

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Tuesday, August 3, 1954.

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

**QUESTIONS.****OIL AND URANIUM DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Through the press recently the Premier issued a warning to the public about investing in oil and uranium shares. Booms similar to what we are now experiencing occur periodically. Can the Premier say whether the legislation governing the launching and control of companies has been examined and, if not, will it be examined with a view to protecting the investing public from some of the consequences of such booms without retarding the development of legitimate development companies?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Members are no doubt aware of the Government's policy on providing licences or leases concerning uranium deposits. Because of its very nature, uranium will always be a speculative mineral. It is not a scarce mineral and it is possible in many places to get a reaction from a geiger counter. Many of the minerals with which uranium is associated render it extremely difficult for practicable separation to be cheaply effected. Whether the production of uranium will be economic or not depends upon the recovery processes available in regard to any particular type of ore. The Government has a firm policy that it will not throw open areas for pegging and the promotion of share dealing until it has examined whether they are feasible propositions and in the public interest. That does not apply to other States or to the Northern Territory where leases can be taken out for this mineral in the same way as for any other mineral, nor does it stop trading in propositions in the Northern Territory, Queensland or any other State. I do not know of any method which could be devised to protect the public, for no-one can say with certainty which of these propositions is good or bad until they have been tested and proved. It would be a fair assumption, however, to say that some are not good. Some, the shares of which are being sold today, have been inspected by South Australian geologists, whose reports have not been favourable. I think that the public realizes that this is speculative trading and I have given numerous warnings that, with Government the only purchasers of the raw

material, it must always be so. Some of the propositions may be highly profitable, but many certainly will not.

**BEEKEEPING INDUSTRY.**

Mr. WHITE—On Thursday last I asked the Minister of Agriculture for information regarding the beekeeping industry. Is it now available?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I have obtained a report from the Director of Agriculture and it is as follows:—

A registration fee of 2d. per hive is prescribed under the provisions of the Apiaries Act, 1931-1943. For the 12 months ended June 30, 1954, the sum of £808 19s. 8d. was collected with respect to apiary registrations. Fees so received are paid into general revenue. The Government meets costs to the extent of £2,975 5s. 7d. per annum salary and travelling expenses of apiaries inspectors directly appointed under the Act. The contents of all hives suffering from foul brood are destroyed. (For the year ending June 30, 1954, only 50 hives were so treated—a very small number in relation to the 90,000 hives registered). The department is at present investigating the possibility of creating a fund from which compensation could be paid to beekeepers whose swarms are destroyed by this disease. Inquiries have been made in the various States as to action taken with respect to compensation payable to beekeepers suffering losses due to the disease. Ideas have also been exchanged with the Apiaries Association on the basis of a contributory scheme by the industry. The contribution necessary as an insurance would be small but would require legislative action.

**WHEAT STABILIZATION SCHEME BALLOT.**

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Agriculture inform the House what roll it is proposed to use for the forthcoming ballot in connection with the wheat stabilization scheme? Has he considered using the Australian Wheat Board list of growers, which is fairly adequate for the purpose, or does he intend to call for applications for enrolment?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—My department is already busy compiling a voters roll for the forthcoming ballot and it is intended to use the Australian Wheat Board's list of growers in respect of the last three seasons during which those growers have delivered wheat to the board. Another qualification agreed upon at the recent conference was that anyone who had sown 50 acres of wheat or more this year should also be entitled to vote. To secure the names of these new growers we shall publicize the matter in the press and over

the air to enable them to realize their rights and submit claims for enrolment. Upon receipt of these claims the rolls will be completed and we will be enabled to go ahead with the ballot.

#### PETROL STATIONS.

Mr. TRAVERS—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last Thursday—whether the Government intended to facilitate sales of petrol in the metropolitan area by making the hours similar to those in the country?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The question was, whether the Government would be willing to alter the hours to enable petrol stations in the metropolitan area to sell on the same basis as country sellers. The position is that we have had a number of requests from organizations representing petrol-selling stations in the metropolitan area, and, with one exception, all requested a curtailment of hours rather than an extension for the selling of petrol. The present hours have been examined in the light of the hours applying in the metropolitan areas in the other States. At present our hours, which are fixed by the Minister of Industry, can be altered by him. Petrol can be sold on Saturdays up to 2 p.m., but I do not think most petrol stations remain open after 12 mid-day. On week days they can sell until 6 p.m., but I believe some of them do not keep open until then. They can sell until 10 a.m. on public holidays, but they must close on Sundays. I do not think those hours unreasonable. We had a request from a taxi station, which was going to open anyhow, wanting to sell petrol around the clock, but it was not supported by the S.A. Automobile Chamber of Commerce, from which we have had no request for an extension. Under these circumstances the Government does not believe that at present there are grounds for making an alteration. If, however, the Chamber feels that it is at a disadvantage representations from it will be examined.

#### ELECTRICITY METER RENT.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the abolition of the meter rent charged by the Electricity Trust?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The trust says that the matter was considered four years ago when it gave consumers the option of having a single tariff, which does not carry with it a meter rent. A great number of consumers are

therefore today free of meter rent. The trust has not considered taking the matter further at present.

#### PRIVATE ARCHITECTS AVAILABLE TO GOVERNMENT.

Mr. DUNKS—In a recent press article Mr. Bruer, vice-president of the S.A. Institute of Architects, said a number of architects could be made available to the Government at week ends if the Government so desired. Can the Premier say whether the Government desires them and, if so, is it possible to make use of them?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—For some time the Government has been negotiating with one of the larger South Australian architectural firms to see whether it would be possible for private architects to assist the Architect-in-Chief's Department in the very heavy programme of public works it is engaged upon. Many difficulties are associated with the proposal, and, notwithstanding that we are trying to get assistance also from interstate firms, we have not yet been able to reach any agreement. Arising out of the press article in connection with a large number of architects being available in Adelaide for this work, I have received correspondence from a number of sources, and in the public interest I think it would be advisable to put this matter in its correct form, because it is not easy for a large institution of the type we are discussing, namely, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, to be produced by bits and pieces of drawings from one place and another. The following letter was received this morning by me from the Vice-President of the South Australian Institute of Architects (Mr. Gregory Bruer), who, I think, is the gentleman referred to by the honourable member:—

The President of the South Australian Institute of Architects has requested that I should inform you that the statement published in the *Sunday Advertiser* of yesterday, also the *Advertiser* of today relative to assistance that could be afforded to the State by practising architects, was not the opinion of the South Australian Institute of Architects but represented my own personal views. The matter has not been considered by the council of the institute, but I have been assured by private firms that ready assistance will be forthcoming from the architectural profession and also I have no doubt that the South Australian Institute of Architects will be glad to help in making this assistance available. I was not aware of the contentious nature of this matter when I was asked to express an opinion, and the offer of assistance was given conscientiously and sincerely in an effort to overcome possible delays.

The second communication, which came to the Chief Secretary (Sir Lyell McEwin) yesterday, was from a private architect and is also worthy of interest. It is as follows:—

I am writing to you concerning the suggestion which has been expressed in the press within the past few days; namely, that private architects should be called in to assist the Government with its hospital programme. I do not know your opinion in this matter, but I would like to express my own thoughts. My investigations with the Federal Health Security Department of the United States and with the Nuffield Research Foundation in Great Britain convinced me of two things:—

1. That the overall control of hospitalization had to be in the hands of a State Department such as your own and that the standards created by such a department should become the yardstick for all hospital planning. This calls for a panel of semi-governmental experts to advise and direct. I would suggest that this panel comprise a medical man, an architect, an engineer, a hospital administrator and a matron or authority on the functioning of a hospital. Such a panel would be under the chairmanship of the Director-General of Hospitals.
2. That hospital planning called for such a high degree of specialization that the average architect in normal practice could not plan efficiently. There is so much research work to be done in the field of planning and equipping hospitals that the architects in private practice could not possibly cope with it without specialization.

My own experience is that there is not sufficient work available to warrant a private architect throwing himself wholeheartedly into this field in all that it entails unless he is assured of Government support either in carrying out the whole project or as a consultant. Irresponsible statements have been made in the press concerning the part that private architects can play in helping the Government in its hospital programme. This field is limited and not as simple as some would imagine. Nevertheless, I believe that there is a possibility of placing the planning of both Government and semi-Government hospitals on a footing producing greater speed and efficiency than at present existing. I would welcome the opportunity of discussing this matter with you.

I have followed the matter up, because the Government desires to use any assistance available. I inquired of Mr. Bruer about the 80 architects who, he said, would be available to assist, and I find that in each of four offices there are three architects, in five offices two, and in five offices one, giving a total of 27 architects who could assist; but they are spread over 14 offices. Honourable members have only to consider the problems entailed in using the services of architects spread over 14 offices in this way, those services not being engaged exclusively on the designing of the hos-

pital, to realize that, for a proposition of this kind, there is not much opportunity of utilizing assistance in the manner suggested.

#### LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Treasurer say whether the Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act, which he purposes to introduce this session, will include a provision for the reconrol of rents of shops and offices?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Although it is not usual to canvass the provisions of a Bill not yet before the House, I may say that the Government proposes to carry out the policy it expressed in last year's debates on this measure. It is not proposed to re-introduce controls over business premises; in fact it is proposed, in the new Bill, to remove the slight control that now exists.

#### STERILIZATION OF HOTEL GLASSES.

Mr. W. JENKINS—Has the Premier a reply to my question of last Thursday regarding the sterilization of glasses used in hotels?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have received the following report from the Acting Director-General of Public Health:—

1. Regulation under the Food and Drugs Act, No. 12. Protection of food from contamination, paragraph 23, relating to drinking vessels and table ware is as follows:—

(a) Every person who serves food, liquors, refreshments, or causes or allows the same to be served in any licensed premises, or restaurant, or bar, or counter, or refreshment stall, or booth, or dining room, or tea room, or other place where drinking vessels, or plates, or other vessels, or spoons, or forks, or knives are used in common shall cause every such drinking vessel, or plate, or other vessel, or spoon, or fork, or knife to be thoroughly cleansed immediately after use.

(b) In all premises where clean water under pressure is available, or where it can be made available, the cleansing of such drinking vessels, or plates, or other vessels, or spoons, or forks, or knives shall be completed by means of clean and clear running water. Provided that every person referred to in subparagraph (a) of this regulation shall, when required by written notice of the local authority so to do, install an approved mechanical glass washing apparatus for the cleansing of drinking glasses.

(c) No person shall use, or have in his possession for use for the delivery of food for sale, any drinking vessel of which any part liable to come in contact with the mouth or lips, is broken chipped, cracked or rough.

The proviso to paragraph (b) was inserted by an amendment published in the *Government Gazette* of September 15, 1949. The duty of administering this regulation in the first instance is the responsibility of the local authorities—in the metropolitan area, the Metropolitan County Board, and in the country areas each local board of health for its district.

2. No.

3. The regulation is not held in abeyance. Places where food or drink is sold to the public are inspected by officers of the Metropolitan County Board, local boards of health, and the Department of Public Health. If the method of glass washing is not satisfactory steps are taken to require the use of a satisfactory method. One of these methods is by an approved mechanical glass washing machine.

#### PORT PIRIE RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIS—Last June I asked the Minister of Railways whether it was intended to run Budd cars on the Port Pirie-Adelaide line, and among other things the Minister replied:—

As the Port Pirie line carries heavy traffic steam trains are necessary to cope with the heavy traffic, therefore it is not intended to use the new rail cars on this line. That means that the railways can give better service to Port Pirie with steam trains than with Budd cars.

At present there are no night trains from Adelaide to Port Pirie on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, or Port Pirie to Adelaide on Mondays, Thursdays and Saturdays. Will the Minister of Works take up this matter with the Minister of Railways to see if Budd cars can be run on these nights, as the traffic is not heavy?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will refer the matter to the Minister of Railways and bring down a reply.

#### EGG SALES IN ENGLAND.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—A few months ago the chairman of the Egg Board, Mr. Anderson, visited England to investigate the possibilities of future egg sales. Has the Minister of Agriculture a report from him, and can he inform us what are the prospects of future sales there at profitable prices to producers?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—On his return from abroad, Mr. Anderson furnished a report to me on the results of his visit. The Agent-General also furnished me with a report on this matter, and highly commended the work Mr. Anderson had been able to accomplish. The net result of his visit is that we have been able

to conclude contracts for the disposal of 10,000 tons of egg pulp in the United Kingdom from the whole of Australia, divided amongst various traders. New South Wales, being the largest egg producer, gets half of this quota, the rest being divided amongst the other States. The price arranged is £215 a ton F.O.B. However, the position in regard to eggs in shell is much more difficult. They will have to be sold on a consignment basis, which virtually means that we have to sell to the United Kingdom and such other markets as we can get to the best possible advantage. When one considers the prices at which our competitors are marketing eggs in the United Kingdom it will be realized that we are up against some difficulties. Denmark, for instance, is able to sell at 2s. 6d. a dozen sterling, and Holland at 3s. 6d., but bear in mind that those countries have to pay much more for their foodstuffs than do our poultry men. Therefore, the position seems to me that to meet our competitors we must reduce the cost of production; there is no shadow of doubt about that.

Mr. Macgillivray—How do you suggest it can be done?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—One of the answers is greater efficiency in the industry, and in that regard the Standing Committee of the Agricultural Council, which recently examined this question, made the following comments:—

The Standing Committee agrees that it is desirable to examine closely all the possibilities for obtaining a reduction in the costs of production in the poultry industry of Australia, and recommends that a special conference of poultry officers from the Commonwealth and all States be convened with the object of formulating proposals for submission to the Standing Committee at its next meeting.

That may not mean much to the honourable member.

Mr. Macgillivray—It doesn't mean a thing to me.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I thought that quite probably he had that viewpoint, but we have able experts in the poultry industry who have done much in developing the egg-laying capacity of our poultry and who have established research stations that have been of great benefit to the industry. Apart from that, the Agricultural Council, and also the Premiers' Conference recently held at Canberra, requested the Commonwealth to either subsidize foodstuffs or egg production to tide the industry over the interim until producers can get down to a better basis in production costs.

### SALE OF URANIUM.

Mr. DUNKS—An article in today's *Advertiser* states—

Britain's atomic future will be supervised by the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, which came into being yesterday. The authority will be responsible for the development of atomic energy on industrial lines.

Will the appointment of this body give any greater facilities for the sale of uranium from South Australia, or will it be any deterrent?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The fact that the United Kingdom is going in for a long-range plan of nuclear energy for industry means, of course, that Australia will have an assured market for uranium over a very long period. The coal seams in the United Kingdom are becoming more difficult to work and coal is more costly. With its heavy industrialization the United Kingdom is, in some respects, in a similar position to South Australia, in that it must find alternative means of power for running its industries. I welcome the setting up of the Atomic Commission. I know one or two of the gentlemen concerned and I am certain that we will get full co-operation from them. More than that, it means that uranium will take its rightful place in the community as a commodity for the benefit of mankind and it will enable us in future to develop our power stations as required.

### TEN SHILLING NOTE QUIZ.

Mr. LAWN—It was recently reported in the press that the police had banned a competition conducted by a local broadcasting station. The position was that if any person had a ten shilling note bearing the number broadcast by the station he had the right to submit himself to a quiz test. If he answered the question correctly he received a prize. The press report stated that the competition was banned on the grounds that the element of chance was greater than the element of skill. Has the Premier any information on this matter and, if not, will he obtain a report?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no specific information on this matter. Parliament has passed certain laws relating to lotteries in this State and has defined lotteries. It becomes a matter for the police to decide whether any action taken by an individual or company falls within that definition. If they believe it does they can either issue a warning to that effect or can take action in the courts to establish an offence. I have no doubt the police would not have acted in this matter unless they had obtained an opinion from the Crown Law Office. I believe that as soon as it was suggested that

this competition was a lottery it was abandoned. There was no dispute when the matter was brought to the notice of the authorities.

### IRRIGATION AREA PLANTINGS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Can the Minister of Lands inform the House regarding the total allocation of citrus, deciduous fruit and vine plantings to South Australia and the Commonwealth generally? Can he say what acreages of those allocations have been used by the State and can he inform us of the Government's intention in respect of any acreages not used?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The honourable member wrote and informed me that he would require this information. I have a report as follows:—

(1)	South Australia. Acres.	Total for C/wth. Acres.
(a) Citrus . . . . .	3,500	7,300
(b) Deciduous tree fruits . . . . .	1,200	7,050
(c) Vines . . . . .	8,300	20,100
	13,000	34,450

  

(2)	Acres.
(a) Citrus . . . . .	2,034
(b) Deciduous tree fruits . .	917
(c) Vines . . . . .	3,201
	6,152

It is desired to state that the following additional plantings will be necessary to complete the Loxton and Cooltong areas:—

	Acres.
(a) Citrus . . . . .	830
(b) Deciduous tree fruits . . .	270
(c) Vines . . . . .	650
	1,750

(3) The original allocation of horticultural plantings to this State for Irrigation War Service Land Settlement totalled 9,000 acres, of which 7,900 acres will be absorbed in the approved schemes at Loveday, Cooltong and Loxton.

A further survey is being made to ascertain how many of the remaining classified applicants desire settlement on irrigation holdings under the scheme and, until the result of this survey is available, it will not be known definitely to what extent, if any, it would be necessary to exceed the original allocation of 9,000 acres to provide the additional holdings.

Assuming that all remaining classified applications for irrigation holdings, based on the survey made in June, 1953, still desire settlement, the planting of an additional 3,000 acres would be necessary. This would bring the total plantings to 10,900 acres, or 2,100 acres less than the total allocation in South Australia of 13,000 acres.

The Irrigation Development Committee is investigating, and will shortly submit a report on, an area in the Hundreds of Paringa and Gordon which, if developed, would provide more land than needed for the settlement of the remaining applicants who have been classified for irrigation holdings under the scheme. In accordance with the usual procedure, the Irrigation Development Committee's report will be considered by the Government for reference to the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement for investigation and, subject to a favourable report by that Committee, the proposal will then be sent to the Commonwealth for consideration.

#### RAILWAY DERAILMENTS.

Mr. STEPHENS—Recently there have been several derailments on our railways. Fortunately, none has been serious but I am perturbed lest there may be serious results if this matter is not examined. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the Railways Commissioner or the Minister has inquired into the cause of these derailments so that the public may be assured that they are not likely to continue and so affect passenger traffic?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Minister of Railways has furnished me with a preliminary report from the Railways Commissioner. I have been informed that an inquiry is now in progress but the Commissioner will not be able to specify the reasons for the derailments until the results of that inquiry are known. In order to make the public aware of what is being done and to relieve any fears the Commissioner reports:—

Since the war a very great deal of work has been done on the track over the hills, and I can assure the honourable the Minister that it is in good condition. The cause of the derailment of the Overland will be the subject of a departmental inquiry, but immediate steps have been taken to check the cant, gauges and alignments of the curves through the hills . . . . The track through the hills is examined each day by one of the maintenance gang walking the track. I shall not be able to say until the board of inquiry has taken evidence, what was the exact cause.

Mr. Riches—Is it a purely departmental inquiry?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes. There are no reasons to broaden the inquiry because no injury has been done to any person. Another peculiar fact is that the derailments have all occurred at low speed on curves and a contributing factor is thought to be the stiffness of the axle boxes of some of the new cars. This condition improves with the running of the vehicles, but every effort is being made to remove the cause of the stiffness by work undertaken in the shops. Every step is being

taken to avoid a recurrence and when the report of the investigating committee is received it will be made available by the Minister direct to the House, if the House is sitting and he so desires it.

#### WHEAT CARTAGE BY ROAD.

Mr. QUIRKE—It has been the custom ever since wheat was grown in South Australia that carriers carting wheat to railway sidings had some rights—completely an unwritten law, I admit—for the placing of that wheat on the railway or of undertaking its transport. The Yorke Peninsula Carriers Association appears to have obtained a complete monopoly of the carting of wheat to the Ardrossan silo. I do not know if tenders were called, but I do know that a contract has been let to that association, which is carrying wheat from much further afield than Yorke Peninsula; in one instance from Kybunga, not many miles from Clare. The carriers who delivered the wheat to that siding applied for the job of transferring it to Ardrossan, but they were told that the whole job has been let to the Yorke Peninsula Carriers Association. I suggested that they apply for membership of that association, but they were informed that as they were not resident on Yorke Peninsula they could not become members. I suggest that if the Yorke Peninsula Carriers Association restricts its membership to people resident on Yorke Peninsula it should also not go outside that area in its activities. Will the Minister of Agriculture take up the matter with the Wheat Board to see if general tenders can be called allowing people who are not residents of Yorke Peninsula to participate in this work? I think members of this place would be very concerned about giving a monopoly to one section under the circumstances I have outlined.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I shall be very glad to ask the Wheat Board for some information on this question. Possibly one of the reasons why the association mentioned has secured a monopoly is that its members are equipped for handling wheat in bulk.

Mr. Quirke—There is no inducement for other carriers to be so equipped.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—That may be so. I shall be glad to secure the information desired if possible.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I understood the member for Stanley to say that wheat was being carted to the Ardrossan silo from as far afield as Kybunga, which is on a railway line with a direct outlet to a port. Complaints

have been made to me recently that wheat is being carted from other railway sidings from which it could be shipped direct to a port, and as a result considerable damage is being done to the roads in the vicinity. Will the Minister of Agriculture inquire into the point raised by the honourable member and consider the economics of the hauling of wheat long distances to the detriment of the roads when it could be handled expeditiously by rail?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—Obviously, the wheat is being shipped from Ardrossan because the customers want bulk wheat and Ardrossan is the only port equipped for handling bulk wheat by modern methods. Of course, it could be taken to one of the other ports and emptied into the ships' holds from bags. Although I assume the Wheat Board has looked into the economics of that alternative method and found it cheaper to send the wheat by road to Ardrossan, I shall be pleased to have the matter thoroughly examined.

#### RAILWAY WARNING DEVICES AT MOUNT GAMBIER.

Mr. FLETCHER—Has the Minister of Works received a reply from the Minister of Railways regarding a question I asked last week about railway warning devices at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Minister of Railways has furnished me with a report from the Commissioner as follows:—

All necessary equipment for the installation of flashing lights is on hand, and it will be brought into service at Bay Road, and Bertha and Whel Streets, concurrently with the introduction of the new signalling arrangements for broad gauge trains. The signal cabin is in the course of erection, and the signal equipment will be installed as soon as the necessary labour can be made available. This arrangement makes it possible to provide complete, automatic operation of the warning devices at Whel Street, and will eliminate the present manual control, which it is understood is the main cause of complaints regarding the irregular operation of the gongs.

#### LONG SERVICE LEAVE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier a further reply to the question I asked last week concerning the possibility of legislation being introduced this session to provide for long service leave for employees in industry generally.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I refreshed my memory upon the position in other States and found it to be as I thought, and have also taken the question to Cabinet. In Queensland

and New South Wales the legislation applies only to those who are working under State awards. In Victoria the legislation purports to cover those who are working under both State and Federal awards, but I am informed that this legislation will be challenged in the courts as being *ultra vires* of the arbitration section of the Commonwealth Constitution. The matter has been considered by my Government and it is not proposed to introduce legislation on the matter this session.

#### COMPENSATION FOR QUORN RESIDENTS.

• Mr. RICHES—When the agreement was reached for the alteration of the route of the railway from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta and it was made known that Quorn would be by-passed it was generally acknowledged that the people of Quorn would suffer severe loss. The Government announced that it would come to their assistance by examining the possibility of bringing an industry into Quorn as compensation for the anticipated loss of railway work, and, secondly, failing the introduction of such an industry, Parliament would be asked to pass legislation enabling the Government to make compensation payments to anyone who could prove severe financial loss, but that legislation was not gone on with. Has the Government had any success in its endeavours to attract an industry to Quorn, or in its search for mineral resources in the locality? Does the Government intend to proceed this session with the legislation to provide for compensation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government introduced legislation last session to establish a committee to go into the question of providing some assistance in cases of hardship, but at that time the consensus of opinion of members generally—not necessarily only those on this side of the House—was that the Bill was premature as it would not be possible for anyone to establish a concrete case of hardship which would enable the committee to make a recommendation. Therefore, at the suggestion of members generally, the legislation was held in abeyance because, in point of fact, railway traffic at Quorn has not in any way diminished and it not likely to do so for some time. That does not alter the fundamental fact that the Government would again consider the matter at the appropriate time. I will get a report from the Minister of Mines regarding investigations by the Mines Department so that the honourable member will have first-hand information on the matter.

# PAYNEHAM TRAMLINE.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last Tuesday regarding lights on trams travelling on the Payneham route?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Tramways Trust has forwarded the following reply:—

With reference to the statement that at night it is difficult to distinguish in which direction the tram is travelling, the General Manager points out that the driving end of the tram has its headlights switched on and headlights of the trailing end are extinguished. For some time, the trust has been endeavouring to secure reflective material for use on tramcars as an additional warning of their presence. This material is now procurable, and a trial has already been arranged. If the test proves successful, all tramcars in the service will be treated with it.

# IRON FOR TANK MAKING.

Mr. WHITE—I have had complaints from tank makers in my district regarding supplies of iron available for their work. They can get some supplies of imported iron, but even here they have to wait in some cases up to three months for it. The imported iron is about 25 per cent dearer than Australian iron and the extra cost has to be passed on to purchasers. Plumbers in my district supply tanks to areas where the water catchment from buildings constitutes the main supply for domestic purposes, so the shortage of iron for their work is a matter of concern. Can the Premier give any explanation of the shortage of suitable supplies of iron for tank-making and will he inquire into the position with a view to speeding up supplies?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am very conversant with the production of galvanized iron in Australia. At present it is inadequate to meet the demands of the Australian market. In addition import licences have been granted to islands coming under the Australian mandate and small quantities are also exported to New Zealand, which market the Commonwealth has held for many years. From time to time the shortage is made up by merchants importing iron from overseas, but it is about £25 a ton dearer than the local iron. I agree that the honourable member has an extremely good case. When the Government controlled iron supplies it gave a No. 1 priority to iron needed for water conservation. If the honourable member gives me the names of the persons concerned I will see whether distribution can be arranged through these channels, although the Government does not now control galvanized iron or

any other building material. If any other honourable member from a non-reticulated area is interested in this matter I shall be pleased to extend the same facilities to him.

# OUTER HARBOUR BREAKWATER.

Mr. TAPPING—Can the Minister of Marine set out the details of the work being carried out at the Outer Harbour breakwater by the South Australian Harbors Board?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Over a period of many years the breakwater at the Outer Harbour had subsided to such an extent that it was ineffective in breaking the harbour entrance from seas raised by prevailing south-westerly winds. The outer end of the breakwater had subsided so much that it showed above water only at extreme low tides. In 1951 the Harbors Board commenced the work of repairing this mound to its original height with the same side slopes using stones to maximum size of 3 tons. Up to June 30, 1954, 4,560ft. of the breakwater had been restored and it is anticipated that the structure will be fully reinstated by the end of this financial year.

# DRAINAGE OF EASTERN SUBURBS

Mr. TRAVERS—In 1941 work was completed on the drainage of the eastern suburbs. Various municipalities were thereupon assessed in relation to the costs under the Metropolitan Drainage Act of 1935. That Act envisages a revision of the assessment at the end of 10 years, based on many circumstances, such as population redistribution, opening of new suburbs, and the like. In view of the great alteration that has taken place in that respect since 1941 the St. Peters Corporation applied in writing to the Minister on October 28, 1953, for an inquiry under section 18 of the Act. The corporation has not yet had a reply. As nine months have now expired since the application was made can the Minister of Works say when the corporation may expect a decision?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The question is very involved. The assessment was based on evidence given to the Public Works Committee at the time and before there can be a re-assessment some equal inquiry should take place. With the Engineer-in-Chief I have been giving a good deal of attention to the matter and obtaining much information to see whether a re-assessment would be justified. The obligation is thrown on to the Minister to say whether a re-assessment is justified and I am obtaining data towards that end. I have the matter practically completed to enable it to



be taken to Cabinet. It is a matter of policy whether another inquiry should be set up. It is not for the Minister to say that there should be a re-assessment by taking from one and adding to another. The purport of the Act goes further than that. The matter has not been overlooked and representations are receiving every attention.

#### DAY LABOUR ON HOUSING TRUST HOMES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Several weeks ago I was interviewed by the secretaries of various unions with members engaged in the building of Housing Trust homes. It was indicated that the Government has assured them that day labour would be used in their erection, but it would appear from reports that whereas day labour is being used on the solid construction type of homes for renting, much of the work being done on homes for sale is being sublet, portion of the work is being done by day labour, and there is also much week end labour. Can the Premier assure the House that the trust will abide by the Government's decision on this matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The trust has never built houses under the day-labour system, this work being done by contractors.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Who were supposed to use day labour.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A contractor contracts to build the houses and either employs labour or sub-contracts. I have never heard a suggestion that the Housing Trust would build its houses by day-labour methods. Experience in other States is that the housing authorities' operations are not ideal for this type of employment. As far as I know there is no suggestion that the trust would undertake the erection of its houses by day labour. It supervises their erection to see that they are architecturally in accordance with the plans and specifications.

#### SEWERAGE OF PORT PIRIE.

Mr. DAVIS—Some two or three years ago I was informed that the Public Works Committee had approved sewerage for Port Pirie, and since I have been advised that it has been placed No. 1 on the priority list. The Minister of Works made a statement in Port Pirie that it was on a very high priority. The people there are becoming much concerned about the position and wonder whether the priority has got so high that it is out of reach of the Minister. I should like to know whether Port

Pirie has been removed from the No. 1 priority, has the Minister any further information, and when is the work likely to start?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I do not know that it ever was No. 1 or No. 2 priority, but I said that it had been accepted generally as being of high priority. When country sewerage schemes are undertaken obviously consideration must be given to the size of the project and the type of country. In such undertakings there arises the question of the availability of loan funds, men, and materials. As policy is involved I will take the matter further to see whether it is possible this year to start anything substantial. The work at Port Pirie is still regarded as being very essential and the Government is willing and anxious to undertake it at the earliest possible opportunity.

#### CONTROL ON FERTILIZER SALES.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of last week concerning the control of spray fertilizer sales?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The Chief Horticulturist, Mr. A. G. Strickland, reports:—

The Horticultural Branch has carried out and is continuing a large number of experiments concerning spray application of plant nutrients. Some of this work has led to far reaching commercial application, as in the case of correction of zinc deficiency in various kinds of fruit trees and vines. On a more limited scale it has been possible to recommend spray application of copper, boron and manganese in special cases where these trace elements are lacking. Work is also proceeding on the feasibility of entering major nutrients, such as nitrogen, potash and calcium, through foliar sprays. However, this work has not reached the stage where clear cut recommendations for wide usage are possible. Nevertheless, in many individual instances it has been sound to recommend foliar sprays of urea to supply an obvious nitrogen deficiency in fruit trees or vegetable crops. Trials with urea sprays are being intensified this year, and extended to cover a wider range of fruit and vegetable crops. It can be said that the department is gradually securing sound knowledge to guide growers in the safe use of this means of providing plant nutrients. In the meantime, however, some commercial distributors have placed on the market nutrient sprays of undisclosed composition. Most often these sprays contain urea, which may be of value to crops lacking nitrogen, but frequently they also contain other plant nutrients which may or may not be of use. At present there is no legislation enabling control of these commercial preparations and the protection of buyers against extravagant claims or exorbitant prices. However, draft legislation which would provide machinery for effective control of plant nutrient sprays and other types of agricultural chemicals is under consideration.

# BRANDING OF TEXTILES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—In 1944 the South Australian Parliament passed the Textile Products Description Act. It was introduced as a matter of great urgency, but it lay dormant until last year when I asked the previous Minister of Agriculture whether it was the Government's intention to proclaim it and bring it into force. The object of the measure was to protect Australian wool-growers by preventing cotton and other goods from being marketed as woollen goods. The Minister in reply said it was intended that similar legislation should be passed in the various States and proclaimed simultaneously, and as the 1944 legislation was not suitable to meet the needs of the Commonwealth, the South Australian Government intended to introduce a further Bill, which was dealt with last year. I noticed in looking through various regulations and proclamations recently that the Act had not yet been proclaimed. I do not know whether it is a form of perverted humour for the Government to get this Parliament to pass legislation which obviously it has no intention to implement, or whether it is intended to implement it. Can the Premier say why it has been delayed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This is a complex question and requires that all States act together, because section 92 of the Federal Constitution provides that freedom of trade between States shall be maintained. Therefore, no action may be taken with regard to unbranded goods sold in South Australia after being brought from another State, unless that State has a similar law. The Act was proclaimed yesterday throughout the whole of Australia and has operated since August 1 as a common measure to overcome the problems involved.

# HONEY MARKETING BOARD COSTS.

Mr. WHITE—Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate the costs incurred in running the Honey Marketing Board during 1951-52 and 1952-53?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

# RAILWAY STAFF AND TRAIN MILEAGE.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—

1. What number of administrative personnel were employed by the railways at (a) June 30, 1924; (b) June 30, 1954?

2. What number of non-administrative personnel were employed by the railways at each of the above dates?

3. What number of miles were traversed by trains in the years 1924 and 1954 respectively?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1 and 2.	(a)	(b)
Salaried staff . . . . .	1,176	1,902
Daily paid staff . . . . .	8,794	9,696
Total staff . . . . .	9,970	11,598
(Figures exclude construction staff in each case.)		

A number of grades which were paid on a daily basis in 1924 are now included in the salaried staff.

3.	1924.	1954.
Train miles .	6,186,769	7,359,045
Gross ton miles . . .	1,350,000,000	2,263,000,000

The gross ton mileage figures have been included as well as the train miles asked for, because in 1924 the railways had no large locomotives and trains were small compared with present-day practice. The gross ton miles, however, are a measure of the work done by the department in each period.

# PENSIONERS' COUNCIL RATES.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to permit local governing bodies to rebate to pensioners portion of their annual rates?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—No.

# BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—Have delays at the Birkenhead Bridge been minimized by the implementation of regulations recently gazetted?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Regulation 13A gazetted on July 8, 1954, is designed as a safety measure for the very infrequent occasions that a vessel signals for a bridge opening that it is subsequently unable to utilize; and its implementation will have little or no effect on the periods that the Birkenhead Bridge is available for road traffic.

# COUNTRY SEWERAGE SCHEMES.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (on notice)—

1. How many schemes for country sewerage extensions have been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee?

2. On what dates were these referred to the committee?

3. On which of these schemes and on what dates have reports been made?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. Thirteen.

2. On December 16, 1949, Bordertown, Gawler, Murray Bridge, Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta and Victor Harbour. On October 26, 1950, Balaklava; on April 12, 1951, Gumeracha; on March 5, 1953, Salisbury, and on January 7, 1954, Whyalla.

3. Committee submitted interim reports on February 5, 1952 in regard to Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln and Port Augusta, and on June 10, 1953, submitted a report on Salisbury.

#### SCAFFOLDING FEES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice)—What revenue was received under section 6 of the Scaffolding Inspection Act for the year ended June 30, 1954—in (a) the metropolitan area; and (b) other areas?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The revenue received during the financial year ended June 30, 1954, under section 6 of the Scaffolding Inspection Act, was—

Metropolitan Area . . . . .	£2,996
Other Areas . . . . .	£407
	<hr/>
	£3,403

#### RAILWAY CARTAGE OF WATER.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Was any water carted by rail to Terowie and Peterborough during 1953-54?

2. If so, what was the cost of carting water to each place during 1953-54?

3. Is water being carted to either of these towns at present?

4. If so, what is the weekly cost of such cartage?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. Yes.

2. Terowie, £23,608; Peterborough, £500.

3. Yes.

4. Terowie, £406; Peterborough, £10.

#### DIESEL LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Is it the intention of the Railways Commissioner to replace steam locomotives with diesel electric locomotives in the Peterborough narrow-gauge division?

2. If so, when will this programme be commenced and how long will it take to complete?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Minister of Railways is having this matter thoroughly investigated.

Mr. PEARSON (on notice)—

1. What is the saving in cost per ton or per train mile of diesel locomotives as against steam?

2. Could similar savings be effected on narrow-gauge lines?

3. If so, is it intended to procure or construct diesel engine locomotives for narrow-gauge lines?

4. In view of the high cost of steam coal on Eyre Peninsula, will early attention be given to provision of diesels for this division?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. The ten diesel-electric locomotives operating on the South line are effecting economies estimated at £33,000 per locomotive per annum.

2. The relative costs of diesel and steam operation are affected by many factors, such as traffic density, grades, and the strength of the permanent way. On the South line the various factors are such as to yield maximum economies with diesel operation. In other parts of the system, whether on broad or narrow-gauge territories, the economies would generally be less. In some areas, where the traffic is light, it would certainly be uneconomical to introduce diesel operations in the near future.

3. A report is being obtained on this matter.

4. It would not be feasible to provide diesels on Eyre Peninsula, because of the light 40 lb. rails with which much of the division is laid.

#### MOUNT PAINTER URANIUM DEPOSITS.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. Has any significant find of uranium been made at Mount Painter?

2. If so, has the Government any plans for further development?

3. Would Quorn be a suitable place for treating any ore found at Mount Painter?

4. What is the intention of the Government regarding development of Mount Painter North and Mount Painter East in the immediate or near future?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. Yes, but only low grade.

2. Not at present.

3. No.

4. Exploration work is in progress to find higher grade deposits.

#### PREFABRICATED HOUSES.

Mr. JENNINGS (on notice)—

1. What was the landed cost in South Australia of the various types of pre-fabricated houses recently imported by the Housing Trust?

2. What was the average cost of erection of each house?

3. What subsidy, if any, was paid on each house by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. £1,672, £1,790, £1,520 and £1,738 for the four overseas contracts respectively.

2. £938, £1,375, £1,046 and £1,226 respectively.

3. £300.

#### COMMONWEALTH TRADES SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS (on notice)—

1. What was the composition of each lot sold at the auction sale conducted by the Supply and Tender Board on July 27, 1954, of surplus equipment of the Commonwealth Trades School?

2. What were the prices obtained for each lot and to whom was each lot sold?

3. What was the total proceeds of the sale?

4. What would have been the total proceeds if retail prices had been realized?

5. Were goods sold in such large quantities that members of the public were precluded from purchasing individual requirements?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. The number of lots offered was 538, made up mainly of used or "shop-worn" tools of trade.

2. The information asked for in 1 and 2 is too bulky to be given in detail.

3. £2,903 17s. 6d. gross.

4. Not known.

5. Because of the large number of items involved and the small attendance of single item buyers, the auctioneer decided that a clearance could not be effected in other than the lots stated in answer to 1.

The Chief Storekeeper states that sufficient stocks of suitable quality and types were removed to Mile End store for all known departmental requirements for five years. The balance, being in excess of, or unserviceable for, requirements were then divided into lots and listed for sale. All members of the Hardware Associations were notified of the sale but they advised that as none of the goods offered were suitable for retailing "as new," they were not interested.

#### CAR FOR SCAFFOLDING INSPECTOR.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government to insist that the Chief Inspector of Factories make application to the State Bank for assistance to purchase

at least one motor car for use by the Scaffolding Inspector to assist him in his duties?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A motor car is used at present by one Inspector of Scaffolding to assist him in the performance of his official duties. An application to the State Bank for financial assistance to purchase a motor car is not made by the head of a department, but by the officer requiring such assistance.

#### CONCRETE RAILWAY SLEEPERS.

Mr. PEARSON (on notice)—

1. Has the Railways Commissioner investigated the possibilities of concrete railway sleepers?

2. If so, what are the conclusions arrived at?

3. If not, will investigations be made and the results thereof made known?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. The possibilities of using concrete railway sleepers have been investigated.

2. and 3. Having regard to such matters as cost, weight and track insulation, it was concluded that the use of concrete sleepers on the South Australian Railways was not desirable.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption of Address in Reply.

(Continued from July 29. Page 197.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—This debate has followed an unusual course. In the past, after the mover and seconder had spoken, the Leader of the Opposition made his speech, followed by members in the order allocated by the respective Whips. That practice was followed on this occasion until the Leader of the Opposition had concluded his remarks, when on Thursday last, by arrangement between the Whips, it was decided that the member for Burnside should speak and that I should follow. I was amazed when advised by a messenger that my claim had been jumped. I protested to the Whip on this side, who conferred with the Liberal Whip, but finally I find myself on the floor. The happy arrangements in this House have been brought about by the tolerance and graciousness of private members, but the action of the Premier, taken without consulting our Whip, will possibly undo those arrangements that have existed so long, and nobody but the Premier will be responsible.

Mr. Dunks—What Standing Order covers that?

Mr. HUTCHENS—There are some unwritten Standing Orders and practices that have led to the happy and easy passing of legislation. They have been of great assistance to the Government but have been thrown overboard to suit the convenience of one member. That is unjust and unreasonable.

Mr. Dunks—I have been here 20 years and have never heard of them.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I shall not deal with all the remarks made by the Premier because before the conclusion of the debate some of my colleagues will prove that the majority of them were made in order to rebut a statement by the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier will be shown to be entirely incorrect, but I now draw attention to the request that the Labor Party has made for years that this House, in order to pass necessary legislation and to serve our constituents properly, should sit twice a year. Our requests have been ignored, yet the Premier made the following surprising statement:—

In the first place, I hope that this year the debate will not be unnecessarily drawn out as there is a considerable amount of legislation to be considered by Parliament.

Was the Premier suggesting that members speak unnecessarily on the Address in Reply debates and waste the time of Parliament? If not, he was certainly setting out to deprive the people's representatives in this place of the right of freedom of expression of thought—a tragic and undesirable attitude. Anyone adopting such an attitude should be deemed unworthy of the freedom of a democratic institution. Parliament met on June 3, but adjourned until July 27 after sitting for only four days. Of course, there was a special sitting when Her Majesty visited this State, but if we sat on every possible sitting day until Christmas we could sit on only 70 days. It is possible, and desirable, for the House to rise during Show week, and that would reduce the number of possible sitting days to 67. However, I have heard a whisper that the House may not sit on some other days, so the number of possible sitting days may be reduced to about 60. When we realize that Parliament sits for about only one-sixth of the year it can be seen that something must be done about it in order that the voice of the people may be heard. Because Parliament does not sit for five-sixths of the year the people have little chance to make their requests known. Parliament is reduced in

status to something like a dictatorship. The Premier said:—

It is my pleasant duty to disclose to the House that the result of the State's financial operations for the year ended June 30 was a surplus of £1,809,859.

He explained that revenues actually exceeded the 1953-54 Estimates by £1,020,000, and then went on:—

This was in part effected by an abnormal number of large estates which came up for succession duties assessment during the year. It is amazing that the senior Minister of this House finds pleasure in our people dying. If he is dependent on deaths to provide a surplus I suggest that there is every reason for disapproval of the extraordinary increase in succession duties. I think the Premier rose so soon in the debate in order to answer a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition. However, I congratulate the Leader on his statement:—

Whatever the measure of stability achieved in this matter, and it is not a great measure, it has been achieved entirely at the expense of the workers. In the achievement great injustices have been done to them.

The Leader of the Opposition was not talking about standards of living. He did not suggest that the workers were being down-trodden today, but was saying that they had not been treated justly. Surely they can, and do, receive unjust treatment without being down-trodden. The Leader of the Opposition was referring to the conditions suffered by workers as a result of the pegging of wages and refusal of the Arbitration Court to increase margins. We on this side consider that the workers have been denied their just reward because of the actions of the Court. To justify his assertions and motive in rising so early the Premier said:—

Before the war 115,000 wireless licences were issued annually in South Australia, but today there are about 220,000.

Does the Premier desire to return to the depression days when the workers had few amenities and when wireless sets were primitive? Only wealthy people could afford a wireless then, but today, as a result of greater economic security, the workers can purchase secondhand sets. Many of the sets purchased in my electorate cost far less than the licence fee. It was only the desire of the Premier, representing the Liberal Party, to reduce the workers to a slave standard that prompted his remarks. The Premier said that before the war there were 100,000 motor registrations and that today there are 220,000. He suggested that the workers owned most of those vehicles. That

is a ridiculous statement. Prior to the war I worked for a firm which owned so few motor cars that it sent them away for repair. Today it has a number of garages with skilled mechanics who are employed solely on maintaining its huge fleet of cars. A number of workers have purchased "rattle-trap" cars on hire purchase. They are being exploited, but prefer such exploitation to paying the exorbitant tram fares which operate today. They are at least able to take their families for trips at the week ends. The Premier, in his speech, was like a patent medicine company which offers money back on its products if the purchaser is not satisfied. He offered to give garden parties.

Mr. McAlees—He has offered three.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I suggest that he will not give any. The Premier also said:—

I have noticed with much concern that in the last two or three years costs of production have been steadily rising, whereas prices for our commodities on overseas markets have been falling.

It was suggested that the Arbitration Court have pegged wages to prevent costs from rising. The member for Wallaroo interjected and asked who had instructed the Court to peg wages. The Premier made much of this and said that the judges of the Arbitration Court were free from interference. They may be free from direct interference, but there is reason for doubt even on that score. They are only human and are affected by continual whispering and pestering. The Liberal Parties in this State and in the Commonwealth are always arguing that the workers are getting too much and should suffer a reduction in wages in order to reduce costs. In the *Advertiser* of July 20, the following article appeared:—

Public holidays cost Australia £75,000,000 a year in production, Mr. R. F. Sanderson, one of Australia's leading businessmen, told a Junior Chamber of Commerce gathering in Melbourne today. Holidays added more to Australia's production costs than to those of any other country in the world, he said. Mr. Sanderson is chairman of William Haughton and Co. Ltd., woolbrokers, Buckley & Nunn Ltd., and the Argus and Australasian Ltd.

This, and whispering campaigns, aided wittingly and unwittingly by the press, have an effect upon the judges. There are some who are continually and hopefully influencing the Arbitration Court in an effort to deprive the workers of the things they are justly entitled to. Today, throughout the world, there is a titanic struggle for overseas markets. I realize that there is some justification for the argument that we have cost ourselves out of some

markets. Those countries which were driven out of markets because of the war are receiving aid from America and are now re-entering the markets. Because of this our salvation depends on the ability of our people to consume our produce and to keep in existence our industries. Because of the Liberal Party's policy of abolishing controls—which did provide some measure of security to our people—we have almost cost ourselves out of overseas markets. Unless we are careful we may cost ourselves out of our home markets and ultimately return to economic depression.

The purpose of this debate is to express our thanks to His Excellency the Governor for having delivered the speech which opened this Session and to provide us with an opportunity of making known the direct and indirect needs of our constituents. Because there are more effective opportunities of dealing with local and direct needs I propose to limit my remarks, in the main, to indirect and wider needs. With other members I express appreciation of the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh to our country. I feel that I would be failing in my duty if I did not congratulate the organizers of the tour. South Australia was one of the last States visited and we gained much from the failures and accomplishments of the other States. However, the efforts of our organizers were most creditable. Members of the police force deserve congratulation because many of them worked long and tiring hours and performed a remarkable service. The musical festival revealed the cultural development of this State and was only over-shadowed by the children's display. The enthusiasm and spontaneity of the children's welcome must have had a deep effect not only upon those present but those listening to the radio broadcast. Such loyalty augurs well for the British Commonwealth of Nations. The Adelaide City Council and many of the large firms exerted great efforts in providing decorations. One of the most spectacular was the fountain in Lake Torrens. I hope it will be retained and will operate during the summer as it will be a great attraction. Most of us had heard Her Majesty before the visit, but to see her and her husband in person was truly inspirational.

Events which have occurred since our rising in last December have been of interest to members. My remarks will be sincere but I trust they will not be taken as approval of the Government's policy. I make it clear that I believe that this L.C.L. Government has never possessed one honest motive. If some of the

Ministers who are idealists, but are possessed of sound common-sense, are not harnessed by the Liberal chariot driver they may achieve something of a worthwhile nature. I offer my heartiest congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on having achieved a record for service as a Speaker in the Commonwealth. You should feel proud, as we do, that you have been returned to your high office. You have served us well and have been unbiassed. However, I feel that your ability may well have taken you into other ranks. You are unfortunate in that you associate with the Liberal Party where the fiddler is the composer, conductor and promoter.

Although I disagree with the political views of Sir George Jenkins, I have always found him to be a man of great ability. I received my limited education in his electorate and some of my relatives still reside there. The people in his district look upon him as a man possessed of kindly manners. I sincerely hope that his reward for his service to the State will be lasting good health. I offer my congratulations to the new Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Christian. He has taken over the reins at a most trying time when our ability to produce, on which our existence as a nation depends, is more important than ever before. The majority of our lines of rural production have failed to keep pace with the demands of our growing population. I will deal more fully with this aspect later. We know something of Mr. Christian's willingness to work and of his courage to follow his convictions, and we look to him with hope. Some members scorn the interest of metropolitan members in rural affairs, but many of us have a deep appreciation of the value of rural development. Many of us came from country districts and look forward to the day when we may return. We regret the circumstances which compelled us to come to the city. From us the new Minister may expect moral support if he produces evidence of a plan to increase the production of our primary products and assists in the marketing of them, as I believe he will.

I congratulate Mr. Pattinson on his appointment as Minister of Education. This is a matter in which I am keenly interested. With all respect to the immediate past Minister of Education—who I understand is ill, which we all regret—I confess it is only since the appointment of Mr. Pattinson that I have been convinced that the department is under the control of a Minister. For many reasons he faces a most difficult task. During and since the war there has been a rapid industrial

development in South Australia, due largely to the decentralization policy of a Labor Federal Government, with the assistance of the Federal Parliament. With the necessity to hold what it has been given, the State Government has been forced into providing fuel, power and water but it is charged with another responsibility, namely, of finding skilled labour, and I hope that I do not lack an appreciation of the difficulties. Those born during the years 1921 to 1926, and perhaps some even earlier, were caught up in the 1931-6 depression, were thrown on to the human scrap heap, and subsequently were called into the services. During this time economic conditions did not encourage the reproduction of the human race in great numbers. With the advent of war and the swift expansion of industry the shortage of manpower, due to the reasons I have just mentioned, became apparent and was met partly by the employment of aged folk. But for the first time thousands of young Australians found themselves enjoying some degree of economic security, even in war-time, and they were able to lead a more natural life, which resulted in an increase in the birth rate, and this became more apparent after the war.

These factors have brought about a need for some mighty changes in education methods and requirements. These facts were, I thought, brought out very forcibly by Mr. J. S. Walker, Superintendent of Technical Schools and Chairman of the Apprentices Board, when addressing the Australian Institute of Management late last year. He said:—

You people here need no reminding that in addition to the facilities I have just mentioned, an adequate supply of skilled workers is needed to set up and operate the machines and to perform the manifold tasks, including supervision and management, required in any industrial organization. This aspect is of particular interest at this time of the year when the annual outflow from our schools of young people eager to find their niche in life is about to begin. The term "outflow" is not inappropriate for I think of the young folk still in our schools as a reservoir, a reservoir of skill which, in a community hungry for skilled labour as it is for water, it is our duty to husband with even more care than we devote to our schemes of water storage and reticulation.

He went on to show the need for more schools and teachers, pointing out the great relative increase in school population that had occurred, being no less than 38 per cent in the last four years—possibly the greatest increase in any State of the Commonwealth. In 1930, 18 per cent of the total population were scholars. This

fell to 13 per cent in 1942, and it was not until 1950 that the 1930 percentage was again reached, with 136,000 scholars. This figure steadily increased and it is estimated that it will reach 200,000 by 1961. Prior to 1930, South Australia was essentially a rural State and consequently secondary education, and perhaps general education, was less necessary than it is today. Nowadays few children complete their school years without some secondary education. Only 4 per cent of scholars fail to complete grade VII, and 68 per cent go on to secondary schools for from one to three years. About 5,500 leave school annually. It is of interest to note that of about 2,000 boys who have high school and technical school education only about 8 per cent go on to higher academic studies. Almost 25 per cent go into clerical careers or the Public Service and about 40 per cent enter the skilled trades, most of them passing through the technical schools, whose aim is to prepare them for careers in industry. Thirteen per cent of the boys go into primary industries, only 4 per cent become labourers, and 10 per cent are not accounted for. The important thing to remember is that more than half the boys entered industry. I make these remarks in order to show that the difficulties of the Education Department are understood and appreciated, but this is the one department that can make or mar the future of this State by its willingness and ability or otherwise to provide the proper facilities to enable each child under its care to follow the calling for which his ability most suits him. I was very pleased to hear the Minister say recently that the Government would spend £7,000,000 on education, most of it on secondary schools particularly technical schools. This latter type is best suited to industrial areas. With sufficient of them and the assistance of a well equipped and fully staffed vocational guidance department industry and future employees would be greatly assisted in the contests for world's markets.

One other thing which I feel is of great importance and which the Minister would do well to consider carefully is to require every scholar who commences a year at a secondary school to complete that year. As things are many use the school as a convenient resting ground, as it were, awaiting an opportunity to choose their employment. Although I agree that it is the right of the individual to choose his own calling I feel that the Government should not be asked to waste the taxpayer's money by providing facilities that are not fully utilized. Many secondary schools, at the beginning of a

school year seek the allocation of staff and equipment to accommodate many more scholars than they have at the end of the year, and this leads to much dissatisfaction due to the rearrangement of staff, perhaps to the detriment of the scholars who remain. No doubt the Minister will do many things which we will approve of and some which we will not approve of, but if he continues in his present attitude he may feel sure of the sympathetic co-operation not only of members on this side, but of the entire staff of the department, school committees, councils and parents. I certainly hope that he will continue on the very high plane on which he has commenced so that when he hands over departmental affairs in 1956 to a Labor Minister they will be in much better shape than they are today.

I now propose to deal with a grave problem in our social life and one that could have far-reaching and ill effects upon the morale of our people. In recent years, in an endeavour to overcome the shortage of manpower, we have brought into this country many displaced persons. Let me make it clear that I have the highest regard for these folk who, if properly treated, will prove to be of great value to the country. However, the majority of them are males and as Australian women are reluctant to marry them because of language and other difficulties, as is only natural, they are unable to live a natural life and this is having a bad psychological effect. I am afraid they will unite into a mighty force and have an extreme dislike of us. To prevent them from gaining such an outlook they should be encouraged and assisted to bring their womenfolk to Australia in order that they may marry, have children, and live happily in a natural way. I realize that this may be a Federal matter but the State Government should refrain from encouraging any worsening of the position. The only way in which the State can be assisted is by the migration of the family unit, but I realize that would create greater problems for the housing authorities.

Here I want to express my appreciation of the work done by the Housing Trust. I do not suggest that every person whose case I have taken to the trust has been given a house, but it has at all times been helpful. It has done a remarkably good job and has been fair in the allocation of houses. Only one thing is needed by the trust and that is more houses. Last Thursday the Premier said that never in the history of the State had we been so well equipped with homes, but in reply



to a question by me at the time he acknowledged that there were 6,000 effective applications with the trust for emergency homes. Last year we saw an easing of the landlord and tenant legislation, but it resulted in many people who had been occupying homes for years being evicted. Owing to the attitude of the Government they have been denied consideration by the trust. Like other metropolitan members I have approached the trust on many occasions on behalf of constituents needing houses. We are told that it cannot allocate temporary houses because of Government pressure to supply them to Government employees. This private enterprise Government told us that it would not pay more than award rates to workmen because it would create unfair competition with other enterprises, yet it has created a trust to deal with housing and denied Parliament the right to direct it. The Government has gained kudos for having constructed houses for people in distressed circumstances, but it has been gained through unjust competition and by enticing people to the Government departments by allocating houses to them. We feel amazed at times when these things happen, but it is only another violation of the confidence of the people, and something we are accustomed to from a Government that is fond of setting up trusts and denying Parliamentary criticism of them.

I draw attention now to a matter which is in the news at present. There is considerable turmoil in respect to the proposed recreation reserve at West Beach, but I trust that out of the turmoil will come an agreement and the establishment of a necessary recreation reserve. Last session we passed the Textile Products Description Act, which today was mentioned by Mr. Macgillivray, and which has for its purpose the protection of the wool industry and the purchaser of the finished article. As a father and husband I feel concerned about a practice which has grown up in this State. I refer to the selling of articles that are sometimes packed in transparent packets and marked "Perfect." Some are ladies' silk stockings. I know that some are sold as seconds and unpacked because they are damaged, but others, supposed to be perfect, are sold in boxes or cellophane wrappers. They are priced from 12s. 11d. to £1 and more a pair, but when the covering is removed many are found to be damaged. The purchaser cannot return them or have his money refunded. When a shop assistant has to buy two pairs of stockings a week it is a mighty tax upon

her income. If it is possible for legislation to be introduced to effectively control this matter I suggest that the Government give it consideration.

Another important matter was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He spoke about our tramways system and the recent announcement to spend on it £6,000,000 over 10 years so that a fleet of diesel buses can replace trams and trolley buses, thus paving the way for the gradual demise of electrically operated street transport. In my district we have had experience of the replacing of trams by buses. The councils in the area are perturbed. In the absence of Mr. Fred Walsh I received from the Thebarton Council a very distressing letter. It explained the need for repairs to its roads through the lifting of tracks and complained about the bus services. There have been complaints also from the Hindmarsh Council and many of the residents in the area. They speak about the damage to roads through the lifting of tram tracks and also criticize the inadequacy and inconvenience of the bus services. It is well known that in order to get the same carrying capacity of a tram three buses are needed, and a bus has a much shorter life than a tramcar. Many of our present trams have been running for 30 years.

This matter has been ventilated in Parliament over a long period. Recently the Premier introduced legislation granting financial assistance to the trust. The sum of £450,000 was to be granted in one year, £350,000 in the next, and it was said that with the expenditure of £1,180,000 all would be well with the trust, but instead of £450,000 the trust received £700,000. We have been told that it intends to scrap the trams and replace them with diesel buses. I challenge members to show that any authority changing trams for buses has found buses to be economical. They have proved to be uneconomical and they cannot provide the same service as trams. We may be asked later to vote £6,000,000 to the trust for it to be poured down the drain. We have no assurance as to how the money will be spent. In a recent inquiry into the wages of employees of the trust it was established that about 50 per cent of trust expenditure went in administration. Will country members who champion private enterprise stand behind the Government in voting this further money to be squandered without Parliament having the right to direct how it should be expended? It is to be spent without Parliament having any control over it. Shame on the Government! The people were

glad to hear the declaration by Mr. O'Halloran that the Opposition would not support the voting of one more penny to the trust until it proves it can establish a system that will provide an economic service.

We know that the Governor's speech is prepared by Her Majesty's Ministers. In entering a protest against the way it is compiled I in no way reflect upon the present holder of the high office, but I have the greatest concern for the retention of Constitutional Monarchy undefiled, unbiased and unquestionably free from Party politics, and a centre of the British Commonwealth of Nations where members of all political shades can unite in common cause with equality of respect. The speech was prepared by a Government which, for a record period, has proudly clung to office by the retention of a vile, undemocratic electoral system, which is a child of the Liberal and Country Party and is cherished by its *de facto* parent, who seems to have little regard for the time-honoured system of Constitutional Monarchy established and retained by the suffering and sacrifice of the people. I invite the House to examine the Governor's speech. The Premier and his Ministers are like Little Boy Blue; they blew and blew about all the great things that had been done during the life of the Playford Government, but a study of their records will show that they have "blued" and "blued." In effect they say, "Have a look at us, the wonderful L.C.L. Playford Government" and then they add "The inflationary factors in our economy have been brought under control. Aren't we good?" Actually, it is stranger than fiction. A few days later the Prime Minister at a Loan Council meeting gave the game away and warned against the danger of the elements of inflation in our midst, and said that they must be arrested. A month later on July 13, we find our Premier addressing the jubilee conference of the Dairy Factory Managers and Secretaries Association and saying "We must do all we can to avoid the position of the late twenties when people bought land regardless of cost. Future prices of primary produce cannot possibly give an adequate return for today's exorbitant land values." Does this make it appear that the inflationary factors in our economy have been brought under control? Of course not. The Government knows that inflation is out of control and this is largely due to the advocates of the State Liberal and Country Party, the United Australia Party, the Nationalist Party or the Liberal Party—any name will do when they want to forget the party. The wrecks of

the twenties will again be with us unless we secure a Government of courage with the interests of Australia at heart, or another world war, the latter undoubtedly only a temporary solution which could even destroy our civilization.

I am concerned because the South Australian Government is willing to use Her Majesty's representative to say something which it wants citizens to believe, but a few weeks later says in the clearest possible language that that is incorrect, not having the slightest consideration of the effect it must have on the retention of Constitutional Monarchy. I am deeply concerned about the need for the retention of this Monarchy, and the effects this present attitude might have upon this wonderful system which has kept us so united for many generations. The Governor's speech continued by claiming credit for the Government for Divine goodness for excellent spring rains, making it possible for a harvest of 29,000,000 bushels of wheat and 28,000,000 bushels of barley. When I heard those remarks I became somewhat irate, because I had ascertained that in December, 1953, the estimated harvest was 27,000,000 bushels of wheat, 24,000,000 bushels of barley and 4,500,000 bushels of oats, a total of 55,500,000. To check the figures I rang the Statistical Office and was amazed to hear that no official figures were available, so I do not know where the Premier got his totals. So, how wonderful is the Creator in giving us a good season to balance the deficiencies of the Government, which, it appears, with the aid of good seasons and the advance of science, is able to secure a production of cereal food per head of the population equal to that of 1938-39. As rightly stated by the Leader of the Opposition, the Government would have been faced with tragedy but for a run of exceptional seasons. During the reign of this Government we have seen a rapid decrease in the number of landholders and in the acreages sown to wheat. We must have a good look at the position before we start giving it credit. We find the member for Mitcham amazed that after the long reign of this Liberal Government we still have much virgin scrub which is being rapidly developed. I have the highest respect for the Minister of Lands, with whom I discussed this matter. The land in question is being cleared on Kangaroo Island and I suggest that this is not in the best interests of settlers. I consider that the money being spent on this work and on the transport of equipment is much more than

would be necessary to develop land on the mainland and the difference in cost would be sufficient to build two bridges across the Murray when the land came into production. Also, it would have allowed us to abolish the black-fellow method of transporting people and goods, as referred to by the member for Mitcham. The Government's policy has denied city dwellers the use of many tons of stone fruits from river areas, and thus deprived growers of the reward of their labours.

I consider that our ex-servicemen have been used to develop undeveloped parts of the State which will be to the ultimate advantage of the land barons. Is it reasonable that all this money should be spent in a locality lacking proper transport facilities when we have square miles of land in the South-East held in single units in areas far and above the needs of the owners, which could be improved and made highly productive? After our men on Kangaroo Island have toiled to develop their farms they will find themselves in the hands of the North Terrace and King William Street bushrangers, who will reap the harvest of their sweat. If these settlers are not supplied with frequent and cheap transport they must become insolvent. The essence of economic farming is the availability of markets at the proper time. It is amazing that the Government should have had to develop land on Kangaroo Island when there are thousands fewer people in South Australia holding land than when the Playford L.C.L. Government first took office, yet it is claimed we must retain the present set-up to foster rural development and which provides that one-third of the Parliamentary representatives shall be from the metropolitan area, the remainder from country districts. Despite that I question whether one metropolitan member of the House lacks appreciation of the necessity for country development. It is strange that in 1938 46 per cent of the population resided in the country and 54 per cent in the metropolitan area, whereas after the long reign of the present Government we find that less than 39 per cent are living in the country and more than 61 per cent in the metropolitan area. In this House the Labor Party has urged a policy of decentralization which would increase production, expedite the delivery of goods to markets and provide more and better roads and transport facilities. Hundreds of our ex-servicemen could then be settled to their own benefit and in the interests of the State's advance, and not in the interests of the banks, shipping companies, etc. Labor stands for more roads, more feeder

services to railways, and more direct routes to markets. Such a policy is necessary if we are to satisfy the many who want to go on the land. It is no idle claim to say that many of our lads in school today would take up land if they could be sure of economic security. This policy is not new in the Labor platform for it gave birth to the great Snowy River Hydro-Electric Scheme which will make possible the cultivation of an additional 2,500 irrigated properties and associated industries producing £25,000,000 of primary products annually. Every time the Party advances the policy of decentralization, however, members opposite jump to their feet and recite verses that they now know by heart, referring to this Government's record in land settlement and water and electricity reticulation throughout the country.

Having taken part in last year's debate on a proposed steel works at Whyalla, I was intrigued to read, in the *Hansard* report of that debate, what Government members had to say about the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. While none but a fool would deny the value of that pipeline, or the advantage of its further extension to other districts, all sensible people know the truth: the legislation that made possible this project was framed merely to benefit the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. However, by emphasizing the incidental benefits provided by the pipeline for country people, every effort was made to smother the way in which the B.H.P. benefited from it; but the fact remains that the primary producer was, as usual, only the secondary consideration in Liberal policy. Further, electricity for the country is a joke that could be laughed at if it were not so serious. I draw members' attention to a remark made by the Premier in introducing the Electricity Trust Bill in 1946. He said that the policy of the Liberal Party was the stimulation of country development and a wider distribution of population by means of decentralization of industry, increased incentive for land settlement and the provision of essential facilities for modern civilized life. True, electricity has been taken to some country areas—but at what cost! Today the farmer using electricity supplied by the trust is paying anything up to 100 per cent surcharge. Is this aiding economic primary production or decentralization? No man can be expected to take up the land unless he is assured of economic security and production that will provide a reasonable profit, but present circumstances make it almost impossible for a man with

limited finance to enter into rural production without proper Government assistance, which the Government has failed to give him.

Members of the Government argue that our present distorted electoral system is based on a desire to assist in the decentralization of industry and population, but South Australians, by their vote in last year's State elections and this year's Federal elections, have shown that they would disown this Government if given the opportunity under an equitable system. Progress, economic security, and increased rural production can only be obtained by the return of a Labor Government—a sane Government—in this State, but this Party is at a great disadvantage because of our undemocratic electoral system. I trust that the desires of the great majority of South Australians will be given effect to, that those who have suffered and died for the cause of democracy shall not have died in vain, and that this State, under Almighty God, shall see a new birth of freedom with the restoration of government of the people, by the people and for the people. I support the motion.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—I, too, support the motion. I was sorry to hear some of the ill-advised remarks of the previous speaker, for I do not suppose there is a legislature anywhere else in the world where conditions are made easier for private members to speak as long as they wish. In this place there are 39 members, one of whom is the Speaker who does not address the House from the floor. This leaves a forum of only 38 members, and, if a member cannot find enough time to talk here, I do not know where he would find it. During my time in this House the gag or any other restriction has been rarely used.

Mr. Hutchens—I did not mention the gag.

Mr. BROOKMAN—No, but the honourable member complained that he had been denied the opportunity to speak last Thursday when he had his name down to do so. The custom in such debates as this, however, is that a member may put his name down with the Speaker, and, when I asked the Speaker, last Wednesday, to put my name down on the list for this debate, the name of the member for Hindmarsh was not down; therefore, if the list had been followed, I might have followed the member for Burnside, but I told the Speaker that anyone else who wished to speak before me might do so. Members will see, therefore, that it must have been as late as Wednesday evening or Thursday when the member for Hindmarsh decided he would like to speak, and his complaint that the Premier

got the call on Thursday, before he did, is most ill-advised, because Mr. Hutchens can speak when he likes on anything that comes before the House. The custom is for a member to get the call from the Speaker, and there is no rule as to the order of speakers. The member for Hindmarsh also discussed the happy position of the State's finances, as it was expressed by the Premier, and pointed out that the Premier had attributed a great deal of this improvement to the increased revenue from succession duties. Although I consider these could be reduced, I do not think the Premier, in his speech, was gloating over the fact that those rates were one cause of the improvement in our financial position.

Mr. Macgillivray—In other words, you don't think people die to please the Premier?

Mr. BROOKMAN—I don't think the honourable member was right in saying that a senior member of this House found pleasure in seeing men die. The member for Hindmarsh has a funny way of taking a statement out of its context, putting it with a statement from a page or two further on and arriving at a wrong conclusion. His statement on this occasion was typical of the exaggerated statements he is accustomed to making.

In opening the Session, the Governor said South Australia is having a good season, and that is true. The results from our primary production have been particularly good over the past few seasons, but the Leader of the Opposition has repeatedly mentioned that we may expect less favourable seasons in the future. I do not deny that, because since 1944-45 we have experienced no major climatic disaster, but from time to time certain districts have had bad seasons. For instance, the Adelaide Hills had one last spring, and landholders there felt it more than the 1944 disaster. South Australia covers a wide area, and it must be remembered that merely because one district has a good season it does not necessarily follow that all other districts have good seasons. All markets for our primary products are to some degree uncertain. Winemakers and potato growers are experiencing difficulty in selling their products. In the past potato growers have not been able to obtain high prices because of price control. Potatoes are now in considerable over-supply; many tons are being sold at prices far below the cost of production, and large quantities are rotting because they cannot be distributed at once. Each week more have to be discarded because of deterioration. The wine industry is not able to dispose of all its products; I

sympathize with it, but we could help to some extent by assisting sales within this country. It is very easy to say that we should increase our exports—in other words, to push the problem back on the industry to sell overseas, but we are further away from the United Kingdom than any other wine exporting country, and our home market could be considerably improved by permitting sales in more liberal ways. It is a pity that there is such a lot of propaganda against wine in this country because its moderate use is much less harmful than the immoderate use of tobacco. We should tackle these problems, for the wine industry is an important one.

Sir George Jenkins recently retired from his portfolio as Minister of Agriculture and I would like to congratulate him on his very distinguished record in that office. The department has improved very rapidly indeed during the past few years, and we can be proud of it. Recently I have travelled in other States, and if the work done by corresponding departments is analyzed it can be seen that we have nothing to be ashamed of. The department has been looking ahead and has a large number of thoroughly enthusiastic officers who are able to talk intelligently with farmers. These men have a spirit of service and courtesy that is an example to other departments.

In the Governor's speech it is mentioned that increasing numbers of graziers are running small herds of beef cattle in conjunction with sheep, and last season the beef cattle in South Australia increased by 29,000, or by approximately 15 per cent. This has been brought about largely as a result of the department's policy of suggesting to farmers that they carry more beef cattle. Although a sound policy, I believe that it has been pushed a little too far and some people believe that beef cattle can be carried on their farms without reducing the sheep carrying capacity, which is incorrect. An average beef cow running with calf at foot consumes the same amount of pasture as 20 sheep, although some people in this State believe the figure to be lower. Mr. A. C. T. Hewitt, a Master of Agricultural Science employed on the animal nutrition staff of the Victorian Department of Agriculture, has recently published a book containing a table of stock equivalents. This can be used only in a general sense because these matters cannot be compared exactly. He used as his unit a merino wether weighing 100 lb. and stated that a beef cow with calf at foot eats approximately the same as 20 wethers.

Mr. McAlees—The beef would not pay as well as sheep, would they?

Mr. BROOKMAN—Certainly not. Mr. Hewitt states that a crossbred ewe after its lamb is weaned is the equivalent of one wether, from mating until lambing it is equivalent to two wethers, and from the time it lambs until the lamb is weaned is the equivalent of three wethers. That works out on an average of approximately  $2\frac{1}{2}$  wethers per crossbred ewe throughout the year.

Mr. Hawker—That means that cattle are equal to 10 dry sheep?

Mr. BROOKMAN—It would bring a cow with calf at foot to the equivalent of eight crossbred ewes or 20 wethers. Beef cattle eat much more than people think, and there are exaggerated beliefs that it is possible to carry beef without endangering sheep production.

Mr. Quirke—The point is that beef cattle cannot be carried on sheep pastures.

Mr. BROOKMAN—They cannot satisfactorily follow sheep on a pasture. It is important that this State should have available adequate supplies of store beef, and the department is to be congratulated on its moderate and constructive approach to the problem of pleuro-pneumonia. Instead of being thrown into a panic it is patiently and thoughtfully trying to solve the problem of cattle coming down from the Northern Territory possibly infected with this disease, which would undoubtedly have a severe effect if it started to spread here. It has been very difficult to get store cattle in some of the higher rainfall areas because the important dairying districts have excluded the possibility of getting Northern Territory cattle. The matter has been handled well; in a year or two the problem might be solved completely and anyone in the State might be able to get store beef from the north. That is as it should be because it is better to breed the cattle on cheap land, and then bring them down to the high price land areas to be fattened for the market.

Recently, whilst travelling in the eastern States, I was impressed by the great strides made in scientific work in the field of agriculture and I urge the Minister to keep up to the minute with the investigations that are going on so that farmers can have the results made available to them at the earliest opportunity. In the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization laboratories in New South Wales a great deal of investigation is being made on sheep feeding methods in drought areas. The development of feed with a very high protein ratio to permit stock to eat

what seems to be useless roughage is one experiment that will bear fruit. Giving beef or any ruminant a diet containing a very high protein content so stimulates the digestive bacteria that they can be fed rough sun-bleached and rain-washed grasses normally considered useless. That might have a big economic effect in this State, and so far the results have been encouraging. Experiments have also been conducted by feeding urea to stock. That could be a cheap source of nitrogen, one much cheaper than the ordinary vegetable protein. Should the experiments be a success they will have a big effect in helping South Australian farmers to carry more stock. Experiments with urea have been conducted in America for some years, though they were begun in Australia only recently.

Last year, by speech and question, I raised the matter of the dissemination of agricultural information. I asked the Premier whether it would be possible for the Agent-General or one of his officers to periodically write letters to South Australia on the latest developments in agriculture in the United Kingdom. Before the war, I understand, the late Sir Charles McCann used to write letters that were given wide publicity. They contained all the latest information and were extremely valuable. I asked the Premier whether similar letters could again be released to the press or published in the *Journal of Agriculture*. The last reply I had from the Premier was that he had given instructions that the Agent-General be written with this in view, but I do not know what has happened.

Mr. Macgillivray—The *Chronicle* has excellent agricultural reports.

Mr. BROOKMAN—The private journals are doing a good job, but they could be helped considerably by the department.

Mr. Macgillivray—There is another excellent journal in Victoria.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Yes, and in New South Wales there is an agricultural paper that publishes the latest information. They are all of great value to the farmer. I wish to stress the value of adult education courses in agriculture. I think adults learn more quickly than children, especially if they voluntarily take courses in which they are very interested. I was greatly impressed by the lasting influence of the Wingfield rural training courses held after the war for prospective soldier settlers. The courses lasted less than three months, but the information settlers obtained has stood them in good stead. Apart from what they learned, they now know where

to look for further information. I wonder whether more adult courses in agriculture should be established in this State. Years ago farmers' schools were held at Roseworthy. They lasted for only a few weeks, and if further schools such as those held at Wingfield, were conducted they would act as refresher courses and would be most valuable to farmers. If held at the right time of the year they would attract many students.

Mr. Hawker—They would bring the farmers up-to-date information.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Yes. It is easy for farmers, especially those working long hours with little time for reading, to get out of touch with modern methods. I congratulate the member for Glenelg on his promotion to the Ministry. I have already had experience of the keenness he has displayed as Minister of Education, and I am confident he will make a great success of the portfolio. The main thing worrying parents in the country, in regard to education, is the transport of their children to school. Some parents say that the buses carrying their children are not satisfactory; others say that the bus goes too early and returns too late; still others say that the bus does not pass their door. One sympathizes with them. If the bus does not pass near the house the parent has to drive the children to school. With the consolidation of schools in the country we have rather passed the day when a child could be sent to school on foot. Even in the old days, when more schools were dotted about the country, it often meant a long walk for the children. I think that the Government has saved considerable money by consolidating schools and establishing transport services, but I wonder whether the money saved has been spent on improving the transport of school children. Where would the department be today if it still had all the old schools? I believe that the consolidation of schools has saved much money.

Mr. Macgillivray—Especially with the high salaries paid to teachers today.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I should think so. I do not think the saving is being devoted to improving school transport. It seems that the parents have a good case for saying that more money should go into it. I realize that the Minister must attempt to keep costs within reasonable bounds and that in making agreements with contractors he must be careful to be consistent. I know, too, that the department is up against difficulties because it cannot have all its vehicles in one place or

depot as other transport organizations have. I appreciate all these difficulties, but we must improve school transport in the future. Again and again in the country one finds problems cropping up. Transport problems occur because the number of children attending a particular school increase or decrease suddenly. A small bus can take only about 12 children. If two married couples without children leave a district and two others move in with large families the additional children alone require a bus for transport. That often happens. Transport requirements are not only difficult to predict but constantly changing. I urge the Minister to persevere with his plans for transporting children to school. Some children have to meet the bus before 8 a.m. I know of an unusual case where secondary school children have to meet the bus at 7.5 and do not return until after 5 p.m. After their evening meal they have to do homework. These children will be sitting for the public examinations, and naturally their parents are worried because their only alternative to school bus transport is for the parents to take the children themselves at considerable personal expense. I desire to congratulate two members of another place. I am sure all members here appreciate the great work that Sir Lyell McEwin has done for South Australia, and we are particularly pleased that he has been honoured by Her Majesty. I also congratulate the Hon. N. L. Jude on his recent appointment to the Ministry, and I wish him every success.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—I join with other members in commending the Government for appointing two extra Ministers, one in this Chamber and the other in another place. I feel sure that we will benefit from those appointments. It is particularly pleasing that the portfolio of Minister of Education has been restored to this Chamber as it is a step in the right direction.

All members appreciated the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh. I am sure that none of us, in our younger days, visualized that the day would arrive when we would have the pleasure not only of seeing but meeting Royalty. Mount Gambier was the first town Their Highnesses graced in South Australia and I am privileged to say how happy not only Mount Gambier but the entire South-East was on that occasion. I congratulate all towns in the South-East which co-operated so well in making that visit such a distinct success.

The organization which came from all quarters in the South-East and from neighbouring towns across the Victorian border made it a day which will long be remembered, not only by older people but by the children. South Australia's effort was magnificent. We must give great credit to one man in particular—Mr. Pearce—who was in charge of arrangements and did a wonderful job. In connection with the visit to Mount Gambier, he went to that town on two or three occasions and was most helpful to the mayor and other officials. We must congratulate all officers and members of the police force. During the visit I never saw a policeman without a smile. They co-operated and were pleasant in directing the public. The school demonstration was a magnificent effort. On the evening of the State Banquet I was privileged to have sitting near me the detective from Scotland Yard who accompanied the Royal Couple on their tour. He said that in all his travels he had never seen anything to equal that demonstration. That is fine praise.

One of the finest tributes I heard in reference to Her Majesty was made by the Leader of the Opposition in supporting the Premier at the banquet. He said that Her Majesty was the symbol of British womanhood. I do not wish to weary the House but would like to quote from a copy I received of the "Mothers in Australia and New Zealand" magazine referring to Her Majesty's visit. The first extract is from the *Sydney Morning Herald* and reads:—

It is true that respect for the Crown has never been greater. Respect must be earned, not demanded. That respect has been earned by the individual wearing the Crown.

The second extract, from a correspondent in Cairns, reads:—

It seemed to me to be realized that the British Crown, as worn by the simple wife and mother, is less a symbol of earthly power and glory than the outward sign of a power not derived from victorious armies but from the only Ruler of princes. She holds dominion not merely over sea and palm, but over hearts and minds.

That, we discovered personally, to be very true. The final extract states:—

No other crowned Sovereign in history has said 'I dedicate my life to service' and given proof that it was meant.

Before I proceed to discuss matters which affect the State I desire to make a personal explanation concerning a question I asked on June 8 relating to whether a doctor had the right to refuse to attend a patient when called upon. The doctors in Mount Gambier have

taken my question up in no uncertain manner and I have received from them six registered air mail letters. My question was prompted by information that was voluntarily supplied to me and was strengthened by a similar case in the city also reported voluntarily to me. In the press of June 8 and 9 were references to two cases in New South Wales. When I asked my question I had no doubts whatever about the genuineness of the story told me. Imagine my surprise and disappointment, after writing my informant and asking him to supply in writing the case as he had stated it verbally, to receive a telegram—"Let all matter drop. Sorry". That was a complete withdrawal of the information he gave me.

On June 22 I wrote the Chief Secretary requesting a full statement regarding this case. I received a reply on July 16 and it provided an entirely different version from what had been supplied to me. It revealed that no blame could be attached to any medical practitioner or other officer connected with the case. My motto, throughout my life, has always been to avoid doing any injustice to any person. My question was prompted by information given to me as a genuine case for investigation. There was never any intention by me to reflect upon the medical profession in Mount Gambier. I believe that in Mount Gambier we have a complete set up in the various branches of specialized medicine. I make this personal explanation with a view to removing any suggestion as a result of my question, which could have been implied as derogatory to the profession.

Referring to land settlement, one of my pet subjects is the Eight Mile Creek area. It is a part of soldier settlement that must still be watched and nursed. Can the Minister of Lands tell me how many settlers have voluntarily left their holdings and how many have not fulfilled the conditions of settlement and been removed? The problems in the area are not found elsewhere. It is a settlement which must be dealt with on its own, and with careful handling it will prove a great success.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Is there any high land?

Mr. FLETCHER—Yes and it has been a blessing. The high land was subdivided and allotted according to the production of the various blocks. The settler who had a fairly productive block did not get the same acreage of high land as the settler with a less productive block. Every settler has a piece of high land.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Was that the position originally?

Mr. FLETCHER—The high land was supplied after the original allotment. The drainage of the area should not be controlled by the South-Eastern Drainage Board, and in saying that the Lands Development Executive should control it I cast no aspersions on the board. The executive should have the task of keeping the drains clear and knowing how the water has affected the various blocks. I have travelled with the Minister of Lands and Mr. Corcoran over many of the soldier settlement areas in the South-East and I was agreeably surprised at what has been done. The Lands Development Executive has done a fine job in bringing into production thousands of acres which otherwise would not be developed. This new country will not prove successful in development unless the settlers can continue to use superphosphate. When fixing the annual rental all settlers should keep in mind that there will be an annual added cost for superphosphate. The development in some of the better areas has surprised me. I have not seen anywhere else the germination of rye grass that has taken place in one block; the adjoining block contained no growth at all.

Thousands of acres are still undeveloped, and despite what the present settlers may say the time is not far distant when the Government of the day will have to take undeveloped land from the holders. More use for developmental purposes could be made of the wonderful equipment of the Lands Development Executive. Holders of large undeveloped areas should be able to use the plant possessed by the executive. It started off with secondhand plant, but during the last few years it has acquired larger and heavier types of clearing machinery. The Government should undertake the clearing of the undeveloped land and make it as productive as the land where the soldiers have been settled. A number of roads have been built in the locality by the executive, and they are the equal of any roads constructed by the Highways Department. It has also attended to the arrangement of housing and the use of buses for taking children to school. It would be a tremendous benefit to members if a Parliamentary visit could be arranged to some of the settlement areas I have mentioned. It would show the types of land approved by the Land Settlement Committee for settlement purposes. Sewerage is a serious problem facing some of our country towns and it must be tackled adequately in the near future.

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



Mr. FLETCHER—Insanitary conditions exist in many country towns, but in this respect Mount Gambier has been fortunate in that a satisfactory sanitary system has been provided by Nature. All that is required is the digging of a pit until the underlying sands are reached, and there one's troubles end. However, that state of affairs does not apply to the centre of the town and as a result most big business premises, hotels and guest homes have no more sites on which to sink additional pits for the disposal of sewage. Provision is being made for the installation of a small plant at the hospital and also at the new Reidy Park School. I was more or less opposed to this, but on an explanation by the Minister of Works I can now see the wisdom of introducing this system because the ordinary septic system would be unequal to the demands of the new hospital which will cater for a staff and patients numbering 450, and the same applies to the Reidy Park School. However, the installation of such a system would not solve the town problem, and the same can be said of other towns which have sought a sewerage system and had their problem inquired into by the Public Works Committee. The Government should immediately see if some relief can be given to the bigger country towns where, if a menace does not already exist, it will in the near future.

Suggestions have been put forward that taxation should be reduced because of the Government's satisfactory financial position, but my argument is that if the present water rate is not sufficient to recoup the department the public should have to pay more. Because of the hospital problem also, taxation should not be reduced. Much publicity has been given by the press recently to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I shall not say there is not justification for many of the complaints, but the same position also applies to many other hospitals. Despite the glowing report of the State's financial position given by the Treasurer during this debate, are we fair to ourselves in asking for a reduction of taxation, knowing that many of our hospitals are crying out for modernization? That view may not be palatable to everyone, but I do not think we can continue handing out all the time. We cannot provide for these institutions on a 1939 income with 1954 costs, and the sooner we wake up to that the sooner we shall get somewhere. Last year I asked the Premier a question regarding the Lord Mayor's Cancer Fund, for which public subscription was being sought, and the

following information was supplied by Mr. Geoffrey Clarke, M.P., then a member of the committee:—The anti-cancer fund stands at £102,791, and of this amount £100,000 has been invested in Commonwealth 3½ per cent stock, which falls due in 1964. None of the money has been spent. Negotiations for the purchase of a 4,000,000 electron volt linear accelerator from Metropolitan Vickers of England are nearing finality. The cost of this machine will certainly exceed £60,000. No doubt such a plant is urgently required at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but if one arrived tomorrow where could it be put? There is no building available on the present site. We have at the head of this department at the Royal Adelaide Hospital one of the best men in the Commonwealth. Provision should be made to house this equipment, but I do not know where any more buildings can be placed on the present site unless some of those already there are demolished. I should like to see other provision elsewhere until such time as we can make room for modern buildings and equipment there. Rather than reduce taxation, which I claim is not hurting anyone, we should continue at the present rate and improve conditions at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and at country hospitals, which are just as short of accommodation as the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

The Premier has stated that amendments will be made to our Town Planning Act. I have studied the Victorian Town and Country Planning Act and discussed it with the Premier and the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, but so far without any success. The time is long overdue for similar legislation to be introduced here. At present it is impossible for a country council to plan for the future because there is no power to direct that a building shall not be erected in a certain position because it might be required for the widening of a road or some other purpose. Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the 8th Annual Report of the Victorian Town and Country Planning Board state:—

Many of the wide powers and duties under the Local Government Act are, in the opinion of the Board, further extended by the Town and Country Planning Acts. These wide powers are necessary for a responsible authority during the preparation of planning schemes and in their implementation after approval.

As councils are responsible for the issuing of building permits, the approval of plans of subdivision of land and many other forms of development, they are in a position to more satisfactorily protect planning proposals during the preparation stages of a scheme than an authority which has limited special powers.

Paragraph 10, to which I draw special attention, states:—

There have been no claims for compensation for prejudicial affection during the operation of the 59 interim development orders at present in force in Victoria.

The reason for the absence of claims for compensation is largely due to the fact that those affected by a planning scheme have been gradually educated to the progressiveness and the necessity of such schemes. The board, since 1946, has carried out investigations in Hamilton, a town of a size comparable with Mount Gambier, and special attention has been given to a railway level crossing on the main road, which has been a deathtrap and the cause of many fatal accidents. Efforts have been made to overcome the present traffic bottleneck and to provide additional means of ingress to and egress from the town. These are typical problems being dealt with by this board under the Victorian Town and Country Planning Acts, and Cabinet should consider taking similar steps in this State and including the necessary provisions in the Bill that has been forecast by the Premier. Attention should also be paid to the fact that in Victoria the planning for the city of Melbourne is carried out under a separate authority.

The member for Hindmarsh said that buses had short lives compared with trams, but, although I am not an expert in this matter, I have been impressed recently by the unsatisfactory state of the roads along which trams run. It would be interesting to know the comparative costs of maintenance of roads along which trams and buses run, for I believe that tramlines, especially in wet weather, are a trap for water, which seeps through where the rail joins the bitumen and gets under the road. I consider a bus would be easier on the road and necessitate lower maintenance costs.

Mr. Hutchens—The Thebarton and Hindmarsh councils have had experience of both and claim that the buses are doing far more damage than the trams ever did.

Mr. FLETCHER—I would not think so, for I have seen tram tracks in Hindmarsh which, in wet weather, are little rivers; whereas a properly constructed road carrying buses would not sustain such damage, because the water would not be able to get into a properly sealed road.

Mr. Hutchens—The Unley Council objected to buses replacing trams, as they claim that the road would not stand up to the buses.

Mr. FLETCHER—Possibly because, in that case, the buses would not be running in the middle of the road, and I agree with the council that the roads would be damaged by buses proceeding along the edges of the road. I will deal with other subjects as they are brought up during the session.

Mr. TRAVERS (Torrens)—I support the motion. His Excellency's speech recorded a year of fine achievements by the Government, and it is confidently forecast that those good works will continue. The Government is entitled to be congratulated on the fine work it has done. I propose, however, during the course of my remarks to refer to a few matters which need attention and which, in my humble submission, should be attended to promptly. I join with other members in tendering congratulations and good wishes to my old friend, Sir George Jenkins. I have known Sir George longer than I have known any other member; he and I were both northerners and, as long as I can remember, in political circles his has been a name to be reckoned with. He has a long and proud record; he is a capable, conscientious and likeable man. I wish him—as I am sure everyone else does—happiness, contentment, good health and long life as a private member.

There were some matters in His Excellency's Speech on which a word or two should be said. Firstly, it is a matter for gratification to note what was said about the state of complete employment. That can disappoint only one section of the community, the section that, unfortunately, insists upon calamity howling, making appeals to fear and hatred, and introducing class warfare into every discussion. It has been encouraging to read the record of all branches of rural industry, of land settlement and of road building. As a former member of the Electricity Trust, I compliment my former colleagues on the trust on their excellent work. Notwithstanding the size of South Australia and the great distances over which transmission lines must be taken, South Australia compares more than favourably with all other States in the reticulation of electricity.

His Excellency spoke of the astonishing record of home building in South Australia, and, from figures given, it would appear that the trust started and completed in each working day of the year no less than 14 houses—a whole street each day. The Government can well be proud of this achievement. Perhaps one of the most outstanding achievements referred to in His Excellency's Speech is the proposed pound for pound subsidy towards the provision of homes for the aged and the

allocation of £300,000 for that purpose. Many people feel heartily grateful to the Government for what it has done in this respect.

I now turn to a subject with which the Premier has already dealt; I hoped we had heard the last of it, but the member for Hindmarsh returned to the field. The Leader of the Opposition said:—

Whatever the measure of stability achieved in this matter, and it is not a great measure, it has been achieved entirely at the expense of the workers.

It is a very great pity that anybody should make such statements and ask people to accept them when the facts belie them. When I made my first speech in this House last year I said that I would talk in the main on matters of which I had personal knowledge; I propose to do so now and speak on matters that are completely inconsistent with the absurd statement that stability has been achieved at the expense of the workers. I ask the House to consider some of the things that have happened in the last 15 years from the viewpoint, firstly, of those who have been referred to as the workers, presumably the manual labourers, and secondly, of the legal profession. That is not because I have any special brief to mention the legal profession, but because I know the facts relating to it. No-one in this House has a greater respect for the dignity of labour than I, and no-one is more keen to see a workman well paid for his labours, with two or three provisos—the first is, of course, that the money is there in the industry, the second is that he shall give a good account of himself and do an honest day's work, and the third that all matters be kept in proper perspective and proportion, because there has been a very definite tendency to get some of these things out of focus so that some people who bear no responsibility at all are being paid a great deal more than those who bear considerable responsibility. That is something that can only damage the country's economy, and it should be watched carefully. Socialist supporters have succeeded to such a large extent in their levelling down objective that the alleged tall poppies of Jack Lang's day have gone and all incentive to do what in olden days was called "bettering one's self" has gone, because good money can be earned by the manual labourer without accepting any responsibility and without any training. Let us look at the worker to whom Mr. O'Halloran referred when he was able to quell those crocodile tears about the matter, and then at the legal profession over the last 15 years. I invite those members who are

engaged in other avocations to make a similar examination in their own fields and see if a similar result is not shown. In 1939 the basic wage was £3 18s. a week; today it is £11 11s. and, as the Premier pointed out, the average in fact paid is £16. I am content to take the minimum of £11 11s., yet even the unskilled labourer has some margin today. Fifteen years ago the worker worked 48 hours a week; today he works 40—at least he is scheduled to do so. Fifteen years ago the worker, upon whose back it is alleged by the Leader of the Opposition the Government has ridden to prosperity, incurred a great risk of unemployment, but today there is no such risk. Looking at the matter from that viewpoint it can be seen what an unfortunate situation arises from making statements of the type made by Mr. O'Halloran. A committee was set up within the legal profession to inquire why students were no longer entering the profession, and a finding was reached after due inquiry. A questionnaire was circulated to members of the profession to ascertain why it was no longer favourably competing with the rewards that industry had to offer young men. This, and the finding of the committee, revealed some interesting and disturbing facts, because both showed quite clearly that men were not entering the profession because of greater rewards offering in industry to labourers or artisans of various types. Some of the facts revealed are worth mentioning. In 1939 the population of this State was 596,000. Today it is 775,000, an increase of 33½ per cent. In 1939 there were 300 practising lawyers, and one would naturally expect a third increase in their number. However, there has been no increase at all. With the increase in population, the rewards to working men have been such that people are being lured away from the professions. Any country that has a weakened legal profession of necessity will have, in due course, a weakened judiciary, and any country with a weakened judiciary is simply on the way out, because it is a fundamental of all British countries that a strong judiciary is essential. In 1934 there were 116 under-graduates in law at the University. In 1953 the number had fallen to 67, so that it can be seen that the rewards offering for the young men are heading not very slowly, but very surely, towards robbing the professions of the men who formerly entered them. Another fact revealed by those inquiries is that in South Australia the ratio of lawyers to population is the lowest in the Commonwealth with the exception of Western Australia

Let us now look at the working hours and see what the story tells. In 1939 the average hours worked in the legal profession were 43½ for 49 weeks a year, and the labourer 48 hours a week. Today the labourer is working 40 hours a week and the average in the legal profession is 48. This complete reversal is for the patent reason that young men are being attracted away by what they can be paid and are being paid elsewhere. The answers to the questionnaire further revealed that those earning the top incomes in the legal profession were averaging 66 hours a week.

Mr. Riches—Are you suggesting that young men have deliberately gone into industry rather than law when they have had the opportunity of studying law?

Mr. TRAVERS—Yes, and that was the finding of the committee. If they choose law their education is paid for. There is hardly a man at the University paying his own way. These boys are lured away by the high wages offering in industry. A boy desiring to enter the legal profession has to do about four years at a secondary school beyond the compulsory school-leaving age, followed by about five years at the university. That means nine years of extra study in order to qualify, yet the committee found that about 20 per cent of practising lawyers were making a net income of less than the £16 a week to which the Premier referred. Furthermore, the committee found that many fully qualified lawyers were employed by legal firms and were being paid less than £11 11s., the basic wage for a labourer, because the industry could not afford to pay them more. So much for those who suggest that the community is in some way riding into prosperity on the labourer's back. No-one is more keen than I am to see every man paid a decent wage, as much as industry can pay, but no one deplores more than I do this loose talk that goes on, this appeal to class hatred, this suggestion that someone is trying to cash in on the labourer. He has never been better off in his life. In England the basic wage, as far as one can state one for England, is about £8 a week. There is a different system there, and it is not quite possible to put one's finger on the base rate, as here. However, that £8 a week is about half what we were told by the Premier was the average rate here.

Mr. Hawker—£8 sterling, or Australian?

Mr. TRAVERS—That is the payment in England, where sterling has nothing to do with this question, because I am dealing with comparable incomes in England, but there is a

different perspective there. Let us see how the tall poppies fare there, and compare their lot with that of their corresponding numbers in Australia, where socialistic levelling out has taken place. The lowest paid member of the British Cabinet is paid nearly double what the Ministers of South Australia are paid. The highest paid member of the British Cabinet is paid nearly five times as much as our Cabinet members. The English judges, who are doing precisely the same sort of work and exercising similar jurisdictions as South Australian judges, are paid 2½ times as much as our judges. I suggest that we are tending towards a somewhat lopsided economy in South Australia. Apart from the complaint made by the Leader of the Opposition having no substance, it can be written down as an extremely unworthy appeal to a sense of greed or fear which ought never to have been made.

When I spoke on the Address in Reply last year I referred to a matter which, in my submission, was in crying need of attention, namely, the question of prisoners not being bailed during trial. I have made inquiries elsewhere and taken the trouble to look at the conditions under which these men live while they are undergoing trial. I say definitely that this is a matter which calls for No. 1 priority in Governmental attention. I am not now referring to the type of case that takes, perhaps, one day, but to the type that is involved and takes a week or a fortnight, as many do, and in which the accused is not admitted to bail. I feel there are some facts that the House and the public should know. In the first place, it is true that the matter is within the discretion of the judges to grant bail in a given case if they wish to, but it is equally true that over the years a rule of practice has been built up by reason of which bail is never granted unless for some special reason, such as illness, and the net result is that the citizen accused of a criminal offence and being tried is kept in gaol throughout the trial. I suppose every member knows a number of citizens who have been charged and acquitted, but who have gone through the experience of being kept in gaol during a long trial. There is legislation dealing with the giving of bail in a court of summary jurisdiction and legislation dealing with the giving of bail upon committal for trial. The rules of practice which have grown up for the refusal of bail during trial will only be altered by legislation, because these rules of practice become as strong as rules of law.

There may have been a time when considerations of border hopping would apply to the question of bail, when a person charged with an offence might hop across the border and there would be great difficulty in getting him back, but the border no longer presents a problem today.

I have heard it said that sometimes juries are squared. Has anyone ever heard of a prisoner himself attempting to square the jury? The accused himself would not undertake it, if anyone would. If there were any risk of that other countries would have experienced it. Let us consider the plight of a man charged and not being granted bail. He is taken to the court and waits for his case to come on. He probably hears an address or a summing up in the case preceding his, and he hears someone express in magnificent language that every accused person is presumed to be innocent until he is proved beyond all reasonable doubt to be guilty. Then he is handcuffed and hustled into the Black Maria and the court adjourns. He is taken away in company with convicted criminals—derelicts of various kinds—to the gaol. Let us have a look at what happens there. I want to make it quite clear that I am casting no reflection on any of the staff or administration of the gaol. No one would say that they have been other than courteous and competent in working under the system that operates. My remarks are directed solely at the system. If the accused gets to the gaol before 4 p.m. he is immediately locked in a cell, and if he gets there after 4 he is immediately locked in the cell, 4 o'clock being the lock-up time. He is locked up from 4 p.m. to 8 a.m.—16 hours straight in a cell. That is the lot of a man who is presumed innocent, a man who is undergoing the greatest ordeal of his life, in circumstances in which he needs solace and comfort if ever a man did. He needs every aid to enable himself to carry through the trial. What reason on earth can there be for subjecting a man to these indignities? Let us consider his rations. The first night his ration is 1½ lb. bread, 1oz. cheese (which I think is about one cubic inch), and 2oz. jam (about a dessertspoonful). That is his total diet. That would put a man in great fettle to defend himself! The cells are contained inside a wall about 18ft. high. Each cell is about 7ft. by 10ft. The accused may sit upon the floor or balance, if he can, on a canvas hammock. There is no ventilation, except for an opening of about 2ft. 3in. by 1ft. 3in. above the locked door. Over that is a fixed metal sheet

in which are round holes of a diameter of about ½ in. There he stays for 16 hours.

Mr. Quirke—There are no windows in the cell?

Mr. TRAVERS—No. There is a little peephole in the door through which he may be observed in his despair.

Mr. McAlees—Is there no light, or books to read?

Mr. TRAVERS—I think if he has the spirit to read he can ask for a book, and I suppose he gets it. For ablutions he is given a tin dish to wash in. The crowning indignity of all is the toilet arrangement. There is a bucket in the cell which has to be used in answering any call of nature whether it be the major or minor operation. The bucket remains there for 16 hours during which time he has two meals. We come next to the question of what happens on subsequent days and we find that the prison regulations are worthy of inspection. It would appear that a person who has not been in gaol in the morning, but who surrenders at court and is only brought to the gaol after the day's adjournment, is considered to be "late." Under the heading, "Diet" are set out three classes. The first relates to hard labour prisoners and prescribes their dietary allowance, the second, to light labour prisoners and the third to "solitary and late" prisoners. The man who is presumed innocent is apparently considered one who should be on a similar ration to the man in solitary confinement. Does anyone ever look at these things or consider them? Does anyone make it his business to know them or is the public to be forever subjected to them without anyone giving them any consideration whatsoever? There are some further matters in these regulations which will bear close inspection. Regulation 378 is not without its interesting side. This is what happens when a man arrives:—

Every article on a prisoner's person on admission shall be taken away from him or her.

He has the comfort of knowing that the regulation provides that an inventory shall be kept of those things. Regulation 384 provides:—

Prisoners awaiting trial or not convicted of a crime may send and receive letters at reasonable times, provided that the gaoler may withhold any letters to or from a prisoner and lay such letters before the comptroller for his decision.

Regulation 386 prescribes what this man, who is presumed to be not guilty must do. It reads:—

The beds of such prisoners shall be made and the cells, wards and yard in their occupation shall be swept and cleaned every morning

and the furniture and utensils appropriated for their use . . . . .  
presumably the bucket included—

. . . shall be kept clean and neatly arranged by such prisoners themselves unless otherwise ordered.

To supplement that, I refer members to section 46 of the Prisons Act which provides that no prisoner of any class—and the definition includes the people I have been talking about—shall not do a variety of things, included among which is “smoke at unauthorized times.” If he does, section 47 provides that the controller or a visiting justice may examine any prisoners touching any such offences, and may order any prisoner so offending to be punished by being closely or otherwise confined in a dark or light cell. I hope that no one will imagine that I am criticising the treatment of convicted prisoners. I suppose convicted prisoners, if they are to undergo punishment, must expect some of these hardships. All I am saying is that in this year of grace people who are not convicted, people who will not, in many cases, be convicted, and people who are falsely charged, ought not be subjected to such indignities and it is a disgrace to a community which will permit it.

Mr. Macgillivray—Why don't you take steps to alter that state of affairs?

Mr. TRAVERS—I am taking steps as fast and vigorously as I can at this minute.

Mr. Macgillivray—You told us this a year ago.

Mr. TRAVERS—I did and I am saying that it has not been altered and it should have been.

Mr. Macgillivray—Then why don't you do something about it?

Mr. TRAVERS—I have examined these conditions and I have also made inquiries. Somewhat comparable conditions apply in New South Wales. I have a letter from one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Victoria as to the Victorian system and an excerpt from his letter reads:—

Except in capital cases, bail is invariably granted until all the evidence is taken.

I have also consulted one of the leading criminal barristers of Victoria who told me the same. If it is good enough there, why isn't it good enough here? I have also spoken to the Tasmanian Crown Solicitor about what occurs there. They have a system whereby a man who is committed for trial enters into bail to attend at the trial and from day to day during the trial. He does not have to enter into a new

bond at the trial, although it is within the discretion of the judge to impose further conditions if he wants to. I have a sample of the bail form which is used there. I have it on the authority of the Tasmanian Crown Solicitor that, in his experience, no one has ever absconded. I also took the trouble to write to one of the co-editors of the Australian Law Journal who is now in London engaged on the section 92 appeal to the Privy Council. I asked him to make extensive inquiries as to the practice there. Portion of his reply reads:—

The normal practice is for bail to be granted during trial if the accused has been on bail pending trial.

Unlike Tasmania, they take a fresh bond for the criminal court and a man is on bail during the currency of the trial. I suggest that the practice elsewhere and the circumstances to which they refer strongly indicate that this matter must receive urgent attention here. When these things are brought to the notice of the Government I would imagine that some official steps ought to be taken in relation to them. Last year I also referred to the altogether inadequate accommodation at the Supreme Court. During the year £50,000,000 was expended on Government undertakings in South Australia and there was a surplus of £1,800,000 but not one penny was spent on remedying the conditions to which I referred last year. There is urgent need for a room in which counsel may confer. Extremely important issues are very often decided in conference and I suppose as many cases are settled as are fought to a conclusion. Counsel must go into the passageway and struggle with papers in their hands while talking about the issues to be settled. They stand in a draught with their clients and confer. Those conditions should not be tolerated for one minute and quite frankly I did not think, when I drew attention to them last year, that the Government would tolerate them.

There is also urgent need for a room in which the accused may be interviewed. Only those who defend accused people appreciate this urgent need. I happen to be one of those people. On many occasions when counsel has to interview an accused person he must go into the cell and sit on a table and rest his papers on the table while writing and taking notes. That ought not to be. Furthermore, there is no provision for a witness room in the Supreme Court. There are greater facilities in out of the way country courts which have jurisdictions

of up to about £30 than in the central courts of this city. It is high time that the position was remedied.

Mr. Stephens—There is a witness room at Port Adelaide.

Mr. TRAVERS—Yes, but witnesses at the Supreme Court have either to sit around on forms at the top of the stairway or outside on a small balcony which is not a particularly entertaining place in cold weather. There is no provision for them to sit in comfort while waiting, sometimes for days, to be called to give evidence. I sincerely hope these things will not be overlooked because after all, as I have said before, one of the basic needs in any community is a sound and proper judicial system. There will not be a sound and proper judicial system if accommodation is not provided. The judicial system will not be held in proper repute if people are subjected to lack of comfort.

There are one or two other matters which I suggest should receive early attention. There are three things to which I shall refer in the Justices Act. In recent years a practice has grown up, which did not exist previously, of a court refusing to hear a submission that there is no case to answer. The court, in so refusing, has been following a decision of the English courts. Until a few years ago, if the prosecution's case was weak and insufficient, a defending counsel would make a submission that there was no case to answer and if the court agreed, that was the end of the matter. The practice has grown up that such a submission will not be heard and the defendant has therefore to wade through the useless procedure of calling all his witnesses before the matter can be argued. If he does not do that he must decide, at his own peril, not to call any evidence. That position demands attention as it is in the best interests of justice that an accused person, or the counsel defending him, should be able to make these submissions as in earlier days.

Mr. Shannon—Does it occur only in justices' courts?

Mr. TRAVERS—No, in magistrates' courts, minor criminal courts. Another matter needing attention concerns the Children's Court. There is a provision which no doubt was all right when passed but it has outgrown its usefulness. A child—that is anyone under 18 years of age—convicted of felony cannot be fined more than £5. The only alternative is to release the child or send him to a reformatory, and I venture to say that many a child

has found himself in a reformatory because the court has not had adequate power to punish him. Nowadays many young lads nearing 18 earn good money and a penalty of £5 is absurd. That stands in urgent need of attention because the court needs sufficient elbow room to impose a proper penalty if it thinks a fine should be inflicted. Another matter which should be dealt with is the position that has arisen from the amendment of the Justices Act in 1943. Prior to that time the Act said in plain terms that no complaint shall be for more than one offence. Accordingly the accused stood to be convicted of one offence or acquitted. In 1943 an amendment enabled the inclusion of a number of charges in the one complaint. That is all right and I do not question it, but it carries with it, as experience has shown, what I suggest is an unforeseen and unfortunate result because an accused person can be convicted of two offences on the one set of facts. Take a charge under the Road Traffic Act of driving dangerously and a charge of driving without due care. The one set of facts is produced and the Court is called upon to find whether those facts are proved and to convict the man on the two charges. The obvious solution is to follow the provisions that have been in the Lottery and Gaming Act for some years. They permit of multiple charges in a complaint but say that there shall be a conviction for only one of the offences. A man can be tried and even if the court decides that more than one offence is proved there can be a conviction for only one. It is wrong to have two convictions on the one set of facts.

Another matter is in relation to the Marriage Act and the Matrimonial Causes Act. If a party to a marriage is convicted of bigamy the position now is that the injured party has still to go to the court to apply for a decree of nullity. There should be a provision that if a court convicts for bigamy the decree of bigamy should be registered and have the same effect as a decree of nullity. If one court convicted a man for bigamy and the application for nullity failed there would be a difficult problem to solve. In any event why should the aggrieved party have to go to the court a second time to spend money in applying for a nullity?

I want now to refer to another matter with a little hesitation, not as to the merits of the case but as to the desirability of intruding into domestic tribunals. I want to refer to courts of appeal as they are called in both

racing and trotting. I suggest that both the racing and trotting authorities ought to provide a proper court of appeal for those who are disqualified and if they do not do so within a certain time the Government ought to consider legislating on the subject. I put it expressly and deliberately in that way. In these domestic tribunals the less Governmental interference there is the better, because people who are engaged in the particular sport presumably have a knowledge of the rules and are prepared to accept them. Racing and trotting have grown to enormous dimensions. Let us look at the turnover shown in the last report of the Betting Control Board. For the year for the totalizator it was about £2,500,000 and for the registered bookmakers about £25,000,000. Racing and trotting have reached the stage where many people make from it a livelihood as trainer, jockey or in one of the other capacities required for carrying on the sport. Let us look at the system which obtains. It may not be important to some people but to those who make a livelihood from the sport it is important that they have a proper means of dealing with a grievance.

In both sports the stipendiary stewards watch the race and have the power to observe what goes on, to call before them any one they suspect and to hold an inquiry. It is an unusual sort of trial but it is the only thing practicable. In effect it is the policeman who is the judge. So far I have no complaint, but both bodies have set up appeal tribunals and they are in no sense satisfactory. What happens is this. The stipendiary stewards, against whom the appeal is brought and who are in essence the prosecution witnesses, do not give evidence at all, and the one who represents the appellant has no opportunity to ask them a question. They are beyond the reach of question and cross-examination. Not only that, but they do not give any evidence and the court simply assumes from the start that the tribunal acted rightly. That is all very well but the court ought to know on what evidence the tribunal acted, and there is no provision for taking the evidence. The appellant is subjected to cross-examination, but the other party is completely beyond the reach of question. What story the stewards acted upon, what they saw or what they thought they saw, no-one has the right to ask. I suggest that in the days when the two sports were perhaps of less dimensions than they are now, and when there were not so many people making a livelihood from them, one could stand

by and see that sort of thing happen and make no complaint, but in these days when the livelihood of so many people and reputations can be adversely affected, and indeed destroyed, by the findings of tribunals there ought to be proper tribunals. On appeal the steward who said, "I saw so and so happen" ought to say it before the court of appeal and he should be available for cross-examination.

Mr. STEPHENS—Do you think the appeals should be open to the press?

Mr. TRAVERS—I certainly do. It is a healthy thing in any court. It is the underlying principle behind all British courts that they should be open courts. I do not suggest that legislative action should be taken in regard to courts of appeal at present, but the trotting and racing bodies ought to put their house in order and bear in mind that if it is not done in reasonable time they will have no complaint if someone else moves for the bodies I have envisaged. I wholeheartedly support the motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I endorse the remarks made by Mr. Travers with regard to accused persons on bail and the necessity to grant bail to people accused before the Supreme Court. The honourable member has done a great service in bringing this matter to the notice of the House and the public. It is a grievous wrong which ought to be speedily remedied. It should not be believed, however, that I agree with the major part of his address, because I do not. He sought to support remarks made the other day by the Premier when he tried to place the situation of this State and its future in an extremely rosy light. He saw the position through rose-coloured spectacles. He said that everything was for the best in this best of all possible worlds—South Australia, that nothing was wrong and that what the Leader of the Opposition said was so much poppycock. In recompense for these glad tidings supporters here and elsewhere have sung him paeans of sweet praise as though he were Demeter, Jupiter Pluvius and Priapus rolled into one. He quoted certain figures and Mr. Travers has referred to one of them. I was surprised to hear the figures given by the Premier, who said:—

The average wage for male adults in South Australia today is £16 a week. A year ago it was £14 17s. In other words the average wage has increased by £1 3s. in 12 months.

I am afraid the Treasurer has got his figures slightly awry. I inquired where they came from and he said from the Government



Economist and invited me to get in touch with that gentleman to find out the origin. Apparently they came from the last Quarterly Summary of Statistics as at December, 1953, and applied to the average weekly wage paid and also earnings, compiled from payroll tax returns. A large number of people have payroll tax paid in respect of them—company directors, for instance, and people in senior positions such as executives—those with very large incomes. The actual figure for December, 1953—the last figure available—was not £16 a week, but £15 16s.

Mr. Pearson—Are you sure that is where the Treasurer got his figures?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am certain.

Mr. Pearson—On what authority?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I rang the Government Economist (Mr. Seaman) at the Treasurer's request and he informed me that is where he got them. The figure for the previous December quarter was not £14 17s., but £15 6s., so in fact it shows an increase for the 12 months of 10s. The Leader of the Opposition was not talking about all income groups, but about the workers.

Mr. Dunks—What is meant by worker?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Normally when a member of the House refers to a worker he means the ordinary wage-earner, and that is what the Leader of the Opposition was referring to.

Mr. Shannon—I think the Treasurer meant people in employment.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In that case he deliberately misunderstood the Leader of the Opposition's words. There is another table published by The Commonwealth Statistician covering industrial wage-earners. This shows the weighted average weekly normal rate for the ordinary wage-earner for South Australia as at December 31, 1953, was £13 18s. 9d., whereas the previous December figure was £13 14s. 6d., an increase of 4s. 3d. From the first pay period in the November quarter of 1952 to the same period in the following year there was an increase in the cost indices of 4s. a week on the basic wage regimen, so in fact the total increase to the ordinary wage-earner for this 12 months was 3d. a week, and not £1 3s. Those figures show precisely what the Leader of the Opposition said—that the stability attained over the last 12 months has been at the expense of the worker—because basic wage quarterly adjustments had been pegged. The basic wage earner has suffered, but the men who had some little margin have suffered more. The

real value of their wages has been steadily decreased and the figures for the whole of employment in South Australia, taking in all the people for whom payroll tax is paid, show that the upper level bracket has increased enormously. It must have done to make the average increase 10s. a week instead of 3d. There has not been this levelling down that Mr. Travers was talking about, but a levelling up. The rich have got richer and the poor have got poorer. Mr. Travers' principle that from those who have not it shall be taken away, and to those who have it shall be given, has been given ample effect to in the last 12 months. His remarks concerning comparative returns for employment are somewhat far-fetched. The questionnaire he speaks of disclosed that the top level incomes in the legal profession amount to about £4,000 a year, which to me seems a pretty adequate return for a 48-hour week of which he complained. I am not one to decry an adequate return from legal fees—I should not be a member of the profession if I did—but my memory of the results of the questionnaire is that young people are not entering the legal profession owing to the difficulties of a young attorney in search of a practice because the older members of the profession have all the lucrative business—all the regular business needed to provide the basis of office overheads—sewn up. It is very hard for young men to break in, as I know to my great expense.

Mr. Dunks—What about the bottom level?

Mr. DUNSTAN—It would be an average of about £1,000 a year, which is not too bad compared with £13 18s. 9d. a week. It certainly is not as good a return as in some professions, but I do not think there should be quite the distinction in income levels as Mr. Travers seems to think there should be.

Mr. Dunks—Does it mean that the legal profession is over-manned?

Mr. DUNSTAN—As a matter of fact most legal offices are pretty busy, but it is hard for the younger men to break into this busy business. I shall refer to two aspects of our State administration which appear to me to be vital to the future of South Australia. The first question is that of education. The recently appointed Minister of Education is doing his best in this difficult portfolio, but it appears to me that nothing will be achieved in respect of educational problems unless it is with the sanction of the person who holds the purse strings. Those purse strings must be loosened before these problems are solved. It

has been disclosed by numerous reports on education, and recently by the Director of Education (Col. Mander Jones) in *Education News*, published by the Commonwealth Office of Education, that South Australia has had by far the largest percentage increase in school enrolments since 1948 of any State. In fact, South Australia experienced a 47 per cent increase between 1948 and 1953, and, as the next highest figure was 33.2 per cent, the educational problem is far greater in this State than in any other. We are faced with an enormous increase in students. In 1946 59,884 pupils attended South Australian primary schools; by 1952, 82,099 attended; in February, 1954, 99,021 and that figure will be increased by the second intake this year. The number of students in our primary grades increased by 22,215 between 1946 and 1952, and during that period the number of teachers increased by 351. As the number of untrained teachers was 311, the increase in the number of trained teachers over that period was only 40. In 1946 there was a ratio of 25.8 pupils to one teacher and the Commonwealth Office of Education and education administrators all over the world recognized that 1946 standard as the one beyond which classes must not go. That ratio, however, is a little unreal, for in many small country classrooms there were fewer pupils per teacher, consequently the metropolitan classroom density was between 35 and 40 pupils to each teacher.

The official ratio of pupils to teachers had increased to 31.1 by 1952, which meant a proportionate increase in metropolitan classroom density. If the Education Department were merely to hold the 1946 position, it needed new teachers at the rate of one to every 25.8 pupils, but since 1946 63.2 pupils have been added for every one teacher, and 555 pupils for every one trained teacher. That the department was fully aware of the position is shown by the 1950 report of the Minister of Education, which states:—

If the 1950 ratios of pupils to teachers are to be maintained, a net annual increase of 200 to 300 teachers will be required for many years. The annual loss of teachers for the last five years has averaged 272. From 500 to 600 new teachers will therefore be required annually. As will be seen from table 3C, teachers newly appointed or re-employed in 1950 numbered 445, while those lost to the service numbered 314. The net increase was due chiefly to the large number of temporary teachers engaged during the year, the majority of them married women who returned to the service. Of the 225 new temporary teachers, 77 per cent were certificated or classified . . . After a period of about 20 years in

which the total number of pupils in secondary schools and classes changed very little, a period of rapid expansion has set in. There was an increase of 800 pupils in 1950, and within 10 years it is expected that present numbers will be doubled.

Further details of these expected increases were given in the 1951 report of the Superintendent of Primary Schools, which showed the following estimated primary school enrolments:—1952, 87,000; 1953, 95,000; 1954, 100,000; 1955, 105,000; 1956, 110,000; and 1962, 130,000. It is obvious that, on its record since 1946, the Education Department has not the faintest hope of providing teachers for this number. Instead of the 200 to 300 teachers needed each year, according to the Minister's report, the number increased between 1950 and 1951 by only 121. By 1952 alone we had only 2,670 teachers in the primary schools, compared with a requirement of 3,182; we were 512 teachers short. Indeed, if we disregard the 311 unclassified teachers, we were 823 short. In his 1950 report the Superintendent of High Schools stated:—

There was a steady decline in high school enrolments from the year 1944 until 1949. A definite upward movement started in 1950, and figures for 1951 already disclose a rise of over 500 in the metropolitan area and 300 in country centres. It is anticipated that there will be a similar increase over the 1951 figures at the beginning of 1952. Figures given by the research officer show a secondary school population of 11,900 in 1950, 12,900 in 1951, and an anticipated increase of another 1,000 in 1952, with a continual rise to 18,000 by 1956.

That was the original belief, but, in fact, by 1954 we have already enrolled 17,621, so by 1955 we will have well over the 18,000. The report continues:—

Thereafter the rise will go on until a total of some 26,000 is reached by 1962. Although these estimates may be regarded as rough indications or trends, it is significant that within the next ten years the secondary school population in this State will nearly double itself. One thousand extra secondary pupils require over 30 secondary trained and qualified teachers, and this additional number will be required each year over and above annual normal losses which in high schools alone average over 20 per year. In any one year we obtain as teacher trainees approximately 20 per cent of the students who gain their leaving certificates.

That percentage is not entirely accurate in the picture it gives, as I will show later.

In 1951 the Superintendent of High Schools reported:—

It is anticipated that similar numerical increases will take place each year for at

least the next six years, and already figures for 1952 indicate that our high schools are carrying 860 more pupils than in 1951. . . . Staffing problems are perennial; the past year proved no exception and the new year is being faced with some anxiety. . . . The high wages offered to young people make it difficult for them to defer employment until they obtain higher academic qualifications, and this is probably the real reason for the abnormal loss at Intermediate and Leaving levels.

Between 1946 and 1952 the pupil-teacher ratio in high schools remained at about 19, but this figure was maintained only because of the failure to implement the rise to 15 years in the school-leaving age. It was estimated that school enrolments would be increased by 25 per cent if that rise in the school leaving age had in fact occurred. With 18,000 pupils in secondary schools it follows that we need double the number of teachers than in 1952—that is, we need an extra 500 teachers, and we will need them next year. It takes four years to train a secondary school teacher at the Teachers' Training College. The teachers obtained to relieve the 1956 position were admitted in 1952, and there were 41 of them. Added to expected graduates of the Teachers' College in the years up to 1956, a total of 117 is provided, without allowing for resignations and normal wastage (which would be about 20 a year) and 500 are needed. What can be done? It has been suggested that to make up the teachers' numbers the high schools would rob some primary schools of degree and diploma holders, but I do not think that would be very satisfactory in view of the primary school position that we are already facing.

Let us now consider the recruiting position. When the Education Department is criticized for failing to recruit enough teachers the usual reply is that of those who take the leaving certificate each year 20 per cent enter the teaching profession. That is contained in a report from the Education Department. However, many teachers are recruited at the intermediate stage and to obtain a proper picture of the ratio of those entering the teaching profession compared with those going into other professions we must look at the numbers going into the intermediate and leaving classes each year. On the 1952 figures, of those who left public schools 276 entered the public service, or 20.5 per cent, other clerical work 485, or 36.1 per cent, and according to the Minister's figure 138 or 10 per cent of the intermediate and leaving classes entered the teaching profession. The Education Department must

realize that in recruiting at the intermediate stage it is unrealistic to offer the present allowances. They are due of course to the purse strings, and I cannot blame the Minister for that. The boy who decides to accept a professional studentship at the intermediate year can look ahead to getting £45 or £55 a year at 16 years of age if he has a leaving certificate, whereas the salary paid to those of the same age in the Commonwealth service is £369, Broken Hill Proprietary Company, £388, State Public Service £351 and Goldsbrough Mort and Company £313. At 18 this boy will be paid £55 a year when his friend in the bank will be getting £477. At 19 when he enters the Adelaide Teachers' College he will receive £250, and at the same age the bank salary is £440 and the Commonwealth Public Service £524.

Mr. Riches—If he is in the country how can he live?

Mr. DUNSTAN—He cannot, and he still has four years of study if he intends to become a high school teacher before he can get £761 at 23, whereas a bank officer of the same age, with little inconvenience and little study, is getting £790. By this method we are placing a premium on a sense of vocation. We should provide comparable rewards for teachers if we are to make adequate provision for our young people. There has been a scheme for recruiting emergency teachers, but I do not think it has been very successful. In 1951 the report of the principal of the Teachers' College stated that of a group of emergency teachers, ". . . before the end of the first term, six had resigned, with a seventh in August. Two men found the requirements and practices in even Flinders Street School unduly exacting; one apparently promising man had a bad nervous breakdown; one woman just disappeared; one man was persuaded by a league football club that he would be unwise to continue a course of training which would lead to a country appointment; one man left because he could not support his family unless he added a full-time job on a lathe to his training course; another man resigned on our clear advice. Seven of the original 14 remained to complete the course." Another step taken was to recruit teacher trainees and women teachers in the United Kingdom, and at the moment I understand there is a departmental officer in England seeking recruits. The Minister has also pointed out that the results of this scheme have been disappointing, but I feel that it was foredoomed to failure because it was obvious as long ago as 1951 that it could not succeed.

In 1951 the Superintendent of Primary Schools reported:—

Since the beginning of 1948, 88 women have been recruited in the United Kingdom, 58 resigned, serving an average of two years two months although their bonds were for three years. Three of those who resigned were married and were employed as temporary teachers.

We have to face the fact that conditions in England are pretty well as good as here, and in some cases better. There is also a very great shortage of teachers there and the possibilities of our recruiting added teachers appear to me to be pretty slight. We must face up to the fact that in the Education Department we must pay better rewards to teachers and provide for accommodation in country areas so that girls going from the Training College will not face a period of living in unsatisfactory boarding conditions. We must also level up the amounts paid to teachers as compared with other occupations, and of course embark on a recruiting campaign. The Education Department has not a recruiting campaign of the magnitude that would be considered necessary in a normal small scale business, and recruiting is largely left to secondary schoolteachers themselves.

Mr. Riches—Why not make it possible for a country child to become a school teacher?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I agree. We have to provide adequate allowances to see that we get recruits from the country areas and anywhere else we can obtain them.

Mr. Riches—Why not have a branch of the Training College in the country?

Mr. DUNSTAN—I do not know whether that outlay would be justified. I have not considered the matter. When I raised this point last year the member for Unley took me to task and said, "The honourable member for Norwood is talking through the back of his neck because we are now spending very much more on education than we spent a few years ago." That is quite true; however, looking at the amounts expended on education as compared with the fall in the value of money will return a fairly instructive answer. In 1946 there were 59,884 pupils; the cost per pupil was £14 9s. 2½d.; the net expenditure was £879,491; and the basic wage was £5 2s. a week. I think the basic wage is a fair index of the real value of money. The State budget was then £17,253,039. In 1952 there were 82,099 pupils; the cost per pupil was £30 7s. 7d.; the net expenditure was £2,531,680; and the basic wage was

£11 9s. The State's budget was £48,076,000. Although there had been a considerable increase in the expenditure per student, an increase of 110 per cent, the increase in the basic wage in that period was 126.3 per cent. In other words, although we have spent more money we have not spent more in real value on education. The money we have spent is not a true indication; we must take the real value of money. In fact, the real value per student spent has declined from 1946 to 1952.

During that period we were faced with the greatest increase in school enrolments in Australia—47 per cent for both primary and secondary education. Therefore, with great respect, when we look at the purse strings we can see that something more has to be done with regard to education if we are to begin to cope with this great problem of providing sufficient teachers and accommodation for our school children. The State budget increased between 1946 and 1952 by 184.4 per cent, compared with an increase of only 110 per cent in the amount spent per child, so the actual share of the State budget for educating children has declined. We must remember to deduct a sum of £220,531, because that was the cost of transport services, which must mean a decline in the amount spent on other items in the Education Department. This sum was not spent in 1946, but it is now. That decreases the proportion of money spent on the other items of the Education Department's budget. Therefore, the comparable value of the services has clearly declined. The problem is clear, but the solution has not yet been provided. I think the only solution is the provision of much more money for education. This may mean raising a special loan for educational purposes to tide us over the period of swollen school populations through which we are now going. Something has to be done urgently, or we shall have a severe breakdown in our education services.

I have previously spoken about my dismay at having an organization, such as the Tramways Trust, which is not directly responsible to Parliament. The trust, since its inauguration, has brought down a policy of providing buses instead of trams. Apparently, this is a policy matter which is not one for Parliament. It is not featured at any length in any of the trust's reports, but it is a matter of vital importance to the average citizen. We shall be asked, in the next Budget, to provide an enormous sum for the trust, although we have already provided hundreds

of thousands of pounds before. It doesn't seem that this practice will cease for some time. Members on this side are concerned to get much more adequate information about the trust's plans before we shall vote another penny for this institution. I am indebted to the trust for its house journal, which is one of the things that we pay for with our grants—though I consider it normally a useless paper—but it published an article which showed, as the trust's reports do not, what precisely were the reasons for favouring buses instead of trams. I am not an engineer and do not pretend to know anything about traction engineering, but most of these matters are not in relation to traction engineering but to general policy. It states first that "passengers prefer the modern bus." It may be that the average passenger prefers a double decker bus to the old bouncing-billy trams, but I do not think for a second that the average citizen prefers a modern bus to a modern tram.

Mr. Hutchens—Particularly if he cannot catch a bus.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Exactly, and I will come to that in a moment. I know from the people in my area what they think of present-day buses compared with trams built in 1924, but of course, considered against a modern tram such as the President's Conference committee car, there is no comparison. The Tramways Trust also claims that "buses can be operated more economically." I have not seen any figures on this from the trust, but I am indebted to the Victorian Government for the report of the Melbourne and Metropolitan Tramways Board to the Victorian Minister of Transport. This report was dated July 24, 1953, and it was signed by R. J. H. Risson, the chairman of the board. It contained a table showing that modern trams were paying and that modern buses were not. The board made a profit on its tramways services, but a loss on its buses. The report was most informative, and I shall read a few extracts, as follow:—

A major consideration in the board's decision to change from buses to trams is economy. At present 83 buses and 158 crews are needed to run the bus services. An equivalent service can be run with 55 trams and 102 crews. Operating expenses are roughly in the same proportion. Their difference in favour of trams is offset appreciably by the higher capital charges (interest, depreciation and sinking fund) on the cost of tramway construction at today's inflated costs. There remains however a distinct advantage in favour of trams. The present bus service is not popular with the majority of passengers. Some of this may be due to

the roads the buses have to run over: unless a tramway is built they are likely long to remain as they are—or get worse. It has been suggested that some is due to the quality of the board's buses: that is not agreed: most buses on the routes are the best and most modern obtainable. In short, buses can carry Bourke Street traffic: they are doing it. But passengers do not agree that they do, or can do, it satisfactorily. And the board is not prepared to argue otherwise. Trams are more dependable than buses. At present the number of "pull-ins" (that is breakdowns sufficiently serious to necessitate taking the vehicle out of traffic) per 100,000 miles is 24 for trams and 160 for buses. Indiscreet though it might be to say this publicly, trams can carry an overload for a brief period more efficiently and with less discomfort than buses. They can clear an abnormal crowd more quickly. The traffic in Bourke Street is heavy enough to warrant trams. Surprising though this may sound at first, trams ride more smoothly than buses. They ride on steel wheels running on smooth steel rails, whereas buses, however well sprung, ride on road inequalities and transmit them to the vehicle and its passengers. It is noteworthy that one can always read a newspaper in a tram but never properly in a bus. Trams depend for power on locally developed electricity; buses, on imported fuel. Trams run on steel wheels wholly produced in Australia; buses, on tyres and tubes of imported rubber. The last two points might be of major importance in times of war or lesser international tension. There are no unpleasant odours or exhausts from trams; it is alleged that there are from buses.

It cannot be disputed that there are odours from diesel-driven buses.

Mr. Riches—Have they any P.C.C. trams in Victoria?

Mr. DUNSTAN—They have an adapted type. In comparing modern trams with modern buses it has been established that running costs are lower per passenger mile for trams. At the moment it is probably true that our trams have a higher running cost, but the reason is obvious: our trams are antiquated. The D-class bogie cars, numbered 121-170 and 191-194 were built in 1911; the E1 class bogie cars, numbered 101-120 were built in 1910; the F class drop-centre cars, numbered 201-284, were built between 1919 and 1924; the H class inter-urban cars, Nos. 351-380—on the Glenelg line—were built in 1930 and the H1 class inter-urban car, of which there is only one, No. 381, was built in 1953. That is the total of our tramways rolling stock of trams. We are comparing those trams with a fleet of buses which comprise the Arizona built in 1936; the Leyland, built in 1942; the Leyland "Canton" built in 1942; the Sunbeam, built in 1953; mixed diesel motor buses built between 1934 and

1947; Ford petrol buses built in 1946 and AEC Regal Mk. III diesel buses, built between 1949 and 1953. That fleet of buses is far more modern than the fleet of trams and we are asked to compare running costs. We need not have had such antiquated trams had it not been for the policy of the trust to discontinue building them.

It is clear from the last report of the trust that we had parts for the construction of a fleet of H1 inter-urban cars, but they were written off at a figure which was fairly low. I understand from other sources that the cost of writing off that rolling stock will amount to about £600,000. That appears to me to be an extraordinary situation when investigations have shown that the comparative costs, once the initial outlay has been made, favour trams. The convenience and comfort of the travelling public is always in favour of tramway operations. The trust suggests that buses aid traffic flow in congested cities. It would require more buses than trams to carry the public. It would take 3½ single-decker buses to carry the equivalent of the average tram. People can be shifted more swiftly by means of trams. It was also suggested that buses are generally speedier and more mobile. The P.C.C. tram, as compared with modern buses, has a greater rate of acceleration and is more speedy. Another suggestion is that "buses mean fewer accidents." I disagree with that contention entirely. I do not think that trams cause more accidents than buses. A tram runs on a predictable route and it is obvious that a person can see where a tram is going and can see it coming. It is much easier to deal with a tram in traffic than a bus. It was also suggested that "buses confine expenditure almost entirely within the sterling area." I point out that we have to import oil and rubber from overseas. The trust also states that buses eliminate costly tracks and overheads. It is true that tram tracks do cost a lot, but at the moment we are shifting the cost on to the municipal councils because they will have to maintain the roads. In Brisbane they are retaining trams which they prefer to buses. In a letter the manager of the Brisbane City Council Transport Department states:—

Here in Brisbane a high proportion of our track is laid in concrete, on which maintenance costs are very light.

The final point the trust makes in relation to buses is:—

They have more reliable fuel supplies, strategic war-time uses, and so on.

In a war there would not be a reliable fuel supply. We are developing electricity supplies in South Australia at a great rate, but we have not yet, despite all the speculation, discovered much in the way of oil supplies in Australia. I personally believe that we must rely on the fuel supplies we are certain of, and we are certain of an electricity supply. I have outlined the sum total of the Tramways Board's reasons for transferring to buses, but I must confess they do not satisfy me, nor do I think they would satisfy a great many other people. I think we must hear a great deal more from the board about its 10-year plan. A series of experts were imported from America but they came from cities which have different transport problems from our own. In those cities there are extensive underground railway systems which provide the majority of their transportation system. Buses are not used for mass transportation. We could not afford an underground railway system here, but we do need an adequate system of mass transportation. New York on its existing bus services is losing colossal sums of money each year. London has gone from trams to buses, but it has a tube system. Other European and American cities, notably Chicago, have no such system, and they are retaining trams because they are more economical and satisfactory. Unless we have a much more comprehensive statement than we have had so far from the trust, we should think seriously before granting large sums of money to be squandered heaven knows how. I am not satisfied with the figures provided so far. I do not propose to say anything further now except that what I have said in regard to the Education Department and the Tramways Trust concerns every citizen. We are not spending enough on education and for the service we get it appears that we are spending too much on the Tramways Trust. I suggest that members look closely at reports from both departments, otherwise we may strike trouble in the future.

Mr. JOHN CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 4, at 2 p.m.