

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, April 28, 1960.

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

NEW MEMBER FOR LIGHT.

Mr. Leslie Charles Nicholson, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took his seat in the House as the member for the district of Light in place of Mr. G. Hambour (deceased).

QUESTIONS.

NEW GAWLER HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK—Over the last 12 months on several occasions in this House and outside I have advocated to the Minister of Education the advisability of purchasing land in Gawler with a view to erecting a new Gawler high school. Can the Minister say whether the purchase has been completed and, if so, can he give any details regarding the project?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The purchase has not been completed but negotiations are in progress for the purchase of approximately 30 acres of land on offer to the Education Department to the west of the southern part of the Gawler racecourse, with frontages to Barnett Road on the east and Para Road on the west, and it is expected that these negotiations will be completed shortly. It is hoped that it may be possible to provide a new school on this site at an early date.

EYRE HIGHWAY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads concerning the progress made in the search for water and for material suitable for forming the Eyre Highway?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Minister of Roads advises that investigations into the availability of road materials and water are still in hand. Stone has been located in various localities but investigations are proceeding in an endeavour to eliminate long distance cartage. At present water appears to be the main difficulty, but investigations are continuing.

RIVER MURRAY STORAGE DAM.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The following is an extract from a Canberra report in this morning's *Advertiser*:—

Technical officers of the Department of National Development have expressed "favourable opinions" on the proposed River Murray dam.

Then follow certain reservations which may affect these "opinions." Has the Premier received a favourable assurance from the Commonwealth Government that, when the details are completed and the scheme has been finally presented, the Commonwealth will to a substantial degree participate with the State in meeting the cost?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I hope the Leader has had a copy of the published statement I made on this matter. I placed the matter before the Prime Minister before putting it to New South Wales and Victoria. In conversation at various times the Prime Minister assured me that the Commonwealth was anxious to assist South Australia in obtaining a better and more adequate water supply. Of course, that was a general statement and must not be taken as anything more than that, for it was not a Cabinet assurance that support would be given. I believe that the Commonwealth will assist to the extent desired, but there has been no approval yet to it, because frankly the investigations have not been taken to the stage where we could ask for approval to be given. We would not be in a position ourselves to go ahead with the work until the investigations have been proceeded with. As a matter of some interest, Mr. Dridan has reported to the Minister of Works that the River Murray Commission will require South Australia to undertake the investigations on the dam site. He has recommended that a sum be available for that purpose; that will be considered at the next Cabinet meeting and I am sure it will be approved. That is for the site investigations that will be undertaken by South Australia in South Australian territory. Finally, the reply given by the Commonwealth Minister yesterday will be looked upon as a very favourable comment on the project. I certainly look on it in that light.

UPPER STURT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—On April 5 last I asked the Minister of Works a question about a reticulated water supply for Upper Sturt and he was not able to hold out any great hopes of that at present. In view of his earlier answer, I ask if he will now investigate the possibility of underground supplies, at least for the Upper Sturt school—for it was difficulty in that vicinity that prompted my earlier question—and the neighbouring houses?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I was under the impression from the honourable member's

earlier question that he was pursuing the possibility of a general reticulated scheme for the area.

Mr. Millhouse—And so I was.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—But I was not aware at the time that he had particularly in mind a certain specific locality or, in particular, the school. In view of the question now asked, I will refer the matter in the first instance to the Engineer-in-Chief, with a view to his ascertaining from the Mines Department what geological data we have in respect of the area concerned, to see what the possibilities are of providing water for the school and perhaps for any other nearby localities that may urgently need it. If the geological reports are favourable, the Engineer-in-Chief will probably ask for approval to engage the Mines Department in sinking a trial bore to ascertain what supplies are available. I will refer the matter to the Engineer-in-Chief with a view to his proceeding on the lines I have indicated.

BRIDGE OVER STURT RIVER.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Roads when tenders will be called for the construction of a bridge over the Sturt River on the Marion Road section to give a through road from South Road to Anzac Highway?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes.

MACCLESFIELD-STRAHALBYN ROAD.

Mr. JENKINS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the Macclesfield-Strathalbyn road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises that traffic counts on the Macclesfield-Strathalbyn section of the Aldgate to Langhorne's Creek main road indicate that traffic is increasing, and it is known that the road alignment and width generally are substandard. In addition, pavement failures are occurring in several locations, and it is expected that reconstruction will be necessary in the not too distant future. There are, however, no plans in hand for immediate reconstruction.

BLOOD TRANSFUSIONS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Premier a reply to my earlier question on the law relating to blood transfusions for children whose parents will not consent to such transfusions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Crown Solicitor reports:—

A doctor has no authority to force an adult patient of sound mind to submit to a blood transfusion. The consent of the patient,

express or implied, must first be obtained. If the patient is unconscious and cannot be asked whether or not he will consent, the law will imply his consent to whatever may be reasonably necessary to save his life or preserve his health. If the patient is conscious, and the blood transfusion is administered without the patient being asked to consent, and the patient does not object, his consent will again probably be implied. But if the patient is conscious and forbids a blood transfusion, all the doctor can lawfully do, after he has exhausted his powers of persuasion, is to let the patient suffer the consequences of his own obstinacy. If the doctor ignored the patient's prohibition and forcibly administered a blood transfusion, he would be technically liable for a trespass to the patient's person. It is unlikely that in such circumstances any more than nominal damages would be awarded; but the doctor might run a risk of serious consequences if some mishap occurred in the blood transfusion or if the patient died while he was being forcibly given a blood transfusion.

Mr. HUTCHENS—My original question concerned a parent who refused to allow a blood transfusion to be given to a child, but the Premier's reply seemed to apply to a person who refused a blood transfusion for himself. I am sure the Premier will agree that it is important to save the lives of children wherever possible, and to protect them against their parents' folly. Can the Premier say whether there is any provision in South Australian law whereby quick action can be taken, such as making a child a ward of the State, in an endeavour to save life?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I know of no legislation in South Australia that takes the control of a child away from parents, except by the process of court action. I know of no arbitrary way by which, for instance, a health authority could prescribe certain treatment and override the lawful control by the child's parents. I doubt very much whether any such law exists. On the other hand, I think the case in Victoria clearly established that under common law a parent must not neglect to attend to the interests of a child from the point of view of medical treatment, and in that case a serious conviction was recorded because the parents had refused to allow a necessary operation to be performed.

Mr. Jennings—But that was too late.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I admit that. This matter has been considered in Great Britain, where some legislation has either been suggested or passed—I fancy, passed—which enables a court to take a child out of the hands of a parent who will not provide for the necessary treatment. I will

have that aspect examined to see whether such a provision could be introduced here, whether it has been applied successfully in other countries, or what the result of its application has been.

CHAFFEY DRAINAGE SCHEME.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the Chaffey drainage scheme?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—The Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage has prepared plans in connection with the drainage of a portion of the Ral Ral division, Chaffey irrigation area, and it is intended that the matter will be discussed with settler representatives by the Director of Lands and the Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage during their forthcoming visit to the district.

GLANVILLE PIPE WORKS.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my earlier question about the Glanville pipe works?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Some years ago the possibility was considered of closing down the Glanville pipe works and transferring those activities, possibly to Sassafras. That was not done although the activities of the Glanville works were curtailed somewhat. At present there are no plans for the removal of the pipe works. The work being done at present, which is on special castings and requirements for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, is being done efficiently and in sufficient quantity to satisfy most of the requirements. So at present there are no plans for closing down the works at Glanville; in fact, for the last two years I think no further consideration has been given to the transfer.

DIESEL LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the construction of diesel locomotives on contract?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Railways, advises that, as stated by me, diesel locomotives were never wholly made at Islington. The equipment for the first ten diesels ("900" Class) for broad gauge main line operation was obtained under contract and the bodies built at Islington. All subsequent locomotives have been built by contract complete and ready for operation.

The decision to build the bodies of the "900" Class at Islington was forced upon the administration by the particular circumstances

prevailing at that time. But the experience of the railway engineers in connection with that particular project, and the fact that proven locomotives subsequently became available for purchase from Australian contractors, led to the decision not to build further diesel locomotives at Islington.

The design and manufacture of engine, electrical and control equipment are highly specialized, and in the hands of relatively few manufacturers. If the S.A. Railways were to build the bodies of locomotives at Islington, it would be necessary first to call tenders for power, electrical and control equipment. If the Railways were able to receive satisfactory tenders, suitable equipment would be chosen and the design of the locomotive structure to house this equipment would be put in hand. This would involve lengthy negotiations with the contractors, as well as considerable time in calling tenders for auxiliary equipment and negotiating with the suppliers of same. Moreover, when the construction of the first locomotive was ultimately completed, extensive trials would be necessary to establish the satisfactory operation of the locomotive before placing it in service.

In short, the diesel locomotive is highly specialized equipment, and its design and construction must be left in the hands of specialists if satisfactory performance and maintenance—so vital to the success of railway operations—are to be achieved.

PORT PIRIE TO PORT AUGUSTA RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question relating to inconvenience caused to passengers proceeding to Whyalla owing to the cancellation of Budd cars from Port Pirie and the failure of the Commonwealth Railways to notify the bus service awaiting the arrival of the Budd cars at Port Augusta?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have been informed by the Minister of Railways that the complaint was taken up with the Commonwealth Railways at Port Augusta and advice was received that on both April 1 and 8 the passenger train from Alice Springs was running late. To avoid a further delay to this train the Budd car travelling from Port Augusta to Port Pirie junction was cancelled and passengers from Port Augusta were carried on the Alice Springs train. Because of this cancellation there was no available Budd car at Port Pirie junction to connect with the 1.30 p.m. East-West express from Adelaide and passengers for Port Augusta and Whyalla were given

transit on the express from Port Pirie junction. The Commonwealth Railways overlooked advising Ansett Road Lines of the altered arrangement but the South Australian Railways has been informed that steps have been taken by the Commonwealth Railways to obviate a recurrence.

SCHOOL CAMPS.

Mr. BYWATERS—Recently all members were furnished with an excellent booklet called *Physical Education in South Australian Schools* and I was particularly interested in the concluding part of the booklet relating to school camps. Excellent facilities are available for school camping and there are great opportunities to have these camps, especially in school time, to further the education of students. Part of the booklet states:—

Camping by school parties is becoming increasingly popular. Financial assistance is provided from the Commonwealth National Fitness grant towards expenses incurred in connection with approved school camps. School camps vary in length from two days to two weeks and are usually held during week-ends and school holidays. Under special circumstances some camps are allowed in school time. Will the Minister of Education consider extending camping in school time because of the undoubted benefits and educational opportunities it gives?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to consider the matter but it is the province of the Director of Education under the Act and Regulations. I shall discuss it with him and bring down a reply in due course.

SECONDHAND DEALERS ACT: TYRES.

Mr. QUIRKE—Regulations under the Secondhand Dealers Act provide that when secondhand tyres are purchased by a tyre dealer he must make an entry in a book, the signature of the seller must be obtained, a tag must be placed on the tyre with the value and identification number, and the subsequent disposal and to whom sold must be recorded. There is no disagreement with that, because it is obviously intended to identify stolen property, but other features are extremely irksome to tyre suppliers. When an owner drives a vehicle into a dealer's premises and requests that four tyres be removed and new tyres fitted, the same regulations apply to those tyres. As most transactions concern the replacement of worn tyres on vehicles, the regulations that must be followed in such cases are extremely irksome. Section 23 of the Act provides for exemption of various

items under certain circumstances, and many items are so exempted. Will the Premier see whether it is possible to exempt from the regulations tyres where they have been purchased on the car but have been removed and new tyres fitted, there being no dispute about the ownership of such tyres?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I can well understand that the regulation in its present form could be extremely irksome. I will refer the matter to the appropriate authority—I think it is in the province of the Police Department—to see whether some type of exemption is possible.

MOUNT GAMBIER SEWERAGE.

Mr. RALSTON—Has the Minister of Works a report relating to the proposed Mount Gambier sewerage scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Plans for the sewerage of Mount Gambier have not yet been completed. Generally, however, the proposals will be the same as previously supplied to the council except that the reticulation required will be extended to provide for the newly developed parts of the town and also to provide for the ultimate development of its immediate surroundings. It is expected that the sewerage at Naracoorte will be completed within the next 12 months and that the final survey of Mount Gambier will be commenced by the end of this year.

SECOND UNIVERSITY.

Mr. McKEE—It is the opinion of most educationists that a university in the country is long overdue, and that something should be done more or less immediately to relieve the already overcrowded Adelaide University. I also consider this an important step as it is beyond the means of most parents to send their children a long distance to further their education. Will the Premier say whether further thought has been given to establishing a second university, and can he indicate where it is likely to be built?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No.

RETRENCHMENTS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the possible re-engagement of employees who had been retrenched by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in recent months?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Public Service Commissioner reports that investigations made by the E. & W. S. Department reveal that 70 persons have been newly

engaged by the department this year until April 14, 1960. None of these persons was an employee who had been retrenched since January 1, 1960. In two instances employees who had been retrenched sought and were offered re-employment by the department but neither reported for duty. Detailed statistics supplied by the Engineer-in-Chief are attached to the Commissioner's report, and are available for the Leader's inspection should he desire it. These figures indicate that the normal wastage of employees for reasons other than retrenchment was greater than the number retrenched by the department. In many instances employees newly engaged have been employed to fill vacancies caused by resignation of employees.

WARREN-PASKEVILLE WATER MAIN.

Mr. HUGHES—Can the Minister of Works say whether progress is being maintained on the new Warren-Paskeville water main to the extent that we can confidently expect it to be completed by 1962?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—When I visited that area in company with the honourable member and the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) to discuss the matter, I forecast that the target for completion of that work was the date stated, namely, the end of June, 1962. The progress has been somewhat slow, or it would appear to be somewhat slow because in the earlier stages of the reconstruction programme the going at the reservoir end was extremely difficult; therefore, the rate of progress in terms of mileage has not been great. In fact, the work accomplished under difficulties has been satisfactory. The project is receiving generous attention by way of consideration in the coming year's Loan programme, and I express now the same hope as I expressed to the honourable member on my visit, namely, that the work will be completed by the date I mentioned.

TELOWIE CREEK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHES—In the absence of the Minister of Education I recently asked the Premier if he would inquire into the possibility of raising on the priority list the construction of the Telowie Creek primary school because of the very serious difficulties obtaining there, and the Premier promised to obtain a report. Has the Minister of Education received a report on this matter, and can he say whether the building of that school can be raised on the priority list?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Work on the provision of a school at Telowie Creek is receiving urgent attention, and it is hoped that

negotiations for the acquisition of the site will be completed soon. As soon as negotiations are complete, work can be commenced on provision of buildings, which are expected to be available for occupation by February, 1961.

LAKE MERRETI.

Mr. KING—My question relates to Lake Merreti which is adjacent to the Renmark area. Has the Minister of Lands a report to make following on the representations that were made by settlers in the vicinity in connection with the lake being retained as a storage basin, and the presentation of a petition to the Minister of Agriculture regarding a flora and fauna reserve?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—Some months ago I was approached on this matter and since then there have been strong representations about a flora and fauna reserve. There are some merits in that matter. The lake itself has been safeguarded as far as the Cooltong settlers are concerned. They are anxious that the lake be retained in the event of another low river.

Mr. King—Chaffey settlers as well.

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—Yes. If the new storage dam across the River Murray is accomplished the problem will be obviated. I am getting a report from the Engineer-in-Chief as to the merits and demerits of retaining the lake.

ELIZABETH HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK—Recently I urged that the new Elizabeth high school be opened as soon as possible because of the Salisbury high school being over-crowded. Has the Minister of Education any comments to make on the matter?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—There is certainly need for the Elizabeth high school in the timber stage to be completed and ready for occupation at the beginning of the first term next year. Sketch plans have been prepared by the Public Buildings Department. It is impossible to say at this stage whether the school will be ready at the beginning of the first term, 1961, but I hope that it will be. Experience has shown, however, that it is impossible to make an accurate forecast in these matters. As the honourable member knows, provision was made in the building programme for 1959-1960 for the solid stage of the Elizabeth high school, and it is hoped that the construction of these buildings will proceed concurrently.

LE FEVRE BOYS TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. TAPPING—Can the Minister of Education indicate what progress has been made on the building of the new Le Fevre boys technical high school at Semaphore?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The new Le Fevre boys technical high school was included among new schools in the 1959-1960 Loan Estimates. I have been informed by the Public Buildings Department that it is expected that tenders will be called about the middle of 1960.

COMMONWEALTH SCHOLARSHIPS.

Mr. RALSTON—During the Address in Reply debate I drew attention to the results of the Leaving examination as published in the press and the number of Commonwealth scholarships offered to students in South Australia who gained sufficient marks in the examination to qualify for such a scholarship. I also drew attention to the disparity that existed between the results obtained in the metropolitan area as against those in the remainder of the State, such as the Unley high school where 50 scholarships were offered as against 44 for all country areas. As the Minister of Education is extremely concerned about this matter, is he in a position to make a statement?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—In the absence of other figures being available to him the honourable member has naturally taken the total numbers in average daily attendance in the two groups of schools concerned, namely, the metropolitan high schools on the one hand and country secondary schools of the Education Department on the other. To enable a true comparison to be made, it would, I think, be more accurate to take the total number of students in the fourth or Leaving year in these two groups of schools. There were 1,326 students in the Leaving year in the 15 metropolitan high schools, and a total of 809 students in country high, area, higher primary and Whyalla technical high schools. The total number of Commonwealth scholarships offered to students from metropolitan high schools was 207, and to departmental country secondary schools, 44. This would certainly be disturbing if there were not two good reasons.

The first of these reasons is that a much smaller proportion of students in the Leaving year in country secondary schools apply for Commonwealth scholarships than in the case of metropolitan high schools. A large number of these students in country high schools do not desire and do not intend to enter the Univer-

sity of Adelaide or the South Australian Institute of Technology. Their interests in life lie in quite different fields. Of the 1,326 students in the Leaving year in the metropolitan high schools, 663 or just 50 per cent applied for Commonwealth scholarships. On the other hand, of 809 Leaving examination students in the country secondary schools, only 185 or less than 23 per cent applied for Commonwealth scholarships. Actually, the percentage of successful applications to the number of applicants was about 25 per cent in one case and 20 per cent in the other.

The second reason is that there is a much higher proportion of Leaving teaching scholars in the fourth year of country high schools than in metropolitan high schools. Leaving teaching scholars are debarred by the rules of the Commonwealth Scholarships Board from holding a Commonwealth scholarship. There were, in fact, 240 Leaving teaching scholars in 1959 out of 698 fourth year students in our country high schools, *i.e.*, about 34 per cent of the total. There were only 307 Leaving teaching scholars out of 1,326 students in the fourth year at our metropolitan high schools, *i.e.*, about 23 per cent of the total.

It may be of interest to honourable members to know also that, out of a total of 144 Intermediate exhibitions awarded on the results of the Public Examinations Board Intermediate examination for 1959, no less than 56 were awarded to students attending the country secondary schools of the Education Department, and only 61 were awarded to students attending metropolitan high schools. The balance of 27 were awarded to non-departmental schools.

I feel that these figures clearly show that the relatively low proportion of Commonwealth scholarships awarded to students from our country secondary schools is not in any way due to differences in the standard of teaching or in the quality of the staff. It is the established policy of the Education Department to staff all its schools, including all its secondary schools, as well and as equitably, both in numbers and quality, as staffing resources permit. In point of fact, country secondary schools are more liberally staffed than are metropolitan high schools and, with few exceptions, classes, including Leaving examination classes, are smaller and often a good deal smaller in country secondary schools.

Mr. RICHES—Why are student teachers debarred from applying for Commonwealth scholarships?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—They are debarred not by the State Education Department but by Commonwealth regulations, as they are receiving benefit by being teaching scholars. Therefore, they come under the means test, something that we in the Education Department are very concerned about; but we are powerless to do anything in the matter.

COUNTRY ROADS.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply to the question I asked recently about the programme for certain roads in my district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises that it is not proposed to reconstruct and seal any section of the road between Burra and Hallett during the next financial year. The councils, however, will be given adequate finance to maintain the road.

The Gulnare to Morgan Road is comprised of main roads between Gulnare and Burra, and a district road between Burra and Morgan. No reconstruction for sealing is contemplated during 1960-61 on either the main road or district road sections. The respective councils, however, in whom these roads are vested, will be given adequate finance to maintain the main road portion and to gradually improve the district road between Burra and Morgan.

WHYALLA INDUSTRIAL SITES.

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to a question I asked yesterday concerning the sale of the old aerodrome at Whyalla and the allotment of industrial sites?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—The department is still awaiting the return of the documents from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. Until these have been received, the land cannot be offered for allotment. Further representations have been made to the company asking that the matter be expedited. In anticipation of the completion of the sale, blocks have been surveyed for industrial purposes and these will be offered as soon as settlement has been effected.

MINGARY TO COCKBURN ROAD.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Works any further information on the sealing of the road between Mingary and Cockburn?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I have two replies, one addressed to the Premier in regard to the Broken Hill to Adelaide Road and the other addressed to me concerning the Mingary

to Cockburn Road. They appear to be parallel so I will read them both. The first states:—

My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises that it was not practicable to commence work on the reconstruction and sealing of the Broken Hill Road during the current financial year, for two reasons, firstly suitable road-making material has been difficult to locate and secondly there was a shortage of water due to the drought. The Mines Department has now investigated the possibility of procuring underground water from bores, and has reported favourably, and is at present investigating a deposit of stone. It is expected that the construction of this section between Mingary and Cockburn will commence during the next financial year.

The other report reads:—

My colleague, the Minister of Roads, advises that it is proposed to commence the construction and sealing with bitumen of the Terowie to Broken Hill main road No. 442 during 1960-61. The first section to be sealed will be between Mingary and Cockburn, which is at present impassable in very wet weather.

ACCIDENT AT BROMPTON GAS WORKS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Premier a report on the accident at the Brompton Gas Works?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Secretary for Labor and Industry reports:—

The timber putlogs which were used in the scaffold at the Brompton works of the South Australian Gas Company, which collapsed on April 4, 1960, were all Oregon. As mentioned in the report of April 6, 1960, the scaffolding concerned was a "hanging scaffold." The scaffolding was hanging from girders by some wire ropes and no piping was used in it.

ALMOND TREES ON PORT ROAD.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question regarding the planting of almond trees on the median strip on the Port Road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads advises that the planting of trees on the median strip on the Port Road is not the responsibility of his department. Under the Local Government Act, however, the respective councils through whose areas the Port Road passes are empowered to plant trees thereon. However, as the median strip of the Port Road could be required in part for road purposes in the foreseeable future, particularly at those major intersections where there are heavy volumes of turning vehicles, the councils concerned, if they wish to establish more trees on the median, should contact the Highways and Local Government Department concerning the location and the suitability of the type proposed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

The SPEAKER—I wish to inform the House that I have received the following letter from the honourable member for Gawler (Mr. Clark):—

Following on my appointment as a member of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, I beg to notify you that it is my desire to be discharged from attending the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, of which I am a member.

NATIONAL GALLERY ADDITIONAL WING.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the National Gallery Additional Wing.

Ordered that report be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from April 27. Page 327.)

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—Continuing my remarks from yesterday and being the first speaker today, I take this opportunity of extending my congratulations to the new member for Light (Mr. Nicholson). Labor did everything possible to defeat him at the by-election and, although we were not entirely surprised at the result, we claim that we did exceedingly well, as the honourable member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) said yesterday. Nevertheless, one would be lacking in feeling if one did not extend to the honourable member congratulations from this side.

Yesterday I was endeavouring to compare the cost of living index figures in respect of both nominal and real wages, and I attempted to point out the difference. Today, I want to take the question of wages a little further and say that I cannot understand why this Government, of all State Governments, saw fit to oppose the recent application for a basic wage increase of 22s., which would have brought the basic wage up to approximately the figure that I referred to yesterday when dealing with the movement under the cost of living figures. The unfortunate part about the opposition by the Government, which I believe should be not only criticized but condemned by all wage-earners in South Australia for its active participation in that application, was not so much that it put forward the views of the Government about the economy of the State as that its representative, Mr. Tucker, saw fit to advise the Commission that he allied himself and

lined himself up with the employers' application. When he appeared before the Commission he said:—

If the Commission please, I appear for Her Majesty the Queen in right of the State of South Australia, a respondent. (Kirby, C. J.) South Australia is a respondent? (Mr. Tucker)—Yes. (Kirby, C. J.)—Are you in a position to indicate whether you support or oppose the application of the unions? (Mr. Tucker)—I accept that the State will make submissions similar to those made in a basic wage case last year generally limited to support for the case of the employers' advocates. I do suggest to the commission that it would be more convenient if the submissions of the State of South Australia were to follow those of the private employers represented by Mr. Aird. It may well be that our submissions would be limited to support for those submissions.

Whom did Mr. Tucker represent—the Government, individual private employers or organized employers in South Australia? If the State Government had certain submissions it felt should be made in the best interests of the economy of this State Mr. Tucker should have put them on its behalf, but he should not have aligned himself with private employers. This Government was the only Government, except for the Commonwealth Government which had an axe to grind, that saw fit to send a representative.

Mr. Jennings—It indicates a natural affiliation.

Mr. FRED WALSH—That is the point I am trying to make. We must also bear in mind that three other State Governments are Liberal Party Governments. Although they call themselves the Liberal and Country Party in some States and are composite Governments in others, they are Liberal Governments and I am sure members opposite are pleased to accept them as their colleagues. We should condemn the Government for taking this line. It sent a representative, not to try to improve the lot of the working people, but expressly to keep them down on a lower standard than they would have had if the court had increased the wage as, in accordance with the evidence submitted, it should have done.

However, the court used an argument that it has been pleased to use for many years—that an increase could not be granted because of the state of the economy of the country. That can be seriously questioned because we must have regard for the fact that, although it took the court weeks and, in some instances, months to give a decision on previous applications by unions for an increase in the basic wage or by employers for decreases, in this instance it took a relatively short time. This

shows conclusively to me—although I may be wrong—that the judgment was more or less concluded before the completion of submissions. Within 10 days of the judgment being delivered the new cost of living figures were announced, and these showed that the cost of living in Adelaide had increased by 5s. a week.

Mr. O'Halloran—The court had to get in ahead of that.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, it must have known that there would have been some feeling if it had waited until the figures were published before giving the judgment. Whereas workers in this State were receiving 6s. a week less than the cost of living figure before the judgment, they are now getting 11s. less. The worst feature, however, is that the court determines these matters on a yearly basis and the applicant unions will not be able to go before it for another 12 months. This means that, irrespective of any increases in the cost of living in the next 12 months, there can be no chance of remedying the position to give the workers higher wages to meet continuing cost of living increases.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is effective 15 months after an increase.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, and it could be longer if the Commission saw fit to continue the case for some months before giving a decision. The cost of living in Adelaide has risen faster than that of almost every other capital city in Australia. This State Government has consistently opposed quarterly adjustments, and it supported the application of employers in 1953 when the Arbitration Commission decided to abandon these adjustments. Since then two States have acted pursuant to the decisions of tribunals and others have pegged their wages in accordance with the action of the South Australian Government. The State that has continued to grant basic wage adjustments in accordance with cost of living variations on the Commonwealth Statistician's figures has had virtually the same rise in the cost of living figures, which shows that South Australia has not gained any advantage by its action. It was said that, if quarterly adjustments were applied to all workers in industry every quarter, the cost of living would be higher in New South Wales than in any other State, but that was not so. In fact, the South Australian increases have been greater than those in New South Wales although workers there have received quarterly adjustments.

Before the decision to suspend quarterly adjustments one of the main objections was

that they caused too much accounting work and it was therefore difficult to carry out costing because of big changes in prices and costs, so half-yearly adjustments were suggested. I suppose it could be argued that six months would be a reasonable period, but only if adjustments were automatic. If wages were adjusted every six months in accordance with cost of living figures no-one would be much worse off. An employer would gain the advantage of having less bookkeeping and of being able to know the prices at which he should contract.

Mr. Jennings—Who has benefited?

Mr. FRED WALSH—That is my point: Who is getting the benefit of the fact that the cost of living has increased by 11s. over the wage that applies today? The worker is not getting it—he is making the sacrifice—so the employer must be getting the benefit, and so, of course, must the Government. I am concerned with the employer, however, because the amount by which the Government profits goes into State funds whereas the gain in industry creates bigger dividends for shareholders and management. Arguments have been put forward by certain people as to why we have had inflation, but I could not pin-point any particular factor that is the prime cause of inflationary trends today. I think it was the member for Gouger—and I do not want to be at him all the time having regard to his unsophistication—who raised the matter of working hours.

Mr. Hall—Your Leader did that.

Mr. FRED WALSH—No. I think it was the honourable member who said that working hours contributed towards inflationary trends, but that is only in keeping with other ridiculous statements he has made. If he analyses the effects of working hours through the years (even if he goes back 50 years) he will find that there has been a gradual increase in productivity as a result of reduced hours.

Mr. Hall—Do you support a 35-hour week?

Mr. FRED WALSH—Of course I do. I advocated a 35-hour week and I was one who had it put in the Labor Party platform in 1936. I do not know whether the honourable member can remember that far back, but that is a fact and it still stands as the policy of the Party. However, we had to fight hard enough for a 40-hour week which was conceded in many other States before being granted here. The 1935 International Labor Conference, which I attended, adopted a convention relating to a 40-hour week and I can remember the argument the then Government

used: that because the Government had no power over State industrial matters it would not ratify it. It would not even give the 40-hour week to its own employees, although there was no question of its not having the power, and it was not until early in 1948 that the 40-hour week operated in South Australia.

Let me quote a statement which was made by Mr. Justice Kirby when he addressed a gathering one Sunday afternoon at which the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) the Attorney-General and I were present. Mr. Justice Kirby said:—

Arbitration—and labour-management relations—have come a long way in Australia since the first eight-hour day was grudgingly won and even since the 40-hour week was introduced to an accompaniment of forecasts of disaster.

Those are the remarks of Mr. Justice Kirby—the President of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. The report of Mr. Justice Kirby's comments, as contained in the *News* of October 13 last, proceeds as follows:—

Mr. Justice Kirby will open many eyes to new concepts of arbitration when he says the court, when it considers reducing hours, thinks not only on economic and material grounds, but of such things as leisure and man's full life. Mr. Justice Kirby says the court is concerned to do what it can to improve the lot of the working man by releasing him from his work for longer periods. It considers the need of a family to spend more time together and of a worker to devote himself to his own pursuits, instead of purely economic ones. This is one more step along the way to a non-materialistic approach beyond the quite new principle of fixing the basic wage not only on the bare needs of a man and his family, but on considerations of national welfare. Mr. Justice Kirby's assessment of real benefit to family and community which have come from the worker's good use of his extra leisure since the start of the 40-hour week in 1947 is an encouraging sign of increasing enlightenment in the community. Challenges will come, to adult educators, social planners, sportsmen and churches, when automation and technical progress release workers from drudgery and give them more and more leisure.

I ask the member for Gouger to study that statement, coming as it does from such an eminent person as Mr. Justice Kirby.

Mr. Lawn—The honourable member wouldn't be able to understand it.

Mr. Hall—Do you think a 35-hour week would raise the cost of houses?

Mr. FRED WALSH—If one looks at it that way, every slight increase in wages, and every slight reduction in hours, affects prices. However, that brings me to another point: I have a report here of the remarks of the

Prime Minister when opening the Melbourne session of the International Congress of Scientific Management. The *Advertiser* of March 1 quotes Mr. Menzies as follows:—

The employer who simply passed on wage increases into higher prices was contributing to the inflationary spiral, rendering inevitable the next wage increase, cost increase and price increase. Vast numbers of ordinary citizens would suffer in the process, the export industries would be penalized and the national finances would be disorganized. The task of the employer was to meet each upward movement of labour cost, first by absorbing it as far as possible, without regarding the current rate of profit as sacrosanct. Secondly, the employer should so improve the efficiency of his operations as to reduce, or at least stabilize, his unit costs of production.

That is what we come back to.

Mr. Hall—We all agree with that.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I have convinced the honourable member on at least one point. I did not think he would deny statements like that by the Prime Minister—his master. I have tried to point out that the very fact that down through the years we have been able to reduce hours—although perhaps not as progressively or as quickly as we would have liked—without there being any decrease in productivity means that the management and workers have seen fit to give of their best in absorbing, as far as possible, that extra cost which there is not the slightest doubt must be created. This has been done by the introduction of modern machinery, more efficient management and more efficient work, and that is how costs will continue to be absorbed in the future when automation comes. If they were not absorbed we would have nothing but a vast army of unemployed; nobody would have any money to purchase goods, and therefore it would be useless to produce.

Mr. Hall—How would you apply that to primary industry?

Mr. FRED WALSH—My friend would give the impression that the primary producer is in a very bad way, and that he is the one who is carrying all the burdens of this community. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) dealt with the question of margins and said it was not intended that they should be universally applied, or words to that effect. I point out that they were not universally applied. Hundreds of workers in this State were not granted any increase in margins, one reason being that their margins were already too low. Strange as it must seem to members opposite, many workers in this State are on the basic wage and many others are near it; therefore, they were not entitled to any marginal increase. It

is, therefore, not true to say that those increases were universally applied. What I thought the member for Torrens meant, and what I thought he should have said, was that it was not intended to apply to men getting between £2,000 and £3,500 a year, who received increases of £290 and £300 a year.

I would agree with the honourable member if that were his objection, because they were not suffering at all; they had already received more than one increase down through the years. The members for Unley (Mr. Dunnage) and Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) pointed out discrepancies in the salaries paid to heads of departments compared with those being paid to our own Ministers. Those heads of departments are the tall poppies about whom I am not concerned; I respect them for their high office and for the good jobs they are doing, but I still do not consider they are entitled to the high salaries they are receiving, unless it is that those salaries are paid to induce them to remain in South Australia in preference to going to another State that might offer them even higher salaries. That might be the motive behind the payment of those salaries, but the Government itself would be better able to answer that question. Many of those officers have other pickings outside their jobs, and even after they reach the retiring age they are given jobs on this board and that board in a part-time capacity, which helps to keep the wolf from the door. We know they are not up against it because they were in a position, perhaps, to finance a higher number of units to guarantee them a reasonably high superannuation on retirement.

The member for Gouger mentioned primary producers. I have a note here of what happened at one primary producers' conference, and the ideas of some delegates at that conference on halting inflation. The report to which I refer is of the Victorian Country Party conference at Warrnambool—and I take it that that would be a primary producers' conference. Of course, the honourable member may not subscribe fully to the Victorian Country Party.

Mr. Lawn—Who would!

Mr. FRED WALSH—That conference passed a motion that Australia's wage fixing system should be completely overhauled (and the Opposition has no objection to that) and that in future it should be based partly on the index figure of the nation's exports. The report continues:—

“When times are bad, the wage earner should be prepared to tighten his belt as the farmer has to do,” said one delegate.

The person who made that statement must have been a responsible person, because he was a delegate to the conference, and I can only assume that he was talking on behalf of the primary producers. His idea was that the basic wage should be based on the index figure of the nation's exports, and I am not too sure that we would not have received an increase in the basic wage if the Arbitration Court had adopted even that principle.

The following report appears at page 19 of the National Bank's *Monthly Summary of Australian Conditions*:—

On the opening day of the second Launceston series the high quality of the clip attracted keen competition, and a record price of 490 pence a pound was paid for a bale of superfine Merino Some 80 per cent of the clip has now been sold, leaving approximately 990,000 bales to be auctioned before the season closes next July. If present prices remain unchanged, the Australian wool cheque for 1959-60 should amount to about £365,000,000 to £370,000,000, compared with £296,000,000 for the previous season and £338,000,000 for 1957-58.

That report does not show any signs of lessening of exports in that particular industry.

Professor Copland, who is the big man today in international economics, said in the depression years that the workers would have to tighten their belts. If Professor Copland has forgotten those words I have not, because they are well imprinted in my mind. He has a different idea today, perhaps because of the changed circumstances, and nobody is going to question his knowledge as an economist, for he is no doubt the leading economist in this country, if not in the world. I am unable to understand a primary producer talking along those lines at a time when everybody is claiming that the country has never been more prosperous and that the future has never looked better.

Mr. Hall—We have not said we agree with him absolutely on that point.

Mr. FRED WALSH—True, the wheatgrowers had a bad year last year. The member for Ridley (Mr. Stott) made a statement to the press at the time of the basic wage decision, and he is another who should not come in on these matters as he knows nothing about them either. I would not argue with him on matters affecting the wheat industry because I am not in a position to do that. He knows more about those matters than I do because he is secretary of the S.A. Wheatgrowers' Federation. He said that there could be no denying that the 28 per cent marginal increase granted

by the Arbitration Commission would permeate through all industry and finally rest as a burden on the man on the land. How does he work that out? He could not tell me himself. Does he expect that the men who have been working in industry and enjoying certain margins since 1954, and as pointed out by the member for Torrens have forfeited much of their leisure in study during their apprenticeships, should not have their margins increased in accordance with the times? He should not be so narrow as to suggest that it would fall as a burden only on the man on the land. If there is any burden it must fall on the whole community, because it is the whole community that benefits in the final analysis. I had several other matters to raise, but I think I can best deal with them at another time. I support the motion.

Mr. HARDING (Victoria)—I endorse the remarks of previous speakers in reference to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Opening Speech. They refer to the birth of a son to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip, the forthcoming marriage of Princess Margaret, and the departure of Sir Robert and Lady George from South Australia. We wish our ex-Governor and his wife the very best in the future. I endorse what other members have said about our sad loss in the death of Mr. Hambour. He and I were close friends, and on one occasion I enjoyed his company on a visit to Eyre Peninsula. I also had the pleasure of his and his wife's company in the electorate of Victoria. His death has meant a sad loss for me, the House and the State generally. I also support the remarks made about the recognition by Her Majesty of the services rendered to this State by Sir Cecil Hincks and other people in South Australia. Money does not count in this matter, for it is the work that is done after hours for the benefit of the State. I am very pleased that the services of these people have been recognized.

I have much pleasure in welcoming to this place Mr. Nicholson, the new member for Light, but he has a difficult task in following in the footsteps of the late George Hambour. The recent by-election for the district of Light has apparently been a very happy occasion. Opposition members say that they are very pleased with the result. We on this side are happy about it, and I am sure the newly elected member is pleased. We can say truly that everything in the garden is lovely.

I have been connected with land settlement schemes for a long time. Any Commonwealth

figures I quote will embrace dry and irrigation settlements, but as I live in a dry lands area I will deal mostly with that type of settlement. There are probably more soldier settlers in the Victoria electorate than in any other in South Australia. They are a satisfied section and play an important part in the local community life. It is suggested that some of them may walk off their blocks, but that is not so. Recently the Minister of Lands visited the South-East and he was amazed at the satisfaction existing amongst the settlers there. He was pleased to see how they were playing their part in community life. The following is an extract from a report presented in 1943 to Mr. J. B. Chifley, then Prime Minister, by Mr. Justice Pike, dealing with Commonwealth war service land settlement:—

It was anticipated that the number of all applicants from the second world war ex-servicemen would be in the vicinity of 54,000 The number of approved and selected applicants for war service land settlement was actually 36,430, of whom 8,344 were allotted blocks.

That was up to June 30, 1959. I believe that after that date there were no further allotments. Some people say that talking about war service is the same as flogging a dead horse, but I do not agree. For war service land settlement in 1959-60 the Commonwealth Parliament voted £10,860,000, and of it New South Wales was allotted £1,700,000, Victoria £1,000,000, South Australia £2,854,000, Western Australia £3,232,000 and Tasmania £2,059,000. The farms allotted in the various States were New South Wales 3,036, Victoria 2,994, South Australia, 984, Western Australia 880, and Tasmania 450, again up to June 30, 1959. The amazing part of it all is that the Commonwealth allotted in all £185,000,000 for 8,344 farms. The Royal Commission of 1943 estimated that the amount involved could be about £160,000,000, but I believe that it thought many more blocks would be allotted. Qualifying certificates held by the selected men for the farms were New South Wales 19,356, Victoria 11,217, South Australia 2,828, Queensland 1,739, Western Australia 1,679 and Tasmania 611. Of the total of 36,430 approved applicants only 8,344 farms were allotted. South Australia has settled about 1,000 men on the land, but 2,828 were qualified.

The trouble in South Australia was that we did not have sufficient suitable land available in good rainfall areas. I regret that more blocks were not allotted and that we could not avail ourselves of more of the money available.

All the men were settled satisfactorily. Of the total money made available New South Wales obtained £43,000,000, Victoria £45,000,000, South Australia £16,000,000, Western Australia £32,000,000, Tasmania £18,000,000 and Queensland £6,000,000, again up to June 30 last. It is unfortunate that we could purchase only sufficient land to settle 1,000 men, and that we could not avail ourselves of all the £16,000,000. I am positive that the men settled in South Australia are now firmly established, and that our land settlement schemes have been as sound as any in the Commonwealth. There were press reports some time ago that of 300 men settled on dairymen's blocks in Western Australia 100 were forced to walk off and abandon their blocks, another 100 lived in dwellings on the blocks and took casual labour outside, whilst the remaining 100 were just able to carry on. Such a thing has never occurred in South Australia, and I cannot imagine its happening here. In my electorate, as far as I know, only four settlers have approached me for Government assistance in order to further develop their holdings. The Government has already taken in hand two of the blocks, so only two are left needing assistance.

Recently there was a big clearing sale at Penola of surplus material belonging to the war service land settlement scheme. It was a very satisfactory sale and I understand that some of the best machinery, such as tractors, implements and lorries, is being used on Kangaroo Island where the land settlement project is not yet finished. I hope we shall be able fully to avail ourselves of the £2,800,000 and that, if we cannot spend that amount during the current year, the unspent money will be available next year.

We hear very much on this side and on the opposite side of the House about the need for a State land settlement scheme. I draw the attention of honourable members to a statement made by the Premier some months ago, which really shook me, but after full consideration, I believe that the Premier is right again. He said that he could not visualize and could not believe that it was economically possible to increase our primary production by more than 30 per cent. As I come from the South-East that shook me, for in the South-East we have continued to increase our production by at least 100 per cent. As an apiarist I have travelled through the northern districts of this State, and seen the dry districts—Bungaree, Jamestown, Wirrabara, Melrose and Hallett. I know that

country very well and of the concern of both sides of the House at that country's deterioration. There is no other word for it: it is denuded of timber and stock. It takes about 10,000 years for nature to build one-tenth of an inch of soil, but in one day one-eighth of an inch of the best of our soil may be lost. What can be done to keep the people in the farming areas in the north when better country is being offered in the South-East? The influx of population into the South-East over the past 15 years has been amazing because of the certainty of a good rainfall there.

I endorse what the honourable member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) said about the provision of electric light and roads and the action that is being taken. I should like to know from the Minister of Lands about the development that is going on where the A.M.P. has taken up and developed some good country. It is developing it with huge tractors, usually working in pairs with a large chain between them weighing many tons. They clear 100 acres in one day. I should like to know whether the Soil Conservation Act is being applied, that where people go into that type of country, where there is a 16in. rainfall or even an 18in. rainfall, they apply to the Government for the right to clear sand dunes. It is one thing that this Government should see is carried out. People cannot ruthlessly destroy vegetation unnecessarily, particularly in the upper South-East, where the law should be enforced. There are thousands of acres north-east of a line from Bordertown which some day will be brought into production. That is very dangerous country if people are ruthless and destroy the vegetation.

I believe it is absolutely necessary to have a State land settlement scheme. Recently in the South-East we had some allotments of land. When applications are called for—and this applies in Victoria too—there are at least 10 applicants for every block open for allotment; in other words, people are land hungry. I said this four or five years ago and I say it again now: unless a person has £10,000 or its equivalent, he is committing suicide in taking up such land. I have raised my figure considerably since I said that: I say now that a person should have at least £15,000 or he is committing suicide. I do not think that applicants who have received land during the last month or so had the necessary capital; most would not have had even £5,000 and I do not think they could make a success of it for long without some assistance from the Government.

I regret that they have no all-weather roads into or out of their properties and I visualize a great tragedy there this winter. That land was bought by the Government about 20 years ago at 4s. 6d. an acre. It was useless country because of lack of access owing to excess water.

I was pleased to see that land was being allotted in March but I was disappointed that there was to be a charge on the settlers before July 1. Three months' rental is not very great, but it may appear to be great to that type of man. They are excellent men; many are sons of established farmers and have little capital.

I hope that, if Federal money is sought for a closer settlement scheme, it will not be used under dual control because dual control would be unfortunate. Previously, when the Federal Government came into negotiations for land, there were long delays and good land was lost. I hope that in any civilian land settlement scheme State money will be available and the whole scheme will be under State control.

To return to my own local matters, I refer now to the great decentralization scheme started by the Party opposite, which had the foresight to institute the forestry project in the South-East. The State forests are valuable and probably 50 per cent of the private mills depend solely on South Australian Woods and Forests "pine timber" for milling purposes, which is a wonderful thing. I believe there are some 10 private mills in the South-East, one of which is at Penola. Although it is only a small mill, the wages there run to about £1,000 a week, which is a lot of money for a small place like Penola. I toured a bigger mill at Kalangadoo with the Premier, and at that stage it was in some financial difficulty. I understand it is the policy of the South Australian Government to farm out about 50 per cent of its millable logs each year to private enterprise. However, the logs being made available to the privately-owned mills were not a fair average quality, which meant that the private mills started a little behind scratch in competing with the State mills. I hope that that has been recognized, because the private mills find it difficult to carry on as they must start from behind scratch.

As regards education in the South-East, I consider the education facilities there are good. Many new schools have been erected, but some, including that at Penola, are overcrowded. I hope that the new high school promised for Penola last year will be provided for on the Estimates, because it is needed now. At

Al

Lucindale there is a very fine school. At Kalangadoo a beautiful school site has been purchased, comprising nearly eight acres. Some figures that I asked the Minister of Education to obtain for me reveal that 96,000 children are attending schools in the metropolitan area, and 70,000 children are attending country schools; but there are also some country children attending schools in Adelaide.

Mr. Riches—Is Elizabeth in the country or the city, for that purpose?

Mr. HARDING—I must ask the Minister of Education that; I presume it would be in the country. Turning to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, I was pleasantly surprised to hear that the Minister of Works considered that the sewerage scheme for Naracoorte might be finished in the next 12 months. That is excellent news, but if the Minister happened to be at Naracoorte on the job, he would see that it would more likely take five years to complete. The men are all hard at work at the moment but are only doing about 100yds. a week. In fact, they are working in an old watercourse 14ft. down, with their pipes below the water table. They are encountering much trouble, and this weather does not help them. They are running parallel with the stream. There is no bottom for the ground there; the top soil just falls in. They have to board it up completely and drive their timbers down from the top. However, between 10 and 11 miles of main have already been laid at Naracoorte.

I have every confidence in the meat killing works suggested some months ago. I have no doubt that the works will be commenced soon and will operate in 1961. I am pleased about the establishment of this works because it will assist many people in the South-East. I have no fear that the South-East will lose all its trade to Victoria, as has been suggested. Naracoorte, Penola, Binnun and places all along the border have great support from Victoria in relation to stock sales. Stock is brought from Victoria and much of the superphosphate used on the border is railed from Adelaide. The Victorian Government sends a school bus to Penola. The people in these parts are working together harmoniously; we are working with Victoria and Victoria is working with us. I have no doubt that in years to come economic considerations will force much of the South-Eastern produce to be exported from Portland to enable us to compete on overseas markets.

Regarding railways, at holiday times I have approached the Minister and forewarned him that there would be congestion, and I regret

that this state of affairs is still continuing. More sleepers are required on the south-eastern service, but two sleeping cars cost as much as 50 homes or a school or hospital of moderate size, so it is for Cabinet to weigh the matter and decide whether homes or sleeping cars are more urgent. At normal times sleeping accommodation is adequate although the cars, which were previously used on the Melbourne express, are not modern. Because of this, and because the roads have improved, many people still travel by car.

Mr. Quirke—What is the cost of one of these sleeping cars?

Mr. HARDING—About £70,000. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood)—I support the motion and at the outset express my regret at the death of the late member for Light, with whom I often clashed in this House but whose views and personality I, like every other member, thoroughly respected. I think everyone was dismayed and upset by his untimely death. I welcome his successor, and I think we can promise him that despite the sometimes somnolent air of this Chamber we will, during his short stay here, give him as lively a time as we are able.

I was extremely interested in the remarks of the member for Victoria about land settlement. This is not a subject upon which I can claim to be anything of an expert, but I am interested in his remarks because I have been diverted to read some of the things the Auditor-General has said about our spending on this subject in recent years. The policy of the Australian Labor Party has been for closer settlement of land. The Leader of the Opposition has often pointed out that in many places there has been a substantial re-aggregation of land into larger holdings; that despite the War Service Land Settlement scheme, financed largely by the Commonwealth Government, there are fewer landholders working the land now than before the war. I have been wanting to see what this State has been doing about closer settlement. There are two main schemes and one minor scheme on our Statute Book for this purpose. The first is the Crown Lands Development Act of 1943, and in his last report the Auditor-General said:—

The Crown Lands Development Act, 1943, empowers the Minister to prepare Crown lands for settlement and on the recommendation of the Land Board to purchase any land for the purposes of the Act and allot prepared lands to suitable settlers. The Land Settlement Act, 1944-58, provides for the compulsory acquisi-

tion of land for settlement and where it is proposed to purchase or develop land at a cost exceeding £30,000 the proposal has first to be inquired into by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Land Settlement. Land and improvements are acquired and developed under these Acts for submission to the Commonwealth for inclusion in the War Service Land Settlement scheme and in previous years a composite statement of account has been published showing the cost to the State in developing land under both the State and the Commonwealth schemes. Separate statements are now compiled for each of those schemes.

The War Service Land Settlement scheme is now, of course, largely wound up, and an examination of the State's budget for this purpose shows that the deficit last year on the undertaking was £12,970, which was provided from £46,369 previously provided by the Treasurer for working expenses of the undertaking. In the last year of review by the Auditor-General I cannot find that any moneys were provided for compulsory acquisition of land for settlement, nor does it seem that any big amounts were spent on the acquisition of land. Indeed, the Auditor-General said that Loan funds increased by £58,000 on the operation and that expenditure on Loan Account for 1958-59 was solely in respect of developmental works on lands previously acquired. The balance-sheet does not show anything very great on that score so it does not seem that we are doing anything about any form of closer settlement under this Act. Then, of course, there is a scheme for the repurchase of land for closer settlement. The Auditor-General, in his last report, said:—

The accounts of this undertaking record the financial transactions in the application and administration of "Part X, Closer Settlement" of the Crown Lands Act. The purpose of that part of the Act is to provide for the acquisition by repurchase, compulsorily, or by arrangement of lands consisting mainly of large estates, and to allot them under various tenures in suitable holdings for the purpose of extension of agriculture and closer settlement. There have been no major acquisitions of land for closer settlement since the year 1946-47, and operations are now concerned mainly with the collection of rents from lessees and interest and instalments from purchasers of land previously acquired and allotted.

We are not doing anything there. There is also a scheme that has been on our Statute Book for many years for the purchase of land for graduates of Roseworthy College so that young men who qualify themselves with Diplomas of Agriculture may be provided by this State with the wherewithal to go on the land, but nothing has been spent on that for years.

Mr. Clark—I have continually raised that.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Yes, the requests often come through for the operation of that scheme but the Government has done nothing about it. It is not merely in relation to country towns that the Government is not assisting country people: it is also doing nothing about closer settlement. This may be a useful policy for the larger landholders in South Australia.

Mr. Riches—It is not a bad policy electorally.

Mr. DUNSTAN—No, it is not a bad policy to maintain large landholders and keep back those who are qualified to go on the land but who are faced with the obstacle the member for Victoria admitted; but that is not a satisfactory policy for anyone interested in the country as such and not merely in large holdings. I should be pleased if the Minister of Lands would tell us later this session what the Government intends to do about this. More money was provided in the last Loan Estimates for closer settlement than was provided in previous years, but I should be pleased if the Minister would enlighten us on how far he is prepared to use his powers to compulsorily acquire land to break up the larger estates and on how far he is prepared to spend money for graduates of Roseworthy College.

While dealing with figures, I now turn to a matter that occasioned me to rise in this debate; most subjects of interest have been dealt with in the excellent speeches made by members on this side of the House. I hope I am not being modest in saying that the Premier saw fit to address a few remarks to me, and I think I should reply. Some time ago I spoke on the subject of expenditure on hospitals and hospital beds in this State compared with other States. I took the Grants Commission figures, which showed that in the year of review this State spent substantially less per capita on health and hospitals than any other State. That has been so ever since I have been in this House, and was so for a considerable time before. As a result, I pointed out that this State had fewer public and subsidized hospital beds in proportion to population than any other State. I do not think I need repeat those figures; members may read them if they wish to refresh their memories.

Mr. Riches—The member for Onkaparinga answered that one.

Mr. DUNSTAN—That was some years ago, but he was guilty of some strange manipula-

tions of figures on that occasion. I heard the Premier recently say this:—

I want to deal now with the statistics given by the honourable member for Norwood who is good at statistics.

I thank the honourable the Premier for that remark. I do not claim to be good, but I generally have my figures checked by professional statisticians. He went on:—

He can usually produce them when they are at least three years old—

My figures were not three years old but were obtained from the last Grants Commission report, which is less than one year old, and from the last figures published by the Commonwealth Statistician because I generally find his figures to be reliable. The Premier has seen fit to question them on this occasion but I shall show what he has done with them. He proceeded:—

which of course is a very good thing; but I can prove anything by statistics.

He has proceeded to do so in a remarkable form. I remind honourable members what the Premier said the other day. He said:—

During this period—

that is the post-war period—

the Government, by spending big sums on providing public hospitals—

this State has spent less on health and Government hospitals than anyone else and has consistently done so since the war—

has been able to provide treatment, not only in the city and suburbs, but in many country areas as well, for 402,000 in-patients, including those people treated in mental and tubercular institutions.

Incidentally, I should like to correct some statements that frequently emanate from our friends opposite regarding the ratio of patients to hospital beds in this State compared with other States. A rather disparaging statement is made from time to time by a very eminent member opposite about the number of people to each bed in this State compared with other States.

It was very kind of the Premier to say that if he was referring to me in those terms, because he usually refers to me as young and inexperienced. If he was referring to me he put me up a bit. The Premier went on:—

I shall correct his figures which entirely overlook a large number of hospitals. He dealt only with a limited number of hospitals, whereas there are 10,190 beds made up as follows:—

Government Hospitals.		
	Number.	Beds.
General hospitals	9	2,251
Mental hospitals	3	2,710
Tuberculosis hospitals . . .	2	224

5,185

We have 48 subsidized hospitals, and the Adelaide Children's Hospital, Crippled Children's Home, Magill Home,

Apparently he thinks Magill Old Folks Home is a hospital. He went on:—

Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, St. Margaret's Convalescent Hospital, Home for Incurables, Kalyra Sanatorium, which provides 2,125 beds. In addition, we have no less than 145 community and private hospitals that provide 2,880 beds, so that the total number of hospital beds available for use in this State is 10,190. These figures do not include the additional beds soon to be available in the Mount Gambier, Port Pirie and Port Augusta hospitals. Taking the round figure of 930,000 as our present population and dividing it by the number of beds I have mentioned, one bed is available for every 92 persons in this State. The requirement established by the Medical Advisory Committee appointed by the Chifley Government was one bed for every 100 persons.

Let me turn to the recommendations made to the Federal Labor Government by the Joint Committee on Social Security in which members of the Government Party took part. The report, and I presume it is this report to which the Premier referred, says this at page 5:—

The quantity of hospital accommodation.—Assuming the present population of Australia to be 7,150,024 the standard requirements of beds in general hospitals is 64,350, in hospitals for tuberculosis, 5,402, and in mental hospitals, 32,169. The beds available in the 1,809 hospitals in Australia are: general hospitals, 57,660; tuberculosis hospitals, 2,439; and hospitals for mental diseases, 26,175.

This report was made in 1943 to the Federal Labor Government outlining the position post-war and the problem with which we were to be faced. The report then set forth the deficiencies in beds and, if we take the figures given for general hospitals alone—that is not maternity hospitals, tuberculosis hospitals or mental hospitals—the requirement for Australia for a population of 7,150,024 was 64,350 beds or one general hospital bed for every 111 people. The Premier took that sum, slightly altered the results down to one for every 100 people, and said the committee reported that we needed only one hospital bed of all kinds for every 100 people. In fact, of course, the committee said we needed one general hospital bed apart entirely from all other specialized hospital beds for every 111 people. In South Australia we have one hospital bed provided by Government or subsidized hospitals for every 232 people. In other words, the Premier's statement that we come anywhere near the position required by the committee is of course complete nonsense.

Let me turn to his analysis of the figure I gave, that figure being taken from the Commonwealth Statistician's report on public and subsidized hospital beds. I took the trouble to find out from the Commonwealth Statistician what that figure comprised and here is the definition. It comprises Government hospitals and those hospitals which receive additional or maintenance subsidies of any kind. They are set forth in the "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous" items of the Budget. The Premier said my figure had not included community hospitals and he specifically mentioned the Whyalla hospital and said that I had ignored hospitals of this kind. If we look at the "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous" item we find community hospitals do in fact receive maintenance subsidies. The Whyalla hospital received a maintenance grant of £10,500 and it was included in the Commonwealth Statistician's figure. The Uraidla and District Community Hospital received a maintenance grant and the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital got a grant. The Lobethal hospital also received a grant and so did the Home for Incurables. It is not true that all the hospitals that the Premier was talking about are not included in the Commonwealth Statistician's figures. Indeed, it includes practically every local and district hospital except the Leigh Creek which comes under the Electricity Trust's provisions. The plain fact of the matter is that apart from one or two instances the Premier gave—the Magill Home for instance, which is an old folks' home and not a hospital available to the general public—and sought to take from my figures they are not instances at all.

I note that the Premier did not go to the trouble of contrasting the position here with that in other States. Having mentioned I had contrasted them, he left it well alone. The figures provided by the Commonwealth Statistician are comparable figures by States. They show what Governments are doing by States in the provision of public hospital facilities and the plain fact is that this State has, and remains to be, far the worst State in this regard. This is completely incontrovertible and the Premier cannot deny that the figure given by the Commonwealth Statistician is either not broadly comprehensible or not comparable. True, it does not include some private hospitals; it does not include, for instance, Calvary or the Memorial Hospital and it does not include all these innumerable hospitals the Premier cited that are registered as private hospitals in South Australia and

which include the infirmaries at the Felixstowe Old Folks' Home and the St. Lawrence's Home for the Aged. They are included in the Premier's figures of beds available and given as one for every 92 in South Australia. How can one include a bed at the Crippled Children's Home as a bed available to the general public?

The position remains that in South Australia we have the worst public and subsidized hospital facilities in the Commonwealth in quantity and again the fact remains that the number of public hospital beds provided is below that standard set by the Social Security Committee of the Federal Parliament in reporting to the Federal Government on the subject. The Premier cannot get away from it: he has deliberately spent in a niggardly fashion on hospitals in South Australia and we are still not getting the provision for the public that we should have. It is not true that many private hospitals in South Australia have satisfactory general hospital beds available; some have, but many have not. Many private hospitals in South Australia are providing, very largely, a convalescent home facility for chronic patients but they are not providing general hospital beds or general hospital facilities. In consequence we are badly off for hospital provisions for the general public in South Australia, particularly for those people who should be entitled to public hospital facilities at no charge at all.

In South Australia, of course, this no longer obtains. What the Government now insists on in this State is that there should be a reduction in the age pension by payment into a private benefit society in order that the Government may reap the benefit. The Government's attitude is that, if a man is providing for himself by medical insurance, then if he gets medical insurance and does not have to pay in a public hospital he is making a profit. What nonsense it is to suggest that a man ever makes a profit out of illness. If he has provided medical benefit insurance for himself then that is extra money he needs in time of illness. A man's expenditure never goes down in times of illness. One needs inevitably to spend more in times of illness. That is what the provision should be there for and the Government should never say a pensioner is making a profit out of illness because he can go to a public hospital and get treatment for nothing. I have known of cases where almoners required that people be removed from a public hospital at a time when

they were not being charged as pensioners. They have required that the patient be put into a private institution where all his pension and more would be taken up and then that the wife should live separately on her single pension and find the extra requirements for the pensioner out of her pension. If they were insured, then the Government's attitude was that if they were getting that insurance it was not something they should use to gain the extra requirements needed, but that it was a profit. That is completely wrong and I was shocked and astonished that the member for Burnside, who represents an area in which there are pensioners saw fit to say that the pensioners of South Australia were an independent lot and that they would prefer to pay into a medical benefits society rather than have a system similar to that operating in Western Australia where far more hospital beds are provided for pensioners than are here. The Marryatville pensioners' branch, as well as other pensioner branches, will be extremely interested in the remarks of the member for Burnside. I have already received many protests against the speech of the member for Mitcham. It is all very well for a member on a reasonable income to say that 9d. a week is not much out of a pension, but anything a week is a lot out of the pension. Many pensioners in my district are desperate in trying to find reasonable accommodation, and some are having to pay as much as £2 a week for a room, leaving them with £2 15s. out of their pension with which to buy food and clothing and provide themselves with tram fares or anything else they may need, such as hair cuts and other necessities. The member for Mitcham says that 9d. a week is not much out of the pension, but it is as much as a tram-fare. Many of these people do not travel on the trams, because they cannot afford to visit their friends, and yet they are told that 9d. a week is not very much and that they can find it without difficulty. These people are interested in such statements, and if that is the attitude of the Government there will be no doubt about the revulsion of moral feeling that takes place among those people who have some contact with the poorer section of the community. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.34 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 3, at 2 p.m.