

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Wednesday, August 1, 1951.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**TRANSPORT OF PARCEL POST.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Prior to the war the railways carried parcel post packages by passenger train to the other States, but during the war that practice was discontinued and parcel post packages were sent by goods train, and that practice still obtains. Will the Chief Secretary take up the question with the Minister of Railways to see whether the conditions pertaining prior to the war can be reinstated in order that parcels may reach their destinations more quickly?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I am not sure whether this is a question for the Post Office or the State Railways. However, I will refer the matter to the Minister concerned.

**ADDRESS IN REPLY.**

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption of Address in Reply.

(Continued from July 31. Page 149.)

The Hon. A. A. HOARE (Central No. 1)—I suppose I, too, should congratulate the mover and seconder on their speeches. It is to their credit, I think, that they really believed what they said was right, and the same may be said of all other members; they all believe in what they say and they have the right to express their opinions accordingly. One member congratulated you, Sir, on your retaining your position as President. This is the first occasion on which I have ever said anything concerning you, Sir, but I had the privilege to sit under the jurisdiction of four Presidents in the Federal sphere and I can honestly say that none was your superior. Every member here is treated with the utmost impartiality and you are always willing to help them in any matter on which they desire advice. No further words of mine could express more adequately the credit due to you, and we hope that you will live long to fulfil your dignified office, for I am sure you will always continue to act in the same fair manner.

Mr. Rowe yesterday referred to democrats and democracy. What is meant by a democratic man? I should say he is a person who believes in doing the greatest good for the greatest number; in other words, one who believes that the people as a body should be treated in a democratic way, thereby carrying

out the will of our great Master. I take it for granted that the Prince of Peace was a most democratic man. He chose for His disciples men from the ranks of labour, men whose hands were stained with toil, and He said to them, "Go out into the world and preach the gospel—the gospel for the poor." "Bear you one another's burdens," and so fulfil the law of the Stranger of Gallilee. The bearing of one another's burdens is the basic principle of Christianity, and if it were carried out we would not need to be worrying about the rise in prices or anything of that description. We would at least be democrats and followers of that lowly Nazarene. What has the world done with that glorious message of "Peace on earth and goodwill toward all men"? We are living in a greedy, war-mongering, and unchristianized world. The "peace on earth and goodwill" message has been trampled beneath the feet of the nations and despised by them. We see some people always looking for war, because they want the property belonging to someone else. We have a number of men who are using their energies, brains, and skill to construct weapons of war, while others are using all their ingenuity to construct a gun to blow them to pieces. Where is the sense and logic in that? There was war in the time of Moses and there has been war ever since. If anything, we are further away from that glorious message of "Peace on earth and goodwill toward all men."

The nations today are all afraid of each other, fearing that one is going to declare war on the other. They are using all their skill and ingenuity to construct the most destructive weapons, because they believe that the nation with the best army and the most destructive weapons will win a war. I once thought that if Russia had remained on the side of England, America, and France there would not have been any war today, because all nations would have been afraid to attack them owing to their potential industrial and military power. I used to think that Russia was a place where there would be no rich and no poor, but I have had to alter that opinion. I noticed in the press recently that the daughter of Stalin had a second wedding ceremony, the cost of which amounted to £100,000. That proves that there are still very rich people in Russia, and there is no disputing the fact that there is a big number of poor people there.

In this world today we have people on the bottom rung of the ladder who suffer because of the lack of sufficient food and clothing, a little above them are others who receive

slightly better treatment, but right at the top are those who have more than their fair share of this world's goods. That does not spell democracy. Although people toil and struggle for peace on earth, they are not likely to get that peace until they reach the better land.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Is there any hope for mankind?

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—That rests with the parliaments of the world, because they are the governing powers. The world is divided into two extreme factions—those with excessive wealth and the toiling, struggling masses. In almost every instance those with the wealth are controlling the parliamentary powers of the world. They make the laws to enrich the few and impoverish the many. On one occasion a man went to the Great Social Reformer and said, "Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?" and He replied, "Keep My commandments." He then answered, "All those I have kept from my youth." The Master then replied, "Friend, there is one thing thou lacketh—sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, and come, take up thy cross and follow me." That is socialism *in excelsis*. When one remembers the command, "Bear ye one another's burdens," he wonders why today we are suffering from rising prices. We should remove Mr. Menzies and his Party from power. We hear the buffoonery about his going to control prices. His job is to say it is a Federal matter and that his Government should control prices. The States cannot do it, because if one State fixes a price another State will fix a different one. Mr. Menzies could hold a referendum and let the people decide. That would be democracy. What harm is there in appealing to the people? The people are appealed to for the election of members of Parliament. Why not let them decide who should fix prices? What right has any Government to stand behind a scheme which amounts to wilful robbery? The people have been robbed because of continually rising prices. Even the income of old age pensioners has been attacked, but what does it matter to some people so long as they are piling up money in the bank? Many of those people will go to church and say "I thank Thee, Lord, that I am not as other men." Such people should be prevented from robbing their fellowmen, especially the poor. Eighteen months ago Mr. Menzies said he would put value back in the pound and his Government received many votes because of that promise. However, he now

tells us he cannot put value back in the pound or control prices. If he was honest he would confess that he was prevented from putting value back into the pound because Sir Arthur Fadden and Country member would not let him. The Government has just passed a banking Bill and it reminds me of what happened when I was in Federal politics. The Bruce-Page Government appointed a board to govern the Commonwealth Bank but restricted its activities in every direction and nearly bankrupted it. Sir Robert Gibson was Chairman of that Board. Jack Lang was blamed for the failure of the New South Wales Savings Bank but it was really the fault of that board. When the Bank of England decreased interest rates, except to Australia, Jack Lang said he would not pay the full interest because the interest rate payable by Australia had not been reduced. The newspapers condemned him and published statements which stampeded Savings Bank depositors into making withdrawals. They queued for hundreds of yards waiting for the bank to open and after three weeks the bank closed. Depositors then made a run on private banks and Sir Robert Gibson became scared and broadcast a message to the effect that there was no need for the bank to close its doors, because it was sound in finance and in principle. If he had made that statement at the beginning of the rush it would have stopped depositors from selling their deposits for about one-third of their value.

In New South Wales there was a rural bank which had over 200 branches, but it was harming private banks by lending money at a lower rate of interest. To get rid of the rural bank the savings bank had to be dealt with, for it controlled the rural bank. By closing the savings bank, in one instant they got rid of the rural banks of New South Wales. Another bank board has been appointed by Mr. Menzies and now there will be scarcely any competition. On several occasions private banks have asked the Commonwealth Bank to raise its interest rates, but the Commonwealth Bank has refused to do so. This board will be an echo of the private banks and do what it is told by them. When the private banks want to raise interest rates they will do so. Interest plays a great part in the prosperity of Australia.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—I see Dr. Coombe accepted the advice of the private banks.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—I shall come to that point. Australia is a place of many and mighty contrasts. One season there may be a bountiful harvest but the next harvest may be a failure. I have travelled through the north-

ern part of this State and seen land for hundreds of miles windswept and devoid of grass with stock too weak to stand. Squatters have been unable to pay their interest due from previous years and the banks have become the owners of the properties and the previous owners have become managers. Last year we had an exceptional season and there are good prospects for the coming season, but many things can happen before the harvest is reaped. Rain may come in time for the sowing, follow-on rains may further improve the prospects but then the fear of rust arises. If rust does not occur there is a fear of grasshoppers, and if not grasshoppers there is a worry lest there be a storm which will knock the crop down. The Government, by appointing this Board, will be able to do what it likes with the man who is hard pushed and wants a loan. It is said that competition is good for business but immediately the Commonwealth Bank Board commences operations competition will cease.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—Would there have been competition if the banks were nationalized?

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—I pointed out to Mr. Chifley, through the press and otherwise, that he need not spend a hundred million pounds or more to nationalize banks when he could get rid of them by reducing interest rates. If the rate of interest was 3 per cent and the banks came down to that the Commonwealth bank could have come down to 2½ per cent. If the private banks followed the Commonwealth could have come down to bare administrative costs and the private banks could not have stood up to the test.

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—What, compete with its own taxpayers?

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—No, the taxpayers would have got the full benefit of the cheap rate of interest, which would have done a lot more for them than the private banks ever did. A man named Cusack, who was secretary of the private banks association, replying to me—and half what he said was truth and half lies—said the banks did not use the depositors' money. Admittedly they do not use money in current accounts, but they do use fixed deposits. Why do they exist otherwise? About that time a well-to-do friend asked me, if I could lend him a couple of hundred pounds as he had over-reached himself. I asked him if he had tried to get some of his own money back from the banks, and he said that though they paid only 3 per cent on his deposits they would let him have a loan at 6½ per cent.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Was that recently?

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—It was a few years ago, but that does not matter.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—That is what we will have again, too.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—Of course we will. During the depression a man told me that the banks would not take £500 at fixed deposit. I explained to him that they had no use for the money as Australia was stagnating and there was no outlook for investments. I told him to go to the Treasury where he might get a low rate of interest.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—Do you think it right that the banks should pay wages?

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—Of course.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—I was just wondering where they got their money, for you seem to think that they can do everything for nothing.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—The Minister should know. They got some money out of him and a lot more farmers during the bad years. I can recall the Verco Bros. case. Farmers around Balaklava had delivered a lot of wheat and stacked it in Verco Bros. yards. When there was a rumour abroad that the firm was in financial difficulties the farmers carted away the wheat they had delivered, but they were ordered to return it because the court ruled it belonged to the Bank of Adelaide. A nice state of affairs!

In 1927, a drought year in Victoria, farmers and station owners were forced to borrow money to buy chaff to feed their stock. The banks refrained from buying feed and allowed the sheep to die on the properties under their control. After the drought broke the farmers wanted to borrow money in order to restock their properties, but the banks foreclosed on the mortgages or else forced the farmers to sell what stock remained to repay their liabilities, and then bought up the stock for almost nothing to restock the holdings on which they had let the sheep perish. The Commonwealth Bank Board appointed by the Bruce-Page Government did everything for the private banks and no-one else, and they reaped their harvest through charging whatever interest rate they chose.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—And we will have a repetition of that.

The Hon. A. A. HOARE—Of course we will. I know of an instance in which a man owned 1,500 sheep, and it required the wool from 1,100 of them to pay the interest on his loan. I think the farmers will come to wish that they had voted for Labor instead of for the Menzies Government. I hope they will continue

to have good seasons and will not be compelled to borrow money from the banks again. I wish them well.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Southern)—I join with members in their references to the impending Royal visit, and I naturally associate myself with all that has been said in regard to the unfortunate illness of our friend, Mr. Redman. Probably the greatest tragedy that has befallen this State in recent months is its undoubted loss in the death of Sir Charles McCann. I referred to him at some length only a year ago and, although I notice some feelers are being put out about the appointment of his successor, I am not concerned in the least how long the Government takes to make the appointment provided it selects the right man. Time spent in making that decision will be time well spent. I am under no delusions as to the value of the right man being at the head of our affairs overseas, and I was even more impressed with that fact after hearing Mr. Anthony's remarks concerning some of the Commonwealth Departments in England.

I compliment the mover and seconder on their considered speeches. I did not hear them, but after listening to the remainder of the speeches in this debate I have been most impressed by the fact that members seem to be more thoughtful and constructive than usual. Whether or not this is due to the serious cloud which hangs over Australia today I do not know, but without exception members have endeavoured, not only to praise the Government and Parliament for things done, but they have looked to the future, and that is a thing which I certainly, and perhaps others, should concentrate on to a greater degree in this debate. It has become somewhat platitudinous to pat this Government on the back. Last year I said that although all was not well throughout Australia, business seemed to proceed as usual in this State. I still think that that holds good. The maintenance of industry and transport in South Australia during the past 12 months is a matter for congratulation to all concerned. We are the envy and admiration not only of our neighbouring States, but also of our sister Dominion, New Zealand, for having managed to keep our house so well in order. Much of that is due to the co-operative spirit of the people.

There has been tremendous development of afforestation in the State. The production of flooring and case timber has been a boon either

directly or indirectly to nearly every person in the State. Last Sunday at Mount Burr I presented trophies for competitions held by trailer pump teams, most of whom came from the forest areas in the South-East. The Emergency Fire Service branch is growing rapidly. Its value to the State is recognized and it is agreed that it is a tremendous factor against possible losses. I am pleased that another two stations have been established, one at Kalangadoo and another at Lucindale, where the people have shown that they are willing to help themselves. If we had a similar policy followed throughout the State it would be a step in the right direction.

I now want to strike a serious note. In the South-East we have one of the greatest assets that the State will ever possess. I refer to its forests and timber industry. If the Government, whatever its Party, is to continue to build up that asset, it must do the whole job. I am somewhat worried that sufficient appropriate steps have not been taken by Parliament to press for the protection of this asset from fire. In the past few years some hundreds of timber homes have been constructed to house employees at the various mills, both private and Government, but many of them have been built on the south side of the forests. That is a matter of grave concern. Anyone with a knowledge of fire knows that it needs only a holocaust like the one in Victoria in 1941 for a major tragedy to occur. Our two biggest mills could be gutted in a matter of minutes. No steps have been taken in any of these mills to protect the personnel employed there. When I remember the loss of life at some of the Victorian mill fires, I am immediately reminded that steps should be taken to protect life in our own forest areas. A forest fire is a dreadful thing. If we are to build up this asset, we should remember that it is also our moral duty to protect it.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Has any representation been made to the Government?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—If there had, I feel certain that it would not have turned it down. Sufficient thought has not been given in many cases where the houses in this area should have been built, and the people are now beginning to realize that it is a menace.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Are not the houses at Nangwarry built on the eastern side of the forest?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—They are south of the long line of forests abutting the Penola Road. In the forest areas buildings should

never be put on the south side of the forest. I would not build a haystack on the north side of my home, because of the danger of my home catching fire.

I will refer shortly to another matter, but will have more to say on it later. Recently the High Court gave a ruling in favour of the Railways Commissioner in connection with fires at Gawler. We must, of course accept that ruling, but it has given cause for grave concern among landholders in the Mid-North, the Adelaide Hills, and the South-East. Landholders do not know where they stand now concerning any precaution they may take against fires caused by railway engines. I hope that before a tragedy occurs the Government will consider clarifying the position and endeavour to deal with what is recognized as a difficult problem.

Practically every speaker has mentioned road transport. The mileage of country roads is increasing greatly, particularly in newly-settled areas. I draw the attention of the authorities to the urgent need for a road from Loxton through Pinnaroo to Bordertown. That would open up much country and facilitate transport. The interim report of the Royal Commission on Transport made several recommendations regarding Kangaroo Island, and I trust that the most important of them will be expedited. I read the final report of that commission with great care, and commend it to honourable members. I consider that we have been too generous to transport on our main arterial roads. South Australia charges the lowest fees of any State in Australia for interstate traffic using our highways. Although I realize that looming in the background is section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, I contend that advantage can be gained by consultation between the States and by greater uniformity in transport enactments. I recall that when the Transport Control Board was appointed it had its teething pains like many other boards and there were many anomalies. It often raised the ire of primary producers, but I am glad to say that through the years the board has dealt with many of those anomalies. Its object has been virtually to protect the railways from unfair competition, and at the same time to co-ordinate their activities. But our chief worry today is not the co-ordinating of railways and roads but to devise means of paying for arterial roads which are being used by interstate carriers. The point worrying our Minister of Works is that the Government pays a huge sum of money for a few miles of road and within a few months the road is destroyed. What we have to pay

for railways pales into insignificance when compared with the cost of our roads. We are spending far too much time in deciding that because Jones transported a piano without a permit with a load of posts for which he held a permit he has broken the law. A man is charged £1 to come from Bordertown to Adelaide with a load of 40 tons and in wet weather he does thousands of pounds worth of damage to the road.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Would you subscribe to a policy of the Commonwealth Government controlling those roads?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I would not: it is unnecessary and beside the point. In the last 10 days I have travelled 1,500 miles on the road to Melbourne and the condition of the road is getting scandalous. The law is being openly flouted and to do anything we will require additional traffic police or inspectors. Mr. Condon interjected that we should alter the Road Traffic Act. I have examined that Act which will require only a few minor amendments to meet the present situation. The position regarding loading and speed is covered, but have we ever had a prosecution where a vehicle has carried more than 30 tons on that road? If two heavily laden vehicles pass they have to go on the shoulders of the road and the road won't stand the weight. Mr. Richmond said that the modern road cannot keep pace with the modern vehicle. If provision was made that no vehicle could carry more than 30 tons we would require additional police. We should insist that the Chief Secretary has enough funds to provide more police. What are a few thousand pounds in salaries compared with the hundreds of thousands of pounds at present going down the drain? The Commission does not suggest that ancillary vehicles should be controlled and as a private enterprise supporter I am inclined to agree. Where a man goes to a firm and says "I cannot get a permit to take your furniture to Melbourne," the firm says "Put our name on the side of your truck." I do not know how we can deal with that loophole. If we could, another would only be discovered. The only answer is to make people pay for the use of the road if they are making their livelihood from it. It is noticeable that no reference is made in the report to the cost of roads when speaking of co-ordination with railways, but there are lengthy details of railway charges over the last 10 years. The Commission could well have called for figures concerning the cost of roads and incorporated them in its report.

The Public Works Standing Committee, like our Ministers, is being grossly overworked. I do not know whether some of their work could be unloaded on the Land Settlement Committee but it does seem lopsided to think that the Land Settlement Committee, although on the same financial basis, should have about one-twentieth of the work that the Public Works Standing Committee has. Some of the load should be taken off the Public Works Standing Committee either by increasing its limitations or by giving it to some other committee. I support the motion.

The Hon. E. A. OATES (Central No. 1)—In listening to previous member's speeches I have wondered on many occasions whether I am in the Legislative Council. I join with them in their remarks regarding the forthcoming visit of Their Majesties to Australia. The Royal party will receive a titanic welcome and I hope that the atmosphere of war which hangs overhead will have cleared. I regret the passing of such a valuable servant as Sir Charles McCann. He rendered great service not only to South Australia but to Australia. I compliment you, Mr. President, for admitting the mistake you made on the concluding day of the last Session. I do not know who said "By our mistakes we learn," but it is true and you will not make that mistake again. No doubt in future years some other distinguished gentleman holding your position will refer to your decision. I said I doubted whether I was in the Legislative Council because something has been lacking in this debate. The only mention made of strikes was by Mr. Densley who referred to the potato strike. We have heard nothing of Communism nor of the slow turn-round of vessels at the waterfront. Have Government members been told to remember there is a referendum and that those people should not be offended? Do they fear that Fascism is now taking the place of Communism? The Labor Party has not merged with another party but I am afraid it will be hemmed in by the infiltration of Fascists, Communists and the Liberal and Country Party.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—Tell us something about industrial committees?

The Hon. E. A. OATES—The honourable member will probably hear something about that at a later date. I know that some workers have been disobedient and have struck, but each time they have been told that they were starving the children of the workers. Did the Government responsible for those state-

ments tell the people that the potato growers had adopted direct action which, I agree, was the only way in which they could get what they required? Did any Minister tell the people that the Communists had got in among the potato growers? Did they say "We want to bring the potato growers under the Crimes Act?" No. They accepted it in silence, but had it been some labour organization which had said "We feel that our commodity, which is our labour, is worth more and we intend to declare a strike or adopt direct action" they would have said "Communist controlled union out on strike." Did they say that to Mr. Jude or other woolgrowers when, in February last, because there was a drop in wool prices they withdrew their wool from the market? Had it been a body of workers who withdrew their labour it would have been declared a Communist organization by a crowd of Fascists.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—The only way the wool was withdrawn was through a transport strike.

The Hon. E. A. OATES—The honourable Minister knows that what I say is correct. The growers refused to sell their wool.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—There were no buyers.

The Hon. E. A. OATES—The buyers were there, but the price had dropped some 23 per cent and the woolgrowers were not prepared to sell—exactly the same attitude as the workers when they declare a strike in order to get an increase in wages. We have heard a great deal regarding the shortage of materials—timber, galvanized iron and cement—from overseas. We heard a long oration from Mr. Bice regarding steel from overseas.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—It has sometimes been made in Australia, too.

The Hon. E. A. OATES—I think it is being made now, and at a cheaper rate.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—In minimum quantities.

The Hon. E. A. OATES—In large quantities. The honourable member disregards the great progress being made in Australia which is forcing the demand for steel. We hear of prefabricated schools and homes ready for shipment to Australia which are held up because of lack of shipping space. I modestly put a proposal to the Government. What is wrong with chartering a ship to bring to South Australia alone what she requires? That is one way to get over the difficulty, and I will guarantee that the ship will be unloaded in double quick time. The Government charters ships to bring

out coal, and if it is right for that purpose what is wrong with chartering ships in which to transport other commodities so urgently needed in the State? We have heard that farmers are unable to get harvesting machinery, or the councils heavy machines for roadwork. They also could be included in the cargoes, and I offer that suggestion for the Government's consideration.

Some two years ago I moved the adjournment of this Council in order to discuss the plight of British migrants at the Rosewater Hostel, and it is one thing of which I have never been ashamed. Although I told members the true position I regret that little has been done to improve the conditions and it is a bad advertisement for South Australia and the Commonwealth. I have offered to take members down to see this hostel, and I am pleased to say that two did go down last week. I refer to Mr. Wilson, a member of this Council, and the Honourable K. C. Wilson, M.H.R. Although they were probably defeated in their objective, I know that their visit was appreciated by the people they met in private. Something will have to be done, as I understand it is proposed to continue to bring out migrants. We Australians should see that something is done to provide them with a warmer welcome. I do not think our Premier will object to my saying—for he did not give it to me in confidence, others being present—that he told me when I approached him that never at any time had he favoured hostels or community kitchens. His idea was that migrants should be housed in single units, or double units at most, and he did not hesitate to say that the emergency homes, which are in very great demand, were the type of homes he had in mind providing for migrants some three or four years ago. However, as I understand the position, when the present Commonwealth Government assumed office in December, 1949, it withdrew all power from the State Government.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Does the honourable member think these people were led up the garden path?

The Hon. E. A. OATES—Definitely. I do not know whether Mr. Anthony, when in England, saw the propaganda which is placed before intending migrants, but I have seen some of the literature, and the picture painted is certainly very different from the actual state of affairs. They were informed that Nisson huts would be provided, and they were told that if they were not prepared to accept them they should not apply to become migrants, but only within the last month or two have we

seen the Nisson huts at Gepps Cross. However, if they are again to be fed in community kitchens I am sure there will be cause for grievance. Two very sensible people called at my place last night and they said that they have no complaint about the quality of the food that is supplied, but it is all slushed up in the kitchen and becomes neither Irish stew nor soup. I do not know what is going to be said when Mrs. Sullivan and her husband arrive back in England and tell the true story of what is happening in South Australia.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—According to their point of view.

The Hon. E. A. OATES—Yes. Most of these migrants are a fine type who appreciate any small thing one can do for them. We found recently that there were many ailments in the camp and at a meeting of the Bush Nursing Society it was decided that the sister should visit the camp. When she went along she was received with open arms, and she is now giving one day a week to the hostel which she can ill afford from her other duties. That is very much appreciated by the migrants. Whichever Minister is responsible, I should like him at the first opportunity to bring the matter to the notice of the Commonwealth authorities. Conditions at the hostel are such as to discourage migrants coming here. I have heard it said that the hostel at Bathurst, New South Wales, is a mansion compared with those in and around Port Adelaide.

I was surprised to learn from the Governor's Speech that the Supplementary Estimates will not provide for further grants to the District and Bush Nursing Society, although the names of numerous other institutions were specifically included. The object of the organization is to relieve stress and sickness in the homes and render skilled nursing aid. This work is done gratuitously where necessary, being particularly welcomed in the industrial areas. The sisters are always prepared to lend a hand to those in need. The first branch was founded in 1894, and 57 years later there are now 17 in the metropolitan area, including three with two sisters and two cars; in the country there are 11 branches. There is no doctor in residence at three of the centres, and the whole responsibility for caring for the sick is thrown on the bush sisters, who work under numerous difficulties. I am proud to be a life member of the organization. The Port Adelaide Branch has to raise about £1,240 a year for the parent body.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—How is the money generally raised?

The Hon. E. A. OATES—We hold dances, baby, grandfather and grandmother competitions—in fact any entertainment which will raise money provided it is within the law. I remind the Chief Secretary that the society will not mind accepting some of the tainted money from the betting tax to assist it in its good work. This organization maintains two hospitals which have no doctor in residence, one being at Marree and the other at Meningie.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—Every one is subsidized according to the number of the staff.

The Hon. E. A. OATES—The society appreciates the grants provided by the Government, but would like further assistance. From July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951, there were 116,479 visits paid, an increase of 17,186 on the previous year, or 17 per cent. The average number of patients visited each month was 1,362. That is an indication that the sisters are not idle. Although supposed to be working a 40-hour week, they work many hours overtime. Sister Nield has asked her staff to report when they exceed their normal working hours, but the sisters do not do so as they do not want to embarrass her. They work after hours and say nothing about it because they feel they are helping those who are unable to help themselves. I was at a home recently and a woman who was standing nearby when a nurse approached said, "This is one of God's angels bringing a welcome message of comfort to me." The scope of the society has been widened because of the lack of hospital beds, which results in patients being sent home earlier than in the past. Also, the society is left with large numbers of definite hospital cases which cannot gain admission. I have no axe to grind with the Chief Secretary. I realize he has done and is doing his duty, and I assure him that I am not bringing this forward as criticism of the Hospitals Department. On occasions I have worried him and the Superintendent of Hospitals in endeavouring to have a person admitted into the hospital knowing that someone might be put out.

When a person leaves hospital he requires some attention and members of the District and Bush Nursing Society willingly supply his needs. The type of nursing consists of—(a) post-operative dressings and treatments; (b) sponging of both acute and chronic cases; (c) varied injections, which must be done by an experienced person; (d) any treatment ordered by the medical man direct or through almoner staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital; closer co-operation from both these directions has given great impetus to the work; (e) in the

small country centres the nurse takes more responsibility. Her presence gives to the people a sense of security where a doctor is not readily available. Some people confuse the District and Bush Nursing Society with the Red Cross Society, which also does wonderful work. The D.B.N.S. nurses are meeting the evergrowing need for their services with keenness and enthusiasm, showing that the true spirit of idealism lives in the modern nurse. They go about their duties, trying to ease the sick, without thought of themselves. A sister at Port Adelaide was a round, blossom-faced middle-aged woman when she started but now she is pale and thin and only because of her devotion to duty. An appeal will shortly be opened by His Excellency the Governor and I would regard it as a favour if every Minister and country member broadcast it to the people he meets. The need is so great that the service must be continued, despite rising costs, and even expanded. More nurses and cars are required. New districts are opening up and nurses will be required to attend in those districts. Port Adelaide nurses are required to assist the Woodville nurse in the newer areas. Sooner or later Woodville will require a second nurse because of the expansion in that district. The first approach for assistance was made to the branch committees. By a superhuman effort they increased their subscriptions this year by over 15 per cent, reaching a total of almost £10,000 besides providing and keeping 27 motor cars on the road. They feel that they have reached the limit of what they can do. As a recognition of what voluntary helpers have done, an appeal will be made to the general public for wider support. It is a matter of concern that the age, and in some instances ill-health, of voluntary workers does not prevent their struggling on with what has been a life work. In the branch of which I have been president for many years there is no member under the age of 50 and one member is 84. The number of patients from public hospitals visited during the year ended June 30, 1950, was 25,548, an average of 234 visits a month. Whilst I ask for additional financial assistance from the State Government, I feel that the Federal Government has an obligation, because whenever a person leaves a hospital the Commonwealth Government is relieved of paying 8s. per day. It is the obligation of the Commonwealth Government to say to this organization "You are relieving us of certain financial responsibility. We will be prepared to meet you on a percentage basis."

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—This Commonwealth Government is running close to the policy of the previous Government.

The Hon. E. A. OATES—It is following the same policy. I have had correspondence with the Minister who replaced Mr. Dedman. For the year ended June 30, 1951, the number increased to 31,677, almost 20 per cent above the previous year, and the monthly average was 273, an increase of 16 per cent above the previous year. I make bold to say that possibly half of those patients are incurable. It is not a pleasant thing for these nurses to visit people with incurable growths and find a shilling or two left on the table for the society. In many instances we have found that patients who have been paying £10 to £14 a week in private hospitals, on being declared incurable, have been taken away by their relatives who immediately ring for the D.B.N.S. sister. Notwithstanding that they have been paying £14 a week to a private hospital they forget about the society, or they may offer a few shillings. It is often those who are struggling most from whom they receive as much as 10s., perhaps once a month. We have thought of fixing a fee of 2s. or 2s. 6d. for each visit, but we have been unable to draw up a scheme to meet hardship cases. I think if the Government laid this responsibility upon us we would do something about it, although here I am expressing only my personal opinion and not that of the society. The Commonwealth Government definitely should accept a share of the responsibility and provide something from the revenue it is collecting for social services; moreover, it is probably collecting money from persons who are sick, since they pay taxation as well as others. Something from this source ought to be available for such an organization as this. I have no wish to deprive our hospitals of the money they so urgently need, but we do feel that the Government should make a grant to this organization, and I hope the few words I have uttered will not fall on deaf ears. It is an expanding organization, and it is therefore all the more difficult for the parent body to finance the branches. I am gratified to know that the Government has subsidized the Marree and Meningie branches through the parent body. I should say in fairness that Sister Nield said to me, "I do not think you should criticize our Government too much." I replied that I did not intend to do so, but assumed she would not mind my asking for a little extra assistance, and she said that they would appreciate anything we could get for them.

In connection with the work of the D.B.N.S. I desire to pay a compliment to the Hon. F. J. Condon, who, when the Port Adelaide branch of the society was in great difficulties many years ago, gave it invaluable assistance which enabled it to be placed on a sound financial basis.

In conclusion, I compliment those who have spoken in this debate, particularly the mover and seconder, for I was rather puzzled to know what they could find to talk about. The Governor's speech, although giving a picturesque history of the Government, said little about the future and consequently, with the little information at their disposal, they did an excellent job. I support the motion.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Northern—Chief Secretary)—On numerous occasions the merit and value of the Address in Reply debate has been discussed. I repeat what I have said on previous occasions, that its value lies in the fact that every member has an opportunity to ventilate matters which concern his electorate and, without any limitation whatsoever on subject matter, can bring under the notice of Parliament and the Government matters which concern him and the territory he represents. At the outset I would congratulate the mover and seconder on their excellent speeches. Unlike Mr. Oates, I feel that they had a good foundation of subject matter in the information placed before Parliament in the Governor's Speech, and they made good use of it. They set the debate in motion on a very high plane, which has been maintained by succeeding speakers. I should like to refer to the very noticeable improvement in the way in which some of our newer members presented their subject matter on this occasion. I would also like to endorse the sentiments expressed by others regarding the contemplated visit of Their Majesties the King and Queen and Princess Margaret. I am sure that we are all delighted that the improvement in His Majesty's health has been such that we can look forward to his visit with confidence, and I know that their reception will be worthy of such an important occasion.

I would also join in the compliments which have been paid to men holding high public offices who have passed on during the recess, and add my eulogies on the work they have done. I also express the wish that our Clerk, Mr. Redman, may soon be back with us enjoying such good health as will enable him to carry on his duties once more. We have missed two personalities in this Council in Mr. Cudmore and Mr. Perry, who are abroad, and I

take this opportunity to pass on to members the good wishes which Mr. Cudmore asked me to convey to members on both sides when he wrote recently.

Prior to the adjournment of Parliament last session, and through the good offices of members, it was my honour to represent the South Australian Parliament in New Zealand. I would like to thank members for the assistance they gave my colleague during my absence and for the honour they conferred upon me in selecting me to represent this Parliament. It was, indeed, a most interesting trip. Thirty-five countries were represented at the conference with over 70 delegates, and what impressed me more than anything else was to view that vast audience and realize the number of religions and colours represented, all speaking the English language. There were, of course, notable expressions of dialect which made some delegates more difficult to follow than others, but one was forced to appreciate the value of so many representatives of countries coming together for discussions and speaking a common tongue. One could not but feel that if that were possible the world over how much easier it would be to iron out the problems threatening the world today. If we all spoke the same language we could dispose of many of the misunderstandings which occur. It would be easier to understand their psychology and overcome the suspicions which exist among people holding different views and speaking different languages, but for whom it is imperative that they shall hold their places peaceably in the world. Apart from the value of the discussion, I think perhaps the greatest value of conferences of this nature lies in personal contacts between delegates and the opportunity to travel together which we had for eight or nine days prior to the conference and for a similar period afterwards. It was then that you had opportunities for unfettered discussion on any subject you chose to raise, and you got to appreciate and understand the personalities of the delegates. Extensive and complete arrangements for the conference were made by the New Zealand Government. Thanks were due to the officers in charge of the conference. In a week or so two delegates from the South Australian Parliament will attend a conference in Tasmania of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. The Council is to be represented by the Hon. F. J. Condon and another delegate will go from the House of Assembly. I congratulate Mr. Condon on his selection and know that he will

worthily represent this Parliament. We hope he will have a most valuable and enjoyable trip.

This year being Jubilee year, on such an occasion one would naturally wish to view in retrospect the life and development of this country. In doing so, one cannot fail to appreciate and be proud of the work of our forefathers who pioneered it. One realizes that the railroads which traverse the country from north to south and east to west were in the main built before Federation, and with few exceptions our arterial roads were surveyed and built in the early days, being used by the coach and four to take mails and passengers from one part of the country to another. In those days a very small number of people accomplished great things in this State. Wherever we travel we see evidence of the great religious faith of our forefathers who built numerous churches, many of which today are, unfortunately, only half-filled. Many of these churches were built even before homes, evidence that our forebears were people of very high principles. They toiled hard for the few amenities they enjoyed, and as they toiled they never lost sight of their obligations to their fellow men. They did not have, as we have today, telephones, radios, cinemas, water reticulation, health and hospital facilities and education facilities.

In this Jubilee year we can look back and find much to inspire us to much greater effort than we are making today. I am afraid that prosperity has not nurtured or fortified within us the essential personal qualities which are so necessary. For more than a century Australia lived smug in the conviction that everything would be all right because it had the protection of the British navy; therefore, we could go along in our own sweet way enjoying all the advantages, giving little consideration to the great responsibilities which must inevitably lie ahead. Today, more than ever before, we are called upon to cultivate a greater conception of world affairs. The Mother Country has been scarred by the impact of two world wars and the responsibility it has carried in the interests of world civilization. There is no need for me to dwell on the history of those wars and the very great responsibility which the Mother Country carried, almost alone, over a great period. We are called upon to exercise greater effort in collaboration with our allies. We are fortunate in having such a great friend as America, which is taking over many of the heavy responsibilities which were

previously left to Great Britain alone. Often we have been prone, in an atmosphere of isolation, to speak too much of our rights and too little of our obligations. In that respect, every section of the community must accept its share of the responsibility. I suppose one should start with members of Parliament. Although we form a component part of a great institution, often we are too prone to act as listeners and not sufficiently anxious to act as leaders. How often do we hear complaints and imaginary grievances which do not merit much justification. It is up to public men to provide the lead in the first place, not in factional fights, but in setting an example of what public men and others should be doing to make this world a better and happier place to live in.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You find all those attributes in the Opposition in this Chamber.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The honourable member had much to say about what the Labor Party had done and what other Parties had not done. We have seen in the last couple of days how various sections of the community have been brought together in conference to consider a matter of great public importance, and how one section has advocated its rights as against the rights of others, and how some sections have expressed themselves unwilling to give away on anything. There was no spirit of compromise. From such discussions we cannot gather much hope, and without unified effort we cannot accomplish anything. Yet, everyone agreed that something should be done; but it is always the other fellow who should do it. I am not going to despair of what has happened. The discussions have been of value to the extent that everyone who attended aired his views. If everyone throws his hat into the ring and then does his best, we can expect something to develop out of it.

I pay a tribute to the speech of our Premier at the conference yesterday morning. He introduced a splendid atmosphere and made a most valuable contribution in putting the second day's discussion on a much higher plane than the opening day. His effort probably prevented a complete break-up of the conference. Pointing the bone will not get us anywhere. While there is an over plus of money and a shortage of goods, controls or any other artificial means of rectifying the position are difficult. No one solution can be offered to overcome inflation. We know that controls are repugnant to human freedom, and if an attempt is made to control something we arrive at a position similar to that mentioned in this

afternoon's press in regard to meat. People who obtain meat from a butcher outside the controls are not going to give evidence against him, and that would happen in regard to other goods as well. It is no use trying to suggest that because control has failed in the hands of one Party, it will be more successful in the hands of another Party, or because control has failed in the hands of the State it will be any more successful under the aegis of the Commonwealth.

I do not intend to be embroiled in an argument on the 40-hour week. I know, as every other honourable member knows, that in many industries a 40-hour week is not operative, and that instead of taking advantage of the opportunity to enjoy recreation of mind and body, many people are engaged on Saturdays and Sundays on work that is most profitable, because the remuneration from it is not taxed. I felt that I could not allow certain remarks of Mr. Bardolph to pass unnoticed. I know he would not wilfully mislead the Council in any way. However, yesterday he made the following comment:—

A falling off in production has not been due to laziness on the part of artisans but has been primarily due to a *laissez faire* attitude adopted by the employer in not modernizing his machinery and not meeting the impact of the 40-hour week and other conditions given to the worker by properly constituted tribunals.

The fact is that a 40-hour week was not originated by a tribunal, but ultimately was accepted by it.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You do not mean to tell me that the Arbitration Court was coerced into giving a 40-hour week?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I will leave the honourable member to judge that for himself. I was referring to a Bill introduced in New South Wales in 1943 but could tell the honourable member something about what the Minister who introduced it did. I believe that Minister now occupies some position in the arbitration sphere. The Bill says:—

In all industries subject to the provisions of this section the number of ordinary working hours of an employee shall not exceed (1) eight hours during any consecutive 24 hours or (2) 40 hours per week or (3) 80 hours in 14 consecutive days or (4) 120 hours in 21 consecutive days or (5) 160 hours in 28 consecutive days.

There the formula runs out, but I think it was expected it would continue for the succeeding weeks of the year by 40 hours a week. I do not think there was any doubt in the mind of the Minister who introduced the Bill

as to what it was intended to do. Mr. Hamilton Knight, who was then Minister for Labour and Industry, said:—

Workers, not in New South Wales alone but throughout Australia, have endeavoured to obtain the 40-hour week by constitutional means by making the necessary application to the Commonwealth Court, but I think honourable members opposite will agree that their patience has been sorely tried by the delays that have taken place. It will be said that the introduction of a 40-hour week will result in loss of production. But will the loss be so great if the workers in this State become more contented as a result of this Parliament granting it? It must be apparent to everyone that as the result of the frequent and increasing stoppages and absenteeism due to the deeply-rooted conviction in the workers that they are entitled to reduced hours the actual hours of work in industry today are not anything like 44 a week.

I do not think we have had any less industrial disputes, but apparently there was great confidence when that was introduced that, because of stoppages and dissatisfaction, when the 40-hour week was introduced everybody would be contented and we would have 40 hours of full production and a happy community. I think that is supported by the Minister's concluding peroration:—

The Bill seeks to bring about one of the greatest social reforms that has ever been sought in this country, and history will record the fact that in 1947 this Government fulfilled its promise to give the worker a place in the new era that followed the second World War.

That was the introduction and beginning of the 40-hour week so far as I can ascertain. Somebody mentioned coercion but it is obvious that you could not have had that condition existing in one State or in two industries in one State without it becoming general. I think that is what happened. However my friend tries to interpret who introduced the 40-hour week, the answer is definitely that it was introduced by a Government which said it would be recorded that one of its great achievements was to emancipate the worker after World War II.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Didn't the Arbitration Court make the 40-hour week universal?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—Exactly: it had no alternative. As I said, it could not operate in one State in the Commonwealth or in two industries within a State without repercussions elsewhere any more than you could apply a basic wage rise to one section of the community without passing it on to the whole. I am not discussing the merits or demerits but

point out that the effect of that legislation was one of the first steps towards inflation. That is inescapable.

We have heard a lot about hospitalization in this debate and newspapers gave factual information in two articles last week. What was the effect upon it? In the last three or four years we have built nothing but accommodation without providing one extra bed for the treatment of hospital cases. That has been the means of diverting labour and materials from other essential needs wanted in a hurry. We had a terrific leeway to make up after six years of war and it meant we had to draw a considerable amount of labour and materials from the normal pool to provide anything in the way of increased hospital facilities which were being clamoured for more and more every day. For four years we have been trying to make up the leeway. I am not criticizing the 40-hour week but we must face the facts and that is the position. Combined with the lack of goods, it has been an inflationary influence. I think everybody will agree that that is a perfectly unbiased factual summing up of the position.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—In spite of what you say there is no Government, for political reasons, game enough to interfere with the 40-hour week.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I never suggested interfering with it, and I have not said one word against the 40-hour week. I said it contributed towards inflation. It is nothing but cant and humbug for the Premier of New South Wales to go to the conference and say that the Commonwealth Government has done nothing about inflation as though it all happened in the last 18 months. It started in 1947, so why not be fair and face the facts instead of going on with a lot of party political nonsense that does not make one atom of contribution towards solving the problem.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—We are not responsible for what the Premier of New South Wales said.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I heard the Opposition refer to many things and I did not object. We heard a lot about the Prime Minister and who were the great men and who were not but I am not responsible for them. I am trying to express some opinion of what the real position is today and why we are in our present difficulties. I suggest that as members of the Opposition were so particular about a proper apportionment of the blame they should not object to taking some portion of it through past practices. If we accept

the responsibility for the last 18 months and call it a truce, let us get down to tin tacks and see what we can do about it.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Does the Minister want to come back tonight?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I listened to the Leader of the Opposition for an hour and ten minutes but I have not spoken for half an hour yet. If he would like to come back I will continue and enlarge upon all the points I wish to raise, but I assure him I do not want to do that.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Did not the Federal Arbitration Court introduce the 40-hour week without interference from Parliament?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—New South Wales was in favour of introducing the 44-hour week first. I am not arguing about the number of hours. I am only trying to get the thoughts of honourable members on what is the position. All I have said about the 40-hour week is that the resulting effect was inflationary. We may as well start from there instead of harping about the position and who is responsible.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What are those in power doing to arrest it?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I suggest that once all sections accept the facts and a proper share of responsibility then there might be some moving force to bring everybody together to find a solution. It is a certainty that as we all benefit in the good things so we will all have some share in any adjustments which have to be made.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You are not foreshadowing another Premiers' Plan of 1931?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—No more than the honourable member suggested anything yesterday. I am only trying to establish the position we are in and I have not thrown accusations at anybody. One should say something about health matters. There were two very good articles published in the press last week which set out the position of hospitalization. I shall not repeat the information, but I thought the heading was rather unfortunate—"Hospital Position is Bad and Getting Worse." So many people read headlines but will not wade through a whole page of a newspaper. The headline does not accurately describe the position and the story actually corrects it. About 1943 a Federal Social Services Committee was established by the Chifley Government and it took evidence all over the Commonwealth in regard to social service benefits and hospitalization. Preceding that committee, which was a joint Parliamentary committee on social security, there was a medical

survey committee, which consisted of many eminent medical men—Dr. Lilley of New South Wales, Dr. McCallum, who is very highly credentialled, Sir Raphael Cilento, the Director-General of Health in Queensland, Dr. Arthur Brown, Mrs. Agnes Walsh, Matron of Perth King Edward Memorial Hospital for Women, a treasury official and a secretary. They established the standard for hospital requirements and set out the position very well. They also established the figure of the bed requirements for hospitalization of the people. They made what I thought were very appropriate remarks and adjustments because of it. They said:—

The recent graduate and the doctor who has kept abreast of the advances of medical science will make greater use of a hospital than a doctor who had his training and developed his professional habits before medicine became institutionalized as it is today. Again, the busy doctor will take advantage of the time-saving services of a hospital.

Those were their comments before they established a standard figure of hospital requirements within the country, and they have more significance than people realize. That is the position today, particularly amongst the newer doctors who look for hospitalization of the people to a much larger degree than ever any previous generation did, and in consequence we are having tremendous demands made upon hospitals. Be that as it may, having made that observation they established the requirements for standard hospitalization.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Is the staff position satisfactory?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I am not dealing with staff at the moment. We are working a 44-hour week at the hospitals and paying award rates, which are four times what they were a few years ago.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—But even working a 44-hour week you are still in difficulties?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—Yes, but I want to refer to the bed position. Statistics show that we have 11 beds per 1,000 of the population, whereas the standard figure established by that expert committee was nine.

The Hon. E. A. Oates—Did that article refer to that?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—It did, but if people, as they so often do, read only the headlines, they would get the impression that we were thousands of beds deficient in hospitalization, whereas we are above standard requirements, despite the fact that all our building of late has been to provide staff accommodation. The fact remains that under modern

medical practice there are demands upon hospitals even above what this committee suggested. Its conclusion was that 2.3 per cent of the population are sick at the one time, and that from 5 per cent to 20 per cent of that number require hospitalization. Having established this fact the committee allowed 25 per cent for overflow, or vacant beds, for it is obvious that there is not a regular flow of occupation. Thus they established a number of five general hospital beds per thousand of population; for contagious diseases .5 per thousand; diseases of children .5; for maternity .45; for sub-acute diseases .5; for convalescent patients .5; and for chronic diseases 1. That brought the number to 8.45. Then the committee made another allowance: owing to the increased tendency for maternity cases to attend hospitals it increased the standard from .45 to one per thousand, and that brought the total hospitalization required, excluding mental and tubercular hospitals, to nine beds per thousand. Now, we have 11 per thousand, and never have we been in the position that there have not been vacant beds. There have been inconveniences, admittedly, but most of them arise from the fact referred to in this report—the tendency for younger graduates to push everybody into hospitals and, because beds may not be conveniently available, to make the general charge that beds are scarce.

The Hon. E. A. Oates—Do you think the doctors were playing up to the opportunity to send people into hospital because the Commonwealth Government was allowing first, 6s. and then 8s. a bed?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—No, I do not think it would have anything to do with that, so far as the doctors were concerned. The whole tendency has been towards institutionalizing medical treatment, for it is much easier for a doctor to attend a patient in hospital than to do a round of visits.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Can the Minister say who inspired that press article?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I do not think it was inspired. It was a very good article provided people read it carefully, and if members have not seen it I commend it to their notice. The writer was courteous enough to show it to me before publishing it, and I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not criticizing it; it is a factual presentation of the position. All that I suggested was that a careless reader was apt to get the wrong conception by merely reading the headlines. I do not think we are in any worse position in respect of hospitals than in other services,

such as sewers or water supplies. We are battling along against difficulties in getting supplies and in getting contractors to build. The Western Districts Hospital contract has been let, but supplies of steel have been cut off, whilst at the same time we are asked to meet two difficult problems—the poliomyelitis outbreak, which places a demand on the greater part of the 240 beds at Northfield, and the terrific motor accident rate which, on the last census taken, demanded 132 out of the 280 beds available. The problems associated with accidents are somewhat similar to those associated with poliomyelitis; both require after care, and if home treatment is not available convalescents immobilize a large number of beds.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—One can be avoided, but the other cannot.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—That is true if we could find a solution, but the accident cases include a large number of fractured femurs which require probably up to three months' attention in hospital, thereby immobilizing a great number of beds. To sum up, I may say that the staff position, although not adequate, has improved to some extent, and we have beds in excess of the standard laid down by that expert committee.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Is there any shortage of medical practitioners?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I suppose it could be said that there is a shortage, but I would not consider it considerable. About 70 students are in their final year, so any deficiency should be quickly overcome. I know there is not an over plus of doctors, because there is difficulty in obtaining locum tenens, particularly to relieve country doctors, but there should not be any great deficiency when those young doctors become available.

I again express my appreciation of the attention members have given to this debate and assure them that the matters they have raised will receive the proper attention of the Government.

Motion for adoption of the Address in Reply carried.

The PRESIDENT—I wish to intimate that I have made tentative arrangements for His Excellency to receive the Address in Reply at 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, August 21.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.1 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 21, at 2 p.m.