

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 6, 1959.

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

QUESTIONS.**USE OF ROADS BY HEAVY TRANSPORTS.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier's attention been drawn to the considerable agitation outside for heavy road transport to be curtailed or prohibited on Sundays and public holidays in order to avoid the inconvenience and danger that occurs as a result of heavy vehicles becoming part of a stream of traffic, thereby slowing it down and causing inconvenience generally? Will he have this matter referred to the State Traffic Committee for inquiry and report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The function of the State Traffic Committee is to advise the Government on road traffic matters. It has always been assumed that its duty is to give attention to road safety and rules of the road. The proposal outlined by the Leader is in a somewhat different category. He asks whether certain types of traffic—economic traffic—should be allowed to use the roads at certain times or whether they should be prohibited. I do not feel that this is a matter the State Traffic Committee should consider because, if any action is to be taken, it would have to be under a policy decision of the Government that would ultimately have to be accepted by the House. A law of that description could have serious repercussions and I do not believe Cabinet would be prepared to adopt it. Our industries are in stern competition with those of the Eastern States, and road transport is one of the important means by which they get their produce to markets. The Leader suggests that a vehicle could be delayed from leaving Adelaide on a Sunday or a holiday until the following day, but many of these transports come from Queensland, New South Wales and other parts, and to deny them the use of the roads would seriously disarrange their programmes. As the matter has been raised I will have it examined, but I think it is a question of policy and I do not think Cabinet would be prepared to accept it.

ACQUISITION OF LAND BY ALIENS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—A few days ago I asked the Minister of Lands a question relating to the acquisition of land by aliens and the effect thereon of section 24 of the Law of Property Act. Is the Minister aware that

that section prohibits the execution of an agreement for sale or purchase subject to his consent but that in fact that is what is being done and it is the only way to do it? Has he considered that matter, has he a reply now, or is it his intention to refer the matter to Cabinet?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I intend to take the matter to Cabinet on Monday next.

“UNIQUE” WINDOW SASHES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Premier ascertain from the Housing Trust whether the specifications provide that, when “Unique” sashes are used in homes, both windows (top and bottom) shall open?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will refer that question to the Chairman of the Housing Trust.

MILK DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Will the Minister of Agriculture give close attention to the matters raised by me in my speech on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply relating to milk distribution as it concerns my district?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The honourable member made some remarks in the debate on the Address in Reply criticizing the activities of the Milk Equalization Committee and certain other things which, I assure him, I am noting. I will give him a considered statement about them later on.

HEALTH ACT.

Mr. STOTT—The Loxton Local Board of Health at its last meeting resolved to bring before the notice of the Central Board of Health a discrepancy in the provisions of the Health Act. In 1953, section 123 was amended and subsection (4) was added. This deleted from the Health Act the powers of subsections (1), (2), and (3) dealing with drainage from houses erected or rebuilt after the thirteenth day of January, eighteen hundred and ninety-nine, in all parts of the State where the provisions of the Building Act, 1923-1953, applied.

Section 8 of the Building Act was amended in 1953, requiring applicants to submit details of the mode of disposal of nightsoil and sullage waste water from buildings. As no standards have been inserted in schedule II of the Building Act, a council has no legal power to reject an application or require plumbing and drainage construction to be carried out in any specific manner.

The Upper Murray health inspector states that two owners of new houses have recently appealed to him for assistance because builders

have installed substandard plumbing and drainage, not connected to septic tank systems. He advises that there is no legislation whereby the local board of health has any legal redress. Will the Premier look into this matter and see that this legal discrepancy is eliminated, and will he bring down the necessary amendments?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined.

SUBSIDIES FOR SWIMMING POOLS.

Mr. TAPPING—For some years the Government has granted to sponsors of the building of swimming pools an amount of £1,500 in one financial year and it could be, if a project took three years to complete, that those concerned would receive £4,500. I am concerned about projects that cost up to £50,000 and £60,000 as against the smaller projects in the country. Will the Premier consider adopting a new formula in this matter, whereby he would grant a greater percentage of the money available to the larger projects and still not affect the smaller projects, which are normally built in country areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The provision of £1,500 to any one swimming pool project has been governed by the total amount of money available for the purpose. Each year, even with the £1,500 limit, the line tends to run into excess, to the extent of £2,000 to £3,000. If we provided money for these large and costly activities it would mean that there would be no money at all to cover the big batch of applications that come from all over the State, many of which have much more merit than some of the larger ones. Some of the larger pools are close to the coast, whereas many of the smaller ones are a long way inland where there are no possibilities of bathing facilities, except through the medium of a swimming pool. I have had an application for one swimming pool that was to cost £86,000 and it would be within a sixpenny fare of one of the best beaches in the State. Obviously the money could be given only at the expense of the smaller pools. If the Government is able to increase the amount it will be made available to all activities because it is on the basis of a pound for every pound spent in any one year. I hope in the future—I cannot say in the near future—that we may be able to give additional assistance, but it must be on a uniform basis.

HACKNEY BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE—I am concerned about the condition of the Hackney Bridge over the River Torrens in Walkerville and Hackney.

The bridge is narrow and it carries a tremendous amount of traffic, which is causing considerable damage and which presents a danger to the users of the road. Will the Minister of Works get from the Minister of Roads a report on the future plans for the replacement of the bridge, and will he ascertain whether counts have been made of the traffic over the bridge, especially in relation to its width?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will take up that matter with my colleague.

TRANSPORT SERVICES FOR KLEMZIG.

Mr. JENNINGS—Some time ago the Minister of Works was good enough to take up with the Tramways Trust a question I asked about transport facilities for Klemzig and he subsequently told me that the trust was arranging for a licensed operator to serve the area, and he promised to give further details when the plans were worked out. Has he any information on the matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—As promised, I have obtained further information from the general manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust, as follows:—

The route which will be taken is:—Fourth Avenue/O.G. Road, Wilpena Avenue, Souter Street, Ilford Street, Harris Street, Vale Street, Walkerville Terrace, Mann Terrace, Melbourne Street, Frome Road, North Terrace, Pulteney Street to Hindmarsh Square and return.

The commencement of operation will be about the end of September, 1959. The licensee is negotiating to purchase the requisite buses.

An hourly service will be run between 6.30 a.m. and 6.30 p.m., Monday to Friday, as an initial schedule.

The licensee is Mr. R. Slattery.

The councils concerned are Enfield, Walkerville, and Adelaide. These have all been written to and consent has been received from Enfield for the use of the roads in their area. Approval is anticipated from the other two councils.

The trust has arranged to let me know in good time of the final arrangements, and when I receive this information I will advise the honourable member accordingly.

WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

Mr. QUIRKE—Can the Premier say when the Commonwealth Government advised the South Australian Government that the provisions of the War Service Land Settlement Agreement that provided for the settlement of returned soldiers on the land were to cease?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Speaking from memory, I believe it was about 15 months ago. I will obtain the exact date for the honourable member.

SEATON RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. FRED WALSH—A few months ago an unfortunate accident occurred at the railway crossing on Tapley's Hill Road, Seaton. As a result of that accident, in which a train and a bus collided, a boy was killed, and a subsequent court action resulted in the conviction and gaoling of the bus driver. Considerable concern has been expressed regarding the possibility of future accidents at this crossing. The Woodville Council has written to Mr. Tapping and myself, as our boundaries adjoin at that particular spot, expressing its concern at the possibility of future accidents. Although visibility may be good at that point, danger always exists because of the number of converging roads, and other fatal accidents could occur. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads (and Minister of Railways) take up with his colleague the question of the adequacy, from a safety point of view, of the present warning device at that crossing?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes, I will take the matter up with my colleague.

MELROSE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HEASLIP—I realize the desire of the Government to provide water supplies, particularly to country areas. Recently the Mines Department put down a bore near Melrose in an endeavour to supply that town with water. My information is that that bore has not been successful, not because water was not obtained but because the salinity of the water was too high. Will the Minister of Works ascertain the future programme regarding the town of Melrose, and more particularly whether another bore will be sunk in an effort to supply that town with water?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The report to which the honourable member referred is one which reached me, I think, only last week, and I believe I informed him of its contents. He is correct when he says that the first bore did not produce water of a satisfactory quality for a town supply. In discussing this matter, the honourable member and people from the area have suggested that there may be other sites to examine. I intend to take up with the Engineer-in-Chief, for his discussion with

the Mines Department, the question of either attempting to link up some other bore or trying to sink another bore at some convenient site. At the moment I cannot indicate precisely what line of action will be taken.

PROGRESS AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES.

Mr. RICHES—The Premier's last policy speech contained this statement:—

Included in the estimate for the Education Department is an amount sufficient to meet the increased allowance for school books for all students attending all the secondary schools in the State.

I am informed that at Port Augusta 30 children who did not pass the Intermediate examination last year have been refused any book allowance at all this year. I raised this question on Tuesday and the Minister of Education referred me to a letter he had written to the Leader of the Opposition from which it appears that the regulations do go some way towards meeting that situation, but apparently the application of the regulations does not meet the situation. Will the Minister of Education make a considered statement on the department's policy in view of the promises contained in the Premier's policy speech, and will he assure me that the situation at Port Augusta will be examined to see whether, even under the regulations gazetted, these children cannot be catered for?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I do not recall the exact expressions used by the Premier, but I suggest that if he said "all students," he was obviously referring to all qualified students. Perhaps I can answer the question best in my own way, even though it will necessarily be a lengthy reply. On March 19, Executive Council approved of amendments to the Education Regulations to provide for the payment of increased book allowances for secondary school students. The new regulations provide for payment of £8 for each of the first three years, for £9 for the Leaving year, and £10 for the Leaving Honours year. The allowances are payable to all qualified secondary school students whose parents are domiciled in South Australia, attending both Education Department and independent schools and are retrospective to January 1, 1959. Previously, an allowance of £4 10s. per annum was paid for each of the first three years at a secondary school, but no payment was made for the Leaving and Leaving Honours years.

On June 25, Executive Council approved of further amendments to the regulations to provide that students, who do not hold the Intermediate certificate but who have obtained a pass in five subjects at either the Public Examinations Board, the Technical High School or the Area School Intermediate examinations, will qualify for book, boarding and travelling allowances in their Leaving and Leaving Honours years. Previously, the regulations had required students to possess an Intermediate Certificate to qualify.

Progress allowances had always been paid only to students who had shown themselves competent to undertake secondary work by reaching a certain minimum standard at the end of their primary schooling, which was the Progress Certificate. The same policy was applied when drawing up the regulations in March for the introduction of similar allowances for students in their Leaving and Leaving Honours years. It was considered that these students should have reached a minimum standard as evidence of their ability to cope with the Leaving and Leaving Honours courses and so qualify for the allowances at these levels. It had been required that students should obtain an Intermediate Certificate to qualify for the allowance. However, it was found that a number of students, who gained passes in five or more subjects at the Intermediate, did not obtain a certificate because they had not gained a pass in English, which is a compulsory subject. Accordingly, they did not qualify for the allowances, although they had shown themselves competent to enter a Leaving class. The new regulations were introduced to make these students eligible, while not reducing the desired standard of qualifications. On July 9, the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me suggesting that the Education regulations covering the payment of book allowances be amended to delete reference to attainment. He suggested the substitution of a provision to the effect that book allowances should be payable to all secondary students unless the Director, on the report of the head master, is satisfied that the student cannot benefit at all from his continued attendance at school. As the member for Stuart has referred to the Leader of the Opposition's letter, I am sure that he will not mind my quoting my reply, dated July 22:—

Actually, in my opinion, the cases mentioned by you are met under the existing regulations. The relevant regulation covering these cases reads as follows:—

In any case where a qualified student fails to reach the Intermediate standard of the

Public Examinations Board, or to reach the Intermediate standard of any secondary course instituted by the Education Department, within three years of the opening of the school year immediately following the completion of the primary school course, and the Director is satisfied that that failure was caused by illness or by other special circumstances, the Director may, from time to time, determine that such student shall be eligible for progress allowances for such period or periods beyond the maximum three years specified by the regulations, as he thinks fit, and such student shall thereupon be eligible for progress allowances for such period or periods.

Progress allowances have always been paid to students who have shown themselves competent to undertake secondary work by having gained a progress certificate. The regulation quoted above does give the Director power to extend these progress allowances in special circumstances. In compiling the regulations for the payment of similar allowances to students in their fourth and fifth years of secondary study, the same policy of a recognized minimum attainment was applied. This minimum attainment, that is, five subjects at either the Intermediate Public Examinations Board, Intermediate technical, or Intermediate area school examination, is considered by the senior officers, secondary superintendents, and the President of the Head Masters' Association as the minimum qualification necessary for a student to undertake a Leaving course of study or a course of study at the Leaving level.

Let me clarify the position still further by adding that provision is also made in the new regulation to meet cases where students may have been prevented from taking the Intermediate examinations by reason of sickness or other unavoidable causes. The regulations provide that a student who does not hold the Public Examinations Board, area, or technical Intermediate certificate, but who satisfies the Director that he was prevented from sitting for the Intermediate examination by reason of sickness or other unavoidable cause, and who produces a certificate from the head of the school he is attending that he is capable of undertaking a matriculation course with reasonable prospects of success, may be considered eligible for a boarding and for book allowance as the case may be: and also provide that a student who does not hold a Leaving certificate, but who does hold an equivalent certificate approved by the Director, may be considered as eligible for a boarding or book allowance at the Leaving Honours level. I should be pleased to submit the specific cases at Port Augusta mentioned by the member for Stuart to the Director of Education for the exercise of his discretion as Director in accordance with the provisions of the regulations.

MYPOLONGA PLANTINGS.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply to a question I asked some time ago relating to extra plantings at the Mypolonga irrigation area?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have obtained the following reply from the Secretary for Irrigation:—

Estimates of cost of additional pumping facilities required are at present being prepared and the information is expected to be available at the end of next week. When this is received the question of whether or not the works are justified will be considered.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT.

Mr. McKEE—This week I asked the Premier a question regarding the Local Government Act. Has he a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I checked the matter on which the honourable member requested information. The amendment that I think he requires with regard to Port Pirie was included in a Local Government Bill last year that failed to pass. The Government intends to re-include that provision in a Bill to be introduced this year and hopes for better success this time.

BIRKENHEAD TUG PENS.

Mr. TAPPING—Recently I asked the Minister of Works when the projected tug pens at the Birkenhead wharf might be built and he promised to find out. People in my district are concerned because while the tugs are berthed upstream they are causing the Birkenhead Bridge to open frequently. A special berth would reduce this inconvenience. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes. As indicated earlier, this matter has been considered from time to time. Provision was made in certain Harbors Board planning for a location for the pens. However, consultations with tug interests show that they feel there is no great urgency for them, therefore they are not prepared to make any substantial contribution to Harbors Board revenue for the accommodation that might be provided. Therefore no provision is being made in this year's Loan programme for the pens.

PINNAROO-CANNAWIGARA ROAD.

Mr. NANKIVELL—The Pinnaroo-Cannawigara Road was recently surveyed and the Pinnaroo and Tatiara district councils were led to believe that construction work would

soon be commenced. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether the Highways Department intends to construct this road and, if so, when it is expected that work will commence?

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

HAWTHORNDENE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—The area known as Hawthorndene in my electorate is rapidly growing and for that reason I know the Minister has considered that a primary school should be established in the area. In the last few days I have heard that reports are circulating in the area that a site has already been purchased. Will the Minister of Education state whether that is so, or what progress has been made towards building a school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have been considering the matter for the very good reason that the honourable member will not let me forget it. An area of land has been inspected and selected by officers of the Education and Architect-in-Chief's Departments and it will now be referred to the Land Board for valuation.

PINUS RADIATA SEEDS.

Mr. HARDING—The annual report of the Woods and Forests Department states that about 1,500 lb. of *pinus radiata* seeds were gathered. How is this seed harvested and what is the approximate price a pound at which it was sold overseas?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will get full information on this matter. The seed is harvested by taking cones from selected trees and placing them in a glass covered hopper. The warmth of the sun then causes the cones to shed the seeds, and they are collected and packaged. It is quite a large business at the Mt. Burr forest reserve. I will obtain information about the price at which they were sold.

WATERVALE WATER SURVEY.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the progress of the water survey that he instituted at Watervale late last year? I believe work started there late last December.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I will make inquiries and obtain up-to-date information.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 5. Page 370.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—In speaking to this motion I want to get the formalities over as quickly as I can, so firstly I congratulate you very sincerely, Mr. Speaker, on your re-election to your eminent position, and I hope that your celebrated impartiality will continue. I also congratulate the member for Unley on his re-election to the position of Chairman of Committees. The occupancy of this position by the member for Unley gives a touch of the bizarre to the proceedings here that is a welcome relief from the humdrum of normalcy. I also congratulate the member for Burnside on her maiden speech and, no matter how wide of the mark that may be literally in this case, it nevertheless seems much more verisimilitudinous to be able to congratulate a lady on making a maiden speech than someone like, say, George Hambour.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member for Light.

Mr. JENNINGS—The honourable member for Light. He would probably be more likely to make a maiden screech. I congratulate the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) not only because of the poise and eloquence with which she addressed the House, not only because I am naturally chivalrous anyway, but because of the content of much of the speech. When she extolled price control members on this side of the House were obviously delighted and what was even more obvious was the discomfiture of members on the other side. I thought, for example, that the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) was thinking that the whole fabric of society was being torn asunder and one could almost hear him muttering about the impending disintegration of the British Empire, or something.

When the member for Burnside spoke about the Magill reformatory, one would have thought she had been reading our speeches, because she echoed almost exactly the sentiments which so often, for so long, and so unavailingly have been expressed from this side of the House. We are hoping that the honourable lady will continue to express her thoughts untrammelled, but we are not very confident about it. We have seen in the past new Liberal members come into this Chamber with views of their own, only very soon to become as sycophantic as all the rest of them. The few intrepid souls who resist the Premier's domination can now be located in Siberia:

it is either subservience or the salt mines! Nevertheless, I congratulate her and, as I say, we are still hoping.

I congratulate also the other new members for successfully negotiating their maiden speeches. They all show quite clearly that they will be an asset to the Parliament. Naturally, I was most interested in the speeches of the two new members on this side of the House. I am delighted that they lived up in full measure to the high hopes and expectations we had of them. There is not the slightest doubt that both of them will be a valuable acquisition to the House, and particularly to the Party they serve so devotedly.

I was also glad to see the new amplifying system that has been installed in the House. It is certainly long overdue and is a great improvement. I was intrigued by the last paragraph of the circular sent out to all members by the Clerk of the House explaining the use of the amplifying system. The last paragraph went something like this: "The principal job of the system is not to increase volume so much as intelligibility." If this little device can increase the intelligibility of some speeches we are accustomed to hear from the other side of the House, then it is certainly the work not of a technician but of a magician.

I am afraid I was not nearly so impressed by the Governor's Speech as many members were, or pretended to be. I found it a boring 45 minutes of ponderous pomposity and platitudinous prolixity. You cannot blame the Governor for that; it is no reflection on him. I listened to the Speech because I was paid to: no doubt the Governor read it for the same reason. He certainly cannot be blamed for having any part in its concoction. The Government alone must bear the responsibility for that, for 45 minutes of nauseating self-praise. Self-praise that we are asked to endure so frequently is no recommendation in any circumstances, and certainly that point must have added emphasis in a case like this where the self-praise has only, at the best, a nodding acquaintance with the truth.

We were asked to believe, in this speech by the Governor, as has become the custom over the last few years, that the Government has been entirely responsible—and by the "Government" I mean the Premier because the two words are synonymous in South Australia—for the recent run of good seasons but certainly could not be held responsible for the prevailing drought. Even though the drought

has been broken in the last few days, it was still prevailing when the Governor made his speech. Conspicuous by its absence from the Governor's Speech was any suggestion whatsoever as to how this State proposes to overcome the tremendous problems that confront it.

To mention just one—which I think is probably one of the greatest problems we have, from a social point of view—there is the tremendous housing shortage in South Australia. There was not one word in the Speech about how we were to overcome this great problem; indeed, what we were told in effect was that in this financial year we would build fewer houses than we did in 1950-51, 1951-52, 1952-53, 1953-54, 1954-55 and 1955-56. Is not that something to be proud of? Is not that something for this "progress and prosperity" State to boast about? Fewer homes this year than for those preceding years, despite our rapidly increasing population and the already serious backlog in homes in this State. No metropolitan member, apart perhaps from the honourable members for Mitcham and Burnside, would need to be reminded of the desperate housing shortage. So far as I know, the same can be said of many country districts as well.

Only this week I had brought to my attention a case in my own electorate of 15 people living in a two-bedroomed house. That is what is happening, and many other comparable cases could be cited in this State, which we are asked by the Premier to believe is the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. Hambour—It is still, by increased population.

Mr. JENNINGS—Then something should be done about housing the increased population. Every time the Premier goes to a public meeting or when he officially opens a sardine tin, or something like that, which he frequently does, we are told that South Australia is the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth—yet this housing shortage exists right in our midst.

Mr. Hambour—The honourable member is referring exclusively to the Housing Trust?

Mr. JENNINGS—In the figures I have mentioned, yes.

Mr. Hambour—You do not believe in people building their own homes?

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes, if they can.

Mr. Hambour—The honourable member would not know anything about that.

Mr. JENNINGS—I would, because I built my own home with my own two hands.

Mr. Hambour—I am proud of you.

Mr. JENNINGS—Good; I knew the honourable member would be some day. I have been taken to task on figures for the Housing Trust but if we look at the figures for all houses we see the same picture—a progressive decrease in each of the last six years. I was explaining that the Premier goes about boasting of the prosperity of South Australia, but this has now caught up with him. For years he has been preaching the prosperity of South Australia and going to Canberra pleading poverty. He has now been told that South Australia cannot at the one time be the most prosperous and the most impoverished State. No longer are we a claimant State, and for this dubious honour we have had increased tram fares, water rates and heaven knows what else. Everyone has to pay to bolster up the Premier's ego. It is grand to say that we are no longer a mendicant State, but where will we get the money which we used to get from the Grants Commission and which a proper Government could have got from the Commission if it had only spent the money?

I want to refer briefly to some remarks made by previous speakers in this debate. Mr. Hambour's utterances always command attention and, not infrequently, astonishment. I confess that on this occasion his speech did not have the usual cathartic effect, because it was much more restrained. Apparently he has given away the wild ambition that he had for an early rise to Ministerial ranks and has now settled down to a more amiable way of life. We congratulate the honourable member for Light, even if he is hiding under a bushel. Talking about bushels, I assure the House that I do not want to get involved in the wheat and weevil fight that has been going on for a week or so. The House has had enough of it. Members on this side are intrigued when they see members opposite get into conflict, because their business interests always seem to claim prior loyalty to their interests here.

A member—Speak no "weevil."

Mr. JENNINGS—We on this side can sit back because we always put public interest first. I am afraid that Mr. Coumbe did not do himself justice and I am sorry for that because he is my neighbour and I like to see him do well, but my heart bled for him on this occasion. He congratulated the Premier, as all ambitious young men in his Party are wont to do. He said it was a great tribute to the Premier that he had led the Government to victory once again. If the honourable member can be really gratified at the Government's being returned with a deficit of 49,000 votes.

then he is completely bereft of any political conscience. Indeed, I say that being bereft of political conscience must be a qualification for any supporter of the present Government. By the way, according to the election expenses of candidates, as published in the *Government Gazette*, the honourable member must have felt pretty shaky about his own seat. It seems to have cost him a fair bit of money to be returned. The most interesting part of his speech was his statement that we must now put our backs to the future. How would the honourable member look with his back to the future, his shoulder to the wheel, his chin in the air, his nose to the grindstone, and putting his best foot forward?

The honourable member made a pathetic attempt to refute all the well-prepared figures produced by Mr. Lawn to show that South Australia is not progressing industrially at the same rate as other States. He accused Mr. Lawn of being unpatriotic and writing down his own State. Mr. Lawn is not unpatriotic. He has served the State well, is still doing so, and I hope he continues to do so for many years to come. It is not unpatriotic to tell the truth. Indeed, it is refreshing to hear the truth about things, after the jingoism we hear from the other side about South Australia being perfection and the rest of the States only a bunch of broken-down hangers-on. We all know that it is absurd to put forward the ballyhoo we hear so frequently, particularly from the Premier. It is disseminated for no other reason than for Party political purposes. When the truth about these things is explained it naturally hurts members opposite, but not their pride in the State. They are not wounded there, but rather in their political complacency and smugness. When Mr. Millhouse first came into this Chamber he still had his milk teeth.

Mr. Shannon—He has got rid of them, whereas some members have not.

Mr. JENNINGS—Since that time, Mr. Millhouse has been indulging in wildly inaccurate statements, made with cheeky aplomb and all the self-righteousness you can imagine. Yesterday's speech was no exception. He said that the Labor Party could not attract and was not attracting youth. He said that Mr. Dunstan was the youngest member of the Labor Party in South Australia. Let me tell Mr. Millhouse that compared with our young members Mr. Dunstan is virtually a Methuselah. He is practically senile—

Mr. Hambour—You said it.

Mr. JENNINGS—He is practically senile compared with a lot of the very youthful members we have in the Party. There was such a demand from young people to enter the Labor Party about three or four years ago that we were obliged to alter our rules and to reduce the minimum age for membership from 16 to 14 years. These young people who were inspired by the policy of the Labor Party and who wanted to join up were so impatient that they could not wait the extra two years. As a consequence, the rules were altered to allow them to enter the Party when they were 14 years of age. These people come in voluntarily; they are not induced into the Party by the method that Young Liberals use—by fancy dress balls, cocktail do's, pyjama parties at Waterfall Gully, and things like that.

Mr. Hambour—You have been funny up to now; don't get any lower.

Mr. JENNINGS—I know how the Young Liberal Movement works. Before I entered Parliament I worked with a firm that was infested with the pests: I worked where a large number of young Liberals were employed, and this is what you would hear: "Oh, Jenny, will you join the Young Liberals?" followed by "Oh, isn't that something to do with politics?" Then would come, "Oh, no, but we are having a party at Lady so and so's next month" and the answer would be "Then I will be in that." So another great convert to the cause of Liberalism is gained. We do not have to do that; we can get our youth into the Labor Party to study and learn and work and fight for the principles we believe in. The member for Mitcham should learn a little of what he is talking about before he expresses himself in this House.

Mr. Hambour—Yesterday he was trying to arrange a home for your future.

Mr. JENNINGS—I will devote the remainder of my address to a subject which I believe the member for Mitcham referred to in his better moments yesterday; I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber, and I was sorry I did not hear him. I refer to the subject of mental health. As the Enfield Receiving Home and the Northfield Hospital are in my district, I became interested in this matter some years ago. I have met not only many of the staff of those hospitals but also many other people who are doing very valuable voluntary work in helping the unfortunate inmates. This Parliament should be very grateful to the voluntary workers who are doing so much to help our mental patients.

One disturbing thing is that we have a crisis in our mental institutions, in which there are 2,800 inmates and only 16 medical officers. According to Professor Trethowan, the Professor of Psychiatry at the Sydney University, we should have 74 psychiatrists or medical officers for our 2,800 inmates. The result of this, I am told, is that at present, because we have only 16 medical officers, only 10 per cent of the inmates in our mental institutions are actually being treated; the remainder are just locked up and left.

This is even more serious when we learn that after four years' incarceration in one of these hospitals the chances of recovery diminish very rapidly. If patients can be treated within the first four years their chances of recovery are immeasurably greater. We can also see what tremendous opportunities are being wasted, and what penny-wise and pound-foolish policies are being adopted, when we learn that 80 per cent of those who are treated respond favourably to treatment. That is a very high percentage, and I was astonished to hear of it, but I am reliably informed that the figure is correct. They respond to a stage between complete recovery and recovery to the extent that they can be of some economic use to society and live a happy life, if not a normal one. Although 80 per cent who are treated respond, I reiterate that at the present time, because of the shortage of trained medical staff, only 10 per cent of those who are in our institutions are being treated.

I have been told that a patient had been in one of these institutions for years and had not received any medical treatment whatever, and that when his turn eventually came for treatment he was able to be released completely and permanently cured after a brief period. In the meantime, that patient wasted years of his life and cost the State thousands of pounds.

Of the 16 doctors I have mentioned, only two hold the Diploma of Psychiatric Medicine, which I understand is regarded as almost essential for a doctor doing this type of work. The two doctors who have this diploma are Dr. Birch and Dr. Salter, the latter having obtained his diploma in London at his own expense. The other 14 doctors do not have the diploma, but it is certainly not for want of trying. This diploma cannot be obtained in Adelaide, the nearest place where it can be gained being Melbourne. Formerly, after five years in the Government service in South Australia, these doctors could get six months' leave, go to Melbourne to study for their

diploma, return here and go on with the job, and as a consequence, of course, be much more efficient in their work and much better servants of the State and the people they were trying to help.

An amazing and almost incredible development is that six months' leave, which formerly they were after five years entitled to in order to go to Melbourne to study for this diploma, has been denied them. That apparently came about because some busy-body found out that in the original regulation this privilege applied only to resident medical officers. Well, none of them are resident medical officers because the department will not build houses at the hospital to enable them to reside there. All those doctors have done much preparatory work to study for this diploma, and they are now faced with the position that they cannot get their six months' leave unless they take leave without pay and go to Melbourne at their own expense. How could they possibly afford that?

Mr. Bywaters—What happens when Dr. Birch retires, which I understand will be in the near future?

Mr. JENNINGS—Unless a doctor with the diploma is imported, we shall have only one doctor with a diploma.

Mr. Bywaters—A pretty poor show.

Mr. JENNINGS—It is a pretty poor show now.

Mr. Bywaters—And it will be worse.

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes. Most of these doctors have done this preparatory work in their own time and at their own expense, and if that effort is wasted it will not be the doctors so much as the State and the people in the institutions who will suffer. In Victoria and New South Wales, departmental doctors are trained for the diploma at the Government's expense. The diploma is gained in two parts and after passing each part they receive greatly increased salaries. One can appreciate how differently they are treated in those States. Here they are virtually precluded from studying for the diploma except at their own expense.

One of the most tragic features of our mental institutions is the way children are treated. I visited Parkside once with some of my colleagues, including the member for Semaphore, and we will not forget the horrifying spectacle of these children locked up like cattle. They are treated kindly, but that is as far as it goes. They wander around vacantly and aimlessly with no attempt being made to treat them and with little interest being taken in

them. Indeed, the only interest taken in them is shown by compassionate nurses and attendants who play with them in off-duty hours. There are 150 children under 16 years of age and 350 between 16 and 21 years in our mental institutions. So far there have been no attempts to educate them but I understand arrangements are now in hand to appoint two teachers. Even if they are to teach only the children under 16 years there will be a ratio of one teacher to 75 children. The Minister of Education would not be pleased with that ratio for normal children. He would probably want a teacher for every 30 children. The children in our mental hospitals need so much more understanding, patience and love. According to generally recognized international standards the ratio should be one teacher to 10. Apparently no provision is being made for educating those children over 16 years of age.

I have not mentioned overcrowding, but at the moment our institutions accommodate two or three times the number of patients they were originally intended for. I have not mentioned the dangerous shortage of trained staff, or staff of any kind, nor have I mentioned the good case that can be made for the establishment of small mental hospitals in country areas where inmates could be visited regularly by relatives and friends. I understand it is beneficial for them to feel that they are not completely cut off from the people with whom they formerly associated. Their chances of recovery are much greater if former workmates can visit them. However, what chance would persons from Mount Gambier or Peterborough admitted to Northfield, Enfield or Parkside have of being visited by friends?

I have scarcely touched the fringe of this subject, but I will have more to say about it later this session. I hesitate to say more now because I want to study the report of Dr. Cawte, who visited overseas for the Hospitals Department. I want to study his recommendations to the Government and inquire what the Government is likely to do about them. However, I think I have said sufficient to impress members with the seriousness of the position. The Premier knows something about it, too. He must know that something needs doing and can be done, because when addressing the second Congress on Mental Health, he said:—

It should be abundantly clear that we must use all possible forms of prevention and of amelioration. . . . The State has its responsibilities in providing proper facilities for the maintenance of good, happy health, and for the treatment of illnesses when they do occur. . . . Good mental health and

happiness must be the responsibility of the individual and the community in the first instance.

I think we should insist, so far as we are able, that he does something about this problem. It is not a Party political matter, nor have I tried to make it such. A Select Committee of the House should be appointed to make a full and proper inquiry. This would take it out of the realms of the Party political arena. I am afraid that if we leave it there and wrangle about it politically the Government will be placed in the position where it will have to defend itself by saying, "We are building a new building here and another one somewhere else so that more and more mental patients can be kept in." That is not the answer to the problem! We do not want bigger hospitals where more mental patients can be kept in custody; we want more and better treatment so that we will have less mental patients.

It has become the fashion in the last couple of days for members to conclude their speeches on a musical note, but I am going to resist that temptation. I am not going to draw the House's attention to the fact that this year is the 800th anniversary of my favourite song *Danny Boy*. I support the motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I rise with some trepidation. My fall into the sere and yellow leaf was publicly announced by the member who has just resumed his seat. I feel somewhat weak in consequence, but I am heartened by the fact that we have never heard the member for Enfield—who is only slightly older than I am—in better form than he was this afternoon. If he is able to keep his end up so well, I hope that, being a little younger, I may be able to do the same. I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, and other officers of this House who have been re-elected and I extend my sincere congratulations to the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) on her speech in moving this motion. All members must have felt some thrill at the way she moved it. The speech of the first woman member of this Parliament interested us all greatly. We shall have an opportunity later to make it perfectly clear, through legislation, that we welcome the presence of women members. I congratulate the other new members who have spoken in this debate and particularly welcome to the Party that commands the majority support in this State the new members for Port Pirie and Port Adelaide.

It has become the custom of Government members to echo the extraordinary statements

that are contained in the Governor's Speech. We have heard year after year the story that this State is making magnificent progress that is paralleled nowhere else in Australia, that the people here never had such good conditions, and that the State is going from strength to strength because of the activities of the magician who occupies the position of Premier. The member for Adelaide produced certain figures on this score. I will quote figures shortly that certainly do not show that the Premier is *sine qua non* to industrial expansion. Let me turn to the figures showing the value of factory production *per capita* in the neighbouring States of New South Wales, Victoria and the small State of Tasmania as compared with our own since the time Sir Thomas Playford took office. In 1938-39 the *per capita* value of factory production in New South Wales was £33 a head, Victoria £35, Tasmania £23 and South Australia £23. During the war years the Federal Labor Government gave considerable assistance to this State, not out of any tenderness of feeling, but because it was strategically advisable to establish war industries here. These plants were used after the war by private industry.

By the end of the war (1945-46), the *per capita* value of factory output was:—New South Wales £52, Victoria £60, South Australia £41 and Tasmania £37. We had the advantage of the establishment of certain industries during the war, an advantage that Tasmania did not have. We are still, of course, considerably behind New South Wales and Victoria in the value of factory output *per capita*. In 1955-56 (the latest figures published by the Commonwealth Statistician) the position was:—New South Wales £182, Victoria £192, South Australia £145, and Tasmania £144. So in fact the expansion *per capita* since the war had gone on at a greater rate in Tasmania than in South Australia, and that without the assistance given to this Government by the intervention of the Federal Labor Government during the war. Tasmania had no Sir Thomas Playford. There was not even a Liberal Government of the kind that honourable members opposite are so forward in talking about.

If we look at the story of the growing expansion in this State, compared with that in the other States, there is not much in it. It so happens that Australia at the moment is naturally expanding. It has the resources and is in an economic position to do so owing to the buoyancy of markets for primary

products; so it is only natural that South Australia should expand and only natural that she should get an oil refinery. We have had the amazing spectacle of South Australia being the fourth State to get an oil refinery, and the kind of oil refinery to be established required a special anchorage. There are only three available in Australia, one being at Darwin. The company therefore decided to establish a refinery here. This is merely a natural development, but from what honourable members opposite say what happened was that the Premier waved a fairy wand and presto! an oil refinery appeared on the scene. The Premier appears as a great benefactor to the State for what was only a natural development. This is the kind of story the Liberal Party is so fond of telling the people: "We have had a great industrial expansion and therefore have no need to worry about other things," so it is said.

It is a pretty fairy story, but if one gets down to the real results from the point of view of services to the people, one finds a different story. The fact is that governmental social services, needed by the ordinary families of South Australia, are worse than in any other State. This has been made clear year after year by reports of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. In answer to the member for Light, I will refer to the money we could have had under the Grants Commission, but before doing so let me turn to the Grants Commission's report of last year to show what was spent on social services. The *per capita* figures for expenditure on social services by the States last year were:—New South Wales 373s. 10d., Victoria 386s. 9d., Queensland 372s., Western Australia 440s. 1d., Tasmania 487s. 2d., and South Australia 357s. 8d., by far the lowest in the Commonwealth. Every item of expenditure on social services, with one exception, was lower in this State—we spent more on education *per capita* than Queensland, but less than every other State. The Grants Commission has pointed out that to give comparable services to those of other States South Australia must spend 6 per cent above the Australian average because of the vast distances in this State and the difficulty of administration of our sparsely settled areas. So, the Commission would normally allow us 6 per cent on the other States' figures. And this is an adjustment that has always been available to us. So it considered that we had spent nearly 20s. a head less than the average on social services, and that to our figure should have been added

\$976,000 to give services equal to the average in Australia. However, we did not do that. I will later show what that failure to spend the money meant to this State. Let me now turn to the impact on the people of this State. I will deal firstly with the matter the member for Light was so vociferous about—hospitals—though I do not propose to deal with his suggestion that pensioners should pay in public hospitals. I do not think any member would seriously agree with that view: at any rate, I hope not. I do not propose to go into the matter of payment in public hospitals because that is clearly contrary to the principles of my Party. I will deal with the provision of hospital beds and hospital staff in this State. In Australia as a whole the average provision of public hospital beds in 1956 was 58.8 for each 10,000 people. The figure was very much lower in South Australia—only 43.3 for each 10,000, the lowest by far in the Commonwealth. This resulted, as many metropolitan members know, in difficulty in getting patients admitted to public hospitals for necessary treatment.

The member for Light challenged me to name a patient who needed cancer treatment at a hospital and who had not been immediately admitted for urgent treatment, so I will give him the name of one. Mr. J. Wordley, of Ashbrook Avenue, Trinity Gardens, is the name of the man, and if the honourable member would like details of the case I will obtain them. This man was a cancer patient under treatment and although he needed an operation on the groin he was kept out of hospital for three months because no bed was available. This is an extraordinary situation, yet the Government would have us believe that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has improved South Australia's figures a little. I will deal with the position in 1956 and since. In order to bring our hospital bed provision to the 1956 average of the other States we would have needed by June 30 last year 1,646 public hospital beds more than we had at June 30, 1956. Since 1956, of course, other States have been providing more hospital beds, but we would have needed this number by June 30, 1958, to attain their 1956 average! I rang the Hospitals Department to ask how many extra public hospital beds there were by June 30, 1958, and was told the number was 243. That is how far we are coping with the problem of extra hospital beds in South Australia! It is true that since that time some 300-odd extra beds have been provided at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but that still does

not bring us anywhere near the other States' 1956 average. However, some of the beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were not immediately opened to the public. Why? Because we did not have the trained staff to cater for the patients who would occupy them.

Whereas the average Australian figure of trained nurses to population is 31.3 to every 10,000 people, South Australia's figure is 24.7. Again this is by far the worst in the Commonwealth. It is not surprising that the Commonwealth Grants Commission figures show that we spend on health, hospitals and charities less *per capita* than any other State of the Commonwealth and that certain country hospitals, unlike those the member for Light is associated with, are not happy about the fact that this State gives a lower subsidy than any other State. I draw attention to articles that have been published by subsidized hospitals in the districts of Victoria and Millicent. The attitude of the hospital boards in those districts is well-known.

It is perfectly true, as the Minister of Education has said, that after the war this State faced proportionately the biggest increase in school population of any State in the Commonwealth. In the last three years our increase in school population has been 26.3 per cent compared with an Australian average of 11.9 per cent. Of course, this situation was known long before the bulge reached the schools. I can well remember that members on this side of the House from 1949 onwards called the Government's attention to the fact that more would have to be spent on education. When I first came into this House and we were crying out about the situation that would face the Education Department, the Premier said in this Chamber, "We cannot spend any more because, if we did, we would be penalized by the Grants Commission." That was quite untrue. The Premier well knew that we were not likely to be penalized, as we were not spending the average of the other States, but that was an easy way out.

Mr. Jennings—We would have been recompensed.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, as I will show in a moment. We did not spend the money and the Education Department faced the gravest crisis it has ever had to face. We still have a situation, which we will have for a long time, in which children are not getting an adequate education in departmental schools simply because there are not enough teachers or classrooms. In secondary schools in the metropolitan area are classes of 50 or more

children in public examination forms. Nobody can properly teach a class of that size in a public examination form; it is quite impossible. The unfortunate part is that in order to get teachers even to teach classes of that size we have had to use retired teachers and temporary teachers, and we have had to take into secondary schools grade VII teachers from primary departments, thereby leaving primary schools without properly trained teachers. If members look at the standards of remuneration of teachers in this State they will find that no other State in the Commonwealth has so many teachers in its lowest salaried brackets. That is still the case, even though there have been recent increases in salaries.

Mr. Nankivell—Are you sure the standard of salaries is the cause of the problem?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, especially the standard that applied some considerable time ago. When I first came into this House in 1953 there were only a little over 300 students in the Teachers College compared with 800 in Western Australia. Western Australia has nothing like our problem; that State has a surplus because it saw what was happening. Although the attention of the Government was drawn to the necessity of spending more to attract these people, it did not do so and we are now facing a serious situation. I will now deal with actual expenditure on education, and turn first to the 1956 figures. According to the Commonwealth Grants Commission report for the last year of review, the amounts spent annually on education were:—

State.	Per capita.
New South Wales	10.146
Victoria	9.829
Queensland	8.063
South Australia	9.571
Western Australia	11.583
Tasmania	12.821
Australian average	9.896

We were spending less than the average although our problem was far greater than any other State's. The Minister of Education has proceeded to tell the people of this State what the Education department has done, and from time to time he publishes a long list of new schools. When these are scrutinized it can be found that established schools where new buildings are being erected are included. I do not think that is a particularly satisfactory method of telling the people what new schools are being built.

On the face of it, it would seem from the Minister's statement that in fact we are beginning to spend a little more on education. No comparable statistician's figures have been published for last year and in order to obtain them I had to examine Estimates and Auditor-General's reports for all States. It is difficult to take out comparable budgetary figures for a total Budget expenditure and expenditure on education, because each State has different budgetary methods, particularly in relation to public transport. The only way I could get comparable figures relating to total Budget expenditure was to exclude anything in the way of revenue or expenditure on public transport other than the deficits on public transport paid by the States from consolidated revenue (where expenditure and revenue on public transport is taken into the Budget) or to a trust (as in our case). By doing that it is possible to get a comparable figure, which shows that the proportion spent on education—that is, on all items included under the lines relating to Minister of Education in our Estimates—were:—

State.	Percentage.
New South Wales	28.3
Victoria	28.5
Queensland	22.2
South Australia	16.7
Western Australia	17.4
Tasmania	19.0
Average	23.4

This is the State with the largest increase in enrolments and the biggest problem in education, yet 16.7 is the percentage of our consolidated revenue we saw fit to devote to education! It is true that to this figure one ought to add a proportion of available Loan moneys spent. South Australia did spend 2.3 per cent above the Australian average from Loan moneys on capital works for education. However, I do not think that is adequate considering the difference between our problem and that of other States. In the year of review of the Commonwealth Grants Commission the expenditure per child in each State was:—

State.	£
New South Wales	71.25
Victoria	77.15
Queensland	54.81
South Australia	61.87
Western Australia	73.80
Tasmania	75.24
Average	69.94

That table gives the reason why we have not had adequate provision for education in

this State. We are not spending enough on buildings or on getting the necessary staff.

Let me turn to the moneys available to us, because the honourable member for Light (Mr. Hambour) challenged me on the statement I made during the election that this State had not had moneys it could have had. Although I have explained this to the House before, for the benefit of the honourable member and of any others of a like mind, I will take him through the Commonwealth Grants Commission's report to show quite clearly how we missed out. Let me turn to the first Commonwealth Grants Commission's report that made this situation perfectly clear. One has to read the report fairly carefully to be able to understand exactly the terms used by the Grants Commission because it has coined some terms that have a certain significance apparent only in the report itself. The 1955 report sets forth at page 24 the principles and methods used by the Grants Commission in recommending a grant. The commission said:—

An examination is made of the audited accounts of a claimant State for the year of review . . .

The year of review was always two years before. That sentence continues:—

. . . and, if necessary, corrections are made in order to preserve comparability of budget results of all States.

That means that they do the sort of thing that I mentioned in connection with the transport budgets. At any rate, they make the corrections to get comparability. The report continues:—

Adjustments are also measured for differences between the claimant States and the non-claimant States in efforts to raise revenue and in levels of expenditure in providing certain services. This examination and these corrections and adjustments provide the following information:—

(a) the published budget result—

That is, what the States say is their budget result. The report continues:—

(b) the corrected budget result (*i.e.*, the published budget result plus or minus corrections); and

(c) the adjusted budget result (*i.e.*, the corrected budget result plus or minus adjustments).

Here is the important clause:—

In the case of a State with a net favourable adjustment the significant figure is the corrected budget result: in the case of a State with a net unfavourable adjustment the significant figure is the adjusted budget result.

Let me turn now to the corrections and adjustments that were made. The commis-

sion examined the expenditure on social services, which revealed that in that year, 1953-54, in South Australia we had spent 283s. *per capita* on the total social services—that is, education, health, hospitals and charities, law, order and public safety—and the all-States average was 302s. 7d. So, in order to allow for our difference, we could have spent up to 302s. 7d. plus 6 per cent, because the 6 per cent is allowed to us for greater difficulties in administration owing to the nature of our State. So the commission said that the adjusted standard expenditure—that is, what we were allowed to spend—was £12,428,000 and the actual expenditure was £11,122,000. The favourable adjustment available to us was thus £1,306,000.

At page 60, the commission gives a summary of corrections and adjustments. This shows that, after taking off amounts for South Australia's failure to charge to the level of the other States on public undertakings and failure to tax to the level of the other States, a net adjustment of £456,000 was due to S.A. We then turn to the corrected budget result and the adjusted budget result. The corrected budget result shows the same figure as our published budget result because we did not get the advantage of the adjustments: we did not get that £456,000. Honourable members will remember from the clause I read out that, in the case of a State with a net favourable adjustment, the significant figure, for the Grants Commission's purpose, is the corrected budget result. We had a net favourable adjustment, and therefore the £456,000 of net favourable adjustment was not taken into account in giving us any money. If we had spent that £456,000 in that year or if we had spent £1,306,000 and taxed to the level of the other States and charged our public undertakings to the level of the other States, then we would have had the whole of that amount added to our grant.

Mr. Hambour—Charged to the level and taxed to the level of the other States?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, but, even without altering our tax or charges, we would have got £456,000, but we did not get a brass razoo.

Mr. Hambour—You mentioned an unqualified £1,600,000 in your election speech.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes; that is in relation to 1958.

Mr. Hambour—Unmodified?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes.

Mr. Hambour—You did not make any reference to tax?

Mr. DUNSTAN—No. I can show the honourable member how it would have affected us if we had altered our tax. I said that, if we had budgeted in the same way as the other States—that is what these adjustments are for, to measure our charges, taxes and the like—there would have been available to us £1,600,000.

Mr. Hambour—You admit it would have meant a lot of increased charges?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Not a great many. If the honourable member would like to go through them, I have the report here.

Mr. Hambour—I get the honourable member's point; he promised me a statement.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am sorry. I remember clearly what I said on that particular point, for it is a point I have often made.

Mr. Hambour—I did not misquote you, did I?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Not really. The honourable member said that I had said that £1,600,000 was available to South Australia, which we did not get; that is quite true. That situation continued with the exception of one year, 1957, when the Grants Commission altered the basis of its calculations. In that year we did not lose money available to us in this way, but in 1958 we did. The Commission then altered the basis of its calculations, as honourable members can see from its summary. It simply adopted a different method of expressing exactly the same principle, and the whole of the favourable adjustment was afterwards whipped off in the recommendations. The basis of that was for exactly the same reason.

The point is that the Grants Commission said, and has said consistently except for 1957, "We will allow you to spend to the level of the other States plus 6 per cent for your disabilities. If you need that money to put you in the same budgetary position as the standard of the other States, then you will get that money but, if you do not need it, you do not get it." That is to say, if you do not spend it first, then you cannot claim it.

Mr. Hambour—Amongst the increases were tram fares and many other items. The honourable member said "not many"; there were many.

Mr. DUNSTAN—There are tram fares, electricity charges, harbour charges, and hotel licences.

Mr. Hambour—Yes.

Mr. O'Halloran—Those were increased substantially.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, but now it will not make any difference.

Mr. Hambour—Did the honourable member advocate an increase of those charges?

Mr. DUNSTAN—No, I did not but, as the honourable member can find out if he looks at some of my speeches in this House and as other members will remember who have paid more attention to what I have said, I have consistently repeated this charge since 1955 and it has never been answered in this House; I gave the details upon which I base my charge.

Mr. Hambour—I did not say you advocated an increase in charges. I am saying you should to substantiate your argument.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No; it still stands because there would still be a net adjustment available to us if we spent money without increasing charges or taxation.

Mr. Hambour—Not as much as you are claiming.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No, not as much.

Mr. Hambour—You said £400,000.

Mr. DUNSTAN—This is how it would have worked. If we had increased taxes we should not have had that money taken off our favourable adjustment; and, if we had spent the whole amount to the level of the favourable adjustment, we should have had not only that money but the money coming in in tax as well.

Mr. Hambour—You would have the tax as well?

Mr. DUNSTAN—You had to tax to get the whole amount, but you could get the whole amount of the tax.

Mr. Hambour—Yes.

Mr. DUNSTAN—That is, if you taxed and you still spent the whole amount to the level of the other States plus 6 per cent, you got the amount without any deductions; that money would have been available for our State services, and the public would not have suffered as a result. It relates not only to the things I have mentioned; it relates to things like public relief. Why is it that, when certain Commonwealth pensions are increased, the child welfare allowances in South Australia are decreased by the same amount, so that what the Commonwealth gives with one hand the State takes away with the other? That happened with allowances from the Children's Welfare Department to widows in this State.

Mr. Hambour—The honourable member is virtually saying that the people suffer because the Government does not spend more money?

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes.

Mr. Hambour—You advocate that the Government spend more money, which is about the most unpopular advocacy I have heard for a long time.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I have been crying out on the street corners about this for six years and I have not found any unpopularity in my district. As a matter of fact, the unpopularity was so great in my district at the one meeting that the Liberal and Country League saw fit to hold in Norwood and that Party managed to get so many people there that they had to take themselves into the Mayor's parlour as there were only 14 people present! I do not think the honourable member would feel that my seat was very uncomfortable. Something else that vitally concerns the people of this State in their ordinary every-day lives—I have dealt with education and hospital provision—is housing. My district is one of the largest rental districts in the State. The alterations to the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act, which have released houses becoming vacant and in respect of which a landlord demands a release from rent control, have brought great hardship to many people in my district. This is what happens. These people seek houses and find that they can get a place of poor quality at a low rental, about £6 to £8 a week, which they have to pay out of a wage. They take the place in desperation. Then the tenant is required to sign a lease drawn up in legal form and protecting the landlord in every possible way. It is an expensive document: the fee is £12 12s. to £13 13s.

Mr. Millhouse—No.

Mr. DUNSTAN—If the honourable member were to tax it on the Supreme Court scale it would show about £13 13s.

Mr. Millhouse—The average fee is £6 or £7.

Mr. DUNSTAN—In that case the honourable member's charges are lower than the average. Let us accept £6 or £7, but taxed on the Supreme Court scale it would be £12 12s. to £13 13s. Then stamp duty has to be paid. Inevitably the lease provides that the tenant shall keep the premises in good order and tenantable repair.

Mr. Hambour—Who prepares the leases?

Mr. DUNSTAN—The lawyers. Most laymen signing a document of that kind imagine that they are signing to keep the premises as they were on occupation, but that is not the meaning, as Mr. Millhouse well knows. It means that the tenant must put the premises in good repair at his own expense and keep them that way. I have had people in my district go into a house where the floors have

been worm-eaten. Some went into a house in Austral Place a couple of weeks ago and found that they were up for the big expense of putting in a new floor. The work had to be done at the tenant's expense while he paid about £6 a week for rent. Tenants find themselves in great difficulties. I had a case not so long ago just near the East Adelaide school. A tenant went into the place on which had been put a bit of paint and plaster. In order to get a roof over his head and a home for his family he agreed to pay £8 a week and signed a lease. He was working on wages at the Long Range Weapons Establishment. He discovered to his horror that although it had been agreed when he went into the place that he could sub-let, and this was how he hoped to pay the £8 a week, the place was literally falling apart. The walls were cracked. There were cracks inches wide and it was possible to see daylight through them. Pieces of plaster were falling out and he could not get people to go in, even if they were desperate about a house, because they were frightened that the roof would fall on them. The walls were cracking because the foundations were not good. The landlord had put some plaster and paint on to make the place look all right, but the tenant did not know the position until the place began to fall down. When he tried to get out of the lease he was sued, and it was said that if the landlord did not allow him to surrender the lease, the tenant would be up for the money.

These are extraordinary situations for tenants to face. I know the feeling of Housing Trust officers who have to try to enforce a fair system of rentals for places that are still under rent control. It is clear in their minds from their experience, and I challenge the Premier to get a report on the matter, that there must be a ceiling for rental homes under leases. It is not proper in the present housing shortage to make the sky the limit, nor is it proper to have people living in wretched housing conditions and paying a rental that means that they cannot properly feed and clothe their family out of the normal wage, yet it happens, and in practically every metropolitan district where there are numerous rental houses. I have widows and families of wage earners in my district who are in that situation. We see school children that are not properly fed and clothed. School committees are trying to get food and clothing for such children because the amount left to the wage earner after paying a high rent is insufficient to keep body and soul together and

feed and clothe his children properly. Such a situation should not exist.

I suggested earlier that these leases should be released from rent control only if the rent were specified not to be more than 100 per cent above the controlled rent. That would be a fair proposition. Nobody can say that 100 per cent increase on what would be the controlled rent at the moment is an unfair rent, or an unfair return to the landlord. The controlled rent would be the 1939 rent, plus 40 per cent, plus an amortization amount for the extra cost of outgoings since 1939, and then on top of that would be the 100 per cent. That is more than fair and more than the increase given to wage earners under the arbitration system.

I do not say that all landlords in South Australia are rapacious rogues, because they are not. Some, and I have assisted some of them, have been extremely fair with their tenants, and all credit to them. Some people will charge the limit, and a bit more besides. They will charge any fee that they can squeeze out of some poor devil who is trying to find a place for himself and his family. We must put an end to this sort of thing. I hope that later in the session I shall be able to debate the matter more thoroughly.

When I came into this House I was incensed at the fact that the people of the State in their ordinary needs were far worse off than they ought to have been in view of the facilities and finance available to the State. I was convinced then that the reason they were not in a better position was that their votes did not count in this House. Every moment I remain a member of this place I am more than ever convinced that the beliefs I held then were right. I believe that the people in this State have not got the facilities and services that they ought to have. They are still needlessly in want because the Government does not represent them. It could not care less, as far as I can see, about their needs and ills. Only one Party represents those people and it believes that every person in the State has the right, by virtue of his humanity, to an equal voice with all other persons in the future of the State. I refer to the Australian Labor Party, the Party which has the support of most people in the State, and which ought now to be sitting on the Government benches. I support the motion.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—Congratulations have been the order of the day with most members who have spoken in this debate, and

I offer my congratulations to the two members who have spoken this afternoon. Their addresses were well prepared and reasonable, and delivered as the voice of people whose voice needs to be heard but whose needs have been overlooked because we have on the Treasury benches a Government that realizes it is no longer necessary for it to pay undue attention to the needs of the people on the lower rungs of the ladder. So long as there is a Labor Party, so long will these people have a voice, and it is a source of satisfaction to us to realize that there are young men in this House who, in giving these people that voice, demonstrate an understanding of their needs and the capacity they have to speak on the people's behalf. It was a pleasure to listen to the two addresses this afternoon.

The Governor's Speech portrayed to us the advance that this State has made industrially in primary industry, in education and in services over the years. That is to be expected because the Government always sees that these advances are well documented, well recorded, and used, as far as possible, for political propaganda purposes. It can be regarded as the accepted thing, and people would be surprised if it were no longer the case. I take a pride in my State. I take a pride in the advances that have been recorded, in common with advances in the rest of Australia. I do not believe that South Australia has advanced at a greater rate than the other States. In my limited travels around Australia I have found that in many respects we are lagging behind some other States in industrial expansion, education and hospitalization, but we all realize that there have been some advances and we are proud of them. We can claim a share of the responsibility for bringing about this improvement. The Governor's Speech looks into the future and indicates that there are greater days ahead. The Speech refers to steelworks being established at Whyalla and what is being done to establish the oil refinery. We know what great play the Premier, in delivering his policy speech, made of these two projects and every other item of industrial development in the State.

I think it proper that we should remind the people of this State that Labor has had a prominent part in the development being undertaken in South Australia, and that Labor has consistently, with vigour and effect, spoken on behalf of the people in the negotiations that have led up to the establishment of these industries and the agreements that have been

brought about. Due credit should be given to the part that Labor has played in the advance that we see. Recently I was given a copy of the *London Financial Times*, which contained statements published by the Premiers of all the States of the Commonwealth and addressed to the captains of industry in Europe and leaders in the financial world generally. I notice that the outstanding feature of the South Australian Premier's statement concerned the good relationships that existed between management and men in industry. This is very largely due to sound leadership in our trade unions and in the industrial sphere, and credit should be given to those responsible for that lead. Labor has every right to be proud of the part it has played in the development of South Australia, and it is necessary for us to write that into such documents as His Excellency's Speech and into the story of South Australia's development.

I have gone to some lengths to make that claim because of the speech made by the member for Mitcham who said, amongst other things, that, Socialism no longer can claim to be the Party of progress, and that in fact Socialist Parties, like the Party in opposition in this Chamber, are now Parties of stagnation. He tried subsequently in his address to show that there was a waning of interest in the socialist ideal. I want the member for Mitcham to understand that this very speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor is eloquent demonstration of the fact that more and more are the people of South Australia, in common with those of Australia as a whole, embracing the tenets of socialism. More and more is business looking to the Government and leaning on the Government for support. More and more is private enterprise depending on the Government for props in order that their industry should continue, and more and more are members opposite, whether they care to admit it or not, not only embracing the tenets of socialism but asking for it in larger doses every time they rise to their feet in this Chamber.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hear, hear! So they do.

Mr. RICHES—I have no disquiet at all, because time is on our side. Whatever label people like to give it, we can see this tendency in industry and in development, and we cannot see any development in South Australia or anywhere else without it.

Mr. Hambour—That is a pretty bold statement, isn't it?

Mr. RICHES—It is the truth.

Mr. Hambour—It is not the truth. You can point to one or two enterprises with a monopoly; that is all right. But you made a statement that South Australia has not shown any progress without socialism. That is virtually what you said.

Mr. RICHES—And I can substantiate it.

Mr. Hambour—You would have the job in front of you.

Mr. RICHES—South Australia could not progress without power, and that power is provided under socialistic control. South Australia could not develop without water, transport, and other essential services, and every member of the Party sitting opposite will ask for more and more Government provision in these directions. South Australian industry is increasingly looking to the Government for props as direct financial assistance.

Mr. Hambour—Don't say "financial assistance."

Mr. RICHES—I am saying that.

Mr. Hambour—The financial assistance your committee has given has been to co-operatives, in the main. What financial assistance has the Government given to private industry? You make statements that you don't qualify.

Mr. O'Halloran—What about the fruit canning industry?

Mr. Hambour—I have mentioned that.

Mr. O'Halloran—Wasn't that private enterprise—over £1,000,000?

Mr. RICHES—For the benefit of the member for Light, every fruit canning factory that has applied to the Industries Development Committee for assistance has been private enterprise—an eloquent testimony to the failure of private enterprise in its leaning on the Government for support.

Mr. Hambour—You are picking on one industry.

Mr. RICHES—No, I am not. The Nairne pyrites industry was recently developed in the Adelaide Hills, and private industry is well and truly represented there. The Government guaranteed £1,000,000 for that industry. Let us examine the type of support that members opposite expect. The people through the Mines Department first of all located the pyrites deposit; they proved it; they worked out and published to the world how this could be worked at a profit, how it could be turned to account for the people of South Australia and how it could protect our farmers against undue demands for superphosphate.

Mr. Heaslip—Are you sure it is reducing the cost of superphosphate?

Mr. RICHES—I did not say that.

Mr. Heaslip—You said it was protecting the farmer.

Mr. RICHES—Yes, because without it I should not like to say what the price of superphosphate would be.

Mr. Heaslip—I could tell you.

Mr. RICHES—With great respect, the honourable member does not know.

Mr. Heaslip—I do.

Mr. RICHES—All the evidence that was presented by the honourable member's own Government when it referred this matter to the committee for investigation—and it was the only basis that the Government and this Parliament had for guaranteeing £1,000,000—concerned the benefit to be derived because the guarantee would ensure that supplies of sulphuric acid were available for superphosphate production in South Australia. All sorts of steps were taken to make sure that our farmers received the benefit of that production, and that under no circumstances could they be denied the benefit.

The Mines Department located the deposit, showed how that deposit could be turned to account, and bore all the expense of establishing that enterprise. Private enterprise is looking to the Government in an ever-increasing way for props, and this Government would not dare remove the props that it is giving to private industry in this State, and without which the State would cease to function.

I am pointing out the arrangement that takes place, and I want to give the House the benefit of what I think should be substituted for the present arrangement. What I am saying about Nairne can be said about the iron ore and steel industry at Whyalla and every other industry that has been similarly assisted. The people discover the ore; they show how it can be developed; they work out a scheme of operation and publish it to the world. Private enterprise then comes in because it can see that it is going to be a good thing, and it applies to the Government for assistance. The people then have to provide water, transport, power and houses, and then guarantee £1,000,000 against the operation. If it is a failure, the people lose, and if it is a success the people get nothing.

Mr. Hambour—You were one who recommended it.

Mr. RICHES—I say that that is good, and that it is a step towards the state of society that I would like to see exist generally. I would like to see it go a little further, with the Government, or the people, and industry

more closely associated, and I would like to see a partnership under which the people can share in the profits as well as the losses.

Mr. Hambour—A system like they have in China?

Mr. RICHES—I do not know about China; I am talking about South Australia.

Mr. Hambour—China has the sort of set-up you are talking about.

Mr. RICHES—I know that that policy, in part, was adopted in Australia, and I think it worked to the benefit of Australia. There was a time when the Commonwealth Government was in partnership in radio production.

Mr. Hambour—That is not socialism.

Mr. RICHES—It is a step towards it; it is not free and unrestricted private enterprise.

Mr. Hambour—It is not good enough for your Party; you want the lot.

Mr. RICHES—Of course we do, eventually.

Mr. Hambour—Why don't you say it?

The ACTING SPEAKER—Order! Honourable members are out of order in interjecting. The honourable member for Stuart.

Mr. RICHES—I am trying to say it now. Where this partnership operated in A.W.A., in petrol distribution, and in a number of other industries, it was too much for our friends opposite and their counterparts in the Federal sphere, and they could not sell out quickly enough. I am firmly of the opinion that the people of Australia have paid dearly for every one of those instrumentalities that have been sold to those who want to make a picking out of the operation. It would have been a tremendous advantage to Australia today if the people had retained their interest in the Commonwealth Oil Refineries and if they had retained their interest in the radio sphere. The Commonwealth Government is continuing the policy with the Commonwealth Bank, and it cannot smash Trans-Australian Airlines quickly enough. It is a glaring instance of what happens in the field of aerial travel. T.A.A. was recognized as the finest aerial service in the world and, for what my judgment is worth, I consider that it still is. However, I am wondering how long it is going to continue so, with the hamstringing that is taking place.

Mr. O'Halloran—And it is carrying the big load of private enterprise on its back.

Mr. RICHES—The Federal Government is taking steps to prop up the private enterprise competing with it. I do not believe that Ansett-A.N.A. is not receiving hefty props from the Federal Government. It doesn't

mind Government control or Government monopoly so long as it gets a picking.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Who provides airports?

Mr. Hambour—Who provides the railway stations?

Mr. Fred Walsh—The people!

Mr. Hambour—Don't forget the roads.

Mr. RICHES—The member believes in socialism although he really isn't a wake up to his basic beliefs. He does not speak in this House without asking for greater doses of it. In this debate he has asked for Government control over the distribution of milk to Broken Hill.

Mr. Hambour—You read what I said.

Mr. RICHES—He doesn't believe in free and unrestricted competition in the distribution of milk.

Mr. Hambour—You've got it all back to front.

The ACTING SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member for Stuart has the floor.

Mr. RICHES—The member for Light was asking for Government assistance in the distribution of milk.

Mr. Hambour—That's not true. I suggest you get leave to continue and read my speech again.

Mr. RICHES—If the honourable member wants to retract or correct what he said he will have plenty of opportunities.

Mr. Hambour—I don't want to correct what I said. It is in print.

Mr. RICHES—I know. I am grateful that I did not have to sit and listen to the honourable member. I read his speech.

Mr. Hambour—You can advocate socialism.

Mr. RICHES—A rose by any other name would smell as sweet, and socialism is just as sweet to me when the honourable member advocates it as when it is advocated by my Party. Whether or not he recognizes what he advocates is another matter. Socialism is

not dying; it is being embraced and asked for, and it is working. If the members for Light and Mitcham consult their leaders in the Federal sphere they will soon be told just how effectively it is working. It may be true that by subterfuge and false propaganda the Party to which I belong is suffering a reverse, but everyone who has attempted to speak for the people has suffered reverses. I do not think this applies in the other States as obviously as here, but our reverse is not a reverse in the estimation of the people, nor is it a reverse in the esteem in which we are held by them. It is not a democratic reverse.

Mr. Coumbe—Well, what is it?

Mr. RICHES—We are without because of the peculiar system of democracy that applies in South Australia.

Mr. Hambour—You are in the wilderness because of your own troubles. You have Cameron now going to form a group within a group.

Mr. Corcoran—What has that to do with it?

The SPEAKER—Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. Hambour—That is where your troubles are. Nobody dislikes you people. I don't.

The SPEAKER—Order!

Mr. RICHES—I am glad the honourable member loves us as much as ever. These groups within groups are similar to the Young Liberals within the larger Liberal sub-branches. We are thinking of the bigger issue and are not concerned so much with the smaller ones. Time is on our side and these things will be resolved. The state I have been talking about will come. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 11, at 2 p.m.