

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, July 22, 1952.

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

ASSENTS TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Appropriation (No. 1) and Supply (No. 1) Acts.

QUESTIONS.**UNDESIRABLE BOOKS FOR CHILDREN.**

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—In this morning's paper there appeared a report of the remarks of Mr. C. W. Warren-Smith, chairman of the South Australian Children's Book Council, who said that undesirable books should be stopped at the source by the Government, and supported Mr. Brideson's suggestion that free lending library services for children should be extended. Does the Government intend to set up a Children's Book State Censorship Board, similar to the Film Censorship Board, in order to prohibit this undesirable class of publication from being sold in South Australia? Further, will the Government extend free lending library services for children to both State and private schools?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—As the honourable member's question involves Government policy I ask him to put it on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Does not the Minister think that it is mainly the duty of parents to supervise the type of literature their children read and to provide proper reading matter for them?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—I thoroughly agree that the prime duty in all these matters rests with the parent. Many of the present-day influences are matters which, in my opinion, come within the province of the home.

ELECTORAL ROLLS.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (on notice)—

1. How many names have been added to the House of Assembly rolls since the last State elections?

2. How many names have been added to the Legislative Council rolls in each of its five divisions during the same period?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—The replies are:—

House of Assembly—

Names added to the roll .. 132,129
Names deleted from the roll .. 122,125

Legislative Council—**Central No. 1 District—**

Names added .. 12,191
Names deleted .. 9,687

Central No. 2 District—

Names added .. 13,151
Names Deleted .. 10,041

Southern District—

Names added .. 5,177
Names deleted .. 4,338

Midland District—

Names added .. 2,879
Names deleted .. 2,891

Northern District—

Names added .. 3,257
Names deleted .. 3,528

WINNING BETS TAX AND UNCLAIMED DIVIDENDS.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (on notice)—

1. What amount was collected from the winning bets tax for the year ended June 30, 1952; and what amount of such tax has been paid to (a) the State Treasury and (b) the various racing and trotting clubs?

2. What amount of unclaimed dividends was paid to the State Treasury for the year ended June 30, 1952?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—The replies are:—

1. The total amount collected from the winning bets tax from meetings held during the year ended June 30, 1952, was £613,309—(a) the State Treasury's share of this amount was £470,115; (b) the racing clubs' share was £115,371; the trotting clubs' share was £27,823.

2. The amount of unclaimed dividends from bookmakers' operations paid to the State Treasury during the year ended June 30, 1952, was £14,486.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the reports of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on the Northfield Mental Hospital additions, Mount Burr Mill new boiler plant, Yankalilla area school and Mount Gambier Hospital new children's ward, together with minutes of evidence.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of Sessional Committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech:—

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open the present session of Parliament.

2. We unite with Your Excellency in lamenting the recent death of our late beloved King, George the Sixth, and join in the general affirmation of loyalty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth on Her Accession to the Throne.

3. We appreciate the tribute of praise paid by Your Excellency to the outstanding work of Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie in this State.

4. We assure Your Excellency that we shall give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

5. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of this session.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)

—I appreciate the honour given me by the Government in allowing me the privilege of moving the adoption of the Address in Reply, more particularly because this is the first sitting of our Parliament under our new and beloved Queen, and marks an epoch in the affairs of all Dominion Parliaments. One must first pay a tribute to His late Majesty. We all know that he was originally untrained for kingship. In accordance with the tradition of the great families of Great Britain which for centuries has been that the eldest son goes into the army, the second son into the navy and the third into the diplomatic service and, if there is a fourth, into the church. That has not been without its value in the stability of Government in the Old Country. In accordance with that tradition our late beloved King was trained as a sailor, being a second son, and it was not expected that he would be called upon to assume the responsibilities of kingship. We all know that he was suddenly called to that position owing to the unfortunate abdication of his older brother. Within a comparatively short time he was not only faced with the responsibility of being the head of a very large Empire, as it then was, but also with a war for the very existence of the British people and all that they stand for. His example was one of the things which maintained Britain and all her Dominions during all those years when she stood alone in the face of the enemy. I had the good fortune to be in England

last year and the first glimpse we had of His Majesty was one of his last public duties when he went to St. Paul's Cathedral to open the Festival of Britain. Everyone who saw him was struck by his extraordinary pluck in carrying out his duties when he was as ill as he obviously looked. We, as a Parliament, mourn his death and pay tribute to the work he did for the Empire.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech refers to the proclaiming of the Accession of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second in the traditional manner and contains the words "My Ministers and I affirm our unswerving loyalty and devotion." I am glad the Address in Reply goes further and brings in members of Parliament, who represent the people, in the affirmation of loyalty. I sincerely trust it will not be necessary to have a similar affirmation for at least 50 years but I draw attention to the form in which it was done on this occasion and also when our late King George ascended the Throne, because it does not seem wide enough. It was purely personal, as certain persons individually affirmed their loyalty on her accession—the Governor, Judges, Ministers, the President of the Legislative Council and the Speaker of the House of Assembly. The ceremony which takes place in London, first at St. James Palace, then at Temple Bar on the way to the city and then at the Mansion House has a much wider form, as it refers to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, members of Parliament, the gentry of the country and others. It is a broad affirmation by the whole populace of their loyalty and I wondered at our ceremony whether somebody in the Commonwealth Relations Office in England had failed to discover that we are not still a Crown colony and that the affirmation used here and by the Commonwealth and other State Governments is not nearly wide enough. The affirmation should include all the people and particularly Parliament.

With all humility I wish to refer to two other matters regarding Her Majesty the Queen. I was horrified to read in the *Mail* of July 12, 1952, that Mr. Walker, whom members probably met when he was here as Minister for Commonwealth Relations in the Atlee Government, stated:—

During the Queen's reign some members of the Commonwealth will inevitably become major world powers. This will make it imperative that the Queen become in fact Queen of all her realms.

Has not she always been in fact Queen of all her realms? It is rather an impertinent suggestion that she has not in fact been Queen

of all her realms. I was at the Adelaide Oval on Saturday afternoon and 45,000 people rose to their feet and sang *God Save the Queen* before the football match began and it stirred me to feel that those people had the same feelings as the people I saw in London last year. She is in fact Queen of this realm as well as Queen of her other realms and I deny entirely that there is any difference between our loyalty and affection and that of people in any other part of the British Empire. It has been suggested that the Queen and her husband may visit us next year. I was, secondly, distressed when in London to see that we were making things too hard for our young Queen. In the last few weeks I have read with interest and anxiety the Queen's list of engagements. Since coming out of mourning she has had a hard programme to endure. We had a programme mapped out for her projected visit this year which I thought was extremely onerous. We must remember that she is a young woman with a young family and I suggest that if we have the pleasure of her company next year we should insist that the planners of the official programme give her one completely free day a week. That was not so in the programme arranged for her visit this year. Even on Sundays she has to attend official services, but she and her husband should have one clear day a week.

I come now to the more mundane portions of His Excellency's Speech. I realize other members will deal with subjects with which they are more familiar than I, and I have no intention of endeavouring to cover the whole field. I propose to deal with one or two things which do not appear in the Legislative programme. The first concerns the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. It has asked the Government to alter and strengthen its legislation in connection with the humane killing of cattle. It has recently been made law in Victoria that the captive bolt method should be used and this method is now almost universal. The society has also asked the Government to enact legislation dealing with such matters as performing animals but there is no suggestion in the Governor's Speech of any alteration of this legislation. I still hope that something will be done about these matters, and no doubt we will have a further opportunity to speak on them when the Appropriation Bill comes before us.

Another hardy annual is the question of trams turning at the North Terrace-King William Street intersection. I cannot resist mentioning this again because trams now cross from Grenfell Street to Currie Street without

any apparent trouble and I still want to know why they cannot cross King William Street at the North Terrace intersection. This is a very dangerous corner. From my observation more trams turn there than ever before and the position is becoming more dangerous. I hope something will be done about this matter ere long. Another point on which I have been rather persistent is that of educating drivers of motor vehicles in the city and elsewhere to drive in lanes instead of, in a wide street like King William Street, just following each other up the centre of the road. Three times as much traffic could be got through with ease and comfort if people would sort themselves into lanes, and I cannot understand why guide lines are not painted on the road to induce people who have not got the idea to get into the right-hand lane if they intend to turn right, into the middle lane if they are going straight through and in the left-hand lane if they propose to turn left. If they would do that the traffic would be much easier to handle and the practice would cause no trouble to anyone.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—What of parked cars backing out?

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—They must wait until the traffic has gone. It is the people who back out and make others swerve who cause considerable trouble. Another aspect of road traffic is the question of hand-signals. This, too, I have mentioned previously and I cannot understand why the "Come on" signal has not been adopted. It is ludicrous to drive in this State after experience elsewhere as one has to rely almost entirely on one's intuition to interpret the signals of drivers. Nine out of 10 make the "Stop" signal when it is their intention to turn. I do not know where this reform is held up because it has been approved by the Traffic Committee. It always seems to be blocked somewhere and I mention it again on the theory that constant dripping will sometimes have the effect of wearing down something at some time.

The first topic of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech on which I wish to comment is that of primary production which, he said, "It is hoped, will be maintained." I draw attention to a speech delivered in this Chamber in 1949 by my learned colleague Mr. Rowe in which he pointed out the fall in production in nearly every primary commodity in Australia. However, his was a voice crying in the wilderness and it was two years before the Government and the people generally awoke to the fact that while, on the one hand, our population was increasing rapidly, on the other

our primary production was falling. I commend him for his most illuminating speech, which did not receive the attention it deserved. The general question of production is not entirely a Federal or a State matter, but a national question of the greatest importance.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Only the Commonwealth Parliament can deal with national matters.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Not altogether. I cannot see how we are to prosper and make this country a good place for future generations if we continually give way to the demand of the majority who live in the city. The 40-hour week has been tried elsewhere before and has failed. A system of wage fixation which relies on need and not on production is bound to fail eventually, and has us in a frightful spiral at the moment. As has been clearly stated, we have in Australia, for better or for worse, a wage system, which, being tied at the base to the cost of living and not to production, constantly and inevitably accelerates the rise in the cost of commodities without—as we now know—any real benefit to the wage earner. I am directing my remarks to the community in general.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Who was the author of that statement?

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Mr. Menzies

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—It would not be political by any chance.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—We seem to have heard remarks like that before and I hope I will not be deflected from saying what I have to say on this occasion. We are getting very near to the old Roman situation of bread and circuses; we still have plenty of mid-week races and they are flourishing as never before, but we are in a serious condition. I cannot say that I have the solution, but it is not possible in these times not to feel and say that no individual or country working at only two-thirds capacity can expect to survive against its opposition which is working harder. I congratulate the Government on its forestry undertaking. Seldom are we able to find a Government organization that is producing some dividends and I congratulate the Government on the expansion of the forestry industry and the results it is achieving.

Another important question is that of the Mannum to Adelaide water main. Few if any of us realized, when we applauded the industrialization of Adelaide which took place under the Butler and Playford Governments and encouraged what was called a balanced economy, that one of the effects would be an enormous increase in the demand for water in the metro-

politan area. We thought when Mount Bold reservoir was completed that we were safe for some years, but all these new industries, and the housing and consequent sewerage, etc., which had to be provided for the people who came to work in the industries, plus the immigrants, made an outstanding and surprising demand on the Adelaide water supply. Therefore, one must commend the Government for pushing on as fast as possible with this work. One must remember that it will not only supply the metropolitan area, but quite a portion of the country *en route* and along spur mains. I hope that this work, however much we have to retrench in other ways, will be given a very high priority. I also congratulate the Government, and particularly the Minister of Health, on the success of the campaign against tuberculosis. There have been various aspects of it, one of which was the compulsory examination of people to see whether or not they are suffering from this disease. Some members obviously had qualms about compulsion, but the people apparently do not object and the scheme is working quite well. It is a matter for congratulation that the latest figures we have show that the death rate from tuberculosis last year was the lowest we have ever had.

The outstanding matter mentioned by His Excellency was uranium mining. South Australia has always been deficient in fuel. We are the unfortunate place that for many years had to rely on coal imported from overseas or brought round from New South Wales, and all our industrial undertakings were therefore subject to our getting sufficient coal from outside the State. We have to thank the Premier for many things, but probably one of the most important was the fact that he opened up and established the Leigh Creek coalfield at the suggestion, I am advised, of the chairman of the then Electric Supply Company. Some of us had doubts about the project at the time because we thought it was uneconomic, but with the passing of years those ideas have gone by the board. Whether mortgaging our future to carry on uneconomic ventures is really a good or bad thing posterity will decide. The availability of Leigh Creek coal has made all the difference to our keeping going during strikes and shipping troubles in other States. By means of Leigh Creek coal our industries have been able to expand and I can say from experience that the shortage of power has not been so acute at any stage here as it has been in other States during industrial disturbances. Now we are faced with the prospect of a new

power—something which a few years ago we had not thought about, namely, atomic power. We have a unique opportunity because we have a uranium mine actually working and so are ahead of all the other States. If atomic power can be harnessed in such a way that it can be used for industrial purposes as well as in warfare we seem to have the opportunity of really being in the forefront. The Premier visited the United States and looked into this matter, being most energetic. I think I am right in saying that nearly all of the uranium mines and finds in the United States are small in comparison with Radium Hill. That mine is actually at work and the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech told us of an agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom whereby we will be able to develop our uranium in this State on a large scale. It is suggested that, in the jargon of the newspapers, we are to have an atomic pile. In addition, we are advised that at Rum Jungle, in the Northern Territory not far south of Darwin, there is a uranium field which will be of great value and is worth exploiting. But that uranium, if it is really there to the extent that has been suggested, will have to be treated somewhere else because Rum Jungle is in practically the most vulnerable place in Australia.

If I might digress to emphasize that fact, before the last war we in Australia had a lot of things to guard us. We had the British Navy which had guarded us for 150 years. We had the Singapore base, the Saletar air base on Singapore Island, the British army in India, the Dutch colonies and Dutch air fleet and a friendly China. We had all these things between us and our enemies in the north, but now all those barriers have gone. We have at least 1,000 million black, yellow, brown and different coloured people north of us in a box that is called Asia—and I remind members that Australasia simply means southern Asia—close to us, and when aeroplanes can fly from the Old Country to Australia in a little more than 20 hours it does not take long for them to come from Indonesia, where millions dwell. Darwin was attacked with impunity during the last war.

Fortunate as the Rum Jungle find is we must not forget that it is in a most vulnerable position. The sensible and obvious way to deal with the ore, when it has been mined, is to bring it to some central and safer place. I notice that the Premier has suggested that it should be taken to Fitzgerald Bay (formerly known as Backy Bay), just north of Whyalla. That opens up at once the question

of the north-south railway and the agreement with the Commonwealth in 1911 whereby it agreed to construct that line. It is still an open question. If mining is to be proceeded with at Rum Jungle on a big scale it will be an excellent point for us to take up—that the railway should be built as originally agreed and not taken through to western Queensland as so often has been suggested. If these things can be done South Australia, far from being the Cinderella State in regard to power, will become the centre of the atomic power industry, whatever the future holds in that direction. I commend the Government on the action it has taken so energetically and is still taking for the production of uranium.

When I entered this Chamber 19 or 20 years ago I had something to say about education. With the indulgence of the House and hoping that I will not be boring members, particularly Mr. Perry who, with me, represents this Chamber on the University Council, I propose to say more about it. There are two mentions of it in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, one as to numbers and the other as to mentally defective children. I agree with what is suggested should be done for these children. I mention that in order to emphasize that the people it is worth doing the most for are those with the highest mentality. Those who are the best equipped mentally are the ones who will pay the dividends and should be looked after. In 1933 I had something to say about too many people obtaining secondary education too easily and I have nothing whatsoever to retract about it. I still think that our best boys and girls are handicapped by having too many people around them who will never obtain the Leaving Certificate let alone Leaving Honours. They are a nuisance and should go straight to some other occupation or be apprenticed to a trade or calling. In this regard I do not refer to technical schools but ordinary high schools.

Since I have been in this Chamber I have represented it on the University Council. Those years have been most interesting. We have had the impact of a second world war and we have seen the end of an era at Adelaide University. I desire to give some figures about the University during the time I have been on the council and some of my impressions particularly during what I shall call the Mitchell era. In 1894 a most important thing happened to the University. Professor Mitchell (now Sir William) took up his appointment as Professor of Philosophy. It is interesting to recall that when he was being

interviewed in London with a view to his accepting the appointment as professor at the Adelaide University, he was taken along for an interview with a man he later described as a "lanky Australian" who wanted to see whether he was suitable for the position. That lanky Australian was the Honourable T. Playford, Premier of South Australia in 1892, the present Premier's grandfather. That is a curious and interesting link between the situation at the University now and the past.

Without derogating in any way from the wonderful work done at the University during the last half-century by Sir Samuel Way, Sir George Murray, Mr. Barr-Smith, Mr. Peter Waite and Sir Walter Young and others, not forgetting the primary founders of the University, I can safely say that Professor Mitchell was for 50 years the directing mind and backbone of the Adelaide University. His career was extraordinary. Interviewed by the South Australian Premier in England in 1892, he took up his duties in 1894. He became Vice-Chancellor in 1916, Chancellor in February, 1942, and retired in February, 1948—54 years in all in the service of the University. Not only did he act as Vice-Chancellor in an honorary capacity, but he also was a most generous benefactor to the University. Showing how the University grew during his time, in 1894 there were 93 undergraduates and 184 non-graduate students—a total of 277. When Sir William Mitchell became Vice-Chancellor in 1916 there were 284 undergraduates, 17 post-graduates, 207 non-graduates and 267 in the Conservatorium, a total of 775. In 1941 undergraduates totalled 1,221, post-graduates 171, non-graduates 819 and in the Conservatorium 233, a total of 2,444. In 1947, the year before Sir William retired, there were 2,438 undergraduates, 315 post-graduates, 1,292 non-graduates and 559 in the Conservatorium, making the total 4,604. The University grew during Sir William Mitchell's time from a total of 277 to 4,604. His holding the reins for such a long period is probably a unique performance. I am glad of the opportunity of saying in Parliament that, in my opinion, South Australia owes him an immense debt of gratitude for his work at the University.

I also have comparative figures for all universities in Australia and they are most interesting. They are produced by the Commonwealth Statistician and are called "University Statistics for the year 1951." I do not propose to quote them because of their length, but any member who desires can peruse them. One interesting fact emerges from them—that the Adelaide University has always been

hampered by having too many non-graduate pupils. In the early 1890's there were two non-graduating students to one matriculated student. Although we now have many new faculties at the University, more than one-quarter of the students are non-matriculated students who should not be there. The University should not be handicapped by these people, who should be at the School of Mines or similar schools. Students with the best brains and intellect should get the best teaching and teachers should not be hampered. Teaching in the university is very different from elsewhere. Our school teachers have to undergo two years training at the Teachers Training College but university teaching is completely different. It is not done by routine but by precept and example and above all things by a system of working together voluntarily. The professor and student seek information and delve into the past to ascertain the real answers to the problems of today. In spite of the handicap of non-graduating students in the period to which I have referred the Adelaide University has done well and produced marvellous results, particularly in medicine and engineering, due no doubt to teachers such as Watson, Stirling and Verco in medicine and Chapman in engineering. In mentioning the results one cannot help referring to the late Sir Hugh Cairns. He was one of the outstanding products of our State educational system. He was a Rhodes scholar who commenced his studies at Port Pirie, went to the Adelaide High School and won his way by scholarships to the Adelaide University. He enlisted when half-way through his medical course and served in the Army Medical Corps. Fortunately he was sent home before being hurt at Gallipoli and finished his course and developed into probably the world's leading brain specialist. It is a great loss to the medical world that he should have died so young. South Australia is fortunate in having another Rhodes scholar practising here who has worked with him in the person of Dr. Lindon, who also has an international reputation as a brain specialist.

I quoted the numbers in the university during the Mitchell era, but we should consider also the finances of the university. In the years I have been on the council the position has changed materially. In 1932 the university's expenditure was £100,807 of which fees represented 27 per cent (£27,499), income from endowments 12½ per cent (£12,694) and the State Government grant 52 per cent (£52,100). In 1939 the expenditure rose to £140,793 of which fees represented 23 per cent (£31,992), income

from endowments 14 per cent (£20,024), State Government grant 47½ per cent (£66,600) and Commonwealth Government grant 3½ per cent (£5,400). In 1952 the expenditure rose to £617,036 of which fees represented 11½ per cent (£73,000), income from endowments 5½ per cent (£25,500), State Government grant 57 per cent (£350,000) and Commonwealth Government grant 20½ per cent (£126,000). The position is that the university owes more and more to the sympathetic understanding and support of Governments. It is the same the world over. The older universities have greater endowments and not the same obligation to train professional men as some of the more modern universities.

I was surprised when visiting my own old college at Oxford last year to learn that, whereas when I was there in 1905 about 70 per cent of the students paid their own fees, only 15 per cent of the students do so today. The rest are attending through county, school or Government scholarships. Because of the enormous increase in costs universities are more and more dependent on Government support. We have to thank the South Australian Government for the real help which has been given but we cannot leave it at that. We must look to the future. In the Lieutenant-Governor's speech it is stated that the Education Department is now responsible for 99,000 students, but members have seen in the press that the 100,000 mark has been passed since then. With the intake for July there are now 102,000 students under the Education Department. Of that number 87,500 are primary students and 14,500 are secondary students in high schools and technical schools. The department estimates that by 1959 there will be 120,000 in primary schools and 24,500 in secondary schools. If that is so and those students have the brains to pass their Leaving examinations the University will have to expect an enormous increase in numbers. That is realized and the university has appointed a sub-committee to consider the whole set-up of tertiary education with a view to meeting the extra demand. If the university is to do its best for those best equipped mentally it must get rid of some of the 1,200 odd non-graduating students.

Sometimes the university's objectives are misunderstood. I had the good fortune to attend two universities and for most of my life I have been concerned with universities and have some definite ideas. A university has two functions. Firstly, to train people for professions such as engineering, medicine and law,

and secondly to enable people to pursue scholarship and learning for its own sake. Oxford and Cambridge contain scholars from all over the world pursuing scholarship for its own sake. They conduct their own affairs and it is interesting to note that they have no councils like ours, which is composed partly of professors and largely of people who are not actually working in the university. They do not have to rely to the same extent on Government aid and that is a reason why they do not have councils similar to ours. Whereas they are remote bodies of students and professors our university is an integral part of a small community and it has a duty to the Government and to the people to steer a course between pure utility, that is, training people to go out and earn a living, and to supply the community with professional men, on one hand, and the pursuit of scholarship on the other.

It is interesting to note that when our university was founded there was no science degree and it was laid down that there should not be. Fortunately that was broken down and the position has almost been reversed to the extent that history and philosophy have been pushed aside by science and engineering, both of which will fit people to earn their living. We must realize that there is this conflict and guard against it if the university is to continue to be really a university. I was interested to read a lecture by Sir Walter Moberly, probably the greatest authority on universities in the United Kingdom, delivered at the University of St. Andrews in February, 1951. He quotes Cardinal Newman as saying—

A university training aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasms and fixed aims to popular aspirations, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power and refining the intercourse of private life.

Moberly invites us to ponder and weigh each phrase and word of that statement. Moberly himself says, "Practical competence in affairs is a by-product of a liberal and intelligent attitude to the things of the mind." That is to say, university training is designed to make one realize some of the things that have happened before, and the possibilities of intellectual thought on questions which crop up from day to day. I said that when the university was first founded there was no such thing as a science degree, and it is of interest to note also what were the ideas of

the people of Adelaide when the university was founded. The then Governor who made a speech at the opening ceremony said:—

The idea is not firmly grasped that higher education is in every sense quite as necessary to the well-being of the State as is the training afforded by the common schools; that it is quite as essential that the men who make and administer laws should be thoroughly educated as that those who choose the lawmakers should be able to read and write.

He continued—

I may say that I am acquainted with no community of English-speaking people where the wants that a university is intended to supply more manifestly exist.

Another Governor, in laying the foundation stone, said:—

“ . . . and whilst there is in the old countries an aristocracy in great part arising from birth and wealth I can picture to myself in this new and far distant land an aristocracy whose genealogy will date from those who best knew how to avail themselves of their educational advantages—an aristocracy springing from the cultivation of the mind.”

The aristocracy of which the Governor spoke is today open substantially to all of the most intelligent and industrious of our young people. Then the question arises as to how far we are using these opportunities. On this point Sir Walter Moberly quotes Lord Bryce. Lord Bryce, in his wonderful book *Modern Democracies*, had this to say, and it is not very complimentary:—

In Australia it is material interests that hold the field of discussion and they are discussed as if they affected only Australia and Australia only in the present generation; nobody looks back to the records of experience for guidance; nobody looks forward to conjecture the results of what is being attempted today; there is little sense of the complexity of the problems raised, little knowledge of what is being tried elsewhere, little desire to acquire such knowledge.

Sir Walter Moberly hastens to say that he does not subscribe to that because he does not know, but Lord Bryce was a very wonderful observer and a person whose opinions we cannot dismiss lightly. I do suggest that we do not take enough advantage of the university on the arts side—that is, in history and philosophy, the teachers of which understand that many of the things we are trying to do have been tried before. In my first speech in 1933 I quoted Patrick Henry as saying, “I know of no way of judging the future but by the past,” and I emphasize that this afternoon. I feel that I should say one thing in speaking strongly for the arts side as equally if not more important than the scientific and engineer-

ing side of the university, that I exclude the economists. Economists—and possibly the products of the “London School of Economics” most of all—have not only misled Government but have made universities unpopular because people are inclined to say, “These planners do not do any good.” Universities have, in my opinion, lost prestige through people saying that they are the holders of a diploma or degree in economics. I am entering a special plea for those who study the history of the past with a view to their applying the knowledge thus gained to the present.

Following what I have called the Mitchell era our university has passed through a very interesting time. We have been lucky in obtaining a most capable and energetic Vice-chancellor who has revolutionized the university to a large degree. We had much over-crowding during the repatriation period, when many hundreds of students were thrown on us with our having little capacity to deal with them. We have had a huge building programme and we again thank the State Government for its assistance. The universities of Australia were offered by the Commonwealth Government the alternative of temporary buildings for which they did not have to pay, or permanent buildings. We chose permanent buildings and payment was guaranteed by the State Government. Today we are on the threshold of a new era. Our buildings and equipment are as good as those of any comparable university in the Empire, and certainly as good as anything in Australia. The staff position has much improved although it is not yet up to the standard of other Australian universities. I have here a graph illustrating the comparative numbers, which shows that the Queensland university is the best staffed and Adelaide is the only one below the general line in that respect. Our finances are pretty well under control, for which we have to thank largely two people, the Vice-chancellor, Mr. Rowe, who has done all the work of reorganization, and the Premier and Treasurer, who has been so sympathetic and has helped us again and again.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What about the subsidy from the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Subsidies are given to all State Governments in the same way.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—How will our university get on under State taxation?

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Broadly I should say that we have never gained anything by being tacked on to the other States

in any walk of life and I think we will be able to look after ourselves quite well. The people of this State have always contributed to their university very well when left to their own resources. Notwithstanding that we have received all this help from the Government the Premier has nevertheless allowed the university to maintain what I may call its academic freedom; that is, the right of the University Council to decide what shall be done and what shall be taught, and that is a very important privilege.

In conclusion I again thank the Government for what it has done for the university and congratulate it on its other achievements. I have great pleasure in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—I appreciate the compliment which has been paid me, and through me my electorate, in being allotted the task of seconding the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I add my tribute of appreciation of the lifelong service which His late Majesty gave to his subjects, and which he carried out so conscientiously that it actually shortened his life a great deal. It has occurred to me that probably most of us in this Parliament have served under four sovereigns, which in one way shows that the wear and tear on those who occupy this high and strenuous office is very great. I can only hope that Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II., will be able to follow some of the excellent precedents set by the Queens of England and that there will be many men in the Parliamentary and public services of the country who will live out their long services under one Royal personage only. I hope that she may look forward during her reign to peace and prosperity far beyond present prognostications, and that the future will be much more peaceful and harmonious than it has been during the last quarter of a century.

We regret the departure from our shores of His Excellency Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie. This State has been very fortunate for a long time in the choice which has been made in the persons who have held the Vice-Regal office here. The standards set by some of the holders of this office have been so high that it must be absolutely daunting to their successors to think that they have to live up to such exalted traditions, but we have been so fortunate in the selections that these difficulties have been surmounted. In the case of Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie, if their great accumulation of both geographical and personal

knowledge can be taken as a criterion, they maintained at its highest the already high standard set by their predecessors. I realize that in speaking on the Address in Reply it would be wise for each member to speak on things he knows most about rather than wander all over the field trying to display some high degree of general knowledge. One might be inclined to launch into a lengthy dissertation on the possibilities of uranium, but I think that what Mr. Cudmore has mentioned was the least he could have said, because undoubtedly we are on the advent of a new era, the possibilities of which cannot be foreseen.

There are several matters in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech which naturally make particular appeal to me and I shall confine my remarks to them. He refers in more than one place to the needs of country people. In one he refers to the food shortage and the development of the South-East and the more closely settled areas. He also refers to an extension of Housing Trust activities by making available building facilities for people who live permanently in the country. It might be true that the drift from the land has not actually been caused by the insufficient housing in the country, although it might have contributed to it. I do not quite know which is the cause and which is the effect and whether housing in the country has caused people to leave there and live in the cities or whether housing on the land has deteriorated to such an extent because people left there and came to the city.

Although I pay every possible tribute to the work of the Housing Trust in providing thousands of most excellent houses throughout the metropolitan area and bigger country towns, the proposal in His Excellency's Speech is a gesture towards the man on the land which comes very close to being in the category of "too little too late." We are making an effort to get people back on the land. Had a little more generosity been extended earlier to people who wished to build—and I do not blame the Housing Trust for taking money from us to stop us from spending it—we might have been able to build houses on the farms and keep people there. From what can be gathered from press reports the type of house to be built by the trust in the country is what we would have looked upon a few years ago as being of very inferior construction. We have, for a generation, apparently looked on these houses as being good and sufficient. Fortunately I was raised in a generation where

walls of the houses were thick and offered a greater degree of privacy than can possibly exist in the houses being built today. I appreciate that more houses can be built with thin walls than with thick and we will have to face up to people living in the type of house that is being erected today.

The Government should investigate the possibilities of using local materials if a land-owner desires them in preference to the pre-fabricated metropolitan materials which, I understand, are to be used in the construction of these houses. It is ridiculous not to mention Mount Gambier stone before a final report is made on these projects. I know from personal experience that ample building stone is available in the north, which could be better employed in building houses than in cluttering up the land. Stone cutting and stone masonry have become almost lost arts, but I am sure that there are many New Australians who are capable of working these materials and I hope the opportunity will be taken to build houses of more substantial quality materials than are used today.

On the question of increased food production, one must always consider the relation of the Nairne pyrites deposit. Some time ago, at a conference between people engaged in the manufacture of superphosphate, certain high Federal civil servants were present to deal with financial aspects. During the conference one of the officials said to a negotiator, "Well, what is super, anyhow?" Although many think they are fairly familiar with it, there are apparently some who are not quite clear in their mind what the substance actually is. Because this artificial soil fertilizer is of very much more vital concern to our existence than is probably realized, I shall refer to it at some length. Our soils, particularly in the more western half of Australia, are notoriously deficient in phosphorus, and as this element is essential to the life and growth of plants and animals, including man, it must be realized that without an adequate supply we, as a nation, would soon starve.

Superphosphate is made by treating finely ground tri-calcium phosphate, commonly known as phosphate rock, with sulphuric acid at the rate of about two tons of rock to one of acid, thus rendering the phosphorus soluble in the water and making it capable of being absorbed by plants, causing the increase in growth with which we are familiar. This rock is in fairly ample supply and exists in large quantities on Nauru, Ocean and Christmas

Islands, as well as in other parts of the world. These three islands are controlled by the British Phosphate Commission, a body that was formed through agreement between the British, Australian and New Zealand Governments, whereby they shared the cost of development, and have rights to share in the output, which is in the proportion of 42, 42, and 16 per cent respectively. The supply on these islands is estimated, at the present rate of consumption, to last about 50 years, but the world supply which, unfortunately, is not of such good quality is expected to last another 2,000 years. That might sound safe enough, but in another 50 years the Australian farmer will probably have to be satisfied with a slightly lower grade of superphosphate.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—Have we none of this phosphatic rock in Australia?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I do not know of any being worked. The other ingredient, sulphur, for the manufacture of acid is derived almost entirely from the United States of America, the world's largest producer of sulphur in its natural state, as well as from gases resulting from the smelting of our own sulphide ores of zinc and lead, and iron pyrites. The American sulphur is mined in large quantities in Mexico. The present needs of Australia are about 260,000 tons annually, of which only about 85,000 tons are produced locally. Imported sulphur is vital to Australian industry. The present difficulty in the supply of super arose because early in 1951 the United States became painfully conscious that sulphur supplies were dwindling at a rather alarming rate and imposed a heavy rationing quota on exports. Although this had been expected, its application came unexpectedly soon before Australia had made the necessary adjustment to enable it to produce enough from its own resources. Through one or two other contributing causes Australia suffered rather badly, being penalized through holding a reserve stock. It was the old question of the person who was far-sighted getting it in the neck. In order to meet this crisis South Australia turned its attention to exploiting its own resources, particularly as they existed in iron pyrites, especially at the Nairne deposit, where there is a visible mass estimated at 40,000,000 tons.

There are three fertilizer companies in South Australia and in order to mine the Nairne pyrites they, together with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, formed a new company known as Nairne Pyrites. The Government, in order to make this venture possible,

granted financial aid by guaranteeing an overdraft of £800,000, thus augmenting the capital invested by the companies. It is pleasing to report that although Nairne Pyrites has been in existence only a short time, extraordinarily rapid progress is being made at the Nairne site because of the great technical knowledge and resources of the B.H.P.

A final hurdle has yet to be overcome, namely, the construction of a plant to produce sulphuric acid from the concentrated ores from Nairne. A new company has been formed by the three fertilizer companies combined, but without the B.H.P. to smelt the Nairne ores to produce sulphuric acid. It is known as Sulphuric Acid Ltd. Finance for this project, which will cost about £2,000,000, has been furnished by the Commonwealth Government by way of guarantee. The Commonwealth Government, for some reasons best known to officialdom, dragged the matter on for some time, but when it did act did so with considerable generosity. It is hoped that this new plant will make South Australia independent of imported brimstone by the end of 1954. People on the land are concerned about superphosphate rationing so let us hope that by the end of 1954 those two works combined will have solved our superphosphate problems, if not for all time then at least for a long time.

In his speech His Excellency referred to the acquisition of a property at Kent Town for the training of mentally deficient children. A mentally deficient child presents only one of the many problems associated with the more unfortunate among us. Since the outbreak of poliomyelitis we realize how many children are physically handicapped. Many are born with other physical disabilities and are hampered for life if left to their own resources. They become not only a burden to themselves but a burden to the State. There are people who think it would be better if more attention could be devoted to them in a philanthropic way in order that both the children and the State could be relieved. In South Australia there is a substantially co-ordinated effort to improve the lot of the handicapped child. By handicapped I refer rather to those who are physically handicapped and not mentally handicapped although they each present a completely separate problem. To educate a mentally deficient child, a deaf and dumb child or a blind child, three completely different avenues of scientific teaching are required. The basis of this work is the belief that it is not only in the interests of the children themselves but also of the State that they should be equipped

as well as possible to live as normal citizens. The specialized teaching required is expensive but obviously the first heavy expense of success is preferable to the life-long drag of maintenance that must result from neglect.

Among handicapped children the preponderant cases are of deafness. Because speech is acquired by the imitation of sounds heard the completely deaf child is also dumb and because a normal child begins to speak at about two years of age the educational treatment of the deaf must begin at that age also. The youngster must be given specialized treatment and it is not difficult to realize that in all cases that can very seldom be done. The object of the treatment is to cause the child to realize that there are sounds and in the course of time to lip-read and even to speak. Some of us had the privilege of meeting Miss Helen Keller a few years ago. At a very early age she lost her sight and hearing and consequently was blind, deaf and dumb. She learned not only to speak but graduated from university and became a world touring authority on this subject. Fortunately, it is seldom that the deaf and dumb child is handicapped by blindness. World opinion agrees that if the deaf and blind are to live normal lives they must be equipped to mingle with normal people and that is why it is so important that the educational treatment should commence in the earliest formative period and be continuous thereafter. A year or two ago Professor Ewings and his wife, Dr. Ewings, who are both world authorities on the treatment of the deaf, visited this State. The Government deserves the highest commendation for the promptness with which it acted on their advice in sending an officer of the Education Department to England to undergo a year's specialized training in connection with deaf children. Since her return this officer has travelled throughout the State rendering most valuable advice and guidance to the parents of such children. We probably do not realize the tremendous problem which parents have to undertake in educating a deaf and dumb child. I understand this officer is gathering around her a competent, highly-trained staff. There are several institutions in South Australia for handicapped children and I believe they are all adequately subsidized by the Government.

The Hon. R. J. Rudall—We have also set up a school for deaf children.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I appreciate the proffered assistance from the Minister and I sincerely believe that during the last few years some important steps have been taken to

alleviate the unfortunate lot of these people. The Government has been very helpful and has a place where children are tested and the degree of their deafness ascertained, so that they can be placed in the proper stage of training. Townsend House is a residential school for both blind and deaf and the South Australian Oral School is a day school for children from the age of two years until they are old enough to attend departmental classes. The formidable size of the whole problem will be seen when it is realized that these children cannot be educated in large classes like normal children. Six to eight children is the practical maximum that can be taught at any one time, even by the most highly qualified teacher, and the smaller the number the better in any circumstances. The treatment requires a considerable amount of expensive plant. It needs acoustic hearing aids and a type of acoustic group hearing aid so that children can be treated to a degree as a class. The organizations actively working in the problem at the moment include the Royal Institution for the Blind, the South Australian Adult Deaf and Dumb Society, the South Australian Institution for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb, the South Australian Oral School, the Retarded Children's Educational Society, the Church of England Guild of Service to the Blind, and the National Movement for the Rehabilitation and Training of the Blind. They are all largely co-ordinated in a body known as the Advisory Committee of Blind and Deaf Organizations. The acquisition of the Kent Town centre is of vast interest to these philanthropic people who regard it as a great encouragement. Some may think I have gone into the subject with unnecessary detail but when the Minister interjected I realized I had rather erred on the other side and in preparing what I had to say I had overlooked some things which have been done.

The opinion which has crystallized out of this co-ordination of thought is that the deficiencies of our Education Act should be attended to. Under the South Australian Education Act the parent fulfils his obligation when he enrolls his child at the age of six years and sees that he attends the school regularly, but the schools provided are for normal children only and if the child happens to be handicapped in any way the onus of providing a good and efficient education for it rests upon

the shoulders of the parents, who have to bear the cost, whereas for the normal child free education is supplied. It is felt that a great step forward will have been made when the Act is amended to permit the Minister of Education to institute and to carry on classes and schools for handicapped children. He has certain powers now, but the problems I have in mind are in respect of transport and of persuading parents to allow their children to be taken into institutions. Opportunity classes have been established since about 1925, but they are for retarded children who, perhaps through living in remote parts have not had opportunities for ordinary education, or whose parents have not seen that it was imparted to them; healthy children, but simply a bit backward. When they are a little older they can go on to what are termed "special classes" and eventually they become useful citizens, but we will not be satisfied until our Act is amended to remove from the shoulders of parents the onus of providing education for children who are handicapped, and the Minister has power to establish and maintain schools and classes for the pre-school-age child as well as classes in which the treatment can be continued during the necessary years to follow. That is where the work of philanthropic societies and bodies cannot be carried. At present they are dealing with a number of small children and it is hoped that they will be enabled to carry their work further.

One could talk on many other things on this motion, but I thought it best to mention this one thing which, perhaps, happens to be more my responsibility than that of any other member of this Chamber. I thank members for their patient hearing and have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1950, to provide for compulsory enrolment and voting for the Legislative Council. Read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.7 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, July 23, at 2 p.m.