplus was reduced to between 3,500 and 4,000 tons. I have received information that tons of grapes were left hanging on the vines in the Barossa and Murray River districts. The 3,500 tons were treated by the No. 2 pool. Much has been said about this pool, but I and growers in my district are concerned about the return from this pool. From the No. 1 pool, which was formed last year and which processed 1,600 surplus tons, growers will eventually receive an amount equivalent to the price fixed by the Prices Commissioner for grapes delivered to that pool. However, it is doubtful whether, apart from the £5 a ton paid to growers under the arrangement between the Government and the State Bank, growers will receive anything near the price recommended by the Prices Commissioner for the 3,500 tons.

Mr. Curren: The official estimated return is £20 15s. a ton.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I hope the honourable member is correct.

Mr. Curren: I have that from the Grapegrowers Association. You can have all the doubts you want to have.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I have my doubts because of certain information I have received. The abortive meetings between the Premier and the winemakers' representatives were referred to, but I am of opinion that the position could have been different. After all,

what difference was there in the position this year from that obtaining in the previous four years, when the then Premier negotiated with winemakers' representatives the payment of the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner? I am sure on this occasion that if the negotiations had been carried out by Sir Thomas Playford, as they had been previously, the result may well have been different. As is well known, the then Premier had arranged a meeting with the winemakers' organizations on March 8, 1965. The honourable member for Chaffey passed over the postponement of that meeting by saying that Sir Thomas had arranged for the meeting on March 8 but because there was a change of Government he left it to the new Premier.

Mr. Jennings: What else could he do?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The information I have is that it was not merely left to him, but that the matter was taken out of Sir Thomas Playford's hands who had arranged the meeting for the Monday. I realize the previous Government was a caretaker Government for a few days, but this meeting had been arranged and, despite the urgency of the matter, which should have been resolved immediately, it was taken out of Sir Thomas Playford's hands by the new Premier.

Mr. Jennings: It was taken out of Sir Thomas's hands by the people.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The matter of negotiating with winemakers with a view to fixing prices is a delicate one, and I am certain that if diplomacy had been the keystone of the negotiations the result would have been different. I point out that over the past four years whenever negotiations took place they were successful on every occasion, and that on this occasion they would have been successful if the negotiations had been undertaken by someone well acquainted with the conditions in the industry, someone who had had much experience over a number of years in negotiating agreements and in coming to successful conclusions on these matters. On previous occasions not only were the Prices Commissioner's recommendations accepted by the winemakers but the prices recommended were paid, which is not the position this year.

The difficulties concerning the industry have in no small measure come into existence by its dependence on oversea markets. I suggest that it is necessary either to improve the export markets or to increase local consumption. I think that the present annual wine consumption in Australia is about 12,000,000 gallons, which is a little more than a gallon per head of

population. If local consumption could be increased annually by as little as one-third a pint per head of population, the entire surplus of 3,500 to 4,000 tons this year would have been absorbed. Also, it may be necessary to encourage a reduction in the acreages planted with wine grapes, and to divert to the drying racks greater quantities of dual-purpose grapes. I think, too, that the export of Australian wines to the United Kingdom should be considerably improved. I was in the United Kingdom in December, where I visited the Australian wine centre, and where I was impressed by the publicity emanating from it, although I am surprised that the results are not better than they are.

Mr. Jennings: Did you say you were impressed?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I discussed the matter with several members of the House of Commons, who replied that the product should receive greater publicity over the television.

Mr. Langley: What about the price of wine in England?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I have already dealt with that. I was most impressed with the South Australian Agent-General's display window in the Strand, where our wines were displayed to advantage. I made it my business to stand on a traffic island opposite the window for 10 to 15 minutes to see what notice was taken by passers-by of the window, and I was surprised to see how many people stopped to see the display. I want to draw the attention of honourable members to the wine import figures of the United Kingdom for the pre-war year of 1938 and the year 1963-64 to show just how insignificant is the quantity percentage-wise that we export from Australia to the United Kingdom at present compared with pre-war years. In 1938 South Africa exported to the United Kingdom 1,532,400 gallons and by 1963-64 the quantity had increased to 2,448,000 gallons, an increase of 62 per cent. In 1938 the United Kingdom imported from Spain 3,330,900 gallons. The quantity increased to 7,384,500 gallons in 1963-64, an increase of 121 per cent. The United Kingdom import from France for 1938 was 998,500 gallons and for 1963-64 it was 6,211,600 gallons, an increase of 522 per cent. Italy had no export to the United Kingdom in 1938 but in 1963-64 the quantity was 2,001,000 gallons. On the other hand, in 1938 Australia exported to Great Britain 3,577,600 gallons, but in

1963-64 only 1,128,700 gallons—in other words, a decrease of 68 per cent.

Mr. Quirke: There was the 4s. a gallon bounty.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I dealt with that earlier. In 1924, under the Wine Export Bounty Act, a bounty of 4s. a gallon was imposed, and this was decreased to about 1s. a gallon in the years following 1924. That bounty certainly stimulated the export trade, but the Act was repealed in 1947. The total pre-war imports of wine by Great Britain were 15,000,000 gallons a year (I am referring to the Second World War). Australia then supplied 20 to 22 per cent thereof. In 1963-64 Britain's imports were 23,920,000 gallons, and Australia's share of that market was only 4½ per cent. It had dropped from 20 per cent to 4½ per cent between 1939 and 1963-64. I believe that much more should be done to increase our exports to the United Kingdom.

Mr. Curren: We should re-organize the Wine Board.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The Wine Board is spending about £50,000 annually in Great Britain. It is being spent on exhibitions and wine tasting in various parts of the populous cities of Great Britain but, nevertheless, I think a large sum is being spent for very little return. Perhaps the whole matter should be examined again properly by the Wine Board. I offer one suggestion. In Australia we have, I suppose, hundreds of thousands of British migrants and I know that the Wine Board, through the wine centre in London, makes available gifts of Christmas parcels. My suggestion is that one way of increasing publicity would be for every British migrant in Australia to be contacted by the Wine Board and asked whether he or she would like to send a gift parcel to a relative in England or Scotland, and, if they wished, that could be arranged through the Wine Board centre in London. I think that, in some small measure, would help to increase the liking for our Australian wines.

Mr. Curren: Would you agree that export under one brand as a national symbol would improve the situation, as it has done for South Africa?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: As I mentioned last year, if that relates to the marketing of surplus wine, I think it has some merit and is worth considering. I also think that there is considerable potential in Japan and South-East Asia. The honourable member for Angas in the Commonwealth Parliament (Mr. G. O'H. Giles), in opening the annual meeting of the

Federal Grapegrowers Council of Australia at Griffith in New South Wales on May 17, had a few suggestions to make that I think merit close attention. He was referring to a market chiefly in Japan and made the following suggestions:

(1) That a careful inquiry be made to see whether bulk wine could not be profitably sold to the existing Japanese wine maker. At present he produces a low cost poor quality article selling at approximately 5s. per bottle. Vineyards cannot physically expand in Japan. Would a market exist for a blended product of better quality selling at a higher price?

(2) A market would probably show some anticipated demand. This would probably show some demand for port, sweet sherry, and perhaps a sweet table wine, such as ringold.

(3) The use of existing commercial channels is always more likely to be successful. For instance, who services the 3,000-odd night-clubs and restaurants in Tokyo alone? Could rebates, or similar encouragement, be given to these establishments to stimulate sales of wine? Who supplies the many Rotary meals held in Japan? Japan is becoming a nation of conventions. Who supplies the hotels who run these functions?

(4) Displays and tastings—Their importance is probably over-rated, but they do make some impact on the market, and wines are sold because of this type of display. Once wine is ordered a follow-up is necessary. One novel suggestion was for the hiring, on a permanent basis, of one man to do nothing more than visit all hotels, night-clubs, etc., carrying Australian wine, and to ask for a glass of the product. The principle behind this action is that bottles must not be allowed to sit on shelves unopened and be pushed further and further to the rear. Once a bottle is opened the barman soon makes sure it is consumed by other people.

(5) Size of bottles—20 ounce bottles are more usual in South-East Asia (particularly in Japan), which are considerably smaller than usually used for Australian wines. If the demand is for smaller bottles then the reasonable thing to do is to meet that demand.

The third suggestion that I make for dealing with the surplus grape position is that perhaps a case could be made out for assistance from the Commonwealth Government through the medium of an export bounty. I mentioned earlier in my remarks that when the industry was in a dilemma in 1924 following over-production because of the new areas opened in the Murray River districts after the First World War, the Commonwealth Government passed the Wine Export Bounty Act, pursuant to which a bounty of 4s. a gallon was paid on export wine and, what is also most important, the grower was guaranteed a fixed price determined by the Minister for Trade and Customs. I suggest that the Commonwealth Government should take a vital interest in this industry, first because of the many returned

soldier settlements in the Murray River districts and, secondly, because it collects from South Australia excise on wine, spirits and brandy. In 1964 this totalled £2,723,400. For the previous five years, the average per annum was £2,515,900. In view of the amount of money that the Commonwealth Treasury gets from the industry, it should be interested in this matter. It may be worth while making representations to the Commonwealth authorities. Immediate action is imperative to give the viticulturist the protection necessary to ensure that he receives a reasonable price for all grapes grown by him.

It has happened in the past that other primary producers have had experiences similar to that of the grapegrowers. I refer to the sugar cane industry in Queensland. I believe that in 1915 legislation was passed there which resulted in setting up cane prices boards, with representatives of growers and millers and an independent chairman. These boards fix the prices paid by the millers. Secondly, the States concerned with viticulture (South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales and, to a lesser extent, Western Australia and Queensland) could give the Commonwealth power to deal with the grape industry as it now deals with the dried fruits industry. I pose the question, however, whether any State on its own can deal effectively with the industry. Assuming that prices were fixed here in South Australia, what would there be to prevent New South Wales or Victoria, if either had a bumper harvest, from processing the grapes and sending the juice in road tankers to South Australia in order to sell it here at a price below that obtaining in South Australia? Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution would, in my opinion, make such a sale legal. It would be impossible to prevent it, because of the words "Trade, commerce and intercourse between the States shall be absolutely free." Therefore, ultimately the whole question of the wine industry and the grapegrowers must be dealt with on a Commonwealth basis.

I refer here to the acreages under production in the various States. For the three years ending in 1948-49, the average showed that New South Wales had under vineyards 16,482 acres, which in 1962-63 had increased to 17,704 acres. Victoria for the corresponding years had 44,114 acres, increasing to 45,662 acres. Queensland, with 3,099 acres, increased to 3,237; South Australia, with 58,971 acres, decreased to 58,266; and Western Australia, with 6,197 acres, increased to 8,685. The Commonwealth total was 124,947 acres, which increased to 133,554

acres. I point out that those acreages include acreages planted not only with wine grapes but also with grapes used for drying. Therefore, the danger is that other States such as New South Wales and Victoria can increase their production through a great increase in plantings, whereas this State may not have a tremendous increase in plantings. The Eastern States, because of increased production of wine, could capture the market that we hold at present. They could also flood South Australia with processed grape juice, because of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Therefore, I think that any tackling of the problem on a State basis would ultimately not be satisfactory.

I note with much interest that a Royal Commission has been appointed to investigate the position in this State, but I consider that the terms of reference of the Royal Commission are not wide enough and should be extended. I noticed in the press last Thursday that the President of the Wine Grapegrowers Council in South Australia (Mr. S. A. Dyer) was critical, for he said:

It is a pity the terms of reference were not extended to cover the whole industry and probe the wide difference between what the grower receives for his ton of grapes and what the consumer pays for them. If there were a more equitable distribution of costs through the industry, it would help the grower receive more money.

I draw attention to the fact that the terms of reference do not mention the fixation and payment of fair and reasonable prices for grapes; therefore I consider that the terms of reference should be extended so that the Commission can deal with those matters. That is what is of paramount importance to the grower, and he is the one who is suffering at present because the prices recommended by the Prices Commissioner are not being paid. I trust that the Government will see its way clear to extend the terms of reference so that every aspect of the position, particularly as it affects the grape-grower, can be investigated by the Commission. After all, a Royal Commission will be useless unless it brings forward recommendations which are beneficial to the industry and which are given effect to. I trust that the commission's findings will be beneficial and, if they are, that effect will be given to them. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): Mr. Speaker, I listened with much interest to the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, and I listened for a long time to him, Sir. I believe that the honourable member for Angus, when

he was talking about the problems of the grape-growing industry, suggested that the only way out of this problem was for us to drink more wine. Quite unwittingly he gave us the solution. If he would make more speeches of the same duration and with the same amount of interest, he would drive every teetotaler in Australia to drink wine.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I would not drive you to it.

Mr. JENNINGS: I got out of that habit years ago. I support the motion and, on this occasion, I certainly do it without any reservations. I agree with so many members who have already spoken that the Governor's Speech on this opening was the best for 32 years; not that I have heard them all, as at the age of eight years I was not taking an advanced interest in politics. However, I have made an extensive study of the opening Speeches that have been made for the last 32 years, and they fortify me in the belief that the Governor's Speech, which we are now discussing, is by far the best we have heard for that period, and that the present Governor and future Governors, if they are enjoying the advice of Labor Administrations will continue to make even better speeches for perhaps the next 32 years.

After 12 years in constructive opposition, I find it personally satisfying to be on this side of the House. However, my joy is not unconfined. I cannot help thinking of many of my former colleagues, Labor members who gave outstanding service to this Parliament for many years, who have left either as a result of death or retirement before they were able to share the privilege that we have of being members of the first Labor Government for over three decades. There are many examples, but the outstanding one surely is the late Mr. O'Halloran, who led our Party in this House effectively and inspiringly, and was only deprived of the honour of being the Premier of this State by unjust boundary manipulations. Other such members were the late Mr. Frank Condon, our Leader in another place, and Mr. Fred Walsh, who retired only at the last election after an exceptional and meritorious career of service to this State. I cannot help thinking of these members tonight.

I share the general sorrow expressed by all members at the recent deaths of Mr. Bardolph and Mr. Jim Coreoran. It is with no little pride that I can say I enjoyed the friendship of both, and I pay my tribute to their character and their works. I express my personal regret at the death of Mr. George Whittle, who was member for Prospect immediately before I was. It is

over 12 years since Mr. Whittle was defeated for the seat of Prospect, but almost to the end he carried out valuable community work.

I turn to less melancholy subjects, the first of which is to congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion. The mover, the honourable member for Barossa, rose to make her maiden speech in an atmosphere that would have tried the composure of the most experienced Parliamentary speaker, yet with faultless delivery, the most appealing phraseology and commanding arguments, showed all members what we, on this side, already knew about her—

Mr. Quirke: Don't read your speech!

Mr. JENNINGS:—which enabled her to win a seat from one of the most popular and able members of our opponents. I have no doubt whatsoever that the honourable member for Barossa will be an adornment of this House for many years to come and that she will play an increasingly important part in its affairs. I received equal pleasure from the speech of the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), and we also know that he won a seat for this Party from a not insignificant Liberal and Country League incumbent. I was impressed by the tribute paid to the member for Glenelg by the Leader of the Opposition, who devoted quite a large portion of his time in the Address in Reply debate in the vain exercise of trying to discredit him. This is high praise to a new member, but I shall have more to say about the former Premier's criticisms later on. The new member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) delivered his maiden speech in a way that assures us that the high standard of representation formerly enjoyed by the electors of West Torrens will be maintained.

The member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) also made his maiden speech, but I am sure that most of us forgot that it was his maiden speech. There were several reasons for this: first, the honourable member entered this House after a by-election last year at a time when no appropriate opportunity was available for him to make his maiden speech. He had asked several questions, and when he made his maiden speech on this motion (apart altogether from the fact that he is an old political campaigner) we all should have been pardoned for forgetting that he had not been a member of this Chamber for the last 20 years. I congratulate also the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), whom I have known for quite a few years; and I only wish that he would pay more attention, because this is probably the last time he will hear me say anything nice about him. On several occasions I have

been canvassing for my Party in the district of Victoria, with (and surely there is no need for me to say it) a signal lack of success. On every occasion I have been there I have somehow or other met the new member for Victoria, but because of the rapidity with which I worked I usually got through half my policy speech before I recognized him.

The fact that he is now sitting in this House on the opposite side to me is surely an indication that I did not have much success there but, with the restrictions imposed on him by an unacceptable policy, he will not be a bad member, and I assure him that I will not be going down to Victoria next time. However, I am not yet done with eulogies, for, after all, it is the first time in 12 years that I have been able to congratulate so many people without having my tongue in my cheek. Having said that, I point out how appropriate it is that you, Mr. Speaker, should be next on the list. I sincerely congratulate you on your election. You possess the character and experience to fulfil your high office with credit to yourself and this Parliament. Let me say that I do not expect any preferential treatment from you, Sir, because of the fact that for so many years I sat beside you in this House.

Mr. Quirke: Don't let him kid you, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. JENNINGS: If I had expected any such preferential treatment it would have seemed to me earlier in the session that I was going to be gravely disappointed, because somehow or other it seemed that I could not attract your attention despite the fact that your vision was not obstructed by a wig. This allusion (for the benefit of new members of the House) concerns the story of the former member for Wallaroo (Mr. McAlees) of fond memory who, after the Speaker of the day (Sir Robert Nicholls) first started wearing a wig, was prone to complain bitterly when he could not get the call. I might say that he complained quite unjustifiably, too.

Mr. Quirke: And quite loudly, too!

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. He complained in terms like this, "The old so-and-so cannot see me now that he has that sheepskin wrapped around his head." I now acknowledge that my complaints of a few weeks ago were due probably to my youthful impetuosity, because I have had an ample opportunity since to experience, Sir, your unscrupulous impartiality.

It is now my pleasure to congratulate my colleague and friend the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) on his election to the high office of Chairman of Committees. All members

realize that this is a very onerous job, particularly during the Loan Estimates and Budget debates, and I believe that every member will acknowledge how suited the member for Adelaide is to this position. His impartiality is unquestioned, and it is not only unquestioned but I have heard it remarked on by members on both sides of the House and on both sides of the House in both Houses of this Parliament. I do not think there is any danger whatsoever of a recurrence of what a former distinguished Labor presiding officer was alleged to have said when things got a little hot once: "I will name the next Liberal who interjects!" However, I have never known the member for Adelaide to take on any job and not make a success of it, and I am sure that this new job will be no exception.

In this debate there has been much criticism from the Opposition about the composition of the Cabinet. The former Premier dilated on it; so did the former Minister of Agriculture, the former Minister of Works, and a lot of lesser lights, including the member for Light. We know, of course, that this is mostly sour grapes and not of the type we have heard so much about today. It is disappointment at defeat and bad sportsmanship generally. Of course, in addition to this, there is the feeling in members opposite that they are the governing class irrespective of the wishes of the governed. They have never really believed in democracy. They have had to pay lip service to it and have had to make some concessions and gestures, at the same time putting so many obstructions in its way that it could never really be effective. From their point of view, any Minister is unsuitable if he is not a member of their Party. That is probably the most important part of their criticism, but what was conveniently overlooked by the Opposition was that we were extremely circumscribed in our choice of Cabinet members because of the ridiculous system that is a legacy of their days in power. We must have at least three members of the Cabinet from the Upper House; not three members, but at least three members. Let me say now that I am not reflecting in any way whatsoever on our members of the Cabinet from the other place, because despite all this we were able to form a Cabinet of the highest calibre.

Most of this criticism has revolved around the fact that we have only one rural member in the Cabinet. Of course, the Minister of Education represents a country district, and the Minister of Works was born and bred in the country and pursued rural work for quite

a time. After that, he spent many years as an employee of a pastoral firm, where he came into regular and direct contact with primary producers and their problems. The present Cabinet certainly does not treat its supporters in this House so contemptuously as did the former Cabinet, and so it can rely on the co-operation and assistance of our many members who have had country experience. The honourable member for Wallaroo, for example, comes from a country district, and he has had farm experience, and it was in the days of the four-bushel bag, too. The honourable member for Frome is a conspicuously successful grazier. The honourable member for Port Pirie certainly knows more about mining than did the former Minister of Mines, and let me say that he also knows more about horse breaking, post hole digging, dam sinking, fencing and banana bending than did any Minister in the previous Cabinet.

The honourable member for Millicent was reared on a farm, and the honourable member for Mount Gambier spent many years of his life in the timber industry of this State. We know that the honourable member for Chaffey is a primary producer, and the honourable member for Gawler was reared on a farm. The experience of all these members will be available to the Cabinet, and I have no doubt that their advice will be sought frequently. Anyway, I think that an administrator, to be successful, needs more commonsense than background, or, as in the case of the member I am going to mention, more acquisitiveness than background, because that well-known farmer from Rocky River seems to be doing all right farming the pasture of the Grosvenor Hotel. We on this side of the House never resorted to the trick of dividing, or trying to divide, the people of this State into separate geographical groups, provoking disharmony as a result. As an example, we have never sought to make capital out of the fact that there was only one metropolitan member in the former Cabinet, although almost two-thirds of the people of the State live in the metropolitan area. On this matter, I must concede that most of the so-called country Cabinet members in that Government resided around the Walkerville area, thereby boosting the number of voters for the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe).

Before the Leader of the Opposition spoke in this debate, he asked an interesting question, reported on page 43 of *Hansard*, about the accessibility of the Auditor-General to members of Parliament, and wondered whether members would still be able to telephone and

get a report from him almost at any time. That it was ever the procedure came as a surprise to me and, I am sure, to practically every other member of the House. True, we all realize that the Auditor-General is a servant of Parliament and not of the Government and that he submits his report to Parliament, but the former Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) during his term of office certainly never encouraged honourable members to believe that they would be in order in making independent inquiries of the Auditor-General. He had ample opportunity to tell us about this if he had wanted to because, as far as I can remember, when the Budget was about to be introduced and members now on this side of the House (usually the Leader of the Opposition, whoever he might have been) asked when the Auditor-General's report would be available the then Premier's reply inevitably was that the Government Printer was busy in the preparation of the Budget Papers but that he would use his good offices to get the Auditor-General's Report expedited. If the then Premier had wanted to acquaint us of the fact that we were able to telephone the Auditor-General at any time and get any information we wanted from him, surely he would have done it on one of those occasions, and the occasion presented itself every year. The net result of this was that we usually got the Auditor-General's Report just when it was too late to be of any use.

Mr. Lawn: It was distributed to the Leader of the Opposition on the day he spoke on the Budget, not before.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes; it was of no use then. Looking through *Hansard*, I find that over many years the only reference to that matter ever made by the former Premier was when he was opposing a motion by our Leader for the appointment of a public accounts committee. Sir Thomas Playford said:

The form of our accounts has been under close scrutiny by the Grants Commission for many years and the Commission has publicly stated that our accounts are better kept and in a better form than the accounts of any other State of the Commonwealth. On one occasion the Commission requested copies of our forms of accounts because an overseas Government which wanted to establish a sound financial accounting system had sought assistance.

Mr. O'Halloran interjected:

Were our accounts the only ones that were requested?

Sir Thomas Playford replied:

I understand so. My final point is that we have scrutinizing our accounts continuously a highly trained Auditor-General and his staff, which comprises the best men we can get from

the Public Service. The Auditor-General is a direct servant of Parliament and any member who at any time wants any information about our public accounts can get it direct from the Auditor-General. He has his officers in every department; not visiting officers but permanent officers examining accounts daily. Information is available to any honourable member.

Mr. O'Halloran then asked, "At all times?", and Sir Thomas Playford replied:

Yes. If any member raises any question at any time the Auditor-General will immediately answer it.

Mr. O'Halloran then interjected, "That has not been my experience." Sir Thomas Playford replied:

If the Leader lets me have any queries I will refer them to the Auditor-General.

Mr. O'Halloran then said that he had been referred back to the Treasury on one occasion, to which Sir Thomas Playford replied, "I am sorry to hear that." That is the only reference that I can find about the accessibility of the Auditor-General to ordinary members of Parliament over the years, even though we have been deliberately led to believe that we could get this information through the Treasury, which would not be private information. Surely, Sir, if such a distinguished servant of this Parliament as Mr. O'Halloran did not know anything about it, as was acknowledged, it certainly was not made very public.

The Leader of the Opposition in his Address in Reply speech said that the member for Glenelg had displayed some knowledge of the early history of this State but that when he criticized the gerrymander he evidenced a weakness in recent history. The Leader, I am sure, for whatever time he remains in this House, will become increasingly and embarrassingly aware of the fact that the honourable member for Glenelg knows just as much about recent history as he does about the early history of this State. The Leader will also learn that the honourable member is not to be fooled by half-finished quotations from Charles Cameron Kingston, any more than the rest of us. The Leader made great play of the fact that the 1955 alteration of boundaries went through without any opposition from the Labor Party. This is true, but what was not mentioned was that the Bill to establish the Electoral Commission was opposed to the third reading.

Mr. Corcoran: That would not be mentioned, would it?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, it was not mentioned. The Bill was opposed to the third reading in this Chamber and in another place, because under the terms of reference it could not pos-

sibly establish electoral justice in this State. However, we did not have the numbers, so it went through. When the report was presented it was clear that the commissioners had faithfully done the job assigned to them, and our fight was not with the commission but with the Government. We have had that fight before.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a bit of a specious explanation, though.

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, Sir, it is true.

Mr. Millhouse: I think there was something said up at the Trades Hall about it, wasn't there?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am coming to that. It is amazing how the honourable member for Mitcham can be just a little bit too early or a little bit too late. It is true that a special conference of the Labor Party was held to discuss the matter because of its importance, and if the member for Mitcham says that this is any indication of Trades Hall control or faceless men, or any other such asinine thing, let me tell him that I remember this conference most vividly. The motion that we should not oppose the recommendations of the Commission (it had done a job faithfully according to the terms of reference which we opposed, but which were given by this Parliament) was moved by the honourable member for Gawler who certainly had nothing to gain and certainly nothing to lose. The opposition to the motion was led by the member for Thebarton (Mr. Fred Walsh) who had nothing to lose or gain either. It was decided that we should not oppose the Bill, and we did not. The only member (and here the Leader of the Opposition said something nearer the truth than anything else in his long and wearisome speech) to oppose it was the late Sir George Jenkins, who had nothing to gain or lose, as long before this he had announced his retirement. He was upset because the District of Newcastle, which he had represented for so long, was losing its identity as a result of the redistribution, and that is why he opposed it. He called for a division but as he was the only one, there was no division. The 1955 redistribution was only the perpetuation of the previous gerrymander and of course—

Mr. Corcoran: It brought it up to date.

Mr. JENNINGS: —it would have been a further perpetuation if the last abortive attempt of the Playford Government had passed the House. When I say "last abortive attempt", I mean "last" advisedly. I do not mean last in the sense of most recent, but last in the sense that it is final, as now it is obvious that the people of this State feel a breath of air free

from one-man control and the general cult of the individual, and consequently, I do not think they are likely to change. If they do in the far distant future, we, as democrats will accept the change.

Mr. Clark: That does not apply only to people who have recently come to this State?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, of course not. In this debate much has been said about the Legislative Council and much has been said about the Legislative Council in the Legislative Council. Most of what was said in the Legislative Council about the Legislative Council was favourable to the Legislative Council. It must be apparent to many members that the Legislative Council will loom large in our affairs, and I think it must be evident, too, how advantageous it is to have a director of the *Advertiser* as a distinguished member of another place. On the day the Leader of the Opposition in this House made a long speech on this motion, his counterpart was doing the same in another place, but it was the Leader in another place who got all the publicity in the *Advertiser*. Things have changed a bit, haven't they? I think we should refer the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber and the Leader in another place to the pertinent remarks recently made by the Leader's great friend, the Premier of Victoria (Mr. Bolte). For the benefit of newer members, I point out that many of us over the years have been deeply touched and affected by the relationship between Mr. Bolte and the Leader of the Opposition in this State. They are souls in complete accord and harmony.

Mr. Clark: But not very often!

Mr. JENNINGS: On May 21 there appeared these headings in two Melbourne papers, "Bolte Hits at Council: to fight out"; in the other paper: "Mr. Bolte wants to end Upper House".

Mr. Lawn: Hear, hear!

Mr. JENNINGS: I never believe in trusting newspapers much, so I arranged to obtain a Victorian *Hansard*, and I think the relevant quotation is as follows:

Mr. Bolte: I have very little more to add. I would be out of order if I developed my theme on another place not only in relation to this Bill but also in regard to other measures. I realize that, under our Standing Orders, members of this House are not permitted to refer to members of another place. For example, if I wanted to refer to Mr. Galbally, I would have to say "the ringmaster in a circus", or something like that.

The Speaker: Order! The Premier will not continue in that manner.

Mr. Bolte: Surely it is farcical that another place can not only take certain action but can also take advantage of the forms of debate under which we cannot reply in this House.

Mr. Floyd then interjected:

Get rid of it!

Mr. Bolte: That is a very pertinent interjection. I do not think it can be got rid of overnight. One would have to whittle it away gradually. I am in favour of having a good look at the affairs and responsibilities of another place, and I believe this would be a valuable exercise during the recess.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Bolte's sentiments to members of the Liberal and Country League in both Houses of this Parliament.

Mr. Lawn: Victoria led the reform on adult suffrage for the Upper House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and I think it was a Liberal and Country Party member who was responsible: Mr. Tom Hollway.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He didn't last long afterwards.

Mr. Hudson: He lasted a little longer there than he would have here.

Mr. JENNINGS: He seemed to be very unwelcome after a while, but as the member for Glenelg has said, he would not receive re-endorsement if he did that in this State. I turn now briefly to my friend the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), who showed in his speech on this motion, as usual, a pathological obsession with the affairs of the Labor Party.

Mr. Millhouse: They are very interesting!

Mr. JENNINGS: He pushed and he prodded, as we should expect of a member of his stature at the bar, to find out the composition of the Labor Industrial Advisory Committee, but surely the honourable member cannot be as ignorant of all of these matters as he pretends to be. He once said that he went to the Labor Party's office, walked in over the plush red carpets, and asked for a copy of the Labor Party rule book, which was not available at the time. Following this, Mr. O'Halloran gave him an autographed copy of his rule book, and subsequent to that I was in the Parliamentary reading room one evening when the honourable member was going to a meeting, and he asked me to lend him my copy of the rules. Glad as I always am to educate adolescents of any age, I lent him my copy of the rules, which, by the way, has never been returned. If the honourable member was so assiduous in his study of our rule book, as one might have imagined him to be, he need not have asked his very penetrating questions the other day. He would need only to have looked at rule 19, at page 14, which states:

A State Labor Advisory Committee, consisting of the State President, State Secretary, two representatives of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, and two representatives of the State Parliamentary Labor Party may be formed for the purpose of regular consultation on

industrial matters being submitted to Parliament in order to achieve unity of action between the industrial and Parliamentary sections of the Labor movement. Meetings of the committee shall be held prior to each Parliamentary session, and at such other times as might be deemed necessary by any of the constituent bodies.

Mr. Millhouse: You win. I will do my homework better next time.

Mr. JENNINGS: Don't do your homework better: just do a bit of homework. What is probably more to the point now is that seeing that we have been discussing advisory committees, I shall read a statement attributed to a very distinguished South Australian, Sir Philip McBride, which appeared in the *Age* of Tuesday, June 8, 1965. That was not very long ago and, seeing that it is so interesting to all of these people who are interested in advisory committees, I think that I should read it in full. It states:

The Federal President of the Liberal Party (Sir Philip McBride) yesterday praised the performance of the Federal Government since the 1963 general election. The legislative programme of 1964 coupled with the recent session had rounded off all the promises made to the people in 1963, Sir Philip said.

He said this performance was probably unprecedented in Federal political history. Sir Philip's praise came in a statement released after a meeting of the Liberal Federal policy committee yesterday. He said the committee acted in an advisory capacity to the Federal Government.

"The committee took the opportunity to review its activities back to the period preceding the 1963 Federal election, together with the Federal Government's legislative programme since its re-election following on that notable victory," he said.

"It did this because the policy committee's recommendations to the Federal Government played a not inconsiderable part in the forming of the broad policies put to the electorate in 1963. Particularly, the committee was interested in the way that its advice was strongly reflected in Government legislation since the election of November, 1963. In the year 1964, some 130 Bills were put through Federal Parliament.

"The committee appreciatively noted the speed with which the Government went about putting into legislative form what it had presented to the electorate. That process is continuing. Over a very long period, the policy committee has concerned itself with restrictive trade practices legislation and is, therefore, pleased to see the introduction into Parliament of an appropriate measure which reconciles many conflicting viewpoints.

"Long-range Government policy on housing has been taken a further stage by the Housing Loans Insurance Act, to which, over a long period, our committee has given keen and detailed study. Twelve months ago our committee devoted a series of meetings to the

whole question of defence and external security and now records its appreciation of the Government's continued realistic approach to these paramount issues, emphasized in the National Service Act and recent amendments to the Defence Act."

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: What is the name of that committee?

Mr. JENNINGS: It is the Federal Liberal Advisory Committee. They are not only faceless men; they are nameless men.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Not a word from the honourable member for Mitcham!

Mr. Ryan: Ask him tomorrow, by way of a question, to name them.

Mr. JENNINGS: He would not know. He is not in the higher echelons.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Is the press allowed to attend those meetings?

Mr. JENNINGS: The press cannot even attend their annual conference in South Australia. How could they attend this super, super secret body?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: But they have said they do not take any notice of outside bodies!

Mr. JENNINGS: If the Minister disagrees with me on this matter I prefer to believe Sir Philip McBride! Before I leave the member for Mitcham, with great regret (because I fancy he might be referred to later in the evening) I want to mention briefly an article that he wrote in his local paper.

Mr. Ryan: He wrote it?

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, it is above his name. I am not going to sully the salubrious air of this House by reading it all. He starts off by saying, "We have not been sitting in Parliament for the last couple of weeks."

Mr. Ryan: What is the date of that?

Mr. JENNINGS: That does not matter.

Mr. Millhouse: It was accurate.

Mr. JENNINGS: The article continues:

The Premier had to go to Canberra at the beginning of the month to the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council.

Mr. Clark: That would not be important, though, to the member for Mitcham.

Mr. JENNINGS: To give him his due, he said it was. He said:

At that, the Federal Government told the States how much money it will let them have in the next few years. We hope Mr. Walsh will bring back as much bacon as Sir Thomas used to.

He says that he is reasonably happy about the income tax reimbursement payment but not about Loan moneys.

Mr. Ryan: He writes rather well, doesn't he?

Mr. JENNINGS: Oh, the way it is read enhances it. He said that the Premier would be away for a fortnight but that a number of other members, from both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, wanted to go to a Parliamentary bowls carnival in Brisbane, so the Government decided that Parliament would not sit.

Mr. Corcoran: An honourable gentleman from another place had it written up in a local paper that he was on a Parliamentary tour, visiting several Parliaments in other States.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the comment by the member for Mitcham was playing the game not quite in accord with the best spirit, because the Clerk of Parliaments has told me that this arrangement for the bowls tour were made in June, 1964. Two members from the Government side of the House went to the carnival and nine members from the Opposition side of Parliament went. To make this sort of implication that Parliament was adjourned merely to allow members to go to a bowls carnival gives the impression (and, no doubt, it was designed to give that impression) that the new Government was more concerned about bowls carnivals than about getting on with the business of Parliament and, as I say, that is playing the game a little low.

Mr. Millhouse: You will admit that the Government was relieved to have a reason for not sitting for a while, to get the pressure off?

Mr. JENNINGS: I have not noticed any member of the Government or the Government Party feeling any pressure at all yet. We have noticed a few ineffectual gestures being made by the Opposition, but that's about all. The honourable member then went on to refer to the removal of the Premier's office from the Treasury building to the new police building, pointing out that the move cost nearly £6,000. He said, "This is more than enough for a substantial new home." We know of this because he had a question on notice about the matter. He did not, of course, feel fit to mention in this article anything about the former Minister of Local Government (Hon. N. L. Jude, as he then was) and his baby pink bathroom established in his office, or anything of that nature.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: And hardly ever used.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know; I have never been close enough to him to be able to form any opinion one way or the other. On the other hand, most members, if they did their homework properly and asked appropriate

questions instead of quite stupid ones, would learn that the Premier has no intention whatever of leaving the building he is now in until the new State building is completed, which will probably take some time.

Mr. Millhouse: I have written another article, too; are you going through that as well?

Mr. Corcoran: Are you going to leave him now?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am promising him further attention tonight. This newspaper is thrown on to the front lawns in the district of Mitcham. It usually gets mixed up with the rain, which is about the best thing that could happen to it. In his speech in the debate on the Address in Reply, the Leader of the Opposition criticized Labor policy about the amalgamation of the State Bank and the South Australian Savings Bank. This matter has been well canvassed so I shall not labour it further. However, I think it would be well for the House to be advised by one of its members who is a great monetary authority: I refer to the honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), a member of the front bench in the last Government. If anyone thinks that the member for Burra is not a financial expert, well just ask him: I think he will be only too glad to admit it. He has said on many occasions that this amalgamation should take place. I shall not weary the House with all his statements but I have one which, I think, covers the lot fairly well. This is from page 1634 of *Hansard* of 1955. It is in the form of a question. He asked:

Recently we have been notified through the press of the intention of certain banks to institute savings bank branches in association with their trading activities. The obvious purpose is to increase the liquidity of their resources, and although I do not blame them for their action—it is a good bank principle—I can see that the State Bank of South Australia could be at a disadvantage. At various times I have brought up the matter of the amalgamation of the Savings Bank of South Australia, which is an instrumentality guaranteed by the State Government, with the State Bank of South Australia with a view to making the State Bank a bank of issue that could act in the same way as other trading banks and issue its own credit. In view of the competition that is now quite obvious from the private banks, can the Premier say whether any such action is likely in regard to the State Bank, for I am certain that this could be an extremely valuable force for the people?

Mr. Ryan: We shall have at least one supporter from the Opposition.

Mr. Quirke: Do you think I have changed my views?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am merely giving the House the benefit of the word of an acknowledged authority on this matter.

Mr. Quirke: You could do that later on when you introduce legislation. The only doubt I have is that you don't know what to do. I never found any evidence that you know anything about it.

Mr. JENNINGS: We might call for the assistance of the honourable member very early in the piece, then, so there will not be any trouble about that.

Mr. Quirke: I will listen with interest to the introduction of something in this matter. I said the same thing when I was sitting on the Government benches, too.

Mr. JENNINGS: That is right; we have never noticed the honourable member change at all in all his long political career! The honourable member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) made a very interesting speech in this debate. It was also a very long speech. He talked about the reserve wool price plan. I mentioned earlier in my remarks tonight that we have had on this side of the House many farmers and people quite well versed in all forms of rural pursuits. I often wonder if those people who are opposing the reserve price plan know just what goes on at wool auctions, because I certainly do, having worked in the auction room for many years. What usually happens is that when the catalogue comes back and the sale is over, about ten people go into the wool manager's room and he reads out the prices he has got. I am only drawing the prices out of the hat, Sir, but if 10 out of 10 say "58", well, it is obviously 58; if seven out of 10 say "58" and the other three say "57½", well, 58 still goes through. If, however, it is five each, the five who have the highest get it, and you then wait for an objection from the buyer.

There is an obvious reason for the highest getting it, because you are doing your best for your client and you are getting more commission, too. It is a horribly unscientific business, and this sometimes can mean thousands of pounds, and, indeed, hundreds of thousands of pounds. Then what is more interesting, of course, is that these auctions are held at a frantic pace. Buyers congregate in Adelaide from all parts of Australia, although they may have been at a sale at Geelong or elsewhere the day before. They make a hasty valuation on the show floor: it is possible that they may buy the wrong lot and, after buying it, find they do not have an order for it. To allow for genuine mistakes, there is a trans-

fer system. If the transfer is in before 9.30 a.m., I think, and is obviously to cover a genuine mistake, it is granted. However, when buying was less animated than usual, the next day one would notice there would be transfers by the hundreds. In other words, the buyers had got together, and told each other to buy lots that would be transferred overnight. That has gone on for years under the open auction system. I wonder whether the woolgrowers opposing the reserve price plan realize how they have been robbed by the present free auction system.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It will do them good to find out!

Mr. McAnaney: How much will the present system alter that?

Mr. JENNINGS: It will enable the organization to come in, and if the lot does not reach its price to buy it on behalf of the growers. The recommendations of the organization represented by the member for Ridley for an alteration of the Constitution are not new. It was put to the Joint Committee on Constitutional Review in 1959. Evidence was given and the committee noted that section 92 of the Constitution made it difficult to sustain orderly marketing of important primary products. The section which required trade and commerce among the States to be absolutely free had been held to bind both the Commonwealth and States and had profoundly affected orderly marketing schemes by making it necessary to exclude produce intended for or committed to, interstate trade. These recommendations about the alterations were made almost exactly the same as the honourable member for Ridley proposed in his speech on this matter. Here is a quote that may be of interest to students of the Constitution, particularly in regard to section 92. It may make us wonder whether this section was intended to act in the way it has been interpreted over the years since Federation. At the convention in 1891, Sir Henry Parkes said:

I seek to define what seems to me an absolutely necessary condition of anything like perfect Federation, that is, that Australia, as Australia, shall be free: free on the borders, free everywhere in its trade and intercourse between its own people; that there shall be no impediment of any kind; that there shall be no barrier of any kind between one section of the Australian people and another; but, the trade and general communication of these people shall flow on from one end of the continent to the other with no-one to stay its progress or to call it to account: in other words, if this is carried, it must necessarily take with it the shifting of the power of legislation

on all fiscal questions from the local or provincial Parliaments to the great national Parliament sought to be created. To my mind, it would be futile to talk of union if we keep up these causes of disunion. It is, indeed, quite apparent that time, and thought, and philosophy, and the knowledge of what other nations have done, have settled this question in that great country to which we must constantly look, the United States of America. The United States of America have a territory considerably larger than all Australasia—considerably larger, not immensely larger—and from one end of the United States to the other there is no custom-house office. There is absolute freedom of trade throughout the extent of the American union, and the high duties which the authors of the protectionist tariff are now levying on the outside world are entirely confined to the federal custom-houses on the sea coast.

Now, our country is fashioned by nature in a remarkable manner—in a manner which distinguishes it from all other countries in the wide world for unification for family life—if I may use that term in a national sense. We are separated from the rest of the world by many many leagues of sea—from all the old countries, and from the greatest of the new countries; but we are separated from all countries by a wide expanse of sea, which leaves us with an immense territory, a fruitful territory—a territory capable of sustaining its countless millions—leaves us compact within ourselves. So that if a perfectly free people can arise anywhere, it surely may arise in this favoured land of Australia. And with the example to which I have alluded, of the free intercourse of America, and the example of the evils created by customs difficulties in the states of Europe, I do not see how many of us can hesitate in seeking to find here absolute freedom of intercourse among us.

True, that is a good argument for section 92, but what, of course, I think it really means is that the Commonwealth Constitution was to be only the forerunner to a unified system in Australia.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Mr. Justice Isaacs had something to say about it in the 1930's—much later than the statement you quoted.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but not couched in quite the same language, obviously. We have heard much in this debate about the work of the Government since its election. The policy speech of the then Leader of the Opposition has been forcibly quoted. Attention has been drawn to the fact that some of the things promised have not yet been done, even though the election was only on March 6, and Parliament has not been sitting very frequently since then. I have taken some trouble to find out what has been done (and any honourable member, of course, who showed the same energy and initiative could have got the same information). The following information refers to

Harbors Board work in the period since the return of the Government: deepening of the approach channel at Thevenard, £42,000 (this is an approved project); provision of restaurant, shop and residence at Outer Harbor, £60,000. Projects referred to the Public Works Committee are: oil tanker berth at Port Pirie, £925,000; new unloading pier for tuna boats at Port Lincoln, £200,000; new head office built for the Harbors Board at Port Adelaide, £700,000.

The case for the new head office of the Harbors Board includes: increased efficiency by bringing together the board's staff; better office accommodation; better supervision of and contact with operators and the activities in the State's biggest port; elimination of courier service between three offices, the annual cost of which is estimated at present to be £3,000, and added prestige for the board and port which, at present, suffers badly in this respect by comparison with other Australian ports, both large and small. Another matter that has been referred to quite frequently by members opposite is the Giles Point grain berth. Possible disabilities are: an open water berth that has fair protection but could be troubled at times by swell and weather from the south-east and north-east; a terminal site in an as yet undeveloped area requiring costly road improvements and alterations, water supply, power supply, telephone services and associated facilities; possibly a low potential throughput for such a considerable total capital cost: and a berth perhaps not sufficiently deep for the rapidly increasing size of bulk grain vessels. The local gypsum and salt interests have not displayed any interest in the bulk loading facility for various reasons, and it is unlikely that any bulk shipments of these commodities will occur in the foreseeable future, because there are already privately owned bulk loading facilities at Stenhouse Bay and Klein Point. The evidence given to the Public Works Committee by Mr. F. B. Pearson, principal agronomist of the Agriculture Department, indicates that the exportable grain of the lower Yorke Peninsula will be only about 70,000 tons a year rising under most favourable circumstances to 100,000 tons by 1972. The annual cost to the South Australian Harbors Board for the new port in interest, depreciation and maintenance charges would be about £75,000 a year, and the normal shipping charge of 1½d. a bushel, plus the voluntary levy of 3d. a bushel, would return only £52,500 a year, rising to £75,000 a year by 1972.

Several other schemes have been approved and I will briefly read from the document of the Public Buildings Department referring to hospital buildings. The projects are approved for the preparation of tender documents. They are: Parkside Mental Hospital, Nurses' Training School, £59,000; steamheating of wards, £69,000; and Port Pirie Hospital, development on site, £90,000. Under the heading of projects for which tenders have been called—Barmera Hospital, extension to nurses' home and alterations to hospital buildings £50,000; and dental hospital, £1,144,000. Under another heading of projects for which tenders have been accepted, Royal Adelaide Hospital—

Mr. McAnaney: Who drew up the plans for that? I saw the plans for it 18 months ago and it was to be completed by 1968. You will be lucky to make it.

Mr. JENNINGS: I will go on with what I was reading. The estimated cost is £11,900,000. I have been reading from the works programme as at June 18. It continues: Enfield Receiving House £91,000; and Islington group laundry £1,022,000. Of course, we know the latter was recommended by the Public Works Committee. The honourable member for Stirling will recall that in his speech on the Address in Reply, the Leader of the Opposition said that we were in a very difficult position at the moment, because if they criticized what the Government was doing they were largely criticizing what they, themselves, had already done, whereas, if members on this side of the House took credit for what the Government was doing, we were only giving credit for what his Government started. I have referred briefly to these matters to show the House that the Public Works programme has not lessened since the advent of the new Government; indeed, it has been greatly accelerated. There are many instances of this already. Attention has been drawn to recommendations made by the Public Works Committee that the Government has already indicated it will not implement. There is nothing unusual about this, because a Government is not obliged to give effect to any recommendation of the Public Works Committee. How many times over many years past have we seen evidence of the Public Works Committee having recommended something that the Government has not gone ahead with? After all, the Public Works Committee, after a long inquiry into electrification of the metropolitan rail services many years ago, recommended it, but nothing was ever done about it.

There are many other indications of our programme. Only this morning in the press appeared a statement by the Minister of Roads about the very comprehensive and well balanced roads programme for this year. I think that certain country members on the other side of the House are more pleased about it than they have been about any of the roads programme announced by the Government they supported. The Government is undoubtedly doing its job extremely well and I only say in conclusion that under the rules of our Party I shall have to retire from the service of this House 30 years from now, but I hope that for the whole of those 30 years I shall be a supporter of a Labor Government in this State.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): In supporting the motion, I join my colleagues in their expressions of regret at the passing on of certain of our colleagues who rendered very great service to the State. I congratulate the new members on their maiden speeches and believe that their speeches were some of the best that have ever been made in this Chamber. Those made by the honourable members for Barossa and Glenelg, as mover and seconder of the motion respectively, were outstanding. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment. I think it is a fitting conclusion to your wonderful period of public service in South Australia. You hold an outstanding record of local government service and service to this Parliament and I believe that everyone in this House not only considers your appointment well merited but also shares the pleasure you derive from the appointment.

My congratulations also go to the honourable member for Adelaide on his appointment as Chairman of Committees. I sometimes wonder whether the members of this House realize the amount of work that that honourable member has performed on their behalf in regard to members' salaries and other matters associated with the work of members in this House. The honourable member has put in an enormous amount of time watching over the interests of members on both sides of this House. He always treats every member fairly in every respect, irrespective of which side of the House that member happens to be on.

One of the most intriguing things about this session so far has been the number of matters that the members of the Opposition have brought up and supported, things that they themselves have had many years to achieve but failed or did not want to do. Now they are

pressing for the adoption of things that in the past they said could not possibly be done. On the question of service pay, the flood of crocodile tears emanating from the Opposition was so great at one time that I felt concerned that you, Mr. Speaker, might have to get a dinghy to row your way out of this Chamber. It was positively a deluge. I shall refer only to the statements of one honourable member, apart from some matters of education that I shall deal with. This statement was made by the honourable member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson). It is worth looking at. In his speech in the debate on the Address in Reply, referring to the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture, he said:

I would have thought that as a recognition of the part played by primary industries in the economy of this State the Labor Party would have chosen a man with a country background and knowledge.

In fact, the Minister of Agriculture has a wide knowledge of rural pursuits and for several years he was a horticulturist. He has been a successful and popular member of Parliament in a district where almost every agricultural pursuit is followed; and, what is more, he has consistently received from his constituents following these rural pursuits an increasing number of votes at every election he has contested. If this sort of member is not suitable as the Minister of Agriculture, I should like to know who is. Yet the member for Flinders said that he would have thought that as a recognition of the part played by primary industries in the economy of this State the Labor Party would have chosen a man with a country background and knowledge.

Of course, that is just what the Minister of Agriculture does possess. The next statement of the member for Flinders is most interesting. Let me quote it:

The reaction to the composition of the Ministry in country districts is one of dismay and disturbance, not only because a man without detailed technical knowledge of country affairs is the Minister of Agriculture but because the Government apparently thinks so little of primary industries it does not even give them a proper guernsey in Cabinet.

Mr. Casey: And this is the sort of trash that some members opposite indulge in.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: When the previous Government was in office, I cannot recall the Labor Party, in Opposition, decrying the then Minister of Works because he was a farmer but, if the member for Flinders sees nothing incongruous in that situation, why does he think it incongruous if the Minister of Agriculture is not a farmer at the particular

period of time he is in office? Are we to believe that farmers have a special gift of Providence which fits them for any and every portfolio? Let us suppose that the Labor Party, when in Opposition, had made the sort of statement that we heard from the member for Flinders. This is how it would read: "The reaction to the composition of the Ministry in those parts of the State not involved mainly in primary production is one of dismay and disturbance, not only because a man without technical knowledge of industrial matters is the Minister of Labor and Industry but also because the Government has seen fit to appoint a farmer as Minister of Works, a horticulturist as Treasurer, and a farmer as Chief Secretary and Minister of Health. This is particularly disturbing in a State where the numbers engaged in industry and factory work are by far the greatest majority in the community. These feelings must be even more acute when it is realized that the members of the L.C.L. in Parliament are 70 per cent farmers and horticulturists."

Now after listening to the honourable member for Flinders I am wondering whether we should insist that every gynaecologist before being appointed should have had twins and still be rearing them. I listened with great interest to the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) today when he dealt with the Martin Report. I thought he made a very reasoned statement in reference to the technological and technical aspects of the Martin Report, and I thought that his statement was in very sharp contrast to the one made by the member for Mitcham regarding teacher training. I intend giving every consideration to the remarks made by the member for Torrens, because I would not disagree with him on what he said. I think the honourable member painted a very fair picture of the importance of the Martin Report on those aspects. However, the member for Mitcham in his address made a heated attack on my remarks concerning the Martin Report, and his attack was mainly remarkable for its inconsistency, his misrepresentation of my attitude towards the report, and his very offensive remarks concerning officers of my department. My colleague, the honourable member for Gawler, has replied very ably to many of the points raised by the member for Mitcham, but there are certain aspects of this subject which need further comment and which are particularly important from the point of view of public information concerning education in South Australia. Consequently I intend to deal with them.

A common criticism of Australian education systems is that their centralization has led to bureaucratic control. But Professor Portus in his thesis, "Free, Compulsory and Secular", points out that the frontiers in Australia would not have received education services had it not been for centralized administration. Without it, country schools would have received far less favourable treatment in staffing facilities and buildings. I hope the member for Mitcham and the other members opposite will remember this when they are talking about bureaucratic control and centralization. The present Administration in South Australia is aware of the dangers of centralized administration, and, as I shall show, seriously considers any suggestions to meet present day needs. For the period 1945-1964, the total enrolments in primary and secondary schools administered by the South Australian Education Department have risen by 186 per cent, a much greater increase than any other State, Victoria having the second highest increase with 141 per cent, and New South Wales the lowest with 91 per cent. Primary grades enrolments have increased nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ times, secondary grades over five times, and the number of teachers $2\frac{1}{2}$ times. Despite this, the Education Department has reduced pupil-teacher ratios, increased retention of students, extended secondary education to many smaller country centres, provided Leaving Honours courses in larger country centres, and made innovations in courses.

Let us look at the developments in teacher training against this background. In 1945, 245 student teachers were in training. At present there are over 3,000, and South Australia has the highest percentage of its population in training to be teachers of any State in the Commonwealth. To meet the expansion, a branch of the department was created to administer teacher training, and every State found this step necessary. If teachers colleges had been left to their own devices to obtain a sufficient intake of teachers, it is certain the great number of teachers required to keep education services going would not have been secured. The present critics would be the first to complain if the department did not supply enough teachers to allow schools to stay open. It is obvious that only by careful administration and control has it been possible to maintain and increase the number of qualified teachers. In making an assessment of the capacity and desire of this branch to meet changing needs, the following facts are significant:

- (a) South Australia has become the first authority in the Commonwealth to make all its teachers college courses of diploma standard; it has set up terminal diplomas which can be gained after three years of full-time study in any course at any teachers college; and this was practice before the Martin Report was published.
- (b) South Australia is the first authority in the Commonwealth to make provisions for the primary course of training to be extended to four years; this was practice before the Martin Report was published.
- (c) Courses developed in South Australia for third-year primary trainees are considered to be a model for other States to follow when they do introduce a third year of training.
- (d) Despite our greater difficulties, South Australia has maintained the opportunity of a four-year course for all secondary trainees. Other States have two-year or three-year courses not leading to university degrees.
- (e) South Australia is well ahead of most States in its programme of in-service training for teachers already in the service. This programme is extensively used by independent schools; the scheme also allows co-operation with university schools and teachers associations in convening conferences.
- (f) South Australia is developing a strong external studies section of teachers colleges to allow teachers in the service to improve their qualifications.

In academic affairs the teachers colleges are already autonomous, and in this respect the staffs are not inspected and have no outside supervision. They have freedom to create their own courses and choose their own textbooks. They act as their own examiners, assessors and markers. Their guidance of trainees has never been questioned. The principals make recommendations on their staffing needs, as does the university. Appointments to teachers college staffs is by open advertisement; present staffs have been drawn from overseas (including America), interstate, independent schools, university and other occupations, as well as from the State teaching service. Staff members have been encouraged to take interstate and oversea study leave. Thus teachers college staffs have a large measure of academic freedom and autonomy in the control of their courses. It is in the matter

of appointments of trainees, staffing allocations, facilities and buildings, recruiting and selection that autonomy could not work in South Australia at present because it would jeopardize the supply of teachers to schools in the near future.

According to the honourable member for Mitcham, I should have accepted without reservation the recommendations of the Martin Report because it was compiled by eminent educationists and well-known public figures, and yet I should have rejected the considered opinions of officers who had spent a lifetime of service in the Education Department: officers who are better acquainted than anybody with the facts of teacher training in South Australia. It would be difficult to find anything more inconsistent than this. My opposition to the handing over of complete responsibility for teacher training to autonomous institutions, as recommended in the Martin Report, is based on the facts as they are known to me and as they are known to the officers of my department. Some of the main reasons given by the Martin committee for its recommendations for autonomous teachers colleges do not apply in South Australia and, therefore, one is justified in challenging conclusions based on that sort of reasoning, however eminent the members of that committee may be. The reasons referred to may be true in other States, but they are not true of South Australia. Page 122 of the Martin Report states, *inter alia*:

In the opinion of the committee the case for the establishment of autonomous teachers colleges rests upon two main considerations. The next two paragraphs 4.81 and 4.82 deal with these considerations.

The first is the need for an improvement of the status of teachers, in other words, the relative standing or position of teachers in society (or how teachers are regarded by the community as a whole). The committee goes on to say that the quality of young people seeking admission to teachers colleges and subsequent status would be improved if the colleges were unquestionably accepted as institutions of higher education. Then the committee says:

Whatever the quality of individual colleges, their students and their staff, it must be said that teachers colleges in general will not be so recognized while most of their students are seen only as bonded beneficiaries of the State, and their staffs as persons drawn from the limited field of the Government school system of a particular State.

If we accept the view that the status of teachers in society is the way in which the community as a whole regards them (and it appears to me

that this is the view that really matters), then, in my opinion, the statement that student teachers are regarded as "bonded beneficiaries of the State" is without foundation. I have never heard them referred to in this way or in any way similar to this, except by one or two people whose attitude is certainly not representative of community thinking on this matter. I am certain that the great majority of people never regard student teachers in this way.

The second consideration referred to by the committee regarding teachers college staffs being drawn only from the limited field of the Government school system of the State is not applicable to South Australia. Vacancies are advertised widely, and last year 18 of the 35 new appointments to our teachers colleges were from outside the Education Department. Furthermore, I fully approve of this policy being continued. Since the committee has stated that its case for autonomy rests on these two main considerations, and since, in my opinion, these considerations do not apply in South Australia, I make no apology for disagreeing with the committee's recommendation in this particular respect. Since the committee has made plain its objection to bonding of teachers college students, I think I should say something about the consequences of abolishing the bond.

The consequences of abolishing the bond for teachers college students must be a matter for conjecture, but some evidence on the question is available in South Australia, and a reasonable estimate of the extra cost to the Education Department can be made. The Weapons Research Establishment finds bonding necessary, and another large South Australian organization has just re-introduced the bond for computer science cadets. When this organization bonded its cadets, it trained 64 graduates over a given period, and retained 47. At the same time 40 unbonded graduates were taken on, and 40 were lost (not necessarily the same 40).

Our departmental officers are of the opinion that, until we can have more than an adequate supply of teachers and can spare graduates for independent schools, the university, the South Australian Institute of Technology, private firms and other organizations, the bond is an essential, practical necessity. Without it the schools could not be staffed. In view of this evidence, I entirely agree with their views.

The experience of our officers is that most parents and students agree that the bond, which after all is simply a contract, is fair and reasonable. It is desirable particularly for the parents in low income groups as it binds

the Education Department to provide an education which students in many cases would not get otherwise. If the bond was removed the consequences would probably be:

1. A short supply of teachers, particularly graduates.
2. Inevitable loss of the most able graduates.
3. A need to increase considerably the intake to teachers colleges to provide for losses.
4. General dilution of the teaching service.
5. Reduced quality of secondary education generally and particularly in country schools.
6. The staffing of our country schools would become extremely difficult.

To meet such a situation, a very much enlarged establishment for teacher training would have to be maintained. This would probably involve increasing the total number of students in training by approximately 50 per cent, with a correspondingly adequate increase of staff of our teachers colleges. A further involvement would be two additional teachers colleges at a cost of perhaps £1,000,000 to £1,250,000 each.

At the present time we are about to build a new teachers college at Bedford Park, but this is simply to relieve the existing unsatisfactory conditions at two of our teachers colleges. These conditions are so unsatisfactory that we should be in a position today to be building yet another teachers college to relieve the present situation. Therefore, to rectify the present unsatisfactory conditions of two of our teachers colleges and to provide sufficient accommodation to meet the situation probably arising from abolishing the bond, would require the building of four new teachers colleges. However, I draw the attention of members to the fact that the honourable member for Mitcham, in his complete acceptance of the Martin Report, thinks the State should be committed to this situation, despite the fact that the Playford Government, in office for many years, was unable or unwilling to keep our existing teachers colleges, buildings and facilities up to a proper standard. If anyone doubts the validity of this statement, I invite him to inspect the Wattle Park and Western Teachers Colleges to see the overcrowding, the inconvenience of having separate annexes in both cases a considerable distance away, and the unsatisfactory conditions of the building in Currie Street.

Returning now to the remaining recommendations on teacher training in the Martin Report, let me say that I agree with them and the particular emphasis that is placed on the

urgent need for additional resources being applied to increasing the supply of teachers in Australia, especially those of high quality. This is a matter of the highest priority, and it is most regrettable that the Prime Minister has said that the Commonwealth Government is not prepared to enter the field of teacher training. In South Australia we need finance to push on with another teachers college in addition to the one at Bedford Park and to provide other facilities to ensure an adequate supply of good quality teachers. Although our teachers colleges in South Australia have a considerable degree of autonomy, I believe that this position can be improved, as I have already stated, by the creation of an advisory board with wide representation from the university, the schools, the teachers colleges and the community. However, it should be pointed out that boards of studies already exist for each of the teachers' diplomas and seats on these boards are held by teachers college staff, senior administrative officers, representatives of the Institute of Teachers, and, where desirable, outside persons. These boards are independent bodies to advise on the courses that lead to teachers' diplomas. However, what is needed more than anything is additional finance. Given that, together with the type of advisory committee I have mentioned, I believe the improvements we all desire could be achieved.

The honourable member for Mitcham accused me of wiping the ground from underneath the feet of the committee, of brushing aside their considered recommendations, of ridiculing their arguments, of adopting a dictatorial and arrogant attitude, and of rejecting the committee's recommendations in a cavalier manner; but he never got down to debating the real issues of the two main considerations upon which the Martin committee made its recommendation about autonomy.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Do you think it was on account of his immaturity?

The Hon. E. E. LOVEDAY: I doubt it. I think he was merely dodging the issue and making political capital out of it. As is usual in such a situation, the honourable member, being devoid of sound argument, had to resort to exaggeration and misrepresentation. He accused me of insulting the members of the committee, but I do not believe the Martin committee was comprised of people who regard a difference of opinion as an insult, and in suggesting this the honourable member for Mitcham is, in fact, writing down the members of that committee. On the other hand, the

honourable member has no hesitation in being most offensive to the officers of the Education Department by accusing them of being so jealous of their own powers, and so sensitive to any kind of criticism of teacher training in South Australia, that they are prepared to subordinate the truth concerning this branch of education in this State to their emotional feelings. I say to the honourable member that that was not written by one of my officers; this speech was written by myself.

These officers are experts in their field. They have devoted a lifetime to the study of education and how it can be improved, and yet he suggests they have produced a report mainly reflecting jealousy and sensitivity. This sort of attack only indicates that the honourable member is devoid of sound reasons for his argument. Of course, the honourable member is well aware that under the Public Service Act these officers cannot answer back, but that never deters the honourable member. This is not the first time he has made most unfair attacks on public servants in this situation. It is a fact that the officers of my department, over a number of years, have been attacked, in the same manner as that employed by the member for Mitcham, by persons making extravagant and unjustifiable accusations. My officers do not pretend that our education system is perfect, but they do object to offensive suggestions concerning their integrity.

The fact is that the shortage of teachers generally, and in particular those of above average quality, in South Australia is to a considerable extent the responsibility of the previous Government, so strongly and vociferously supported by the honourable member for Mitcham. I will deal with that later.

Let me turn now to a leader on the subject of teacher training in the *Advertiser* of June 16, which, after referring to my opposition to the concept of autonomous colleges, said:

The Minister has since shown some resilience of attitude on teacher education. He has foreshadowed legislation aimed at granting freedom to experiment in the pattern of teacher training at the new Bedford Park College.

In fact, this is not a change of front on my part, as the idea was instituted by the present Administration, and has been in existence and actively pursued by the officers of my department for years. Furthermore, agreement on this matter was reached before I became Minister. It is implied in this leader that the Education Department has been resisting a greater variety of outlook and is jealous of power in teacher training. No-one will believe that this is a criticism of the previous Govern-

ment. It is obviously a criticism of the officers of the Education Department.

Now let us examine what happened following the visit of the Director of Education to Great Britain and the United States of America in 1958. On his return the Director prepared a comprehensive report, but the Playford Government was not prepared to publish it, without assigning any reason. During 4½ months in Great Britain and 4½ weeks in the United States the Director visited education authorities at many levels, as well as schools and teacher training establishments, including separate colleges and those that are constituent parts of universities. He had discussions with the Under Secretary of the Ministry of Education and his principal officers in London, the Senior Chief Inspector of Schools and some of his subordinates in Scotland, and the Deputy Commissioner of Education and a number of his officers in Washington, D.C. He attended meetings and had discussions with school boards and committees responsible for the conduct of groups of schools in Great Britain and the United States. Besides schools and education authorities, he visited 20 university schools of education or teachers training colleges, 14 in Great Britain and six in the United States. In all, he met several hundred educationists and teachers, from commissioners and chief education officers to the senior members of their staffs, Her Majesty's inspectors of schools, county inspectors of schools, university professors, heads of teachers colleges and heads of schools and their assistants.

In his report, which the Playford Government was not prepared to publish, he had this to say about the training of teachers:

(a) It is recommended that the normal length of training for primary teachers should be at least two years. It is desirable that as large a proportion as possible should have three years full-time training. The normal length of training for craft teachers should be three years. All teachers should be encouraged to continue their studies and to add to their professional qualifications after they receive their first appointments.

(b) It is recommended that some university work should be a constituent part of the training of all primary teachers. Those who so desire should be encouraged to proceed to a degree in arts, science, or some other appropriate faculty. Teachers colleges should always be closely associated with a university or at least with a university college.

(c) It is recommended that the normal length of training for secondary teachers should be four years. During this period they should be expected to graduate in arts, science, or some other appropriate faculty. Students who show special promise should be encouraged to take an honours degree. Where necessary, a fifth year

of full-time training should be made available for this purpose. Professional studies should normally take place towards the end of the period of training.

(d) Practice teaching is an important part of teacher training. Although some practice teaching may, with advantage, be introduced at or near the beginning of the student's course, the greater part of the student's practice teaching should be concentrated in reasonably long periods towards the end of the training.

(e) The three important elements in the training of a secondary teacher are:

- (i) the development to the fullest extent of the future teacher's knowledge of the subjects he will be required to teach;
- (ii) the development of his or her professional competence and skill as a teacher;
- (iii) a sound understanding of the educational needs of teen-age girls and boys and of the learning processes.

All three elements should receive adequate emphasis if the courses of training are to be fully satisfactory.

(f) It is recommended that one or more additional teachers colleges in South Australia be established as the number of students in training increases to keep pace with the growing school enrolments. The most effective size for a teachers college intended for the training of primary, secondary or craft teachers is generally considered to be from 600 to 800 students.

(g) It is recommended that if a university college is established outside the metropolitan area of Adelaide, a teachers college should be established in close liaison with it.

(h) The appointment of a Professor of Education with a suitable staff at the university would be a great advantage, not only in the conduct of courses in education as a university subject but also to take a full part in the professional training of teachers and in the direction of educational research at the post-graduate level. It is recommended that steps be taken to convey this view to the council of the university.

In-service Training of Teachers.

(a) It is recommended that in-service training be recognized as an effective way of raising the efficiency of practising teachers. It is equally necessary for those who have been newly appointed and for those who are more experienced. These latter require to be brought up to date, not only in their knowledge of recent developments in their special fields but also in new and more effective means of presentation and of teaching. In-service training is specially necessary for those teachers who have been appointed with less than the regularly prescribed professional qualifications.

(b) It is recommended that in-service training should be carried out at three levels: first, by the head of the school and senior members of the staff; secondly, on a regional basis in courses conducted by Inspectors; and, thirdly, by departmentally organized courses at a suitable centre. These central courses should be conducted by officers chosen for the purpose. Members of the university and teachers college staffs should be called upon to assist as required.

(c) Summer schools conducted by the university and by the Education Department are a useful means of continuing the training of teachers by extending their knowledge in special fields in which they may be interested.

(d) It is recommended that steps be taken to establish a permanent centre for conducting courses of all kinds for teachers from the whole State. This is the most valuable single step that can be taken to improve the in-service training of teachers in South Australia. Such a centre would be in continual use for the greater part of each year and should have residential facilities. Such a centre could well be provided in a large house with adequate grounds, purchased for the purpose.

The Playford Government did nothing about this, but in the few months we have been in office we are already giving serious consideration to this particular matter and we hope to make an announcement soon on it.

The report continues:

(e) In in-service courses of every kind it is important to provide ample opportunity for informal discussion between all who take part. Informal discussion is often more effective than even the best lectures and should be regarded as an important element in in-service training.

Obviously the Director anticipated many of the main recommendations of the Martin Report by some years, but the Playford Government was not prepared to publish them, probably because it was not prepared to act on some of them, however desirable they might be.

I said earlier that the previous Government is to a considerable extent responsible for the shortage of teachers in general and in particular those of above average quality, and this is borne out by the repeated refusal of the previous Government to increase the allowances of students attending the teachers colleges. These refusals have been in the face of repeated recommendations from the Director of Education that they should be increased. I have the dates here, but I am not going to read them all. All I will say is that no fewer than seven recommendations to increase these students allowances were made by the Director between August 4, 1961, and January 28, 1965. The first one was simply filed. The remainder reached Cabinet but got no further. The importance of increasing student teachers allowances, quite apart from consideration of the change in the value of money, can be gauged from a recent report (22/4/65) of the Superintendent of Recruiting and Training in the Education Department on the question of how greatly the system of Commonwealth scholarships is affecting the quality of our teachers college intakes. The report pointed out that while Commonwealth scholarship benefits have been raised for 1965, the teachers college allowances have remained at the figure

they were at in 1955, unchanged for nearly 11 years.

By comparison the teaching scholarship and teachers college allowances scheme is no longer the powerful inducement it once was. Until this year, some Commonwealth open entrance scholarships have always been offered to some Leaving teaching scholars, and those so selected would be the cream of our teaching recruits for that year. Some of these Leaving teaching scholars relinquish the Commonwealth open entrance scholarship offer and remain in the Education Department. Others resign from the Education Department, take up Commonwealth scholarships and are apparently lost to the teaching service. Whereas in 1964 only 44 resigned to take up the Commonwealth open entrance scholarship, the 1965 figure has soared to 102, a two and a half times increase in one single year. The report states:

Whereas in 1962 the Commonwealth Open Entrance Scholarship attracted only 19 Leaving teaching scholars, three years later that number has increased to more than five times the 1962 figure.

Realizing the urgent need to increase student allowances at teachers colleges if the teaching profession is not merely to retain but to increase its share of the total number of able secondary students, the present Government, within a few weeks of coming into office, has approved of increases in these allowances to the extent considered possible with the available financial resources. This is in accord with Labor Party policy on education as outlined during the recent election. There is another matter concerning the Martin Report that I am sure will be of interest to members of this House and the public, and particularly to the honourable member for Torrens. Arising from discussions with Dr. S. I. Evans (Director of the South Australian Institute of Technology), I have approved of the formation of an advisory committee to consider and report to me on:

- (a) the desirability of setting up a South Australian Institute of Colleges as suggested in Chapter 6 of the Martin Report.
- (b) the implications of introducing three-year post matriculation professional diploma courses into the present tertiary education pattern in South Australia.

Should the committee favour the establishment of the Institute of Colleges, I desire that it should comment in its report on the functions of the institute, the composition of its governing council and the relationship between the Institute of Colleges and the Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology. I

also approved of the membership of the committee, consisting of six representatives from the South Australian Institute of Technology, two representatives from the University of Adelaide, two representatives from the Education Department, one representative from the Australian Universities Commission, and one representative from Roseworthy Agricultural College.

I have shown how the Playford Government delayed for nearly three and a half years the increases in student teachers allowances which were needed to maintain and increase the supply of teachers. Time after time, the members of the Labor Party drew attention to this matter in this House. I have shown that we are urgently in need of additional teachers colleges to replace the two overcrowded and unsatisfactory college buildings at Wattle Park and Western Teachers Colleges. It may be asked what have the officers of my department been doing in regard to these matters. Immediately it was announced in 1960 that the university was considering Bedford Park reserve as a future university site, the Superintendent of Recruitment and Training asked for purchase of land across South Road for a future Bedford Park Teachers College. He was informed that land would be made available on the Bedford Park reserve. The first set of requirements for the college were prepared in August 1960, and the Director of Education asked for approval to build on December 22, 1960. In January 1961 the Minister of Works asked for details of the proposed college. On January 9, 1961, in a memorandum to the Director, the Superintendent of Recruitment and Training pointed out the college would be required by February, 1965. In the Minister's report of 1962 is a statement that the college was urgently needed by 1965. In 1962 a liaison committee was set up with the university and 40-50 acres of land was requested for a teachers college, but under negotiation this had to be reduced to 20 acres on the Bedford Park reserve.

The Bedford Park university buildings are well on the way and in some instances already roofed. However, the teachers college building is not yet started. It is expected that the tender for the siteworks will not be let until September of this year, and the tender for the building in 1966. Yet the need for this college is just as great as that for the new university. Turning now to the need for other sites for teachers colleges, I find that in 1963 purchase of land for a teachers college north of Adelaide was requested and that the

Minister of Education announced the possibility at a meeting of the Gawler Branch of the Liberal and Country League. When submitted to Cabinet in November, 1963, the file was returned saying, "Cabinet considered this recommendation was premature and consequently did not approve." Since then departmental officers negotiated with the Housing Trust for land in Parafeld, but since becoming Minister I have approved of the recommendation for the compulsory acquisition of the original site that was not approved for purchase.

To obtain a site for a permanent Western Teachers College, the Minister of Education was requested in July, 1963, to ask the Minister of Works for the release of the Engineering and Water Supply depot as a site, but release was refused. Since then the departmental officers tried to purchase land and properties in Currie Street; they considered the use of Adelaide Girls High School and adjacent properties; they considered enlarging the Taylor Road block; they have investigated properties in Thebarton and land in Holbrook Road. The present Government, in the short time it has been in office, has been investigating this matter and an announcement will shortly be made. The Government regards the provision of an adequate number of fully trained and fully qualified teachers as a matter of the highest priority. This involves satisfactory facilities and teachers colleges and the recruiting of a sufficient number of good quality young people to train as our future teachers in each of the categories required. I am already giving consideration to other ways and means by which this can be achieved.

In all the matters I have mentioned I hope it will be remembered that every professional officer in the Education Department is a trained and experienced teacher. The majority have had successful teaching careers in which they have made significant contributions in senior teaching positions. When it is alleged publicly, as it has been, that as Minister I have succumbed to the blandishments of departmental officers unwilling to see the slightest diminution of their powers, then it is time for the people of South Australia to be told the facts concerning these officers and their work. They are not allowed to reply in the press, and if the critics who are so vocal about the status of the teaching profession are in reality concerned about this question, then let them at least be constructive and refrain from casting doubt on the integrity of the officers concerned. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend to delay the House unnecessarily, but I should be failing in my duty if I did not commend the Minister of Education for his illuminating address, or at least say that we, as a Government, are well aware of the need for the long overdue improvements in the matters mentioned. Indeed, many matters mentioned during this debate will receive the Government's consideration. It is unnecessary for the Government to further consider some other matters, which it will pass over. I will not mention them because possibly I would become personal. If anything more were said about the sour grapes I might have had something to say about the subject. However, I do not want to do so tonight, particularly at this late hour. I assure Opposition members that some of the matters raised will receive the Government's attention.

If I may be forgiven once again for upsetting the procedure of the House, I inform honourable members that, as there is not likely to be any more debate on the Address in Reply and as it should be adopted tonight, they can be relieved of the obligation to sit tomorrow night. The House will adjourn on Thursday afternoon. Members have been informed that a Parliamentary visit will be made to the Woomera rocket range on July 20. Parliament will resume on Tuesday, July 27, and on Wednesday, July 28, there will be a social function arranged by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I inform honourable members that probably the House will commence night sittings on August 3.

I again express my appreciation, as the Leader of the Government, for the contributions made to the Address in Reply debate. I sincerely join with other members in their references to the passing of former members of this House and of another place. I also support the remarks about the contributions made by new members. In fairness to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, I hope that the egg position will so improve that hens will be relieved of their obligation to some extent.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor has intimated that he will be pleased to receive members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at Government House on Wednesday, June 30, at 2.10 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, June 30, at 2 p.m.