

Mr. Connor
Mr. Crabtree
Mr. Crook
Mr. Dalton
Mr. Downing
Mr. Dring
Mr. Enticknap
Mr. Evatt
Mr. Ferguson
Mr. Fowles
Mr. Gollan
Mr. Graham
Mr. Green
Mr. Hawkins
Mr. Heffron
Mr. Hills
Mr. L. B. Kelly
Mr. Landa
Mr. McGrath

Mr. McMahon
Mr. Maher
Mr. Mallam
Mr. Murphy
Mr. R. B. Nott
Mr. O'Neill
Mr. Robertson
Mr. Ryan
Mr. Sheahan
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Tonge
Mr. Walsh
Mr. Wattison
Mr. Wetherell
Mr. Williams
Mr. Wyatt
Tellers,
Mr. R. S. Jackson
Mr. Morgan

NOES.

Mr. Askin
Mr. Jack Beale
Mr. Black
Mr. Brain
Lt.-Colonel Bruxner
Mr. Crawford
Mr. Dickson
Mr. Easter
Mr. Fitzgerald
Mr. Stewart Fraser
Mr. Gamack
Mr. Hearnshaw
Mr. Howarth
Mr. Hunter
Mr. H. E. Jackson
Mr. Lawson
Mr. McCaw
Mr. Morton
Mr. Murden
Mr. Padman
Mr. Pelly
Mr. Robinson
Lt.-Colonel Robson
Mr. Stephens
Mr. Storey
Tellers,
Mr. Deane
Mr. Willis

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at 12.9 a.m. (Thursday).

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 4 November, 1954.

Printed Question and Answer—Questions without Notice—
Lean Estimates, 1954-1955.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at 11 a.m.

The opening Prayer was read.

PRINTED QUESTION AND ANSWER.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING SCHEME.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked the MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT,—(1) Is it a fact that by proclamation in the *Government Gazette* of the 23rd July, 1948, the Northumberland

County District was formed and the Northumberland County Council constituted for the purpose of preparing a town and country planning scheme? (2) Is it also a fact that in compliance with section 342C of the Local Government Act, the former Minister for Local Government granted a period of three years from the 8th April, 1949, in which the scheme was to be prepared, and that this period was subsequently extended to the 31st December, 1952? (3) Is it further a fact that the draft scheme was placed in the hands of the Department of Local Government on the 31st December, 1952, for review by the Minister, the department and the Town and Country Planning Advisory Committee? (4) Is it also a fact that this review has not yet been completed, and that the county council is still in existence, and that the cost to the ratepayers of the County of Northumberland will be £133,787 to the end of this year? (5) If the answers to (1) to (4) above are in the affirmative, will he inform the House,—(a) the date on which he expects the review of the draft scheme to be finalised; (b) when he proposes to place the draft scheme on public exhibition for the lodgment of further objections thereto; and (c) the approximate date upon which the scheme may be proclaimed as prescribed?

Answer,—(1) Yes. (2) Yes. (3) Yes. (4) Yes. The average annual cost of the operations of the Northumberland County is slightly less than 1s. 5d. per head of population. (5) (a) and (b). It is proposed that the scheme will be exhibited in sections. The first of these exhibitions will commence in the early part of next year. Within the limitations of staff and mapping facilities available, action towards exhibition of the remaining sections will proceed as rapidly as possible. (c) The scheme cannot be prescribed until after the exhibition has been completed and objections determined. The time to be taken in reaching finality after close of the exhibition will depend largely on the extent and nature of the objections, the availability of staff and the arrangements that can be made for map processing. Every effort will be made to see that this action is expedited.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.**ASSEMBLY CHAMBER: AIR
CONDITIONING.**

Mr. SPEAKER: Yesterday the hon. member for Tamworth asked me a question in regard to the ventilation of this Chamber. He asked whether, because of the installation of an air conditioning plant, there is "an unnatural atmosphere in the Chamber and hon. members are subjected to varying degrees of hot and cold air". Members will appreciate that a room of this size, which at times is occupied by nearly 200 persons, must have some system of mechanical ventilation. Prior to 1949 a system was in operation for many years but it apparently did not meet with the approval of some members, judging from the number of occasions on which questions on the subject were addressed to me and to my predecessors. That system simply forced an adequate quantity of "natural" untreated air into the Chamber. Members complained of the humidity and the temperature of the air, and of the noise of the plant itself.

In 1949, an air-conditioning plant was installed. This equipment is similar to that which has been in operation in the Legislative Council Chamber since 1937. It is of a normal standard pattern used in many buildings not only in Sydney, but also throughout the civilized world. Such installations are found in picture theatres, large stores, office buildings and so on, and apparently operate elsewhere to the complete satisfaction of the users. They work on the broad principle that air is pumped into the room from the ceiling and escapes through vents near the floor. The air is "unnatural" only to the extent that its humidity is regulated to prevent discomfort, and its temperature is controlled by heating or cooling, as required, in order to maintain the temperature as nearly as possible at 69° F.

About twelve months ago, following complaints by hon. members, I ordered a complete investigation of the working of the plant. A specialist engineer from the Department of Public Works and officers of the House conducted exhaustive tests to establish whether the plant was behaving abnormally in any way, and thermometers

were installed at three different points in the Chamber. The engineer reported that the machinery was working efficiently, and that smoke tests showed no draughts or abnormal movements of air in any part of the Chamber. The Serjeant-at-Arms kept temperature records from September until December, 1953, which showed that at any one time the temperature varied in different parts of the Chamber by no more than 2 degrees. The average temperature in the Chamber did not fall below 66 degrees and did not rise above 72 degrees. During that period temperatures recorded at the Observatory on sitting days were as low as 49 degrees and as high as 100 degrees.

I fear that it will be impossible to please all hon. members all the time in regard to ventilation. Some people like cold weather, others like the heat. Some habitually wear warmer clothing than others. The temperature in this Chamber is kept very close to what has been accepted throughout the world as a comfortable room temperature standard. Perhaps I might conclude by quoting from a question addressed to Mr. Speaker Clyne by an hon. member in 1946:

I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether it is a fact that the ventilation in this old Chamber is bad and that atmospheric conditions are such as to make it difficult for hon. members to remain here continuously for a long stretch of hours and to give of their best? Is it a fact, also, that the Public Library, which is in the adjoining block, is air-conditioned and has perfect atmospheric conditions, with the result that persons can work there for long hours in complete comfort? If these are facts, will you, sir, see whether a similar type of ventilation can be installed in this Chamber so that Parliament may function with maximum efficiency.

The desired system is now in operation but some members are not satisfied with it. We could revert to the old system by putting out of action the mechanism for controlling the temperature and correcting humidity, but I doubt whether hon. members would welcome the return of the so-called "natural atmosphere". However, I am prepared to order that the air-conditioning plant be put out of operation for a trial period if members generally desire it. At 11 a.m. to-day the following temperatures were recorded in this Chamber: behind the

chair, 68°; at the side door, 67½°; behind the Serjeant-at-Arms, 67½°. The temperature will rise by about 2° now that the Chamber is occupied by hon. members.

HIGH SCHOOL: CAMPBELLTOWN.

Mr. PELLY: I ask the Minister for Education whether next February a new high school will be opened at Campbelltown? Is it a fact that, as a result, a number of additional teachers will be transferred to that centre? Is it a fact, also, that there are no houses available in Campbelltown, and that teachers may not enter housing ballots until they have been appointed to a school? If these are facts, will the Minister take up with his colleague, the Minister for Housing, the matter of allowing teachers to enter ballots in anticipation of appointments' being made, so that they may have a chance to find accommodation?

Mr. HEFFRON: It is true that a new secondary school will be opened at Campbelltown at the beginning of the first term next year, and that we shall need more teachers there. I have not had a report on local housing conditions and do not know whether the Housing Commission has been approached on the matter. In the past the Commission has always helped in these matters and I have no doubt that it will do so again. It is serious that teachers should be appointed to a school and then be unable to find accommodation locally. The department experiences the same difficulty all over the State because of the shortage of houses that has followed the increase in population. However, by one means or another, accommodation is usually found. It is very much better if permanent residences for teachers can be provided. I shall make inquiries and give the hon. member a more detailed reply later.

BUSINESS OF PARLIAMENT: USE OF GAG.

Mr. MURPHY: I ask the Premier whether it is reported in this morning's press that last night the Government gagged the Opposition during the debate on the Estimates? Is it a fact that the debates on the Address-in-Reply, the

Budget and the Estimates have occupied nine weeks? If these are facts will the Premier say how the Government's generosity compares with the record of anti-Labour governments?

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: I have had a long experience of this Parliament and can recall occasions when bills with many clauses have been pushed through without any discussion on them being permitted. That is wrong in a deliberative parliament and since this Government took office in 1941 it has used the gag very infrequently, and the guillotine never. For the benefit of hon. members who were not here in the days when that instrument was used, let me explain its effects. It would be announced that the discussion of the clauses of a bill would terminate, say, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Even if that bill had ninety clauses and only two of them had been discussed by 3 o'clock, the guillotine would be applied ruthlessly and the remaining eighty-eight clauses would be decided by one vote, without further discussion. That practice was used extensively before this Government came into office. There have been times since this Government occupied the Treasury benches when it has been moved, "That the question be now put", and I realise that our opponents will naturally differ from my opinion about the use of this procedure, but the fact is that, taking everything into consideration, it has been infrequently used.

The Government is charged with the administration of the Estimates and it felt that a reasonable time was allotted to their discussion. Nine weeks since the House met have been devoted to a discussion of the Address-in-Reply, the Budget and the Estimates. During that period hon. members had the opportunity of dealing with virtually any matter they chose, and the scope of debate was infinitely wider than that of any debate on a particular bill or a number of bills.

Mr. WILLIS: That is if hon. members were not gagged.

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: If they were not gagged. I am pointing out what was the position, and that the House has had nine

weeks of this wide debate. On the Estimates alone I think there were 112 speeches. So hon. members had every opportunity for debate. There is an obligation on all hon. members to co-operate to ensure that the business of the House is conducted effectively. As these nine weeks have been given to wide debate, including three weeks to the discussion of the Estimates, the Government felt that the House should get on with the legislative business and that the debate on the Estimates should finish yesterday. I suppose that it is wrong to ascribe any motives other than the best to hon. members, but I know that after this decision of the Government had been made, hon. members attempted to rise in order to prolong the discussion.

Mr. ASKIN: No.

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: The hon. member himself rose last night when he had no intention of speaking in order to force the Government to move the gag.

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: On which estimate was that?

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: I forget now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is answering a question that has been directed to him, and he must be heard in silence.

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: I am not making a provocative statement because this behaviour has not been confined to the present Opposition. I frankly admit that former Oppositions followed the same practice. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition attempted to rise last night and he was quite satisfied when the Government Whip moved before him and proposed that the question be put.

Mr. ASKIN: That is not true.

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: It is quite true. It was my impression at any rate.

Mr. ASKIN: On a point of order—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There could not possibly be a point of order on what the Premier is saying, but if he misrepresents the Deputy Leader of the Opposition or any other hon. member, when he has finished

the Deputy Leader or that other hon. member may make a personal explanation. There is no point of order at this stage.

Mr. ASKIN: May I speak on it, Mr. Speaker? There is a point of order in this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I refuse to accept any point of order at this stage, but I shall allow the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to make a personal explanation when the Premier has finished. That is the correct procedure.

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: I was very interested in the debate on the Estimates, and felt that I had a responsibility to know what was being said. Therefore I sat through almost the whole of the debate, and I am giving my impression of it. It was my distinct impression that the hon. member did as I said, but if he says that it was not his intention to do as I thought. I am prepared to accept his statement. Nevertheless, I say quite frankly that I think his intention last night was as I understood it. In any well regulated business when it is decided to take certain action, it should be taken unless something extraordinary happens. As the Leader of the House I thought that, as so much time had been given to discussion of the Estimates, it was fair and proper to complete that debate last night so that hon. members could proceed to-day to a discussion of the Loan Estimates and then be free to deal with the Government's legislative programme. The Opposition objected to this course. I have not seen what was published in the paper this morning, but it is true that last night the Government applied the closure more frequently than it has done for some considerable time. Generally speaking, it will not apply the closure, and it will allow plenty of time for discussion in the House. However, if attempts are made to obstruct the Government in carrying out its business, it will take whatever action is necessary to ensure that the legislative programme is dealt with without undue delay.

Mr. ASKIN: I take a point of order that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer has contravened Standing Orders in reflecting upon my motives in rising to speak

last night during the debate on the Estimates. Standing Order 152 provides *inter alia* that "all imputations of improper motives and all personal reflections on members shall be deemed disorderly". That is why I rose to take the point of order while the Premier was speaking. I do not wish to make a personal explanation because I take it that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer has completely withdrawn his imputation against me.

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: I said that I accepted the hon. member's personal explanation.

Mr. BOOTH: I ask the Premier and Colonial Treasurer whether the guillotine was introduced into this Parliament by the Stevens Liberal Government and whether it was used viciously until the elections of 1941 and has never been used since that time? Is it a fact that during the debate on the Estimates over the past few weeks the Transport Estimates were allowed to go through in only four minutes and that when the Opposition discovered its mistake it tried last night to make amends for its lapse in allowing the most important Estimates to go through without discussion?

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: The hon. member for Kurri Kurri has been a member of this House for a long time and he was present in the Chamber when the standing order providing for the guillotine was introduced by the Bavin Government. It is true that it was viciously used and in those days there were in this old Chamber some scenes which, fortunately, have not been repeated since Labour has been in office. The guillotine was used also when the Government, of which I was the Whip, was in power in 1930 and 1932. Since Labour came to office in 1941 the guillotine has not been used and the Government at all times will allow ample discussion on every measure which comes before the House. The fair thing has always been done by the Government. I am not sure of the facts with regard to the second part of the hon. member's question, but quite frankly, if I had been Leader of the Opposition and my party had missed its opportunity of discussing the Transport Estimates I would have done exactly the same thing as the

Leader of the Opposition did last night—I would have tried to hold up the Government on a subsequent Estimate. The lapse of his party would have been noticed by his supporters outside and they would expect him to try to make amends. However, the Opposition must realise that the Government must ensure that its business is not delayed merely to overcome some mistake on the part of the Opposition.

Mr. MURDEN: I ask the Premier whether this House was closed for the greater part of the past year, thereby effectively gagging the Opposition? Is it a fact that I asked the Minister for Local Government whether the debate on the Local Government Estimates would be gagged, as I wished to speak on those estimates, and that he replied that it would not be gagged? Is it a fact, also, that the debate was gagged?

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: The first part of the hon. member's question appears to be a stock argument used by the Opposition to try to condemn the Government. The hon. member does not carry much weight when he makes such a statement. It is not true to say that the House was in recess for the best part of the year. The hon. member has certainly made his quota of speeches. He has spoken more during the debate on the Estimates than I have ever heard him speak before. The House met in the early part of the year. It then adjourned until later in the year, and has sat continuously since. It is not so much a matter of whether the House meets as whether anything effective is done. The amount of legislation passed last year was a credit to the Government and Parliament, and compared very favourably with that passed during much longer sessions. I assure the hon. member for Ashfield that next year he will not have cause for complaint that Parliament sits too infrequently. Hon. members are entitled, after spending a busy session in this atmosphere, to look forward, for their health's sake, to a recess. It is wrong to say that Parliament should meet every day. That will not happen, but the session will be kept going. The Government will allow reasonable time for discussion of legislation and Parliament

will continue to sit until Christmas. It will meet again shortly after Christmas and will continue to sit until the Government's legislative programme has been disposed of. When the hon. member has had a little more experience of this Parliament, he will learn that he should allow older members to ask such questions.

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: The hon. member is entitled to ask a question.

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: I suggest that it was inappropriate for him to ask it.

Mr. WILLIS: He has the same right to do so as has any other hon. member.

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: In view of the record of this Parliament and the legislation that it has considered, such a question was inappropriate.

POINTS OF ORDER:

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether a few moments ago, when the Premier and Colonial Treasurer was making a reply to a question asked of him by the hon. member for Concord, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition rose to his feet on a point of order? Is it further a fact that when he was on his feet and after he had uttered the words "Mr. Speaker: On a point of order", you said, without having heard what his point of order was, "I refuse to accept anything on a point of order. You may, if you wish, later make a personal explanation"? If these are facts, are hon. members to understand that in future if an hon. member is speaking and another hon. member takes a point of order in conformity with the rules of the House and standing orders, you will, in the light of this precedent that has been created, refuse to accept the point of order and allow the hon. member who is speaking to continue to be heard, the hon. member objecting being confined solely to making a personal explanation?

Mr. SPEAKER: The answer to the first two questions is "yes". The answer to the rest of the question is "no", because the suggestion is ridiculous. I thought from the interjections that had been made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—and I may have been wrong, if so I will admit

it readily—that he was objecting to the statement on the grounds of misrepresentation.

Mr. ASKIN: I protested against the imputation on my motives.

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: The hon. member was entitled to take a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: As I have said, the answer to the first two questions is "yes" but it is ridiculous to suggest that it is to be taken as a ruling and that no hon. member will be allowed to take a point of order when another hon. member is speaking.

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: The precedent has been laid down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will not argue with the hon. member nor will I allow him to argue with the chair. I did something in good faith and I have said why I did it. I believed from what I heard that I was right, I still believe that what I thought then was right. The suggestion that because I have taken action on this occasion I must on all occasions in future do the same and that I have created a precedent is a ridiculous one and the answer to the Leader of the Opposition is "no".

TRAMWAY SERVICE: SECTIONAL FARES.

Mr. MORTON: I ask the Minister for Transport whether it is a fact that last night during the debate on the Estimate for the department under his control I asked the Minister to tell hon. members whether he was prepared for a trial period only to abolish the two-section fare on the tram route between Circular Quay and Railway Square? Is it a fact also that the debate was gagged before the Minister had an opportunity to reply to my suggestion? If these are facts will the Minister say whether he is prepared to consider the proposal submitted by me last night?

Mr. WETHERELL: It is true that the hon. member suggested that tests be made of the principle of reducing fares and he specified a particular route. He also claimed that the result would be to the benefit of the Transport Department, but experience has shown that this would not be so. On all occasions that the system has

been tried it has failed. The most recent instance was the experience of the Transport Department in Western Australia which succumbed to this type of propaganda. It must have been considered by that department and Government that it was worth a test but the results from the viewpoint of Government finance were, to say the least, devastating. A similar result was obtained in Hobart. On the evidence available there is nothing to suggest that the introduction of the scheme suggested by the hon. member would be other than a heavily losing proposition. I assure the hon. member and the House that the condition of the Government transport finances does not permit the department to experiment with fantastic suggestions.

LEGAL ASSISTANCE: MEANS TEST.

Mr. GREEN: I ask the Attorney-General whether the limiting of the means test to £650, plus £50 for a wife and £50 for each child under 16 years of age, is denying applicants the legal assistance that they require from the Public Solicitor? If this is a fact will the Minister consider raising these amounts?

Mr. SHEAHAN: I have no personal knowledge that the fixation of the means test in respect of legal assistance from the Public Solicitor is denying applicants legal assistance. It is a fact, however, that the means test is £650, plus £50 for a dependant's wife and £50 for dependent children under the age of 16. This is the most liberal means test allowance in the whole of the Commonwealth of Australia. I am prepared to examine the suggestion of the hon. member, but any increase in the means test might affect the efficiency of the department and result in an increase in the number of legal officers and the provision of additional accommodation. There are some anomalies that I will examine, but I am unable to give any firm undertaking that it will be possible at this stage, at any rate, to raise the means test.

Mr. HOWARTH: Does the means test for this purpose include the possession of assets, such as motor cars or other valuable property?

Mr. SHEAHAN: No, as the Public Solicitor has a discretionary power in respect of property, it applies to income only.

MOTOR VEHICLES: PERIODICAL INSPECTION.

Mr. MALLAM: I ask the Minister for Transport whether the hon. member for Earlwood said in this House last night that many garage proprietors are issuing certificates of fitness for motor vehicles without examining them? Is it a fact that both the authorised garage proprietors and the Department of Motor Transport thoroughly examine all motor vehicles before they are passed as fit for registration? If these are facts, can the Minister inform the House whether the hon. member for Earlwood made this statement with a view deliberately to damaging the reputation of the authorised motor garage inspection stations?

Mr. BLACK: On a point of order. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the last part of the hon. member's question seeks an opinion, and that, therefore, the question is out of order. The hon. member has asked the Minister for Transport whether the hon. member for Earlwood made a statement for a certain purpose.

Mr. McCaw: On the point of order. I submit that the question is out of order because the hon. member has used the word "deliberately". I submit that this is contrary to the standing orders, because it is impossible for the Minister to say that an hon. member deliberately intended to do something.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should reframe his question, the latter part of which certainly seeks an opinion from the Minister for Transport. No hon. member is entitled to seek an opinion from any Minister, nor is a Minister entitled to give an opinion. With regard to the point of order taken by the hon. member for Lane Cove, the hon. member's question does contain an imputation that should not be made. I rule the question out of order and suggest that the hon. member reframe it. I will call him again later.

FODDER CONSERVATION.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I ask the Premier whether on 17th November, 1951, the railway concession rate in respect of fodder stored for use in time of drought was withdrawn? Is it a fact that this concession encouraged graziers and others to store fodder in times of plenty so that the effects of drought might be lessened? If these are facts, will the Premier consider restoring this concession rate?

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: I will have inquiries made from the responsible Minister and let the hon. member have a reply later.

SYDNEY HARBOUR: TRAFFIC TUNNEL.

Mr. H. E. JACKSON: I ask the Premier whether he has stated that he intends to give serious consideration to the building of a harbour tunnel? Is it a fact that this project is to cost between £40,000,000 and £60,000,000? If these are facts, will the Premier defer consideration of this expensive experiment until country schools, hospitals, water supplies and roads are brought up to standard?

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: The hon. member has based his question on an assumption that is quite without foundation. His action is typical of the actions of hon. members opposite nowadays.

Mr. H. E. JACKSON: The Premier said it.

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: I said no more than that when hon. members make suggestions, especially on the Estimates, they will be considered. Some suggestions, of course, must be rejected at once. I have never said that the Government proposes to undertake the building of a tunnel, and it is unfair of the hon. member to suggest that I have. It follows that the remainder of his question falls to the ground.

FINES: PAYMENT TO UNIONS.

Dr. PARR: I ask the Minister for Labour and Industry whether to-day's *Sydney Morning Herald* reports that yesterday two catering firms and their employees were fined £199 10s. by the Chief Industrial Magistrate for baking during prohibited

hours? Is it a fact that one-half of the fines will be paid to the New South Wales branch of the Federated Pastrycooks' Union, which issued the summons? If these are facts, will the Minister inform hon. members whether the Government intends to bring down amending legislation to end the payment of fines to unions which issue summonses?

Mr. LANDA: It is true that yesterday two catering firms were fined by the Chief Industrial Magistrate. It is also true that if a magistrate so directs, half of the fines are paid to the union involved. The Government's intentions on this matter of policy will be announced in due course.

ESTIMATES: DEBATE ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS FUND.

Mr. WILLIS: I ask the Premier whether the principle that Parliament alone controls the public purse is a fundamental part of the British system of Government? Is it a fact that expenditure from the Government Railways Fund is this year estimated to be in excess of £66,000,000? Is it further a fact that this vote was gagged through Parliament last night at the rate of £10,000,000 a minute, and that only one hon. member was allowed to discuss it? Is this in accordance with the cherished traditions of the sovereignty of Parliament?

Mr. J. J. CAHILL: If the hon. member had been present last night he would know what took place. I cannot recall exactly what happened in regard to the vote for the Government Railways Fund, but the decision was made by the Committee as a whole. If the hon. member neglected an earlier opportunity to speak on that subject, it cannot be helped. The Government will allow reasonable time for discussion, but will not allow undue obstruction on the part of members of the Opposition.

CONTRIBUTING FUNERALS SERVICES: INVESTIGATION.

Mr. PELLY: I ask the Minister for Labour and Industry and Social Welfare whether his attention has been directed to an organisation, known as Contributing Funerals Services, of 65A Enmore-road,

Newtown, which is conducted by a Mr. George? Is it a fact that this organisation, in return for subscriptions from members of the public gives the assurance that upon the death of the subscriber he will receive a suitable and reverent funeral? Is it a fact, also, that the business at this address has now been closed down, and that the subscribers are greatly concerned about the money that they have paid into the organisation? If these are facts, will the Minister have the organisation investigated and take action to prevent the public from being exploited?

Mr. LANDA: I am not aware of the facts mentioned by the hon. member, but will inquire whether action can be taken in the matter, which might well be one for my colleague, the Attorney-General, to deal with. I shall give the hon. member a further reply later.

AUTHORISED INSPECTION STATIONS.

Mr. MALLAM: I ask the Minister for Transport a question without notice.

Mr. STEWART FRASER: Who wrote it for the hon. member?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members on the Opposition side have been very "finicky" this morning, and the Speaker can be just as "finicky" as anybody else. That is an offensive remark and I direct the hon. member for Gordon to withdraw it.

Mr. STEWART FRASER: I bow to your direction, sir, and withdraw that remark.

Mr. MALLAM: I ask the Minister for Transport whether it is a fact that the hon. member for Earlwood stated in this House last night that many garage proprietors were issuing certificates of fitness for motor vehicles without properly examining them? Is it a fact, also, that both the authorised garage proprietors and the Department of Motor Transport thoroughly examine all vehicles before passing them as fit for registration? If these facts are true, can the Minister inform the House whether the hon member for Earlwood made this statement and would it have a damaging effect on the reputation and integrity of the authorised inspection stations? Further,

would the Minister arrange for an investigation of all authorised inspection stations in the hon. member's electorate to ascertain whether there are any irregularities?

Mr. BLACK: On a point of order. I submit that exactly the same point of order as I took previously applies again. The third part of the question is, "Would it have a damaging effect on registered service station proprietors?" The very use of the word "would" indicates that it can only be a matter of opinion. We on our side might think one thing. You might think another thing. I submit that clearly that part of the question is asking for the opinion of the Minister. The hon. member for Dulwich Hill might as well have asked, "In the Ministers opinion, would it . . . ?"

Mr. McCaw: I support the point of order that has been taken by the hon. member for Neutral Bay, first on the ground that what the hon. member for Dulwich Hill is asking the Minister for Transport to express is an opinion, and that that would be contrary to standing orders as you, sir, have already directed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Which portion?

Mr. McCaw: The part that asks him to say whether the matter raised by the hon. member for Earlwood would damage authorised garage proprietors. That must amount only to an opinion, if he expresses it at all, and would be contrary to the standing orders which preclude a question asking a Minister for an opinion.

Mr. SHEAHAN: On the point of order. I submit that the question in part at any rate is wholly in order, and that that portion of the question should be allowed. On the matter that has been raised—as to whether or not an opinion is being asked for in relation to the statements made by the hon. member for Earlwood—I submit that the wording "If these facts are true", in referring to the first two portions of the question and asking, "Can the Minister inform the House whether the hon. member made this statement?" is capable of being answered as a question of fact.

The next portion is, "Would it have a damaging effect on the reputation and integrity of the authorised inspection stations?" I submit that that is allowable under the standing orders because it seeks information on a matter not reflecting upon anybody in this House, upon anything that Parliament has done, or upon any statute. It is not asking for an opinion in any of those directions but is asking for information upon something that is germane to the administration of the Minister for Transport.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The point of order taken is a play upon the word "would" and it is submitted that "would" in this instance should be construed as a word seeking an opinion. It is very easy to play with words. I could ask the hon. member who took the point of order whether, if he walked down Macquarie-street this morning in the pouring rain without an umbrella and without an overcoat, "he would" be likely to get wet.

Mr. BLACK: That is playing with the context.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! It is the word "would" that is objected to. I hesitate to say this at the moment, but if certain hon. members, when I am on my feet answering a point of order, seek to enter into altercation with me I shall have them immediately removed from the Chamber as being grossly disorderly. It is grossly disorderly for any hon. member on either side of the House to attempt to argue and interrupt the Speaker, no matter who the Speaker may be, when he is addressing the House. In this instance I take the opposite meaning of the word "would" to that taken by the hon. member for Neutral Bay. One can play with that word as with many other words, one side taking it to mean something and the other side taking it to mean the opposite. The question is a legitimate question and the Minister for Transport would not be giving an opinion in answering it. If he said, "in my opinion," he would be, but if he said, "Yes, it would interfere", or "No, it would not interfere", he is quite entitled to do so. The point of order is dismissed.

Mr. WETHERELL: It is a fact that the hon. member for Earlwood stated in this Chamber last night that many garage proprietors were issuing certificates of fitness for motor vehicles without examining them. It is a fact also that the Department of Motor Transport authorises qualified people to make inspections and to issue certificates based upon their qualifications and their authority to act in this way. The Transport Department has inspectors and I have every reason to believe that they perform their duties as I should wish them to do. It would be news to me if any of the authorised garage proprietors were failing to do their duty. I should regard as serious any allegation that they were failing in their duty.

Mr. WILLIS: The Minister does not know what goes on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That interjection is an objectionable remark and I direct the hon. member for Earlwood to withdraw and apologise.

Mr. WILLIS: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and withdraw and apologise.

Mr. WETHERELL: I have a fair knowledge of what is going on, and I assure the hon. member for Earlwood that if he knows that wrong things are being done and that the law is being flouted, the obligation is upon him to notify my department. I shall ensure that prompt and correct action is taken immediately.

CARDIFF NORTH SCHOOL.

Mr. HEFFRON: Yesterday the hon. member for Kurri Kurri asked me when the department is likely to go ahead with the new building at Cardiff North school. As promised, I have made inquiries and find that the site which I mentioned yesterday is a difficult one upon which to build and that the Works Department is having some trouble in this regard. However, the school will be built there and will be ready for occupation at the end of the first term next year.

NORTH NEWTOWN BOYS' DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL.

Mr. HEFFRON: Yesterday the hon. member for Eastwood addressed a question

to me regarding the transfer of the North Newtown Boys' Demonstration School. The transfer of pupils from North Newtown Intermediate High School to Enmore has been approved. Enmore will also enrol pupils who were previously attending Canterbury Junior High School, for whom accommodation cannot be found at the new school at Punchbowl. Enmore will open as a junior high school, but a fourth year will be established and will expand to a fifth year in 1956, thus enabling the school to meet requirements for the establishment of a full high school. The school at Enmore will occupy the premises that are being vacated by the Sydney Teachers' College annexe, which will be transferred to the school building at North Newtown. This transfer will be of great advantage to the Teachers' College because the enrolled students will be able to use the library and other services of the Teachers' College and take part in its activities. In the past there has been some feeling of isolation which will now be overcome.

North Newtown Intermediate High School buildings are inadequate for its development, and in conformity with my policy, fourth and fifth year classes are being established so as to enable the schools to function as full high schools. This is not possible in the present North Newtown buildings. The new building at Enmore will provide much greater accommodation. Although it is not yet adequately equipped for the teaching of science and manual arts, action is being taken to this end. It is expected that some temporary measures will have to be taken in 1955 to accommodate the large enrolment arising from the combination of one school with another and the establishment of fourth-year classes. The emergency provision will include the use of some rooms for manual arts at either Enmore Activity School or at Newtown Junior Technical School. During 1955 provision will be made for the development of a school on the main northern railway line. A great proportion of the pupils who are now enrolled at North Newtown Intermediate High School come from this area. The establishment of that school will permit the reduction of enrolment at Enmore so

that from 1956 onwards there should be no difficulty in meeting all the accommodation requirements on the Enmore site. Generally speaking, accommodation at Enmore is good. The school receives special attention in its painting and furnishing as an annexe to the Sydney Teachers' College, and pupils will benefit accordingly.

It was originally planned that the establishment of Enmore should be concurrent with the establishment of a school on the main northern line so that there would be no accommodation problem. Such problems as will exist, however, will not be major ones, and the accommodation gained by pupils at both North Newtown Intermediate High School and Canterbury Junior High School will be an improvement on past conditions. Pupils will further benefit by the opportunity of proceeding to the Leaving Certificate in their own school. Figures just received show that fifty-nine boys have offered for enrolment in the fourth year at Enmore. This response to the establishment of the school is gratifying.

LOAN ESTIMATES, 1954-1955.

IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

(Mr. FOWLES in the chair.)

(Consideration resumed from 27th October, *vide* page 1287.)

Mr. BLACK (Neutral Bay) [11.53]: I apologise to the Committee for having a somewhat croaky voice but, whether or not my remarks are heard by all hon. members I have no doubt that they will be heard, ultimately, far and wide throughout the State before the next general elections. Of the many scandals that involve the Government of this State, some have greater publicity value than that concerning the expenditure of loan moneys. Nevertheless, the greatest scandal for which the Government is indictable concerns the profligate spending of money from loan funds purely for party political purposes. This scandalous practice has been followed for many years. Recently when the Leader of the Opposition had some words to say about this matter he used good, plain, blunt, Australian language that we, as Australians,

could understand. I support my leader in both his choice of words and his criticism of the Government. The magnitude of the scandal can be gauged from the fact that since June, 1946, the Government has spent £300,000,000 of loan funds, at a time when there was an overall shortage of materials and manpower. For political purposes it suited the Government to bid for manpower and materials that were so scarce and in this way it made a major contribution to the inflationary condition which existed in this country until the end of last year.

I have given a lot of thought to the question of completed major works and, coming to work in the car this morning, I decided that, in its administration of finance, the Government has completed one major work, namely, a major contribution to inflation in this country since the end of the war. Many of the public works that have been undertaken since 1941 were never meant to be anything more than propaganda stunts, as I shall demonstrate clearly to hon. members. First, however, I want to refer to the extraordinary speech of the Premier and Colonial Treasurer last Wednesday in this House, following the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. The Premier and Colonial Treasurer, in an endeavour to answer the specific charges of my leader about the non-completion of major works since the war, regaled hon. members with a long list of public works which, he said, had been completed by the Government in the post-war period, and he claimed that they were works of a major character. I have made a close investigation of his claims and have discovered that, by and large, his speech was just another propaganda statement. It was, in fact, a farrago of facts, falsity and fumbling with words.

What is a major public work? In Tasmania or Western Australia, States which have not the financial resources and population of New South Wales, a major public work is entirely different from one in this great State. In the past thirty-five years, virtually every major public work in this State has been designed and completed as the result of the foresight of non-Labour governments. Everyone will agree that probably the greatest public work

Mr. Black.]

in Australia is the Sydney Harbour Bridge. It is a public work outside the ordinary concept of the term. Only one really great dam has been completed in this State since 1928, namely, the Wyangala dam on the Lachlan River. The huge dam holds 303,000 acre-feet of water. It was conceived by the Stevens Government and although construction work proceeded during the Lang regime, the dam was completed by the Stevens-Bruxner Government.

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: A completed public work.

Mr. BLACK: A completed major public work. What is a major hospital? Obviously, the great Repatriation General Hospital at Concord falls within this category. That great project was conceived and carried through to completion by the Stevens-Bruxner Government. One must consider, not the extremely small public works—however important they be—to which the Premier referred, but outstanding projects. The building of the railway line along the North Coast through to South Brisbane was a major public work. If hon. members regard the addition of nurses' quarters to hospitals, important though they may be, as major public works, their vision is restricted and they do not deserve to be members of Parliament. A major public work is one which makes a major contribution to the social or economic welfare of the State and the people of Australia. I have in mind a great powerhouse such as Bunnerong, which has a generating capacity of 375,000 kilowatts. That was a big job. I admit that additions have been made to power stations at Pyrmont, White Bay and Bunnerong, but, in each instance, new units have been installed in the existing works.

The Premier and Colonial Treasurer cannot claim that they are major public works. At Pyrmont the additions have not been completed and an examination of the Estimate shows that many of the other works mentioned are not completed jobs. It is true that on 22nd October at Tallawarra the Premier staged a somewhat spectacular ceremony at which he declared the Tallawarra power station open. The plans for this undertaking provide for the station

to be completed in two stages and the first is to have an output of 120,000 kilowatts—four 30,000 kW generating units. So far one unit is installed and has an output of 30,000 kW. To claim that this partially completed power station is a completed major public work is sheer, unadulterated nonsense.

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: Propaganda!

Mr. BLACK: It is propaganda and effrontery for the Premier and Colonial Treasurer to speak in that way in this Chamber. He referred also to generating stations at Liverpool, Penrith, Maitland, Port Kembla and several other places. I do not wish to show improper partisanship, but it cannot be denied that they are all package units and though they are important and make a contribution to the system, it must be remembered that the Colonial Treasurer has admitted that there has been an expenditure of £70,000,000; therefore one must expect some result. I am not so silly as to say that no work has been completed, but I object to the Colonial Treasurer speaking of major public works being completed when on perusal they are found to be incomplete and not major works. Each package unit has a 25,000 kW capacity. In this great State in which electric generation is over 1,000,000 kW, the Premier and Colonial Treasurer, as head of the Cabinet, claims that a few 25,000 kW package jobs are major public works. To make such a claim is unfair to the officers of the Electricity Commission who would be the last to claim that these small jobs are major public works. Let the committee think in terms of generating 375,000 kW—that is a major job. The transmission lines that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer mentioned are important parts of the grid system; some are extensions to country areas, important in themselves, but none represents a major completed work.

The Premier and Colonial Treasurer referred also to the transmission line from Canberra to Cooma. That is part of a scheme to connect the grid system with the hydro-electric power station at Guthega, which in turn is part of the general reticulation system. He referred to the Sydney-

Newcastle transmission line, but in this instance the line for which the Government has for years been responsible became inadequate to cover the voltage load from Zara-street to Sydney and vice versa and new transmission lines became necessary. The work was done but I object to the Premier and Colonial Treasurer coming to this committee and making the inaccurate claim that this is a major public work completed. Perhaps the classic example, even for the Premier and Colonial Treasurer, was his claim that the small auxiliary unit at the State Dockyard at Newcastle was a completed major public work. The Dockyard power station has a total output of 5,000 kW. How can it be hoped that this Government will apply itself to the development of the State when the Premier claims a 5,000 kW job at the State Dockyard as a major public work? I agree that it is a good job and it fits into the inter-connected system. I saw it a little while ago and it has 2-2,500 kW diesel generators.

What is the use of wasting the time of this committee which is deliberating seriously on the expenditure of £60,000,000 by talking of the State Dockyard power station as a major completed public work? The really large power stations that are being constructed are at Tallawarra, Wallerawang and Lake Macquarie, and none of these is likely to be completed for years to come. It should be noted in passing that the transmission line between Carlingford and Blacktown was claimed as a major public work, but this is the first section of a transmission line that is being built to connect with the new power station at Wallerawang. It is probably making some contribution now, but it is the first section of a major job which will not be completed for years to come. Why should the Premier and Colonial Treasurer mislead the Committee and the people on these matters? It is most improper. I have a nasty feeling that he picked up the wrong speech and gave the Committee a speech that was meant for the hustings but was not suitable for presentation to this Chamber.

That sort of nonsense may be put over electors who cannot inform themselves on

all details of the Government's action or inaction, and such a speech on the hustings frequently gains votes, but he cannot foist that nonsense on the Opposition. While he tries to do so we will fight back. Again he had the effrontery—I wish he were here—to suggest that so long as the Leader of the Opposition attacks him as he did the other day, the Opposition parties will not be successful. What does he think we are? Either he is a bad tactician who tells us how to improve our tactics, or an altruist who gives us good advice. He is not an altruist so the Committee may pass its own judgment. The Opposition will keep cracking until it gets rid of this Government so that its members in opposition may learn some common sense and realise that it does not always pay to mislead the people. All the works that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer mentioned are important. Some are partly completed, some, relatively small ones, are completed, but none can be described as a completed major public work.

The Premier and Colonial Treasurer regaled the Committee with a list of additions to various hospitals. A major public work in the hospital field is an institution such as that at Concord which was the brain-child of a non-Labour government, and is now occupied by the Repatriation Department. No such work has been completed in the thirteen years that this Government has been in office. The claims made by the Premier and Colonial Treasurer in relation to schools are contemptible—I say that deliberately. Members of the Opposition keep propaganda and politics out of education. Over the years education has rarely been the subject of a straight-out political debate. It became necessary this week for the Leader of the Opposition to raise in this Chamber a matter of political significance.

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: It had its result, too.

Mr. BLACK: That is so. The Minister for Education agreed to withdraw the leaflet in question. It is rarely that politics intrude upon education, yet the Premier embarked upon a propaganda speech during the debate on the Loan Estimates. The schools throughout New South Wales are in

a scandalous condition, and I challenge any hon. member to say that they are not. Schools are a vital social necessity, and, short of the completion of some major school providing a service over and above existing material and intellectual standards, no school building can be described as a major public work. It might be said that a new school on the lines of the present Sydney High School could be described as an important public work, but it is wrong to suggest that school buildings generally are major public works. They are part of the ordinary amenities of life, and as the schools of New South Wales are in a scandalous condition it was most improper for the Premier to read out a list of school buildings completed—some of them prefabricated probably—and claim that they were major public works.

The Premier mentioned the Liddell and Awaba coal mines as major public works that had been completed. He may be able to explain to hon. members why, if these works have been completed, sums of £167,277 and £37,875 are shown on the Loan Estimates for these works. Either the Loan Estimates are inaccurate or the Premier is wrong. Some country killing works have been completed. These are important works, but it is nonsense to describe them as really great public works.

Mr. RYAN: What would the hon. member consider to be a major public work?

Mr. BLACK: I said at the beginning of my speech what I considered to be major public works. Here is another of the high water mark claims of the Premier. He claimed that the Fish River dam is a major completed public work. This constitutes a high water mark, because this dam is part of an uncompleted water scheme. The Public Works Department is now working on the dam, yet the Premier said in this Chamber that it is a completed public work. The Fish River dam now impounds 7,500 acre-feet of water, and the Premier claims that to be a major public work. My honourable friend, the Leader of the Country Party, will bear me out when I say that the Wyangala dam, which has a capacity of 303,000 acre-feet,

is a major public work. It is absurd for the Premier to say that a dam that impounds 7,500 acre-feet is a major public work. The hon. member for Marrickville will be interested to know that the Stevens-Bruxner Government commenced the Wyangala Dam in 1928 and completed it in 1935. That is a really major public work. On the Premier's own statement, the Broken Hill water scheme is not completed.

Lt.-Colonel BRUXNER: The Bavin-Buttenshaw Government was responsible for the commencement of the Wyangala dam; the Lang Government stopped the work and we finished it.

Mr. BLACK: History is repeating itself, because in the financial year 1952-53 the Government stopped work on the Keepit dam. It must be a tradition in the Labour Party to start an important work and then to close it down. If it suits that party politically to sack a few men, they are sacked. The Premier spoke of the Warragamba pipe line. That is an important part of the Metropolitan Water, Sewerage and Drainage Board's scheme for reticulating water from the uncompleted Warragamba dam to the metropolitan area. It is worth saying, in passing, that most dams under the control of the Board were undertaken by non-Labour governments and completed during their term of office. There is the Avon dam, which has a capacity of 175,000 acre-feet; the Nepean dam, with a capacity of 75,000 acre-feet; and the Woronora dam, with a capacity of 60,000 acre-feet. The work on the Woronora dam was completed within a few weeks of the change of government in 1941, but the whole of the foresight and initiative for the construction of that dam came from the Stevens-Bruxner Government.

The railway works to which the Premier referred are all either relatively small or portions of uncompleted major projects. For example, he mentioned the quadruplication of the line to Blacktown, which is part of the job of quadruplicating the line to Penrith. Even when that work has been completed as far as Penrith, I do not think that it could be described as a great major public work. The objective

is for the line to be quadrupled to Wallerawang. When that job has been completed it will be of overwhelming major importance, because at present the Blue Mountains line carries either the second or the third heaviest main line traffic in the world, and has either the second or the third steepest main line grade—that between Emu Plains and Katoomba—in the world. The line is overladen with traffic and the conditions are difficult, so that the quadruplication of the line to Wallerawang would be a major job. When that work is finished I shall be the first to say that a major work has been completed, but I object to the Premier's coming here with such a farrago and laying "foundation stones" in an endeavour to mislead the electors. This is a major scandal in New South Wales.

The debate on the Loan Estimates is a vital one, because it is the profligate spending of this Government for political purposes that has made a major contribution to the inflationary pressure in Australia. The New South Wales and Victorian Governments get the lion's share of loan funds. These funds should be made available to the great industries, but all the labour, materials and capital have been soaked up by this Government. For years there has been a shortage of steel. Why? Because the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd., and associated companies producing steel cannot get the labour they need. If there had been some rhyme or reason in the policy of the Government, by now the steel and all the other important commodities that are needed in this country would have been rolling off the production line, and the Government would have been able to get on with the job of completing major works. It has put the cart before the horse and must accept responsibility for having done so. It is difficult for a person who has no reason to be closely interested in these details to appreciate their significance. As members of a responsible parliament we must explain it to them. I intend to suggest specific action to expose once and for all this Government's profligate spending for political purposes on uncompleted public works.

Even the Premier admits that the Quay railway has not yet been completed. It is interesting to learn that he visits the Quay railway each day on his way to work, and gives frequent instructions that the work must be speeded up. Is he usurping the authority of the Minister for Transport, or merely snooping on the Minister? After all, he is not Minister for Transport but Premier and Colonial Treasurer. Is he, perhaps, under the delusion that he is now in fact the Cabinet? Rumours are circulating in New South Wales—I say this deliberately—that he aspires to occupy, in the not far distant future, at least the position of head of the executive government. It is a pity that the Premier's daily perambulations do not take him past the uncompleted Keepit, Burrendong, Glenbawn, Warkworth and Blowering dams. If he could drop across to Cowra and look at Wyangala it might inspire him to get on with the job of finishing the others. It is demonstrable that the New South Wales public works programme is in such a scandalous state as a result of the Government's mismanagement during the last nine years that a select committee of this Parliament should be appointed to investigate and reorganise the whole programme, and show the taxpayer what is happening. If the Government had any sense of responsibility it would accept that challenge. If such a select committee found nothing to complain of my colleagues and I might lose the next election, but I have no fear that that would happen. The hollow political farce perpetuated by the Government could easily be exposed. Unfortunately, it has desperate implications for Australia. I shall give an example of the way in which the Government has been playing politics with public works. In 1947 the then Premier's policy speech contained the following:

Health. Labour is vitally concerned with the question of health. The Government will construct a modern Medical Centre. This will embrace—a Cancer Institute for Research Work and treatment. This institute which alone will cost £325,000 will have 400 beds, a general hospital with 800 beds, an eye hospital with 200 beds, a maternity hospital with 400 beds and accommodation for ear, nose and throat cases.

Mr. Black.]

Where is this great medical centre? On 2nd September, 1952, when the present Premier introduced the Loan Estimates, he made all sorts of complaints about the wicked Federal Government. My colleagues and I still burn with indignation when we think of the way in which the Premier conducted his campaign in the elections which followed. He said that the Federal Government had starved his Government of loan funds. At that very moment the Federal Government was increasing the volume of treasury bills, and accepting all the odium of underwriting loans to New South Wales from taxation. I assure the Committee that I am accurately condensing the *Hansard* report of the Premier's remarks when I say that he stated that because the Federal Government was holding up loan funds his Government had to leave in abeyance the calling of tenders for thirty-six new hospitals and been obliged to reduce spending on twenty-nine contracts. That was the year in which the Premier wanted £70,000,000. The vote for health was £2,500,000. If what the Premier said was true the vote for health would probably have been £3,100,000. Under the suggested increased vote the Government would have spent £600,000 on thirty-six new and twenty-nine existing contracts—almost seventy in all. Apparently less than £9,000 was to be spent on each during the year. That is not an efficient rate of construction for public works. The plain fact was that the Government's hospital programme was in a mess, and it had to use the 1952-1953 Loan Estimates as an excuse.

What I have said has been borne out in debate. The Premier, without complaint about the shortage of funds, told the hon. member for Auburn that he had directed the Minister not to commence any new hospital contracts. Have those sixty-five hospitals been completed in the meantime? The Premier would have given a similar direction to the Minister in 1952 if he had had the courage, and if it had not been bad politics to do so. He has been condemned out of his own mouth.

One of the Government's greatest blunders has been its policy of undertaking too many conservation projects. I

do not want to be misunderstood, and emphasise the need for the completion of these great projects. However, one's spending must be equated to the availability of finance, labour and materials. In 1946 the enabling legislation for the construction of Burrendong and Glenbawn dams was introduced in this Parliament. On 28th March, 1946, the second reading of the legislation authorising the construction of Glenbawn dam was brought down. On 3rd April, a few days later, the second reading of the legislation authorising the construction of Burrendong was moved. The Minister for Conservation said, "Burrendong dam is another of the works of high priority on the Government's fifteen-year plan of water conservation". That was said eight years ago. Burrendong has staggered to a stop and Glenbawn is behind schedule. In the meantime, a vast amount of money has been spent on these projects. On 1st March, 1950, legislation was brought down to authorise the building of Warkworth dam. This was to be a big dam, 100 feet high, nearly 1½ miles long, and impounding 400,000 acre-feet. The Minister on that occasion said, "We are determined to press ahead". This was more than four and a half years ago! I hope that this select committee is appointed so that the members may have a look at Warkworth and report the truth to the people about it.

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: It is scandalous.

Mr. BLACK: It is a scandal. I notice that among the public works that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer mentioned was the Peat's Ferry Bridge. This is an important bridge and, in fact, the contracts for it were let by the Stevens-Bruхner Government in 1938. The steel was supplied and fabricated by The Clyde Engineering Company Limited under contract for a sum of £94,000, and Balguy Constructions Proprietary Limited built the bridge under contract for £247,000. The job was well under way when this Government came to office in 1941 because the Stevens-Bruхner Government had let the contracts in plenty of time. The Premier and Colonial Treasurer must have made an oversight when he did not claim credit for the Hexham Bridge. No one denies the

importance of that bridge but equally no one would compare it in magnitude with great undertakings like the dams that I have mentioned or the bridge over the Clarence River at Grafton which carries both road and rail traffic, or the Hawkesbury River railway bridge. Indeed, I do not know why the Government does not try to get some kudos for the Hawkesbury River railway bridge built by the Railways Department. I should give the Government credit for completing this public work—except for one thing. The factor that takes the milk out of the coconut is that the Hawkesbury railway bridge was built on the basis of a high defence priority. The project had behind it all the powers which, by the National Security Regulations, were vested in the Commonwealth Government. It was not built in ordinary circumstances. It had the highest defence priority for materials and labour. The engineers and the men who worked on that bridge get full marks for the job they did.

I have said on many occasions in this Chamber that it is perfectly clear that the Government has landed itself in an unholy mess in relation to public works. The tone of the speeches of the Premier and Colonial Treasurer in relation to public works over the years had softened until last Wednesday when he rather let the cat out of the bag. He told hon. members that he had mentioned to the hon. member for Auburn that he had directed the Minister for Health not to begin the building of any more hospitals. But he went back to his old form when he made this extremely ill-timed and inaccurate speech in an endeavour to answer the Leader of the Opposition. As I listened to him I had the thought that perhaps he was trying to assert some sort of debating and moral superiority over the Leader of the Opposition. We who have known the Leader of the Opposition for years have learned that one thing that no one can do to him is to bounce him. I give that advice to the Premier and Colonial Treasurer. The Leader of the Opposition is very unpleasant when anyone tries to bounce him and I hope that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer will not try anything like that again.

The legislation of the great Blowering dam was brought down in 1951. That dam was to impound 846,000 acre-feet of water coming down the Tumut River because of the diversion of the Snowy River. In 1951 the Minister said that work would begin at the latest in 1952-1953. Two years have passed since that latest date of commencement and so far as I know—I speak to correction—no work has been done. In 1953 when the water is flowing down the Tumut River from the Snowy Diversion, there will be no dam at Blowering to impound it. The Murrumbidgee flow will not be controlled, despite the great increase in its volume. This is a serious state of affairs and I hope that the Government agrees to the appointment of the select committee so that all the circumstances connected with the Blowering dam will be fully investigated.

Lt.-Colonel BRUXNER (Tenterfield) [12.36]: It is not my intention to cover the whole of these Loan Estimates because my Deputy Leader, in my absence a few days ago, dealt with them in general terms. I have read *Hansard* on the debate and I was surprised at the procedure that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer adopted in the presentation of these estimates. He brought them down, the Leader of the Opposition spoke, and then the ordinary procedure was changed. The Premier and Colonial Treasurer replied to the Leader of the Opposition straight away. I have not seen anything like that in this Chamber before. To some extent this departure makes the task of other hon. members in dealing with the Loan Estimates difficult because they are prone to spend valuable time replying to the extraordinary speech that was made by the Premier and Colonial Treasurer. That speech was more or less a long list of works and as the hon. member for Neutral Bay pointed out, it was an apology for what the Government has done and has not done. It would be wrong for me to attempt in this speech to deal with every detail of the position but outside the Chamber I have gone through the statement of the Premier and Colonial Treasurer carefully. Hon. members who represent country electorates would do well to add up all these

expenditures on works. When they do so, they will find that the old countryside has had a pretty raw deal. Huge sums have been spent on the development of electric power and hon. members who take the trouble to dissect the figures will find that in an expenditure of about £40,000,000, the power stations built in the country that the Premier mentioned are a mere bagatelle.

The greatest expenditure by far has been in the big centres of population. As modern industry is geared to electric power, wherever power installations are made and electricity is available at a lower price, industries are established, population is concentrated and all the ills and problems that come from centralisation and congestion are accentuated. Centralisation aggravates problems relating to housing, slums, passenger transport and a thousand and one other things. Where the money goes the people go. Until this Government realises that it must put its present policy into reverse, there will be no worthwhile decentralisation. So long as it continues with its present ideas it will go on stacking the people in heaps in the dangerous places. I am perfectly frank when I say that once this vicious circle begins—and it began many years ago—it is mighty hard to break. The demands come from the people in these places through their representatives in this Chamber, where no fewer than sixty-three hon. members represent Sydney, Newcastle and Wollongong-Port Kembla. If they do not get the big bun out of the Loan Estimates, what are they here for? The remaining thirty-one members of this honourable Chamber represent areas scattered throughout the rest of New South Wales, including the big industrial centre of Broken Hill.

Mr. RYAN: It is not the quantity, but the quality that counts.

Lt.-Colonel BRUXNER: Two pigs make more noise than one pig. I notice in the main roads allocation of loan moneys that this year the amount proposed to be voted is only £400,000 and that the estimated expenditure is £200,000. I do not advocate the use of loan moneys for maintenance, but, as I said during my remarks in the Budget debate, New South Wales is lagging far behind in road development

through lack of money. More money must be spent on construction if we are to have roads capable of carrying the tremendous increase in heavy vehicles. To-day, the Department of Main Roads is spending on road maintenance 14s. 6d. of every £1 that it receives from Commonwealth and State taxation, leaving only 5s. 6d. for new construction. It is not possible to strengthen all the old pavements and create new roads in that way. Road building is a major and costly work. The Department of Main Roads, along with local government authorities, is responsible for 26,000 miles of roads, including more than 6,000 miles of highways, throughout New South Wales. £400,000 is a meagre sum to allot for its work in the next twelve months.

The United States of America will spend one billion dollars on its roads. Certainly, we in this country do not have the same road mileage, but in many respects New South Wales is comparable to the United States of America. That country admits that it has obsolete roads, in spite of the fact that since 1941 it has spent more than forty billion dollars on road construction and maintenance. The problem of roads in this State is something like a Frankenstein monster; it has developed into something that can hit back at us! I have pleaded with the Premier and Colonial Treasurer on this matter, and I hope that the Deputy Premier will listen to what I have to say. Through my electorate runs the greater part of one uncompleted work which, from the point of view of decentralisation, is of the utmost importance. I refer, of course, to the new route of the Gwydir Highway between Glen Innes and Grafton. The old existing highway is unsuited to modern transport, and when I was Deputy Premier and Minister for Transport, a modern motor road was surveyed. Half the work has been done, and to-day, one may travel at 50 miles an hour along the road from Glen Innes until one comes to a clearing in the bush, beyond which there is nothing: and that nothing has been there ever since Labour came into office in 1941! Another 10 miles of completely new construction and the reconstruction of the existing road from Cangai to Grafton would connect the great North-

West of New South Wales to the port that the Government has begun to build at Iluka.

Can any hon. member conceive anything so ludicrous as what is taking place to-day. The Government is proceeding with work on the port at Iluka on the Clarence River; there is virtually a first-class road from Moree to Glen Innes; and then there is a hiatus between Glen Innes and the coast. Completion of that road to make possible the full use of the port at Iluka for the produce of the North-West would cost about £1,250,000—a paltry sum when compared with what this project would mean in the development of New South Wales. The Main Roads Department and all concerned want the work to proceed, but this cannot be done if only a handful of chips are given to the department. It costs big money to move large road-building units to the place where work ceased on the road; and it is not worth putting big plant on a job such as this unless a substantial section of it is to be done.

The Minister for Transport led me to believe that this year we would get somewhere with this national work, and I expected to see in the Loan Estimates for the Main Roads Department, not £400,000, but £1,000,000, some of which could be used on this job and the balance on other important constructional works that are required. The total amount of loan moneys available this year is £62,632,000, out of which the Government is giving the Department of Main Roads a miserable £400,000. I know that Government supporters have a happy knack of saying, "What did you do?". I shall tell them how a non-Labour government built roads and bridges. I have in my hand a copy of the loan estimates for the financial year 1937/1938, when I was Deputy-Premier and Minister for Transport. In that year the government had the colossal sum of £8,786,287 to split up among all departments. What did that government do for the road system? It made available £200,000 to the Country Main Roads Fund for construction and reconstruction. That is half the amount allocated to-day from an estimate of £62,000,000. Also, £150,000 was provided for developmental

roads, something for which this Government has provided none of its funds. It calmly takes a slice from the Commonwealth contribution and puts it into the developmental fund.

Mr. GREEN: That is good business.

Lt.-Colonel BRUXNER: The hon. member for Redfern says that it is good business, but God help the country roads and the development of the State if that policy is followed by the hon. member and his colleagues. Developmental roads give access to those who are courageous enough to establish themselves where no roads are provided, and people like the hon. member ride upon their backs. If they are not given roads, the hon. member will become as lean as they are. Also, a sum of £350,000 was provided for the Country Main Roads Fund and the Developmental Roads Fund, and £662,000 was allocated for roads and bridges. In the following year, 1938-39, which was near the end of the regime of that government, the loan allocation totalled £8,013,410.

With such a sum under present circumstances we would be "out on our pink ear" within a week. It requires experience, courage and business acumen to divide £8,000,000 over various departments to give the best results. What was done? A sum of £1,350,000 was allocated for roads and bridges, £130,000 for the County of Cumberland Main Roads Fund, £140,000 for the Country Main Roads Fund, and £164,000 for the Developmental Roads Fund. That was the policy of the government of which I was privileged to be deputy leader. No wonder that it was able to build a thousand bridges. The Premier and Colonial Treasurer has mentioned the building of a few bridges, but the government of which I was a member built a thousand. It was my privilege to start and to provide finance for both bridges over the Hawkesbury River, and to my astonishment a subsequent Premier, now the Hon. Sir William McKell, opened those bridges and made speeches that almost suggested that he and his government were responsible for their construction.

Another matter that seriously affects country residents is country water supply

and sewerage. I have heard it said that if such services are provided in country districts, people will go there to live, but from a vote of £62,000,000, only £570,000 is to be spent on country-town water supply schemes throughout New South Wales, which is a very large area. For water supply and sewerage works in charge of municipal authorities a capital grant of £700,000 is provided. Is it expected that this will overtake the demand for these essential amenities in country districts? Much has been said about the development of power, but there is a village in my electorate—Ashford—in which the North-west County Council is developing a coal mine to generate power. Miners will settle there. The climate is hot, and I have asked the Minister to provide a water supply to the village now. He says that it will be provided next year.

A large amount of money is not involved, and it seems to me that it could be provided this year so that those who work in the mines will have the same services as are available to miners in the Newcastle area. I hope that the Minister for Education will recommend that more money should be made available to meet those needs. When the Government of which I was a member was in office almost as much money was made available for these purposes as this Government now provides from £62,000,000. I hope that the Government will allow reasonable discussion on this estimate. There has been some discussion to-day about gagging of debates, but I have been a member of this Chamber when a short title of a bill was the subject of lengthy debate. I have heard an hon. member speak for three hours on a short title, and when that is done, if there is no guillotine it is necessary to use a gun. The Government of which I was a member acted mercifully and used the guillotine. There is generally a reason for the application of the guillotine or the gag, but when an Opposition behaves as does the present Opposition it should be treated decently. I have never seen an Opposition behave more quietly than the present one. The preambles and short titles of bills are never debated.

I hope that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer will make special funds available to the Department of Main Roads so that the works to which I have referred may be completed and also the railway project that has been left suspended in the air between Sandy Hollow and Maryvale. A gentleman is now a member of this Chamber who defeated a colleague of mine by promising that because he was a supporter of the Government work on the Sandy Hollow-Maryvale railway would commence within a month of his election. He was elected, but work on the railway has not been recommenced and no provision is made for it in this estimate. The Government of which I was a member was responsible for the provision of equipment and storage space for the receipt of hard wheat from the North-West at Newcastle. A terminal silo was built at Newcastle to blend the hard wheats of the West with those from other districts. Three million pounds has been spent on the Sandy Hollow-Maryvale railway, but this Government has not spent a penny upon it. In spite of this, a certain hon. member masquerades as the hon. member for Mudgee.

[*The Temporary Chairman (Mr. Freeman) left the chair at 1.2 p.m. The Committee resumed at 2.30 p.m.*]

Dr. PARR (Burwood) [2.30]: In considering this year's Loan Estimates, I should like to refer to the previous year's figures. The 1953-54 programme of expenditure was £55,267,000. This has been exceeded by a sum of £4,700,000, making a total of over £60,000,000. Of that amount £3,172,000 has been expended without parliamentary authority and is shown as "Unauthorised in Suspense". The interesting point is that the Auditor-General revealed last year that the cash balance brought forward at the beginning of the financial year was £6,900,000. The total amount available for expenditure in the year 1953-54 was £63,500,000, and at the 30th June, 1954, there was a considerable balance. This indicates to me that there was so much money available that many items were shown as "Unauthorised in Suspense", and that money was diverted to this, that and the other purpose because there was so much surplus cash available.

It is well for hon. members to look at the picture. Last financial year £1,500,000 was advanced to the Metropolitan Water, Sewerage and Drainage Board, making the amount available £2,500,000. That £1,500,000 was made available because there was a surfeit of money available to the Treasury. Hon. members on this side do not say that the Board should not have got that money, but at a time when there was a surfeit of money this Government squealed that it did not have enough funds and therefore it stands condemned of endeavouring to fool the people. At the same time last year £1,000,000 was given to the Rural Bank for the development of home schemes on Crown lands. I put it to the Committee that there was money to burn.

I ask hon. members to compare the years when the Chifley Government was in control with the years during which the much-maligned Menzies-Fadden Government has been in office. In the five years that the Chifley Government was in office it granted the New South Wales Government £56,684,000 for expenditure on public works. During the five years from 1949 to 1954 the much-maligned Menzies-Fadden Government made available to the State Government £248,000,000. It gave this State, during the last five years, four times the amount of loan money that was given to New South Wales by the Chifley Government. The State Government should give credit where it is due, and acknowledge the good treatment that it has received from the Menzies-Fadden Government. In the year 1947 the State debt was £362,000,000. By the end of this year it will be £660,000,000, so that in a period of eight years it will have almost doubled. This is an indication of the exceedingly large sum of money that the State Government has received during the five years that the Liberal-Country Party Government has been in office.

In the financial year 1951-52 the loan money made available to this State was £64,000,000. In the quarter ending September, 1951, New South Wales drew only £9,643,000, in the quarter ending December, £3,932,000, in the quarter ending March, 1952, £5,164,000, and in the quarter ending

June, 1952, the last quarter of the financial year, the Government drew over £45,000,000 making a total of £64,000,000. These drawings reveal that the Government did not want to draw adequate funds during the early months of the financial year, and followed a deliberate policy of starving the State of loan moneys until the last quarter because it wanted to malign the Menzies-Fadden Government.

In the 1952-53 financial year the same financial racket was continued. In the quarter ending December, 1952, the amount drawn was £5,762,000, in the quarter ending March, 1953, £8,477,000, and in the quarter ending June, 1953, at the very death of the financial year, the Labour Government of New South Wales, which is constantly saying that the Federal Government robbed it of funds, drew more than £36,000,000. These are the official figures. The Government stands condemned for not drawing money adequately throughout the whole year. It adopted a deliberate policy of restricting loan moneys so that there would be unemployment and so that it could malign the Menzies-Fadden Government. That demonstrates the depths of immorality to which this Government will descend. In the next year the error of its ways had apparently been brought home to it because in October, 1953, the drawings were £19,469,000; in March, 1954, £16,988,000; and in June, 1954, £16,793,000. In the last financial year the drawings were even but in the two previous years this Government, in order to damage the reputation of the Menzies-Fadden administration deliberately neglected to draw the money that was available to it until the very end of the financial year. Now, years later, the pattern of subterfuge lies clearly revealed. The least that society demands of a Government is that it should be honest and moral and this Government has been neither. It has led the people "up the garden path".

It is always interesting to refer to what has actually been said in the past. In 1952, the Premier, speaking on the Loan Estimates, said "On the contrary the public is beginning to feel that Australia is sinking in the depths of despair . . . I assure hon. members that the blame will be put

where it truly lies. The States have asked for £225,000,000 but they have got only £188,000,000." That as the year in which, in June, the Government asked for £36,000,000, of its total allocation of £51,000,000. It tried to pull the wool over the eyes of the people, of Parliament and of its own supporters and it concealed its drawings from the Commonwealth Treasury.

Mr. WATTISON: In 1952 a public loan floated by this Government was not fully subscribed.

Dr. PARR: I shall show hon. members how rotten is the record of this Government. In the five-year period from 1944 to 1949, when the Chifley Government was in office at Canberra, £2,082,428 was spent on education in New South Wales. From 1949 to 1953, when the Menzies Government was in office, £17,427,802 was spent in that field an increase of 800 per cent. The much-lauded Chifley Government allotted insufficient funds for this purpose.

Mr. McMAHON: The hon. member should state the administrative costs for each department in 1944-49.

Dr. PARR: Last year I disposed of the suggestion that the increased basic wage accounted for the difference in the grants. It did not increase by 800 per cent. This Government is now claiming that its percentage allocation for education is a record. If one sets aside the expenditure on social services, one sees that the average percentage of revenue spent on education declined from 33.3 at the end of the previous, non-socialist government's term of office to 30 under this Government. The comparison is even more revealing when one realises that in pre-war years school enrolments were either static or declining. To-day they are increasing sharply. In 1945 the average weekly enrolment was 335,000. To-day it is approximately 480,000—an increase of 45 per cent. in less than ten years. Enrolments are increasing by about 25,000 annually. In 1939, when a non-socialist Government was in office the percentage of loan money spent on education was 7.3. In

Dr. Parr.]

1954 it was 6.3. That shows that more and more money has been diverted from education to support this Government's socialistic enterprises.

In 1951-52 the Cahill Government deliberately cried "poor-mouth" in respect of revenue and loan funds in order to justify its miserable inaction and to engender public resentment against the Federal Government. This Labour Government of New South Wales has been guilty of scandalous misrepresentation. It sacked over 3,000 men from the Railways Department in the very year during which it had £7,000,000 of loan funds unspent. The Government to its lasting discredit, peddled unemployment for the filthy lucre of office. I should not like to have on my conscience the sacking of 3,000 men just for political gain when there was ample money in the "kitty" to keep them in jobs. If the members of this Government want to have that blot on their conscience, they are welcome to it. I believe that every working man should have a job, and I should keep him at work as long as I had the money, but this Government is smeared because it sacked working men when there was no need to do so. It took this despicable action merely so that it could say, "the Menzies-Fadden Government has denied us loan money". At the same time it had £7,000,000 in loan funds that it could not spend! This is the sort of Government that the people of New South Wales have. However, the people are waking up to it. On 3rd September, 1952, the Minister for Education made this statement:—

Honourable members opposite will have to explain to their constituents why these schools are not being built and I advise them to listen to what I have to say so that they will be able to tell their electors that all these buildings are ready to go ahead, that the Education Department has completed all the preparatory work and that the Minister for Education and the Colonial Treasurer argued before the Loan Council a strong case for the allocation of the necessary money. In this bright young Australia—

darkened only by the Labour Government of New South Wales—

that has just passed through the most prosperous period in its history—

The Minister for Education recognises his own words; they should haunt him and keep him awake at night—

the government of New South Wales unfortunately is unable to obtain from the Commonwealth enough loan monies to proceed with the erection of schools for the education of the children who will one day be expected to contribute their share to the nation's development.

This Government abused its trust by indulging in lying misrepresentation to the people through the statement of the Minister in this Parliament and did something that should make every member on that side hang his head in shame. The Minister for Education said also:

I declare that the position which we face is a calamity, it is a tragedy which will surely blight and may even ruin numerous young lives and destroy the hopes and ambitions of very many parents. In every hamlet, village, town and city of New South Wales, people are entitled to be shocked by the appalling story that I have to tell. After eight years of unremitting work as Minister for Education and just when we have turned the corner to rectify the parsimony, neglect and mistakes of the past, I have to tell New South Wales that our education plans, programmes and ambitions have to be abandoned. Because the Federal Government has taken the outrageous and wholly unjustifiable action of cutting off the essential finances for our education, the Education Department has to take this action:

- (1) Abandon at once many buildings and works already approved and marked as urgent.
- (2) Cancel and repudiate many existing signed contracts for school buildings.
- (3) Abandon the building of many schools already under construction so that soon throughout New South Wales there will be scattered the grim skeletons of half-built schools to flaunt parents and teachers and to remind children that they have been cheated.

Mr. FERGUSON: Who is the author of that?

Dr. PARR: The Minister for Education. These are his flamboyant words. They will always live in the minds of hon. members, but not for their truth. They are a permanent stain on the Minister's political character and on this Parliament. They will never be erased until *Hansard* is destroyed. The Minister's statement went on:

- (4) Dump and forget all the tenders that we are just on the point of accepting.

- (5) Curtail and cripple our carefully prepared programme for the training of more teachers.
- (6) Pigeonhole and forget for years plans and specifications that our architects now have ready.
- (7) Sack numbers of loyal painting and repair workers who have been employed for years in our painting and repair organisation.

Many hon. members when they look at some of the schools in their electorate probably wonder what work the painting and repair staff is doing because there are still many jobs waiting to be done. Why did this Government sack men from the painting and repair staff, when it had £7,000,000 of loan money unspent? The statement by the Minister of Education to which I have referred was the most disgraceful ever made in this Chamber by a Minister of the Crown. The Auditor-General has proved that it was a lying misrepresentation of the position and the Minister should never hold up his head again. He stands condemned before this Parliament and before the people. This Government even had the parents and citizens' associations on side for a time and persuaded them to sign petitions urging that the Menzies-Fadden Government should give New South Wales more money for education. I went to the schools in my electorate and told the parents and citizens associations the truth. I knew the real position then, and my constituents believed me. At the annual conference of parents and citizens' associations held in Sydney on 20th and 21st August 1954, it was reported that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer, in reply to the request by the Federation of Parents and Citizens' Associations for increased funds for education and school buildings particularly, had intimated that no school building project had been held up for lack of funds. In 1952 the Minister for Education was sacking men, abandoning buildings, putting off the painting and repair staff and doing all sorts of other dire things because he had no money, yet two years later the Premier and Colonial Treasurer declares that no school building

project has been delayed for lack of funds. This is a strange situation. The Premier and Colonial Treasurer said also:

The limiting factor as far as school building is concerned is the available resources of the building industry.

The Government has gone on to another tack: First the "wicked" Menzies-Fadden Government was its excuse. Now it is the building industry. These are glib excuses trotted out one after the other just like the excuses for that hospital with 400 empty beds. In that case the first excuse was that the medical profession was at fault though the real reason was maladministration by the hospital board. This Government is very clever at finding excuses. The parents and citizens' associations were fooled for a year or two but their reply to the Premier and Colonial Treasurer on this occasion was that he should make the building of additional school buildings a matter of the highest priority. Their eyes are open. They realise that this Government has deliberately misrepresented the financial position of education to parents, to the members of the Opposition and to the people generally. It stands condemned for its political immorality. The Minister and other supporters of the Government do not like my reminding them of the Minister's words in 1952, but I shall continue to do so. I shall remind the people of New South Wales also, and the teachers, and the parents and citizens' associations that this Government lied to them and cannot be trusted. It is recreant to its trust. Doctor R. B. Madgwick, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of New England, in an address to the Advance of Education Conference on An Analysis of Education Problems, had this to say when speaking of the need for more money for tertiary education:

At the tertiary level the story is much the same. Trained scientists and technologists are needed to lead and direct the development of industry in this country—industry related not only to defence but to the broad economic development which this country has the resources to expect . . . I estimate myself, and I know figures are always capable of criticism, that to be on a basis comparable with that of the universities in the United Kingdom, the income of the Australian universities would need to be doubled, and that would

do little more than solve our immediate problems. The pressure that you are feeling already in secondary education the universities will feel in five years' time, and by 1960 and 1965 we will be faced with a student population at least 50 per cent. greater than we have now, and probably greater than it was at the height of the Reconstruction Training Scheme. To provide for that inevitable increase in numbers, action is necessary now. It will be far too late when those students are within our walls.

More money should be made available to the University for the training of more scientists. Writers in all professions have been stressing the insufficiency of trained scientists. I have with me a copy of a paper that comes from the Murray Valley, containing a report of the remarks by Sir Ian Clunies Ross, chairman of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, at the annual congress of the Agricultural Bureau of New South Wales in September, 1954. The article quotes him as saying:

The basic reason why agricultural scientists were not carrying out all the work they should—either on the research or the advisory front—is that there were simply too few of them, Sir Ian continued. For 120 vacancies advertised recently by the C.S.I.R.O., only eight applications had been received. The lack of scientists, in turn, was due to the fact that the nation seemed unwilling to pay young scientists as generously as they deserved.

Recently I brought up that matter in the Chamber and asked the Premier and Colonial Treasurer to increase the salaries of the teaching staff of the University. Those gentlemen are inadequately paid; they receive only a little more than an ordinary member of Parliament. Even the Professor of Physics at the Sydney University gets only £2,250 a year, not as much as a Cabinet Minister. With due deference to any Minister, I suggest that a trained university man who occupies that position should get at least the equivalent of an ordinary Minister of the Crown. He has just as much intellectual acumen. The article continues:

There was a widespread feeling among parents that it did not pay to send sons to the university or to agricultural colleges. The current crop of agricultural students at universities and colleges fell far short of the needs of the C.S.I.R.O., State Departments, and private industries concerned with the land . . . Unless some way was found to attract brilliant

young men into the ranks of Australia's agricultural scientists, our future—instead of being one of promise grasped and realised, could be one of promises never realised.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLES): Order! I ask the hon. member to return to a discussion of the Loan Estimates.

Dr. PARR: I am dealing with the need to make more money available for tertiary education, and I have pointed out the need to train more scientists. To illustrate my remarks I have just quoted from a report of a speech made by the chairman of the C.S.I.R.O. to the annual congress of the Agricultural Bureau of New South Wales. That gentleman stressed the need for more money to be made available to the University and to agricultural colleges.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is definitely not directing his remarks to the Loan Estimates. He has tried to make a case for the provision of more money for tertiary education and I ask him now to return to the discussion of the Loan Estimates. I shall not allow him to continue in the present strain.

Dr. PARR: On page 11 of the Loan Estimates appears the item: "University of Sydney—Grant towards Building Programme—further sum £250,000". That should be increased to at least £500,000, for only in that way can the University produce the scientists needed for the development of this country.

The allocation of loan moneys for the Electricity Commission is £12,000,000. Generation of electricity is extremely important to this State, but the cost of electricity is a threat to secondary industry and the living standard of the average family. Unless the impact of this on production costs is made clear hon. members will not see the problem in its true perspective. The Tariff Board, in its annual report for the year ended 30th June, 1954, has exposed the stark reality of the threat. The report reads:

Not only is the cost of power in New South Wales much higher than in Victoria . . . but also this item places factories at a great disadvantage in competing with manufacturers in the United Kingdom. At present the cost

of power in Australia per kilowatt is approximately double the cost of that in the United Kingdom, and treble the cost of that in the United States of America.

It is most interesting to note that the cost of power in New South Wales is higher than it is in Victoria. The Government continues to overlook the significant fact that New South Wales is the industrial heart of Australia, and it has failed consistently to see that the present high cost of electricity has an important bearing on costs in industry. Unless something is done to cheapen electricity, the prosperity of this State must decline. The report of the Tariff Board continues:

The board has noted with growing concern the increasing costs of electric power in Australia which are an additional factor placing Australian manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage. . . . High charges for electric power could adversely affect Australian industry where total costs had already reached a dangerous level.

The ability of a nation to put electric power to work is reflected in the standard of living of that nation, and the Government by providing electric power is following a correct policy, though I disagree with the socialistic methods that have been followed. The following figures show the monthly averages of electricity production during 1953 and illustrates this important point: in Canada kilowatts produced per head on a monthly basis were 369, in Sweden 260, in United States of America 231, in Switzerland 190, in New Zealand 140, and in New South Wales a dismal last, 123. This reveals a tragic position and shows how far this State is lagging in electricity generation.

A little extra money is to be spent on hospitals. The Minister may examine the figures that I quote and check their accuracy, but he will find that in 1939 there were 7.2 beds a thousand of population for treating the sick. To-day there are 6.3 beds, thus the State is worse off than it was in 1939. Considering the ageing population, the number of beds now available for a thousand of population should be at least 7.5. That is why so many patients await hospital accommodation. In 1921 when I went as senior medical officer to the St. George Hospital there were 121 beds. Now there are 330 or 340 beds. In the Western

Dr. Parr.]

Suburbs Hospital during the same period there has been hardly any increase, yet over 100,000 additional people have to be served by the 130 beds that are available. In that area there should be at least 350 beds. The Prince Henry Hospital should be a post-graduate hospital in which a large number of students and medical men are given training. That is one of the most important things the Government should do within the next twelve months.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLES): Order! The hon. member has exhausted his time.

Mr. HEFFRON (Maroubra), Minister for Education [3.15]: This debate has been reminiscent of the day—

Mr. H. E. JACKSON: Two years ago.

Mr. HEFFRON: That was when the hon. member thought of going over The Gap because his political star was on the wane. I refer to the days when the leader of the Stevens Government had to listen to members of his own party vilifying him as a budget faker and his deputy leader attacked him in this Chamber. They were the tactics resorted to by the pepper-pot group of his own party.

Dr. PARR: The Minister should deal with the facts.

Mr. HEFFRON: I listened to language that is characteristic of the hon. member when he referred to persons having a stain on their character. He was referring to me. I am willing to put my character alongside his at any time and in any walk of life, private or public. There comes a time when that kind of aspersion will not be tolerated, because that type of vulgar black-guardism is resorted to only by those hon. members who cannot make an intelligent case. They can use their vulgarity, Billingsgate and abuse in another place but they will not get away with it in this Chamber. The hon. member suggested that the Government rather than do the right thing was "prepared to peddle unemployment for the filthy lucre of office."

That comes with very bad grace from one who has been anti-Labour all his life,

and never voted or moved in favour of any improvement for those who work in industry or their dependants. That super-charged venom for which the hon. member is noted will not help him out of his difficulties when the people take him to book for the propaganda that he uses inside and outside this Chamber. He poses as an authority on everything but his main stock-in-trade is the implication of something sinister and dishonest against those who are opposed to him. Government supporters aver that Opposition members have no monopoly of morality and straight dealing. I do not say they are the last who should speak I say that those who sit on this side of the Chamber can compare very favourably with them in matters of common decency and straight dealing.

Dr. PARR: Does the Minister think that his 1952 speech was decent and correct?

Mr. HEFFRON: I shall have something to say about my 1952 speech. What my leader and I then said proved that we were in good company, if what has been said by leaders of the Country and Liberal parties in other States could be regarded as putting us in good company. During this debate I have listened to all manner of suggestions that the New South Wales Labour Government was responsible for unemployment scares, and that it did things that were deliberately planned and designed to bring about unemployment. I propose to refute that statement.

Mr. STEWART FRASER: It is true.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLES): Order!

Mr. HEFFRON: I propose to make my speech in my own way. I did not interrupt any other hon. member who was speaking during this debate. I should like to be heard in silence. I do not want my remarks to be disfigured by interjections from hon. members opposite.

Mr. H. E. JACKSON: The hon. member for Burwood was not heard in silence.

Mr. HEFFRON: Hon. members rarely hear the hon. member for Gosford speak in this House, but he has adopted the practice of sitting at the end of the bench and making inane interjections as fast as

his tongue can get them out. That may be all right when he is telling stories in the party room or in his electorate but it is something that cannot be tolerated in this Chamber. I should not have spoken during this debate had it not been for the remarks of some hon. members opposite. A lot has been said about the Loan Council meetings in 1951-52 and 1952-53. I shall take up the time of the Committee by referring to some of the events of that time because it is necessary to refresh the minds of hon. members. At its 1951 meeting the Loan Council unanimously approved a borrowing programme of £225,000,000, of which £64,000,000 was allotted to New South Wales for the year 1951-52. In the following year, although the States voted for a borrowing programme of £247,500,000, and this was therefore the decision of the Loan Council by a majority of six votes to two votes—the Commonwealth having two votes—the Commonwealth Government refused to implement a borrowing programme of more than £190,000,000. The New South Wales share of this sum for the year 1951-52 was £51,200,000.

I remind the Committee that the representatives at that meeting included the Country Party Premier of Victoria, the Liberal Party Premier of South Australia and the Liberal Party Premier of Western Australia. They were all parties to that resolution which, apart from the Commonwealth votes, was carried unanimously. It was not a meeting dominated by representatives of Labour governments, as three of the six representatives of the State Governments were anti-Labour Premiers. This State's share of the £190,000,000 was £51,200,000, a reduction of £13,000,000 in one year. Because of inflation during this period money values fell by 16 per cent. in that year, and the £64,000,000 that was available in the year 1951-52 was comparable with £74,000,000 in 1952-53.

Mr. BLACK: Money does not grow on trees, as the Minister apparently thinks.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLES): Order! I ask the hon. member for Neutral Bay and other hon. members to hear the Minister in silence. I shall not warn hon. members again.

Mr. HEFFERON: It is difficult to reduce a spending programme by 30 per cent. without definite adjustments in day-labour works and contracts. It is easy for irresponsible people to dismiss in airy fashion the difficulties of a large-scale reduction in the loan programme, but perhaps those hon. members who see no difficulties in this and are resorting to the kind of interjection and criticism to which the Committee has listened might consider for a moment what the Premier of New South Wales said when he returned from the Loan Council meeting, and what I, as Minister for Education, said because my programme was being affected. What we said was not nearly so strong as what was said by Mr. McDonald, the Country Party Premier of Victoria, and by Mr. Playford, the Liberal Party Premier of South Australia, and it was certainly no stronger than what was said by Mr. McLarty, the Premier of Western Australia. Is it to be suggested by hon. members opposite that Messrs. McDonald, Playford, and McLarty were "peddling unemployment", to quote a phrase used by an hon. member opposite, "for the filthy lucre of office"? Those gentlemen returned to their States with insufficient money to carry out their programmes and told the people just what was going to happen. What was said by the New South Wales Premier was said with equal force by these three anti-Labour Premiers.

My memory is clear as to what happened at the Premier's conference and the meeting of the Loan Council, but I do not ask hon. members to accept my word. Let me quote from the *Melbourne Argus* of Saturday, 3rd May, 1952, at page 5. If hon. members opposite did a little research work it might prevent their falling into the pitfalls into which some of the critics of the Government have fallen during the last few days. This is what was said in the *Argus*:

The Loan Council deadlocked in bitter wrangling tonight after the Commonwealth refused State pleas for more finance.

The Council will probably meet again tomorrow, but present signs are that the States will share a £50-million cut in loan funds for 1952-53.

Mr. Menzies, Prime Minister, flatly told Premiers that the Commonwealth would provide only £125-million from revenue for State Works.

I regret that I must give this detailed information, but it shows what the other Premiers thought about the matter. No one could accuse the Hon. J. G. B. McDonald, the former Victorian Premier, of seeking the "filthy lucre of office", or any other kind. The paper says that he replied bitterly that the Commonwealth's proposals would "throw thousands out of work in Victoria".

That was not the Premier of New South Wales trying to frighten the public of this State; it was the anti-Labour Premier of Victoria. Continuing:

Present indications are that Victoria will be forced to accept only half of the £128 million Mr. McDonald has asked for.

Heated clashes developed tonight when Mr. Menzies and Sir Arthur Fadden (Federal Treasurer) refused to consider a compromise plan by Mr. Cahill (N.S.W.) with the backing of the other States.

Mr. Cahill urged the Commonwealth to reconsider its stand and grant the States a 10% increase on last year.

This would bring the total to £247,500,000.

Mr. McDonald, supporting Mr. Cahill's plan, promised that the States would share the onus of accepting the plan with the Commonwealth.

Ultimatum.

When the Council met this morning the States presented an ultimatum to the Commonwealth which was subsequently rejected.

Through Mr. Cahill, the States declared that they believed that any substantial cut in works programme could not be undertaken without serious repercussions on all essential works, including food production . . .

I quote again from the *Melbourne Argus*, of Monday, 5th May, 1952. On page 1, under a one-inch heading in heavy type, appeared the following:

Forced loans may be the only way.

Again, these are the words not of the Premier of this State, but of Victoria:

Compulsory loans to finance essential public works were proposed by Mr. McDonald, Victorian Premier, last night.

Mr. McDonald, Mr. Cahill (N.S.W.), and Mr. Cosgrove (Tas.) all forecast that large scale sackings would result from the Commonwealth's limitation of this year's loan programme by £180 million.

Mr. Playford (S.A.) said that he would enquire whether the Commonwealth interpretation of the Loan Council's functions was legally correct.

That is how he felt about the situation. Further:

On Saturday the Premiers unanimously adopted a proposed borrowing programme of £247½ million.

I must point out that half the members of the Loan Council are anti-Labour Premiers. Continuing:

The Commonwealth rejected this and adhered to its figure of £180 million—providing £130 million from revenue and carryover, in addition an estimated loan market yield of £50 millions.

Victoria's share of loan money would be only £40 million and the State already has commitments of £41 million in contracts.

That is what caused him to feel as strongly as he did on the matter. Further:

Mr. McDonald said in a broadcast that the fact that the last two Commonwealth loans had not been as successful as expected, did not mean that the money was not available.

He said he did not suggest increased taxation, because he thought taxes already took too much from industries.

"A better plan would be, after a certain range of income, to tax compulsorily by way of loan and pay interest," Mr. McDonald said

Mr. McDonald said that unless the total borrowing programme could be raised to the level suggested by the Premiers—£247½ million, of which Victoria would get £55 million—large scale dismissals from public works were unavoidable.

Was Mr. McDonald peddling unemployment for the filthy lucre of office, or merely telling the people of Victoria just what they must expect. Continuing:

Prestige Loss.

"I cannot yet say what will happen to the many developmental works Victoria has on hand, or how the cuts will affect hospitals, schools, housing, mental institutions and other social services," Mr. McDonald said

Repudiation of contracts will have a damaging effect on Australia's prestige.

It is interesting to see who were forecasting these things. The *Adelaide Advertiser*, of Saturday, 3rd May, under the block heading, "State's Fight for Works Aid", reported the following:

Mr. Playford's leading part. Highest Federal offer "inadequate", Canberra, May 2. The S.A. Premier (Mr. Playford) was the leading advocate at today's resumed Loan Council meeting for substantially higher amounts to the underwritten amount by the Commonwealth

Hon. members have said that New South Wales was asking for too much; but Mr. Playford, Mr. McLarty and Mr. McDonald apparently did not think so. It is further stated:

This was regarded by the State Premiers as being totally inadequate to finance their works.

Mr. Playford led a determined bid by the Premiers to induce the Commonwealth to increase this amount, but when the meeting adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow, there was no indication that it would accede to the Premiers' demands.

This means that the future of S.A.'s projected loans programme of £59 million is uncertain.

It is already certain that the £59 million will not be available for the next financial year.

The Premier—

This refers to Mr. Playford—

said that the Loan Council will meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, but at present the Commonwealth appears adamant that it will not increase the amount of its support to the programme.

All these people who were shouting warnings did not belong to the Labour Party. Mr. Playford said further:

This would mean a drastic revision of the State's loan programme and many works that were desired to proceed with would have to be held over.

The whole matter will be discussed by the S.A. Cabinet on Monday when more details of action to be taken will be released

Another part of the *Adelaide Advertiser* reads:

South Australia to receive £30,000,000. State Public Works to be reduced. The Loan Council, after three days of bitter battle, voted a works programme for 1952-3 totalling £247 million, or about 10 per cent. above last year's total of £225 million.

South Australia will receive £30,010,000, of which £8,400,000 will be for semi-governmental and local council authorities.

This will leave just over £21,500,000 for expenditure by the State Government. For the 1951-52 financial year South Australia was allowed £28,000,000 of loan money. The amount sought this year was £59,000,000.

This is South Australia speaking:

There will undoubtedly be a curtailment of public work and State Cabinet to-day will discuss the order of priority.

This statement reveals how Mr. Playford's State—the Liberal-governed State of South Australia—was affected. Cabinet had to meet to decide the priority for public works under the limited allocation of funds!

Lt.-Colonel ROBSON: Did Mr. Playford sack men to get votes?

Mr. HEFFRON: He sacked men because he did not have the money to keep them on. Mr. McDonald sacked men because he did not have the money to keep them on. The worst thing that any State Premier could do would be to sack men for the purpose of catching votes, and the suggestion implied in that interjection is unworthy of the Leader of the Opposition. Though Mr. Playford belongs to a political party opposed to mine, he is a man for whom I have the highest regard. After the Loan Council meeting at Canberra, Mr. Playford said that the amount granted would not permit the same scope for public works in South Australia as last year. He said also, "In my opinion it will most seriously delay the completion of a number of important projects. About two-thirds of the important works undertaken by South Australia last year can be financed, and State Cabinet will have to consider the difficult problem of what essential works can be cut down". Mr. Playford said that at least a third of the public works in South Australia had to go. His statement continued:

The State Government will do its utmost to maintain employment and will take this into account in deciding the State's works programme in light of the Loan Council's decision . . .

There were other persons besides the Premier and Colonial Treasurer and myself who saw the danger, and who were prepared to state it. This is the editorial note of the newspaper from which I have been quoting:

An article by the Premier (Mr. Playford), in which he says that the Loan Council meeting last week brought the financial relationships between Commonwealth and States to an all-time low, and declares that he intends to examine the legality of the Commonwealth stand is on page 2.

The article referred to has a heading, "Federal Stand Criticised by the Premier". Another newspaper, *The Age*, published in Melbourne, had these headings to its columns: "Bitter Exchanges on Loan Cuts", "Wrecking Community, says Premier". The news item under those headings on Saturday, 3rd May, 1952, reads:

Canberra, Friday. Commonwealth tactics to force upon the States the responsibility for cutting their works programme to-day caused some of the most bitter arguments ever spoken at a Loan Council meeting. The Victorian Premier, Mr. McDonald, and the South Australian Premier, Mr. Playford, joined forces in denouncing the Commonwealth's attitude. Mr. McDonald said it was wrecking Australia, and Mr. Playford—

The level-headed, cool and calm Liberal Premier of South Australia—

condemned it as "throwing the States to the wolves". Mr. McDonald said . . . Victoria would have to repudiate contracts and close works unless the money were found. Thousands of men would be thrown out of work.

The hon. member for Burwood quoted my statement about what would happen to the building of schools in New South Wales. I have quoted what Mr. McDonald, the Premier of Victoria, had to say about the conditions that would result in that State from the Federal Government's attitude.

Mr. DEANE: Did these things happen in Victoria?

Mr. HEFFRON: Yes. Men were thrown out of work, to their sorrow and to the everlasting disgrace of those who were responsible for that situation. The State Premiers, whether Labour or anti-Labour, were not the men responsible. The newspaper report in South Australia was:

The New South Wales Premier told the Council in an impassioned plea for more money that the Commonwealth's attitude would lead to widespread unemployment and open the door to Communism. New South Wales would have to repudiate Federal plans to increase food production, and his own promises to give the people more adequate power, transport and food . . .

Let me quote further from the *Melbourne Age*. On Monday, 5th May, 1952, an article headed "Unemployed through heavy cut in loans" read:

Wholesale dismissals from public works throughout Australia were predicted last night by the Premier (Mr. McDonald), unless the total borrowing programme of £247,000,000 authorised by the Premiers could be raised.

That amount was insufficient to enable the States to carry out their planned works programmes, and some sackings would be inevitable, he said.

Mr. McDonald returned to Victoria from the Loan Council painting a gloomy picture of the State's prospects during the next financial year . . .

This is not the statement of the Minister for Education in New South Wales. It is the statement of the Premier of Victoria!

I did everything possible to induce the Commonwealth to bridge the gap between the £180,000,000 proposed by the Commonwealth and the £247,000,000 agreed to by all the States. I emphasised that the Premiers, unless they got the money, would be forced to repudiate contracts—an action which would seriously affect Australia's prestige.

The newspaper report continues:

Mr. McDonald said the Government would decide the works to be closed down after he had conferred with departmental advisers. Details of these works and the effects the reduced allocation would have on hospitals, schools, housing, mental institutions and other social services would then be determined.

This was the effect in Victoria. At the Loan Council meeting I heard Mr. Playford in expressing himself go to lengths to which I am sure he has never let himself go before. I heard Mr. McLarty, the Premier of Western Australia, express himself in a similar fashion. These men were not seeking to create a scare in their own States. They did not want such a thing. They did not have particular motives for their statements. Mr. McLarty was not after the filthy lucre of office. Mr. McDonald was not looking for the filthy lucre of office. Mr. Playford was not looking for it. Neither was the Premier of New South Wales. No Premier had that motive. All that the leaders of the State Governments were seeking was enough money to fulfil the programmes that they had undertaken, and they expressed themselves strongly when they found their financial resources suddenly reduced to an extent that made it impossible for them to continue and to complete the jobs that they had in hand, or even to work at the same pitch as before. Consequently, unemployment, the closing down of some works, the slowing down of others, and even the repudiation of contracts, were inevitably thrust upon them. They were compelled to do these things.

Dr. PARR: Why did not the Government spend some of its £7,000,000 surplus loan funds? Can the Minister tell us that?

Mr. HEFFRON: I shall not permit the hon. member for Burwood to waste my

time. I need only refer him to the effective answer that the Premier and Colonial Treasurer gave in this Chamber a few days ago. If the hon. member for Burwood has not read it in *Hansard*, I suggest that he do so at once. In a speech in this Chamber on 19th March, 1952, I pointed out what would happen if the money needed in the State were not forthcoming. I gave a detailed list of the schools on the works programme and said that if the loan funds were reduced to £3,000,000 the department would not be able to go ahead under a programme which was geared for expenditure at the rate of £4,500,000 a year. Hon. members need only look about in their own electorates to see what happened to the schools on that list and to realise the extent to which work had to be slowed down on some buildings and completely stopped on others, and tenders in hand had to be refused.

I have taken up much time in replying to the statements that have been made, but I felt that circumstances warranted this course. I do not live in the past and I want to give the Committee information as to what the Government has done, and is doing, despite the limitation of funds. Under the 1953-54 loan programme the following works have been completed at the cost shown:—

	£
Bankstown North—New Infants' School	37,877
Brookvale—New Infants' School	81,675
Canley Vale—Infants' School	72,990
Caringbah—Infants' School	81,746
Coff's Harbour—Infants' School	87,595
Coogee South—New Primary School .	43,782
Gosford Primary School	132,505
Kingsgrove Primary School	86,713
Liverpool Home Science School (part of major contract)	200,000
Miranda Infants' School	68,196
Padstow Park School (additions) ...	77,000
Peak Hill School (additions)	11,942
Port Kembla School	95,313
Villawood Infants' School	84,965
Wollongong Junior Technical School (part of major contract)	200,000
Wyrallah Road School	31,000

Under the department's prefabricated building programme, 469 classrooms were provided, including the first stage of the major prefabricated secondary schools of Cooma, East Hills Girls', Kiama, Jannali Girls', Narrabeen Girls' and Richmond.

Obviously, the Government has not been wasting any time or money. It has been getting on with the job.

Mr. WILLIS: Those are the schools that the Minister said would never be built.

Mr. HEFFRON: I said that the Government could not build them at that time and that a restriction of loan funds would cause delays and result in much overcrowding of classrooms and in many thousands of children not having the school accommodation to which they were entitled. The following schools are expected to be completed by the end of the current financial year at the cost shown:—

	£
Bingara	62,904
Fairymead Infants	64,619
Peakhurst Infants' (occupied October)	100,576
Cowra High—Home Science and Manual Training Unit	31,357
Liverpool Junior Technical (Balance of major project)	404,748
Manly Boys' High (occupied July)	324,799
Penshurst Home Science	225,160
Punchbowl Secondary (now partially occupied)	250,040
Wollongong High (balance of major project)	343,976
Armidale Teachers' College—New Men's Hostel	220,000

Under the department's prefabricated school programme for the current financial year it is planned to complete a primary school in monocrete at Caringbah North at a total cost of £88,566 and a similar school at Villawood East. In addition, the following schools are under construction and will be finished by June, 1955:—Campbelltown Secondary, Cooma Secondary, East Hills Girls' Secondary, Fairfield Boys' Secondary, Kiama Secondary, Jannali Girls' Secondary, Narrabeen Girls' Secondary, Richmond Secondary. Yet it is said that the Government has not completed any major works! Under the department's loan programme for the current financial year the following schools are under construction and will be partly occupied before next June: Riverstone Primary, at a cost of £55,555; Camden Secondary, at a cost of £125,099; additions to the Farrer Agricultural High School, at a cost of £222,791; Nowra Secondary School, at a cost of £191,849; and Randwick Boys' High School, at a cost of

£221,357. Prefabricated monocrete buildings for the East Hills Boys' Secondary School, costing £180,216, and the Fairfield Girls' Secondary School, costing £197,671, are under construction at present and it is expected that they will be partly occupied by the end of the current financial year. Other works in progress in this financial year are: Moree Infants' School, at an estimated total cost of £103,200; Birrong High School, costing £212,914; Inverell High School, costing £24,874; Kurri Kurri Secondary School, at a cost of £176,988; additions to Narrabri High School, at a cost of £121,988; Sydney Technical High School at Hurstville, at a cost of £233,621; and Wiley Park Secondary School, at a cost of £172,411.

New works scheduled to be commenced during the current financial year are as follows:—

	Estimated Cost. £
Balgowlah Infants'	100,000
Booragul Secondary	200,000
Broken Hill High—Home Science Block (first stage of new high school at total cost of £450,000)	80,000
Cessnock High—Additions	130,000
Coonabarabran Infants'	30,000
Cootamundra High	100,000
Dubbo High—Manual Training Block	20,000
Dubbo High—Additions	30,000
Grafton High—Additions	50,000
Kempsey High—Additions	30,000
Lindfield East—New Primary School	126,000
Lithgow High—Manual Training, and Home Science Unit (final stage of new high school at a total cost of £200,000)	80,000
Miranda Secondary	200,000
Normanhurst High	300,000
Wentworthville—Additions	65,000
Parramatta High—First plan not yet completed and no estimate of cost available.	

Major items on the prefabricated building programme for 1954-55 include the first stage of the Meadowbank Boys' Secondary School, the Jannali Boys' Secondary School, and St. Mary's Secondary School. In addition, it is expected that approximately 700 classrooms will be provided under this programme which will include the following new schools or departments:—

Balgowlah North—New Primary School.
Beacon Hill—New Primary School.
Bellambi—New Primary School.
Berkeley—New Primary School.

Cabramatta West—New Primary School.
 Canley Heights—New Primary School.
 Caringbah North—New Primary School.
 Chullora—New Primary Department.
 Cooma East—New School.
 Curl Curl North—New Primary Department.
 Denistone East—New Primary Department.
 East Hills—New Primary Department.
 East Hills Boys' Secondary—New Secondary School.
 Ermington West—New Infants' School.
 Fairfield Secondary—New Secondary School.
 Fairfield Heights—New Primary Department.
 Fairfield-Canley Vale—New Primary School.
 Fern Bay—New School.
 Glenroi Heights—New Primary School.
 Griffith North—New School.
 Guildford West—New Primary School.
 Hay—New School (replacement).
 Jamali East—New School.
 Katoomba North—New School.
 Keiraville—New Primary School.
 Meadowbank Secondary—New Secondary School.
 Mornington (Gunnedah South)—New Primary School.
 Narraweena—New Infants' Department.
 Nowra Hill—New Primary School.
 Oyster Bay—New Infants' Department.
 Parramatta Sub-normal—New School.
 Pelican Flat—New Primary School.
 Pennant Hills—New Infants' Department.
 Quirindi—New Primary Department.
 Revesby South—New Primary Department.
 Roseville East—New Primary Department.
 Russell Vale—New Primary Department.
 Rydalmere East—New Primary School.
 St. Mary's Secondary—Nucleus New Secondary School.
 Seven Hills—New Primary Department.
 Tamworth South—New Primary School to free Secondary site.
 Tarrawanna—New Primary Department.
 Wentworthville North—New Infants' School.
 Woolooware—New Primary Department.
 Yennora—New Primary School.

That programme is in hand and going ahead. This work is being done now, and is not to be done in the distant future. The amount in hand is being turned to good account. I have completely refuted the statements that the Government has not completed a major job.

Mr. McCaw (Lane Cove) [4.1]: I have to-day listened to one of the most remarkable speeches that it would be possible to hear in this Committee from a Minister who for years has become known to us for his kindly smile and placid disposition, and as one who in no circumstances would make a personal attack upon another hon. member. Yet in the first few minutes of

his speech the Minister for Education made a bitter personal attack on the hon. member for Burwood. It might well be said that the hon. member for Burwood asked for it, because he said that the political character of the Deputy Premier bears a stain. That is the remark that was resented. The speech of the Deputy Premier has done nothing to erase the stain from his political character. The attack that he made upon the hon. member for Gosford following a friendly interjection was completely uncalled for and inconsistent with the character of the Minister. The hon. member for Gosford simply said that the hon. member for Burwood was not listened to in silence and the Minister knows that that was so. The Minister retorted that the hon. member for Gosford is in the habit of sitting at the end of the seat and making inane interjections.

Mr. MORRIS: He did not mean it.

Mr. McCaw: Perhaps he did not. I think that he was angered by the home truths that had been uttered by the hon. member for Burwood who had stirred his recollection of what he said in 1952, of which to-day he feels ashamed. Because his recollection was stirred his temper was aroused. The Minister, having made an attack on two hon. members, did not say, as I believe the people of this State would expect him to say—"I am glad that I was wrong in 1952". That is what one would expect from a responsible Minister who knew that he was wrong. It is no help to-day to the cause of the Minister to say, "though I was wrong in 1952, so were Mr. Playford, Mr. McDonald and Mr. McLarty". They were all disgruntled Premiers who had gone to the Australian Loan Council with demands that might as well have totalled £1,000,000,000. They pluck their figures from the air when they ask the Australian Loan Council to make loan funds available for the States. The Premiers on that historic occasion asked for £247,000,000.

The Commonwealth Government voted against the granting of this figure and had two votes to six. Every Premier has the right to seek as much loan money as he can get, but the Loan Council can obtain only what can be raised on the loan market.

The Commonwealth Government took the view that the loan market would not yield more than £190,000,000, and so it was that the Premiers and Deputy Premiers went back to their States and made these disgruntled statements. I do not complain about that, or that afterwards they accused the Commonwealth Government of starving them of loan funds. We live in a land of free speech and political controversy. Any hon. member may say what he thinks; but he is bound to be judged afterwards by what he said. Two years ago the Deputy Premier was clearly and demonstrably wrong. It may be irritating to him to find the truth of it now thrust before him, before the Committee and the press, and in *Hansard*, but it is equally irritating to hon. members of the Opposition to hear him seek to justify what he then said. Instead of saying he is sorry he said it, it appears that he is glad that he said it but is sorry it was wrong. What did he say in 1952?

The Deputy Premier made that infamous ministerial statement, without a word of warning to the Leader of the Opposition, who was in his room and not well, having just come from a dental chair. The Leader of the Opposition, when he was warned, came to the Chamber and in his opening sentence in reply said: "We have listened to the greatest political hypocrisy that we have ever heard in this Chamber". What will the public say now that it is reminded of this two years afterwards? The most kindly thing that could be said is that the Minister made a mistake, but to-day when the hon. member for Burwood accused the Government of "peddling unemployment for the filthy lucre of office" the Deputy Premier resents it. I concede that I should resent such a remark: the more true it was the more I should resent it.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the hon. member deny that the Federal Government over-rode the decision of the Loan Council?

Mr. McCRAW: The Commonwealth Government has the responsibility for underwriting what the Loan Council allocates, and it has to estimate what the loan market, the public purse, is likely to produce. The Loan Council then allocates it according to a formula between

the States and the Commonwealth. The Premiers at the Loan Council meeting asked for £57,000,000 more than those responsible for raising the loan money considered the loan market would yield. It should be pointed out that what was in fact given to New South Wales in that year was more than was given in any three years by the Chifley Labour Government.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member's leader claims that the decision of the Loan Council is supreme. The hon. member is disagreeing with him.

Mr. McCRAW: That is not so. When the Loan Council makes its decision, it might as well pluck from the air the figure of £1,000,000,000 as £247,000,000 or any other sum.

Mr. CRABTREE: The Co-ordinator-General of Works had already approved the programme.

Mr. McCRAW: Does the hon. member suggest that he would know what the loan market would yield? It is proper that Premiers at Loan Councils meetings should demand the utmost for their States, but those demands must be related to what the loan market is likely to yield. The authority responsible for raising those funds is the Federal Government, whether it be a Labour or a Liberal-Country Party Federal Government. The responsibility for raising loan funds does not belong to the Premier or Deputy Premier of the State of New South Wales. The amount that has finally to be raised by the Commonwealth and apportioned to the States by the Loan Council is not a figure taken from the air. It is what the loan market will yield. On their return from the Loan Council the Premiers were disgruntled, or they believed that it was politically wise to say they were bitterly disappointed. They had not got all that they wanted. It does not aid the Deputy Premier for him to call as witnesses to support him men like Mr. McDonald of Victoria, Mr. Playford of South Australia, and Mr. McLarty of Western Australia. That does not help him unless he can show, as one must in a court of law, that those gentlemen are experts and that their credit is good.

They turned out to be as wrong in what they said after the Loan Council meeting in 1952 as was the Deputy Premier of New South Wales. Though they spoke at that time about the possibility of unemployment, this Committee has no evidence that there were sackings in any other State of the Commonwealth.

I ask any hon. member who suggests that Mr. McLarty, Mr. Playford or Mr. McDonald sacked men to inform the Committee from what public work they were dismissed, how many men were concerned, and the percentage that it represents in relation to the total unemployment figures. Those things can be demonstrated in this State. More than six thousand men were dismissed from the Department of Railways, and many men were dismissed from work on the Keepit dam and other public works. The mistake was not only in what the Deputy Premier said it was in 1952. It lay rather in what the Labour Government did. The hon. member for Burwood this afternoon truthfully and properly called it "peddling unemployment". That was designed to hurt the economy of the State, but merely talking about it does not hurt as much as actually sacking men, and on that occasion to its eternal disgrace, the Government did more than talk. It sacked men as no other State government did.

Mr. MURPHY: My word they did.

Mr. McCAW: What State was it, and how many men were dismissed? The Minister for Education told this House in 1952 that there would be stark skeletons of unfinished works because of the dreadful Commonwealth Government, and that the public of this State would learn to judge the Commonwealth Government by the suffering and unemployment that it had caused. Those words of the Minister in 1952 are indelibly impressed on my mind. They were uttered as the opening move in an election campaign when an attempt was being made to discredit the Commonwealth Liberal-Country Party Government. They were backed up day after day by questions in this Chamber, and by speeches and statements elsewhere, culminating in the Werriwa by-election. But some of the dark prophesies did not come

to pass. I challenge the Deputy Premier, who has another opportunity to speak during this debate, and every other hon. members, to point to any single sentence in the speech that the Minister made in 1952 which is true. The attitude of the Minister was that he regretted that what he had said had not come to pass; nevertheless, towards the conclusion of his speech he read to the Committee a list of public works completed by his department.

I am not partisan on the subject of education. I offer the Minister my congratulations on the work that is being done. If, in 1952, he had said, "In spite of a shortage of loan funds, I invite hon. members to co-operate with me, and to ensure that the cause of education does not suffer," hon. members on this side would have co-operated with him and admired his spirit in lifting this great subject above party politics, but he resorted to party politics. Did the Minister believe, when he made that speech in 1952, that the things that he then said were likely to come about? Let us give him the benefit of the doubt, because hon. members must not impute motives in this Chamber. This State has had in each of three years, including the year 1951, more loan money than it ever received in any period of three years during the regime of a Labour Federal government. It is true that the sum received by this State in 1952 was not as much as that received in the previous year, namely £64,000,000, but that allocation has never before been equalled.

Mr. MURPHY: The pound was dropping in value.

Mr. McCAW: Yes, and there were good reasons for that. The pound did not drop so much as public morale dropped when these declarations were made in 1952. In pre-war years the enrolment rate in the schools was falling. Notwithstanding this, the expenditure of loan funds by the Stevens-Bruxner Government during the last three pre-war years was more than 7 per cent. of the total loan allocation. In one of those three years the amount reached the record proportion of 7.3 per cent. of the total loan allocations of this State. Those allocations were made by non-Labour governments, and the figures are irrefutable.

Only once in the post-war years has the expenditure on education reached the average for those three years. It has never again reached the record figure of 7.3 per cent. The Labour Government has been in office since 1941, and must have known that war increases the birthrate. The policy of the Commonwealth Labour Government, which has been pursued since by the Liberal-Country Party Government, included an increasingly rapid immigration. The Labour government should have known that both the increased birthrate and the immigration programme, would add countless thousands of pupils to the schools of this State.

By 1948 and 1949 the impact of these factors upon the education system was very heavy. The responsibility for the allocation of loan funds rests not upon the Loan Council or the Federal Government, but upon the Colonial Treasurer of this State. The allocation for education has not, in the post-war years, reached the non-Labour peak of pre-war years, or, indeed, the average of the last three pre-war years. I do not mind giving credit to the Government where it is due. There is no more important work in its hands than education. True and wise education builds character and trains the leaders of the future. The Minister bears that heavy responsibility very well. I have no doubt that the stain that he placed upon his political record in 1952 was the result of zeal for his party, and that for a time he forgot his heavy responsibility as Minister for Education. Though I shall not use the phrase that was used by the hon. member for Burwood, that gentleman can hardly be said to have earned the reply that he received at the hands of the Minister. He merely stated, albeit a little graphically, what the public should know—that this Government made a political plaything of education, and sacked men and women in order to bolster its story that unemployment and misery would flow from the machinations of the Federal Government. The hon. member for Burwood accused the Government of peddling unemployment for the filthy lucre of office. There are ample facts to justify such a statement in a political arena.

Mr. McCaw.]

I should not have risen if the Minister had said that he and other statesmen of this country believed his 1952 statement to be true; that it was fortunate that it was not, and that he regretted saying it because it must have had a detrimental effect upon this State's economy and created a false picture during a State election and some Federal by-elections. That would have been a statesmanlike utterance and, if the Minister had been able to feel remorse, would have been quite true. I am sorry that the Minister's only regret appears to be that the skeletons of the past have been taken from the Government's cupboard. It seems that the stain made on the skyline by the unfinished public works of this Government is equalled only by the stain on the Minister's political character.

Mr. DRING (Auburn) [4.25]: In view of the repeated misrepresentations of hon. members opposite in an attempt to cover up their ineptitude and neglect in the years before 1941, it is necessary once again to stress the magnificent work that this Government is doing in the field of education. Before 1941, school buildings, with few exceptions, were a disgrace and a reflection upon this prosperous young State. Children had the benefit of an adequate infant and primary training, but there were not liberal opportunities, either as to locality, or curricula, for secondary education. Boys and girls could not choose the course in which they would be enrolled at a secondary school. I knew of many parents who wished their girls and boys to have junior technical, commercial or domestic science training, but they were denied it. The children were drafted, at the will of the department, into what were considered suitable courses for them.

Mr. WILLIS: Do school children select their own courses and schools now?

Mr. DRING: There was an attempt to create a class distinction between those who followed general courses and those who followed technical courses—even when they used the same building. The morale of the teaching staff had never been lower.

Mr. WILLIS: That is a question of opinion.

Mr. DRING: In the 'thirties teachers were overloaded with work. Often, on a reduced salary, one teacher was doing the work of two. There was but little equipment in the schools to assist the imaginative teacher. The mental capacity of every child in the school was regarded as being similar. In those dark days for education when an anti-Labour government was in office there was a demoralisation of those persons who were anxious to serve in a voluntary capacity in the parents and citizens' associations. Those associations flourish to-day. I have recounted the conditions that obtained before Labour took office in 1941 because they throw into even more splendid contrast the achievements of the last fourteen years. Labour had to overcome the defects of former years before it began to raise the status and morale of education to the heights that have been attained in New South Wales. Every child should have and is given opportunities within the range of its natural ability. The Department of Education was neglected by anti-Labour governments because education is not a field that can be exploited by commercial and industrial interests, as can some of the other departments. For example, the Lands Department under anti-Labour governments, was one in which outside interests who were powerful enough to gain an advantage had opportunities for exploitation. They took those opportunities before Labour was elected to the Treasury benches but education offered them little scope.

A new technical college had been built at Newcastle and the Stevens-BruXner and Mair-BruXner administrations decided to hand that institution over to private enterprise by very subtle and effective means. But those machinations were abortive because when Labour was elected to office in 1941 it immediately took legislative action which prevented that building and all its valuable equipment, and the direction and control of the technical college, from falling into the hands of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. The Newcastle technical college remained in the hands of the Education Department of New South Wales because Labour is vigilant, but its situation under an anti-Labour government

was typical of the situation of education generally. All the electorates in this State, in the suburbs of the city and out in the towns and villages in the country, unfortunately still have grim monuments to the administration of anti-Labour governments in former years. The job of improving school buildings has been tremendous. The work that this Government had to do in relation to school buildings could be likened to the work of turning a slum area into a garden suburb.

Ninety-five per cent. of school buildings before 1941 were sub-standard. This Government has built thousands of classrooms and many new schools during its fourteen years of office. They are aesthetically and functionally fitted for their task, in sharp contrast to the unsatisfactory school buildings in which children were taught before Labour took office. This Government has provided for education to the limit of its financial ability. The people are demanding the best in education for their children and they are getting it. The consequence is that the atmosphere in education is happier and better than ever before in this State or indeed, in any other State. The hon. member for Lane Cove made a speech of brazen misrepresentation this afternoon. The evidence of the truth of what the Minister for Education and Deputy Premier said at the Loan Council in 1952 is still with us. The Liberal Party Premier of South Australia, Mr. Playford, was the most bitter of all in his criticism of the Liberal Party Prime Minister and the Country Party Federal Treasurer. The Country Party Premier of Western Australia, Mr. McLarty, joined in opposition to the Menzies-Fadden Government. These gentlemen were not prompted by political motives; they were fighting for the rights and needs of the people in their own States.

Mr. GOLLAN: Mr. McDonald of Victoria, too.

Mr. DRING: Yes, and he was a Country Party Premier. Every day members on the Opposition side demand that the Minister for Education build new schools here; there and everywhere in their electorates. This situation is clear evidence that the Minister's statement in 1952 about the effect of the Menzies-Fadden policy on school build-

ings in this State was a correct one. Had New South Wales got the money to which it was justly entitled there would not be a lag in meeting the requirements of education generally. Hon. members opposite condemn themselves by the questions that fall from their own lips. What was said in 1952 of the action of their Federal colleagues in the Liberal and Country parties is just as true now as it was then. The requirements of New South Wales at that time were not excessive. They were real and necessary. When Labour came to office in 1941 this State was spending on its school building programme about £230,000 a year and about £30,000 a year on technical education. This year's Budget, the thirteenth successive Budget of a Labour government, provides for an expenditure of £4,500,000 on school buildings and £700,000 for technical education! Compare those figures with the expenditures of an anti-Labour government. It is obvious why the people of New South Wales threw the discredited Opposition back on that side of the Chamber for the fifth occasion at the elections last year. This Government established the University of Technology. Members of the Opposition are not well versed in technical skills and applied science and they are not acquainted with the requirements of industry, so they have not yet realised the importance of the University of Technology to this State and the Commonwealth. Furthermore, hon. members opposite do not appreciate the influence that this institution, which is unique in the British Commonwealth of Nations, is already having on other English-speaking countries.

During this financial year the department is spending £4,500,000 of loan funds on its works programme for primary and secondary education throughout the State. It is spending £700,000 to meet the ever-expanding needs of technical education and £1,000,000 this year on the University of Technology, to say nothing of the annual grant to the Sydney University and other educational grants. The Loan Estimates under consideration clearly show that the Government is continuing its progressive policy in regard to education and, at the same time, demonstrate to the public the

raw deal that the State received from anti-Labour administrations years ago. To-day, New South Wales has the most complete educational system of any country in the British Commonwealth of Nations. It covers not merely the limited curricula of primary and secondary schools but also technical education, tertiary education, and all phases of industrial education. In addition, it embraces education on the agricultural side, which is so important in this State.

Mr. WILLIS: On a point of order. The present debate deals with the Loan Estimates. For some considerable time the hon. member has been concerned with government policy in respect of education, technical education, and indeed, the whole sphere of education. He has not, to my knowledge, linked his remarks with the subject of debate and I submit that he is out of order.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLES): The debate on the Loan Estimates, which has been proceeding throughout the day, has been very wide, and this afternoon the Committee has heard hon. members on both sides of the House make remarks that were very far from the actual Loan Estimates. At this stage I am not going to restrict the hon. member because I feel that he is about to link up his remarks with the Loan Estimates.

Mr. DRING: I have tried to show the weak and inefficient educational system which Labour inherited in 1941, and how education in all its phases has been so developed under Labour's wise administration that to-day, New South Wales has the most complete education system in the British Commonwealth of Nations. Fortunately, the State has moved far from that slum period of education of fourteen years ago. The other night in the Chamber the Premier and Colonial Treasurer pointed out that some eighteen or twenty schools, many in electorates that are not represented by supporters of the Government, and ranging in cost between £300,000 and £400,000, have been completed by the Labour administration of this State. Anyone who moves about the State or within the metropolitan area may see on all sides new schools costing up to £250,000 in the

Mr. Dring.]

course of construction, and in some instances they will be completed as a result of money allocated under the Loan Estimates which are now under consideration.

The Government has a positive education programme. It has risen above the old school board system which still operates in many overseas countries to the detriment of the children and the welfare of the nation. Under its enlightened policy, the Government has sought the advice and services of the best experts in all phases of education, and on that basis is now providing a wonderful scheme of education for not only the rising generation but also adults. On almost every night of the week in most suburban schools and those in country towns, one may see classrooms occupied by adults of varying ages who are being taught a great variety of things.

Mr. LAWSON: Where is this happening?

Mr. DRING: If the hon. member will only look around he will see for himself.

[*Quorum formed.*]

Let me place on record once again, the inattention to the affairs of State of the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Country Party, and their deputies and whips. It must be remembered that this administration has increased expenditure on education from £5,250,000 to almost £30,000,000.

Mr. WILLIS: What has that to do with the Loan Estimates?

Mr. DRING: The loans are needed to take up the lag resulting from years of anti-Labour administration.

Mr. WILLIS: The hon. member is making a budget speech.

Mr. DRING: I am referring to the need to take up the leeway. This Government came to office with a serious handicap in the education field. During the depression years of the 1930's, there was no educational building programme. In the early 1940's, when this Government was in office, the nation was geared for war, and consequently a vast sum of money is now required to overcome the lag of the last eighteen or twenty years. Labour has been criticised for not spending all the money that has been allocated for various pro-

jects, but anyone who knows anything of community activity is aware that since the war ended, there has been an industrial upsurge and a demand for the building of homes. The Government has let millions of pounds worth of tenders, but has had the utmost difficulty in getting tenderers to complete their contracts. One large firm in the city signed contracts to build a number of schools, but merely diverted to this work men who were temporarily thrown out of private activity.

The Government was not in a position to bribe the builders to get on with the job, but private enterprise was. Sums ranging from 25 per cent. to 30 per cent. above original contract prices were paid by industrial concerns to have their premises completed within certain time limits, but at the same times some Government contractors did not strike a blow, and did not care a rap for the welfare of school children. Despite that, the list submitted to this Committee shows that twenty major works had been completed, and an additional number will be completed this year. The Leader of the Opposition was criticised recently in his own journal, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, which said that he should not attack the Government in respect of incomplete works. That is how much he is out of touch with the administration. There has been a tremendous development in secondary and rural industries, and in rural services, electricity and water supply. Hon. members should remember the words of Mr. McDonald, Mr. Playford and Mr. McLarty.

Mr. DEANE: And of Mr. Heffron.

Mr. DRING: Yes. He was truthful and correct. The Menzies-Fadden Government overrode the decision of the Loan Council in respect of loan moneys. I compliment the Minister for Education on his progressive educational programme. By the end of this year the Government will have completed many more educational monuments, which will stand as a credit to the Labour Government and the Minister for Education.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 5.2 p.m.