

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 26, 1961.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.**ADELAIDE TELEVISION SALES LIMITED.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have received certain information regarding the electrical firm Adelaide Television Sales Limited. My information indicates that it is in financial difficulties. Have its activities been brought to the notice of the Government, and can the Premier say whether this company has gone into voluntary liquidation and, if it has, the number of persons involved in service contracts with it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable Leader asks whether this company's activities have been brought to the notice of the Government. I can only say that they have certainly not been brought to my notice. I shall have to inquire whether any other department has been informed of the matter and see whether I can secure the information the honourable member seeks.

FRANCES TRUCKING YARDS.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning improvements to the Frances trucking yards?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, has informed me that filling has been provided at the Frances trucking yards and provision of an additional yard and a crush pen is listed for attention among other related works to be undertaken by the Superintendent. These will be carried out when tradesmen become available in the locality.

POLICE TRAINING CENTRE.

Mr. TAPPING: During the recent debate on the Loan Estimates I raised questions concerning the proposed new police training centre at Largs North and the Semaphore police station, and the Treasurer promised to obtain a report. Has he that report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Police reports:

At present no special provision has been made for the police band at Fort Largs. The band uses the gymnasium at the Thebarton barracks when this building is not required for other purposes. The estimated cost of the completed work at the Semaphore police station is £80,000. This is included in a total building programme of £435,000, of which £126,000 is the proposed allocation for this financial year.

BORDERTOWN COURTHOUSE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week regarding tenders for the proposed new courthouse at Bordertown?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Tenders will be called for the erection of a courthouse at Bordertown to enable work to begin late in this financial year. It is not possible at this stage to estimate whether funds can be re-allocated to enable earlier construction to commence.

OFFENCES BY POLICE OFFICERS.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last Thursday concerning the suppression of names and occupations of certain persons charged in the Adelaide Police Court on Wednesday and Thursday of last week?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Police reports:

There has been no attempt whatever by the Police Department to suppress the names or rank of either of the sergeants who appeared before the court on September 20 and 21 respectively. In the first instance the solicitor appearing for the sergeant applied to the magistrate for the suppression of his client's name on medical grounds. This application was granted by the magistrate in accordance with his powers under the Evidence Act. The attached newspaper cutting (marked "A") accurately records the court proceedings.

In the second instance a comprehensive outline of the case was about to be read to the court by the prosecutor when the solicitor for one of the defendants objected. The prosecutor stated that he felt it was quite proper to relate the facts which would be proved by the prosecution because they were relevant on the question of assessing bail. However, the submission of the defending counsel was upheld. I attach a carbon copy of the statement (marked "B"), the original of which is with the brief, and it will be noted that the sergeant's rank is shown in three places. Also attached is a report from the prosecutor (marked "C") and a newspaper cutting (marked "D") clearly showing in large print that one of the defendants was a police sergeant. A copy of the information (marked "E") is attached, and it will be noted that

the occupation is not shown in connection with the police sergeant although a space has been left for it to be inserted.

Early on the morning of September 21 I suspended the sergeant from duty in the force. When the information form was being typed the constable was in doubt as to how he should show the occupation and left it blank until he could refer it to his inspector. In the short time before presentation at court the matter was overlooked, but there was no intention of concealing the fact that this man was a police officer. This is the only document on which an omission appeared.

I am determined that South Australia will continue to have an honourable and respected police force and I seek the full support of Parliament in maintaining this objective. Every member of the force knows what to expect if he brings the name of the South Australian Police Force into disrepute, and there is no point in concealing the name of an officer who offends in this regard.

The documents to which the Commissioner referred are here if the honourable member would like to peruse them. I assure him, after looking at the documents, that there was no attempt on the part of the Commissioner or the police to have the names or occupations suppressed.

TANTANOOLA HOUSING.

Mr. CORCORAN: My question relates to the building of Housing Trust houses at Tantanoola. I understood that 12 houses were to be built consequent on the demand by employees of Apeel, but only seven have been built. As I shall be retiring from Parliament this year, it would be gratifying to me to know that all 12 would be erected, and I assure the Premier that the demand will be forthcoming. Will the Premier say whether there is any prospect of my expectations being gratified? I am sure he will honour his undertaking to this House.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was not aware that the programme had been abandoned or delayed so I do not know the reason for holding it up. I will inquire thoroughly and advise the honourable member in due course.

FIREWORKS.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding the control of the sale of fireworks?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter has been considered in several investigations, and I have a docket relating to it. Section 254 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act provides:

Any person who throws or fires any fireworks in or into any public street, house, shop, highway, road or passage, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour punishable summarily, and liable to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding six months.

Section 52 of the Police Offences Act provides:

Any person who throws, sets fire to, or explodes any firework or explosive material so as to injure, annoy or frighten or be likely to injure, annoy or frighten persons in any public place shall be guilty of an offence. Penalty: Twenty-five pounds.

Both these sections are actively policed and any persons detected contravening them are prosecuted. I am informed by the Commissioner of Police that he does not think it is necessary to alter these Acts to give his officers additional powers.

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Premier ascertain how many prosecutions have been launched under the sections he quoted?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

GEPPS CROSS HOSTEL.

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently a series of articles and photographs has appeared in the South Australian *Truth* newspaper about conditions at the Gepps Cross hostel. I understand that the matter was taken up with the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration but, as the Premier knows, this hostel is now being run by the South Australian Housing Trust. To be fair to the Chairman of the trust, I indicate that I recently spoke to him about this matter and that he undertook to make an unexpected inspection of the hostel to see conditions for himself. However, since then the Enfield City Council made an inspection (mainly concerned with hygiene and so on, of course); it was most dissatisfied with the conditions and agreed to take up the matter with the Housing Trust. In view of this latest move, will the Premier also take up the matter with the Housing Trust to see whether substantial relief can be given to tenants of the hostel?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This hostel is the property of the Commonwealth Government and for many years was run as a hostel, when it was the subject of great criticism. At the request of members, the Housing Trust was prepared to take a lease of the property and to make some adjustments to turn accommodation into living units rather than have it like a military camp. We are not able to alter the property substantially. I think I can go further and say that the continuation of this type of establishment is

not in accordance with our general ideas on housing. As members know, we are incurring great expense in converting temporary housing into good permanent housing and the time must surely come when we will get away from this type of housing altogether. However, in the meantime I shall attend to the honourable member's question. I have not previously seen the correspondence to which he referred, but I shall take up the matter with the Chairman of the Housing Trust and obtain a report.

BERRI SCHOOL.

Mr. KING: Will the Minister of Education indicate the present state of preparatory work for opportunity and special classes at the Berri school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department informs me that the erection of classrooms for opportunity and special classes at Berri primary school commenced yesterday. The Senior Psychologist of the Education Department expects that teachers will be available to enable some of these classes to operate early in 1962.

GASTRO-ENTERITIS AT ANDAMOOKA.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I have been reliably informed by a medical authority that at Andamooka there is an abnormal incidence of gastro-enteritis and that two children have died from the complaint in the last six months. With the approach of summer this type of infection will increase because of the poor sanitation and transference of the infection caused by the prevalence of flies. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health to have this matter investigated by the Central Board of Health to see what can be done immediately to rectify the situation and to reduce the number of infectious cases soon?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

ORROROO ELECTRICITY.

Mr. HEASLIP: I asked a question on August 17 regarding the changeover from direct current to alternating current at Orroroo and the Premier said that inquiries were being made locally and in other States about equipment. I understand the Premier has a report.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have been in touch with the Chairman of the Electricity Trust on this matter and he has forwarded me details of some proposals that I hope will be satisfactory to the district concerned. An examination has now been

made of the requirements for D.C./A.C. changeover of the council's electricity undertaking at Orroroo. Briefly, this would involve the expenditure of about £38,000, comprising £10,000 for conversion and improvements necessary to power station plant, £12,500 for improvements to the distribution system, and £15,000 for the supply of components necessary for consumers to convert their appliances to A.C. operation. While the expenditure on the distribution system and consumer's appliances will be of permanent value, the expenditure on the power station will become almost valueless when the trust gives a supply to Orroroo.

The district council, in its letter, submitted that even with a 50 per cent subsidy under the Electricity Supplies (Country Areas) Act, 1950, on the total expenditure of £35,000 which it expected this changeover to cost, the resultant effects on tariffs would render the price of electricity beyond the reach of most users in the town. Because of the very substantial subsidy that would be required and the fact that conversion on the basis proposed would involve wasteful expenditure on the power station, the trust has decided that, despite statements made previously concerning delays which would have to apply to any possible extension to Orroroo, it would be in the overall interests of the community to construct the necessary transmission line from Booleroo Centre to Orroroo as soon as this can be arranged. It is expected that work could start in January next.

This would, of course, involve acquisition of the council's undertaking by the trust and the trust proposes to submit a formal offer to the council. The trust expects that the council will be able to quit its electricity undertaking and discharge all its liabilities in connection with the undertaking, leaving a small surplus. By these means the council can be relieved of all responsibility of the undertaking and the trust would carry out D.C./A.C. changeover early in 1962 on the same basis as for other trust consumers. Under this arrangement there would be no question of subsidy under the Electricity Supplies (Country Areas) Act.

There may be a very minor postponement of some other works in the area to enable this project to be completed on the schedule proposed. However, by the end of the financial year any such delays will have been overtaken and, overall, the trust is treating this as an additional commitment to be completed within the financial year without prejudice to other works. The local council will be advised of

the Electricity Trust's offer, which should be entirely satisfactory to it. In the event of the council's agreeing, the work will go on in accordance with this report.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. RYAN: Some time ago I was advised that a scale model of a tunnel was being built at the Adelaide University to assist the Public Works Committee in its investigations concerning a new bridge to replace the present Jervois bridge over the Port River. I was told that the model would be completed and that it would be available for inspection. Can the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee say whether the scale model has been completed and, if not, when its completion is expected? Is the delay in completing this model delaying consideration of a further matter which has been made public and which will be considered by the committee?

Mr. SHANNON (Chairman, Public Works Standing Committee): The investigation by the committee of any project is not necessarily held up by any one factor, but all factors are considered in deciding the desirability or otherwise of any project. Some aspects of this proposal which must be decided by the committee are wrapped up with the other proposal. The absence, on leave, of Professor Bull, who is in charge of the Engineering Department of the university, has denied the committee an opportunity of inspecting what I understand (although I have not been told by Professor Bull) is now virtually a completed model. I assure the honourable member for Port Adelaide that the committee will take the first opportunity available when the professor is again on duty to inspect the model and to take from the professorial staff of the university such advice as it can get on this matter.

EGG GRADING.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding the grading of eggs?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of the Egg Board reports:

The charges deducted by the board are 6d. per dozen handling and selling commission. This charge is paid to the grading agents for the receiving, candling and grading of the eggs, and accounting to the producers. The pool levy is 3d. per dozen, and this is retained by the board for advances to producers on eggs and egg pulp packed for export, financing and purchasing of eggs for other purposes and administrative charges. It is pointed out that the last increase in handling and selling charges

was made in November 1959, and the last pool deduction increase in April 1960. With regard to the need for efficiency in handling, the board is constantly investigating this matter, but unfortunately the question of wages, rent, electric power and other matters associated with this particular purpose are beyond the control of the board.

It may be interesting to compare the total deductions of all State boards. They are as follows:

| | Per dozen. | |
|--------------------------------|------------|----|
| | s. | d. |
| South Australia | 0 | 9 |
| Victoria | 1 | 2½ |
| New South Wales | 1 | 3½ |
| South Queensland | 1 | 5 |
| Western Australia | 1 | 5½ |

Mr. LAUCKE: Will the Minister have overseas methods of grading and testing eggs investigated? Although the grading charges in South Australia are lower than in any other mainland State, I should like to know whether South Australia and the other States are using the most modern systems in egg grading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will inquire from the Chairman of the Egg Board and let the honourable member know.

MURRAY BRIDGE ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. BYWATERS: I have frequently asked the Minister of Works to draw to the notice of his colleague, the Minister of Roads, the need for painting the road bridge over the River Murray at Murray Bridge. I believe the Minister now has a reply to that question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have been advised that tenders for the painting of the road bridge at Murray Bridge have been forwarded to the Auditor-General for examination prior to submission to the Minister of Roads for consideration. That is the usual course in calling for tenders. They go to the Auditor-General for certification, and then the recommendation goes to the Minister concerned for his examination.

RAILWAY OVERCROWDING.

Mr. CLARK: I am reliably informed by some of my constituents that on Friday, September 8 (that is, the day after the recent Royal Show commenced) the 11.53 a.m. train from Gawler, which was a single "red hen" where it used to be the double one, with a seating capacity of 90 left Gawler with 170 on board. This meant, of course, that 80, including a number of women, with pushers, and children were crammed standing in the car. Because of the conditions, I am told, one child vomited, which made the situation rather more uncomfortable. When the train arrived

in Adelaide this vomit was partially covered with sawdust and the train returned to Gawler at 1 p.m. with 32 people standing. It seems that, in the interests of economy, seating accommodation has been decreased with the result that often trains are overcrowded. Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways in this House, obtain a report from his colleague on this overcrowding, particularly with reference to the incident that I have described?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. RALSTON: The Minister of Education will recall that we have had considerable correspondence about the new additions to the Mount Gambier high school. In addition to the building of the school, toilet facilities are needed on the playing fields at the school grounds. The provision of these facilities is included in a part of the building programme as outlined by the Public Works Standing Committee. They were to be completed, I think, by the beginning of the 1962 school year. Recently, I received a letter (dated July 4) from the Acting Minister of Education (Hon. C. D. Rowe) as follows:

I refer to your letter of June 8 in which you requested information as to when tenders would be called for additions to the Mount Gambier high school. I have now been advised by the Director of the Public Buildings Department that tenders for this work will be called during this month, July.

Can the Minister of Education say why the calling of the tenders has been delayed and, if he cannot, will he obtain a report on when the tenders will be called?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I cannot give the honourable member definite information on the spur of the moment other than to repeat what I have often said in this House in answer to questions from other honourable members: that the department has the most ambitious school-building programme in its history and it is physically and financially impossible for it or the Public Buildings Department to complete, or even to commence, all the schools we desire at present. As a consequence, the Director of Education was asked to prepare a strict list of priorities, which he has done; and he has submitted them to the Director of the Public Buildings Department. Just what is the exact position in relation to the Mount Gambier high school I do not know at present but I will find out and let the honourable member know this week, perhaps tomorrow.

SERVICE CONTRACTS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: As this question concerns Government policy, can the Premier say what consideration, if any, the Government has given to insisting that, where persons enter into a contract for service (for example, concerning television sets, washing machines and other similar appliances), the contract shall be effected through a registered insurance company that has lodged a deposit with the Commonwealth Government as a guarantee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think that this matter is governed somewhat by the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act passed last session, which, I think, provided that the hirer should have the absolute right to choose his insurance company whereas, previously, the seller was able to nominate the company. I will inquire into the matter.

MILLICENT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN: Some time ago, in reply to a question, the Minister of Works informed the House that some of the pipes required for the Millicent township water supply had been delivered. I am concerned about the supply of water to the town, particularly as trouble occurred last year in the Housing Trust area. Can the Minister say whether any further progress has been made with this scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I understand that it is proposed that the Housing Trust area will be served with water this year. I am not certain of the position, but if it is any different from that I will let the honourable member know.

CARAVAN BRAKE LIGHTS.

Mr. TAPPING: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 3 regarding the fitting of brake lights to caravans?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Police reports:

Until such time as standard laws are passed in all States to cover motor vehicle equipment, road signs and rules of the road, difficulties such as that referred to by Mr. Tapping, M.P. will occur where motorists travelling interstate do not comply with specific State laws. The legislation in Victoria requires that "brake lights" shall be attached to the following vehicles:

- (1) Motor cars registered for the first time since 1934.
- (2) Motor cycles which exceed 1½ h.p.
- (3) Combinations of motor cycles and side cars.
- (4) Every trailer and other vehicle attached to motor cars if the trailer or other vehicle obscure the brake lamps of the car; or other vehicle has unladen weight in excess of 4cwt.

Although "brake lights" have become standard equipment on motor vehicles in this State as a commendable safety measure and their value as a warning device is recognized (this is particularly so at night time) the legislation does not make them compulsory and no measure has been included in the current Bill designed to consolidate the Road Traffic Act. In New South Wales the relevant legislation also provides that the use of "brake lights" is optional. Victorian legislation also requires mud-flaps to be fitted to trailers and there are probably many other matters where State legislation differs from our own. Until uniformity is achieved, I can only suggest that motorists contemplating interstate visits should make inquiries from the Motor Vehicles Department, the Royal Automobile Association, etc. in regard to the laws of the States in which they will be travelling. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles (Mr. H. E. Kay) is a member of the Uniform Traffic Code Committee and I understand from his discussion with an officer of the traffic division of this department that the question of "brake lights" is not one listed for early discussion by the committee.

HENLEY HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the transfer of certain land from the Housing Trust to the Education Department for use as a playing area at the Henley high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: A considerable time ago the Education Department approached the trust to obtain an additional six acres of trust land (making 21 acres in all) for the Henley high school. The trust has informed the department that until confirmation is received from the Corporation of Henley and Grange and the Woodville City Council of the location of certain drainage works it is not possible to proceed with the proposed plan of subdivision of the area of which the department's land is part, consequently the exact location of the site cannot be indicated at present.

PLASTER BOARD.

Mr. LOVEDAY: There is considerable concern in Whyalla amongst those people interested in the production of plaster board at a recent happening in the provision of board for Housing Trust houses. Apparently within the last fortnight sufficient gyprock has been imported from New South Wales to build 15 timber frame houses, and that material has been delivered to the site. The contractor has told the fibrous plaster firm previously supplying wall board that the trust intends to revert to gyprock for all its ceilings and wall linings. If this policy is proceeded with it

will mean closing down three fibrous plaster factories and a plaster mill in the town. Will the Premier take this matter up with the trust to ensure that unemployment does not result from this action and that we use the local product?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter is not a new one to me. I am not sure whether it was the honourable member or someone else who asked a question on this subject some time ago, but at that time I inquired and was informed by the trust that it was its policy to use local materials where the service and the conditions of sale were satisfactory. I believe that there was some argument in Whyalla at the time about certain building equipment, and that it involved some question of sub-contracting. I will inquire to ascertain the position and inform the honourable member as soon as I have the necessary information.

TELEVISION PURCHASE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: A constituent of mine has informed me that he signed a contract two years ago to purchase a television set from a company known as the King William Television Company, of which a Mr. K. David was manager. The constituent says that after he found out what he was up for in cost he advised the company that he did not desire to take delivery of the set and wished to cancel the contract, and consequently no delivery was made. A finance company has now forwarded him a letter asking for £288. I have tried to ascertain whether this person's interests can be safeguarded. I am at a loss to understand why the finance company should be asking for £288. My constituent was honest in this matter and, because he had signed a contract but had not notified the company of the cancellation, it appears that it wants to press a charge. Will the Premier indicate whether this type of trading can be prevented?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know what is involved in the contract so it is difficult for me to express an opinion on the merits of the contract or the basis of the action now being taken to secure the money. I think the Leader will realize that, if I contract to purchase something and refuse to take delivery of it, my obligation to pay is not normally reduced. I cannot make a contract and merely say that I have altered my mind; a contract is legally binding on me and on the other party. Where a person cannot pay and is honest enough to admit that, I think that is

the type of case where the selling agent should be only too happy to cancel the contract. If the Leader will let me have the facts I will inquire to see what is involved.

PARKING NEAR INTERSECTIONS.

Mr. TAPPING: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding breaches of the Road Traffic Act caused by motorists parking near intersections?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Police Commissioner reports:

Since the provision in section 136a of the Road Traffic Act for parking to be prohibited within 15ft. of an intersection or junction, the Police Department has had correspondence with local governing bodies, the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board and the Municipal Tramways Trust regarding the implementing of the new law. This action was taken following on the receipt of legal advice as to the correct interpretation and to ensure that all parties concerned would act in concert to ensure that the provisions of the Act were uniformly and properly administered. In addition, a State-wide education campaign was conducted through the press and radio and attention was drawn to the fact that the 15ft. was to be measured from the building alignments and not from the kerbing alignments, as some motorists might have believed. This campaign lasted for 28 days, during which time all offenders detected were cautioned. Publicity is still given from time to time in the police news broadcasts, particularly towards weekends when parking near ovals and sports grounds is heaviest. During the 11 months from October 1960 to August 1961 there were 432 prosecutions with 426 convictions for offences against this section and, in addition, 33 other offenders attended lectures at our advanced driving wing in lieu of being prosecuted. The Police Department is aware of its responsibilities and its policy of reminding the public of its responsibility will continue at appropriate times.

BOWMAN'S BUS SERVICES.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question, which was supported by over 1,000 interested persons, concerning the possible retention by Bowman's Bus Services Limited of that portion of its present service proposed to be taken over by the Municipal Tramways Trust at the end of this year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This involves the policy of the M.T.T. The petition, which I received only last week, was forwarded to the trust but I doubt whether the board has met since receiving it. As this question arises frequently where private bus services are concerned and as the question involves policy, I doubt whether a reply will be available for a fortnight.

PLYMPTON POLICE STATION.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about additions to the Plympton police station?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have been advised by the Director of the Public Buildings Department that tenders for this work have been advertised in this week's *Government Gazette* with a closing date of October 18, 1961.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT.

Mr. TAPPING: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked last week about whether the Government intended to introduce a Bill this year to amend the Physiotherapists Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have been advised by the Minister of Health that it is not intended to introduce a Bill this session.

SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The Premier has sought to convey by statements on the radio and in the press that the Government intends to introduce a Bill to amend the Superannuation Act to provide substantial increases for subscribers. Can the Premier say when this Bill is likely to come before us and whether it will be possible for members to get the information before further statements are issued to the public?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Substantial amendments to the Superannuation Act, many of which will be of an administrative nature, will be introduced. I indicated publicly that the Government intended to introduce a Bill. From the point of view of subscribers, there are three principal matters of interest. Last session, when Parliament increased to £1 the value of each of the first ten units for persons who had retired, I said the Government would consider this matter when it had time. In his opening Speech the Governor said that this matter would come before the House. A Bill will be introduced to give effect to this subject to an overall provision that for most senior public servants pensions will not exceed 50 per cent of their salaries and, for the intermediate and lower grade public servants, 66 per cent of their salaries. The value of widows' pensions will be increased by 2s. a unit (an increase of 20 per cent) and the benefit payable in respect of children and orphans will be increased by 100 per cent.

POLLING BOOTHS.

Mr. TAPPING: Has the Premier received from the Electoral Office of South Australia a report on poorly lit polling booths, about which I asked a question two weeks ago?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Phillips has replied that the lighting in many halls used as polling booths is adequate for the usual functions, but the introduction of the voting cubicle and the shadow of the person voting considerably affect the light. This department has no control over lighting in private halls and buildings, and often finds it difficult to procure halls. Presiding officers are expected to arrange polling booths to the best advantage regarding lighting.

PORT ADELAIDE TO HENLEY BUSES.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice): Will the Municipal Tramways Trust consider improving existing bus services operating from Port Adelaide to Henley Beach which at present do not operate from Port Adelaide or Henley Beach beyond 7 p.m. on week days?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust reports that the licensee of the Port Adelaide-Henley Beach-Glenelg Bus Service states that he cannot see his way clear to operate after 7 p.m. The service previously run after 7 p.m. consisted of trips from Port Adelaide to Henley Beach at 7.25, 9.15 and 11 p.m., and from Henley Beach to Port Adelaide at 8.45 and 10.30 p.m. This service was discontinued in January, 1961, because of the loss incurred by the licensee resulting from extremely poor patronage. The revenue from trips previously run after 6 p.m. averaged 14.3d. a mile, which was well below the cost of operation. The revenue secured from this service generally is insufficient to withstand unremunerative running of this order.

BY-ELECTION COST.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice): What was the total cost to the State of the recent Legislative Council by-election for Central District No. 1?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Deputy Returning Officer for the State reports that he is unable to give the total cost of the by-election at this stage, but it would appear that such cost will be about £3,550. This does not include forms and equipment used in the booths, as this is supplied from election stock held in the Electoral Office.

POTATOES.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice):

1. What are the names of the chairman, directors and manager of the South Australian Potato Distribution Centre Limited?
2. What is the issued capital of this company?
3. For what reasons has a private company been granted the sole right to control the distribution and sale of potatoes in South Australia?
4. How much a ton does the South Australian Distribution Centre Limited receive from potatoes by way of charges?
5. How much a ton does this company withhold from growers?
6. How many growers and merchants are licensed to sell potatoes in this State?
7. Is a list of these names available for perusal by the public?
8. What quantities of potatoes are held at present in cold stores and by merchants, respectively?
9. Why has the South Australian Potato Board not obtained sufficient supplies of potatoes from interstate when prices were lower, to relieve the acute shortage?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of S.A. Potato Board reports:

1. Directors: Messrs. P. Joseph (chairman), A. C. Tansell, H. Horsfall, G. S. I. Queale, W. E. Smith, L. J. Bishop, R. W. M. Johnson, A. D. Coin, W. H. Norman. Manager: J. J. McCullagh.

2. The issued capital of the company is £10,000, fully paid up in cash.

3. The Potato Distribution Centre was set up at the request of the Australian Potato Committee, under National Security (Potato) Regulations, as sole primary potato distributors in South Australia. The centre set up this organization which completely satisfied the Australian Potato Committee, and, at the end of Federal potato control, continued at the request of the potato growers of South Australia to carry on as primary distributors until their efforts to establish a Potato Board in this State were successful. The S.A. Potato Board is a non-trading body, set up to control and regulate the marketing of potatoes produced in this State, and on its establishment (because of the machinery set up and operational knowledge of the centre and its close liaison with growers and merchants) appointed S.A. Potato Distribution Centre Ltd. as primary distributors of potatoes in this State. The board had no financial resources, and could not undertake to set up and maintain an organization to function as economically as the distribution centre.

4. The primary wholesale margin allowed by the board is 15s. a ton and for this sum the centre accepts all potatoes offered by growers, distributes them to licensed merchants, and is

responsible for all payments to growers, accepting full responsibility for trading and payments for all potatoes passing through the board at the price determined by the board from time to time.

5. Nil.

6. There are 57 licensed merchants—915 growers registered in this State.

7. A register of growers and merchants is kept in the board's office and is available for inspection.

8. The board does not hold potatoes in cold stores. Stocks held by merchants are not known.

9. The South Australian Potato Board can only regulate the marketing of potatoes grown in South Australia and is not empowered to enter into interstate purchase of potatoes.

LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. Lawn, for Mr. CASEY (on notice):

1. How many narrow gauge locomotives are in service on the Peterborough Division of the South Australian Railways?

2. What is the average monthly mileage for each locomotive on the Peterborough Division?

3. How many locomotives are in service on the Port Lincoln Division?

4. What is the average monthly mileage for each locomotive on the Port Lincoln Division?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. 61.

2. 1,423.

3. 25.

4. 1,147.

The average monthly mileages per locomotive given above are for the 12 months ending June 30, 1961.

COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES ACT (ROYAL NAVAL FRIENDLY UNION OF SAILORS' WIVES AND MOTHERS INC.).

The Legislative Council transmitted the following resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

That this House approves of the making of a proclamation under section 16 of the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, in the following form:

South Australia, to wit—Proclamation by His Excellency the Governor of the State of South Australia.

By virtue of the provisions of the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, and all other enabling powers, I, the said Governor, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, being satisfied that moneys or securities for moneys to the amount of £500 held by the Royal Naval Friendly Union of Sailors' Wives and Mothers Incorporated, a body corporate incorporated under the provisions of the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956-1957, and a body to which a licence has

been issued under the said Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, for certain charitable purposes within the meaning of the said Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, are not and will not be required for the said purposes, do hereby by proclamation declare that the said moneys or securities for moneys shall be paid by the said Royal Naval Friendly Union of Sailors' Wives and Mothers Incorporated to the H.M.A.S. Watson Memorial Chapel Fund of Watson's Bay in the State of New South Wales.

The making of this proclamation has been approved by resolution of both Houses of Parliament.

Given under my hand and the public seal of South Australia, at Adelaide, this day of _____, 1961.

By command,

A. LYELL McEWIN, Chief Secretary.
God Save the Queen.

ADELAIDE PARK LANDS ALTERATION BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

THE BUDGET.

The Estimates—Grand total, £91,544,000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 21. Page 860.)

THE LEGISLATURE.

Legislative Council, £12,417.

Mr. RALSTON (Mount Gambier): In speaking to the first line of the Estimates I shall refer to several matters that are of interest to the people of the South-East and, I think, to the State in general. However, before doing so I shall comment on the high standard of debate attained by most honourable members in presenting their views. In the main, this debate provides members with ample opportunity to speak on a wide variety of subjects and, despite the wide divergence of opinion on these matters, the debate serves a useful purpose and we hear many valuable contributions.

It was, therefore, with regret that last week we heard one member showing complete irresponsibility in every way. At times his actions appeared to be bordering on the hysterical outbursts of a petulant child: they were not the considered thinking of someone elected to the responsible position of a member of Parliament. Why the honourable member for Gouger thought it necessary to ignore the real purpose of this debate and to descend to a smear campaign against the Transport Control Board, the Leader of the Opposition and

several other members, in the manner of the outmoded and now despised American cult of McCarthyism, is beyond my comprehension.

It is difficult to understand why he felt it necessary to do that in a debate that offered such ample opportunities to advocate so many things of advantage to his electorate and to the State in general. Performances of this sort will not enhance the honourable member's reputation in Parliament or anywhere else, nor will they add prestige to the Party he represents. I am sorry that any member should have launched forth on a smear campaign of that type, for it is rather despicable in many ways for a man in public life to do such a thing. I trust it will never be my misfortune again to listen to such an ill-considered, ill-advised and irresponsible speech while I am privileged to be a member of this Parliament.

I now wish to refer to the work done in this State by the Woods and Forests Department. During the last 12 months, and for some years prior to that, the department has made substantial contributions to the Consolidated Revenue of this State. We see from page 8 of the Auditor-General's report for this year that from the exploitation of the plantations of our State forests £300,000 has been contributed to Consolidated Revenue. That is a magnificent effort, and I offer my congratulations to the Minister of Forests and to all the officers of the department. It is a wonderful effort on the part of a State enterprise. I draw further attention to that by mentioning that page 127 of the report states that the royalties received from the Broken Hill Proprietary Company for iron ore are less than the amount contributed to Consolidated Revenue by the State's pine forests. We hear of the magnificent contribution those royalties are making to the Consolidated Revenue of this State and how we would be so poorly off without that contribution. I agree that it is a valuable contribution, but I emphasize that in the year just past it amounted to £257,000, or £43,000 less than that contributed by the pine forests. That indicates to honourable members just how valuable an asset we have in the pine forests of the South-East. These forests are continuing to expand, and I look forward to the much greater returns that we can expect from this State investment soon.

Honourable members on other occasions have heard me advocate the extensive use of radiata pine in all our Government and semi-government instrumentalities. I draw the attention of the Committee to the opinion of Mr. J. D. Cheesman, one of our leading

architects. Mr. Cheesman is past president of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, a member of the Commonwealth Government Building Research Advisory Committee, a member of the South Australian Government Town Planning Committee, and a member of the South Australian Institute of Architects' Board of Architectural Education. His qualifications are very high indeed. When speaking in Mount Gambier on Friday, September 1, Mr. Cheesman said:

The general impression I gained of the pine industry is that we now have a timber comparable in many ways with the best of the imported timbers, and I know we architects in Adelaide are not appreciating this.

Does that not bear out what I said in Parliament not so long ago, that the Adelaide architects in general have no appreciation of the remarkable building qualities of radiata pine? Here we have one of Adelaide's leading architects saying the same thing. He went on to say that he thought more architects should have a first-hand look at what was being done in the pine industry so that they could judge its possibilities. It is on account of the comments of architects with wider vision than others (and certainly wider vision than some architects that have been employed in the past by the Public Buildings Department) that we can expect to see throughout South Australia a much greater use at Government level of the products of our pine forests.

In addition to the increased use of structural timbers and scantling, I believe, from information given to this House and to the public generally about the proposed establishment of a paper pulp industry in the South-East, that we can expect an even greater return from the profitable use of the thinnings and other salvaged timbers that at present are somewhat of a problem. These can prove a more valuable asset than the matured timber. The returns from pine used for pulp purposes, on a per hundred super feet basis, are far greater than the returns from timber used for building construction. World trends today are for greater use of paper and paper products rather than for the use of softwoods as building timber.

Members who have studied the Auditor-General's reports for the last few years will realize that the milling of case timbers has not been profitable, but has shown a loss to the department. The timber had to be used and the milling had to proceed, even though at a loss. The State mills have continued to produce first-class fruit cases for use, primarily

in our fruitgrowing districts, and have made them available at the lowest possible cost to the fruitgrowers. The assistance to the fruitgrowing areas could not have been accomplished without this State enterprise. Members opposite, who believe that State enterprise should be scrapped, favour State enterprise when it operates to the advantage of producers, as the member for Chaffey well knows. If the State mills had not provided these cases at a reduced cost to the growers, the growers would be in difficulties today. This State enterprise has competed successfully with private industry and has supplied cases for use for export fruit at a price that the growers would never have received from private industry. Without our State mills the citrus industry would probably have been held to ransom on the price of these cases.

Where there is no State enterprise, restrictive arrangements and agreements prevail. Cartels, which are completely merciless when the growers' interests are concerned, operate. Don't let any member think that these things do not happen. I need only instance what happened a few weeks ago when the paper and pulp interests appeared before the Tariff Board seeking additional duty on imported pulp. The evidence produced to the board clearly indicated that a most restrictive trade practice was being enforced by Australian Pulp and Paper Manufacturers Limited and other private interests. Of course, under those circumstances, additional tariff duty was refused. They were holding the people to ransom because they had created a monopoly for the supply of paper. They were not satisfied with that, but had the audacity to seek additional protection so that they could enhance their profits at the expense of the Australian public.

The Opposition believes in the principles of Democratic Socialism—not the things that some members opposite try to imply. The State must intervene when the people are being adversely affected by restrictive covenants and cartels. Democratic Socialism aims to prevent exploitation of the public. There is nothing wrong with that policy, and those members opposite who represent fruitgrowing areas should be most grateful that the State has been able to protect those areas in these difficult times of trying to export fruit and in the more difficult times that lie ahead.

We have an example of an enterprise being managed jointly by the State and private interests at Cellulose Australia Limited near Millicent. That is an outstanding illustration

of the advantages that accrue to the people through the State having some say in the final manufacturing process of the products of our pine forests. Last year that industry returned to the Treasury £13,868 and is estimated to return £20,600 this year. We believe that the Treasury should benefit and receive this finance to enable it to undertake other State enterprises that can benefit the State rather than taxing the people to achieve these ends. We all know that taxes invariably fall heaviest on the shoulders of those least able to bear them. When a State like South Australia has a direct interest in industry it has a voice in the policy of industry and can help to establish continuity of employment. All members realize what happens when we have overseas investments in this country. Those investors are interested only in profits, and whether or not people are employed is the least of their concerns. We have seen the recent happenings in General Motors-Holden's. That industry has not worried about continuity of employment or things like that: it has simply sacked people, discarding them on a labour market that is full of unemployed people. It could not care less, but where the State has some interest in an industry the position is different.

The Woods and Forests Department has not, so far, laid off labour. It has done its utmost to absorb its labour in various forms of employment within the scope of its industry. Men have been put on maintenance and developmental work that will benefit the State in the future. The same thing has happened with Cellulose, but G.M.H. sacked men in their thousands. That is why I believe that the Commonwealth and State Governments should have some say in the policy, especially at the employment level, of all enterprises in the Commonwealth.

The State does not demand excessive profits, but is just as interested in the social results of employment and continuity of employment for the people. It is not to the advantage of the Commonwealth or the States to have hundreds of thousands of people drawing unemployment relief and contributing nothing towards the economy of the State or the Commonwealth, but that aspect does not interest the overseas investor. He is interested only in coming to Australia for one purpose: to make profits. If it were not for that motive he would not be here. Members opposite have, in the past, always advocated the sanctity of private enterprise. I do not know whether they realize how amusing that sounds to members on this side when we see

them, one after the other, get up in debates of this nature and laud to the skies the manifold advantages that have accrued to the State from the socialization of electricity by making it a State enterprise.

If all the benefits accruing to South Australia have been as manifold as members on both sides claim, and have resulted from the socialization of many essential things needed by the people, why do members opposite put on such a performance when it is proposed to extend this trend a little further? They claim that they are so proud of the past. I do not suppose they realize the Jekyll and Hyde attitude they are adopting when they do these things. They are not consistent in their actions.

This is a proper time to remind Government members, and members on this side, of recent happenings. On October 14, 1959, the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran)—reported in *Hansard* at page 1062—moved:

That in the opinion of this House a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into the effect on the community of differential charges for petrol and motor fuels, and to recommend any action deemed necessary or desirable to ensure a more equitable apportionment of distribution and other costs.

An excellent case was advanced by members on this side but the motion was opposed by Government members who did not want a Select Committee to examine distribution costs and the bearing they had on petrol prices. They were happy with what was going on so they denied us the appointment of a Select Committee. I had an interest in that debate, because I pointed out clearly how the people of Mount Gambier and the lower South-East were being exploited by differential charges. Following the debate the Prices Commissioner saw fit to reduce freight differentials in that area by one penny half-penny a gallon and that meant a saving of between £40,000 and £50,000 a year to the people in the lower South-East.

Mr. Jennings They had you to thank for it.

Mr. RALSTON: They had a few members on this side who could see the wisdom of what we were advocating. That clearly showed that over the years the people had been exploited to the extent of nearly £50,000 a year. Why was that practice permitted to go on for years? No one could tell me that the Government was not aware of the position. It was fully aware of what was going on and there were reasons for us to believe that the Playford Government permitted the charge to continue. That opinion

is held by many people in the South-East and by many people in other parts of the State. Recently, the Port Pirie Chamber of Commerce discussed freight differentials on petrol and said that the people of the Lower North were being exploited to the tune of nearly £400,000 a year. I do not know whether those figures are correct but I am sure that when the honourable member for Port Pirie speaks he will have something to say about what the present Government has permitted to be done to the people of Port Pirie and the Lower North. People at Port Lincoln are paying a freight differential of 2½d. on every gallon of fuel landed there. Why are these things permitted to happen under the Playford Government? They do not happen in the major eastern States, although differential rates are permitted at the deep sea ports in Western Australia.

A booklet published by the Petroleum Information Bureau of Australia shows where oil refineries and seaboard bulk storage installations are established around the coast of Australia. In Queensland an oil refinery is established at Hamilton, near Brisbane, and there are seaboard bulk storage installations at Gladstone, Mackay, Townsville and Cairns. Although Cairns is 1,040 miles in a direct line from the refinery, the price of petrol there is the same as at Brisbane. The same price is charged in every deep sea port in Queensland I have mentioned. In that State a freight differential is not permitted at ports where bulk installations exist.

In New South Wales refineries are established at Kurnell, Clyde and Matraville, and there are bulk storage installations at Sydney, Newcastle and Port Kembla. At every deep sea port where there are bulk installations the price of petrol is identical. In Victoria there are refineries at Geelong and Altona and deep sea installation ports at Geelong, Melbourne and Portland. There is no price difference between any of those places where there are bulk installations at deep sea ports. The whole eastern coast of Australia from Cairns to Portland has identical prices for petrol at each port. But what happens in South Australia? Port Adelaide is a deep sea port with bulk installations and the price for petrol is the same as at the other deep sea ports along the eastern coast of Australia, but at Port Lincoln and Port Pirie a freight differential of 2½d. must be paid on every gallon of fuel landed. Why do people in these places have to pay the differential when nobody along the whole eastern coast of Australia has to pay it? Is this brought about

because the present Government has been negligent in not applying to have Port Pirie and Port Lincoln declared deep sea ports?

Mr. Quirke: What is the official price for petrol at reseller's level in Sydney and in Adelaide?

Mr. RALSTON: That is a matter for the State Governments to control. I am dealing with wholesale prices.

Mr. Quirke: Is petrol cheaper in Sydney than in Adelaide?

Mr. RALSTON: That is a matter for resellers to decide with the various State Governments. I am talking about the landed cost at deep sea ports.

Mr. Quirke: Our petrol could be as cheap as that in Sydney.

Mr. RALSTON: It is not as cheap at Port Lincoln as it is in Sydney, yet both are deep sea ports. This Government has been negligent. Only a few years ago the Victorian Government had Portland declared a deep sea port for tariff purposes, and petrol can be bought there as cheaply as in Melbourne, but it is not as cheap at Port Pirie or Port Lincoln as it is in Adelaide.

Mr. Jenkins: There would be no comparison between the quantities off-loaded at those ports.

Mr. RALSTON: Surely the honourable member does not think that more petrol is off-loaded at Portland than at Port Pirie? Petrol is landed at 2½d. a gallon cheaper at Portland than at Port Pirie, and the Chamber of Commerce at Port Pirie is not over-pleased about the actions of the Government in this matter, as anyone who reads the local newspapers can see. I do not think people at Port Lincoln are happy either. In a few months I think we shall see some propaganda by the Treasurer, who will say that as a result of the establishment of an oil refinery at Port Stanvac the price of petrol at Port Pirie and Port Lincoln can be reduced to the price of that landed at Port Adelaide. He will say that that is the great advantage of bringing this refinery to this State.

People at Port Pirie and Port Lincoln could have had petrol at the same price as the people in Adelaide years ago and they would have been saved thousands of pounds if the Government had applied in the proper way to have these ports declared deep sea ports, as the Governments in the eastern States saw fit to do for their ports. It is time that the

people who have been paying these exorbitant prices were told the truth. I think it will be necessary for my Party to try to bring price justice to the people of this State, the same as Labor Governments in other States have done for their people. I am pleased that I was successful in obtaining substantial reductions in the South-East and I look forward to members who represent electorates where justice has not been done taking up the cudgels on behalf of the people they represent.

I will now deal with the costs borne by the State in dealing with the problem of juvenile delinquency, about which we hear so much. The last reference to this matter in South Australia appeared in the annual report of Mr. Scales, S.M., of the Adelaide Juvenile Court, for the year ended June 30, 1959. One or two things he had to say are not pleasant reading to the public. His report included the following:

England has for many years had separate institutions such as Borstal, approved schools and detention centres for delinquent children who are further sub-divided into smaller groups. The United States of America also has a similar system of training in small groups and varied institutional treatment for them according to their needs.

Nearer home we can view with envy the facilities in New South Wales where there are five separate training schools for delinquent boys, three of which are run on the cottage system where groups of 20 to 30 boys are each placed in the charge of a married couple as house master and matron.

Apart from the homely atmosphere—usually previously lacking in the children's life—the other obvious benefits of the cottage system are—

- (i) the segregation of youths according to age, interest, religion, physique, intelligence and maturity, previous history, and associates, and
- (ii) the opportunity to transfer a child from one cottage to another if he is making no progress.

The term "homely atmosphere" is not the one that I have heard used by various members when discussing the Magill institution. Mr. Scales has pointed out just how far we are behind with our thinking on this problem compared not only with other countries, but with other Australian States. Mr. Scales has given much thought in the presentation of this report, and he further goes on to say when dealing with the needs in South Australia:

Present planning in South Australia must surely have an eye to future and present needs. There is every reason to believe that before the end of this present century the delinquency figures will double what they are today. What will be the facilities for them?

He emphasizes a very pertinent problem when he says that the figures for juvenile delinquency will be doubled by the end of the century—and today it is already a major problem in South Australia. What are we doing at State level to deal with it? It appears to me that the only thing the Government intends to do at the moment, that is if it can be persuaded to spend the money, is to build bigger and bigger institutions at greater cost.

Mr. Quirke: It has some ideas different from that.

Mr. RALSTON: If that is so, no one is more pleased to hear it than I. This is what the last annual report of the Auditor-General has to say regarding the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department:

Contributions towards maintenance are made by children resident at hostels, and, where circumstances permit, by parents of children in institutions. Last year attention was called to the high cost to the department of maintaining each child at certain institutions. In most institutions the annual cost to Consolidated Revenue for the year 1960-61 has again increased. There has, however, been a reduction in the average daily cost of maintaining each boy at Struan Farm School because of the greater numbers placed there. The cost per boy at £18 4s. per week or £949 per year is still regarded as very high.

I'll say it is regarded as very high. The report continues:

At North Adelaide boys hostel, where working boys pay for board, there has been a reduction, but the average subsidy per boy paid on such board was still high at £542 per annum. The average cost to Consolidated Revenue per child at institutions in 1960-61 was £719 per annum compared with £705 in the previous year.

For the boys in these institutions it is costing the State an average of about £14 a week. This is a fantastic amount. What have we done to try to obviate the need for these institutions, or to reduce the number of children committed to them, and to try to find out why these children go wrong? In his report Mr. Seales said, in referring to the age groups, that those who seemed to get into trouble were chiefly in the group from the time when the children left school until they were about 18 or 20 years of age. These children seemed to develop some desire for a more active life, and unless provision is made to cope with this increased activity it tends to develop into a problem of the children's doing the wrong thing. It is during that period that attention should be given to this problem of juvenile delinquency, and one way to do it

is through youth clubs which, if properly conducted, can do much to guide our younger people through these difficult years.

What is the State doing to provide clubs to inculcate into youths a team spirit, and to teach them the principles of good citizenship? In South Australia the only Government provision for youth clubs is a vote of £500, which is less than the cost of maintaining one juvenile delinquent for a year. It cannot give us much comfort to read of such a miserable effort on the Government's part towards reducing the incidence of juvenile delinquency.

Comparisons are odious, but let us examine what Victoria is doing in the matter. In 1958 Victoria passed the Youth Organizations Assistance Act, which consolidated the law providing for assistance for youth organizations. Under it a youth advisory council has been established whose function it is to allocate grants made by the Government to organizations that are doing a good job in providing for the needs of youth in that State. Last year the amount allocated was £50,000 and it is intended to grant another £50,000 this year. From investigations I have made it appears that the money is given to group organizations, organizations within church activities, the Young Men's Christian Association, and such organizations in order to encourage the establishment of youth clubs in an attempt to minimize juvenile delinquency as much as possible.

In South Australia it costs the State £719 each year for each delinquent. Surely the wisdom of following in the footsteps of Victoria can be seen. In South Australia we have Y.M.C.A. youth clubs whose function it is to promote activities at youth level. They are doing a mighty job and I hope their activities will have a major beneficial effect on our problem of juvenile delinquency. Apart from a grant to the National Fitness Council, at least half of which goes in salaries and wages, the magnificent sum of £500 is granted by the Government for youth club activities! The member for Burra and other members are as much concerned as I am about what is being done for the youth of this State and I hope their concern will continue. Many of us have not had the problem of youth delinquency within the immediate family circle, as have some people with whom we come in contact. We are justified in granting to youth clubs much more money than we do at present. It is better to have the youth clubs promoting decent citizenship at a far less cost to the

State than the State building institutions in which to house juvenile delinquents after the crimes have been committed. Parliament should appoint a Select Committee to investigate and report to Parliament, not to the Government, on what is being done in the other States. We should do something practical in this matter, and the cost would be much less than the cost of the present method of dealing with delinquency, which is not achieving very much.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): From long experience I realize that the Budget is nothing but a presentation of the State's receipts and expenditure. It cannot be said to be a balance-sheet. I often wonder what would be the position if the finances of the State were drawn up in the form of a company balance-sheet. I am sure it would be illuminating and ludicrous. Under our system we have now had presented receipts and expenditure for this year totalling over £91,500,000. Today, that is not much money, and apparently few people take an interest in the Budget.

The member for Mount Gambier spoke about child delinquency and urged that certain measures be taken. Every member supports him because more money should be spent on combating the problem. The State proposes not to build bigger and better institutions but to handle some phases of delinquency along the lines suggested by the honourable member. The cottage system is not new; it is already operating well in one or two places in South Australia. Much has still to be done, particularly in connection with the causes of delinquency. I do not say that it is the sole responsibility of the State because the origin of delinquency is often in the home. It is not always there, but too often it is. Many parents scornfully repudiate an imputation that they have neglected their children.

“Neglect our children? Do we starve our children?—No, we do not. Do we dress our children well?—Yes, we do. Do we see to it that they have amusements; can they have comics or any of the other things that children delight in?—Yes, they can have them. We do not neglect our children.” No—except in the personal touch. The father is away during the day; the mother is away during the day; the children come home from school and are left to their own resources. There is plenty of food for them but there is no family association, and there is the beginning of all delinquency. The beginning of all delinquency is in the home—at least, that is

where the vast majority of it starts. All authorities say that.

As a member of the Public Works Committee I have been through Victoria and New South Wales, as well as South Australia, dealing with this question, and the story is the same everywhere—broken homes, homes in which there is no family life, homes where the parents would repudiate the fact that their children were neglected. By ordinary material standards they are not neglected, but on human values and moral grounds and in family association they are devastatingly neglected, shockingly neglected. Children want the close association of their parents. When they are hurt they want to go to their parents. Boys are bigger sooks in that regard than their sisters. A young boy is hurt, he wishes to go to his mother. We have seen it happen repeatedly with children. The mother is not there. Something is lost, something has gone that can never be replaced. By no other medium can the mother's love and the mother's care be replaced in that child. It starts when the child is young. Apparently, it does not matter in the young childhood—but that is just when it does matter. When that child's mind is being formed, the mother is something extraneous, somebody who comes home and looks after its material welfare, puts it to bed and perhaps goes out again at night. There is the origin of delinquency and, until we can correct that materialistic outlook in our children, we cannot get away from delinquency. There it is.

This Parliament should start playing a robust game, something that calls for the expenditure of manly energy, not something like ring-a-rosy. If ring-a-rosy is too exuberant a game, then let us have oranges and lemons, or something like that!

Mr. Jennings: What about leap-frog?

Mr. QUIRKE: That would be outside the pale altogether; that would be too stern a game! I have listened to four speeches that in some respects can be described only as absolute twaddle. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), who is a member on the Government side, has been the target. It looks as though it is a concerted attack on him—and why? He has defamed the poor helpless people who are the personnel of the Transport Control Board. That is what was said of him. He never did anything of the sort. Then it was stated that he said hard words against the Leader of the Opposition. He did nothing of the sort. I defy any honourable member to read out anything that he said (and I will

read it to honourable members in a minute) where he defamed or said anything against the Leader of the Opposition or where he said anything that defamed the Transport Control Board. Shades of the past! Twenty years ago, when the Hon. R. S. Richards was Leader of the Opposition, when he stood up to criticize one really knew that there was criticism.

Mr. McKee: The member for Gouger said that our Leader was preventing men from going to work.

Mr. QUIRKE: He did not. I read his speech again. The trouble is that the honourable member does not listen and does not read. I will read it to him. I have got sick of listening to rubbish, to this molly-coddling nonsense. Listen to some of this hysteria! The honourable member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) said that member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) gave an exhibition of "instability, immaturity, and even irresponsibility". Have members ever read or listened to such twaddle! Then the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) got snarled up: he did not know whether he was talking about the Transport Control Board or the Railways Standing Committee, but he gave the game away. One could see it was a combined effort. I was, however, sorry that the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) came into it. Then last, but not least, was the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston). He was the most hysterical of all. He wanted the pack to bring him back.

What did the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) say about the Leader of this House? I would say that the late Mr. O'Halloran and the previous Leader (the Hon. R. S. Richards) would have been smiling all the time if such nice things had been said about them in their day. In those days they did not play ring-a-rosy or oranges and lemons; they were men who got right into it.

Mr. Ryan: There was probably no gerry-mander then.

Mr. QUIRKE: Maybe, but they were men who did not resent a little criticism. If they got it, they got up and shot it back. They were not arguing on pussy-footing lines, as we have heard in this debate. Get into it and fight one another by debate, and do not complain when you get a little criticism!

Mr. Ryan: You were going to read from *Hansard*.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and I shall. I was merely preparing the honourable member for it because the shock would have been so great that he would not have recovered from it. The member for Gouger said this:

The speech of the Leader of the Opposition reflects very little credit on him.

Is that a criticism that anybody can resent? I do not think the Leader did. He came in here when I did and he can tick as well as anybody else when he wants to. He has not said anything or objected to it. Give him time to reply to it—that is what we should do. The member for Gouger continued:

I would say it reflects no credit on him at all for the criticisms he has made of the Treasurer's Budget for the coming year.

That is fair enough. That gives the Leader an opportunity to reply. The member for Gouger continued:

The honourable member tried to couple this Government's policy with one of restriction and of creating unemployment in this State, but all members in this House know that the Treasurer fully explained the position earlier when he laid before the House correspondence and copies of letters he had sent in an application relating to the measures that caused the troubles we are now experiencing. He did everything in his power to avert the restrictions that have affected South Australian industry.

I come now to the passage about which somebody claimed that the member for Gouger had said that the Leader was causing unemployment. The member for Gouger then said:

He is not in line with his Federal Leader (Mr. Calwell) who said publicly that something would have to be done to alleviate the difficult position of the Australian primary producer. In this Parliament we have tried to bring about some alleviation, but the Leader of the Opposition does not approve of it and is well out of line with his Federal leader.

I want to see where this vicious attack was made on the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Gouger continued:

The Leader's remarks have been recorded in *Hansard* and they can be read tomorrow. He criticized the allocation of money for the construction of a power line to the South-East. He said that the money should not have been allowed to accumulate and should have been spent last year. He criticized the Treasurer's careful efforts in accumulating funds to be used to good effect in the attempt to solve our unemployment problem. He decries the fact that these funds are available to assist the people whom he says he wants to help. It is good that we have these resources because it enables the Government to employ more men on public works . . . it will mean that much more work will be available on a decentralized basis. When the Leader of the Opposition criticizes what has been done in this instance it is not in accord with his many suggestions on other matters.

Where is the vicious attack in that? The honourable member continued:

His speech tonight was a mass of confusion and contradiction.

The honourable member may have thought that, and the only person who can resent that remark is the Leader himself. The honourable member went on:

He wants more people employed on public works, yet he decries the fact that about £6,000,000 is to be spent on new buildings . . . the Leader of the Opposition said that the Treasurer would crush anyone who stood in the way of his achievements.

Where is the vicious attack there? It is not there.

Mr. Ryan: It is there. You are reading only what suits you. What about the passage where he doubts the sincerity of the Leader?

Mr. QUIRKE: Just imagine the member for Port Adelaide entering into a fight on this matter! Is he going to play ring-a-rosy, or something like that? For the honourable member to be worrying that puny criticism like this may hurt anybody is absolutely ludicrous. I am amazed that a stalwart like the honourable member for Port Adelaide, who has fought his way through all the trade unions, should join in this argument. How ridiculous it is! It hurts me to see this place degenerating to the level of a kindergarten and members becoming afraid to be criticized. Apparently the concerted efforts of the Opposition are being thrown at one man. Why? Obviously, because they do not like him in the first place. What he has said has evidently got under their skins, but why should that affect them? Debate is the principal thing here.

Mr. Ryan: Not slander!

Mr. QUIRKE: There is no slander in it at all; I guarantee that the member for Gouger has said nothing he would not say from the front steps of this building. I would have said it, anyhow. Let us return to this question of foot rot. It was not only the foot that was rotten on this occasion, as I have never heard so much rot. We have this question of the poor defenceless Transport Control Board. If it had not been for the fact that my tears dried up long ago I would have become lachrymose, only there would have been tears of blood to think that we could have descended this far.

What did the member for Gouger say in relation to this little flock of sheep afflicted by foot rot and forced by the Transport Control Board to be loaded into a truck away from the ordinary loading facilities? The carrier's vehicle had to be backed into the truck and each of the sheep manhandled into that truck. Why? Because the Railways Department says—and wisely—that its ramp cannot be used to load sheep afflicted with foot rot. That is

what the Railways Department, in its wisdom, says, and it is backed up by our own Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Harding: And the stockowners.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and veterinary surgeons. They say it is possible to transmit foot rot that way, and the Railways Department is taking no chances. However, the Railways Department does not come into the picture at all; it was the Transport Control Board that forced these sheep on to the railways instead of allowing them to be taken a few miles by road transport. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) read from a Victorian newspaper in an endeavour to prove that foot rot cannot be conveyed by means of railway truck. Well, our Department of Agriculture says that it can. We do not have to go to Victoria for that information, for it is available free of charge in a splendid little booklet produced in this State. That publication states:

Foot rot is a contagious disease caused by the organism *Fusiformis nodosus*. It is transmitted to healthy sheep by diseased sheep through the contamination of pastures, yards or roads with the disease organisms.

Later, it states:

If there is an outbreak of foot rot on the property, prompt action can limit its spread. Isolate the affected flock immediately. If the outbreak is confined to the one mob and the mob is small enough, the best way is to sell them for slaughter.

That is precisely what this gentleman whose sheep are the subject of this discussion decided to do. It was a small flock, so he sold them for slaughter and applied for permission to take them by road transport to the abattoirs—one cannot take them anywhere but the abattoirs—but he was told that they had to go on the railways and that the Railways Department would have to disinfect the trucks afterwards. No doubt the department would do that.

The member for Murray said that the action of the member for Gouger in bringing this matter up was all nonsense because foot rot was not contagious and they could be put on to railway trucks in any event. However, that is not the point. The member for Gouger was not complaining about the conditions of the trucks and the transmission of foot rot so much as he was that the Transport Control Board would not let a person cart them by road. Obviously, it was not that person's vehicle and he wanted to employ another vehicle. This booklet to which I referred is issued by the Department of Agriculture in this State. It is a splendid work on the

subject of foot rot, and I recommend it to any person interested in the subject. It goes on to say:

Once the eradication plan is started, it is essential to make sure that no new infection is "bought" in.

Mr. Nankivell: It is a South Australian statement, and therefore much better than the one the member for Murray quoted.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, it is a South Australian statement by two of our senior veterinary officers. It continues:

All new sheep must be isolated until it is certain that they are free from the disease. Stud rams are a source of infection that is often overlooked. Every ram should be inspected thoroughly before joining. Each claw should be pared and feet dressed with formalin solution. All purchases should be foot bathed when they come on to the property even if purchased from a foot rot free property. This will kill any infection picked up in transport or on roads. If the property is divided and sheep must be moved along roads, any flock moved should be walked through a foot bath as it comes off the road. This avoids the danger from infected roads.

There is not the slightest doubt in the world that the Railways Department is concerned with the information given to it, obviously by our Department of Agriculture, that foot rot is infectious, and it takes precautions by saying that sheep men are not allowed to use the loading ramps but must go through this horrible business of pushing sheep into a rail truck from the side of a motor truck. If any member wants to know what that is like I suggest he try it. He will discover how much work is involved and how much it must hurt animals with infected feet.

What did Mr. Hall say to bring down the howl of hysteria on his head? He was speaking about approaching the Transport Control Board and Mr. Bywaters interjected and asked whether he went to see Mr. Holden, adding that he had always found him reasonable. Mr. Hall replied that he did not and Mr. Bywaters said that he had always found Mr. Holden most co-operative. Mr. Hall said, "We have always found him most unco-operative." So have I! He is unco-operative, but is that unjust criticism? If we are going to sit down and take everything that is handed to us without raising a voice we should stay home.

The winery I manage has a vehicle. We imported a piece of machinery worth £3,500 from Germany. It was in Adelaide having a pedestal attached to it, and I wanted to cart it to Clare on our own vehicle. However, that vehicle was about a foot too short, so I

applied to the Transport Control Board for permission to use another man's semi-trailer, but was refused.

Mr. Jenkins: The case was not treated on its merits?

Mr. QUIRKE: Of course not, but we fixed a couple of bearers on the back of our truck and made a false extension and used it. Why should we have been stopped from using another man's semi-trailer? Our machinery was a pneumatic press weighing about 3½ tons. The Railways Department would have done a good job in transporting that machine, but I did not want the department to do it. Of course, I only owned the machine, so could not be unduly considered! An owner has not much say in these matters. That machine would have been loaded by the Railways Department on to a vehicle, taken to Mile End, loaded on to a rail truck and sent to Clare where it would have been removed from the truck by crane, loaded on to another vehicle and then taken to where we had another crane ready to lift the machine through a roof 10ft. above the ground. What we wanted to do, and what was fully explained, was to put the machine on our vehicle, take it to Clare without all that unnecessary movement, and back the truck into position so that our hired crane would lift the machine into position. We did that. However, we were told we could not do that with the semi-trailer.

Can anyone say that the people in charge of determining these matters are exercising their authority to the benefit of this State? The Transport Control Board has outlived its usefulness and is like a barnacle on a ship's bottom. It is about time it was removed, and in its stead we should have a co-ordinated transport body. We need a co-ordinating body to co-ordinate all transport on a basis that will be fair to all concerned. Transport must have a measure of control, but it should not be controlled to force goods off the road on to our railways system irrespective of the trouble involved.

I know of an instance where three lots of lambs were to be taken from Hallett to the lower end of Yorke Peninsula. An application was made for road transport but it was refused. I approached the Transport Control Board but was refused too. Three persons were concerned and they each brought a truck-load of lambs into the railway station and loaded them into rail trucks and away the lambs went. But where? Down to Dry Creek! These lambs were intended for Yorketown.

They were marshalled, at Dry Creek and were despatched to Paskeville where they were loaded into road trucks and taken 60 miles down the peninsula. When the Transport Control Board does things like that it should not be immune from criticism. Nothing Mr. Hall said was in any way derogatory of the board's dignity. It was straight-out criticism for barefaced stupidity. Now have a go at me!

If any member believes that some outside authority should be criticized to make it work better, it is his job to do so. If he does not, then he is falling down on his job. Our immunity is not an immunity to enable the defamation of character. I would be the first to decry that, but nowhere in Mr. Hall's speech was there anything that could be classed as unfair. As he got such a hiding after he spoke I thought I should rise to help him because, like the Transport Control Board, he was no longer able to defend himself.

Mr. Lawn: Do you still persist in saying that the member for Gouger did not accuse the Leader of stopping men from working?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes.

Mr. Lawn: It is in my copy of *Hansard*.

Mr. QUIRKE: Would the honourable member look it up and give me the page number?

Mr. Lawn: Yes. I will give it to you later.

Mr. QUIRKE: Look it up now. I should like to examine it. If the member for Gouger accused the Leader of preventing men from working then I will apologize. It should not be difficult for the honourable member to give me the page. I will lend him my copy of *Hansard* and he can have a look at that.

Mr. Loveday: I will read it to you.

Mr. Lawn: Give it to him later.

Mr. QUIRKE: Can the honourable member tell me where it appears?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. McKee: We will read it to you directly.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am amazed that I cannot find it.

Mr. Nankivell: Neither can anyone else.

Mr. QUIRKE: Can honourable members show me it in *Hansard*? So far as I am concerned the member for Gouger never said that the Leader was preventing men from working. That is my statement, and it is a straight-out challenge.

Mr. Harding: What page does it appear on?

Mr. Lawn: We will tell you as soon as the member for Burra finishes. We will read it to you, if we are allowed to.

Mr. QUIRKE: I will let the honourable member read it.

Mr. Lawn: The Speaker won't allow me to read things.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you give the Committee a reference to it?

Mr. Lawn: We will tell you in our own time.

Mr. QUIRKE: It will come up again. That has been an interesting aside, but before I sit down I shall say something regarding the Budget. I am always intrigued by the Budget and to see how much we leave behind all the time. Page 23 of the Auditor-General's report refers to total liabilities and the public debt. If members look at that they will see that from 1952 to 1961 the debt has risen from £175,000,000 to £402,000,000 and the debt charges amount to £19,272,000, an increase of £1,111,000 for the 12 months. The total increase in our interest-bearing indebtedness is £129,500,000 over the last five years.

This is the Budget we are supposed to have balanced. There is a discrepancy here of about £3,000, but that does not matter. I have concluded that there is no such thing as a balanced Budget in the real sense of the term. Anybody can equate receipts and expenditure but, as for striking a true balance, that is impossible. Recently, in the Commonwealth sphere, a deficit of about £15,000,000 was proposed. In that way a deficit was budgeted for. Members know what budgeting for a deficit means—it is when money is obtained from outside sources, such as Treasury bills or something like that, money that is made for the purpose of meeting that deficiency.

Mr. Calwell (Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition) said, sometime ago, that he would budget for £100,000,000 deficit in his first Budget and, of course, he got the usual flogging for saying why he was going to budget for that deficit, but Sir Arthur Fadden did the same in 1958. There is nothing wrong about that.

Mr. Ralston: He is out with Hooker at the moment.

Mr. QUIRKE: If we have a deficit that does not represent a balanced Budget, but there are ways and means of making up the deficit and the Budget can soon be balanced. It is not really so important after all, but what is important is that the accounts of the State shall be well and truly kept and I think in this instance they are well kept. I am not one of

those who are likely to fall down in admiration of balanced budgets, because a balanced budget can mean unemployment. As there is unemployment today in this country budgeting for a deficit may be one means of combating it. If we cannot combat unemployment with what we have then we must have more money, so what is the use of a balanced Budget. That is the way I look at it. I could say much more than that about this Budget, but I do not intend to do so as other members wish to speak today.

Referring to the recent interjections, I think this is what the honourable member for Gouger is supposed to have said and, in case other members do not know where it is, it is on page 838 of *Hansard* on the Budget debate. The honourable member said:

I very much doubt the sincerity of a man who calls for full employment yet is closely associated with people who prevent men from working. Projects are standing idle because of illegal black bans.

Is that it?

Mr. McKee: Read further on.

Mr. QUIRKE: It continues:

We have seen press reports that pickets have been standing at the gates of the oil refinery at Port Stanvac. That sort of thing is illegal and a contravention of the Industrial Code. We have heard statements in this place and reports from elsewhere that these actions have been endorsed by the Opposition. We have good South Australians waiting to get on with the work but they are prevented from doing so. Prevented by whom? By people outside? All right! My first criticism stands: never was any such criticism uttered of the Leader of the Opposition that he was responsible for men not working.

Mr. McKee: That it was endorsed by him!

Mr. QUIRKE: He is a member of the Party. I have never heard anybody raise it and say that the pickets outside Port Stanvac should have been gaoled. That is what should have happened to them.

Mr. Ryan: You did not hear that said when a company locked men out.

Mr. QUIRKE: They should be gaoled too. This is not a one-way traffic.

Mr. Ryan: Not much!

Mr. QUIRKE: Nobody, not even the Opposition, has spoken more bitterly than I have of the actions of General Motors-Holden's. I will match my statement on its actions against the statement of any other member.

Mr. Loveday: Would you gao them?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, gao them too if they are culpable.

Mr. Loveday: You know there is no hope of that.

Mr. QUIRKE: There is no hope of the other one either. If there were any hope it is a pity they weren't gaoled. If there is no hope of gaoing them somebody is responsible for not gaoing them, because they should have been gaoled. There were people there and they had a proposition. Work was provided for them and they came and said, "Unless you agree to the terms we are laying down no-one will start."

Mr. Fred Walsh: They didn't say anything of the kind. They wanted a conference.

Mr. QUIRKE: Those were the terms.

Mr. Fred Walsh: They didn't say that, if they laid down terms, they would not accept any others.

Mr. QUIRKE: When a conference was not forthcoming what did they do? They picketed the gates and kept people from going through.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The men, themselves, determined that they would not work.

Mr. QUIRKE: The men did not determine anything of the sort.

Mr. Fred Walsh: They had a meeting and determined it.

Mr. QUIRKE: How many men were at the meeting? How many trades representing men working at Port Stanvac and how many men said whether they would work there at all? They were told that they were not to work.

Mr. Jenkins: If the men didn't want to work, pickets wouldn't have been needed.

Mr. QUIRKE: If the men ever agreed not to work, what was the use of the pickets?

Mr. Jenkins: The men were actually turned away.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. Tonight's *News* reports that General Motors-Holden's is now going to reconsider the position to decide whether it will pay the wages of the men who were put off.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't that a lock-out?

Mr. QUIRKE: No; but, if it does pay the men, great will be the wailing at the wall for the loss of an argument that if it pays the men it should have made provision to keep them. The company had enough motor cars and did not want more. It was going to put some employees off for a few weeks to delay progress and that should be paid for out of its profits. I said that before and I say it again now, and on that I spoke in stronger terms than any other member, in

Opposition or otherwise. It is not a one-sided matter. Employers have no more right to do that sort of thing than these people had to picket the gate and stop people who wanted to work from doing so.

Mr. Ryan: You are criticizing people who stand up for their rights.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not: I am criticizing people who prevent others from getting their rights—and in this case the rights were their desire to work. The right and proper thing to do was gaoil these pickets.

Mr. Ryan: We will get you a job in the Arbitration Court.

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member would not get anyone better; I would be able to adjudicate even on propositions he put up. It is evident that progress in this country is being delayed because there is not enough preparedness on either side to get together on these matters. I have always advocated this, as it is the only answer. The responsibility is on both sides. The employer is not a blameless angel by any means.

Mr. Ryan: You are coming around to our way of thinking now.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have always thought that. When I criticize one side for doing something wrong I always consider whether the other side is doing wrong, and deal with the matter to the best of my ability. We heard a lengthy oration regarding petrol from the member for Mount Gambier, who spoke about the villainous oil companies and what they were doing in South Australia.

Mr. Ralston: They should be gaoled.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

Mr. QUIRKE: I obtained from the Prices Commissioner the retail prices of petrol in every capital city in Australia and found that the price in Adelaide was the lowest.

Mr. Ralston: Cheaper wholesale price?

Mr. QUIRKE: I obtained the retail prices because they were the only things that concerned the consumer. For premium petrol the prices are: Melbourne, 3s. 8d.; Sydney, 3s. 8d.; Brisbane, 3s. 7½d.; Perth, 3s. 8d.; Hobart, 3s. 9d.; and Adelaide, 3s. 8d. For standard petrol the prices are: Melbourne, 3s. 4½d.; Sydney, 3s. 4½d.; Brisbane, 3s. 4½d.; Perth, 3s. 4½d.; Hobart, 3s. 5½d.; and Adelaide, 3s. 3d. What is all this fulminating about? This is standard petrol.

Mr. Ralston: What about the wholesale price?

Mr. QUIRKE: I am concerned not with the wholesale price but with the price I pay. I asked by way of interjection what was the difference in the retail prices of petrol in the capital cities.

Mr. Ralston: Tell us the wholesale price.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not know. I asked the honourable member to give the retail prices of petrol in the respective capital cities, and he said he did not know.

Mr. Ralston: I said that was a matter between the State Governments and the resellers.

Mr. QUIRKE: Had the honourable member known he would have been quick to tell me.

Mr. Ralston: The wholesale price is material to the argument.

Mr. QUIRKE: What is material to me is how much the dummy who pays for everything has to pay for his petrol. It does not matter what happens in between; it is what the consumer pays that counts. If the honourable member can show something that will bring the price down, that is all right by me. I am not concerned with how things are messed around between the provider and the wholesaler. What concerns me is what I pay—and I pay less than people in any other capital city, which is fair enough. With these few remarks of disapproval and approval I support the first line.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): This is the third occasion on which I have listened to a Budget debate with great interest. It seems to me that it is a great opportunity for members opposite to sing the praises of the Treasurer. Perhaps the time of the year has some effect on them, as springtime is supposed to be the romantic time of the year, and we have most certainly been subjected to some heavy romancing from members opposite. Once again we have arrived at one of the most important functions of any Parliament, which is, of course, the presentation of its Budget. As I have previously said, the Budget creates wide interest among people in all walks of life throughout the State, particularly the unemployed. They are hoping that this Budget will provide them with some employment and enable them to provide adequately for their families. Little can be said in favour of the Commonwealth Budget, as it is doubtful whether it is likely to stimulate the economy to any great extent.

The sum allocated to Port Pirie looks good on paper and, provided that it does not disappear like the amount allocated for the

removal of the railway lines in Ellen Street and that this work is carried out as promised, it would appear that Port Pirie can look forward to a year of full employment that will no doubt benefit all sections of the community. With wharf rehabilitation, dredging, the construction of the bulk-handling terminal, and the construction of the new primary and technical schools, there is every indication of plenty of activity. This appears to be good, and it gives one the impression that Port Pirie is going ahead. While all this modernizing process is being carried out the future of Port Pirie for the next 12 months seems to be reasonably bright, but what concerns the people of that town and myself is what will happen when this modernizing is completed. I should like to see further ahead than 12 months, and no doubt that is the desire of the business community and people of Port Pirie, particularly the waterside workers (who will no doubt be affected by the bulk handling terminal) and those employed by the South Australian Wheat Board. The future of the uranium industry looks rather uncertain at present. It is generally recognized that with a work force of an area or a State in full employment, a sound economy is assured. I know that all honourable members on this side will agree that that is so. When the Treasurer introduced his Budget last September he said:

This, my 22nd Budget, I put before the House with a greater sense of confidence in the strength of the State finances and the assurance of progress in the State's economy than ever before.

He said that we had entered the year 1960-61 with seasonal conditions and outlook as good as ever we had known them. He forecast that as the year progressed work activity and employment would reach peak level, and his remarks were proudly supported by honourable members opposite. It was going to break all records, but six months after the Treasurer introduced this very prosperous Budget, which he claimed to be the champion Budget of 22 efforts, the Budget that was going to give jobs and full security, all at once something happened and the wheel of the prosperity waggon collapsed. Within a few short weeks we had thousands of unemployed people in this State. I shall not blame the South Australian Treasurer entirely for the credit squeeze. His big chief, Mr. Menzies, and his advisers must take full honours for inflicting that disaster on Australia; unless of course our Treasurer offered his advice to the Prime Minister at any time, and that would automatically put him in the picture as well.

I say that the Treasurer could have relieved the unemployment position by putting more money into public works. There are plenty of council and State projects that could have been proceeded with straightaway. Had grants been made available to councils, work could have been found for thousands of workers, and very necessary work too, such as kerbing and road-making. There are some Housing Trust areas, established for 10 years or more, that have not roads or footpaths yet. In the winter the people plough about ankle-deep in mud and in the summer they are practically suffocated with dust. Therefore, I think that money should have been allocated much sooner to offset the unemployment position. Unemployment is a matter that concerns not only those who are unemployed, but also those who are employed. We shall soon be losing our standard of living to the extent of the loss of the workless; therefore, I believe it is the concern of the whole community, and particularly of the Government.

The Treasurer said during the Address-in-Reply debate that the unemployment we unfortunately have in our State was serious. I agree with him that it is serious. He also said that if steps were not taken to deal with it, it could easily resolve itself into a hard core of unemployment; and he went on to say that when people become unemployed through the credit squeeze the tradesmen are picked out and the unskilled workers are left in the unemployment office. It is not only the credit squeeze that is responsible for leaving the unskilled in the unemployment office, for we also have automation, which is making its presence felt. I am not opposed to automation; improved mechanization is progress, but it can hardly be termed progress if it is allowed to put people out of work. We are reaching the stage where we have machine versus man. We already have many young South Australians who left school last December and have not yet secured work, and in a few short months we shall have thousands more joining in the annual job hunt. I think that every honourable member will agree that this no doubt is causing great concern among many parents and ambitious youths.

If the Government and responsible authorities are concerned about juvenile delinquency, of which we heard something this afternoon, they should see that the industrial society is regulated to accommodate its oncoming young men and young women in productive and useful employment, for which the community has been training them for the last 10 or 12 years.

It is true that automation has been creeping into our lives for many years, but over the last few years it has really been stepped up. One only has to watch a bulldozer, a grader or excavator at work on all kinds of construction, and then it is not difficult to visualize the number of semi-skilled and unskilled workers whose services are no longer required on these types of projects. The same position is to be found through-out practically every industry, and I believe it should be the responsibility and the first duty of all Governments to insist that the welfare of any displaced person should be safeguarded, even if it means a charge on the wealthy companies that are experimenting with automation; and if any company that increases its production and profits by the benefit of automation at the same time retrenches its employees, steps should be taken immediately to deal with it, because it is definitely exploiting the people. I believe that the Government should be strong enough to say to these people that they are doing the wrong thing by exploiting their workers.

I presume that most people will agree that the only solution to this problem is a shorter working week—and it must come—so that those who are displaced through automation may be employed in other work. We should begin with the assumption that every man has both the right and the obligation to work, and so contribute to the nation's wealth. We cannot afford to carry passengers, either because of their wealth or their inability to find work. The Commonwealth Government should pay unemployed persons a reasonable wage and put them to work. We all know that Australia is crying out to be developed. The nation is spending millions on social services for which it sees no benefit whatever and no returns. Its money is just poured down the drain, whereas further constructive work could be performed. Once the unemployed people were put to work the demand caused by their spending power would tend to create more natural jobs, and this would seem the most commonsense approach to the unemployment position; but the Commonwealth Government has done nothing, not because of the cost of putting the men to work, but because it represents the employers. The truth is that capitalism, in order to function, has to maintain a surplus of labour.

Earlier, we heard the member for Burra, Mr. Quirke, defending his friend from Gouger, Mr. Hall. When he was speaking in this debate Mr. Hall said that our Leader was closely associated with people who prevented men from

working. I cannot recall having heard such a ridiculous statement before. The Labor Party is not only closely associated with the trade union movement but is part of that great organization. We belong to it, we come from it, and we represent everybody that belongs to it. It is our duty to maintain the conditions for which our forefathers and fathers died, right from the days of the Eureka Stockade. I remind the honourable member that thousands of young Australians died in two world wars fighting to maintain conditions won by their forefathers and fathers, so that we, including the honourable member, might live in a free world. Earlier this session the honourable member said he was not anti-union because he was a member of a union that operated for the benefit of all who joined it.

Mr. Lawn: What was the union?

Mr. McKEE: A union of woolgrowers, probably. He said it was a union to protect his interests. Having said that, I cannot see how he can accuse our Leader of preventing men from working when they are fighting to maintain benefits, which he claims was the purpose of his joining a union. Although he says he is covered by a union, the men who work for him cannot be covered by a union, for there is no union for rural workers. The honourable member supports a Government that will not allow rural workers to be covered by an award. If he thinks that the Labor Party will stand idly by and allow the wealthy oil companies to come to South Australia and exploit the labour of our Australian brothers, by taking advantage of the credit squeeze brought about by an irresponsible Government which he supports, he has another think coming. The member for Mount Gambier pointed out that the oil companies have been allowed to get away in South Australia with outright robbery in the matter of differential petrol prices. Every member representing districts where these differential prices operate should strongly protest against the outrageous exploitation.

Finally, the Government should consider carrying on the uranium industry in this State in an attempt to offset the unemployment that is likely to follow the introduction of the bulk handling system of grain at Port Pirie.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): In this debate we have heard a lot about economic crises, credit squeezes and unemployment, so it is refreshing and stimulating for me to study the Estimates brought down by the Treasurer recently. When we remember that over the

years the South Australian Government has been able to produce such a satisfactory state of affairs the people of this State must count themselves fortunate indeed that they live under conditions that are the envy of all other States. Where else could we find such a record of achievement based on sound planning, vision, and a proper use of the resources of the State? Without doubt we enjoy economic stability with security for all who are prepared to work and show initiative and enterprise. We have industrial harmony that has attracted to South Australia people who seek employment and people who want to invest capital in establishing industries. It is difficult to reconcile the Opposition's professed concern about unemployment with the Labor Party's support of a claim (made by the trades union movement) for an extravagant and unwarranted allowance to men employed at the new oil refinery, mainly on the ground that this type of industrial blackmail had been applied to contractors undertaking similar work in some other States.

Mr. Ryan: Remember the credit squeeze.

Mrs. STEELE: We have heard our Treasurer explain that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has been exceeding its monthly allocations of money in order to provide work for men from other industries. We also know that the Electricity Trust is pressing on with development in the South-East, again with the idea of absorbing men at present out of work.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Where will they come from?

Mrs. STEELE: We all know we have unemployed people in South Australia. We were prepared to accept the published figure when it was high, so surely we can now accept the figure when there is an improvement.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Where will we get the men for the South-East power line?

Mrs. STEELE: Men will be employed in extending power lines.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Where will the labour come from—this State or another State?

Mrs. STEELE: This State, and I should have thought that was elementary. The people of South Australia will show what they think of the stable administration provided for them when they return the present Government for a further term of office at the polls in March of next year. I want to speak mainly about two items, libraries and library staffs, and the provision of hostels in the country for children attending area and high schools. From time

to time I visit country areas to address meetings and to attend functions, and almost without exception I am asked whether I can do anything to influence the Government to consider the establishment of hostels in country centres to which students are attracted to take advantage of the secondary education provided there.

It is generally accepted that this is a field which the Government is not anxious to enter. Nevertheless, in the light of the tremendous development that has taken place in South Australia, the growth in our population, and the consequent increase in the numbers of children enrolled at all schools, both urban and rural, country parents desire to keep their children as near as possible to home whilst taking advantage of the comprehensive courses offered at area or high schools. They want to take advantage of the opportunities provided for country children with the ability to avail themselves of the progress towards tertiary education, and to have the same chances as city children to enter the professions. They want to keep their children in the country, and we must not forget that primary production is still the mainspring of this State. Those young people, although taking every advantage of all education provided, still want to make the land their way of life.

This matter has crystallized in a case being presented by a number of interested organizations, including the Country Women's Association, the Public Schools Committees Association and the School Welfare Clubs Association. All these organizations are vitally concerned in the matter. A questionnaire instituted in consequence of resolutions passed by the Parent-Teacher Council and the South Australian Institute of Teachers elicited much valuable information. It was circulated amongst all metropolitan hostels, the teachers' colleges, 23 private schools, 40 metropolitan and country high schools, 17 metropolitan technical high schools, 13 area schools, eight higher primary schools and 96 branches of the Country Women's Association. The survey established, among other things, that the introduction of Leaving and Leaving Honours courses at a number of country schools had attracted a number of students but had posed its own problem of accommodation to enable them to avail themselves of these courses. School transport has had much the same effect because children who would otherwise have become boarders at metropolitan schools now stay in the country, but in many instances

are still at a disadvantage because the distance required to be travelled thus reduces the time available for study. Again, the problem would be further aggravated if the school leaving age were raised, and already the Minister in answer to a question in Parliament recently said there was a noticeable trend towards later school leaving.

I will use one particular area to indicate the typical situation which could arise and is arising in other parts of the State. I refer to the position at Cleve, for at this centre there has been a definite move made for the establishment of a student hostel, and a great deal of detailed information has been gathered in support of such a hostel. The Country Women's Association has taken a leading part in this move because of resolutions moved by a number of branches at their annual conferences over a number of years. Last year members of the C.W.A. branches at Cleve, Darke Peak, Arno Bay and Wharmina formed a District Committee consisting of representatives of those branches and including the Chairman of the District Council and a former Chairman, and this followed a public meeting at Cleve which strongly supported the need for a hostel at that town. I should like to give the House some of the facts which have emerged as the result of the work undertaken by that committee and which supports the need for a hostel there—and similar information would no doubt apply also to other centres.

At Cleve board for students, teachers and young people generally is most difficult to obtain. The area school is to have a Leaving class and also an agricultural class. These added opportunities for secondary education will be lost to many boys and girls unless board is available. As I mentioned before, many parents cannot afford to send their children to Adelaide and some will not send them so far away from home. This in fact applies to the whole of Eyre Peninsula—many children are not receiving secondary education because board is unavailable in centres where there is a high school. Port Lincoln hostel is booked up more than two years ahead. As a matter of interest, I understand that the young boy lost in the *Lincoln Star* tragedy was away from school only because board could not be found for him to attend a secondary school on Eyre Peninsula. A hostel for students in Cleve would automatically make private board available for more teachers—and the school can take more teachers. Young people quite literally go around from door to door looking for board. Some have bed and breakfast only—and other

meals at a cafe! Teenage girls have to share a double bed. This is the position at Lock, 50 miles west of Cleve. Several children are boarding at Arno Bay, 20 miles south of Cleve, in order to get secondary schooling. This was the nearest available board after weeks of advertising in the local paper. Three girls from Darke Peak are in Cleve, two having tried unsuccessfully to obtain accommodation at the Port Lincoln hostel. One of these lives in a caravan with her older sister, another lives at great inconvenience with her married sister who has four young children, and the third one lives with friends on the school bus route. Five Darke Peak children are at school in Adelaide (two having just got in). Two are not going on to secondary education—one whose parents cannot afford to send the child away and the second whose parents do not want to send the child away from home. Another boy is living with his sister's fiance's mother at Bridgewater so that he can attend school at Mount Barker and next year the picture looks even grimmer when there will be 14 children in Darke Peak ready for secondary education.

At Wharmina three children boarding in Adelaide and attending school there would return home if board was available at Cleve. Another child is boarding at Arno Bay to attend Cleve and travels 20 miles each way daily by school bus; yet another is doing grade 8 at Wharmina as no board is available in Cleve. In most cases grade 8 is quite unsatisfactory as the children have to be largely left to do their own work with little supervision, which usually results in lack of interest and the children are often allowed to leave school half-way through the year. I could go on giving further instances but feel that what I have said already will, Mr. Chairman, give honourable members the general picture.

Now, in order to make a practical contribution to the solution of this increasing need, the Cleve hostel committee waited on the Minister of Education and requested that the Government give consideration to the building of a student hostel at Cleve, and the members of the local C.W.A. offered, if that was done, to furnish and administer it through the local committee: that is, they would furnish, staff and run the hostel and accept the necessary financial responsibility involved, the building to be owned and kept in repair by the Government. The members of the deputation felt that the Minister gave sympathetic consideration to their request, but subsequently Cabinet decided it could not, at present, undertake the

building of the hostel. I understand that some time ago a deputation from the Public Schools Association also waited on the Minister to discuss the subject of hostels, and more recently still a more widely representative deputation also saw him.

Mr. Chairman, a similar position prevails in some other States of the Commonwealth, and in at least two of them (Western Australia and Queensland) a happy compromise has been reached between the State Governments and the C.W.A. along exactly the same lines as the State association has suggested here. I should like to give honourable members some information about these schemes and will take the W.A. position first because it most closely conforms to the South Australian proposition. In 1960 an Act of Parliament was passed which provided for the establishment of a Country High School Hostels Authority. Before this was set up the Government purchased buildings for schools hostels, four of which are administered by the C.W.A. The Government has provided the buildings and furnishings and the administration of the hostel is left entirely to the C.W.A. A committee is appointed annually. In each hostel for girls there is a matron, cook and other necessary domestic staff. A mistress from the high school is given free board in return for supervising "prep". In each of the boys hostels there is a matron, and two masters from the high school, who are given free board in return for supervision of "prep". At Northam hostel, 41 girls are accommodated at a cost of £3 a week. At Bunbury hostel 58 boys are accommodated at £2 10s. a week plus 3s. 6d. a week Government subsidy. These are 1959 figures so the charges could well have risen a little since then.

In Queensland 17 student hostels (16 in country areas) are administered by the C.W.A. There boys and girls are accommodated in the same hostels which are usually built with accommodation for boys at one end and girls at the other, and with the matron's or superintendent's quarters in the centre. Three of these hostels were established by shire councils, who own the buildings, but the C.W.A. administers them and they pay their way from board received from the students. Of the other hostels, a number were built by the C.W.A. with a 50 per cent subsidy from the Government on a pound for pound basis.

The charges at a typical hostel, where there were 84 students, were £2 15s. a week, but again, as these were 1959 figures, there could have been some slight increase recently. In South Australia, the average board charged

to students in hostels away from home is about £4 15s. In private homes it varies between £4 and £4 10s., whereas in Queensland and Western Australia, where the satisfactory arrangements between the C.W.A. and the State Governments apply, the charges average only about £2 15s. a week. I feel that an important consideration is the moral well-being of students, and this demands closer supervision of students than is normally provided by the proprietor of a boarding house. There is widespread evidence of shared sleeping accommodation and dormitories in both hostels and boarding houses, and this, as I am sure members will agree, is highly undesirable. Study facilities in both hostels and boarding houses are few, and more often than not quite non-existent, and an expensive educational system should provide all reasonable means to enable students to derive the maximum benefit from it. Teachers can be found who would act in the capacity of residential housemistresses or housemasters in charge of hostels in country areas, because many teachers are themselves having great difficulty in finding accommodation, and providing them with accommodation in return for these services in this direction would solve both of these problems.

I know it is very easy to put forward schemes which involve Government expenditure, and I am reluctant to do so, especially at the present time when we know the current temporary economic difficulties which concern the Government, but if our country students are to take advantage of the excellent and comprehensive educational system being developed year by year in South Australia, we must face up to this acutely growing problem of providing the necessary accommodation for students attending our country high and area schools. I do not think we are living up to our responsibilities as members if (with the co-operation and help of country people who, in making the offer they have done have shown that they are prepared to go to great lengths to help themselves and, more importantly, their children) we do not concern ourselves with this growing need. I ask the Government to give sympathetic consideration to this problem.

The other problem is the situation confronting libraries and librarians in South Australia. At a time when the demand for public libraries is growing in communities all over the State, and when provision is being made for libraries in the many fine new schools being built, it is alarming that the number of trained librarians is decreasing. I believe that

television is increasing the urge of many people to have a wider general knowledge on a great range of subjects, and that the reading habit has been stimulated by this modern wonder. In fact, it is interesting, in passing, to note that the effect of television in England for two years after its introduction there was that subscriptions to all kinds of libraries had suffered a serious decline, and its effect was also felt in the book publishing industry. However, after that period the pendulum swung in the other direction and there was a great revival in both the number of subscribers and the number of books published. At the same time, the demand for a different type of literature emerged, and we have seen evidence of that in the great popularity of the cheaper editions of the classics, great biographies, and travel books, as well as technical and academic text books in an amazing variety of subjects. It was not quite the same in Australia, as our libraries were not so plentiful, and apart from the small type of library, which did not cater in the main for people of discriminating taste in reading, public libraries with limited resources could afford to buy only the better type of book. For this reason, the impact of television here was felt less in its initial stages in this direction, and library statistics now show that the demand for all types of books is steadily growing. In fact, the Principal Librarian at the Public Library recently wrote to all television stations asking to be advised in advance of projected serials for young children, as there was a three months' waiting list at the children's library for books which were being presented in serial form on television.

This is the background against which we must review the present grave shortage of librarians, both professional and under training. What are the training facilities available in South Australia? The only training system is at the Public Library, and whereas it used to be available to all who were desirous of studying librarianship it is now restricted to staffs of the Public Library and local public libraries, and it is felt even then that it is not adequate in the subjects it covers and that there are large areas of librarianship not covered. This is because since 1959 there has been no staff training officer and lectures are undertaken—in addition to their other duties as heads of sections, etc.—by senior officers. This restriction has meant that for librarians employed in companies and in Commonwealth Government departments, and the librarians

who should be employed in schools, no training is available. After surveying the whole situation, certain recommendations have been made to the Libraries Board by the South Australian Branch of the Libraries Association of Australia, to which our library here belongs, and the board is well aware of the need for a library school here similar to those conducted elsewhere in Australia. This library association enjoys a very high reputation abroad and has reciprocity with countries overseas, and it is interesting to note that the examinations conducted by the association are considered by the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization as being equal to those conducted by the five most advanced countries in the field of library education. Lack of training facilities is only one factor contributing to the general malaise in the service, and it is complementary to the second one to which I now want to draw the attention of members.

The Chairman of the Libraries Board has made several statements publicly supporting the necessity for a review of the whole range of salaries paid to professional librarians, librarians in training and allied staff, stressing that until we do pay salaries on a par with other States we will continue to lose our trained people and will not attract young people to the profession, which is so necessary with such growing demand for library facilities. In fact, it has been said that South Australia's chief export is trained people, brains and ability, and this comment is applicable not only to the library field. The Minister of Education himself, when opening the annual conference of the Institutes Association of South Australia last week, said:

It is a matter of concern that in South Australia we are losing to other States the services of so many of our comparatively few trained librarians because of the more highly paid positions, better conditions, and more avenues of promotion offering elsewhere. In addition to the competition from other libraries, outside institutions are realizing the value of trained librarians. Surely, if these librarians are of such value in these more limited spheres, they must be of even more value to the State itself, where they serve all sections of the public.

Our professional staffs are of high calibre, but the salaries paid are not comparable with those paid in other States and by other universities. A comparison is revealing and I think that members of this Committee, who, in these Estimates, are considering the vote to the Public Library, should know these relevant facts. Take, for instance, the Principal

Librarian who holds a position of great responsibility in administering and controlling an organization which includes the State Public Library, the central agency for local public libraries and the functions of a metropolitan public library, the Archives and a photostat service: in fact, more services than any other library in Australia. He receives a salary of £2,850 compared with £3,572 in New South Wales, £3,341 in Victoria, £3,290 in Queensland, £3,938 in Western Australia, whilst the Principal Librarian at the National Library in Canberra receives £4,400—£1,550 more than Mr. Brideson.

Recently the position of Deputy Librarian at the National Library was advertised at a salary of £3,783 which, in simple arithmetic, is £933 more than our Principal Librarian receives. Comparative figures for the Assistant Principal Librarian show that here the salary is £2,450, whilst in Victoria it is £2,666, in Queensland £2,300, in Western Australia £2,956, in the National Library £3,780, with New South Wales also paying less, namely, £2,400. Senior sectional heads in South Australia receive £2,050 compared with £2,180 in New South Wales and £2,261 in Victoria. There are no similar posts in Queensland, Western Australia and in the National Library. The post of Chief Cataloguer carries a salary of £1,920 here which, with the exception of Queensland where the post carries a salary of only £1,800, is below that in New South Wales, £2,180, Victoria £1,991 and Western Australia £2,642. I am giving these figures because I believe that members should appreciate the disparity in salaries paid here and in other States.

Mr. Loveday: They should get the same salaries as their counterparts in other States.

Mrs. STEELE: We are going to lose our librarians if they don't.

Mr. Clark: Could you say why the salaries are so low in South Australia?

Mrs. STEELE: No, unless they are compared with positions of administrative officers in the Public Service. Heads of specific sections in South Australia receive £1,920 compared with £1,950 in New South Wales, £1,991 in Victoria, £2,428 in Western Australia and £2,200 at the National Library. A graduate library assistant with registration certificate receives a salary of £1,280 in South Australia compared with £1,560 in New South Wales, £1,580 in Queensland and £1,920 in Western Australia. To obtain this recognized qualification a prospective librarian has to matriculate (as everyone is expected to take a degree), and undertake three years of tertiary education

plus specialization in all branches of library work—archives, cataloguing, work with children in school or public libraries, administration, processes and services of general reference libraries, general lending libraries and a host of other specific subjects, at the same time gaining experience and/or training in librarianship.

The Chief Photographer of the Public Library, whose excellent work is known far beyond the borders of this State, receives a salary of £1,061, and it is interesting to note that a fourth-year cadet photographer under the Australian Journalists Association scale receives £1,080 6s. Let us now examine the salaries paid to principal librarians at some universities. In Adelaide the salary is £4,000, and compared with the Public Library it is a small library that provides but a few of the services available at the Public Library. Monash University and the University of Western Australia pay £4,000 per annum and the Australian National University and the University of New South Wales pay £4,250—all equivalent to professional salaries. Is it any wonder that we are losing librarians right and left? Of course it isn't! What encouragement is there for young people to take up the profession, and how can they afford to stay in South Australia when conditions and salaries are so much better and more tempting elsewhere?

I have, as members know, asked many questions regarding the appointment of a Supervisor of School Libraries and the Minister, in reply, has expressed his concern that this important and responsible post has for so long been vacant. He said recently that when the position was last advertised there had been a suitable applicant from Western Australia, but he withdrew his application when a similar position was created there for which he had the qualifications. I might add that the salary range was from £2,190 to £2,410. But what was the salary range here? For a male it was from £1,590 to £1,780 and for a female from £1,415 to £1,605.

Mr. Fred Walsh: That is what we are always saying: South Australia is a low-wage State.

Mrs. STEELE: What has been the effect of these higher salaries being paid elsewhere than in the South Australian Public Library? Let me quote from the annual report of the Libraries Board for 1959-60 which draws attention to the difficulties confronting the Public Library. It states:

The year has been marked by severe staff difficulties. There has been a further progression towards youthfulness, inexperience and lack of qualifications. During the year there was a 27 per cent turnover of the staff with the loss of 40 staff members. Twenty-nine per cent of the staff who had passed the Preliminary Certificate of the Library Association of Australia resigned during the year and 24 per cent of those with the Registration Certificate.

While the board realizes that staffing is not its direct responsibility, it must draw attention to the impossibility of carrying out its policies without qualified librarians. The chief reason for the heavy losses is that the Public Library is in direct competition for staff with other libraries, particularly those of the universities. The board believes that the members of the staff of the Libraries Department should receive salaries in line with those of similar positions in the universities. Unless this is done the exodus from this State will continue and the board fears that it will be forced to curtail its services to the public.

The board would also point out that, while it does not provide staff for libraries subsidized under the Libraries (Subsidies) Act, it does have an obligation to see that local public libraries are under the direction of qualified librarians. Without trained staff much of the value of the public libraries would be lost and the money spent by the Government on subsidies would not be utilized to the best advantage. As yet there is no school for librarians in this State and the only source of librarians is the Public Library of South Australia. With the Public Library's staff becoming so gravely depleted the time is rapidly approaching when the board will not be able to insist on the appointment of trained librarians.

It is believed that one of the difficulties in raising the salaries of librarians in the Public Library of South Australia is that they are compared with other clerical and administrative positions in the Public Service. The board is of the opinion that it should not be impossible to remove the professional staff of the Libraries Department from these comparisons as has been done for the professional officers of some other research establishments in the State service.

Mr. Clark: In other words, we have to convince the Public Service Board?

Mrs. STEELE: Yes. I have further figures. In 1958-59 the Public Library lost 21 of its professional staff, who left to go to other and better paid posts. In 1959-60 the figure grew to 28 and in 1960-61 to 31. In July and August of this year seven left, and on that basis 42 could be lost to the service before June 30, 1962. It is estimated that at present the Public Library is losing one-third of its trained staff each year. A further revealing survey, made during the current year, into the percentages of professional staffs holding degrees and employed at public libraries

throughout Australia shows South Australia to occupy the most unfavourable position. Whereas here only 10 per cent of the staff of the Public Library possess degrees the percentages in other States are as follows: Western Australia, 40 per cent; Queensland, 51 per cent; New South Wales, 54 per cent; Victoria, 50 per cent; Tasmania, 20 per cent; and National Library, Canberra, 83 per cent. All these facts that I have quoted add up to a serious position in South Australia. It is not just a question of pounds, shillings and pence and justice to loyal library staffs: it is a matter of grave concern that we are losing the services of librarians trained by our own Public Library which, I may say, has a reputation second to none, despite all these factors that I have quoted, to the library services of other States and universities, and to business organizations who are profiting at South Australia's expense. I think it is only right and proper that we, as members of this Parliament, should be aware of the alarming state of affairs, which has been developing for a number of years in this branch of the Public Service, and the trend must be arrested before it is too late. I have much pleasure in supporting the first line.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I, too, rise to support the first line of the Estimates, but first I wish to comment briefly on statements already made in this debate. I was most impressed with the standard of this debate although much was said with which I could not possibly agree. Much of the comment has been constructive and interesting. I was particularly interested in the remarks of the member for Burnside. Unfortunately I was denied the opportunity of hearing the first part of the honourable member's speech because I was called out on an urgent matter, but I was interested in her remarks about libraries and the salaries paid to our librarians or, should I say, not paid to our librarians, because this is a matter which is close to my heart. I have always been most interested in our libraries and our library services and agree wholeheartedly with the remarks made this afternoon by the honourable member for Burnside.

Mr. Millhouse: What should be done about it?

Mr. CLARK: I think the honourable member who has just interjected did so more in a kindly and inquiring manner than in any critical manner. I hope he did, anyhow, because I know he would be interested in this problem.

It has seemed to me, and I have discussed this with our own Parliamentary Librarian and with other librarians I know, that throughout the general run of librarians in this State there is grave concern over certain things that are happening. As the honourable member said, librarians are not getting an opportunity to be trained and, if they are trained, they are not getting the inducement to remain librarians in South Australia because the salaries offering here are not adequate. In these days young people, say girls of 15 or 16, even if they have obtained only the Intermediate certificate, have avenues open to them for earning salaries that most of us who are members of Parliament did not manage to obtain even when we were married. I know that to a great extent that is caused by the inflation which we have experienced, but librarians' salaries, obviously, are ridiculously low compared with those in other States.

The honourable member has shown us that, and yet it seems that in the last few months it has been almost impossible to convince the Public Service Board that these salaries should be increased. Quite frankly I believe that the board must be made to realize that the situation is serious, and it appears that the Government will have to do something to try to convince the board of that. Most honourable members would agree with me when I say that one of the most worthwhile habits anybody can have is the habit of reading. There is much that we can learn from reading and, probably more important, there is so much entertainment that can be obtained from reading books. I have never been one who has maintained that it is best to read certain literature and that other matter is rubbish. I was a teacher for many years and I never made any attempt to restrict the scope of reading of the boys and girls I taught, for I believed that if they read anything at all it was better than reading nothing. I remember, as a young teacher, that we had a headmaster who encouraged the boys and girls to bring comics to school. They were not the type of comic we see today which, strictly speaking, have nothing funny about them at all. The only thing about them that is funny is the exaggerated stories they tell. I am going back about 30 years to the type of stuff the member for Enfield mentioned. They were in the main English comics with bright, coloured pictures and stories that really were funny. They did not feature space travel, trips to the moon, or supermen with phenomenal powers that enabled them to fly through walls or over

buildings, as many comics do today. The old comics were really funny, and the headmaster I mentioned felt that provided the boys and girls read something it was better than their reading nothing at all. I suppose some of the young people he encouraged in his schools to read have grown up to be men and women who have learned to discriminate between the stuff that is worthwhile reading and that which is not.

I agree on this matter with the member for Burnside, and it is nice occasionally to find oneself in agreement with someone on the Government benches. It would improve our library services if the suggestions she so carefully enumerated were adopted, particularly in regard to salaries. We must have an opportunity of producing men and women who are fully qualified for the job of librarian. Honourable members have only to stop and think of the value of our Parliamentary library to members in this place. This afternoon I went to the librarian, having a vague recollection of something I had heard over the Australian Broadcasting Commission in a news item a week or two ago. This matter had been discussed in the Commonwealth Parliament. I did not know whether it was in the Budget debate or on the adjournment of a debate, but I set out to find it. The library staff set to work and within half an hour they dug up the information I wanted. There was only one snag about it: when the information was found I saw that the speaker opposed what I supported, so it would not have helped my argument. However, that is one example of how an efficient librarian can help.

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

Mr. CLARK: During the adjournment I was reminded of some remarks made on April 10 of this year at the official opening of the Burnside public library. The remarks that particularly interested me were those made by the present chairman of the Libraries Board (Mr. McFarling), who said:

The growth of libraries, not only in South Australia and other States but in the large industrial and research establishments, had caused a shortage of skilled librarians. South Australia had become a plundering ground for libraries in other States, which could and did offer higher rates of pay. Since July 1 last year 25 highly trained members of the Public Library Staff and seven juniors, representing 25 per cent, had been lost.

That is a serious situation, and I am reminded that soon after the statement was made the member for Hindmarsh asked a question of the

Treasurer, and I shall quote a few sentences of the reply which are strictly relevant to the question. The Treasurer said:

There has been in South Australia, and in Australia as a whole, a fairly big expansion—I believe a good expansion—of library services, and for the time being at least there is an Australian shortage of trained librarians. On the other hand, those things are apt to cure themselves. I am informed that many people are now coming into training in this field, so although we are embarrassed at present I believe that the current training will help solve the problem in due course.

I find, particularly after the factual remarks made by the member for Burnside, that I cannot agree with what the Treasurer said. First, he said that these things were apt to cure themselves, but I do not see how this can happen in South Australia. Secondly, he said many people were coming into training in this field, but I do not know where. It is certainly not so in South Australia because, although for a considerable time a librarian training scheme was attached to the Public Library, that scheme no longer exists. I was told last week that at least four senior officers of the Public Library had recently received letters from other States offering them much more lucrative positions than they had in South Australia, so it can be seen that this situation is a real problem. Along with the member for Burnside, I sincerely urge that further attention be given to this problem.

Some speeches made in this debate have been well worth hearing, and I was particularly interested in the remarks made today by the member for Burra. Actually I did not intend to refer to his speech, but as I feel that the honourable member may be a little disappointed if I do not, I shall now say a few kindly words about his remarks. For a long time, and particularly since I have been a member of the Public Works Committee (on which the honourable member is one of my colleagues), I have known that he is a kindly-natured man, and I appreciate the kindness of heart that led him this afternoon to come, shall I say, to the defence of the member for Gouger. The member for Burra may have felt "After all, these naughty boys have been attacking the member for Gouger, so why shouldn't I be his guardian angel, take him kindly by the hand, pat him on the back, wipe away his tears and encourage him in the more innocuous parts of his speech?"

Mr. Quirke: I did not see any tears on his face.

Mr. CLARK: They may give some emphasis to his speeches. I doubt if the member for

Burra had read the speech until this afternoon when he looked through it for things he was quite certain were not there, but I am glad he is taking the member for Gouger in hand because, although I do not know that the member for Burra could believe this, many in this House think that a guiding hand might be helpful to the member for Gouger.

Mr. Shannon: You will give my young friend a swollen head.

Mr. CLARK: I do not think it needs me to do that. The member for Gouger and the member for Burra would have one thing, if they had nothing else, in common—usually they are heartily and inevitably right. That, of course, would be a binding tie. I suppose the member for Burra realized that after chiding the Opposition most severely for its criticism he then chided it for not being more voluble in debates. It is hard to see how it can do both. I agree that criticism is good, and the harder the criticism the better, but I make the proviso that criticism, no matter how hard-hitting it is, is not much good unless it is backed up with something concrete in the way of argument. I take it as a compliment if I get plenty of criticism because, after all, nothing damns a member more than being ignored altogether in this place; which happens fairly often.

Recently I have had the pleasure of reading the new book written by L. F. Crisp entitled *The Life of Ben Chifley*. I commend it to members, no matter to which Party they belong, as in many ways it is a history of our times. In view of certain remarks made in this debate which, despite the opinion of the member for Burra (who is entitled to disagree with me), I thought were necessary, I was struck by the words of the late Ben Chifley on page 217 of this book, which were:

Our democracy does not receive a very good advertisement when the representatives of the people in Parliament give emphasis to material that might create a false impression. Members should not forget that in the life of a democracy it is important that the public respect not necessarily a Party but the Parliament. Everything we do to destroy that respect deals a death blow at democracy itself.

I am, of course, not setting up the late Ben Chifley as an oracle. I think most members would agree that he had a fund of good common sense that made most of his observations well worth remembering; and I am sure the Treasurer would agree with that, as he has said this publicly in this House and outside. I know that in the heat of debate most of us at times may have sinned in this

respect. Certainly, I have been guilty on many occasions, but I think that is vastly different from making remarks in a studied and deliberate speech such as we heard from the member for Gouger earlier in the debate. Such speeches invite recrimination. I may be the fifth or sixth speaker that has mentioned it, and this may give to his speech an impression of importance that it did not deserve. I had what I think was my opinion of it before, though I can be wrong, as most of us can.

I checked up to find from a recognized authority a couple of little quotations which I hoped I could use in this debate to make the point I am seeking. I do this because it is obvious that at least one member of this Parliament has not much knowledge, to put it nicely, of political etiquette. I believe that the honourable member concerned has no knowledge at all of the functions of the Opposition, as they are generally recognized in British-speaking Parliaments. I sought a definition that could be regarded as authoritative on this. Despite the way that this Parliament is at present elected—we on this side consider it undemocratic—the debates in this place are conducted usually on democratic lines and until recently tactics fairly close to Fascist tactics have been, happily, absent from our debates. It does not matter at all whether the honourable member I mention makes juvenile speeches in the House, and when I say "juvenile" I am not referring to his age, but simply to the subject matter of his remarks. It doesn't matter to me. I think it was the honourable member for Burra, Mr. Quirke, who this afternoon mentioned that we on this side obviously did not like the honourable member for Gouger.

Mr. Quirke: I shall take the blame, anyway.

Mr. CLARK: The honourable member said that he thought that the Opposition did not like the member for Gouger. I should like to disabuse him on that idea, as that certainly is not the truth. Certainly, I do not dislike him. As a matter of fact, he gives me more genuine amusement in this place than any other member; but at times he also irritates me fairly extensively. After all, I think we should all be prepared to agree that a healthy irritant is a very good thing. It can be fairly effective, but we find that an unhealthy irritant is simply an annoyance and very often it is damaging to the one causing the irritation. I spoke to the Parliamentary Librarian and he said that on matters such as this the recognized authority was a book called *An Encyclopaedia of*

Parliament, by Norman Wilding and Philip Launay. They are not Party men, but experienced Parliamentary officers who study Parliament and know its proceedings—men of the type of our Clerk and Assistant Clerk in this House. Speaking of Parliamentary debates these gentlemen said:

There are standards of fair dealing which are normally respected.

A point is valueless in debate unless backed up with a convincing case to prove it, also, it is unethical to attack people (particularly Government servants or quasi-Government servants) who cannot reply to such an attack where it is made or at all. I am referring now not to Mr. Hall's remarks about the Leader of the Opposition, but to his remarks regarding the Transport Control Board which almost brought him to an attack of apoplexy. Apparently its actions did not suit him. I am far from being an out-and-out supporter of the board. Like many country members, I have had cause for some annoyance at times, but in this case I think it was slightly different. In his speech the honourable member gave only his side of the case, and said some extravagant things in referring to the board. We were told this afternoon that there were no remarks of a defamatory nature in his speech. If there were not, they were awfully close. Mr. Quirke may try to convince me that I am wrong in this and I should be happy to be convinced. In referring to the board, which has no hope of replying to these statements, this is what Mr. Hall had to say:

It is a disruptive influence on the economic life of this State.

Mr. Quirke: That is correct.

Mr. Hall: That is an under-statement.

Mr. CLARK: Secondly, he said that its members should be replaced with competent persons and that its actions represented a breach of the delegated authority of this Parliament; and that the board was a hindrance and a disruptive influence to our society and something should be done about its membership.

Mr. Quirke: The greater the lie, the greater the libel.

Mr. CLARK: I should be happy if the honourable member gave me a break and stopped trying to be funny, because he is not succeeding; he is only adding to his unconvincing speech, which I consider his worst made in this House. It was an atrocity. I claim that both speeches were most insulting, and if the member for Gouger is so thick-skinned that he can sit back and smile and

be proud of making insulting remarks from the coward's castle of the floor of this House . . .

Mr. Quirke: That's stupid!

Mr. CLARK: I am not trying to be funny, and if the honourable member believes in that stupid type of interjection, it is akin to the remarks of the gentleman whom he supported this afternoon.

Mr. Quirke: Nonsense!

Mr. CLARK: I suggested that they were cowardly remarks because they were made under privilege.

Mr. Quirke: That's a reflection.

Mr. Counce: Is the member for Gawler directing his remarks to the Budget?

Mr. CLARK: I am doing my best. I regret that the honourable member made that interjection because I promised myself faithfully that I would leave his remarks to be replied to by somebody else. He tempts me to start replying to them now, but I think I had better confine my remarks to what I was talking about previously. I have no real objection to any criticism of the actions of the Transport Control Board, but I have a strong objection to the personalities expressed in the two quotations I have given. I await with much interest the Treasurer's reply to these insinuations. I doubt whether he will consider them worthy of reply, but I hope he does answer them. I have not always agreed with the board, far from it, but if I have any criticism to offer about its actions I try to offer it directly to the board. Unfortunately, it usually has an answer to what I say, and even if it does not convince me it is usually a reasonable answer. Now, however, the board is denied the opportunity to answer the charges made against it. Despite what has been thought by one or two members, I think that most members agree with me on this issue.

Let me now turn to the first part of the member for Gouger's speech, where he showed a complete ignorance of Parliamentary procedure. This time the honourable member's remarks were meant to be an attack upon the Leader of the Opposition, simply because he did not agree with the Leader. Of course, every member has the right to attack a critical speech. It is good to hear a fighting speech, but if an attack is made the speaker should try to prove his point. It is useless in debate to say, as the honourable member did, in effect, "Because I think a thing is wrong

it must be wrong and I do not have to prove that it is wrong." He attacked the Leader because he dared to criticize the Treasurer. I suggest the Treasurer would have been astounded and disappointed if the Leader had not criticized his speech.

Mr. Quirke: Let the Leader reply for himself. He does not seem to be taking umbrage at what was said.

Mr. CLARK: The honourable member is going on like Tennyson's brook. He will find that at the first opportunity the Leader will let members know what he thinks of the remarks by the honourable member for Gouger. If that does not convince the member for Burra, let him ask the Leader privately and without inhibitions he will be told what the Leader thinks about the speech. The book, previously referred to, also says:

Under modern conditions it has fallen to the Opposition to discharge the control by criticism of the Government. No better system has yet been devised for ensuring that the indispensable function of criticism shall be effectively co-ordinated and exercised in a constructive and responsible spirit.

The member for Gouger is unaware that this is a function of the Opposition. In the main, it appeared that he attacked the Leader for daring to be critical, but after all that is his job. The terms used by the member for Gouger were not happy ones for this occasion. He said:

I would say it reflects very little credit on him: I would say it reflects no credit on him at all for the criticisms he has made of the Treasurer's Budget . . .

In other words, he attacked the Leader for criticizing the Treasurer. It is the Leader's job to do that, and I hope to show later that he did criticize the Treasurer. I remind members that these words were used by the member for Gouger to describe remarks by the Leader of the Opposition, but most members would think that they described the speech by the member for Gouger. He also said, when referring to the Leader of the Opposition, "His speech tonight was a mass of confusion and contradiction", but he failed to prove that. He did not say anything else, only that the speech was a mass of confusion and contradiction because it did not agree with his ideas. Making such a statement, without supporting it, does not score points in debate. It does not score points with his colleagues or his constituents. I object to his remarks, as I know the Leader does, and so does every colleague of the Leader on this side of the House. I think that even members

on the other side, including the Treasurer, do so, too.

The member for Gouger also said that he doubted the sincerity of the Leader of the Opposition. Why not call him a liar and be done with it? Personally I would prefer to be called a liar than have my sincerity doubted. I have been in this place for about 10 years and I remember one occasion vividly when by interjection one member on this side questioned the sincerity of a statement by the Treasurer. In my opinion the Treasurer rightly objected to this questioning of his sincerity. When Sir Robert Nicholls was Speaker of this House he always made a point of objecting to any remarks questioning the sincerity of a member. He had the feeling that it was an unfair thing to do and that it led to repercussions and difficulties that were better avoided. There may have been some value in the remarks by the member for Gouger if he had made some attempt to prove insincerity on the part of the Leader, but he did not try to do that. Whether we agree with the Leader or not, I am sure members will agree that he has always shown in this place, when a member has violently disagreed with what he has said, that he is one of the sincerest of members. After all, are we not all supposed to be honourable men, or at least nearly all of us? If we examine even briefly some of the points made by the Leader in his speech, and if we look at them without bias, we shall see that they fulfilled more than adequately the two basic requirements of the Opposition, firstly to be critical, and, secondly, to be constructive. I will not examine the Leader's speech at length. It was a good speech and if any member has not yet read it I suggest that it is well worth studying.

Those members who paid attention will remember that the Leader began by disagreeing with the Treasurer's statement that we are now recovering from severe economic shocks. The Leader went on to ask how this could be when so many were out of work and the business confidence of the community was shaken by the actions and attitudes of the Commonwealth Government. Do not forget that the Leader has moved in every way open to a Leader of the Opposition to have this position alleviated, and he did this before other responsible people even realized the state of affairs.

The Leader went on, rightly, to claim that special circumstances now existed, because of the results of the so-called "credit squeeze",

for approaching the Commonwealth Government for special assistance. Remember, this was in reply to the Treasurer's own statement, referring to the Grants Commission, that "we have agreed not to go to the Commonwealth for special assistance except in exceptional circumstances." Surely we would all agree that we are now living in exceptional circumstances. The Leader then went on to make what could rightly be considered a constructive suggestion that immediate grants be made available to councils for urgent works and finance be made available for the repair of rail tracks. He suggested also that the Treasurer approach the Commonwealth Government for an immediate grant, under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution, to relieve the unemployment position created by the actions of the Commonwealth Government and so far not corrected by any action of the State Government.

Some members may not agree with that statement but that does not alter the fact that it was a critical and constructive suggestion, whether or not it was agreed to. The Leader then dealt fully with the unemployment position. He analysed carefully the Government's claims on electricity, housing and school buildings. He stressed to the Committee that Parliament last year provided £945,000 more for school buildings than was spent, and he bluntly stated that in the forthcoming year it could well be physically impossible to spend the £6,000,000 allotted for similar works. He did not stop at criticism; he made further constructive suggestions, including other means of using the money that will not be used, to provide works and to assist in alleviating the hardships of unemployment. To strengthen this point, he went on to say that 30 per cent of the money allotted last year for water and sewerage (an amount, I think, of £629,000) was not spent. He claimed that this money, if used, could have helped relieve unemployment. So the speech up to that point was constructive, yet critical.

The Leader then went on to examine every facet of the proposed Budget expenditure section by section in what could be regarded by most of us as a critical and constructive way. If honourable members further take the trouble to examine the Leader's speech and if they do so with an unbiased mind, I think they will be able to see that that is so, even if they do not agree with what the Leader had to say. I claim—not in defence of my Leader, for he needs no defending—that it was a very good speech indeed. As I have said, members may not agree with some of his ideas but, unless

one is the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), one will agree that he discharged admirably the duties of Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition: to be critical and constructive, and also to show that the Opposition is an alternative Government. That is the duty of the Opposition. I believe it is particularly the duty of the man who has been chosen by his colleagues to be the Leader of the Opposition—because I can assure the Committee that that is an honour by no means easily won.

Mr. Shannon: In fact, one can win it by a narrow margin.

Mr. CLARK: That is possible. In conclusion, I shall make a few remarks on education which, I am sure, will not be controversial. Honourable members will know that over the years I have constantly advocated, both inside and outside the House, Commonwealth assistance for education, and over the last 12 months or so, since having the honour to be appointed a member of the Public Works Committee, I have been convinced more than ever before of this necessity. Much of the time, energy and thought of the committee has been devoted to investigating the proposals for new schools. They have been interesting and costly proposals. Also, we know there are many schools which the Minister of Education would have liked to come to the Public Works Committee so that they could be put on the Estimates, but which we have not yet seen. Many additional schools should have been put on the Estimates and indeed would have been but for non-availability of funds. I am not criticizing the department, the Minister, or even the Government for that.

I now refer to a report I received a few months ago, which is really the submissions on education made to the Premiers' Conference. I hope that honourable members will forgive me if I quote straight from the report. I have been accused, when speaking on similar matters, of exaggerating the story so I am making sure that I shall not be now because much of this matter that I shall quote is not my idea but the considered opinion of all the Ministers of Education gathered together. It goes back to February, 1960. The Australian Educational Council, which comprises the Ministers and Directors of Education of all the six States of the Commonwealth, met in Hobart and decided to compile a comprehensive report covering the requirements of education for the whole of the Commonwealth, with a view to submitting it to the Premiers' Conference. They had hoped to submit it to the Premiers' Conference of 1960, but difficulties made it impossible for them to do that. So it was not

until the following year (I think in June, 1961) that this report was submitted to the Premiers' Conference. The Parent-Teacher Educational Council was also interested in this. Some members will remember that it had been responsible for a petition that was being signed throughout Australia for presentation to the Commonwealth Government.

In March last it was announced that five Premiers had agreed that the Australian Educational Council's report should be submitted to the Prime Minister with the request that it be placed on the agenda for the 1961 Premier's Conference—which it was. Also, the petition, with 241,000 signatures, was presented seeking the very same thing. So we find the stage set for the Premiers' Conference when on June 15 the Premier of New South Wales (Hon. R. J. Heffron) submitted this report, which was supported by the other Premiers.

I should like to read to the Committee, if I may, a section of the speech made by Mr. Heffron introducing this statement on education:

This statement endeavours to set out in factual and concise manner, and on an Australian wide basis, the extent of the three major deficiencies in the Australian education system of today. These are: (1) A shortage of school buildings; (2) An insufficient number of adequately trained teachers; and (3) Limitations in the provision of equipment and supplies. In adopting this statement of the situation, the Australian Education Council resolved that the report should be submitted by the Ministers for Education to their respective Premiers, with a view to the matter being raised for discussion at the Premiers' Conference and that it should also be presented to the Prime Minister . . . As you know, I forwarded a copy of this statement to the Acting Prime Minister in March of this year during your absence abroad, and I am aware that you have since given some consideration to it . . . I may say that I am personally acquainted with the background to the preparation of this statement because at the time it was undertaken I held the portfolio of Education in my own State and took part in the discussions of the Australian Education Council. The experience of these Ministers, as they exchanged views on a number of problems, had convinced them of two things: firstly, whatever the differences there might be, as between the States, in terms of special problems or of the relative urgency of particular needs, the situation in regard to education was, in general, the same in all States.

The Ministers agreed that, despite the best efforts of their respective Governments, educational services had not kept pace with the swiftly-increasing demands made upon those services during the post-war years. Secondly, while they were naturally aware that the responsibility for education rests with the States,

they could not escape the conviction that not only the size of the task, but the extent to which the efficiency of education has implications for so many aspects of the life of the nation as a whole made it a national problem. In effect, their view was that the problem with which they were confronted was more significant than the needs of any one State and should be looked at in the light of a problem facing them all . . . In speaking to this matter, I do so with the full appreciation of the fact that you—

and this, of course, was addressed to the Prime Minister—

have already demonstrated your interest in education, as a national problem, at the university level. My colleagues, I am sure, share my appreciation of your contribution in this field and welcome the collaboration of the Commonwealth Government in making possible the expansion of university facilities to meet the national need. I would be ignoring one of the obvious facts of the situation, however, if I were to refrain from pointing out that it is impossible to isolate the problem of university education from the general problem of providing adequate educational facilities in this country . . . To take only one other aspect of this inter-relationship, the task which the universities in this country have to undertake will be made less onerous if the young people coming to the university from the school are of the appropriate calibre and are adequately prepared. A dispassionate review of the work of our secondary schools would, I think, indicate that their achievement is better than is often realized or acknowledged, yet there is no ground for complacency, for every university is concerned with the rate of failure among its first-year students. Part of the answer to the problem lies within the universities themselves, but part, I am convinced, lies within the school where lack of an adequate number of qualified teachers and of many necessary teaching facilities and the presence of unduly large classes, all serve to limit the effectiveness of our schools.

I am not reading all of this speech, but am trying to pick out points that should be of interest in any discussion of this problem. Mr. Heffron went on:

I think it is fair to say that every State has allocated to education all the funds it could, having in mind its other pressing commitments, and no doubt the other Premiers who will follow me will bear me out in this . . . I realize, and so do the other Premiers, that the Commonwealth has in the past adopted the firm attitude that this is a State responsibility, but, as I have already mentioned, the Commonwealth has recognized the realities of the situation in so far as university education is concerned and is collaborating to a substantial degree in the development of this field of education . . . I would ask at this stage that the Commonwealth accept the principle of assisting the States in these directions and agree to establish a committee to investigate and make an up-to-date assessment of the needs of primary, secondary and

technical education on a national basis and to suggest a long-term basis of assistance. Such an inquiry would necessarily take some time and, in view of the urgency of the present situation, I would also ask that the Commonwealth agree to make available some special assistance as an interim measure. This could, I suggest, be based on the position as disclosed in the statement prepared by the Australian Education Council. We would be happy to co-operate with the other States and the Commonwealth in formulating firm proposals in this connection, if this course appeals to the Commonwealth. As I have already said, the States have done all they can from within the resources available to them, and I feel sure the other Premiers will agree with me that the situation calls for a special allocation of funds by the Commonwealth.

Mr. Heffron then presented the case which is printed here under the heading "Some Aspects of Australian Education". I know it would be of great value to the Committee if all the submissions were quoted, but that would occupy more than a fair share of the Budget debate. However, I think members can obtain copies of this publication for themselves, and if they cannot do so I should be only too happy to lend them the copy which I have here.

Before I conclude my remarks on this matter I wish to quote three of four illuminating points made in the appendix to the submissions dealing with school accommodation. They are not my words but part of a submission based on figures supplied by Ministers and Directors of Education in all States, and they give not the picture in just one State but the average picture throughout Australia. I readily admit that the position in some States may be worse than this average but in some States it may be considerably better. After I briefly give these points members will have some idea of the enormous problems facing all the States on education. As I mentioned earlier, I thought I knew something about these problems before, but when senior officers of the department have given evidence before the Public Works Committee on a number of occasions this year I have been staggered at the enormous task ahead in the provision of accommodation.

These points concerning accommodation relate only to the building of schools and the accommodation in schools. They do not refer to other aspects at all—although the report did—and I remind the Committee much additional finance would be required for other phases of education which could not possibly come under the heading of accommodation. The report, dealing with the general conditions throughout Australia, states:

Major building problems lie in accommodating anticipated increases in actual enrolments, improving existing accommodation, catching up on the accumulated deficiencies, reducing the size of classes and meeting the needs of those who should be offered longer schooling. In addition, provision should be made for items at present deferred and in some cases not supplied. Such items include shelter-sheds, gymnasia, school halls, teachers' quarters in rural areas, the improvement of school grounds and suitable sanitary installations. Increased enrolments mean both the addition of rooms to existing schools and the construction of new schools. In some cities, movement of population from older suburbs to newly-developed housing areas means that accommodation must be provided additional to that which would be required for new enrolments alone. This factor increases the demand for new buildings in some States by more than 50 per cent. For Australia as a whole, it is estimated that the movement of population increases school-building needs by 25 per cent.

The cost per pupil place in new schools can be higher than £500 per pupil, depending on the type of construction, the level of schooling and the site. Allowing for the fact that some of the additional enrolments are housed in existing buildings, a conservative estimate is that approximately £300 is required for new sites and buildings for every pupil added to the net enrolment.

The cost of adding classrooms to existing buildings—as, for example, when reducing size of classes—varies greatly according to the type of material used, the level of schooling, and the building costs from place to place. A survey of actual costs indicates that, to allow for these variations and to include equipment for the rooms and auxiliary building costs, £5,000 per classroom is required.

That is only a brief picture of the accommodation problem, but it is rather a grim picture. They are not my figures, but are figures carefully compiled by men in a position to know them. This, of course, is not a political issue and should not be regarded as such. We are in an extraordinary situation caused primarily by our greatly increasing population and by immigration. The problem can only be solved by extraordinary means and our children are well worth the effort required to solve it. I support the first line.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): In supporting the first line I do not intend to delay the Committee, but shall refer briefly to one matter. This Budget has been well thought out by the Treasurer. He has endeavoured to employ the funds available to him to provide for every section of the public and for every department and to ensure the greatest availability of employment possible.

I was pleased that the Commonwealth Government purchased the *Southern Endeavour*

for exploring our off-shore fishing resources in the Great Australian Bight from the funds of the Western Australian Whaling Company which it sold. I am somewhat disturbed, however, to hear that the sale of this vessel may entail its loss to South Australia. Probably one of the reasons for the difficulty in making the sale to South Australian fishing interests was the story abroad that the exploration of this vessel had been uneconomic. Considering the difficulties under which this vessel commenced operations, it has done a great job. Members will recall that about eight years ago I advocated that a vessel of this nature should be purchased for exploration purposes and I visualized then that it would be controlled by the State Government. However, that did not eventuate, and it was purchased and operated by the Commonwealth Government. It is now under the control of what is called the Southern Trawling Company.

I shall try to summarize the activities of this vessel during the period it has operated and to point out why it has not been as economic as expected. The skipper is highly qualified for trawling. He has had experience in many waters—in Newfoundland, Iceland, the Dogger Bank and, indeed, in most waters of the world. He started on this vessel with a raw crew that was inexperienced in trawling of this nature. The vessel is ideally suited for this trawling. It has a beautiful flare in the bow, high out of the water, and will withstand almost all weather. It is capable of trawling through any weather encountered in the Bight, according to what the skipper told me about a month ago. The crew has now attained a high standard of efficiency.

Mr. Ryan: Do you know that they went on strike the other week?

Mr. JENKINS: I did not know, but I suppose the honourable member had something to do with it.

Mr. Ryan: I know who organized it.

Mr. JENKINS: The skipper told me that the vessel is now capable of undertaking different kinds of exploration in the Bight. Up to the present it has been fishing, just inside the Continental Shelf, at depths of up to 100 fathoms. I believe it is now going to explore water up to 150 fathoms. I have examined all of the modern devices on board this vessel, including echo-sounding devices for searching the ocean bed and for disclosing where the fish are to be found. Despite all these modern appliances and a good crew it is almost impossible to carry out these fishing operations profitably. I do not know what

the profit or loss has been, as I have not been able to secure that information, but I have been told that several losses of comparatively large amounts have been made. I do not think it would be possible for a single vessel with the comparatively small experience it has had in the Great Australian Bight, which has many miles of coastline, to be able to assess the value of the fish to be caught there.

I visited the vessel about a month ago and found that about 25 varieties of fish were brought ashore. Among the fish caught were morwong, hake, barracuda, nunagai (red schnapper), sea perch, bream, ruby, gurnard, shark, flathead and other varieties I cannot remember. These are all edible fish, although the Australian public has to be educated to appreciate their value as food. It will take time for the markets to absorb these fish and sell them, but with more coming on to the market people will become accustomed to them and will purchase them more readily at a good price. Fish caught in trawls are not as attractive in appearance as fish caught by other methods. The mesh of the trawl itself is about 4½ in. to 5 in. and consists of about ¾ in. rough rope or cordage. When the fish get into the pocket of the trawl in 100 fathoms of water one can imagine the milling around that goes on, and because of the roughness of the cordage the skin is rubbed off the noses of the fish and the scale off their backs, consequently they are not as presentable to the public as fish caught by line or in ordinary nets. That is one of the disadvantages of trawling, and some value is lost in selling such fish to the public, but the fish are edible and have a good taste. About a month ago I was told that 500 people visit the wharf where the *Southern Endeavour* berths each week-end after it returns from its operations and take away a few hundred pounds worth of fish. Much of the fish, however, goes to other States at present.

I do not know how a single vessel of this nature could possibly do better than this vessel has done over the past two or three months. It goes to sea for three weeks or thereabouts and then comes back to port for a week. That means that the vessel loses one week in four for fishing purposes. It has to come in for discharge of its fish, for minor maintenance and taking on stores. If a fleet of vessels operated as this one operates, or if three or four small vessels worked with a mother ship, the proposition could be much more economic. This vessel comes into port with its load of from 25 to 50 tons of fish and,

although it goes to sea fitted with echo-sounding and fish-finding devices, it still has to find the fish. If four vessels worked together three could fish while the fourth was in port and they could alternate in this manner. When a vessel went from the port to the fishing ground it could go straight to the other vessels, finding them by radar or radio, and could immediately get on the grounds where the fish are to be caught. However, when a single fishing vessel goes into port it leaves the fish and, when returning to the grounds, it may waste one to four days before finding them again. Much time, fuel and power is wasted, but a team similar to those operating in Iceland, on the Dogger Banks and in Newfoundland could carry on and make the job much more economic than it is when a single vessel operates. If a mother ship were used smaller vessels could operate in the Bight and stay out longer. The mother ship could take off fish and put on fuel and stores and that would extend fishing activities where the fish are instead of the vessels having to leave the grounds and go back to find them.

The fishing industry is of great importance to the economy of the people and of South Australia. We need fish foods. If honourable members turn to the *Statistical Register* of South Australia for 1957-58 at page 64 they will find a summary of the fish caught over the years. Most of these figures are estimates because many fish are caught by line fishermen and they go into the markets and are consumed by people not found by the fishing inspectors who compile the records. From these figures we obtain some idea of the fishing industry and what it means to the State, because they indicate the increase in the take and value of the fish caught over the years from 1948. The quantity of crayfish caught in 1948 was 870,000 lbs. In 1949 the catch was 1,671,000 lbs., in 1954-55 it had increased to 4,590,000 lbs. whilst in 1957-58 it had decreased slightly to 4,460,000 lbs. The value of the crayfish caught in 1948 was £42,000; 1954-55, £396,000; and in 1957-58, £558,000. The total quantity and value of other fish caught was, 1948, 5,264,000 lbs., £224,000; 1954-55, 7,171,000 lbs., £782,000; and 1957-58, 8,651,000 lbs., £675,000.

The total value of all fish taken for the year 1957-58 was £1,233,000 and that is only in respect of the fish estimated and recorded by the Fisheries Department. From those figures honourable members can appreciate the value to South Australia of the fishing industry. I hope the Minister of Agriculture

will do everything in his power to induce the Commonwealth or the Southern Trawling Company to continue with its exploration of our off-shore fishing resources, because in the Great Australian Bight are many miles from the Continental Shelf inshore and hundreds of miles in length which can be exploited and explored for different types of fish. We have established, from the efforts of the *Southern Endeavour*, that there are huge quantities of different varieties of good edible fish about which the public have still to be educated as to its food value and taste. If we can retain this vessel in South Australian waters it will prove a great asset to the State and it will help to ensure a reasonable quantity of fish always coming on to the market in both slack and glut times. The skipper told me that this vessel could go to sea and continue trawling in every type of weather. South Australia would experience a great loss if this vessel were lost to us and I hope that the Minister, even if he cannot make a sale somewhere in South Australia, will be able to induce this company to carry on with its exploration work. I support the first line.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I rise to support the first line and in doing so I wish to thank the member for Burnside because, although she has been in the House for some years, today was the first time I have ever heard her offer any criticism of the actions of members on this side of the House. Although a believer in equality of the sexes, I do not feel disposed to reply to her in a way that I would have done to a male member, although she may not agree with that statement. I hope that in future, when she starts to offer criticism, she will give more thought to the point on which she is criticising the Opposition and as much thought to it as she did to other parts of her speech, for which I commend her.

I regret that you, Mr. Acting Chairman, are in the Chair at present because it is you to whom I wish to address my remarks principally. On this occasion you (as member for Torrens) went out of your way to attack the Leader of the Opposition. As usual you can be relied upon to sing the praises of the Government. On this occasion, in fact, you ran out of material in superlatives. You really excelled yourself in praise of the Government and of course we, on this side of the House, expect members on the Government side to praise the Government. It is only natural that we should expect that and I shudder to think what would happen to any Government member who dared

publicly to criticize the Government. You, Sir, in the course of your remarks, which I consider were far from becoming when you made reference to the Leader, reflected on his knowledge of finance and on page 848 of *Hansard* it is reported that you said:

Surely anyone knowing anything about sound finance and good housekeeping must agree that the Budget has been balanced. It has not been balanced for some years because of the financial position of the State. From a sound business point of view the Treasurer of any State has an obligation to try to balance his Budget, and that has been done this year by our Treasurer, yet the Leader of the Opposition criticized him for doing it. In fact, he advocated a Budget with a deficit. I suggest that he would have been the first to complain if Loan expenditure had been reduced in order to make up the deficit.

Later, he said:

By making use of as much Revenue money as possible the Government is spending on these public works with the deliberate aim of creating unemployment, yet the Leader of a responsible Party advocates a deficit Budget, which would mean less Loan moneys available next year for public works.

Dealing with the last aspect first, I fail to see how any expenditure from the revenue of this year would affect next year's position, particularly in respect of Loan money, because how we will be furnished with more money from Loan moneys will depend on how we are situated next year and on the requirements of this State.

I feel that in your attack on the Leader, Mr. Acting Chairman, for his criticism of the Budget you stooped to a fairly low level. I do not refer to it here because I feel that perhaps it would be inappropriate, because of the position in which you find yourself now, but I believe that with your intelligence and experience you know that it is the prerogative of an Opposition to criticize Government policy and actions, so you should not have gone out of your way to the extent you did to attack the Leader merely for doing his duty as Leader of the Opposition.

Frequently references are made, particularly by you, Mr. Acting Chairman, to the 23 years that Sir Thomas Playford has been Premier and Treasurer and to the advantages that have accrued to this State as a result, but no-one can convince me that 22 of those 23 years were not the most prosperous years in the history of this country. Certainly five were war years, when factories, which were later used for peace-time production, were established. No State benefited more than South Australia from the creation of those

industries in war-time factories. I doubt whether this Government has received as much assistance from the present Commonwealth Government as it did from Commonwealth Governments during the Second World War, led by Mr. Curtin and Mr. Chifley.

Mr. Bywaters: The Treasurer has often admitted that.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes. Time after time we have heard the Treasurer criticize the Commonwealth Government's actions as they affected South Australia and the policies of his own Government.

Mr. Jennings: Not at election time, though.

Mr. FRED WALSH: No, but in my time in this Chamber I have never heard the Treasurer in any way criticize the actions of Labor Governments between 1942 and 1949.

Mr. Frank Walsh: In fact, he went out to support them.

Mr. FRED WALSH: If he did not go out to support them, I know from personal conversations with both of the Labor Prime Ministers what they thought of him during the war years, and I understand the feeling that existed between them and Sir Thomas Playford, but it is entirely wrong for members of this Parliament to give credit entirely to the Playford Government for what happened in South Australia when this State has been enjoying such prosperous times because of the assistance received from the Chifley and Curtin Labor Governments. The member for Torrens (insultingly, I believe) attacked the Leader for his suggestions that the Budget should have provided for a deficit. Has he never heard before today of any Government's budgeting for a deficit? I know he has. As the member for Burra said this afternoon, the Commonwealth Government budgeted for a deficit of £16,500,000 this year, and during my life-time Governments, both Commonwealth and State, have often budgeted for deficits. I believe that is only right. After all, political economics is only the application of domestic economics to the State, and, although nobody would deny that the Budget should be balanced where possible, at times this is neither practical nor desirable.

I am one of those who believe that now is the time to budget for a deficit because, as I said earlier this session, I would rather see a deficit in the Budget than a deficit in jobs. That is something that should concern us all, and I believe that most members of this Parliament, and of the Government, desire to create employment if possible, but that will not be possible with the present rate of expenditure in the

Budget. In times of prosperity we should budget for a surplus, and that surplus should be used in times of stress such as we are now experiencing. In good times many people over-indulge and when a shadow appears on the economic horizon they immediately adopt a fear complex. That applies to many businessmen and manufacturers; they restrict their buying and investing, and this spreads like a bush fire until businesses soon fail, unemployment spreads, the purchasing power of the community is reduced and the demand for goods is further lessened. Then there are more business failures and more unemployment, and so the vicious cycle goes on.

That is where we find ourselves until somebody gives the economy a shot in the arm, which can be done only by more expenditure by the State. This is the time when Governments should come to the rescue by embarking on policies of expansion and development by means of ambitious programmes of public works. These programmes will absorb those who have been thrown out of employment by private industry, which finds it is not economic to continue to employ them. It is by this means that confidence can be restored in the community and, if there is such a thing as normality (I do not know what that word means: perhaps it means getting back to something or to some conditions that previously existed), nothing would hasten it more quickly than the means I have suggested.

I know that the problem of exports will be posed and I am not unmindful of the importance of exports to the economy of the State and the country, but that problem is facing every country in the world today—at any rate, every country in the free world. A week or two ago Japan had to re-check its imports and exports. Only a few weeks ago Britain had to impose austere measures on its citizens. Let us analyse the position further and ask what brings it all about. When speaking on the position of world markets earlier, I mentioned that they were exploited during the years immediately following upon the second world war, when we had such countries as Germany and Japan out of production, but with financial aid and certain economic aid they developed their economy to such an extent that they became the biggest competitors with the free world.

The position is not new as regards the United States of America, which we should take as a guide and as a world indicator. I refer to budgeting for deficits. The late Franklin Roosevelt chose, after the years of

depression in the early 1930's, to introduce what he called the new deal into the American policy and at the same time budgeted for a deficit to meet the programme he had in mind. No-one will deny that as a result of his efforts the economy of the U.S.A. was restored and ultimately the world felt the effects of its restoration.

When President Kennedy came into office early this year he found the American economy in such a bad way and with the possibility of its getting worse that he advised Congress that something had to be done, and although faced with grave problems arising from the international position associated with the cold war, he set about the task of putting his country's economy on a sound even keel, not by restricting credit as has been done by the present Commonwealth Government, but by getting Congress to vote more money for the programme he proposed. I should like to quote some of the facts of the position in the U.S.A. relating to the first six months of this year. I shall not go deeply into figures, because I know they can be boring and difficult to absorb. However, these references will be brief and give some idea of the position there in the last six months. Unemployment for the first six months of this year averaged 5,580,000. In June near record figures were established when 2,500,000 teenagers joined the work force. In addition there were more than 3,000,000 persons working part time, but despite this there has been an increase in employment by slightly more than 4,000,000. There has been a marked improvement in wages during the past six months. In January the pay of the average factory production and maintenance worker with a wife and two children was 80½ dollars after taxes had been deducted. In June this year the figure was 83 dollars 74 cents, which is approximately £37 (Ausn.). Living costs have levelled off. The consumer price index remained at 127.5 or slightly below that for the straight six months. There was a slight increase in June of .1 per cent as a result of a small rise in food and transportation costs, which really did not affect the position at all. Farm income is holding up. After a drop of 25 per cent between 1951 and 1960 farm income, after deductions for production expenses, has risen again in the past year, reaching a little over 12½ billion dollars.

I have a graph here showing the rises and falls during that period and unless they were closely related they would be difficult to absorb.

Here is an interesting position, one that is similar to what is happening in Australia. The number of business failures remains high. Altogether, some 15,445 commercial and industrial failures were reported in 1960, actually more than in any year since 1933. So far this year businesses are going broke at even a faster rate than in 1960. That reads as a contradiction to what I have already read, but I think the same position applies in Australia, with businesses still going broke, despite the fact that there are at least signs of a temporary recovery in our economy. The figures I referred to show the economic recovery in the U.S.A. since President Kennedy took a hand six months ago. At that time he reported "an economy in trouble". Under his leadership unemployment benefits have been extended temporarily, aid has been voted for the children of needy unemployed, the United State's employment service has been expanded, Federal aid for depressed areas has been voted and defence contracts funnelled into depressed areas, surplus food distribution has been increased, social security pensions have been increased and the retirement age lowered to 62 years, the Federal minimum wage has been increased and its coverage is to be broadened, interest rates on Federal housing mortgages have been reduced and loan mortgages liberalized, highway construction has been stepped up and G.I. life insurance dividends have been speeded. Today 4,200,000 more Americans are gainfully employed than six months ago. The minimum wage is about 50 dollars a week, which is roughly £23 (Ausn.).

I believe that Australia should take notice of what happens in the U.S.A. The unfortunate part about it is that when things are going well everyone indulges in spending money and possibly I am guilty of the same thing. We tend to forget the possibility of a change in the future. If any country indicates the trend in world trade, it is America. We experienced that during the period just prior to the world depression in the early 1930's when it affected America before it reached Australia and England and other European countries. Because of that, we should have taken heed during the subsequent years and been aware of any worsening of the position in the American economy and immediately started to prepare for it and not sat still until we found the recession upon us, and not, like the Menzies Government, immediately started to curtail credit and place certain restrictions on trade and generally affect businesses that would have no alternative but to dismiss some employees.

I do not have to refer to the number of idle workers in Australia today. Little, if any, new employment has been created. We all know what has happened in regard to General Motors-Holden's, which would make worse the figures that were last quoted. The Commonwealth Government is taking steps to preach a different policy and is trying to give the impression that because of its action the economy of Australia is being restored, that unemployment is being reduced, and that next year not only will there be a recovery but the risk of a boom, so Mr. Menzies says. If a boom does develop we can look forward to his taking steps similar to those of last year to break it down.

Mr. Loveday: He will even take credit for it!

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes. It will be political propaganda to get people prepared for the Commonwealth elections in December. I will not refer further to that matter, but we face the Commonwealth election with every degree of optimism, despite what has been said about our Party's feelings in the matter. If returned to office the Labor Party, as has been said by Mr. Calwell on a number of occasions, will put the economy on a sound basis and restore full employment.

Mr. Lawn: The Treasurer secretly hopes that Mr. Calwell will take office because he will get more money from him than from Mr. Menzies.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Perhaps the Treasurer would look forward with confidence to what he would get from a Labor Government. Not only has he been refused financial assistance by the present Commonwealth Government, but has been in open conflict with it. He would be pleased with a Commonwealth Labor Government because he has not received from the present Commonwealth Government the go to which he is entitled. The Commonwealth Attorney-General, Sir Garfield Barwick, when speaking a few weeks ago in Brisbane during a television interview said that when the Government applied the credit squeeze it knew there would be some dislocation. Whom does he think he is kidding? He also said that he did not know how much dislocation there would be as conditions would be hard to forecast, and that the Government, when it put the squeeze on, hoped for the best. There is a contradiction in words. He also said that the effects of the squeeze would be over by Christmas. When the boom comes no doubt there will be another squeeze. Sir Garfield said that

what was stopping recovery was the fact that people were not spending normally. How can they spend normally if wages are not being received and businesses are failing? The Treasurer and the member for Torrens both said that what we need is confidence, but someone has to give that confidence. It will not come just by giving it to ourselves. Many of us have the utmost confidence in ourselves. I draw the attention of the member for Torrens to the following in the issue in September of the *Monthly Summary of Australian Conditions* by the National Bank of Australasia Limited:

The other alteration of economic import is the intention to have a small cash deficit of 16.5 million pounds as compared with a cash surplus of almost the same amount budgeted for and achieved last financial year. A cash deficit of this size is hardly likely to shake the economy, although the move from surplus to deficit was a move in the right direction. I would like the member for Torrens to study that and see whether he still believes that there should be no budgeting for a deficit. In his Budget Speech the Treasurer said:

There is evidence also of an increased recognition by both employers and employees that their common interests are much wider than hitherto supposed, and the room for benefit of one group at the expense of the other is very limited. Increased recognition of these factors can form a solid basis for future progress in productive activity and living standards.

I think the Treasurer was referring to employer-worker relationships. During and after the last war there was developed a high level of relationship between employer and employee organizations, and I believe it was to the advantage of all parties. I am probably more competent to speak on this matter than any other member of this Parliament. For nearly 40 years I have been negotiating agreements with various employer associations. One agreement my organization has with an employer association is registered in neither the Commonwealth nor the State court, and it has no force of law behind it. It is recognized by both parties and its contents are abided by honourably. We have not had one single dispute over it. I believe in this sort of relationship. What I have now said about a certain section of industry I believe could apply to all sections. When conditions were good and there was a demand for labour, employers were prepared to pay more in wages and provide better conditions than was normally the case when the matters were referred to arbitration. When conditions started to get bad last year the relationship began to deteriorate, and it is deteriorating week by week.

The Government should restore the relationship between employer and employee organizations. When matters are referred to arbitration the common touch is lost. Facts are put before the commissioner, or the arbitrator, or the chairman of the wages board. On a wages board there are direct representatives of the employers, or even the employers themselves. That is not the case in the courts where argument is put forward by both sides with neither prepared to give anything away, and both trying to get the commissioner to agree to what they want.

Mr. Quirke: By means of costly counsel.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes. I am speaking mainly now about wages boards, where there are no counsel. That is why I appreciate the South Australian wages board system to which I have always subscribed.

We can take as an example of this feeling what Mr. McMahon (Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Industry), who has no sympathy at all, as far as I can see, with the Labor movement or the worker, said, as reported in a newspaper article dated September 20, when he expressed himself at the annual convention dinner of the Printing and Allied Trades Employers' Federation:

"It seems extraordinary that just because you get a rise in the price of potatoes you also get costs rising, prices rising and wages rising. But when you get a fall in prices you do not get a corresponding fall in the cost of production."

He continued:

"I don't think many businessmen have realized that, as a result of the recent decision of the Arbitration Commission, we are in the future to get rises and falls in the wage structure in accordance with the consumer price index." He had looked at the commission's decision with some misgiving. Previously automatic adjustments had been tried, found wanting and abandoned.

My point on that is that, first of all, it was the influence of the Commonwealth Government in the then Arbitration Court and not the fact that these methods had been tried in respect of quarterly adjustments on the "C" series index figures that quarterly adjustments were suspended. So we find after argument down through the years that only last year the "C" series index figures were abandoned as the means of indicating the cost of living, and a new system, known as the "consumer price index", was introduced. The consumer price index was introduced (according to the Commonwealth Statistician, despite what Mr. McMahon had said here about misgivings about the acceptance of the consumer price

index) for the very purpose he mentioned here: that it seemed extraordinary that, when there was a rise in the price of potatoes, costs and wages rose as well. It was done for that purpose. Abrupt and acute fluctuations in potato prices affecting the cost of living and, in turn, wages, were one reason why this index was introduced, yet Mr. McMahon criticizes it and says that he looks at it with misgiving.

We on this side all appreciate the fact that, at least to some extent, the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission is to recognize a system of accepting the cost of living and adjusting wages accordingly on the consumer price index annually, and strong arguments would have to be introduced against it to satisfy the Commission that it should not be applied. That is coming at least some way round to the question of automatic adjustments. It is not going as far as we on this side should like. We do not agree entirely with the consumer price index; we think it has its shortcomings. We believe that some formula can be evolved that will truly reflect the cost of living. When that is done, we on this side should be happy to accept it—and not only we but the whole trade union movement.

Returning to the question of relationship, Mr. Clayton in his criticism of the printing trades unions and during his attacks made these points. I shall not refer to all of them because they are many and I have touched on this briefly once or twice. Mr. Clayton said:

Restrictive union policies designed to make work take longer and "thus sustain wasteful employment should have no place in Australian industry".

A little later he said:

Future employment can only come from an efficient industry, but continually rising cost levels will soon reduce the high level of efficiency our industry has now reached.

He points to the restrictive practices applied by the unions creating wasteful employment, yet he refers in later paragraphs to the high efficiency of their industry. Something is wrong with his summing up of the position because, if it is true that the unions apply these restrictive practices, as he infers, then their efficiency cannot be of the high standard to which he refers.

I should like to hear the newly elected member for Central No. 1 District in the Legislative Council (Mr. A. F. Kneebone) express his views on that. We have only to go through the local newspaper establishments to get some idea of the efficiency with which they are conducted. It would be difficult (speaking not of

their policies but of the way they are conducted) to find any establishment anywhere more efficient and better conducted than newspaper establishments. So it is wrong for these people to talk like this, particularly if they want to return to a happy relationship between employer and worker, because such remarks create discontent, not confidence; and confidence is essential for that happy relationship between employer and worker that is so desirable.

I wished to touch on several other matters this evening but I shall leave them for the time being and deal with them on the lines of the Estimates. At this stage I content myself with saying that I hope that in future, when

members of the Government see fit to criticize any statement, speech or part of a speech made by any member on this side, they will at least be decent about it. Let them not stoop to anything belittling or (I think I can almost say) indecent in their remarks about members on this side. We welcome criticism, and we are prepared to give it back. I would not introduce an attack on any member opposite, but when anyone unjustly attacks me or any member of my Party I reserve the right to hit back at him. I support the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 27, at 2 p.m.