

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 23, 1958.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

OIL SEARCH IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier a report to make following on his visit last weekend to the Innamineka area in order to conduct investigations into the search for oil that is proceeding in that area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes, but I will qualify my remarks by saying first that I do not advise anyone to buy oil shares and I am not in any way interested directly in any oil shares. As I have previously mentioned to the House, the reports that have been coming down from our geologists regarding formations in that area and the reports regarding seismic work being carried out by the Mines Department for the Delhi-Taylor organization have been extremely good and there is no doubt that, geologically, there are large structures which would constitute a major oil field if oil were present. Whether oil is there can only be determined by drilling. That stage has not yet been reached, but the Delhi-Taylor organization is of opinion that the seismic work will have advanced sufficiently to enable drilling to start early in December, and the Commonwealth Government will make a contribution towards drilling the first hole. It will be necessary for a road to be provided to the field, and one of the purposes of the visit last weekend was to examine that matter. It will not be an ordinary bituminous road for general traffic, but one sufficiently improved to enable heavy plant to get into the field. It will probably be constructed from Lyndhurst and follow the Strzelecki Creek as far as Innamineka, and work will start immediately. My impression is that there are major structures of great importance in the area and that it is essential that they be thoroughly tested. Geologically, they have great attraction and their enormous size means that if oil is present it will undoubtedly be a major field.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Minister of Works inform me after inquiry, whether the road the Premier mentioned, to be constructed from Lyndhurst to Innamineka, will be constructed by his department which, in the main, undertakes construction of roads in areas outside local government areas, and whether that road will follow the existing route from Lyndhurst through Mt. Lyndhurst Station on

to Murnpeowie? If it could follow that route it would be of great assistance to pastoralists further on, such as the Mount Freeling, Mount Fitton and Moolawatana people, and to the carriers of tale from the Mt. Fitton mine.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—As the honourable member implied, I am not able to state forthwith the route to be taken, but I can tell him that my department will construct the road. Investigations as to the route are in progress. I ask him to bear with me while I obtain the information.

SOVIET UNION PUBLICATION.

Mr. SHANNON—Last weekend I read a publication known as *Soviet Union*, and as it was printed in English it was obviously intended for export and not for home consumption. It is a clever, insidious form of propaganda designed to undermine the western powers and their allegiance to each other. Obviously, well-educated and clever western people were engaged in its publication, for it is a first-class work and its format, photographs and reproduction rank it with the best coming into this country from any source. That makes it all the more important that we should ascertain how it came through the customs or the censorship departments, and I ask the Premier to take this matter up with the appropriate Minister in Canberra. I am not sure whether it is for general circulation throughout the Commonwealth, but I should like to know whether this propaganda is permissible under our Commonwealth censorship laws.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I presume that the Commonwealth Government's officers have examined this publication, together with other publications that are imported. I have no knowledge of that, but if the honourable member will make available the copy he has I will refer it to the appropriate authorities for their consideration. The fact that a document is propaganda does not in itself, I think, constitute an offence under the Commonwealth law, but if it is seditious I think it would be a different matter. South Australia's powers regarding publications relate to the censorship of obscenity, and we have no such powers regarding this publication.

LINES ON ROADS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand there is some dispute between the Kensington and Norwood Corporation and the Highways Department about lines that have been marked on the Norwood Parade. Much money has

been spent on widening certain parts of the Anzac Highway, and I am concerned about the lines on the road between South Terrace and Keswick Bridge. This road is wide enough to permit three streams of traffic in peak periods, but because of the presence of these lines if a car breaks down in the left-hand traffic lane there can only be one stream of passing traffic. Will the Minister have this matter investigated to ascertain whether the best use is being made of our roads and whether fewer lines would not permit a freer traffic flow?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I shall be pleased to direct the inquiry to my colleague. I understand the lines to which the honourable member refers are single lines, not double lines.

Mr. Frank Walsh—They are lines representing nature strips.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—If they are single lines I do not think it is obligatory for a motorist not to cross over them to pass other traffic. Traffic is not permitted to cross double lines. However, no doubt the Minister's officers will investigate this matter.

STRATHALBYN RAILWAY CROSSING

Mr. JENKINS—Last Saturday afternoon, in a tragic accident at a railway crossing near Strathalbyn, a man and his child were seriously injured and another child killed. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the Minister of Railways is aware that on the approach to this crossing—which is a deep cutting—the banks on the side of the road extend to within four to six feet of the actual crossing and a car has to pull up right on the railway lines in order that the driver can see whether a train is approaching from either direction? Will the Minister take up with his colleague the question of investigating this crossing to ascertain whether it will be closed in the near future; whether the banks on each side will be bulldozed sufficiently to allow approaching traffic a clear vision of approaching trains, and whether stop signs will be erected to ensure that motor cars pull up in time to enable the drivers to see whether the line is clear?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will refer the matter to my colleague.

MOTOR CAR INSURANCE.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Some weeks ago I asked a question regarding the 50 per cent excess charge made by insurance companies on comprehensive policies of motor cars on hire-

purchase. Since then I have received a number of complaints showing that this is not the only excess charge imposed on comprehensive policies on cars under hire purchase. Further, persons purchasing cars under hire purchase have no right to choose the company to whom they will go to be insured, but are obliged to accept the insurance company nominated by the firm selling the car. If they are not satisfied they are obliged to continue with the company nominated.

In accordance with this set-up, the National and General Insurance Company Limited has not only charged the 50 per cent over and above the ordinary charges, but has imposed extra charges when the purchaser has been unfortunate enough to have an accident. I would quote only three cases to make my point. *Case A.*—The insured, who was making his first claim in five years on damages totalling £30, was told by the company that they were reluctantly forced to place a £20 excess charge on his policy. *Case B.*—The damages of £60 on a first claim—the insured was asked to pay a further £25. *Case C.*—On damages amounting to £97—the first claim for 3½ years, and incidentally, the first claim ever on the National and General Insurance Company—the insured was requested to pay a further £40.

I believe the actions of this company are a real embarrassment to some other companies and are placing the repairers in real difficulties, as many of the insured people buying cars under hire purchase are unable to meet these payments, and the cars are left with the repairer. I ask the Premier whether the action of the insurance company is legal? If so, will the Government take steps to see that persons who insure will be covered for the whole of the damages, except the amount of £10 when stated in the policy?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As the honourable member knows, under the Road Traffic Act companies approved by the Treasurer are the only insurance companies that may provide the cover necessary under the Act—the compulsory cover for third party insurance. The honourable member's question apparently relates to comprehensive policies. For the compulsory cover a premiums committee decides the premiums and there is no difference, so far as I know, between ordinary premiums and the premiums that cover vehicles purchased under hire-purchase. If the honourable member will give me the information he has, together with the names in the cases he has mentioned, I

will have inquiries made and try to find out whether the insured people are getting a fair deal.

THEBARTON SOOT NUISANCE.

Mr. LAWN—Yesterday I received a petition signed by 56 constituents residing in the Thebarton area concerning smoke, soot and dirt nuisance from the South Australian Co-operative Bottle Company, Cawthorne Street, Southwark. These people complain that they are forced to wash clothes on Saturdays and Sundays because of the nuisance during the week. A number of women, incidentally, have signed this petition. Many have gone to trouble and expense in providing stucco fences, which have become completely covered with black soot. They complain that curtains are rotting and furniture inside the houses gets covered with soot. I believed this was not a Parliamentary but a council matter, and rang the town clerk who informed me that councils have not power to control smoke, soot and dirt nuisance. He said that the Hindmarsh council had been in a somewhat similar position and had approached the Minister of Industry requesting that the Government pass a special Act—similar to what was passed in New South Wales—to give councils direct control over such matters. Will the Minister of Education ascertain from the Minister of Industry what progress has been made in respect of the Hindmarsh council's request and secure whatever other information he can?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to do so.

INFORMATION ON RACECOURSE PROTESTS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Last Saturday at the Gawler racecourse a protest was entered on behalf of the third horse against the first and second horses in a race. It was assumed by the betting public and bookmakers that the protest was entered by the owner of the second horse against the first horse because no information, other than that a protest had been entered, was broadcast over the course amplifiers. Punters were betting and taking as much as three to one against the second horse being declared the winner when it had no prospect of securing the decision because it was not directly involved in the protest. An established principle in betting is that if you have no chance of winning you cannot lose. These people had no prospects of winning, but the bookmakers got the benefit—in fairness to them I must say unintentionally—because of

the neglect of the club and the Betting Control Board to supply adequate information to the public. As the Government gets a considerable amount from racing through the winnings bets tax and the bookmakers' turnover tax, bookmakers and punters should be adequately protected. In order to avoid a repetition of the incident will the Premier request the board to take appropriate steps to ensure that in future racecourse patrons are given the fullest information on all questions appertaining to betting and matters arising therefrom?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The honourable member's question ultimately went a good deal further than his explanation of it led me to believe, because he referred to "all" matters. The board could not advise punters on all matters.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It usually does.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—There are many things which it is probably not informed about. I will take up the question with the board and inform the honourable member in due course if it can comply with his wishes.

MAGILL REFORMATORY.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Will the Premier ascertain when it is likely that plans for the new Magill Reformatory will be referred to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have not the information before me but I will get it for the honourable member.

CRADOCK COAL BASIN.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier any further information respecting the search for coal in what is known as the Springfield area near Cradock?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No, but I will get a report from the Mines Department on the latest results. I understand two plants are working on the field and that the coal seams at the outset were disappointingly thin, but that was fairly early in the investigation. I understand there is a big field to be covered.

NORTH WALKERVILLE SEWERAGE.

Mr. JENNINGS—Last week I asked the Minister of Works for a report about the extension of the sewerage system in one street in North Walkerville. The work has gone ahead more expeditiously than I could have hoped. Will the Minister report regarding the latest position?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I point out that from time to time the various Government departments do get things done. Following on my reply of last week I can now say that the work commenced as scheduled on September 8 last and has now been completed.

TRAMWAYS EMPLOYEES' UNION.

Mr. HUTCHENS—It has come to my notice that the Tramways Employees' Union, in fighting compensation claim cases in which tramway buses are involved, have up to a recent date not been able to get reports from the Police Department, which has denied it the right to put forward factual cases with all the evidence the police have. Will the Premier see that the reports are made available to the Union in order that complete cases can be submitted in the interests of employees?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This matter has been considered by the House on several occasions. I understand that any evidence the police have concerning an accident is available to solicitors if they pay the appropriate fee for the typing of it.

Mr. Dunstan—Not including the statements of witnesses.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is so with the general report. I will get precise information, but I do not see that there is any difficulty in getting the basic information on the payment of the appropriate typing fee.

PORT AUGUSTA CRAFTS CENTRE.

Mr. RICHES—A situation at Port Augusta is causing concern and it is a situation over which I think the Minister of Education has been personally let down by his department. I refer to the erection of the craft buildings at the Port Augusta high school, which work should have been completed at the end of 1957, with the building ready for occupation at the beginning of this year. The Minister will remember that I wrote to him personally, and the committee has written also, asking that the work should be expedited, that the old woodwork room be made available to the primary school at Port Augusta, and that Grade VII boys at the other primary school be given the opportunity to do woodwork. The Minister gave me a firm assurance that the building would be ready at the beginning of this year. It was not ready. He then assured me that it would be ready in March. It was not ready in March. He will remember giving me a further assurance it would be ready for the beginning of the second term. The Minister will remember that a few weeks ago he said

it would be ready at the beginning of the third term. Nobody knows yet when it will be occupied. Will the Minister call for a full report on the reasons for the delay and inform me when we can confidently expect the block to be ready for occupation? Will he call for a report as to the date when equipment for the building was ordered and the reason for the rooting up of the floor last week, the general circumstances surrounding these buildings, and the reason why the assurances he received, apparently from responsible officers, have not been honoured?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to accede to the honourable member's several requests. The assurances I have given him from time to time were given in all good faith, and were based on reports I received on several occasions.

Mr. Riches—I accept that.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am personally disappointed at the delays, but I do not think it would be proper for me, in reply to a question without notice, to apportion the reasons for the delays, so I will obtain a comprehensive report, because I am interested to see how the work can be expedited and the centre opened as soon as possible.

RADIO TALK ON ROAD TRAFFIC.

Mr. LAWN—Speaking from station 5AD last night an executive officer of the *Advertiser* gave a five minute talk on traffic and the attitude of some drivers. It was evident that he had put into his talk some thought and study of the Act and other matters pertaining to the subject, and as he made some suggestions, one of which was that we might consider psychiatric tests for some drivers, will the Minister of Works endeavour to obtain a copy of his remarks, which I think would be available from 5AD, with a view to examining them and seeing whether it would be possible to adopt one or two of the suggestions?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I was not privileged to hear the broadcast, but I am quite sure that useful suggestions made would be gladly examined. The matter may be one that should be referred to the State Traffic Committee. However, I will make inquiries and direct the information to the proper source.

HOUSING TRUST EMERGENCY DWELLINGS.

Mr. LAWN (on notice)—How many applications to the South Australian Housing Trust for emergency dwellings are awaiting consideration?

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The chairman, South Australian Housing Trust, reports that it is considered that there are outstanding about 3,000 effective applications for emergency dwellings. Of these it is estimated that about 1,700 have some degree of urgency. A great number of the applicants have also applied for permanent rental housing.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES PARKING FEES.

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—What is the total amount received during the past twelve months by the South Australian Railways Department from fees charged to employees on shift work for car parking in the area set aside for the purpose adjoining the railway bakehouse in Adelaide railway yard?

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

No fees are charged *bona fide* employees on shift work who commence or finish duty outside the hours when public transport is available. All other employees who use the area adjacent to the railway bakehouse in the Adelaide railway yard for parking their vehicles pay 1s. per day parking fee. The revenue derived from this group of employees for the year ended 31/8/58 was £975. This amount covers the cost of the attendant, whose responsibility it is to prevent unauthorized persons from parking on the railway land in question.

REJECT MEAT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Have any quantities of mutton or lamb intended for export to the United States of America been rejected by the Commonwealth inspector during the last twelve months?

2. If so, what was the reason for such rejection?

3. What was the total estimated value of the meat so rejected?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Owing to the difficulty in obtaining the necessary information, the honourable member is requested to ask the question again next week.

PETHICK ESTATE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice)—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to use portion of the land known as Pethick Estate situated on Oaklands Road, Oaklands Estate, for erection of the South-Western Districts Hospital?

2. If so, when is building likely to commence?

3. Has any portion of the land been made available to the Tourist Bureau?

4. If so, what area has been so affected?

5. Is it the intention of the Government to develop this area?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. Land has been purchased for a future hospital site.

2. No decision has been made regarding the erection of a hospital.

3. Yes.

4. The whole of section 1508, Hundreds of Adelaide and Noarlunga were dedicated as a national pleasure resort on 26th February, 1953. (Vide *Government Gazette* of that date, page 345.)

5. Plans have not yet been prepared for the development of the area.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1934-1957.

Read a first time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

OIL REFINERY (HUNDRED OF NOARLUNGA) INDENTURE BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Ordered that report and minutes be printed.

BUDGET DEBATE.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 18. Page 802.)

Grand total £73,413,000.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—This is the Treasurer's twentieth Budget, and in presenting it he produced a marathon physical effort, though it seems a pity that this will be the last one he will have the opportunity of presenting for some time at least.

Mr. John Clark—He will make a first-class Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I hope to play some part in his transference from the Treasury benches to the Leadership of the Opposition. Then I shall be in a position to enjoy his criticism of a Budget brought down by the Labor Party with the same relish as I hope he enjoys my constructive criticism of his Budgets. I believe that long, uninterrupted periods of office, even when sustained by public opinion, can be bad for the electorate and the people generally, but the Treasurer's long period in office has not been completely sustained by public opinion. If it were not for the gerrymander of the electorates the Government would have been out of office on at least two occasions. I have made some study of British history and have found an instance similar to that of the Playford Government. Robert Walpole retained office for 20 years from 1720 to 1740. Few people were entitled to vote, and there were pocket boroughs, rotten boroughs, and even bribery. I believe that we could include rotten boroughs and pocket boroughs in the category of the South Australian gerrymander. The Premier's continued retention of power is also due partly to intimidation within his own Party and partly to the gigantic myth that has been built up by the press.

Last Thursday we heard from the Treasurer a great deal about the so-called developmental period, but I stress that the Government has ridden on the back of inflation, increasing population, good seasons, high prices for primary products, and a defence backwash. During the last war, because South Australia was the safest place in the Commonwealth, the Federal Labor Government decided to concentrate great defence industries in this State. After the war the buildings, and much of the plant, were offered to industry at advantageous prices, thus giving a great impetus to secondary production. Nevertheless, there has been an entire absence of comprehensive planning. It has generally

been a matter of plucking something out of the air, and sometimes a project has remained in the air. For instance, we heard of proposals to establish an atomic power station at Lake Leak and a deep-sea port in the South-East, which became a portable port that was moved from place to place as exigencies of the political situation required. With a great fanfare of trumpets and sounding of brass the Treasurer announced the proposal to electrify the suburban railways. The project was referred to the Public Works Committee, which reported in favour of the scheme, but it has joined the limbo of forgotten things.

The outstanding result of the Treasurer's policy has been the rapid growth of public indebtedness without any corresponding or compensating overall development of the State. Let us examine revenue expenditure incurred by this State. Estimating, as modified by the Treasurer, has become largely a formality. When we pass the Loan Estimates we do not know whether the money will be spent on the lines stipulated. Money is often taken from one line and used for another, so it is difficult to decipher the picture of Loan expenditure, and the same applies to revenue expenditure. Despite the glowing account related by the Premier in his Budget Speech about an improvement in finances generally, we find considerable discrepancies in various individual items. In respect of railways, for instance, the receipts were £752,000 down on the amount estimated and in respect of stamp duties and Engineering and Water Supply Department the receipts were up by £110,000 and £122,000 respectively. It is interesting to consider the errors in budgeting which are disclosed by figures relating to the last five years. I have a table that I ask be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The table was as follows:—

Budget Error.

Year	Revenue.	Estimated Expenditure.	Result.	Revenue.	* Actual Expenditure.	Result.	Budget Error.
1953-54	£51,355,000	51,345,000	10,000S	52,376,000	50,003,000	2,373,000S	2,372,000
1954-55	51,049,000	52,982,000	1,953,000D	51,884,000	53,414,000	1,530,000D	403,000
1955-56	59,765,000	60,513,000	748,000D	59,402,000	59,674,000	272,000D	476,000
1956-57	65,129,000	65,982,000	853,000D	65,761,000	65,374,000	387,000S	1,240,000
1957-58	71,095,000	71,615,000	520,000D	70,642,000	70,415,000	227,000S	747,000

* Excluding expenditure subsequently authorized.

S = Surplus.

D = Deficit.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It is interesting to examine the revenue increases between 1948-

49 and 1957-58 which have been astronomical. I have selected this 10-year period because it

is more or less a normal period following the settling down process after the war. The following table reveals the position:—

Revenue Increases 1948-49 to 1957-58.

Item.	1948-49		1957-58.		Increase.	
	Amount £	Percentage of Total.	Amount. £	Percentage of Total.	Amount. £	Percentage.
Taxation . . .	2,870,000	13.1	9,771,000	13.8	6,910,000	240
Public Service	10,533,000	48.2	36,072,000	51.0	25,539,000	242
Territorial . . .	288,000	1.3	546,000	0.8	258,000	90
Commonwealth	8,184,000	37.4	24,253,000	34.3	16,069,000	196
Totals . . .	21,845,000	100	70,642,000	100	48,797,000	223

I think this table bears out my earlier contention that the factors I have mentioned are responsible for the increases referred to by the Treasurer and are due to circumstances beyond the control of the Government and are not in any way the result of competent planning by the Government.

Let us consider the special grants the State receives under section 96 of the Constitution. As honourable members know, Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria are contributing States and Tasmania, South Australia and Western Australia are benefiting States who receive special grants from the Commonwealth which have to be met by the people in the three contributing States. If this State is as prosperous and is bounding ahead as the Premier suggested in his lavish encomiums I wonder whether we shall long sustain our claim to special consideration from the Commonwealth. Judging from reports that have reached us from the eastern States it appears that there may be a change in the position because Queensland and Victoria have both announced that they are potential applicants for Federal financial assistance. It only needs New South Wales to come in and the whole thing will cancel itself out because there would be no-one contributing and therefore nothing to receive. I have suggested that the Federal financial set-up is outmoded and that there is a need for a complete investigation under section 96 of the Federal Constitution and the adoption of a sounder system. The annual Commonwealth grant is becoming relatively insignificant in relation to the total Budget expenditure. I have some figures which show that this is so. In 1948-49 the grant to South Australia was £2,850,000, representing 35 per cent of total Commonwealth assistance, and 13 per cent of total State revenue. In 1957-58 the figures were £5,700,000, 24 per cent, and 8

per cent. This grant is a sort of safety valve, taking the place of the State's "elastic" income tax, and possibly used as a means of supplementing reimbursement grants. A sensible system of adjusting Commonwealth-State financial relations could well be investigated. It is remarkable that in the days of Mr. Chifley the Premier was continually demanding the abolition of uniform taxation and a return to the State of its own income taxing powers, but that in recent years a strange silence has descended and we hear nothing now from him about the need for the State to recover the power to impose its own income tax.

I suggest that one reason for that is the increase in the tax reimbursement grants that the State gets from the Commonwealth. In 1948-49 the grant was £4,630,000 or 56.6 per cent of the total received from the Commonwealth. In 1957-58 it was £17,481,000, or 73.2 per cent of the total from the Commonwealth. In 1948-49 the total from the Commonwealth was £8,184,000 and in 1957-58 it was £23,885,000. This represented an increase in the tax reimbursement grant of 278 per cent compared with an increase of 193 per cent in total revenue from the Commonwealth. We all know what happens in regard to tax reimbursement grants. The various State Treasurers meet the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer in conference in Canberra and have a wordy discussion as to the amount to be made available to the States, and then, having agreed on a figure, it is divided according to the formula. This matter should be investigated and it would be if South Australia joined with some of the other States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria, which have been insistent in their claim for a better system of money distribution by the Commonwealth.

I come now to the Leigh Creek coalfield and the Port Augusta power station. The

last report of the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner showed that the cost of hauling coal from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta was 33s. a ton. Personally I think that is a high figure and not a true figure, but the rate was later reduced to 11s. 6d. a ton, which again I think is not a true figure.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—The honourable member is not right. It was increased from 7s. 1d. to 11s. 6d. There has been no decrease.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is according to the old agreement, made in the days before inflation. In those days the pound had a considerable value and it was before the Commonwealth Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, proceeded to put value back into the pound in accordance with promises he made to the people before the 1949 elections. Now it takes many more pounds to meet the cost of conveying coal from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta than it did in the days when the Commonwealth Labor Government made the arrangement to rail it for 7s. 1d. a ton. With that qualification, I find that the cost of coal has an important bearing on the economics of the Electricity Trust, and the fact that the Commonwealth railways are carting it at a rate that Mr. Hannaberry says is very much lower than it should be has helped the development of the trust, and through the trust, the economy of the State. I do not in the least object to that, but it is one of the things for which this Government cannot take credit. The expected deficit is unreliable, but supposing it is reliable, the actual deficit will be £966,000. Of course, it could be more or it could be less: I hope it will be less, although I do not share the Treasurer's optimism, expressed in introducing these Estimates, that ultimately the Commonwealth grant will meet it. The Treasurer said:—

An anticipated deficit of £966,000 would appear, at first sight, a matter for serious concern, and so it would be if the last word had been said on the extent of financial assistance for 1958-59 which the State could expect from recommendations of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. The present recommendation is for £5,250,000, consisting of £5,201,000 for the current year and £49,000 to cover the deficit of 1956-57. The amount for the current year, although £343,000 higher than the grant for 1957-58, is over £1,000,000 short of the amount which was notified to the commission in July last as my best estimate of the State's financial needs.

Apparently the Treasurer notified the Commission last July that £1,000,000 would be required to balance the State's accounts for

this financial year, and the deficit shown in these Estimates is very close to that figure, but I would like to know what justification he had for believing that the amount will be recouped, particularly as Victoria and Queensland are likely to become applicants for financial assistance from the Commonwealth Government. If that should come to pass, and we are thrown on our own resources to meet the deficit, it will be a difficult task—one to which I do not look forward with relish.

Mr. Riches—We shall not get it for two years.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is so, for in this year's Budget is taken into account £49,000 to cover the 1956-57 deficiency. In the meantime we hope to finance this year's deficit, plus that from last year, out of loan funds, and to that extent loan funds will not be available for works on which they were intended to be spent and should be spent. No great responsibility is shown in conducting the finances of the State. There has been extravagant expenditure on several public works, and if there is a surplus the Treasurer looks for a means to spend it; if there is a deficit, it is added to the public debt. Who cares about money! A few years ago we had a fairly substantial surplus. We did not use it to liquidate past deficits or put it into the fund under the Public Finance Act to be used later in accordance with that Act, but called a special session, and passed Supplementary Estimates to appropriate the money for some purposes for which it could not possibly be expended during that financial year. As a result, we were penalized by the Grants Commission. The Treasurer said:—

South Australia has ordinarily conducted its finances with an extent of economy and effort somewhat greater than the bigger States.

What does that actually mean? Was it said merely for effect? What evidence have we that South Australia has conducted its finances better than the other States? Has the Grants Commission ever pointed out that because New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland have been extravagant, South Australia will receive certain financial benefits so that it will have some loose change to play about with? If South Australia is more efficiently run than the other States what is the criterion? Is the wasteful expenditure on Elizabeth Hospital an example? This hospital was originally to cost about £2,000,000, but already over £6,000,000 has been spent on it, and it has not been completed. The Mannum-Adelaide pipeline and the Yorke Peninsula

water supply were estimated to cost comparatively small sums, and although, of course, neither is completed they have already cost millions of pounds more than the original estimates submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee. Does that indicate that we have conducted our affairs with economy and effort? I say it indicates the opposite. Perhaps the Treasurer will explain, with some examples, how his financial arrangements are superior to others. I have already referred to tax reimbursements, and I do not propose to deal with that again. The Treasurer said:—

The Government proposes no increase in taxes and charges in this Budget. The general level of taxes and charges in this State has been kept somewhat below that of other States, chiefly by the avoidance of such unsatisfactory imposts as entertainment tax, hire purchase tax, and the operation of a lottery.

We have not been told in what States these particular forms of revenue-raising apply, but I have a shrewd suspicion that they apply in the States that are contributors to the special grants to South Australia; so it ill befits us, after accepting assistance from them, to cast aspersions on the methods they use to collect revenue to balance their Budgets. They have no special grants from the Commonwealth, but have to depend on their own resources.

It has been the pride and joy of the Treasurer's financial statements for some time that taxes are not to be increased. One illustration shows that taxes have not been increased, but charges have been increased, and I refer to increased assessments for water rating. Some assessments have been increased by more than 100 per cent, and many by 70 per cent or 90 per cent. If that is not an increase in charges I do not know what it is.

The Government is pleased at the economies effected by the Tramways Trust and the fact that tram and bus fares are not to be raised. In 1957-58 the Government subsidy for the trust was £480,000, but it is proposed to provide £490,000 for this year, so where is this economy in the Tramways Trust? I am concerned at the great damage being done to roads by heavy buses. This will result in a great burden on councils that was not envisaged when we accepted the changeover from trams to buses. The buses have to pull into the kerb to set down and pick up passengers, but the water tables were only lightly constructed because years ago there was little heavy traffic on them. I am also concerned about the comfort and safety of the travelling public. I cannot understand what economy the

trust hopes to achieve and what good it seeks by running large buses as one-man buses.

Mr. Hutchens—Those buses have three doors.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, but two of them are useless under the one-man operation because passengers have to enter and leave by the front door so that the driver can collect their fares. That responsibility should not be placed on the driver of a big vehicle in these days of traffic congestion. I do not know of any other city where the employee has to collect fares and give change in addition to driving the vehicle. The time lost in transit would probably counterbalance any saving in wages. Passengers should be able to leave and enter by any of the three doors and avoid having to struggle down a narrow, congested aisle.

The Treasurer gave the impression that railway finances are much improved, but what do we find? In 1957-58 the subsidy to the railways was £4,300,000, but £4,350,000 is provided this year. I believe the railways are conducted efficiently and that credit must be given to the management and to the humblest men in the service, but I am concerned about some things that could be rectified by the Government. The railways have to withstand much unfair competition. New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland have provided some form of protection by imposing a road-mile tax on hauliers. That tax has withstood court action, and in the past the Treasurer was keen on doing something on those lines here. We passed several Bills in an effort to make road hauliers contribute to the maintenance of the roads they used, but they were declared null and void by the High Court or the Privy Council. We used to hear the Treasurer say he was looking forward to the day when something would be done to make road hauliers contribute towards the maintenance of roads, and that is all the Labor Party said they should do. After all, the railways have to provide and maintain tracks and rolling stock, so road hauliers should pay something for the use of the roads. If they can then successfully compete with the railways I say good luck to them, but I do not believe they can.

I shall now refer to right of appeal against dismissal from the railways. Members will remember that I have advocated that railway employees should have the right of appeal against dismissal, because to a railway man who has spent a considerable number of years, and perhaps the best part of his life-time in the job, dismissal is a type of economic death

sentence. In 1941, thanks to the good graces of the then Minister of Railways, Sir Malcolm McIntosh, the Railways Commissioner agreed to a limited form of appeal against dismissal. If it was reported to him that a man had been guilty of some misdemeanor meriting dismissal he would report it to the Railways Appeal Board for an opinion before finally exercising his right to dismiss. However, he insisted that he should have that right. I did not like it at the time but accepted it as an improvement on the conditions under which there was no right of appeal. I believe this system worked satisfactorily for some time but recently cases have been brought to my notice which indicate that it is now not working as it should. This matter should be examined by the Government with a view to providing a more just system for those employees likely to be affected.

Another matter relates to promotions within the service. I know that there is a right of appeal against promotions, but generally speaking the reasons that can be produced to the appeal tribunal are such that it makes a right of appeal of little or no value. I suggest we should revert to the time-honoured practice in promoting men in the railways—giving the advancement to the senior applicant, other things being equal. I think that is reasonable and fair. A man who has spent the better part of his lifetime in the service and acquired knowledge as a result, and who has given meritorious service, should be entitled to promotion over a younger man who has only been a few years in the service. Unfortunately, in recent times instances have been brought to my notice where older men with many years of service and without a mark against them have been passed over in favour of younger men.

Mr. Hutchens—That does not apply only to the Railways Department.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It applies throughout the Public Service generally, but I am dealing with the Railways Department now. If we are going to retain the confidence of railway workers, or of employees in the Public Service generally, the cardinal principle that at all times must be observed is that promotions should be on the basis of seniority, other things being equal. I know it is argued that some of these younger men might attain to greater heights than those they are being promoted above, but that is problematical. The important consideration is that if we deny men the right, after many years of faithful service,

to the position they have been aspiring to, studying for and working towards, we shall cause the great body of public servants, including railway employees, to lose some interest in their jobs and become simply concerned with doing their ordinary duties in accordance with the book and not trying to advance themselves and the department or to safeguard this wonderful socialistic system we have in South Australia. I mention these two points because I think they should be considered.

The Treasurer mentioned the efficiency of our forestry undertaking. I entirely agree that it is efficient and profitable, but I point out that it was founded by and nurtured in its early days by Labor and would not be of the magnitude it is had it not been for the foresight of the Labor Government of that day. I will refer briefly to the general administration of hospitals in this State. It is time we examined the hospital set-up here. We have public hospitals, which are maintained almost entirely out of the public purse; government-subsidized hospitals to which the Government makes substantial subsidies, ostensibly for the purpose of treating pensioners and indigent persons; community hospitals, which receive handouts from time to time because they want to increase the number of beds or do something else of that nature; and finally we have a system of assisting approved private non-profit-making hospitals. I am not concerned about the latter two at present, but I am much concerned about the difference between subsidized and Government hospitals.

There are Government hospitals at Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Barmera, Mount Gambier, Wallaroo and Adelaide, and about 52 or 53 Government-subsidized hospitals, some in quite large towns, rendering a great service to the sick in those areas. I know that the Chief Secretary said recently that the amount made available in subsidies to these hospitals is sufficient to meet the total cost of treating pensioners and other indigent patients. I believe the great majority of these hospitals treat this type of person sympathetically but there are some which do not and they should be made to do so. I believe that our hospital system should be revised and Government hospitals should be established in all parts of the State where they are needed. We could then leave it to the cottage or community hospitals to handle casualties and such cases on a subsidy basis and private hospitals could deal with patients not eligible under the present social set-up to receive assistance at public hospitals.

According to the Treasurer, stamp duty receipts exceeded the estimate by £110,000 because of a marked increase in the volume of land transfers. In former days a charge of £1 per £100 was not regarded as a form of taxation but considered a just charge for the services rendered in maintaining the Land Titles Office which, by the way, is a most efficient institution rendering a great service to the community and particularly to the land-owning and land-transferring section. It is not possible to get a figure to show by how much the total State revenue was increased through stamp duty collection on land transfers, but the Treasurer admits that much of the increase of £110,000 was due to that stamp duty. He could have said that much of the increase was due to the rise in the value of the land transferred. Regarding land tax he said:—

Changes in ownership of land and the subdivision of land previously used for primary production will have the effect of increasing land tax collections by some £10,000 over last year.

Here again the rise in values has had some bearing, but let us compare land tax with water rates. Land tax is based on a quinquennial assessment, but for water rates apparently a new assessment can be made every year. Apparently the Government makes up its mind to collect a certain amount in water rates and then increases the assessments accordingly. There should be a better system. We on this side have suggested a court for the purpose of valuing land for all forms of taxation. It could be on an unimproved basis and then the improved values could be worked out. The point is that there should be a just and uniform basis on which to start. This is long overdue and it will be given to the people by a Labor Government at the earliest opportunity. The Waite Institute is an excellent organization, and one of the greatest research institutions in the Southern Hemisphere. It is heavily subsidised by the Commonwealth and State Governments, and scholarships and bursaries are provided for students to enable them to undergo the various types of study available at the Institute. Many of the scholarships and bursaries are reduced in value because the students have to pay a fee for the use of laboratories, etc. The fees collected in this way would not amount to much in all, but it is a big item for the students, particularly those who come from families in the country on low incomes. I suggest an inquiry into this matter.

I want now to refer to the difficulties experienced by parents of retarded children. There

is only one school in the metropolitan area for such children and to it go children from other suburbs. I have had brought under my notice the case of a mother having to take her 14-year-old son to school on the back of her bicycle. No mother should be asked to do this. She does her best for her child and to see he is educated so that he will later play a useful part in society. The Government should provide an appropriate form of school transport for these retarded children. My information is that they cannot continue to attend the approved schools beyond the age of 16. There should be some form of continuous education class so that they can continue to be taught after they have reached 16, because it is at about that age the parents have most difficulty in handling them, and when they will show the greatest improvement if their education is continued. Not many children are concerned in this matter, but if we continue their education after 16 and provide them with transport we shall be doing something to turn them into useful citizens and be a help to the mothers who are now experiencing great difficulties.

At present there is no way in which people can borrow small sums of money for various purposes. A person may want to start a small business of his own, or a young couple may want to furnish their home. In order to get furniture the young couple may have to use the hire purchase system, and the tradesman with a few tools wanting to start a small business for himself cannot get the necessary finance. I noticed recently that private banks in England have established an excellent scheme whereby they make personal loans to a maximum of £500. Such a scheme would cover the cases I have mentioned. The Government should discuss with the State Bank and the Savings Bank the advisability of establishing such a scheme here. Parliament would agree to a Government guarantee for loans of this nature. After all, it is something we have agreed to do in a much bigger way. We have the Industries Development Act under which people who desire to establish an industry can apply to the Treasurer, and if it is considered that the application is a worthy one, it is referred to the Industries Development Committee. If the committee's report is favourable, the account of the person or persons desiring to establish an industry is backed by the Government with the bank. In some cases considerable sums have been guaranteed by the Government. I agree with that entirely, but suggest that the Government give

serious and immediate consideration to establishing some form of small loan through the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia.

Although I have spoken longer than I intended, I cannot pass without comment the last part of the Treasurer's speech in which he dealt with general and economic matters. Two novel features appear in the Estimates this year—the adoption of extravagant phrases (perhaps to be consistent with extravagant expenditure) and the emphasis placed on the significance of the United States of America in the economic scheme of things, with special reference to South Australia. Although we are all friendly-disposed towards the great United States, and welcome improvements in their conditions following the serious position earlier this year, I do not know how we can compare conditions in the two places.

Mr. Riches—They have placed an embargo on South Australian lead.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—That is another thing. The Premier said:—

There has been no suggestion that the era of magnificent development and of expansion is over, but rather a sober replanning for the development we all believe is ahead.

I do not suggest that the era of expansion is over, but it has not been such a magnificent expansion, and it has been due to matters over which the Government had no control rather than to any proper planning by the Government. In recent years there has been a tendency, when anyone has expressed doubts on whether a particular project is sound, to decry that person as a harbinger of gloom seeking to precipitate and enjoy a crisis. We on this side have an abundant confidence in the future of our great nation and of our own State, and are pleased to note that some improvements have been made in South Australia as the result of the adoption of Labor's socialistic policy.

Mr. Fred Walsh—We are just as proud of the development of our State as members oppose.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Of course we are, and we want more of it. We want more people on the living areas in the good rainfall parts of South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe—Like Mr. Ward.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The honourable member for Torrens is a ward weed.

Mr. Coumbe—He is your friend, not mine.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Isn't it amazing how, when a Labor man is propounding something really worthwhile and of advantage to the community, he is always interrupted by some echo

from the past or from the mother State! I am responsible for what I say as Leader of the Labor Party. The members of my Party in this House are responsible for what they say, and I am espousing their policy when I say we want more people settled on the land on holdings in the good rainfall districts. We can go a bit further and provide for some tightening up of the distribution of pastoral land. There are some great pastoral organizations in this State for which I have the utmost respect. They have been operating for years, they are well managed, they do not overstock, and they observe award rates and condition for all their employees. However, there are other Johnny-come-latelies for whom I have not such respect, so it may be wise to have an inspector to see what these people are doing or not doing on pastoral land.

Under the heading "General financial and economic matters" the Premier said:—

After a poor season with near-drought conditions over most of the State during 1957-58 there was a long worrying interval between the opening rains in May and the follow-up rain in mid July. A second poor season would have put a very severe strain upon our rural economy with considerable reflected damage to business activity and employment elsewhere in the State as well as upon the Government's finances. Most fortunately the July rains have been followed by adequate falls well spread, both in time and location, so that the present seasonal outlook is excellent.

That is an amazing assumption from the head of the Government, who said that everything that is good was brought about by the Government. Last year was not a drought year; taking the State by and large, it was a reasonably good year. I only wish that, in the days when I was on the land, all the years had been as good in my area as last year. I think that statement was inserted for the purpose of bold relief. The Premier was saying, in effect, "Despite this great difficulty we weathered the storm and are sailing blithely ahead."

We are criticized because, it has been said, we have sought to cut back migration. I agree we should not cut back migration: we need more people in this country, because I think it can carry a much larger population; but we are not doing a service to the country or to prospective migrants if we bring them here without jobs, shelter or security for the future. These are the things that Labor says must be provided, and when they are, migrants can come here and be welcome. They, like their grandfathers, will build up Australia into a greater nation in years to come. We

are told that South Australia has the highest standard of living, the greatest industrial development and the greatest increase in population in the Commonwealth. That may be so, and it is something we should all be pleased about; but it is something that the Labor Party has played no small part in achieving, in that most of the development works were Labor policy. I assure the Government, and the Treasurer particularly, that we shall be happy to continue to help the Government in implementing our policy in this last session of this Parliament.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I support the Budget, which is the 20th that has been presented by the Treasurer.

Mr. Lawn—It is his last.

Mr. JENKINS—I heard that remark passed before the last two elections, but he is still in office. When last year's Budget was being debated I was sitting in the Chair when the member for Adelaide gave a discourse on finance. He usually says that his views reflect the opinion of the Labor Party, but if the discourse he gave us last year reflected the manner in which the Opposition would implement its financial policy its occupation of the Treasury benches would be very short lived, though I do not know how long after the next election the Labor Party will have to wait before bringing down a Budget. The Treasurer has budgeted for a deficit of £966,000, but I do not think it will be as great as that. He has allowed a certain amount for grants from the Commonwealth Grants Commission, but it could be more than that sum. Secondly, we have had excellent rains since the Budget was prepared. Last year the State had to incur heavy expenditure in pumping water through the Mannum-Adelaide main. That cost up to £16,000 a week, and in my district water had to be pumped from Goolwa to the Encounter Bay water district to supplement supplies from the Hindmarsh Valley reservoir. Water had to be pumped from Macclesfield to the Strathalbyn reservoir *via* the Angas River, and farmers were paid to pump water from bores. The late rains have saturated the country, and I believe that the springs that feed rivers and creeks that run into the reservoirs will ensure supplies well into the summer. This will cut pumping to a minimum, so the deficit may be reduced to £200,000 or £300,000.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the Treasurers' marathon effort in presenting his Budget. He endeavoured to give a full

explanation of the expenditure proposed, and that is probably a result of the demands made by members several years ago for more information. The Leader of the Opposition said the Treasurer announced some years ago a proposal for an atomic power station in the South-East, but I understand that the Treasurer said in this House that a plant for generating electricity might be established in that district at any time between 1960 and 1962. He said he was anxious to get all information available about atomic power stations, especially about experiments being conducted in England and America, before a plant was established in this country so that we would get the benefit of those experiments and keep down costs. The Leader of the Opposition also referred to the gerrymander, that good old horse he has been riding for many years. However, I stress that the same set of circumstances exists in every State in the Commonwealth. He said the majority of people did not vote for this Government, but I am sure most people support it. At the last Federal election South Australia returned three Liberal senators, and I believe it will do so again at the coming elections. Tasmania has the same representation in the Senate as New South Wales has, but its population is much smaller.

The Leader of the Opposition criticized the Budget, but it is a well-balanced one. The funds have been allocated so as to give every utility and service as much as possible. The allocations are evidence of the acumen of those who drafted the Budget. I am pleased that £50,000 has been provided for the commencement of the scheme to supply water in the Encounter Bay district. I understand the total cost will be about £319,000, and that it is expected the scheme will be in operation by the summer of 1959-60. The Engineer for Water Supply (Mr. Campbell) is examining a scheme to supplement the supply for the coming summer, and if it is adopted the people of Encounter Bay will be assured of sufficient water until the major scheme is carried out. The Leader of the Opposition was pessimistic about future grants from the Commonwealth Grants Commission. He said that New South Wales and Victoria had indicated that they will become claimant States.

Mr. Riches—No, Queensland, where there is a Liberal Government.

Mr. JENKINS—He mentioned Victoria specifically, and I think he also mentioned New South Wales. However, this State is now in a

better position to withstand any discontinuance of these grants, but I cannot imagine that the Grants Commission will suddenly stop providing assistance. South Australia has gradually evolved from being the poorest State in the Commonwealth to one of the most prosperous. This has not been brought about by accident, but by much foresight and planning. I believe that our Government departments are administered efficiently and, in co-operation with the Government, they have planned for the future development of this State.

Mr. Lawn—What about the worker in industry?

Mr. JENKINS—He is doing as well as the worker in any other State, or even better. The *per capita* Savings Bank deposits in South Australia are higher than in any other State, and we have perhaps more motor cars and household appliances than any other State on a population basis. Only last week I received a letter from a man employed in the Homebush Abattoirs in New South Wales asking for a job in South Australia, and I believe he will get one here. He is one of many who are pleased to come to this State.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to hospital subsidies and said that a private, non-profit making hospital would get a subsidy, and I endorse that policy, for all hospitals serve a good purpose in the community. This morning I took a deputation to the Minister of Health from the board of the Soldiers Memorial Hospital at Strathalbyn. This board has done a remarkable job in running this community hospital, which has catered for the needs of the district, which has a growing population. The board has raised much money, and has carried out a considerable building programme. The Minister of Health appreciates what it has done, and I believe he will find a grant for the hospital, to provide nurses quarters. After the Director-General of Medical Services has furnished a report the Minister will consider the matter. The Strathalbyn Hospital Auxiliary has done a remarkable job, and at stock sales each week the women provide meals, the proceeds going towards hospital funds. I am proud to have such people in my district. Recently two ladies have been appointed to the hospital board. They are Mrs. Laucke (Mayoress of Strathalbyn) and Mrs. Martin. I pay a tribute to the work they are doing on the hospital board and in the community. The hospital is of high standard and gives a good service.

The Leader of the Opposition said that more men should be established on the land with a living area. I agree that that should be done

where possible, and the Government's implementation of the land settlement scheme is good. I can recall when land settlement schemes were started after the first World War. Men were settled on the West Coast near the Goyder's line of rainfall and given an area of 1,000 to 1,500 acres, which later proved to be totally inadequate as a living area. Mr. O'Halloran also mentioned the aggregation of farming lands. The first indication the Government had that the West Coast areas were not large enough was when the then Premier, Sir Richard (then the Hon. R. L.) Butler, went to Streaky Bay and I approached him on behalf of the returned soldiers to have interest payments lifted. He wrote to me some weeks later to say that the settlers I represented and myself would be entitled to an interest remission. I told him I was not interested in any interest remission in this way, but for all settlers in South Australia, and eventually that resulted. In 1924 wheat was from 5s. to 6s. a bushel, but within three or four years it fell to 1s. 8½d. Wool prices also fell. It was all right for small holdings from about 1923 to 1925 when prices were good, but immediately they fell the settlers could not make a living, so the soldier settlement authorities began to aggregate farms. They did it by taking one settler off his block and giving two blocks to another settler. It meant that many men left the district, with a consequent aggregation of farming lands. I remember on one occasion whilst sitting around a table that Mr. Lawn said an area of about 300 acres should be allotted to everybody. I mentioned the West Coast with its poor rainfall and Mr. Lawn said he would give the settler the land and he would have to make a go of it. Two other Opposition members at the table agreed with my view of the matter. I support the first line.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—The Budget debate is one of the most important we have in Parliament. So far we have had good speeches, although I was amazed by some of the statements made by Mr. Jenkins. He said the State would be in a better position if the Commonwealth Grants Commission were abolished, but I hope it was not said in all seriousness. During this debate there has been a reference to the State's progress over the last 20 years. Naturally there has been some progress and I am as proud as anyone else of it. One would not be worthy of being a South Australian if he did not concede that some development has taken place. Mr. Jenkins spoke about his experiences on the land.

I know of the difficulties of land settlers and we should have a great respect for the courage they display in remaining on the land when things go wrong. Mr. Jenkins said that the more he worked and the more crops he grew the worse off he got financially, but that does not indicate progress. What progress has been made in this House in granting facilities to members? In the 20 years mentioned the population of the State has grown by about 300,000, yet 20 years ago we had 39 members, the same as we have today. Every member, irrespective of his political views, applies himself to his tasks with sincerity.

No progress has been made in granting facilities for members in this House and it is time the matter was investigated. As a private member I have no proper facilities for doing my work. When any research work is necessary I am entirely dependent upon the Parliamentary Library, where the staff is very helpful. Private members have the same pigeonholes for their correspondence as were there in the very early days. The public get a wrong impression about the facilities available to members. There is much glamour associated with being a member of the Commonwealth Parliament. Each Commonwealth member has a private room and the services of a secretary. I do not suggest that each member here should have a secretary, but better facilities should be available. We should not have to wait in a queue for letters to be typed by one typiste. Other typistes and a proper filing system should be available. Then important papers could be put away in the proper place and be ready when wanted. I worked for a private firm before becoming a member of this House and as a humble member of the staff had facilities for filing, the keeping of records and the typing of letters. Such facilities should be available here and members are largely to blame for accepting the position. I cast no reflections anywhere, because the people responsible for the well-being of members have done their utmost in the limited way possible. Most of the things required by a member in his work are kept in the room he occupies with others, but when he wants to refer to *Hansard* or to get papers he must go to a common room, and often when he does he finds that the copy of *Hansard* or the paper he wants has been taken by another member. Members should keep an open door, but doing that makes it difficult for them to carry out their Parliamentary duties. I wonder how country members overcome the diffi-

culty. I appeal for an investigation into the matter.

We have heard a lot about changing conditions in South Australia. It would be wrong to say that in the 20 years mentioned there have not been marked changes all over the world. One important change is that we now have a British Commonwealth of Nations instead of a British Empire. The greatest changes have occurred in the more backward countries and they have been a "must." The changes that have taken place in South Australia have also been a "must." But for them we would not be in the position we are today. We find that, because of the change in political outlook in the world, every country such as ours has been obliged to work for survival. No member will deny that in the last 20 years there has been a battle between two political ideals, and unfortunately we have seen communism spreading over the face of the earth. There are only two political ideals today, when you come down to fundamentals—democracy and communism. I believe that no matter how small the degree of democracy may be, provided that there is an essence of it, it is better than communism.

Mr. Lawn—We should like to see some democracy in this State.

Mr. HUTCHENS—There may be an essence of it.

Mr. Lawn—It is very small.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Then I will say there is an odour of it. If we do not develop we shall succumb to communism. What does development mean in the final analysis? Does it mean we are better off? I am not sure that it does. If every section of the community is not richer because of increased production, it is not development for the benefit of democracy, because a nation can only truly develop when the benefits are shared equally by every section of the community. When that is done we have unity within the nation and a satisfied people, and we can be an example to the rest of the world. In the years to come this State must use all its energy, resources and reasoning to the full if it is to survive. We must plan our finances, not to meet tomorrow, but to meet the next 20, 30 or 40 years—not to meet a time of world prosperity, but of drought or economic crisis.

The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that the Treasurer had to acknowledge that had there been a second poor year our economic position would have been strained to the limit. The Treasurer went on to say that industrial

production had increased; he left the impression in my mind that he thought secondary industry was more important than primary industry. It seems to me that primary production is all-important in this country. In the last 20 years we have enjoyed peculiar conditions brought about by the war and the needs of the world, something we have not experienced before, and we, like people in other countries have experienced a development of secondary industry. Some people give all the credit for this to the Government, but, although I do not wish to take credit from anyone who has helped to develop this country could any Government have done less than this Government? Are we keeping up the rate of development we should? Every section should take its share of the responsibility for developing this State. Despite a population increase of 300,000, we must plan, work and budget to double our present population within the next 20 years, and to do that there must be a planned policy and decentralization.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Government has not a clue on that.

Mr. HUTCHENS—That is obvious. It is a sin that anyone should be unemployed when the need to develop to the full is so urgent. We cannot do this when we have an army of unemployed persons. I know that the Government of this State is not the offender; however, the Premier said that, although only 1½ per cent of the work force was unemployed, this could not be contemplated without concern. It seems to me that he might take the platform with Doctor Evatt and expound Labor policy in the forthcoming Federal election.

The Leader of the Opposition, like others, acknowledged that there had been a development in industrial production. The Statesman's Pocket Year Book shows that from 1938 to 1949 there was a 300 per cent increase in industrial production. Production over that period was amazing. We have made great play of our industrial development, but the serious aspect is the percentage decline since 1949. Although there was an increase of 300 per cent from the beginning of the war until 1949, in the 10 years since 1949 it has declined to 124 per cent. This is a serious thing in the affairs of a nation. The member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) spoke about growing wheat and getting poorer, and I am inclined to think that as a State we are doing that, for we learn from the Treasurer's speech that with all this development he talked about with almost a fanfare of trumpets our public debt

in one year increased by £20,000,000, which is about £22 per capita. Although we have worked harder we have become poorer. This seems a strange way to develop. If I kept working and got deeper in debt, I would not think I was developing very much.

Production in 1938-39 was valued at £13,678,930 (£22 19s. 10d. *per capita*) and it increased by 1955-56 to £120,935,925 (£144, 18s. 6d. *per capita*). That sounds very good. The gross output increased from £35,005,264 (£58 16s. 5d. *per capita*), in 1938-39 to £316,961,412 (£379 16s. 9d. *per capita*). That also sounds very good, but the public debt increased from £124,000,000 (£183 *per capita*) in 1949 to £296,000,000 (or £253 *per capita*) in 1958. The gross increase was £172,000,000, which is £170 *per capita*. This is rather disquietening. The Premier talks about development, yet the public debt has increased by an average of £19,000,000 a year. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) have advocated on a number of occasions the use of national credit to get us out of some of our financial difficulties, and I support them in this. In doing so, I am reminded of the honest admission of the Treasurer that we are dependent on primary production for a stable economy. Recently a report was tabled in this House from the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee on the drainage of the eastern division of the South-East. It stated *inter alia*:—

The survey shows that 455 square miles, or just under half of the total area, is covered with water for part of each year. This, with those adjacent drained lands which are inaccessible through flooding, could be developed to produce at least half of the above annual income, or £1,815,000 a year. The eventual production from this area when fully developed would be much higher than this, so that it appears that the flooding of the area has reduced production of the area to at least £2,000,000 per year below what it would have been if the district was reasonably well drained. That shows that this area could return an additional £2,000,000 per annum, yet the work has been held up because of an alleged shortage of money. This project could pay for itself if we used national credit for its implementation, and I see no reason why we should not use national credit for such development. Some people argue that money does not grow on trees, but they do not say why national credit should not be used. Members on this side of the House acknowledge that the production of this State has increased, but who has been responsible for it? Many companies have been

making record profits, but the worker has not received his fair share of the State's income. I remind the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) that as a result of the discontinuance of quarterly cost of living adjustments to the basic wage the workers have been penalized to the extent of £16,000,000. They have applied themselves to their tasks assiduously, the result being that we have a total of 5,000 unemployed in South Australia—about 3,600 males and 1,400 females.

Mr. Lawn—The Liberal Party believes in having a higher level of unemployed.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, and it believes there is a danger in over-employment, but the member for Stirling said, in reply to an interjection from the member for Adelaide, that the worker in South Australia was as well off as the worker in any other State. I could prove him wrong, but time will not permit me to delve into conditions in every industry. However, I will quote the salaries of members of the Police Force, who comprise a middle-class and important group.

Mr. Lawn—We have the poorest-paid Premier and poorest-paid members of Parliament.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, and we have a good police force, but our policemen get the lowest salaries in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Lawn—Because of a Liberal Party Government.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Of course. The following table gives the salaries of constables and sergeants in Tasmania, Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia:—

	Tas. £	Vic. £	N.S.W. (Reduced to S.A. Living Wage). £	S.A. £
Constables—				
1st year	1,044	934 to 1,083	993	890
2nd year	1,066	944 to 1,083	1,005	910
3rd year	1,066	969 to 1,094	1,017	930
4th year	1,079	979 to 1,094	1,029	955
5th year	1,079	989 to 1,100	1,041	980
6th to 9th year	1,105	999 to 1,100	1,053	1,005
15 years or over	—	1,126 (after 12 years)	—	1,045
Senior Constables—				
Over 5 years	—	—	1,208	1,135
Sergeants—				
Third grade	—	—	1,263	1,175
Second Grade	—	—	1,353	1,215
First Grade	—	—	1,413	1,255

That table shows that policemen in South Australia are paid much less than those in other States. The member for Stirling said that an employee of the Homebush Abattoirs in New

South Wales wanted to come to this State, but that is an isolated case. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the position of the Tramways Trust, and we now find members of the transport unions saying fearlessly that they have been so neglected by the authorities that they will form one union to demand better conditions. The Leader of the Opposition drew attention to the trust's policy of using one man buses. I travel on these buses frequently, and I know they are very costly. Because the driver has to collect fares they dawdle along the road and create a danger to the travelling public, yet the trust asks the people to believe that this is sound policy.

We have heard frequent references to the benefits our people are getting from increased industrial development. One would imagine that every section of the community benefited, but recently I have received many complaints about a new scale of payments operating in the Children's Welfare Department. Women, charged with the responsibility of rearing and educating young Australians and tending to their moral welfare have had their incomes reduced by 17s. 6d. a week under this new scale. Is this prosperity and development? Is the country so poverty-stricken that it must reduce the incomes of these poor unfortunates? The Budget contains some pleasing features. A grant of £1,000 is proposed for "Meals on Wheels." This is the first time such a grant has appeared. "Meals on Wheels" operates in my electorate and is rendering a wonderful service. It is non-profit-making and has six branches in the metropolitan area, all functioning under the wise guidance of Miss Taylor. It supplies meals to pensioners and sick people, and to those who are unable to prepare their own meals. Meals totalling 1,300 a week are being supplied to people, many of whom, but for this service, would have to be accommodated in hospitals—possibly in the Parkside Mental Home where there is a ward for people unable to care for themselves. This organization has done much for the people, and on behalf of those who have been helped I express appreciation to the Government for this grant.

It is also pleasing to note that the Highways Department has decided to undertake the surfacing and sealing of 110 chains of the Grange Road at an estimated cost of £25,000. I believe the most costly feature of Highways Department expenditure is that involved in heavy equipment and I suggest that in order to secure full value from it it should

be worked 24 hours a day on shift work because while it remains idle costs are mounting. I realize it would be necessary to pay shift work rates to the men but that would be more than compensated for by the continuous use of the equipment.

Recently questions have been asked in the House about the congestion that occurs at the North Adelaide railway crossing, and I have referred to its effect on the Park Street crossing. Whilst the Highways Department does not consider that the North Adelaide crossing affects the Park Street crossing, I am sure the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) will agree with me that when one travels from North Adelaide into the western districts and is delayed by a train at the North Adelaide crossing it is a certainty that he will encounter another delay at the Park Street crossing. Because of the delays to transport industry is heavily taxed and we must make some arrangements to avoid bottlenecks and clear the traffic. We should also do our utmost to overcome the congestion of traffic within the city proper and I suggest that if the uptrack from Port Adelaide were continued across the parklands to connect with the Memorial Drive, the situation would be remedied. The Port Road, where it branches at the Hindmarsh Bridge, would be available for city traffic and traffic moving from the western into the eastern suburbs could utilize the new road. I know it would be a costly project, but the authorities could commence planning for it.

On 3 September I asked a question relating to concrete specifications, particularly as they affect an industry in my electorate which mixes concrete in large quantities. The Building Act regulation No. 31 lays down that the Australian Standard Specification for concrete shall be used in building, and the Standards Association lays down that if the proportions are by volume, one bag of cement of 94lb. shall be regarded as one cubic foot. However, the Australian Association of Surveyors in its journal stated that 90lb. of cement was sufficient to make a cubic foot of concrete in a mixture such as that laid down by the Building Act. The industry in my electorate believes that the authorities should insist on the 94lb. and I have asked that the matter be clarified. I realize that the matter is being investigated and I am prepared to bear with those making the inquiries, but I emphasize that this is of importance.

This debate is of a serious nature and the Opposition believes that in order to maintain the democratic system of government we

should bring all our wisdom and energy into operation. The greatest need of the world today is for peace, and peace can only come from understanding. Those in authority should exercise understanding and do their utmost to enable all to share the advantages arising from increased production. If we, as a nation, can achieve unity and order, we may be able to influence others.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens)—I support the first line and congratulate the Treasurer on the presentation of his twentieth consecutive Budget. This is a great personal achievement.

Mr. Lawn—It is only because he has the electorates sewn up.

Mr. COUMBE—I do not believe we should indulge in party politics during this debate, but if the honourable member wishes to introduce such a feature I will do the same. It is a great achievement for any Treasurer to introduce 20 consecutive Budgets. We must remember that the Treasurer has brought us from 1939—when the State was in the doldrums—to the present period of progress and prosperity. Interspersed in those years were the war years—a period of great turmoil which disrupted the normal run of things. Added to that was the rehabilitation period after the war when not only ex-servicemen and workers in wartime factories had to be rehabilitated, but many industries had to completely change over from war work to peaceful occupations. That has all occurred during the Treasurer's term of office.

Mr. Lawn—Are you after a knighthood in the New Year's List?

Mr. COUMBE—Not straight away. There is one outstanding feature that appears in these Budget papers. We had a disastrous agricultural opening this year because rain came too late. It has been one of the worst openings for many seasons. Consequently revenues must fall, yet the Treasurer has introduced a Budget in which there are no announcements of tax increases. That is in direct contrast to tax increases announced in other States. We are living in a State that is expanding its economy and increasing its population, which must of necessity demand more public works, yet no tax increases have been announced. In South Australia we are achieving a far better balance between primary and secondary industries than we have had for some years. I suggest that this has had a buffering effect in this year of a bad agricultural opening. South Australia is primarily an agricultural State and is likely to be

so for years. When the man on the land suffers through falling prices so do workers in industry. As we get a balance between the two aspects of production, when one suffers through, say, an adverse season the effect is absorbed. That can, of course, occur only in one year and not in two consecutive years.

Mr. Lawn—Do you think we shall have a slump next season?

Mr. CUMBE—No. We shall have a better season because the good rains have come.

Mr. Lawn—Will the farmers be able to sell their products?

Mr. CUMBE—I hope so, and I think wheat and wool prices will increase. Before coming to this House I was an engineer and I am proud of the advances that have taken place in our industrial undertakings. Our leading plants, with management and workers being given equal opportunities, can produce goods as good as, if not better than, other Australian plants. The South Australian workers have proved that. It is essential to our economy to achieve this balanced output between primary and secondary industries, because it is a definite help, and it will be so in the future. Industrially South Australia is in a peculiar position. We must produce economically so that we can place our goods on the eastern markets at equal or better prices and at the same time meet the freight charges. If we cannot produce goods cheaply and in quantity we might as well pack up. To get a cheap unit cost we must produce goods in large quantities. In order to sell the large quantities and keep up our output we must market the goods at the big centres of population. In South Australia we are not near the big centres of population in the eastern States, so we must produce goods rapidly, in large quantities and pay the freight charges to the eastern markets, and at the same time sell at prices equal to or better than the locally-produced goods.

Mr. Lawn—There would be no freight charges on local sales?

Mr. CUMBE—No. To keep the unit cost down there must be a large production and the local market will not absorb it, so we must export to other States. Higher productivity is one of the greatest factors in the development of Australia. It applies equally to primary as to secondary industries. I am not an expert in all phases of primary production but I know something about secondary industries and my remarks will be confined mainly to industrial production. Higher productivity

means a larger output of goods and services from the resources used. That must not be confused with higher production, which is a larger output of goods and services from more and more resources.

Mr. Fred Walsh—You do not suggest that the productivity has been lowered?

Mr. CUMBE—No, but it is important that we get a higher productivity. This productivity can be used in four ways. First, there is the personal consumption of some of the goods produced, secondly, there is defence, thirdly, production for export at competitive prices, and fourthly, there is the provision of capital facilities to cope with the growing population. Any increase in productivity means that more goods and services can be devoted to any of these four objectives without impairing any one of them. Higher productivity must contribute towards the solution of our urgent economic problems. Lower costs of production must assist the sale of our exports overseas and must also reduce the demand for imports. If we have this it must ease the balance of our payments overseas. If we stabilize costs of production it must contribute to the stability of our home prices and raise the standard of living. The consumer must benefit from stable or lower prices. The workers would benefit from higher wages and improved working conditions.

Mr. Loveday—How would they get that?

Mr. CUMBE—Higher productivity can be obtained from the adoption of incentive schemes and I will have more to say about that directly. I have pointed out how proprietors and workers must benefit. Then there is the building up of reserves and ultimate expansion. The view that we should have increased productivity in Australia is not widely accepted. Up till now we have had a succession of good seasons and living standards have been rising, with national development booming. Because of the recent fall in wool prices many people are now giving very serious thought to the matter of higher productivity. The trouble is that many people dislike making changes in the habits they have followed for years. Many employers have been disinclined to alter their methods of production. Some have refused to confer and co-operate with their employees. That situation is beginning to disappear. Many employers—persons who would not have dreamt of doing so 10 or 15 years ago—are now prepared to confer with employees. The honourable member for Adelaide would agree with that.

Mr. Lawn—We know plenty who do not.

Mr. COUMBE—The trade union movement, with some notable exceptions, has resisted the introduction of incentive schemes and methods that would increase efficiency.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—Why would that be?

Mr. COUMBE—I do not think we should go into that at the moment.

Mr. Lawn—Go into it, by all means.

Mr. COUMBE—The responsibility for increasing productivity must primarily rest with management. Improvements can only be achieved if management realizes its responsibilities to its establishment and staff, and effectively exercises that responsibility. After all, it is the management that decides what shall be made in the factory and how it shall be made; it has to provide the means of making the product, pay for it to be made, and generally decide which machine the product will be made on, which method is to be used and which process is the best; so it is management that has to decide whether it will go in for higher productivity or not. On the other hand, the initiative in planning by the management cannot go very far unless employees and the trade union movement are prepared to accept that they have a responsibility and can benefit by higher production. The Australian Council of Trade Unions has made several official public statements that it believes in the necessity for higher productivity. Mr. Monks is one of those who made that statement, and I give him full marks for it.

Mr. Lawn—We do not object to increased production.

Mr. COUMBE—The Australian Council of Trade Unions was a party to the report issued by the Ministry of Labour Advisory Council, and was also represented on the Standing Committee for Productivity. The reports make very interesting reading, and I only regret that certain members of the Australian Council of Trade Unions saw fit to withdraw.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Congress decided that.

Mr. COUMBE—I am sorry it decided to withdraw, because the committee was doing a very useful job.

Mr. Lawn—Mr. Holt was using it politically in the House.

Mr. COUMBE—That is only the honourable member's opinion. An advisory committee cannot function properly if it knows only one side. However, I will not go into the reason for the withdrawal of these representatives.

Mr. Fred Walsh—There should be three sides; there should be Government representation as well. You had representatives from

two or three different sets of employer's organizations.

Mr. COUMBE—Such a council cannot fulfil its true function without equal representation. I hope the Australian Council Trade Unions representatives will soon be back, because the committee did some useful work, and the publications it issued are very helpful to industry.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What about the industrial council the Curtin Government tried to establish in 1942? That was sabotaged by employer's representatives, Sir Frank Perry being one of the leaders.

Mr. COUMBE—That is past history. The trade union movement also has its responsibilities, and as a tripartite member the Government has to play its part in providing conditions under which there is full employment and a proper reward. I am pleased to see that a grant of £1,000 has been made this year for the Institute of Management, because that organization fosters among management and the future leaders of this State the principles of good management, as the School of Mines does in its course on good management and foremanship training. I think we could do more in this direction. An interesting aspect is that management is now being taught in many country areas—I think at Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Port Pirie and perhaps Port Augusta. There is demand in the larger country centres for this type of training, and the fact that many industries have seen fit to send their executives, or those who will become executives, is a step in the right direction, because we are getting to the stage where, if we are going to have trained personnel, as against men jumping up because of seniority, there must be a background of training. The Government has an important part to play in fostering such movements. Management and foremanship training is one example. The Government can inspire confidence and so preserve economic climate and conditions in the higher productivity that will be achieved.

I also suggest that there should be more and more conferences between the Government, employees or the Australian Council of Trade Unions and employers, seized very fully with the importance of higher productivity, so that they could hammer out ways and means to co-operate one with the other on this all important subject. I will now suggest several means by which higher productivity can be achieved. Firstly, greater use must be made in factories of plant and machinery, either

existing or new. If there is obsolete machinery, it should be replaced with new plant with which new techniques could be used because, if a machine is obsolete, productivity cannot be increased.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What are you going to use for money?

Mr. CUMBE—If a machine is obsolete it should have been written off on the books and provision made for new plant to replace it. Secondly, an extensive study should be made of methods of production. I have seen wasteful methods in many factories, and now there are many new methods of handling materials. For instance, years ago heavy articles had to be shifted laboriously, but now fork lifts are used for this work. Thirdly, we could have better training of managers, technicians and foremen; I believe this is most essential. Fourthly, properly planned incentive schemes should be introduced, but only if strictly policed by both sides. I have seen many of these schemes tried out; some have worked and some have failed. An incentive scheme cannot be carried out properly unless, before it is put in operation, agreement is reached between both parties, and after introducing the scheme, it is properly policed. When any adjustment is to be made the parties should confer on it. I believe such a scheme is absolutely essential to improve productivity, and in fact workmen in many factories demand jobs in which there are incentive schemes.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Many of them are victims of economic circumstances.

Mr. CUMBE—True, but more and more workmen ask for jobs with incentive schemes to increase the amount of money they take home each week. Under these schemes the worker gets more money and the employer gets increased output; there is a greater output with a lower unit cost.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Many workers have been seeking jobs with more overtime.

Mr. CUMBE—What is wrong with that? Overtime comes about mainly because there is a greater amount of work about than can be done with the employees available.

Mr. Loveday—Sometimes overtime is given just to hold employees in a job.

Mr. CUMBE—Exactly; I have been guilty of that myself. Finally, it is absolutely imperative to have a vast improvement in the relationship between management and labour. There has been a lot of talk about this, but I do not think it can be over-emphasized. If we are to have higher productivity there must be co-operation between the two sides,

although we shall always have the old-fashioned element on both sides.

Mr. Fred Walsh—There must be a recognition of the rights of both sides.

Mr. CUMBE—There must be greater co-operation and a greater respect from each side for the rights of the other. We must realize the prime importance of increasing our productivity. If we do not increase it, what will be the result? I contend that we can easily be priced out of our overseas markets by countries with a lower wage rate and standard of living. We do not want to come down to the standard of living of some other countries, but if we want to export some of our products we must produce them economically, for we have to compete against countries that produce goods with sweated labour. They pay low wages, but their employees have a long working week and a much lower standard of living than Australians. Australia must produce her goods more cheaply in order to expand our overseas markets.

Mr. Lawn—Do you think prices would come down?

Mr. CUMBE—If we increase production without using greater resources, costs will be reduced, and in many cases prices could come down.

Mr. Loveday—In many cases they have not, despite improved methods.

Mr. CUMBE—I am afraid that is true in some cases. Higher productivity has a great bearing on the Budget, for we are achieving a better balance between primary and secondary production. Recently we have had adverse seasons and the price of wool has dropped, but the improved position of our secondary industries has acted as a buffer so that this year we are able to provide for increased public works without increasing taxation. However, if we had two or three bad agricultural seasons the position might be different, for secondary industry could not hope to act as a buffer against that. Secondary industry is greatly affected by the condition of our primary industries, and if we had two or three bad seasons the employee in the factory would have a bad time. I do not think we shall ever reach the stage when we shall not have to rely largely on the man on the land and his production.

Mr. Lawn—What do you think will happen at the next State election?

Mr. CUMBE—The honourable member seems to have some doubts about that question and needs enlightenment. I am not in any doubt, for I am sure the Government Party

will be returned in greater numbers. The honourable member does not have to look in a crystal ball to see the future. If he takes stock of what is going on he will see the position clearly.

Mr. Lawn—I am closer to the people than you are. What about the Mount Gambier and Wallaroo by-elections?

Mr. CUMBE—The honourable member will be able to put forward his views when he speaks on the Leader of the Opposition's motion about electoral boundaries.

Mr. Lawn—Are you opposed to Royal Commissions?

Mr. CUMBE—I have not expressed my views on that motion. Does the honourable member oppose it?

Mr. Lawn—I should like your views on whether you think the Playford dictatorship will still occupy the Treasury benches next year.

Mr. CUMBE—I am afraid I must disappoint the honourable member: the L.C.L. Party will be returned with an increased majority. I give full credit to Government departments and Ministers concerned for grants to various bodies in my electorate. I have several private hospitals in my district, most of which are of the non-profit-making type. The Adelaide Children's Hospital is the only one in the State that treats children's illnesses, and this year it will get a grant of £460,000. The hospital is embarking on a major programme of expansion. A five-storey kitchen block will be completed soon, and another nurses' home of six storeys will be constructed. In the next two or three years a six-storey wing will be built to provide further accommodation for patients. A building will be erected on land purchased with Government assistance from the St. Peters Girls' Collegiate School, which has been moved to the eastern suburbs. A large number of hospital auxiliaries has been formed, of which the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) is State President. They will raise money to provide the furnishings of the extra wards.

I pay a tribute to the staff and nurses of the Children's Hospital for the excellent treatment given to children. I am sure that many members have had children at the institution at some time and that they will speak highly of the services given. The board of governors has done a wonderful job in keeping the hospital going, but it is essential for the Government to provide further assistance. The sum allocated this year will

be of great benefit to the institution at North Adelaide and to the one at Estcourt House, where children are taken for rehabilitation after treatment.

Calvary Hospital will get £83,000 and the Memorial £13,000 towards improvements and extensions. In Prospect we have the Northern Community Hospital, which is doing a wonderful job, and it will receive almost £6,000. Grants to private and community hospitals relieve the load on large public institutions. The Government's support for smaller hospitals will result in decentralizing hospital treatment and patients will be able to get the type of treatment they wish. This year the Royal Institute for the Blind at North Adelaide will receive £20,000. Any member who has visited this institution must have been impressed by the work being done there. Many inmates are now self-supporting and do a wonderful job. The institute tries to place trained inmates in jobs outside the institution, and full marks must go to the Royal Institute for the mighty job it is doing. The South Australian Oral School will receive £1,700. It is giving excellent service in teaching children who were born deaf and could not learn to speak. The Kindergarten Union trains young girls to teach children of pre-school age. It has a college at North Adelaide, and this year it will receive £135,000. Four University colleges in North Adelaide will receive £20,000, mainly to provide board and tutorial assistance to students from the country. Parents are glad to be able to send their children to these colleges—Aquinas, Lincoln, St. Ann's and St. Mark's.

Despite the comments made by the member for Adelaide, I agree entirely with the member for Hindmarsh that "Meals on Wheels" is a wonderful institution, and I commend the Government for granting it £1,000, which is the first grant it has received. I had the privilege of working with "Meals on Wheels" at Port Adelaide in delivering food, and also at the new centre established at Prospect early this year. A new building has been erected there with the assistance of the Prospect Rotary Club, which deserves much credit for its work. I hope the grant for "Meals on Wheels" will be increased later, for it is providing a great service to many pensioners and sick people. The Government must have the confidence of the people. We are consolidating past achievements and planning for the future.

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

Mr. CUMBE—I suggested that the Budget was remarkable because there were no tax increases, despite the adverse comments

levelled against those on this side of the House. The Budget is in keeping with the atmosphere of the times. One of the duties of the Government in introducing the Budget is to inspire confidence—confidence in the people and confidence in the business community—because if a community does not have confidence it cannot flourish, and certainly the business community must have confidence if it is to expand. If it does not expand it cannot absorb more of the work force.

This Budget certainly inspires confidence in the people, creates an incentive for expansion, and at the same time provides for increased public works. It reveals a large number of public works planned for this financial year, including a record number of schools, expansion of hospitals, an additional building for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, extension of waterworks and sewers and many other projects. Despite our setbacks, there are to be no tax increases. In addition to an increased number of public works, provision is also made for social services and for those needing a helping hand, including grants to charitable bodies and social service workers. Once again I congratulate the Treasurer on having brought down his twentieth successive Budget. It is easily a record, but this record will be eclipsed next year when he brings down his twenty-first. I know that Mr. Lawn will support that Budget, as he is about to support this one. I have much pleasure in supporting the first line.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I do not know why the honourable member thinks that I should support this Budget, which is a farewell Budget.

Mr. Coumbe—Perhaps it is because you will not be here next year.

Mr. LAWN—We have just heard the honourable member's swan song. He has walked the plank of no return, but he need not think that members on this side are doing the same, for we shall be occupying the Treasury benches next session. If the honourable member would like to contest Adelaide next March, I should welcome him as an opponent. Earlier this session the member for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) half sang the words of the old song "Tell me the Old, Old Story." Sitting here throughout the session and watching the performances of members opposite, I am reminded of the song "He holds a little biddy Baby in his Hands." The master holds the Liberal Party in his hands, and he must feel sometimes like ringing their necks. We heard from Mr. Coumbe

about increased production over the years and we have heard the Premier say that South Australia has the highest per capita production of any State in the Commonwealth. Mr. Coumbe is quite correct in saying we have the highest production, but we on this side demand that the workers have some share in that increased production. However, those who create the production do not share in it. It is all very well for members of the Liberal Party to say that increased production means a decrease in costs

Mr. Heaslip—The Americans think so.

Mr. LAWN—I agree that increased production results in decreased costs. Whether or not South Australia has the highest production in the Commonwealth does not matter, because, although today our production is greater than ever, prices for goods are higher than ever.

Mr. Hambour—And so is the standard of living.

Mr. LAWN—The fact remains that the benefit of increased production is not being enjoyed by those who produce it, and that means that someone is getting a rake-off. It is not going to those who create it.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Taxation takes some of it.

Mr. LAWN—And yet the honourable member wanted to burgle £111,000,000 from the Federal Treasurer a few weeks ago. I am not suggesting that some of the value of the increased production is not taken away in the form of taxation. Whereas workmen are producing at the highest level, so are General Motors-Holdens, the Broken Hill Proprietary Company and other concerns making greater profits than ever before. The master and his colleagues claim that our workmen produce more *per capita* than in any other State and have more *per capita* in the Savings Bank, but I point out that individually they are more in debt than they have ever been. That cannot be denied.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—They have one motor car to every three people.

Mr. LAWN—And those cars are not paid for. The honourable members should know that, according to the Commonwealth Statist, the amount involved in hire purchase indebtedness today is greater than it has ever been. The people owe more money. Notwithstanding their increased production they are not getting their fair share to enable them to pay their way. They are mortgaging their future. It is interesting to refer to the master's policy speech on behalf of his Party three years ago. In the *Advertiser* of February 16, 1956, he is

reported as having said that the Government would continue to encourage and support the development of secondary industries, not at expense of primary production, but complementary to it. He said that agreement had been reached on a proposal for a meat works at Kadina, giving the firm the right to sell a quota of meat in the metropolitan area. He also said the Government wanted to secure a similar agreement for a freezing works in the South-East. What has happened to those meat works?

Mr. Heaslip—Who backed out? Did the Government? No!

Mr. LAWN—That was not the principal reference I desired to make from his policy speech, but it indicates that he has not kept the promises he made three years ago. In his policy speech he said that at every session of Parliament workmen's compensation had been improved in accordance with the recommendation of a committee comprising employers and employees. Every time he delivers a Budget speech he boasts of the workers' increased production and their savings, but the workmen have the worst Workmen's Compensation Act in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Heaslip—They still have the best bank balances.

Mr. LAWN—Who have? I remind the honourable member that in June the Government asked Parliament to pass an amount of £72,000 for the Welfare Department to help the unemployed—those who were destitute. The Premier said that our unemployed had to wait seven days before receiving unemployment payments from the Commonwealth Government and without assistance from the Welfare Department could not pay their way. The department checks on every person before it makes a payment. A person must produce his bank book and make a declaration that he has no money elsewhere before he can get relief from the department. If the department discovers subsequently that he has a few pounds it sends a demand for a refund of the money paid to him. The fact that we had to pass this grant of £72,000 proves conclusively that whoever has the money in the bank it is not the worker.

Our workers are the best in the Commonwealth yet they have the worst Workmen's Compensation Act. We do not mind increased production provided it is not secured from sweated labour. Our workmen receive the lowest basic wage in the Commonwealth, have the worst Workmen's Compensation Act and the worst Factories Act in the Commonwealth, and have the worst long service leave in the world. Our Government employees get 90 days'

long service leave after 10 years' service and all other State Acts relating to Government employees provide similar provisions. In other States private employees receive 13 weeks' long service leave after 20 years' service but in South Australia we have a specially evolved system—and I suggest evolved in the mind of a spiteful man—providing one week's long service leave after seven years' employment. Even decent employers are signing agreements in accordance with the claim set out by the Allied Council of Trade Unions rather than adopting the provisions of our Act.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), who is himself an employer, referred to incentive payments. In either 1950 or 1951 I conducted a case before the Arbitration Court and referred to a matter in respect of Kelvinator's. A few years before, a certain person who was general manager of Kelvinator's was a piece-work fanatic. In every industry in which he has been employed he has introduced or tried to introduce piece-work. In the motor industry the workmen stopped work and, as a result, piece-work and bonus work were discontinued.

Mr. Jennings—Do you think this person could introduce it in the Tramways Trust?

Mr. LAWN—I do not know whether it would work if the trust had to pay per mile. I think the Railways Union has asked to be paid per mile and the Tramways Trust would probably be in a similar position. Piece-work was introduced at Kelvinator's and production increased. Workmen were earning an amount over the normal award rate, but when the manager thought in about 1950 or 1951 that the workman was sweating as much as possible, a factory notice was posted stating that after a certain date piece-work would be stopped, workers would revert to day wages, and any man whose daily production dropped would be sacked. The employers want the incentive system in order to boost production but when the workmen are producing the maximum the employers want to cut out the incentive payments and revert to award rates, and then if production is reduced the workmen are sacked. Not all employers are like that, but 99 per cent of them are. There is also the group bonus system, which is even worse. In a factory the employees are sectionalized in order that the system can operate. The men in each section are paid, not on their individual output but on the output of the group, and we have young men competing against old men. In the motor industry we have seen father and son working together on a chain line. We have also seen

as many as four men battling to work inside a motorear body and always being in one another's way. This was a sweated industry. On the chain work a curtain is hung and various sections of the men work on the motor car body. If one pair of men are not finished by the time they reach their curtain they carry on whilst another pair come in to do their work, so there are four men trying to work together on the one motor car body. These are systems which the employers can evolve and when the workmen oppose them it is said they are not interested in boosting production. We do not mind properly regulated increased production but we do not want any vicious system.

There is also the individual piecework system, but it is not as bad as the group bonus system. A workman whose normal award rate is £15 a week may be producing 300 articles in that time, which means that the labor cost per article is one shilling. If piecework is introduced this man does not get another shilling for each article he produces over the 300: if he produces another 300 he may be paid an additional £1 or £2. He would not get £30 for producing the 600 articles, but even if he got that payment it would pay the employer, for the same machinery would be used and there would be the same overhead costs.

Earlier Mr. Coumbe, with his eye on the next election and the arrangements the Liberal Party is making with its colleagues in the "disguised" Liberal Party, referred to unity tickets. Of course, as a Liberal he is an expert in this matter. The Liberal Party and the disguised Liberal Party have made a pact to swap preferences. The two parties have decided that at the next Commonwealth elections the Liberal Party will have its-how-to-vote instructions printed on a blue background and the Democratic Labor Party will print its on a yellow background. For the next State elections they will again swap preferences, but this time the Democratic Labor Party will use a blue background and the Liberal Party a yellow.

Mr. Bywaters—How many Democratic Labor Party men have been members of the Labor Party?

Mr. LAWN—Only one as far as I know. I will not mention his name. We know of others who have contested Liberal Party pre-selection ballots. Despite the fact that they are swapping preferences, the electors know there is no difference between the two parties except in the labels. If I had a couple of empty beer

bottles, one branded West End and another Southwark, the only difference would be in the labels. They would both be empty inside, and that applies to these parties.

The member for Mitcham said he dreamt that he went up the steps of the Liberal Party office, thought he was in the Labor Party office, and asked for a copy of the rules of the Party. I had the pleasure of tripping up the steps of the Liberal Club office and obtaining a copy of the constitution, principles and State platform. I knew the Party had no principles, but I thought it had a State platform, although on reading the book I found it has not. The first object is:—

(a) To stimulate interest in public affairs throughout South Australia.

The Liberal Party does not want to stimulate interest in public affairs; the less knowledge it gives the people, the more hush-hush it can be, the better. Its members make secret visits in and around the State, interstate and overseas. The next object is:—

(b) To foster a spirit of industrial and political co-operation amongst those engaged in industries throughout the State.

Only last session a Bill was introduced to provide long service leave, and although employers and unions made it clear what they wanted—13 weeks leave after 20 years service—the master, because he had rejected the trade union movement on two or three previous occasions, and had rejected a Bill brought forward by the Opposition a couple of years previously, was not big enough to admit he was wrong, and was not prepared to give the leave employers and employees desired. The third object of the party is:—

(c) To advocate sound, progressive and humanitarian legislation and unite in one movement all electors who believe in a fair deal for all sections of the community.

That sounds like Fascism to me. They are not prepared to give people an electoral system that will enable them to change the Government. I have heard the Premier condemn the situation in Queensland in a far more condemnatory way than I have condemned the gerrymander in this State. Despite the situation in Queensland, the people can change the Government. They threw out a Labor Government in 1930, and recently another Labor Government was put out of office. Although there was a change of Government in 1930, the Upper House was not restored, and there has never been any suggestion that it would be restored. The Government of South Australia does not want a fair

deal for every section of the community; it has electorates so sewn up that its opponents are grouped into a small area, as suggested by the member for Gawler (Mr. John Clark) when he quoted what Dr. Finer wrote about gerrymanders. Dr. Finer was right—to bring about a gerrymander you put your opponents in a small area and spread your own electorates over as large an area as possible.

The Liberal Party says that it supports humanitarian legislation, yet this week I received a letter from the Chief Secretary about two married invalid pensioners who live in a slum house in Adelaide, and have been given notice to quit. Their landlord gave notice to the tenants next door, and after renovating the house he is now obtaining £4 4s. instead of the 15s. he received previously. The wife is bedridden and has to go to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for treatment every few months. In addition, a nurse calls daily to give an injection and a doctor calls four times a week. All this couple receives is £4 7s. 6d. a week each by way of pension. The woman has been receiving special foods from the Public Relief Department, but as a result of the tightening of the belt process referred to by the Treasurer, she must go without these life-giving foods. The doctor sent a letter to the department certifying that she must have special foods but the department said that it had been instructed not to provide them. I forwarded a doctor's certificate to the Chief Secretary and was told in reply that the foods had been stopped because of the financial position of the couple. I went to school with the man, and I have known his wife for many years. I thought their only income was the pension, but when I received this letter I thought I had been taken down, so I wrote them a letter stating that I was not aware of their financial position. The wife replied, and enclosed a Commonwealth Bank passbook which had a balance of 10s. 10d. In the accompanying letter she assured me that their sole income was their pension of £4 7s. 6d. each—and this Government, according to the constitution of the Liberal Party, says that it stands for "humanitarian legislation."

I remind members that the master, under condemnation from this side of the House of what he was doing, stated here that pensioners attending the Royal Adelaide Hospital would not be charged; attention would be free. The honourable member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) and I have on several occasions had to take up either with the Government or with the hospital departments cases of charges

being made on pensioners. The lady I have just spoken about was coming out of the Royal Adelaide Hospital from one of her many visits. All patients received their accounts as though they were not pensioners. Nobody seems to be making inquiries or, if they are, they are not worrying anybody. All pensioners coming out of the Royal Adelaide Hospital are receiving accounts. If they send them to their M.P. or raise the matter themselves, they are getting them cancelled, provided they have not subscribed to a medical benefits fund, in which case the Government takes their medical benefits. Some of them were insured before they became pensioners and they are continuing today; I do not know why. In such cases this Government has taken from those pensioners the amount of money they are receiving from their societies. They are paying for it out of their £4 7s. 6d.

Yesterday a lady said she had recently spent four months in the Royal Adelaide Hospital. She received an account; she said she was a pensioner and asked whether she would have to pay. I said "No, you will not have to pay. Call on me tomorrow and bring your account with you or post it to me, and I will take the matter up." She said "I could not come and see you; I am a polio victim." She is not an old lady, but an invalid pensioner. She is one of the poor people in the community who need help. She has spent four months in hospital and cannot come and see me because of this complaint. She received an account for four months' attention, yet this Government says in its Party objects "We advocate humanitarian legislation." We on this side of the House could give many more instances of this type of thing happening in South Australia. Then:—

(d) To guard the interests of those engaged in productive enterprise, including a reduction of the tariff, and a solution of the transport problem.

Tariffs are a Federal matter, but the transport problem is a State matter. This Government is not prepared to stand up to the transport problem. The Premier is not going to fight private enterprise in regard to transport. He will not even make it obligatory on interstate transport operators to have some identification on their vehicles. They have identification in other States and they have successfully applied legislation (which has been favourably regarded by the High Court of Australia) regarding taxes. In South Australia they pay nothing towards the upkeep of the roads. An ordinary workman in South Australia may own a vehicle

which he does not take out of the State but uses only at week-ends, and he is paying taxes to keep these roads in good repair for these big semi-trailers to tear up. They are competing with our own State enterprise.

The Liberal Party says it is going to find a solution to the transport problem. When he introduced certain legislation the Premier said he was not prepared to provide for heavy taxation in it and neither of the two Acts that we have passed provides for heavy taxation. There were judgments of the High Court of Australia previously, and Victoria was the first State to break through the High Court; it has been followed by New South Wales. Now it is up to South Australia; we are always the last. Our workmen were the last in the States to get a 48-hour week, a 44-hour week and then a 40-hour week. We were also last in the matter of annual holidays and sick leave. All those conditions were first granted in the eastern States because the Governments there are progressive. Then:—

(e) To educate electors to understand that the prosperity of the State depends upon the success of production and the encouragement of private enterprise.

The Liberal Party is going to teach the people that. No matter whether private enterprise was running our motor industry or steelworks, the State could run them with probably more advantage to the workmen and people of the State. I will not be a party to handing over any more rights over the iron ore deposits to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company.

This Government will hand over the iron ore deposits to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company and then come down to Tonsley and run a railway line, confiscating people's houses and backyards in the process. The Government does not care a rap about running a railway line through the backyards of these people. The legislation of this Government is not in accordance with its objects because those objects are only for public consumption. We can see plenty of that going on this year because it is the last opportunity of members opposite to do it before the next election. Next we read:—

(f) To elect to Parliament representatives who uphold the tradition of a free British deliberative assembly. All members of Parliament shall be directly and solely responsible to the people.

We know that all members of this House are not responsible to the people. Members on the other side of the House are responsible to their master, but we on this side are responsible to the best people, the workers. One mem-

ber opposite was elected in 1956 and expressed certain opinions about the Government's activities. He wanted a Royal Commission to inquire into various matters, but we told him that before he had been here three years he would be congratulating his master. He wanted to know why. He said, "I can say what I like," but I told him his master would put him straight. Last session he started to commend the Government for what it was doing, and this year he is falling over backwards to congratulate the Government. He has toed the line at last, as we said he would. Members opposite cannot deny that they do what the master tells them.

Mr. Jennings—They do not seem to be anxious to send it.

Mr. LAWN—Of course not. They have sewn up the position in their Party so that if anyone competes against them in pre-selection he gets the sack. Employees at the Labor Party Office do not get the sack if they contest a plebiscite. Mr. Sexton has contested a couple, but he did not get the sack. Rule No. 70a of the Liberal and Country League states:—

Any member of the staff must resign from the service of the League before nominating for selection as a Parliamentary candidate; any subsequent re-employment of such member by the League to be approved by the Executive.

That person has to resign. In other words, he is sacked, and before he can return to his job he has to be approved of by the executive, yet members opposite say they belong to a democratic Party. It is a Fascist organization. The Liberal Party tried to make capital out of the fact that Mr. Chambers was expelled from the Labor Party, but only the State branch can expel a member, and that is the highest authority of the Party. Rule No. 3 of the Liberal and Country League states:—

Any member, after due notice and hearing, may be expelled by resolution by the Branch of which he is a member.

There may be several branches within each Assembly electorate. There may be six in the electorate of Burnside, and any one of them could expel a member.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—There are 12 branches in Burnside.

Mr. Hutchens—With perhaps only six members in each branch.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, and five of them could expel one, but a member of the Labor Party can be expelled only by the highest authority.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—The delegates do not carry 2,000 votes in their pockets.

Mr. LAWN—I do not know what the honourable member means.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—I am referring to your undemocratic card system.

Mr. LAWN—Let us examine the Liberal Country League rule about district committees. It states:—

Each branch shall be entitled to representation on the district committee as follows:—

Up to 25 financial members—two delegates.

25 to 50 financial members—three delegates and one extra delegate for every additional 25 members or part thereof.

No branch shall send more than six delegates.

That was copied from the Labor Party's rules. The Liberal and Country League has various methods of representation. One rule relating to the selection of Parliamentary candidates states:—

Up to 500 financial members—four delegates.

500 to 1,000 financial members—six delegates.

Over 1,000 financial members—eight delegates.

The Liberal Party accepts the principle, if it can be called that, that its branches should have voting strength according to the number of members in them. There is nothing wrong with that, but that principle is not applied to South Australia's electoral system. I represent over 21,000 electors, but the Premier and some of his colleagues represent only about 6,000 each, plus stockyard confetti, sheep, goats and galahs, but they have a vote each in this House, and I have only one, too. Some years ago a referendum was held, and the Liberal Party expelled one young Liberal because he advocated a "No" vote when the Party supported a "Yes" vote. A report of that instance stated:—

The Liberal and Country Party State executive has suspended Mr. Alan J. Missen, vice president of the Young Liberal movement, from holding executive office for 18 months. This is the sequel to action taken by the Party against Mr. Missen when he published a letter advocating a "No" vote at the referendum. The Liberal and Country Party State executive originally censured and suspended Mr. Missen in August pending a decision by the Young Liberal Movement's Co-ordination Council. Early this month he resigned as vice-president, but was re-elected.

That man was probably expelled by about half a dozen members of his Party, but no one can be expelled from the Labor Party unless by the State authority.

Mr. O'Halloran—And not by a card vote, either.

Mr. LAWN—That is so. I wish we had the card vote system in this House because I would then be able to adequately represent my 21,000 electors. A few years ago the member

for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) said the metropolitan members carried the country members on their backs. I believe he was referring to his colleagues in the Liberal Party. Metropolitan members are restricted in their franchise and those in the Liberal Party representing an electorate of about 6,500, including stockyard confetti, sheep, goats and galahs, are being carried on the backs of metropolitan members, such as the member for Burnside. They talk with their tongues in their cheeks when they talk about the card system of voting.

I have never missed an opportunity to draw the Government's attention to its shortcomings in relation to workmen's compensation. Because we have not the necessary legislation on our Statute Book, every time a workman is killed on his way to or from work his widow and children are entitled to no workmen's compensation payments. With the exception of Western Australia, this is the only State where that applies. Also, the relatives of Commonwealth employees killed in these circumstances are entitled to payment. A workman goes to work to produce profits for such organizations as the Broken Hill Proprietary Company, General Motors-Holdens and the Perry Engineering Company, and to get enough money to buy food to give him sufficient strength to continue working, but he is not covered for workmen's compensation until he gets inside the gates of his place of employment. We know that the Liberal Party has no principles or conscience, or otherwise it would rectify this anomaly. In *The News* of September 10 appeared a paragraph relating to the death of a man aged 48 who, while riding a bicycle on his way to work at Balhannah, was involved in a head-on collision with a utility and killed instantly; but unless his relatives can substantiate a third party claim no payment will be made to the widow. They would have to endeavour to brief counsel and obtain witnesses, and perhaps no one saw the accident.

Mr. Jennings—What would have been the position had the accident occurred across the border in Victoria?

Mr. LAWN—Let me come nearer home. If he had been employed by the Commonwealth Government he would have been covered for workmen's compensation. Any workman in South Australia employed in a Commonwealth workshop would be covered when going to or from his place of employment, whereas his neighbour, working, say, for the Hon. Sir Frank Perry, would not be covered and the widow and children might be left destitute. Only once since 1938 has the Liberal and

Country League really won an election, yet members of the Party talk about 20 years' of responsible government and 20 consecutive budgets by the master. If the public had had their way during those 20 years he would have approached nowhere near his 20th budget. I say now that he will not deliver his 21st. What do the public think of the last 20 years and what will future citizens think of them? I know that Government supporters since the Wallaroo by-election, and particularly since the Mount Gambier by-election, have panicked and are very much afraid of what will happen next year. This session the Government has shown signs that it has panicked.

The master will be finished after this year. Not being the Premier of the State he will have more leisure time, something which I think he will appreciate. He will have more time to spend in his garden and with his family, to which he is entitled. I can visualize his being visited by his grandchildren and his grandchildren talking about the time when he was Premier. I suggest the conversation may be somewhat on these lines:—"Dear Grandpapa, during the last year you were Premier did you go on a hush-hush visit to America to load some ships with industries to bring back to South Australia? Were you there when Mr. Cahill, the Premier of New South Wales, and Mr. Tonkin, the deputy Premier of Western Australia, were there, and did they come back with promises of many millions of pounds to be spent in their States? What did you bring back, Grandpapa? Was it a little white elephant? Is that right, dear Grandpapa? When you were Premier did you go all around the coastline of South Australia digging deepsea ports? Dear Grandpapa, did you put in the coal at Leigh Creek and then dig a hole to get it out again? Oh Grandpapa! And, dear Grandpapa, did you build a lot of factories in South Australia when you were Premier, and did you build a big office for the *Advertiser*, and big insurance offices, and erect all those beautiful petrol stations and garages we see around the metropolis? And, at the same time, dear Grandpapa, is it true you could not build homes for the poor people? Is it true, dear Grandpapa, that where we see these beautiful petrol stations and garages there used to be lovely homes? On one occasion, dear Grandpapa, did you say you could not build homes because, whilst you had plenty of money in the State Treasury, there was a shortage of labour and materials? And, dear Grandpapa, did you later say that when there was plenty of labour and material

some beastly bounder had burgled the State Treasury? Was that about the same time as Mr. Menzies became Prime Minister?"

That is how I suggest posterity will view the last 20 years. We have listened to propaganda about deep sea ports and swimming pools. The Government even claimed credit for the swimming pool at Mount Gambier which was provided by the people of that city. We have heard much lately about our prosperity, but I remind members that the *Mail* had to make a public appeal for money to buy warm blankets for cold pensioners. We are still that poor as a State, despite our prosperity, that we cannot give our pensioners concessional fares on our trams and trains. Women of 75 years of age are still being thrown out of their homes to sleep in the streets until such time as some friendly person or charitable organization takes them in.

I look forward to going to the people during the forthcoming Federal and State election campaigns. During the past three years we have heard nothing from the master but criticism of the Prime Minister and Federal Treasurer, the last instance being in respect of the Snowy waters. Prior to that he complained about the poor hand-out of money for housing the people. There have been other instances and yet between now and November 22 he will tour the State kissing in Menzies' pocket.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—Perhaps I am the most unfortunate member of the House in that I have to follow the member for Adelaide, because it has been necessary for me to remain in the precincts of the Chamber and listen to the greatest lot of twaddle I have heard since I have been a member. I do not know if the honourable member sought to be a comedian, or what his intentions were, but his statements were stupid and beneath the dignity of Parliament. I say that in all seriousness. His tirade against the Treasurer, including his reference to the Treasurer's grandchildren, was not funny. It was typical of his low sense of humour.

Mr. Lawn interjecting:

Mr. HAMBOUR—It was only out of respect for the honourable member's disability that I did not get into him while he was on his feet.

Mr. Lawn—My disability!

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes. The blood rushes to his head and I am sure it clouds his sense of proportion and his otherwise normal attitude to life. What did we hear tonight? Statements

that in part could have been comical if this was a comedy show. However, this is a serious Legislature and we are dealing with one of the most important documents of the session—the Budget. What did we hear from the member for Adelaide? We heard criticism, stupidity and abuse. However, if he prefers to continue with his rabble-rousing, let it be on his head. He made one statement concerning my entry into this Parliament and my criticism of the Government. I do not make any excuses for any criticism I have offered of the Government from time to time—and I have offered plenty. I have more to offer tonight. However, I have had the satisfaction of having some of my suggestions approved.

The member for Adelaide ranted about the treatment pensioners received at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I plead guilty to advocating in my first speech here that a charge should be made at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. For years the annual revenue derived from the hospital was about £9,000 or £10,000. People who could well afford to pay entered the hospital and were treated free of charge and the general public had to pay for that treatment. The Government, in its wisdom, saw fit to make a charge of 36s. a day in 1956. I have examined the Budget and have ascertained that, as a result of the allegedly harsh treatment meted out to patients at the hospital, the Government has received £219,863, whereas it should have received £571,583. I appeal to the House: is that so harsh? I wonder how many pensioners have ever paid money to the hospital. It is all very well to speak in generalities and make charges against the Government that cannot be substantiated.

The Leader of the Opposition asked the Treasurer what was the position in country subsidized hospitals regarding treatment of pensioners and payment therefor. I have had considerable experience in this respect and the arrangement is that pensioners are asked to contribute £3 10s. a week for the care they get while in hospital. There is no compulsion. From personal experience I know that more contribute the whole of their pension than pay the £3 10s. a week, because they are grateful for the attention they receive. Nearly every subsidized hospital will forgo the charge if it finds a pensioner is in difficult circumstances. If that is not humane treatment I would like to know what is.

Mr. Riches—Do you know of any sick pensioner who would not be in straitened circumstances?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I know of plenty with relatives who have humane hearts. I know there are people in dire circumstances, but can any member charge the Government with not giving them care and attention? Can any member point to a person who has been refused admittance to the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

Mr. Dunstan—Certainly.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The member for Norwood will have an opportunity to speak, but I challenge him and suggest that if he lifted a finger to help those people he would have secured admittance for them.

Mr. Dunstan—Nonsense!

Mr. HAMBOUR—It is not.

Mr. Dunstan—It is! I have had honourees from the Royal Adelaide Hospital sending to me people they have not been able to get into the hospital.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member is a cultured gentleman and when I asked the Government to make a charge for admission to the hospital he held up his hands in holy horror about what was going to happen to the people. He thought the Government would flay the people. The result has been that people who could not afford treatment have had it free of cost. The total of pensioners' payments was £219,000, whereas the Government should have got £571,000. The Government should increase the charge at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to 45s. For those who do not pay for treatment what does it matter what amount is charged? No one can say that pensioners will be penalized if the charge is increased. Should not those who receive treatment pay a charge commensurate with the cost of the treatment?

Mr. Riches—Is the hospital charge the only one they have to meet?

Mr. HAMBOUR—No. There are other charges. It is all very well for the honourable member to sit there in glory, but he has a Government hospital in his district. He says "Keep charges down" and does not worry about other parts of the State.

Mr. Riches—All the charges should be reduced.

Mr. HAMBOUR—How can they be reduced?

Mr. Riches—Have a look at the other States and other parts of the world.

Mr. HAMBOUR—It is all very well to say that, but let the honourable member give the details. In America people are afraid to

get sick because they cannot afford the cost of the treatment.

Mr. Riches—We are not concerned with America.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member may say that Queensland gives free hospital treatment, and so it does but only at the central hospital. I want equal treatment for all people in this State. I plead with the Government to increase the charge at public hospitals to 45s. so that the money available can be equalized amongst all hospitals. Mr. Lawn dealt with the Liberal Party's platform, the way its members are pre-selected, and other matters. He said we had to bow to the master and that certain things would happen to us if we did not obey him. I have never been asked to sign anything as a member of the Liberal Party nor have I ever been told what I have to do. I feel that I am responsible to the electors of Light, whom I will serve. I am not dictated to as members of the Party opposite are. They have caucus meetings at which matters are decided by the majority.

Mr. Dunstan—Didn't you have a caucus meeting on the Bank Bill?

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Bank Bill has been discussed on two occasions and is still being discussed. Not at any time during my association with the Party have I heard of a vote being taken or a resolution moved in our Party room. I claim that I have absolute freedom in respect of my district. I go back to my electors and discuss their problems with them because I consider it my duty to do so.

Mr. Fred Walsh—How do you determine the policy of your Party?

Mr. HAMBOUR—It is determined by the Government, which in turn lays it before members of the Party for their criticism. We are free members in this House. If we do not like a Bill introduced by the Government we can vote against it, provided we notify the Minister in charge that we do not intend to support it. The Minister of Works will tell members that I told him on one occasion that I would not support a clause in his Bill. He said I could do as I liked and later the clause was withdrawn. On another occasion I told the Minister of Roads that I did not like a provision in his Bill and subsequently the provision was defeated. I am proud to be the member for Light. Labor members have to abide by the decision of the caucus majority. They also have an executive in Grote Street

which determines policy for them: that cannot be denied.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Our convention determines the policy.

Mr. HAMBOUR—It did in connection with the Long Service Leave Bill, on which members of the Labor Party were hogtied. The Labor Party has Federal and State conventions. We have our convention. If Labor members do not obey theirs they are out.

Mr. Frank Walsh—We believe in that.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member can please himself what he believes in. What happened to Cyril Chambers for criticizing his leader? Have members heard of any Liberal member being expelled for criticizing someone? The Labor Party can please itself. I have no criticism of what it does but it is ironical for Mr. Lawn to speak about the Liberal organization as he did, for fundamentally it believes in freedom for everybody, including members of Parliament. I know what Labor members would like to do with Dr. Evatt, but he is their leader and they must obey him. Mr. Lawn built his speech around the policy of the Liberal platform. He also quoted from a newspaper. He was completely without any other material, but he admitted that the Liberal organization had given him a copy of its Constitution. On two occasions the member for Mitcham asked for a Labor Party Constitution, but was told at the office that it did not have one. That is true, too: they have not one, at least not one they are proud of.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Give us the quotation out of *The Farmer*.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The honourable member can give that when he gets on his feet. References were made to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company, but as the Indenture Bill will be before us shortly there is no need for me to refer to it tonight. In one of my earliest speeches after entering this House I criticized Government policy on hospitals. I am still not satisfied, but I want the complete opposite of what members opposite want. The Government has said what it considers to be a fair and reasonable policy, but I still criticize it. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) has chided me on my early criticism, saying that I bowed to the master. I criticized the Electricity Trust's policy soon after I entered this House, but since then nearly everything I sought has come to pass. I will continue to criticize until I get what I think is right. I realize, of course, that I can get what I seek

only if the financial position allows it, but that will not stop me from criticizing what the Government does. Every member on this side of the House is able to criticize the Government, provided his criticism does not adversely affect the welfare of the State.

Mr. Corcoran—Don't we all do that?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I believe the honourable member does. The member for Adelaide has made much play on the word "master." I am proud to serve under the leadership of Sir Thomas Playford. I do not think it would be denied by anyone in South Australia that he is the greatest leader of our times, and I hope he enjoys good health to continue his leadership because, if we ever lose it, it would be the greatest loss we could suffer. Using the word "master" does not ridicule him in any way; I am proud to serve under him.

During the debate on the Loan Estimates I discussed at some length the hire paid by the Highways Department to councils. After due consideration by the department and the Minister, I was notified by letter that what I sought could not be granted. I believe the Minister and the department are wrong in paying the rates they do. I cannot be convinced that it is right for the department to pay private contractors one rate, yet councils are paid a varying rate. To give the two extremes, councils are paid between 8d. and 2s. a mile, whereas the contractor's rate is fixed for all, and varies between 2s. 4½d. and 2s. 6d., including the wages of the driver. On an average, a contractor would receive 2s. 1d. or 2s. 2d. a mile for his vehicle. I am not asking that local councils receive as much as private contractors, because it is to the benefit of councils to perform as much work as possible with the money available, but I believe the variation in the rate is completely wrong. If the department fixed a rate, whether it be 1s. 3d., 1s. 4d. or 1s. 6d.—it need not be as much as 2s.—councils would be encouraged to be economical in their work. A hard-headed councillor would be likely to say it does not pay to run trucks for 1s. 4d. or 1s. 6d. a mile, so private contractors should be used. The Highways Department argues that the rate is adjusted to keep its plant account in balance and, although that may be true, this does not encourage councils to be as economical as possible or to run their own vehicles.

Much has been said about production and what we can achieve. Primary producers now have no lines that can be called profitable. Wheat is profitable in good seasons, but in

normal seasons they are asked to produce wheat at the cost of production, based on a formula they must accept. Nobody seems to worry about primary producers, although everybody worries about secondary industries. It is admitted by all that the greater the production the more efficient the undertaking and the lower the costs. As secondary industries are protected by the Tariff Board it should be incumbent on them to export a percentage of production. If they were forced to export five per cent of what they produce, it would be a start towards assisting an export drive. This is not a new idea, nor is it my idea; it is done by every progressive nation.

Secondary industry is allowed to market every item of production at a profit, but it should make a contribution to assist the economy of the country in the same way as the primary producer is expected to do, regardless of what profit he will make. I could refer to lines coming into this country from overseas that are being exported at well below cost of production, and the home market has to support the manufacturers. Our secondary industries are protected by the Tariff Board, and the primary producer has to pay the price, so surely secondary industries should make a greater contribution towards our export markets. I realize that primary producers are divided; there are different organizations that cannot seem to get together. I was interested to read that the Chamber of Manufactures and the Chamber of Commerce are at variance as to what should be done in relation to our overseas policy.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Haven't they always been at variance?

Mr. HAMBOUR—No. They have always gone hand in hand. I pay a tribute to the Federal Minister for Trade who, in my opinion, is gaining in stature day after day. He is moving around the world finding markets for Australia. He has found new markets in Malaya and is a dominant figure today at the Montreal Conference. I wish him well and am sure the primary producer will pay homage to him when he returns. At least he has tried, which is more than you can say about many people. What has the Labor Party to offer?

(*Members interjecting.*)

The SPEAKER—Honourable members must not interject from other members' seats.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I believe that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Calwell) would be in a position to express the policy of

the Labor Party. At Port Pirie he advocated a shorter working week. If we get that, who will pay for it? It will be the primary producer who has to sell on the open market. One does not have to be an economist to work that out. I see the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) taking that quietly because he knows it is true. The shorter the working week, the greater the cost of the article falling on those making it who have to sell it on the open market.

Mr. Fred Walsh—A shorter working week does not increase the cost of the article.

Mr. HAMBOUR—If the honourable member examines the position in America today, he will observe that, in spite of their efficient machinery and set-up, prices are rising because they are increasing beyond the purchasing capacity of the people. Nobody can suggest that the purchasing power of the American citizen is not great: it is the highest in the world. I think it is something like 20 per cent higher than that of the next country, which is Canada; we run a good third. An analysis of that statement will show it to be true. I am not just issuing propaganda.

I think it right and proper that the Government should be given some credit for its policy on education. There will never be enough money to spend on this department because we have a goal at which to aim that will never be reached. The more money we pour into education, the further that goal will recede with increasing discoveries and knowledge on the part of our scientists and others. We shall have to increase our pace to try to make up the leeway. The Government will be criticized on education but in the Budget of 1947 we were contributing more than the eastern States were per head to education, and in 1958 we are still contributing more per head than the eastern States.

Turning to the Public Works Committee, first and foremost I must say how deeply appreciative I am of the work it does. It devotes much time to its investigations, and its work is of untold benefit to the State, but I am concerned with the limitations placed upon it. It can recommend a proposal for £600,000. If it is accepted by the Government and proceeds, the Public Works Committee has no further connection with it although it may cost £1,000,000 or £1,200,000.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Where is the Public Accounts Committee today?

Mr. HAMBOUR—If the deputy Leader will wait, I will provide what I think is the answer. As £100,000 is the limit of expenditure without reference to the Public Works Committee, would it not be sound that any proposal costing £100,000 more than the estimate should be referred back to the committee for investigation?

Mr. Frank Walsh—It has got to be £100,000 before the committee can deal with it.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Let us take the Blanchetown bridge as an illustration. That is to cost £656,000. If that exceeds £756,000, in my opinion it should be referred back.

Mr. Frank Walsh—How are they going to do it?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Once they start the work, they can tell. In other words, if they ran out of money, they would have to go back for more. Then people giving evidence before the Public Works Committee would be more careful in their estimates. Some estimates have been upset because costs have risen, but that has not always been so. Some of the estimates given to the Public Works Committee are completely haywire.

Mr. Frank Walsh—By what department?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Mr. Chairman, I was censured early in my Parliamentary experience for naming people. I have no desire to do that. The honourable member knows the answer very well. If he likes to investigate, he will find that some of the estimates are so far out that the men who give them should be censured. If they had to go back, I believe the Public Works Committee would censure them and say "You should pay more attention to your estimates."

Mr. Frank Walsh—I think the honourable member ought to consider his reflection on the departmental heads.

Mr. HAMBOUR—If it is a reflection, it is too bad. All I am saying is that their estimates are often haywire.

Mr. Frank Walsh—The only solution is to go to the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. HAMBOUR—What would they do? The Public Works Committee can perform both functions. I ask that more attention be paid to the estimates, that a greater endeavour be made to get the estimates nearer the costs. I am prepared to make concessions for increased charges, etc.

Mr. Corcoran—If you had an inaccurate estimate, would you defer building the bridge because of that?

Mr. HAMBOUR—No. Let me make myself quite clear. Say £600,000 has already been spent and they want another £200,000 or £300,000. In that case, they should go back and report where they were wrong and ask for the additional amount.

Mr. Corcoran—You are arguing against that. There would have to be amendment to the legislation.

Mr. HAMBOUR—There would have to be an instruction by the Minister. Once the Public Works Committee recommends a proposal, it goes into the hands of the Government. If another £300,000 is wanted, they should be told, "Go back to the Public Works Committee."

Mr. Frank Walsh—Where would the Queen Elizabeth hospital be?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I should like to know who was responsible for the original estimate.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Who was responsible for the estimate for the South Para reservoir?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Let us find out. All I am asking the House to do is to ascertain who is so wrong in these estimates. The Government, and in particular the Premier and Treasurer, should be congratulated on this Budget.

Mr. Frank Walsh—One minute you want these things amended, the next minute you say something different.

Mr. HAMBOUR—The Premier has not increased taxes, but has increased the outgoings of almost every department. If honourable members opposite were fair, they would acknowledge that as a major feat, quite apart from the fact that the Premier is to be congratulated on presenting his twentieth budget. (I hope he lives to present his thirtieth). It is a good Budget, well received. Probably what rankles with members opposite is the good reception it has been given. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) issued a challenge to the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) and me. He said I made a statement, "You cannot take a rabbit out of a hat if it is not there." He also said he would reply to any argument that I put forward about finance. He said, "Every penny of money that comes into existence comes in the form of debt." That is true, but if I said the grass was green it would be true. I inferred from his remarks that we could produce money whenever we wanted it. That is true, but I have

never heard anyone deal with the consequence of taking such action. Members opposite have often said we can get money for wars, so why can't we get money for houses?

Let me show the result of raising money in this way to fight wars. I am not a war-monger, but what price do we pay for fighting wars? They are paid for in sweat and blood, and with money that has to be found by future generations. Before World War I the franc was worth 1s. 2d., but after World War II it was worth only a farthing. Our war debt has resulted in inflation, which depreciates the internal debt, and I think the member for Whyalla will agree with that.

Mr. Loveday—Do you know that the Governor of the Bank of England agreed with what the member for Burra said?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I said that the member for Burra's contention was true, but that it was not desirable.

Mr. Loveday—You think what the Governor of the Bank of England said is not desirable?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Statements are often taken out of their context.

Mr. Loveday—This one was not.

Mr. HAMBOUR—I will prove what I shall say is true. Bank overdrafts, or money advanced, are against assets, which are the result of production. Hire-purchase loans are from investment, which is the result of savings or earnings. Private banks are traders performing a function that is controlled by the Central Bank. I believe the member for Burra would be content to refer his challenge to the Commonwealth Bank. If he does not I will disprove his statement in a moment that credit or money can be created by an entry in a ledger. He said that such money would be costless. It would not cost anything in interest, and I shall give illustrations of that. The last Federal Budget provided for £110,000,000 in Treasury Bills to finance the deficit. We have £348,000,000 of Australian currency floating around the country and this is being used by the Federal Government interest free. That £110,000,000 in Treasury Bills could be any amount. Members opposite may say it should be £70,000,000 or £210,000,000, but the Federal Treasurer has the responsibility of fixing the amount. Even the Right Hon. J. B. Chifley was very cautious in financing his deficits when he had to finance them by issuing Treasury Bills. I referred previously to the effects of finding money to fight wars, and I gave the

illustration of the French franc, which is worth only one farthing. The German mark went completely out of existence.

Mr. Frank Walsh—As a result of deliberate inflation.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes. In 1940 the Japanese yen was worth 14 to the pound sterling, but after the war the ratio was 1,010 to the pound. That resulted from Japan's method of financing the war. The Australian pound has depreciated by some 60 per cent.

Mr. Loveday—Our currency is an example to the rest of the world, and that is the result of the efforts of a Labor Government.

Mr. HAMBOUR—We incurred a big war debt, and I am only giving the result of what happens by financing on national credit and borrowing beyond our means.

Mr. Corcoran—Where did Krupps get his £100,000,000 that he wants to invest in Australia?

Mr. HAMBOUR—He has the material assets.

Mr. O'Halloran—What happened to the currency of France and Germany?

Mr. HAMBOUR—I have given examples of what has happened to the currencies of countries that have financed wars on national credit. I think the Leader of the Opposition will admit that our currency has depreciated greatly in the last 16 or 17 years. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) challenged me to refute his arguments on finance, but I should like him to refer to three books. They are *An Economic Survey of Europe*, 1956; *A World Economic Survey*, 1956; and *An Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East*, 1956. Those three volumes give analyses by the United Nations (which all members will agree is an impartial body) of the result of deficit budgeting by various countries. When such budgeting is continued for long there must be inflation.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you support the Budget?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes. The leader may remember that I was challenged by the member for Burra on the question of cheap money. No-one wants cheap money for housing more than I do.

Mr. O'Halloran—You are supporting a deficit budget?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Yes, and I am honest enough to admit that I have nothing better to offer. Those three volumes I have just quoted

show what happens to countries that fiddle around with their currency. The same result is obtained whether a country is under capitalist, communist, or socialist regimes. They have all experienced inflation, which has been to the detriment of the rank and file.

Mr. O'Halloran—The rank and file in West Germany are in a pretty good position today.

Mr. HAMBOUR—That is correct. The people there are working harder and producing more than any other people in the world, and when people work hard and produce, prosperity is the result. Mr. Quirke wants cheap money for houses and so does every honourable member. We all applaud the erection of cottage homes because there is no capital liability and no interest to pay. Let us assume we can get more cheap money for the intermediate wage-earner. Where are we to draw the line? Who is to get the money at 3 per cent or at 4 per cent, and who is to pay 6 per cent? I think it is admitted that the man who saves is entitled to earn interest on his savings and to a reasonable reward for his labours. If we say to the lender that his money is worth 5 per cent or 6 per cent, on the other hand we say to the borrower that the money is worth differing amounts in varying degrees. We do have differential rates. For instance, ex-servicemen can borrow money at 3½ per cent. This is because they have given so much of their time to their country without having the opportunity to earn. The best years of their lives could not be utilized in earning because they were fighting for Australia, therefore, they are entitled to a concession. This Government has adopted the policy of there being no interest charge to pensioners, which I hope it can pursue with even greater vigor. The question arises, where are we to get cheap money? It could come only from the national pool.

Mr. O'Halloran—How long would it take pensioners to get a house on the principle you enunciate?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Let us hope that the day is not far distant when all pensioners can get a house without there being any interest liability. Our Treasurer is the first man in Australia to implement the idea. If the Leader of the Opposition moves over this side of the House next year, although I do not think he will, I hope he will pursue the policy laid down by Sir Thomas Playford. I felt that I had to answer the challenge regarding the quantity theory of money. I go back to the time of Aristotle and his theory of money. In

its crudest form, the theory is that the value of money varies inversely with its quantity. If the quantity of money in a country is doubled its purchasing power is halved; that is, the general level of prices will double. All money spent in a period equals the value of all goods and services on which it is spent.

Mr. O'Halloran—Did Aristotle produce a thesis on managed currency?

Mr. HAMBOUR—No. I shall now refer to a managed currency. The only data I could get was for 1951. I submit an analysis of the average balance-sheets of nine of the Australian trading banks.

Liabilities.

£

Shareholders funds	78,000,000
Non-Interest-bearing deposits .	951,000,000
Interest-bearing deposits .. .	247,000,000

£1,276,000,000

Assets.

£

Cash with coin, bullion and notes	61,000,000
London funds	28,000,000
Treasury bills	42,000,000
Government and municipal securities	92,000,000
Special accounts with Commonwealth Bank	523,000,000
Advances	495,000,000
Sundry items, buildings, etc. .	35,000,000

£1,276,000,000

From those figures one can work out the extent of the credit and the amount of shareholders' funds, the amount bearing interest on deposit, and the amount not bearing interest. Figures concerning the Commonwealth Bank can be obtained from the Library, and by comparing our position with that of other countries one can see how far we can fiddle with credit.

Mr. O'Halloran—You do not claim that those deposits not bearing interest are cash deposits?

Mr. HAMBOUR—Not necessarily. I have much pleasure in supporting the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

MAINTENANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.40 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 24, at 2 p.m.