

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 6, 1953.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

SMALL SCALE IRRIGATION PROJECTS.

Mr. MICHAEL—I understand that last year the Irrigation Development Committee was asked to have a survey made of land along the River Murray available for small scale irrigation development. Has the Minister of Lands received the report?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received a report, which is as follows:—

A survey of the River Murray frontages from the New South Wales border to Mannum showed that land suitable for small scale irrigation projects adjoining the river has been freely sought during the past few years and much of it has been either partly or wholly developed, and that other areas have already been secured by private individuals with the object of development in view. The survey reveals also that there are few remaining suitable areas for small scale schemes and the conclusion has been reached that this form of development is one best suited for private enterprise.

FOOD WRAPPING REGULATIONS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—An article appeared in the *News* of June 29 under the heading "Move to Change Wrapping Law Likely," in which it was stated that the Government was likely to be asked to amend regulations covering the wrapping of meat, fish, and bread following on a decision in the Port Adelaide police court last week. It went on to explain that Mr. Johnston, S.M., had found loopholes in the regulations, and further stated that the health authorities said that it was likely the Government would be asked to amend the law as considerable dissatisfaction existed because of the unhealthy methods of wrapping food. Has the Premier received any request for an amendment of the Act and, if so, does the Government propose to bring down legislation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Such a request would naturally go to the Minister of Health and I have not seen it. I will, however, get a report from Mr. McEwin in due course.

CONTROL OF POTATO PRICES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Premier seen the statement in today's *Advertiser* suggesting that the Victorian Labor Government proposes to relax controls on potatoes, thus following the example of the New South Wales

Labor Government? Is it the intention of the Government to relax the controls on potatoes in this State?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Two controls operate at present; the operations of the Potato Board and the operations of the Prices Commissioner. I am not sure whether the honourable member refers to the relaxation of all controls on potatoes or only the price control.

Mr. Macgillivray—Price control.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Under the legislation setting up the Potato Board the price shall be the price determined by the Prices Commissioner, so by Act of Parliament the Prices Commissioner, so by Act of Parliament the two things are tied together. It would not be practicable to relinquish the control of prices without disbanding the board. A difficulty has arisen because of the position which has been allowed to exist in New South Wales, where absolutely no control over the selling price has operated for many months, and the upset price is now getting near £100 a ton. The New South Wales position has been allowed to continue contrary to the requests of all other States. If it is maintained it will bring us back to what the honourable member logically assumes in his question—that if one State does not control prices all States will in time have to follow its example.

AFFORESTATION ON EYRE PENINSULA.

Mr. PEARSON—In speaking the other night in the Address in Reply debate I mentioned the fact that there was a considerable area of land south and west of Port Lincoln which is undeveloped and very rough. Following on reports that there was a considerable area of arable land in the vicinity Mr. Michael, as chairman of the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee, and I made a very memorable trip into the area last year to have a look at it. I have now received a letter from a constituent, a Mr. Moody, who I think is well known to the Minister, and who is an authority on trees. He suggests that before the land is proclaimed a flora and fauna reserve, as I believe is contemplated when the lease expires, it would be well to have a look at it with a view to its being planted with pines. Before the land is created a permanent reserve, will the Minister of Lands confer with the Minister of Forests with a view to having tests made to see if the land is suitable for afforestation purposes?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will take up the matter with the Minister of Forests and get a

report. The area is well known to the Lands Department and although it contains some land suitable for development, I believe the growing of pines might be the best proposition.

WALLAROO DISTRICT HARBOUR AND FORESHORE FACILITIES.

Mr. McALEES—Seeing that the Harbours Board visited Moonta Bay, Port Hughes, and Wallaroo last Thursday on the matter of harbour and foreshore facilities, I ask the Minister of Marine whether he has any report from the board?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—No, but I have an appointment for next Monday or Tuesday to discuss with the board the conclusions they arrived at. As soon as possible I will let the honourable member know the result.

RENTS OF PREFABRICATED TRUST HOUSES.

Mr. JENNINGS—Will the Government consider subsidizing the rents of prefabricated Housing Trust homes, as £3 5s. a week is so high that the trust can only allot them to people on high incomes? As a result, many of the people in most urgent need of them cannot be considered.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government has no authority under which it can pay subsidies for this purpose.

Mr. JENNINGS—Does the Government intend to seek authority from Parliament to enable it to subsidise rents of prefabricated homes?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. This year the Government has changed over to the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement scheme under which houses will be built in future and which already provides for what the honourable member suggests.

Mr. Jennings—Could it be made retrospective?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is not proposed. Under the scheme the average rent will still be 3s. a week higher than those now being paid.

MUSIC FOR ROYAL VISIT.

Mr. RICHES—In a desire to pay a tribute to Her Majesty the Queen, Miss Mary Hakendorf, of Port Augusta, who composed South Australia's centenary song and the music for Kipling's poem "If," has composed a special Royal march. I understand this has been arranged by a well-known Adelaide musician and it is now in the hands of the Adelaide Municipal Band

and has been approved by the Australian Broadcasting Commission for broadcasting. Can the Premier refer that march to the massed bands of the city that will be contributing towards the music for the Royal visit?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not aware of the details of what the honourable member has mentioned, but I will see that competent authorities examine his suggestion.

CEMENT SUPPLIES.

Mr. FLETCHER—For some time a number of dairymen in my district have been unable to secure cement for use on their milking sheds and yards. As the Premier told Mr. Stott yesterday that cement is being imported from Tasmania, what is the procedure necessary for these small men to get supplies?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Purchases are made through normal trade channels. There is some control over the price of cement, but none over its distribution. If the honourable member will let me have the details I will see whether any action can be taken to alleviate the position. The demand for cement at Mount Gambier has grown greatly since the war. Normally that centre was supplied by Victoria, but since the broadening of the gauge commenced Victoria has been unable to meet the demand and the requirements of the district are now met from Adelaide. Probably the trade avenues have not yet been fully opened up, and I will do my best if the honourable member will let me know who desires the commodity.

HUNGRY HILL WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. WHITE—Last summer the Hungry Hill section of the Murray Bridge water reticulation system gave out completely. Although pipes were there no water was available and water carting became common. About 50 families in the area depend upon the water supply for domestic purposes. Several dairy homesteads are watered by this reticulation system and during the last two summers have not been able to cool milk properly. Last summer the pipes were cleaned out but this did not greatly help the position. Recently the Engineering and Water Supply Department installed a new pipe from the pump house on the river to the White Hill storage tank. The pipe is larger than the original one and capable of standing higher pressures. Can the Minister of Works say whether the new pipe will help the summer pressure in the Hungry Hill area? If not, will he take proper

action to step up the water pressure in this part of the Murray Bridge water reticulation system before next summer?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I can only say, yes. Obviously it was designed by some of the most competent engineers in Australia and the work approved by the Public Works Standing Committee after careful investigation. If it is not performing the work required every engineer and the members of the committee should be sacked.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS.

Mr. McALEES—On July 22 I asked about an increase in the rents of Housing Trust homes in the Wallaroo district. The rent of about 40 families in the Wallaroo area has been increased 7s. a week and I have been informed that the increase is to help cover the cost of building houses so that people who occupy new homes will have their burden eased. That assistance will not apply to Wallaroo. Are Wallaroo tenants rated for the purpose of relieving the burden of those in the metropolitan area? Only about one home a year is being built in Wallaroo but 40 families are asked to pay the extra 7s. If the extra rent is for the purpose of lightening the burden of tenants in the metropolitan area I consider an unjust object.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have replied to this question on a number of occasions and pointed out that the Housing Trust does not deal with the housing problem from the point of view strictly of locality. It considers its obligations to be much more comprehensive than the metropolitan area and is trying to provide houses in the districts where they are most wanted. It equalizes rents not on a strictly district basis. I will make inquiries about the Wallaroo position on behalf of the honourable member, whose interests in the district are intense, to see if there is any particular action which can be taken as regards Wallaroo, Kadina and Moonta.

CITY PLANNING.

Mr. STOTT—On his return from abroad, the Premier, with his usual energy, tackled the Adelaide city traffic problem. As a result of relating his observations overseas to local traffic problems, has the Premier or his Cabinet approved or even considered the city council's scheme of taking over Bank Street Adelaide, which will aggravate the traffic bottleneck near the Adelaide railway station? Further, has the Premier or his Cabinet considered widening the Morphett Street bridge with the

idea of creating another north-south highway to relieve the traffic congestion in the city?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—My remarks were directed towards long-term planning and not the control of traffic in the metropolitan area, for that has been affirmed and re-affirmed by various Acts as the function of the local governing authority. In fact special legislation has already been passed giving the corporation of the city of Adelaide power to widen certain city streets and to acquire land for that purpose, therefore such alterations as are necessary in the city are already within the legislative scope and competence of the council. My remarks were directed to something rather on the lines of planning for the future development of the metropolitan area as a whole so that we will not be faced with the problem that is so obvious in so many other places where, through lack of planning, almost inconceivable congestion occurs. I had in mind the reservation of certain areas for recreational purposes in and transport communications to the outer districts, so that the various utilities could be effectively provided. At Hyde Park corner in London a motorist may be held up at any time for half an hour or even longer, because of a complete cessation of all traffic through a restricted and badly organized area.

Mr. Quirke—London had a wall around it once.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I realize that, but the object I had in view, and about which I hope we may be able to do something effective, was to provide for the future so that we would not find ourselves, through lack of necessary funds, unable to provide reasonable transport facilities and recreation grounds for our citizens.

GAWLER ROAD.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—The burning question in my district relates to the dual highway which some day will be constructed along the Gawler Road. At present the traffic in normal times is heavy but the position is aggravated on race days and trotting nights. Can the Minister of Works indicate when this work will be commenced and, in view of the element of danger, can it be expedited?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—In order to provide a comprehensive idea of what is involved I point out that all moneys received by the Highways Commissioner by way of petrol tax, motor registration fees and licences and from Loan funds are spent, except in one or two minor instances, at his discretion and subject to the over-riding power of Parliament to

remove any commissioner it thinks is not performing his duties. He was deliberately given that power by Parliament to remove the question from outside control or political pressure. The questions of construction, and particularly the reconstruction, of highways are matters entirely in his hands and do not come before the Minister or Parliament for decision. It is assumed that with his knowledge of the State and his integrity he will do the best with the amount of money available and he is trying to provide the greatest good for the greatest number. In the meantime, a considerable amount of money has been expended with the object of widening that road but not necessarily making it a dual highway. As the Premier mentioned there is a possibility of establishing a plantation of trees along that road.

Mr. John Clark—Do you think widening the road would be satisfactory?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—To date I have not been asked to adjudicate upon that question, but now that it has been propounded I will discuss it with the Highways Commissioner and obtain his considered opinion. I am sure he will apply himself assiduously and earnestly to it but the fact remains that there is not enough money for all work required.

EX-SERVICEMEN APPLICANTS FOR LAND.

Mr. CORCORAN—From time to time I am asked by qualified returned soldiers what are their prospects of being settled on the land. Can the Minister of Lands say, in view of the re-survey which has been made, how many applicants are on the waiting list and how long it will be before they are settled?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Before the House met this afternoon the honourable member indicated that he would require some information on this question. About 18 months or two years ago a survey was made of dry lands and irrigation areas and the number of persons still interested in soldier settlement. Of the number written to about 30 per cent withdrew from the scheme. The honourable member is right in saying that a recent survey had been made. That was completed only about a week or fortnight ago and it did show that of approximately 350 applicants for dry land areas 105 either have withdrawn or did not reply to the circular. As to irrigation areas, approximately 180 were written to, some 40 of whom either had withdrawn from the scheme or did not answer the circular. It will be seen that about 30 per cent of the

dry land applicants and 20 per cent of irrigation applicants had withdrawn. In reply to the latter part of the question, it is difficult to say when the actual settlement of all applicants can take place. That depends entirely upon the quantity of suitable land in good rainfall areas that can be secured. In consultation with the Returned Soldiers' League, it was agreed 18 months or two years ago that about 400 be written to advising that the position was looking very difficult and asking them if they could secure single unit farms or carry on share farming arrangements or such other arrangements they had at that time. The last survey shows that of the 350 written to about 245 are still interested, and if the 400 who were advised about two years ago that there would be difficulty in providing land were included that would give about 700. However, of the 400 a number would have dropped out, so I estimate that there are still about 500 men waiting for settlement in dry land areas and about 140 in irrigation areas.

BAIL FOR ACCUSED PERSONS.

Mr. DUNSTAN—A report appeared in the *News* of August 4 relating to bail procedure and the remarks of the magistrate who dealt with the case of one named Adams who appeared before the court on that date. Mr. O'Grady, who appeared for Adams, said that his client was before the court the day before on a charge of having been in unlawful possession of some watches and watchbands and he was remanded by the magistrate and granted bail. Later in the day Adams was arrested on the charge before the court—a smuggling charge—and to prevent his spending the night in gaol Mr. O'Grady said he acted under the Justices Act and made the necessary arrangements for bail to be granted before a justice of the peace. The magistrate said it was most improper and how it came about and by whose authority he did not know. He said it was a definite breach of the careful arrangements which had been made regarding night courts and he trusted that it would not happen again. That seems to reflect upon the justice concerned, who is a senior member of the Justices' Association and a very responsible honorary magistrate. Mr. Hannan, Q.C., in his handbook *Summary Procedure of Justices* says:—

The examining justice has discretionary power to admit every defendant to bail, whatever may be the crime with which he is charged.

Consequently, I ask is there any limitation on the power of justices to constitute themselves

a court at any time for the purpose of admitting an accused person to bail? What regulations or statutory rules exist if any, which require that justices should notify the Police Magistrate of their intention to admit persons accused to bail outside the normal hours for holding courts of summary jurisdiction at Adelaide? If any such regulations exist is there any evidence that they were brought to the notice of the justice concerned, or other justices, before August 4?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will confer with the Attorney-General and bring down his full and considered reply at the earliest possible date.

COMPENSATION FOR RAILWAY DIVERSION.

Mr. RICHES—When the report of the Royal Commission that inquired into the route of the railway linking the Port Augusta power station with Leigh Creek was known the Government announced that legislation would be introduced to provide for compensation to people in Quorn and other districts who might suffer as the result of the alteration of the route of the railway. Legislation was introduced last session, but allowed to lapse. Will similar legislation be proceeded with this session, and has the Premier had any success in his search for some compensating industry for Quorn?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Reintroduction of the legislation will be considered. The Government did announce that it was prepared to bring in legislation to assist any cases of hardship and a Bill was introduced last session. However, some members expressed the view that perhaps this action was premature as it dealt with a contingency that had not yet arisen. That is the reason why it was not proceeded with last session, not that the Government had altered its view. I will have the honourable member's question considered with a view to seeing whether the time has arrived for the re-introduction of such a measure.

EXTENSION OF LOXTON IRRIGATION AREA.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Lands give any details about the progress made between the Commonwealth and State Governments in respect of the extension of the Loxton soldier settlement scheme, and when it is expected that this will be finalized?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—My department has been in communication with the Commonwealth Government on the matter and approval

as to the suitability of the soil has been given. The department is now preparing estimates of costs for submission to the Commonwealth Government for final approval of the scheme.

USE OF ROYAL PHOTOGRAPHS AND EFFIGIES.

Mr. FRED WALSH—During the Coronation week celebrations in Adelaide I was disgusted by the use by small and large business people in the main streets of photographs and effigies of the Queen and her husband in the display of goods for sale. It was reported in the press in Perth, when I was there last month, that the Western Australian Government had adopted a policy in respect of similar matters to be observed in connection with the Royal visit next year, and the Acting Premier, Mr. Tonkin, is reported to have said:—

A policy had been decided upon to cover portraits and effigies of the Royal Family. The policy would also cover reproductions of the Royal Arms and the Australian coat of arms. Articles on which portraits and the Royal Crown were used as designs, he said, should be classed as souvenirs or mementos of the Royal visit and this should be made apparent on each article. The impression should not be given that the product or firm concerned had received Royal custom. The articles should be those manufactured particularly for disposal to the public in association with the Royal visit, and should be of a kind suitable for retention as souvenirs of the occasion.

To provide against the cheapening and exploitation of the occasion of the visit of Her Majesty and the Duke of Edinburgh to this State by unscrupulous business people in the guise of loyalty will the Government consider issuing regulations requiring permits to be obtained before photographs or effigies of the Queen and her husband may be associated with goods displayed for sale?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—An existing statute prohibits the use of certain words, particularly in trade names, and limits the use of the term "Royal" to certain approved institutions. I am not quite sure of the advisability of taking the matter further along the lines suggested. At the recent Coronation festivities in London I doubt whether there were any of the principal business places which did not display in some form something to commemorate the Coronation, and it frequently took the form of a photograph of Her Majesty. I was surprised indeed to see just how fully the Royal Coat of Arms was displayed, and there appeared to be no restrictions on the use of photographs of Her Majesty and the Royal Family. I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hear, hear!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think rather that the exhibition of the Queen's photograph was encouraged. I will ask the Director of the Royal Tour to ascertain what action is being taken in other States. I assure the honourable member that in regard to the Coronation celebrations quite the opposite of what has been suggested was the order of the day.

TYPHOID BACTERIA IN DESICCATED COCONUT.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Has the Premier anything further to report regarding the question of contaminated desiccated coconut concerning which I asked a question earlier this week?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. I informed one member yesterday that the typhoid incubation period was considerable and that it might be some time before the health authorities could give us the necessary information. I have since seen in the press that in some instances the period is as long as 14 days. I give an assurance that as soon as the report is available it will be given the fullest publicity, particularly if it requires any action to be taken by the public.

QUALITY OF LEIGH CREEK COAL.

Mr. JENNINGS—I understand that the Minister of Works now has a reply to the question regarding the quality of Leigh Creek coal.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have spent some time in arriving at the actual facts and have had an investigation made. Those inquiries amply justify my assurance that no preference is or ever has been given to anybody in relation to the quality of Leigh Creek coal. It is supplied to firewood vendors at 60s. a ton, whereas other consumers pay 62s. 2d. for lorry loads. Therefore, the householder obtains this advantage of 2s. 2d. a ton as against lorry load consumers. This is open to any purchaser. Should they require specified coal, such as large, a further 2s. is charged by the lorry load to cover the screening and shovelling by hand into the lorries. Naturally, if any rock or shale shows up during this process it is discarded. This practice has been continuous since the opening of the depot at Mile End. The Coal Commissioner reports that he has not been asked to replace any coal complained of by the vendors or by householders, but he will readily do so if the quality delivered is below the normal standard. In the case of the coal offered for

loading to the Premier's driver, the quality was such that on his own initiative the driver decided to take only about half the quantity required, and this in fact contained a high percentage of shale. In some seams there is a greater proportion of shale than in others, and if and when this becomes evident, as happened this week, immediate steps are taken to avoid further delivery thereof to the public. When it was manifest that this coal was not up to standard over 300 tons were taken off the local market and used at Osborne power station. Incidentally, it can be used with a great deal of advantage. The other things complained of, such as sparking, are unimportant as far as the power station is concerned.

LOXTON IRRIGATION SETTLEMENT.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Lands give any information as to whether the investigations over a long time in regard to permanent sprays for the Loxton irrigation settlement have been concluded? If not, can he give any idea as to when they are likely to be put in, and will they conform to the recommendation of the local soldier settlement committee?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The department has come to a decision on the matter and the information has been sent to the settlers, with whom we had a discussion on the type of spray recommended. I understand that some of them are not satisfied with the recommended type, and that they are making representations to the Commonwealth for a type which they consider would be more efficient and more to their liking. However, the type we have recommended is much cheaper and we consider equally efficient.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

(Continued from August 5. Page 305.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—A Premiers' conference will be held in Canberra early next week, and it is possible that I may not be back in time to speak in this debate, so I am doing so this afternoon as I want to refer to some of the matters mentioned by members. It is fitting for me to say how much the Leader of the Opposition and I appreciated the opportunity to represent the State at the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth. The ceremony itself was indeed remarkable. It was something we will

not witness again in our lifetime. I felt it had a real meaning to all British people and I am sure the view is shared by the Leader of the Opposition that we were honoured and lucky to represent South Australia on that memorable occasion.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hear! hear!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—From my observations I can say that when the Queen visits us next year she will quickly gain the deep affection of our people. She already has their loyalty. She is a remarkable woman and she gives her life unstintingly to the cause of the common people. In whatever circles she moves in South Australia next year she will get a warm and affectionate welcome. Her visit will have a lasting effect on the minds of all our people. I join with other members in welcoming to this State our new Governor, Sir Robert George. We always ask for a direct representative of the reigning sovereign and we have been fortunate in getting a succession of able administrators. I feel certain that Sir Robert will fully live up to the traditions of past Governors. In an Address in Reply debate we usually have more criticism than anything else, but an endeavour should be made to suggest improvements which will add to the prosperity of our people. Most members criticized something but in many instances they were small matters which could have been taken to the office of the Minister concerned for investigation.

Mr. O'Halloran—We must examine the fault in order to get an improvement.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have never shirked criticism. During the time this Government has been in office there has been no attempt to stifle debate, and on several occasions we have had lengthy discussions. I do not think that the gag has ever been used in this House to stifle a debate, but if it has been used it has been only in abnormal circumstances. South Australia is in the very enviable position of having the only Liberal Government in Australia. Of course, that is a matter of some concern to the Opposition, which attempts to discredit this Government. I am not complaining about that because it is the Opposition's duty to criticize, but members opposite found their task extremely difficult; in fact, frequently they tried to prove their points on grounds that were completely erroneous. It is easy to say, as some members did, "I believe so and so is the case" and then prove the argument not on established fact, but upon opinion. Naturally, that often

leads to results which are fantastic and pure humbug. I shall deal with some of the points raised in some detail.

A lengthy speech was delivered on education. We were given a lot of statistics about our teachers, lack of teachers, inadequate payment of teachers, and an assertion that the Education Department was going to the dogs. What are the facts? The last official information was given in the Council of Education Bulletin No. 17, which I think was issued in November, 1952. The ratio of primary school teachers to pupils in South Australia is 1 to 31.2.

Mr. Riches—That would not apply to my district.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is the average of all schools in South Australia. Victoria is the only State with a better ratio, 1 to 25.6. In New South Wales it is 31.6; in Queensland, a State under Labor rule for innumerable years and where you would expect ideal conditions, according to members opposite, it is 35.5; in Tasmania, another State under Labor Government for at least 15 years, it is 43.7; and in Western Australia, 31.9.

Mr. O'Halloran—What is the average number of children in the schools in the various States?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will deal later with other statistics about education, but I can understand the Leader of the Opposition would not want the figures I have just quoted because they disprove the statement that one of his colleagues made. Victoria is the only State with a better figure than South Australia, but everyone knows that the Victorian Labor Government has only recently come into office. The ratio of teachers to pupils in secondary schools in South Australia is 1 to 18.4. In Tasmania it is 19; Victoria 20.5; New South Wales 22.3; Western Australia 32.2; and Queensland 23.2. South Australia, therefore, has the best ratio in the Commonwealth. Some members said many of our teachers were not qualified.

Mr. Lawn—And we have a Ministry that is not qualified.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There are many people who are not qualified, as I will show later today. We were told many of our teachers do not know their job, that they are not trained properly, that they are not doing their job properly, and that as a result the education of our children has suffered. A

report from the Director of Education to me states:—

I find it hard to take this complaint seriously. It has always been the policy of the Education Department to re-employ those women who have been trained as teachers and who, after resigning to become married, find that their domestic responsibilities are such that they are able to undertake further teaching work. This is a valuable source from which teachers may be obtained and cannot be construed in any way as a dilution of standards. At the present time there are 1,104 teachers on the temporary staff of our schools of whom only 31 are men. Of the 1,073 women, 60 per cent are trained teachers, most of whom have returned to service after marriage. As to the complaint that the Education Department is continuing to employ teachers who have reached the retiring age, the number of these, namely, 68, is very small and in any case these are trained and experienced teachers, many of whom have held a position of great responsibility prior to reaching the retiring age.

Mr. John Clark—Did any member here complain about teachers being re-employed after retirement?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Certain statements were made in the press and they were taken up in the House. Some members based their speeches on the press statements.

Mr. O'Halloran—It would be appreciated if you told us who made that claim in the House.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. Dunstan raised the matter here. Instead of teachers in the Education Department being below standard, a large number of temporary teachers, against whom this complaint was made, went through a full course at the Teachers Training College and are highly qualified. I have never taken the view that, because a young woman gets married, she ceases to be of any value as a teacher in the Education Department when circumstances warrant her taking that employment. It has been the practice in the Education Department from time immemorial. The report continues:—

It is, of course, true that the Education Department has conducted a number of emergency short courses, mainly for married women who have been selected on their educational qualifications and on qualities of character, as well as their probable aptitude as teachers. As the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers has pointed out, a majority of these teachers are doing good work, and those who do not are not likely to last long. In the meantime, it is peculiarly unjust to compare our actions in this regard unfavourably with other States. The steps which have already been taken to increase the intake of students into our Teachers College are necessarily of a long range nature, but we can expect to see some result from our efforts from the beginning of

next year in a substantial increase in the number of students entering the Teachers College. In the meantime, our schools must be kept open and no other State in recent years has had anything like the same proportionate increase in primary school enrolments.

In other words, we are getting more children in our schools than other States in proportion to population, which shows how effective are the steps that have been taken in promoting the general welfare of the State. The report goes on:—

In any case, to say, as one honourable member has said, that 48.5 per cent of our teachers are "quickly trained on the temporary basis" is nonsense. The percentage of short course trained teachers is less than 12 per cent of the total number of full-time teachers in the service and is only one-third of the total number of temporary women teachers. The statement printed in a letter to the press on August 3, 1953, allegedly based on a recent issue of the *Teachers' Journal*, that only "14 per cent of the teachers in infant schools are fully trained" is even more absurdly inaccurate. Actually, 59.6 per cent of the staffs of our infant departments are certificated or classified teachers.

I could give a lot of details on this matter and also deal with the criticism that there is no possibility of advancement in the Education Department. I could also supply information as to the standard required and the salaries paid in the department.

Mr. John Clark—I would like that.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Very well. Some members of the Labor Party are new to the House and do not know what pains the Government takes to satisfy all members. The statement continues:—

Adverse criticism has been levelled against the Education Department and the Government for keeping the scale of salaries paid to teachers below the comparable scales paid in other States. In this connection I should point out that the salaries of teachers are fixed by a specially constituted Salaries Board on which the teachers are fully represented. When the teachers were in a dilemma they went to the Arbitration Court and found that it did not take into account their special qualifications, and it made an award which was totally unsuitable and which they hated like poison. The Government created the Teachers' Salaries Board and it has on record the joyful reaction of the teaching profession.

Mr. John Clark—That is so.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The report continues:—

The Government accepts the awards of this board and has consistently refrained from making representations to combat the claims of the South Australian Institute of Teachers.

As a matter of interest I should also point out that the average salary paid to men teachers in the department was more than £1,000 per annum in May, 1953, and in the same month the average salary paid to women was £763 per annum. The range of salaries paid to men goes up as high as £1,404 for head masters of primary schools and to £1,659 per annum for the highest position in the teaching service.

Is there any justification whatsoever for suggesting that the Government has been niggardly in providing an adequate salary range for the teachers as well as opportunities for them to better themselves in the service? The Government has gone much further in this regard, I believe, than any other State; at any rate, - than the average of the other States. I have some figures dealing with the salaries paid to student trainees. Because South Australia is a claimant State, the Grants Commission provides for its services on the standard of the three non-claimant States.

Mr. Lawn—If South Australia resumed its taxing powers, could it tax at a lower rate than the non-claimant States could?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—At present it could, for the production value per capita in this State is higher than that in any other and, whilst enjoying a lower income tax rate, we could live up to the ordinary standard of other States. Like the Grants Commission, I will compare the salaries of student teachers in this State with those in other States. In Queensland, which has been completely dominated by a Labor Government for 25 years, student teachers living at home receive £156 in their first year and £182 in their second year, compared with £190 for first year and £200 for second year student teachers in this State. Whereas in this State four years' training is considered necessary in the teaching profession, only two years' training is given in Queensland. South Australian third and fourth year student teachers are paid £210 a year. Student teachers living at home in New South Wales are paid £156 a year in their first and second years and £166 in their third and fourth years, which are less than the salaries paid in this State. It is true that a special rate of £235 a year is paid to a married student teacher in New South Wales, but very few married people enter the teachers college, for the Education Department seeks to recruit young people who have recently passed their leaving certificate examinations.

At present Victorian rates of pay for student teachers are above South Australia,

but this is due to the fact that for many years the Victorian Education Department was poorly staffed. I was recently told by my cousin that she was unable to get her child into a secondary school in Melbourne, and frequently students desiring secondary education are told that no school is available for them. Over the years the Victorian Department got into difficulties, and it is now paying its student teachers £316 a year in their first and second years and £355 and £368 in their third and fourth years in an effort to maintain a definite standard of education. Therefore, the rates paid to student teachers in South Australia are above those paid in two non-claimant States and below those paid in the third. Student teachers are not actually teachers but trainees and I cannot see why their salaries should be determined by the Teachers Salaries Board any more than by the Public Service Board or any other wage fixing tribunal. It is interesting to note that no application has been received for any increase and if the Teachers' Union have this matter so much at heart one would have expected an application. Each year a survey is made of the requirements of the Education Department and the amounts provided in other States, and the question of the availability of children is considered. The Director of Education reports to Cabinet upon those grounds and I cannot remember any occasion when Cabinet has not acceded to his suggestions. It is also interesting to note the increases that have taken place under the present system. Figures reveal that for students living at home £190 is paid for the first year, £200 for the second, and £210 for the third and subsequent years. The corresponding figures for the students living away from home are £260, £270, and £280. These figures exceed the allowances paid in New South Wales and Queensland—two of the three non-claimant States. The New South Wales education policy has been cited by the President of the Australian Institute of Teachers as an example we might follow. During the last seven years the allowances for students in our training colleges have increased by more than 250 per cent. In 1946 the allowance was £70 for students living at home and £100 for those living away from home. I assure members that the Government is most anxious to ensure that the education of South Australian children is not inferior to that in other States.

Mr. Dunstan—Can you supply the figures of salaries paid to Western Australian trainee students?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I believe they are higher but I did not quote them because Western Australia is a claimant State and its figures do not affect us. The Grants Commission considers only the figures of non-claimant States in determining our grant.

Mr. O'Halloran—Western Australia would have the same difficulty with the Grants Commission.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. It is possible to build up the figures by transferring revenue from other branches of the Public Service and a good deal of equalization takes place. The fact remains that the Grants Commission compares us directly with the non-claimant States. In its last report the amounts provided for education are set out and reveal that in South Australia it was 104s. per head of population; in New South Wales, 95s. 7d.; Victoria, 93s. 8d.; Queensland, 82s. 11d.; Western Australia 108s. 5d.; and in Tasmania, 110s. 9d. It can be seen that we are ahead of the three non-claimant States. More recent figures which are not contained in the Grants Commission report reveal that for 1951-52 New South Wales expended 120s. 8d. per head of population; Victoria, 114s. 1d.; Queensland, 96s. 5d.; South Australia, 118s. 8d.; Western Australia, 143s.; and Tasmania, 141s. 1d. The Australian average was 117s. 6d. but the South Australian figure is higher. That surely answers the suggestion that the amount spent on education in this State is niggardly. One only needs to examine the total vote on education, remembering that it is provided by 780,000 people, to realize that the Government is fully conscious of the need for higher education. About £6,500,000 is provided for education annually.

Mr. John Clark—That does not necessarily mean it is enough.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I imagine a number of us are like *Oliver Twist* and always want more. There is a limit to what 780,000 people can provide. If the honourable member will fairly examine the increased amounts provided for education even he will be staggered. No other State has better teachers or an Education Department which performs better work. Our teachers are doing a magnificent job and it is the policy of the Government to support the Education Department to its fullest extent. I rather deprecate statements that our teachers are unqualified.

I now come to the question of housing. In the course of the debate there have been long effusions concerning the Housing Trust's activities, the inadequacy of housing and so on.

Therefore, it is rather interesting to make comparisons with other States where Labor Governments have been in office for a number of years and in a position to put their policy into operation. The latest figures available are those for the nine months ended March 31, 1953, and are as follows:—New South Wales 18,523; Victoria 16,144; Queensland 7,973; South Australia 6,899 (not including emergency houses); Western Australia 5,984 and Tasmania 2,596. Dealing with them on a population basis we get this position:—New South Wales has built 541 houses to every 100,000 of the population; Victoria 687; Queensland 638; South Australia 918; Western Australia 974; and Tasmania 811. Do those figures, which refer to houses actually completed, show that there is anything wrong with the rate at which houses have been built in this State? Whereas in New South Wales 541 houses were built for every 100,000 of the population, in South Australia 918 were built—almost double on a population basis. Members opposite have criticized the Housing Trust. The following information relating to houses built by State housing authorities is still more interesting. During the last nine months New South Wales completed 3,408 houses; Victoria 2,396; Queensland 1,576; South Australia 2,718; Western Australia 1,042; Tasmania 557. Relating these figures on a population basis per 100,000, we find that New South Wales built 99 houses; Victoria 102; Queensland 126; Western Australia 169; Tasmania 182; and South Australia 362. In other words, the output of the South Australian Housing Trust is double that of the housing authority in the next best State.

Mr. McAlees—Does the trust allot houses to the most deserving cases?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Members opposite always shift their ground. They say that the trust is doing nothing to house the people and that its functions should be given to the State Bank, and yet it has doubled the result of any other State Housing authority. Then we hear the criticism that the trust does not build the right kind of house, that it always builds houses of the wrong size or that it should build more semi-detached houses, and so on. At the precise moment when one member was making an impassioned speech about the trust not providing homes for the right kind of people, particularly those with big families, there was placed on my desk a letter, portion of which reads as follows:—

I take this opportunity to write and thank you on behalf of my wife and myself. I find it difficult not to express my gratitude enough to you for giving our children a decent home

to live in. We have been here two months and are completely settled and happy. My family comprises eight girls and two boys, the oldest being 15 years and the youngest, also a girl, 18 months.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Where did they come from? Why not do the same for our local people?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They are local people.

Mr. Davis—How many others have you like that?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I could bring along a surprising number of similar letters.

Mr. McAlees—I will tell my clients to write to you.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am always pleased to deal with the honourable member's clients when he is unable to give them satisfaction. Let us deal with this matter fairly and squarely. The Housing Trust has done a magnificent job. I invite members opposite to go down and talk to its tenants and find out what the conditions were before the trust met their needs. I know it is for political purposes that members opposite have always been opposed to the trust.

Mr. Stephens—No, they have not.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—For political purposes members opposite have always decried the trust.

Mr. Stephens—That is not correct.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—On the first day the House considered the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply the Acting Leader of the Opposition moved a motion of criticism against the trust, and he wanted the Government to appoint a committee to inquire into its operations. Before the Address in Reply was considered the Acting Leader of the Opposition—not some back bencher—took it upon himself to try to take control of the House out of the hands of the Government in order to criticize the Housing Trust, so it is useless members opposite saying that they are not always critical of the trust. They have been and always will be.

Mr. Fred Walsh—We are critical of the Betting Control Board and many other bodies.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Of course. Like so many Socialists they set up a Socialistic undertaking and then proceed to pull it down. The Housing Trust has done a magnificent job—

Mr. Stephens—And would do more if the Government gave it more money.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member does not seem to be aware of the relationship between the Housing Trust and the Government so I will enlighten him. The trust

is, by Act of Parliament, given complete control over its own affairs and it takes no direction from anyone in the exercise of that control. It has been given a franchise by Parliament—

Mr. Fred Walsh—A parliament dominated by your Party.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I thought the Opposition dominated Parliament. From time to time the trust requests sums of money required to carry out its functions and its requests have always been given the utmost consideration. Speaking generally, I know of no occasion when its requests have been cut back. Last year, when there was a very drastic reduction of Loan money by the Loan Council, it was not possible to provide the trust from State funds with all the money it required, but this Government did get approval for a semi-governmental loan and in this way provided sufficient to maintain the trust's activities. As members know it was the only housing authority in Australia that did not sack men, and it kept its full activities going.

Mr. Pearson—And the public fully supported the loan.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is so, and what was particularly interesting about it was that so many small investors supported it. Notwithstanding that South Australia set out with probably fewer natural resources than any of the other Australian States I believe she has already climbed the ladder successfully and has a very great future. I do not subscribe to the view expressed by one member that we should neglect to develop our uranium resources. I know why he expressed that opinion; it was so that the money could be expended in other directions, but evidently he was not aware that money was supplied from overseas particularly for the development of our uranium resources, and in point of fact does not compete in any way with the activities the honourable member had in mind. Right from the outset the project will be substantially self supporting by sales of uranium and the large amounts of money that came into the State would not have been available for any other purpose. Let me deal with three general activities; I realize that they are only general but they do, I believe, throw some light upon the standard of administration in this State. During the State elections we heard a good deal about unemployment; it was one of the things specifically featured by the Opposition, and we have heard during this debate a good deal about those elections. I observed, however, that during the election campaign it was not

State matters on which our worthy friends of the Opposition assailed us, for they featured Federal matters. I understand that one notice of motion has already been placed upon the notice paper and hastily withdrawn. I believe also that another is coming on and that we will have an opportunity to give some facts and figures about electoral reform at an appropriate occasion, so I do not propose to anticipate that debate. I was reliably informed that the Opposition's election campaign was taken over very substantially by another State.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Whoever told you that did not know what he was talking about.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I know that electoral advertisements were authorized by a gentleman who resides in this State, but I understand that most of the advertising matter came from another State. Indeed, I was told by a very eminent member of the Labor Party in another State that he was in the process of preparing stuff for my downfall, so I got it firsthand.

Mr. O'Halloran—We haven't seen it yet.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I had proposed to attribute what I am about to say to influences beyond the State and I am sorry if I have to attach to it a local influence; I was going to let the Opposition off lightly, but allow me to quote the sort of stuff that appeared in election advertisements. I appreciate that in the heat of an election campaign many statements will be made but never before in any election with which I have been associated have I seen a document deliberately falsified. I have here one which was deliberately falsified for the purposes of an election advertisement. This is it, and it shows how the interstate influence came into this election, because I say frankly that, although it portrays a photograph of the Leader of the Opposition—and a very good one too—I do not in any way associate him with it, nor do I think he ever saw it. The report originated in Canberra and was printed in the *News* of February 17, 1953. Under the heading, "Workless in Australia, 41,633" it said:—

Of 41,633 unemployed in Australia, South Australia has 1,205—the lowest in proportion of any mainland State. More than 47,000 in Australia are receiving unemployment and sickness benefit payments. Figures compiled by the Social Services Department show also that 6,000 are on sickness benefit payment lists.

In the election advertisement the fact that South Australia had the lowest number of unemployed was deleted; there is no suggestion of it. I do not attribute that to any member opposite. Quite obviously that advertisement

was not correct. However, my purpose in raising this was something totally different. When the election was fought it was rather significant that our friends directed all their propaganda to Federal issues, and the reason was this—

Mr. Stephens—Not all of it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I did not see any other, and I was a constant reader of it. Let us consider the latest unemployment figures—and I think every member will agree that South Australia, from the point of view of natural resources, is the least endowed State in the Commonwealth; 90 per cent of our total land area has a rainfall of less than 10in. These are the latest figures I have been able to obtain; there are at present 25,682 unemployed in Australia receiving benefits. Of this number 14,642 are in New South Wales, which is probably the most richly endowed State, 6,024 in Victoria, 3,186 in Queensland, 770 in Western Australia, 380 in Tasmania, and 680 in South Australia.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Are they the latest figures issued last week?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—These are figures supplied by the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service. There is nothing more important to the well-being of any community than a high standard of employment. Nothing reflects more on the happiness of the community than the opportunity to work. On a population basis those figures show that in New South Wales 1.4 per cent is receiving unemployment benefits, .8 in Victoria, .9 in Queensland, .4 in Western Australia, .5 in Tasmania, and .3 in South Australia. We were unable to get enough labour for the fruit harvesting season along the river and we obtained people from other States to assist in the work. These people have now been absorbed in South Australia, yet our percentage is only .3.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The official figures issued last week show differently.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—My figures are up to July 18, 1953.

Mr. Fred Walsh—The figures issued last week were up to the end of July.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The difference would be insignificant. Although South Australia is the poorest in the matter of natural resources she has the lowest unemployment figure. That is a good guide to the way our economy is developing.

Mr. Riches—Is it not true that South Australia was the only State satisfied with the Loan Council allocation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That may be, but decisions of the council must be unanimous. If they are not unanimous, a formula set out in the Constitution is adopted. If the honourable member thinks we have a way of getting a large sum of money by a backdoor method I point out that the State can borrow through the Loan Council only with the unanimous agreement of all States. The other States get their loan moneys from the same Loan Council as does South Australia.

Mr. Pattinson—They do not always use it as wisely.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is another matter. Under the Financial Agreement each State Treasurer is a member of the council, and the Commonwealth Treasurer is the chairman. Each State has one vote, but the Commonwealth has two. If there should be a tie in the voting the Commonwealth has a casting vote.

Mr. Lawn—South Australia votes with the Commonwealth.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I would not be surprised, because if the Commonwealth is right South Australia will vote with it. Each year the Loan Council decides the amount of money which can be raised for loan purposes. Then it allocates that amount amongst the respective States. If one State opposes the allocation, the allocating is done in accordance with the formula in the Constitution. That formula relates pro rata to the amount of money spent by the various States over the last five years.

Mr. Riches—Does that apply when the Commonwealth cuts the amount approved by the Loan Council?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It applies when there is any dispute in the allocating of the money. The honourable member is wrong if he suggests that this State has a backdoor way of getting loan moneys. South Australia has used its loan moneys more efficiently than have the other States, and I think got better value for it, which I will show later.

Mr. Riches—The other States were more severely cut than South Australia in the allocation of the money.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Every one of the other States approved the formula under which the money was distributed. Does that satisfy the honourable member?

Mr. Riches—I have not queried that.

Mr. O'Halloran—The other States were not satisfied with the gross amount.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is so. They wanted an amount which could not be raised on the market except by forcing the rate of interest to an exorbitant figure, with which Mr. Riches would not agree, or by having gross inflation. I have seen the results of gross inflation in several overseas countries and I am not enthusiastic about it. South Australia is deficient in natural resources. Our greatest deficiency is in coal. By carefully looking after our resources, South Australian users of electricity are not paying as much as electricity users in New South Wales. The charges vary somewhat, but for general purposes the householder in South Australia pays the same as the New South Wales householder, but in industry the South Australian consumer pays much less than the New South Wales consumer. For instance, a flour milling company would pay £844 a month for electricity in Adelaide, but in New South Wales would pay £1,115. A food manufacturer would pay £236 here, but £280 in Sydney. Iceworks here would pay £404, but in Sydney £606. A city store in Adelaide would pay £249, but in Sydney the charge would be £270. A small suburban shop here would pay £5 15s., but £6 5s. in Sydney. It must be remembered that we get our coal from New South Wales, and we have to pay freight on it.

Every member of this House is concerned about the number of motor vehicle accidents, and it is a matter to which Parliament must give serious attention. In South Australia for the 12 months ended June, 1953, there were 134 deaths through motor vehicle accidents, in New South Wales 490, Western Australia 185, Victoria 464, and Tasmania 53. For the 12 months ended June, 1952, which are the latest figures available, the number of deaths in Queensland was 251. In relation to vehicles on the road, there was one death in South Australia to 1,542 vehicles, in New South Wales one to 1,345, Victoria one to 1,183, Tasmania one to 1,133, Queensland one to 996, and Western Australia one to 737. The death rate in the State with the worst figures is twice as high as that in South Australia. That shows that our police officers are making efforts to solve the problem.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Motorists are making an effort, too.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Of course. I have noticed an improvement in road courtesy

and although the figures are still not satisfactory, as a general guide to the administration of the State they provide a comparison that is not detrimental to our officers here.

Mr. Stephens—Can you give us the accident figures in relation to the population of the various States?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, but they could easily be worked out. The figures are on the basis of motor vehicles registered because it has been held that the motor vehicle is the lethal weapon. Many matters have been raised during the debate by members, and some have yet to speak. It is not possible for the Government to give a detailed answer to all the points raised, for that would take a long time and not be conducive to the prompt dispatch of business. However, I assure mem-

bers that the speeches are studied by the Ministers and all useful suggestions are examined to see if they are practicable.

Mr. Lawn—Then we have something to hope for in regard to electoral reform?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member always has something to hope for. Criticism of Government departments will be analysed to see whether it is justified and whether suitable action can be taken. I thank members for their patient hearing and support the motion.

Mr. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 11, at 2 p.m.