HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 1, 1951.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

"HALT INFLATION" CONFERENCE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier any statement to make to the House as a result of the "Halt inflation" Conference he attended in Sydney this week; particularly as to whether any proposals which would assist in halting inflation have been determined on, and, if so, what part this Parliament will have to play in the implementation of such measures?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In opening the conference the Prime Minister said that no resolutions would be submitted and no votes taken. The conference had a wide representation, but its object was fact-finding rather than the making of decisions. The Prime Minister hoped that as a result of the conference useful determinations could be made, and hinted in his opening statement that the action to be taken would become apparent at the time of the Premiers' Conference and the time of the presentation of the Budget. The discussion was of a broad nature. Many topics were introduced and I believe, from the aspect of bringing forward the points of view of various organizations of people, the conference was most useful. Some fine contributions towards solving the general problem were made by various sections of the community. Generally speaking, the conference was strongly in support of action being taken to curb inflation. Various organizations had a different approach on the action necessary, but there was a universal feeling that unless some action were taken dire results would ultimately accrue. In the discussions many proposals were brought forward. Some of them had limitations in as much they proposed that the other man should bear the burden of taking the necessary action, but that was only to be expected in a conference of that nature. Nevertheless, even between the employer and employee groups there was a ready acceptance of general principles. From that point of view I believe the conference was successful. Subsequent action to be taken will depend on the Premiers' Conference, which has been called for August 15.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I noticed that at the conference the Premiers of four State Governments said they were in favour of returning price control to the Commonwealth Government. The South Australian Premier, according to what I gather from press reports, was silent on that matter, but he suggested that the States should extend the ambit of price control, particularly to cover luxury goods. Can the Premier say whether he is taking any immediate steps to see that that matter is considered by a conference of State Prices Ministers so that something may be done immediately to curtail the inflationary tendency, which is added to by the consumption and distribution of what are considered luxury goods where there is no price control?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Prices Commissioner has been instructed to prepare for me a list of commodities and goods in respect of which we could usefully take action. This is not a new departure, because from time to time a list of items for suggested re-control has been prepared and submitted at conferences of Prices Ministers. At present the State has a large number of items down for consideration at the next conference. Some of them I confess have been on the list for several months. In some instances the State has not had the support of other Governments in getting re-control.

Mr. Stephens—Will the list be published?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It has not been the practice to publish such lists, because we have found that there has been a manipulation in some of the goods and commodities before action could be taken. It has not been the custom to announce proposed price increases, de-control or re-control before it becomes operative. On one or two occasions it has leaked out that price adjustments or de-control would be considered, and it has been difficult then for consumers to get goods and commodities. The attitude of the Ministers has always been not to announce anything until they are in a position to give effect to decisions. A very large general list of commodities is before the Prices Ministers for re-control, and I believe now that the items will probably be accepted by the other Ministers. A further list is being prepared and in due course it will be submitted to the Prices Ministers for re-control. There are a number of items of which I do not personally advocate re-control where experience has shown in this State, and is showing at present in New South Wales, that controls are impracticable and that it is not possible to achieve any result except to compel a large number of people to become law-breakers. That is not in the interest of the maintenance of law or price control. In reply to the general question, what I said was not mere idle words, because I am prepared to take action to give effect to the policy I advocated.

SATELLITE TOWN NEAR SALISBURY.

Mr. DUNKS—Can the Premier inform the House what progress has been made in the establishment of a satellite town near Salisbury?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will get a report from the chairman of the Housing Trust on that matter.

RURAL WORKERS AND INDUSTRIAL CODE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—This week the press reported that the annual conference of the Australian Primary Producers Union held in Adelaide had passed a resolution requesting the Government to amend the Industrial Code so as to cover certain rural workers. Can the Premier indicate whether an approach on that matter has yet been made to him by that organization?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have seen no correspondence dealing with that topic, but as I have just returned from Sydney it may be awaiting my attention.

RIGHT-HAND TURN OF VEHICLES.

Mr. HAWKER—The Road Traffic Act states that when a motorist is about to turn to the right he shall drive to a point as near as practicable to the left-hand side of the road into which he is about to turn. I have noticed continually in the city that motorists usually stop at a point near the centre electric light pole, and usually there is room for one or even two motor vehicles in front of them. Can the Minister representing the Attorney-General take action to ensure that the traffic police are instructed to see that, especially when the traffic is very congested, vehicles do not stop at the centre pole but go further over, so that they are nearer the left-hand side of the street into which they are about to turn?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Matters affecting the Road Traffic Act are generally dealt with by the Premier. However, as the question has been addressed to me, I will take the matter up with the appropriate authorities. I may mention that today I noticed a policeman directing motor vehicles forward in the manner suggested.

MEAT PRICES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Today's *News* contains the following report:—

Butchers in City Defy Price Law.—Some Adelaide butchers are charging up to 1s. lb. above fixed maximum prices for beef and mutton, in defiance of prices regulations.

This was disclosed in a survey of some city and suburban butcher shops today. Samples of the illegal prices include undercut steak at 4s. lb.—the fixed price is 3s. 3d.—and 3s. 6d. lb. for rump steak (fixed price 2s. 6d.). One city butcher today quoted 4s. 4d. lb. for undercut, 3s. 10d. for rump steak. Other prices quoted today for beef cuts, compared with fixed prices, are:—

	Today's price. Lb.	Fixed price. Lb.
	s. d.	s. d.
Rolled sirloin	2 3	1 11
Stewing steak	2 2	1 6
Corned silverside	2 3	1 9

Typical suburban prices for mutton are:—

	Today's price. Lb.	Fixed price. Lb.
	s. d.	s. d.
Forequarter	1 6	0 9
Leg	2 0	1 4
Loin chops	2 0	1 3½

One butcher, who admitted charging above fixed prices said: "If you were running a business, what would you do?"

Will the Premier take action to have the regulations properly policed so that price control in this State will not become a farce?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will certainly refer the matter to the Prices Commissioner and ask him to take the necessary action.

MOONTA BAY AND WALLAROO BOAT HARBOURS.

Mr. McALEES—This morning it was broadcast over the air that the fishing fleet from Moonta Bay had been forced to take some of its fish to Port Broughton and some on to Port Pirie, because part of the old jetty usually used had been washed away, endangering the safety of the fleet. For a long time its condition has constituted a menace. Can the Minister of Works say whether something will be done about the improvements to the boat havens at Moont Bay and Wallaroo? I have asked the question previously, but nothing has been done.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Harbors Board is doing first things first, and, like everybody else, is short of men and materials. If they are to be used in one direction they must be taken from some perhaps more urgent job elsewhere, and that is most uneconomic. This harbor is not regarded as one of the worst or most difficult on the coast. Some years ago it was suggested that, because of existing conditions, the position could be improved by having the harbour in a different site. However, the local folk did not want that, and we did not go ahead with the proposal, which was then

well advanced. Some of the delay may be attributed to the lack of cohesion amongst those people. However, I will get something more specific from the General Manager of the Harbours Board and let the honourable member have a more detailed reply tomorrow.

SCHOOL OF FARM ENGINEERING.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Todays *Advertiser* reports Professor Trumble, in addressing the Commonwealth Club luncheon, as saying that in this age of mechanization there is no South Australian school where agricultural workers could study the care and maintenance of tractors. A tremendous amount is invested in tractors throughout the primary industries of this State and the men handling them know very little about them. One of my constituents, seized with this position, wrote to the Hawkesbury Agricultural College in New South Wales, from whom he has received a reply saying that 10 tractor firms are co-operating with that college this year, supplying tractors, mechanics and lecturers. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether his department is prepared to organize a similar school in South Australia and co-operate with firms prepared to supply the tractors and mechanics so that a school may be established similar to that in New South Wales?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—This question has been raised before, primarily in connection with the School of Engineering connected with the University of Adelaide. At that time no-one seemed to know exactly what was required. However, I will have investigations made as to what is done at Hawkesbury and see what can be done in South Australia.

PRICE OF BLANKETS.

Mr. LAWN—Recently the Adelaide press reported that a city firm had reduced the price of blankets by about £5 a pair. Can the Premier say whether that reduction was the result of action by the Prices Branch?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Onkaparinga Woollen Mills announced last week a reduction of up to £5 a pair in the price of first grade blankets manufactured by them. Sales of blankets from that company as from that date will have the retail prices adjusted accordingly. Quite apart from that, the Prices Department has been making a close check upon the prices of commodities, particularly woollen commodities, to ensure that new higher prices are not charged for goods that have been in stock for some time.

Mr. Macgillivray—Five pounds is a terrific reduction in the price of blankets.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I believe the Onkaparinga Woollen Mills managed its purchases of wool extremely wisely and as a result it is in a position to make available blankets more cheaply. There have been reports of big falls in the wholesale price of wool. The company, by avoiding buying at the peak of the market, is in the happy position of being able to make fairly substantial cuts in prices. The £5 reduction still allows a fair margin for the company to work on.

Mr. LAWN—My question was whether the reduction in price was made as a result of action taken by the Prices Department.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not quite understand what the honourable member is driving at. An order was made by the Prices Department reducing the price, but that action was possible because the company, in the purchase of its wool, had avoided the high peak of the market and purchased on advantageous terms. It might be that another company selling blankets would not be in a position to make the same reduction if it had purchased wool under less favourable conditions.

ATOMIC BOMB TESTS.

Mr. RICHES—I read a London message in the Adelaide Chronicle to the effect that the first tests of British atomic bombs would take place in South Australia at the Woomera Rocket Range. Has this Government been consulted in any way in connection with those tests? I trust that every safeguard will be taken, because the carrying out of atomic bomb tests is something quite different from the programme outlined to this House when the rocket range was originally established.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I believe the report referred to was a speculative one, and as far as I know there are no grounds for it.

DRAINAGE OF WINGFIELD AREA.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Some years ago the Government determined that part of the Wingfield area would be set up as a noxious trades area. Having conferred with the member for Port Adelaide and at the request of many of my constituents, I submit a question on the matter, because many people engaged in noxious trades in Hindmarsh have been advised to set up plant in the Wingfield area, and have spent about £250,000 in doing so. There are no sewers or drainage systems in that area and their plants today are under water, not only

for the reason mentioned, but because water has been pumped there from the Woodville area where Housing Trust homes are being built. The plants are under water to such an extent they are unable to operate, nor will they be able to operate for some time. Can the Minister of Works indicate whether there are any plans to prevent a recurrence of such flooding?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Although, as I indicated last week, we have more men employed in the Engineer-in-Chief's Department—well over 1,000 more than we had at the end of the war—we are still struggling to keep abreast with home construction programmes, and this has been given the highest priority. I believe the honourable member will agree with this policy. Although I regret the conditions in the Wingfield area, they could only be rectified at the expense of more urgent work. The honourable member realizes that much work has been carried out in that area by the department. Many men are employed on the treatment works at Port Adelaide, which is essential to the drainage of the Wingfield area. The treatment works should be completed towards the end of this year and the trunk main along Tapley's Hill Road has been completed, and there is also the sewerage of the Housing Trust areas at Hendon, Seaton Park, and Woodville Gardens. When all those works are finished it may be possible to transfer some men to Wingfield, but until we can see daylight ahead to some degree I am sure this House would not want the department to concentrate on trade wastes at the expense of household sewerage connections. However, I will get the Engineer-in-Chiefs opinion as to when he can make a start at Wingfield.

PRICES IN COUNTRY DISTRICTS.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Premier say whether the Prices Department is policing prices charged in country districts?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—For some time prices inspectors have been touring country areas and I believe that as a result a substantial number of prosecutions are pending in respect of various country centres. I think that quite recently up to 160 country areas have been checked for breaches of the Act.

PETERBOROUGH SEWERAGE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I understand that some time ago investigations were made with a view to the formulation of a plan to provide a sewerage scheme for Peterborough. Have those investigations been completed, and if not, when will they be completed and the details of a plan submitted to the local government authority of that town?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will get that information for the honourable member and bring it down tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

(Continued from July 31. Page 168).

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—In common with other members I express pleasure at the honour bestowed on this country by the impending visit of their Majesties next year. The Royal Family is the strongest link between the various members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and we all hope that that link will never weaken. I congratulate the new member for Flinders, Mr. Pearson, on his speech in moving the motion. He clearly showed that he has a good grip of the subjects he dealt with and displayed much commonsense in a most interesting address. My remarks today will be brief and I shall not discuss some of the matters which have been discussed at length by other members. We have heard some gloomy forecasts recently about primary production. The Leader of the Opposition is greatly perturbed and recommended immediate drastic steps to improve the position. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is also greatly perturbed about the dairying industry, and comments of other members as well indicate that primary production is in a bad way. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the drift from the country to the city and quoted figures to show that 8,824 fewer people were engaged in primary production in 1947 than in 1933. He also said that there were 3,526 fewer holdings in 1948 than in 1935. The reductions mentioned are not things we desire to see.

Mr. O'Halloran—I also showed that the State's population had increased substantially during the same periods.

Mr. BROOKMAN—The periods quoted are peculiarly unsuitable for showing any particular trend. Between 1935 and 1948 we had a war, and other important things occurred in the economy of the country. In any case, the figures he gave are three years old. The period mentioned covers 15 years and little can be gained from the inferences contained in his remarks.

Mr. O'Halloran—Take the previous 15 years and you will find an increase in primary production.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Many things could have occurred in the years since the war that are not disclosed in the figures given by the Leader of the Opposition. He mentioned particularly a reduction in the number of holdings in the country. He desires to go further than the large acquisition powers which the State Government possesses and acquire, for closer settlement, land that today is being well handled and used.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not say that; you don't know what I said.

Mr. BROOKMAN—The honourable member suggested that well-developed property should be acquired.

Mr. O'Halloran—I said that acquisition should apply to properties other than under-developed properties.

Mr. BROOKMAN—The honourable member said that people should be prepared to give up their land upon receipt of fair compensation. He also said that people should be given a family maintenance area. Page 105 of *Hansard* reports Mr. O'Halloran as follows:—

We do not suggest that people who have acquired land under the laws of the State should be dispossessed of their properties, but when the future well being of the community and the Australian nation is concerned the individual should be prepared, on receipt of fair compensation, to forgo his rights and make his land available for closer settlement.

That is close to what I said. The the following appears:—

If he is not prepared to do that compulsion should be applied in the same way as under the Lands Act in the acquisition of under-developed lands.

Mr. Heaslip—You are opposed to a farmer making provision for his sons.

Mr. O'Halloran—No. I believe that a farm should be a family maintenance area. That postulates an area sufficient to provide for at least one or more generations, but I am not prepared to allow any man to hold an area which will provide for his descendants 100 years hence.

Many people have provided for that, but apparently Mr. O'Halloran thinks that well farmed lands should be acquired for closer settlement. The Government has power to acquire under-developed land and Mr. O'Halloran's suggestion, if adopted, could only lead to insecurity of the tenure that farmers have today. It is a bad trend. Closer settlement would be better achieved if a proper price were paid for the land, but the trouble is that when the Government acquires land it does not always pay a fair price. If it went into the open market it would always obtain it.

Much has been said about the fall in production in the dairying industry, which everybody must agree is particularly grievous. Everybody is sorry to hear that dairy herds are being reduced or disposed of and that dairy production has dropped so sharply during the past few months, but the position is not as bad as some people think. After all, dairy farmers who go out of business are engaged in doing something else of a useful nature. Lately we have heard a lot about dairy cows being slaughtered, but I am positive that the slaughtered cows have been the worst in the herd, and that the survivors have been particularly good. Dairy herds are not being sacrificed. It is not easy to find bargains when purchasing dairy cows. For various causes, including the Korean war, the high wool prices, and probably the 40-hour working week, some dairy farmers prefer to leave a controlled industry where there are agreements which earlier dairy farmers thought were in their favour. They prefer to enter other industries, such as the production of beef, sheep, vegetables, and clover seed, where there is a much higher return. Dairy products are of vital importance to Australia, but even in his new work the dairy farmer is doing a good job. Beef, wool, and vegetables are needed, and clover seed, which was referred to derogatively by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, is also important. The position in the rural industries is not as gloomy as we are led to believe. I want to refute statements made about high wool prices and the impression that people who grow wool are living in luxury. The farmer is not now struggling for an existence. Some people in rural production, particularly those who produce wool, have been spending money on luxury goods not free of sales tax, but much of the spending by them has been on goods considered necessities by city people. They have bought washing machines, new motor cars, refrigerators, stoves, and lighting plants. Many of these things are needed in the home and are not considered luxuries by other people, but immediately the farmers buy them they are said to be luxuries.

Mr. O'Halloran—Who said they were luxuries?

Mr. BROOKMAN—Not the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. O'Halloran—No-one on this side has said it.

Mr. BROOKMAN—There is a general impression that farmers are spending money extravagantly and having a wonderful time whilst other people are in trouble. Every time I mention the woolgrower someone thinks I am talking about the man who produces 1,000 bales of wool. I am talking only of the farmer who produces a few bales. When we talk of inflation we must remember that high wool prices have helped people who have been in trouble in the past. In the country there is an air of confidence. If we can solve the other problems, we will find that there is nothing wrong with land production. It has been said that farmers are not doing as much work as in the past, and that is so.

Mr. Quirke—Why?

Mr. BROOKMAN—In the past they worked too hard. Now they manage their farms by doing a little more thinking instead of so much manual work themselves. Much of the time farmers spend away from their properties is spent at field days and bureau conferences. By no means is the farmer wasting his time or neglecting his land. There has been much talk about the labour shortage in the country, and all sorts of remedies have been put forward to solve the problem. The labour position has been over-stated, and is not as bad as has been claimed. It is due largely to the shortage of houses in the country. The factors which apply now applied largely before the war. Then in the Adelaide hills men lived on small areas of land where they could not support themselves and had to seek work elsewhere. Now because of high prices for their products they can spend all their time on their properties, and not go elsewhere to work. This is practicable only in certain areas. There are few single men available. We have two classes of single men in the country. One is the indolent type which prefers to not go on the land but to seek work elsewhere. The other type is the industrious man who does private contract work, such as fencing. This is not regular farm work, but it is important in rural production. However, the whole crux of the matter is that if good accommodation is available country labour is not seriously short. Accommodation on farms is a responsibility which farmers should accept and which they will accept if they can supply the accommodation. I know of a case where a farm job, together with a five-roomed house, was advertised. Within three days at least 40 applications had been received. No-one would be gullible enough to think all those people wanted to work on the land. Many worked in the metropolitan area and had very little interest in rural work; but a considerable percentage were men experienced in rural production who liked the work and wanted the job. That number of applications may surprise many people who think country conditions are so bad.

Farm work today is by no means the back-breaking job it was years ago. Although a half-wit might be employed in some jobs on a farm, no labouring job in industry generally calls for so much initiative or general inventiveness as farm work. Nor is the work unpleasant. Such jobs as chaff cutting and wood chopping, which requires much stamina, do not take up much of the farm labourer's time. Tractors do not have to be fed early in the morning, like horses. In fact, farm work is far more congenial today than in years gone by. Generally speaking, it is free from the strain which is found in many other jobs. In rural industry there is a general air of cheerfulness, which is to be commended; and rural wages are not far behind those in industry generally.

In many public works activities, both State and Federal, there are a great many people not doing very much work. One of the most important tools in land improvement is the bulldozer, the biggest and best of which come from America. These are naturally the hardest to get. Today private contractors are paying prices above the new price for these machines. They are also doing their best with machines which have been kept operating too long. Some private machines are worked for at least 45 hours a week with one driver—a very high figure. Where drivers work in shifts, this is often exceeded. On the other hand, bulldozers used on public works are not being used to the extent they should be. I know of some machines which would be doing very well if their hours of use totalled 30 per week. One would think that, in view of the shortage of plant in this country, bulldozers would be worked to the greatest possible extent.

Many complaints have been made of the shortage of materials. It is said that certain projects cannot be carried out because materials cannot be obtained, but I suggest there has been too much whining about the position. Often the necessary materials may be acquired by a person who can get around and who uses a little nous. I do not suggest, that everyone can get everything he wants immediately, but that those with no initiative are not getting materials which others may be obtaining.

In the last few years farmers everywhere have been showing more interest in getting the best out of their land by scientific farming methods without spoiling it. Only today a members asked a question regarding the setting up of a school for farm engineering, a subject about which there is a great demand for information today, as instanced by the number of agricultural bureaux all over the State, which arrange tractor field days. Credit for the increased interest in the science of farming must be given to many people—department officers, scientists, private firms producing farm equipment, and not least, private people who work with both hand and head. There are several ways of imparting information to the farmer, but the best is by the force of example. The farmer takes more notice of what his neighbour is doing than of what anyone coming into the district tries to tell him, or of information in newspapers and journals. The picture of rural production is not quite as gloomy as has sometimes been suggested. If we can solve the problems of currency and the shortages of materials, maintain security of tenure and foster the spirit of self-help, the food supply of this country will be assured for years to come. I support the motion.

Mr. DUNKS (Mitcham)—I look upon the debate on the Address in Reply as a valuable part of Parliamentary procedure. It gives members the opportunity of, in effect, moving a vote of thanks to His Excellency for opening Parliament and for reading the Governor's Speech. It also gives them the opportunity of analyzing the Speech and of raising matters not mentioned in it. Further, members are able to congratulate the Government on what it has done, or criticize it, or make suggestions. This State is fortunate in having a Governor of the calibre of Sir Willoughby Norrie. He came to us practically from the field of battle and has proved one of the best Governors we have ever had. He is ably supported by Lady Norrie, who has traversed the country with him and seen the conditions in every part of the State. Along with the Governor, she has mixed with the people admirably. I join with other members in looking forward to the visit of the Royal Family. It is a splendid thing that from time to time Royalty should visit the outposts of the Empire. I am delighted that the King is well enough to be able to come to this country at the time suggested and I am sure that every citizen looks forward with pleasure to his arrival. In these times of inflation and other difficulties I hope that the money expended on the Royal Visit will be in a direction making for the beautification of our city and country towns, and that enormous sums will not be spent on decorations and other things that, when the pageantry is over, will be thrown away or wasted. After all, we should like the King and Queen and Princess Margaret to see us under normal conditions. They are really visitors from another part of the world, very honoured visitors of course, but I suggest to members and to the Adelaide City Council that the expenditure of much money does not necessarily mean a friendly greeting. If the Royal Family can come here and see us as visitors from another State or from the Old Country do in our own homes we can still give them a friendly welcome. We do not bedeck our homes with flags and clean up everything as we have never done before when we receive visitors. We accept them, and they come to us, in our natural environment. We should remember that in planning for the Royal visit.

Mr. Stephens—The expenditure of money does not necessarily indicate loyalty.

Mr. DUNKS—I thank the honourable member; that is exactly what I mean. I hope I am as loyal as any honourable member, but I do not believe that coloured lights and the waving of flags are more expressive of loyalty than our actions are.

Mr. Macgillivray—Still, it is a natural way of showing appreciation to your guests by doing something special for them.

Mr. DUNKS—When I have guests I do not parade something before them that I cannot keep up in the ordinary way of life. The Governor's Speech refers to the lack of farm labour. I was delighted this afternoon to hear the member for Alexandra tell us that this picture had been much overdrawn. The Governor stated that "a serious difficulty affecting primary industries is the lack of farm labour." I have often heard in this Chamber and in the lobbies that one of our greatest difficulties in primary industries today is the lack of such labour.

Mr. Macgillivray—It is still true.

Mr. DUNKS—It may be, but Mr. Brookman said if there was a lack of farm labour it was not because labourers did not want to go on the land, but because there was not adequate accommodation. I hope that before long better accommodation will be provided on farms. The member for Port Pirie yesterday referred to conditions of 100 years ago. People today expect better conditions than

they did even 20 years ago, and I think they are deserving of some support in that respect because there is no question that in the early days, and even the not so early days, housing conditions, not only for the farm labourer but for the owners of the farms, were very poor compared with conditions today. I was on a farm 40 years ago and know something of those conditions. I am pleased to know that in both primary and secondary industries we are able to house our people better than we did in those days and so give them the amenities that have been suggested by Mr. Brookman this afternoon in the provision of refrigerators, washing machines, and other appliances which tend to make the lot of the women on the land, for whom I have great admiration, much better. The Governor's Speech contains the following statement:—

The position in regard to steel affords an example. On the one hand this State cannot secure sufficient steel from Australia because production is kept low by shortage of coal and because interstate transport is impeded by shipping and loading difficulties.

This is a very real problem. Although we have been told from time to time, and quite rightly, too, that our production has increased over the last decade, there is not the slightest doubt that the production of many things is below the requirements of the country. I hope a little later to be able to show that we are still short of the necessary materials in industry and this is largely brought about by the shortening of the working week and other things, such as strikes.

Mr. Macgillivray—Transport difficulties come into it.

Mr. DUNKS—I did not intend to touch on transport.

Mr. Macgillivray—Restriction on road transport by the State Government is aggravating the position.

Mr. DUNKS—I am a firm believer in freedom, but still think that as we have nationalized a particular section of transport we must in some way try to co-ordinate the various methods of carting goods. The day may arrive when there will have to be some co-ordination. There are many commodities that could be more successfully handled by road transport than by rail. Steel, cement, and coal are the most important commodities in short supply today. Where is the potential power for producing goods? It is in the bottom of the coal mines of New South Wales. Without that coal and without adequate transport to this State it is impossible for us to increase production, even if we have sufficient manpower here. I refer now to the question of education. His Excellency said:—

Every effort has been made to ensure adequate accommodation and instruction for the State's growing school population. The number of pupils is now 93,500—the highest in the history of the State—and it is expected that during the next 10 years it will increase to 150,000.

The Leader of the Opposition criticized His Excellency's Speech where it said that the Government did this and that and he asked whether Parliament did not have a hand in those accomplishments. That is partly true. The provision made for education, although sponsored by the Government, must have been agreed to by Parliament. I thank the Minister of Education for the school accommodation that has been and will in the near future be provided. I heard the Government criticized the other day for the lack of schools in one particular area. In my district a new primary school has been promised for Mitcham. Land has already been acquired and the building, I believe, will be started before long. The Government has also provided a large block for a new high school in my district. Accommodation for about 400 scholars was provided when the Unley high school was built.

Mr. Frank Walsh—You told us that in your speech last session.

Mr. DUNKS—I have told the honourable member other things on many occasions so that he can remember them. The *South Australian Teachers Journal* of May 15 last contains an article which I commend to the Minister of Education, the Government, and Parliament. The article is along the lines of what is happening in many other professional organizations. Under the heading "Refresher Courses and Conferences" it states:—

A director's experience.—To a considerable degree a teacher's work is carried on in isolation. Even in a large school most of the day is spent in his own classroom. This is the reason why conferences and similar gatherings are of such importance in keeping the teacher's outlook fresh, for only from such an attitude of mind can pupils derive benefit.

That is called a refresher course, and it is suggested that teachers from all over the State and in certain zones should assemble once a year and discuss their problems from a teacher's point of view. Doctors do it by taking a refresher course at the University. If a teacher is located in a small country town and left there for a couple of years he naturally

gets out of touch with what is happening in the metropolitan area and in the Education Department.

Mr. Macgillivray—They have conferences in their own area.

Mr. DUNKS—That is carrying it a little further. About three or four months ago I was invited to attend a Salvation Army conference and was greatly impressed with what occurred there. I asked the officer in charge, "What is the idea of bringing all the officers of the Salvation Army together?" He replied, "It is what we call a refresher course. We meet and I tell them what our problems are. If they want any advice or desire to speak on any matter they are given the opportunity. We find that it has been of wonderful benefit to the Salvation Army." I prefer that all teachers should assemble in the metropolitan area to discuss their problems.

I intended to say something about loans, but as this is an involved question I shall not say much. Reference is made to it in paragraph 24 of the Governor's Speech. I entered Parliament in 1933, when problems were nearly as difficult as they are today, but of an entirely different character. In that year we had a loan programme of £1,300,000. Last year, according to the Governor's Speech, our loan programme totalled £21,000,000, and it has been suggested that it will be bigger this financial year. The loan programme for the whole of Australia will be larger than it has ever been in the history of the Commonwealth. That has made me wonder whether, in this period of inflation, the question of loan moneys should not be looked into.

I turn now to what I believe is the most important matter that has been discussed here—inflation. While we have been discussing it a conference was held in Sydney, representing all sections of the community, trying to find a solution to this great problem. The Treasurer said this afternoon that nothing definite had been done at the conference. Speeches have been made by certain members who earnestly believe that they have found a solution to the problem, and I was reminded of the thoughts expressed by Omar Khayyam in chapter XXVII. of his *Rubaiyat*:—

> Myself when young did eagerly frequent
> Doctor and saint, and heard great argument
> About it and about: but evermore
> Came out by the same door where in I went.

After listening to some of the cures for inflation put forward by members I feel that I came out of the same door by which I entered and I am not yet convinced that the problem has been solved. I do not usually talk about speeches made here unless it is to praise a member for something he has done, but some things that have been said during the past few days call for comment. I refer to statements made by the member for Port Pirie, Mr. Davis. I bear him much goodwill, but if he looks at the *Hansard* report of his speech I think he will be sorry for it and probably say that it was not exactly what he intended to say. Speaking of the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, Mr. Davis said:—

> He is out to crush industrial organizations and to bring us back to the conditions which existed about 100 years ago. He is following in the footsteps of his Tory ancestors.

He said something even worse:—

> The present Prime Minister has struck a greater blow than any ever struck on the battlefields of the last war. Instead of taking the lives of soldiers, he wants to take the right of the workers as well as those of their wives and families. He would be very happy to have the workers in the position they were in during the depression years.

I know the Rt. Hon. the Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. Davis—We all know him only too well!

Mr. DUNKS—The Prime Minister's father was a poor man and I am convinced that Mr. Menzies today is a man who thinks, not of one section of the community alone, but of all sections, and I would be greatly surprised to find that what the member for Port Pirie said was correct. I feel that, on second thoughts, and after he analyses what he said, he will say, "Probably I was a little hasty and was worked up by interjections from members on the other side of the House. I am really sorry for what I said." Mr. Davis told us how people on farms and in industry had to work 100 years ago, and yesterday afternoon in an impassioned speech, which runs true to the pattern of speeches of members of the Labor Party, the member for Adelaide, Mr. Lawn, dealt with the 40-hour week. He made some of the most curious statements I have heard in this House. He referred to the 40-hour working week as "mythical." Surely it is not mythical, but definite. Those hours have been awarded by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court as the hours of the ordinary working week and any time worked in excess of that must be paid for at rates which have been fixed by the same court. How can Mr. Lawn call it "a mythical working week"? Replying to an interjection by the member for Rocky River, "Why mythical?" Mr. Lawn asked "Who works 40 hours

a week?'' Mr. Heaslip replied, ''Not very many,'' and Mr. Lawn said, ''No, because everybody is working more. How many hours do Government supporters work?'' Later Mr. Lawn said that in the motor body building industry an arrangement had been reached for employees to work 17 hours overtime a week.

Mr. Lawn—That is incorrect; I never said that.

Mr. DUNKS—Mr. Lawn said:—

Members opposite allege that the workers are only working 40 hours a week or less . . .

Who alleged that? Did any member on this side say that the workers were working less than 40 hours a week? Mr. Lawn went on:—

. . . that they have a go-slow policy and that if we went back to a 44- or 48-hour week everything would be all right.

I say definitely that in certain directions there is a go-slow policy. Perhaps that will satisfy the honourable member, and many members on this side will support me. Mr. Lawn continued:—

Let me now turn to private industry. The industry in which I worked, and all industries covered by Commonwealth Arbitration Court awards, have compulsory overtime provisions which compel all union members to work a reasonable amount of overtime. There are factories in the motor industry at present working 17 hours overtime, which means that the employees are working 57 hours a week.

Mr. Lawn—I did not say it was done by arrangement.

Mr. DUNKS—I understood the honourable member to say that. I shall couple this statement with a later reference to a lack of production. Mr. Lawn also said:—

Before I forget it, let me tell a story about an Adelaide cake manufacturing company.

This is the funniest thing I have heard for a long time and it proves what I have been saying for many years, that men in the industry are having a thin time and would get out of it if they could do so profitably. Mr. Lawn went on:—

It was not satisfied with the profits under price control and thought it could make more by going to Darwin. There it found it could not get sufficient white labour and tried to recruit aborigines. The boss said to Jacky, ''I will give you good money and you can buy plenty of good food and good clothes,'' but Jacky declined. Then the boss said, ''You work for me long hours and work well, and I will make you a boss, and then you will not have to work any more,'' and Jacky replied, ''Me not work now, boss.''

Apparently Jacky was shrewd enough to know that instead of going into business it was better for him to work 40 hours a week, get £14 to £15 a week for ordinary time, and double rates for overtime. Some true things have been said in this debate, but what impressed me more than anything else was the statement that too much money is chasing too few goods. It is a jolly good thing to have plenty of money, and I am not so much concerned about this bogey of inflation. That might surprise members, but I cannot see many people suffering under present conditions, although they might suffer under future conditions.

Mr. Macgillivray—People who have retired on superannuation are suffering.

Mr. DUNKS—I was just about to refer to that. Today there is a section of people in difficulties, but they are not so bad as they will be if this inflationary tendency continues. When the prices of wool, wheat, and other primary products fall, farmers who have to pay inflated wages and machinery costs will be in difficulties.

Mr. Macgillivray—You are wrong because if the prices of primary products fall the prices of tractors and wire will also fall, and that will be a good thing for the farmers.

Mr. DUNKS—I am pointing out that if prices continue to increase it will not be the workers who will suffer. They will still have their wages fixed by the Arbitration Court, but the man on the land, who sells his produce overseas, will suffer. People retired on superannuation and primary producers will suffer. The present high prices for wheat, wool, butter, and dried fruits are causing much of our trouble. When Mr. Macgillivray spoke members listened to him without much interjection. Now that I have my chance to speak he is continually interrupting. That does not worry me, but instead of trying to speak for three-quarters of an hour—

Mr. Macgillivray—And saying nothing.

Mr. DUNKS—Mr. Speaker, I object to that interjection.

The SPEAKER—Honourable members are out of order in interjecting and I ask them to listen to the member for Mitcham without interruption.

Mr. DUNKS—The interjection was distasteful to me. The honourable member said that when I speak I say nothing.

The SPEAKER—I do not want it to be taken that I am setting a standard in connection with remarks, but I hardly think the interjection was offensive. It was an observation by the honourable member, who may have

meant that there was nothing of interest to him. I do not know whether he meant his interjection to be offensive.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying that my interjection was not intended to be in any way offensive.

Mr. DUNKS—In the *News* of July 31, in a report from London, there appeared the following statement:—

Inflation is no more a sin committed by Attlee than it is a sin committed by Truman in the United States of America or Menzies in Australia. It is just something that's happening all over the world, and it's happening without any degree of respect for Party or policy.

I regret that criticism is levelled at the Commonwealth Government, because inflation is not peculiar to Australia. Irrespective of whether our Prime Minister is a Liberal, a Labor man, or a democrat, inflation is occurring everywhere and it is a difficult problem to solve. Conditions today are entirely different from what they were in 1933, when we had a depression and a dearth of money. Three years prior to that the Leader of the Opposition Party when going to the country said that if his Party was returned there would be land for the landless, food for the foodless, and many other things. His Party was returned and he found to his surprise that the State was in a difficult financial plight. During those three years we had a Premiers' Plan. When I entered the House about that time we had three Parties in Parliament—the Liberal Party, the Australian Labor Party, and the Political Labor Party, because the Labor Party could not agree on the Premiers' Plan. Although conditions now are entirely different from what they were in 1933, I feel that we will have another Premiers' Plan within 12 months. When I entered Parliament first I was much younger and inexperienced, and I thought I could do something to help overcome the unemployment problem, so on August 30, 1933, I moved the following motion:—

That, in the opinion of this House, conferences should be arranged between employers and employees in each industry to discuss shortening of working hours with a view to relieving unemployment; and that legislation should be introduced to amend the industrial laws to enable employers of labour to distribute the work available among a greater number of people.

I thought that as 30 per cent of our people were unemployed we should try to get them back into full employment, and spread the money available among 100 per cent of our workers instead of 70 per cent. The motion was not carried. Eventually under a Liberal Government the State got out of its difficulties. Today we are facing a depression brought about by entirely different circumstances. One way to cure the position is to review the present working week. Just as I suggested then that it be reduced to make work available for all employable men, I suggest now that it be extended to enable more goods to be produced by the men now employed. I do not say that huge profits are not being made. Members on the other side have quoted from time to time the rates of dividend paid by some big companies. Many industries are making huge profits today. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. That has practically a monopoly of the steel industry in Australia and is making very good profits, which it is using to further its development.

Mr. Quirke—It produces probably the cheapest steel in the world.

Mr. DUNKS—Yes, mainly because its raw product is the cheapest procurable. That company has had many concessions, with which I agree, because it is a wonderful organization. Other firms in secondary industry such as motor body builders, construction engineers, and motor car retailers, are also making big profits.

According to the *Quarterly Report* from Canberra, in the first quarter of 1951, of the total amount spent by Australians, £80,000,000 was spent on motor cars, spare parts, and petrol; £43,000,00 on groceries; £20,000,000 on meat; £36,000,000 on other foods; £27,000,000 on beer, wine, and other spirits; and £53,000,000 on other goods. Australians spent almost twice as much on motor cars as on groceries. A total of about £71,500,000 on drapery, clothing, and piece goods, which were once considered the lines on which the highest expenditure would be incurred, was less than that spent on motor cars. I do not say a motor car is a luxury. If a man earns enough to buy a motor car he should be able to own one. However, as the owner of a motor car over a number of years, I have found it a very costly asset, and that was never more true than it is today. A motor car owner can reckon on a bill of at least £5 every time he takes it to a garage for an inspection and any repairs. Even if a worker receives £14 a week, he cannot afford to buy and run a motor car costing £800. The day of reckoning must come and, when it does, the fact that he owns a car may affect his economic position.

Mr. Quirke—Where is a car to be bought for £800?

Mr. DUNKS—I am informed the Hartnett car will cost less than that. Race horse owners have had a prosperous time during the last few years. They are still having it and are difficult to chase from the taxation point of view.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Government made a good job of getting at them last year.

Mr. DUNKS—The punters were taxed.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is one way of getting the money.

Mr. DUNKS—I agree. Hotelkeepers have made exorbitant profits over the years. Another section of the community who neither toil nor spin are the bookmakers, who have amassed fabulous sums. They have been able to pass on the effects of rising prices, and I was very amused to read in the press recently that a lady at a meeting of the Victorian Housewives Association had said that the only two things which had not gone up were the bookmakers' odds and the "Plimsoll" line on the whisky glass.

Today it is so easy to sell goods. In fact, one need not sell but may take an order only if he feels like it. Once a person could enter a shop and wait for the assistant to come up and say, "Yes, sir, what can I do for you?" Today, after waiting five minutes, the customer may ask in a trembling voice, "I don't suppose you have so and so?" Usually, the correct reply would be, "You are perfectly right, we have not got them." A regular customer might be told, "I have something under the counter for you, as I know you well." Today we go along begging for the goods available, whereas in the old days we demanded them, Huge sums of money have been made in big industries where £10 may mean very little. The man who ordered a motor car two years ago when it cost £1,000 may be told on going to collect it that, because of rising costs and differences in exchange, the price has now risen to £1,350. He still buys it without apparently turning a hair. However, in many cases, the small business man such as the milkman, the cafe proprietor, or the greengrocer, may be put out of business by these rising prices. Human nature is peculiar, and very often a man with no experience in an industry is prepared to pay a big price for a business, thinking he has a lot more ability than the previous owner; but to his sorrow he finds, in a few years' time, that he has made a big mistake. People in small industries have felt the impact of the 40-hour week, particularly when their prices have been fixed.

Mr. Riches—How would the honourable member go about lengthening the working week?

Mr. DUNKS—I cannot understand why, when we were so short of goods, the workers approached the Arbitration Court for a reduction of hours. I advocated a shorter working week when our barns were full, but in these days of shortages why should a Bench of Judges, who should know the conditions in this country, award workers a 40-hour week?

Mr. Whittle—The New South Wales Government forestalled them.

Mr. DUNKS—The Court should take no cognizance of the action of any Government, but should be a law unto itself. In his *Harvester Judgment* Mr. Justice Higgins said industry should be examined as to its ability to pay. The same principle should apply today.

Mr. Lawn—The Court made that examination and said it was an opportune time to shorten hours.

Mr. DUNKS—If that was an opportune time to shorten hours, I suggest we are now past the opportune time to increase the hours until we have caught up with production. I am interested in the welfare of my employees. When I was a worker I was glad to work for a successful man because I knew that, if I were working for a man who was struggling, one day he might go out of business and I would have to get another job.

Mr. Lawn—The honourable member still works.

Mr. DUNKS—Yes, but not in the ordinary, accepted sense of being an employee and producing for an employer. I shall quote Mr. Heath, president of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of Australia, who said:—

The 40-hour week had caused an annual loss to Australia of 1,125 houses, 22,500,000 bricks, 45,000,000 super feet of timber, 675,000 square feet of cement and building sheets, and 540,000 tons of coal.

That is a great loss to the community. If we let supply and demand look after the situation and find out to what extent the working week should be lengthened to produce more goods we may get out of our difficulties. Many housewives may have remarked in the last few months that the price of eggs was 4½d. each and questioned why it should be so high. The answer was that there was a shortage because hens do not lay many eggs during the winter.

It was announced in last Monday's newspaper that the South Australian Egg Board had reduced the price of eggs by 3d. a dozen. What caused that? Had that anything to do with inflation or did it prove hens were working harder last week-end than in previous weeks? Hens were laying more eggs and as a result the price came down. I suggest that if we worked longer hours and produced more goods the price of commodities would automatically come down just as surely as the price of eggs came down—and that would then probably come down another 3d. per dozen very shortly.

Mr. O'Halloran—Would you say that seasonal conditions had nothing to do with the fluctuation in the price of eggs?

Mr. DUNKS—I said nothing of the sort. Seasonal conditions enabled hens to lay more eggs and the price dropped as a result. A 48-hour week would enable workers in industry to produce more goods. If seasonal conditions enabled hens to produce more eggs, so would the workers of this country produce more in 48 hours than in 40. More goods would become available and this would bring down the prices. I understand that when the workers of Australia, through their organizations, went to the Arbitration Court for a 40-hour week they submitted that by working longer than 40 hours they became fatigued. I have heard many times that working more than 40 hours a week was extremely tiring and that people would die at an early age if we did not give them more leisure. What happened? After working 40 hours for their employer many men worked on Saturdays and Sundays, supposedly worn out, and at overtime rates. Is that logical? I still believe that an average man who has been properly reared should be able to work 48 hours, especially under present conditions.

Mr. Lawn—Do you suggest that unionists place a ban on overtime?

Mr. DUNKS—I have never said anything of the sort. In fact, I am arguing to the contrary. We should ask men to work as long as they are prepared to, but 48 hours at ordinary rates in order to get us out of our difficulties, and at overtime rates after that.

Mr. Lawn—If your theory is correct, would it not be better to work 60 hours a week and cut wages by 50 per cent?

Mr. DUNKS—I do not want to go that far. If the honourable member wants to get out of our difficulties quickly and is prepared to put his suggestion into operation I am sure that within 12 months we should have righted the inflationary spiral, but I like to do things in moderation. I do not lay all the responsibility on the workers; many employers are lazy. Many are not troubling to see that their factories are properly managed. However, I take exception to what the Leader of the Opposition said, that the success of this country was attributable to the efforts of the workers during the years gone by.

Mr. O'Halloran—When did I say that?

Mr. DUNKS—A few days ago.

Mr. O'Halloran—I wish you would quote me correctly.

Mr. DUNKS—I shall come back to that later. The member for Adelaide knows as well as I that many men, after working 40 hours in industry during the week, work for someone else at week-ends because they can get £3 or £4 a day on Saturdays and Sundays.

Mr. McAlees—How many do that?

Mr. DUNKS—Quite a number. Many employees in the building industry work from Monday to Friday for their employer and do building trade work for someone else on Saturday and Sunday.

Mr. Lawn—Do you approve of that?

Mr. DUNKS—No.

Mr. Lawn—Then what are you prepared to do about it?

Mr. DUNKS—Ask them to work another eight hours during the week so that they would be working for someone who is paying their wages, and not do a black market job for someone else and sabotage the man who has been employing them during the week.

Mr. Lawn—The employers encourage week-end work, but the trade unions are trying to stop it.

Mr. DUNKS—Nobody on this side of the House has suggested that the workers, when asked to work 40 hours, do not work those hours. That was the challenge thrown out to us yesterday afternoon when certain members said the workers were not working 40 hours. If we allowed the good old theory of supply and demand to operate as it did before the war we would not be in our present difficulties. This is what the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech on the Address in Reply:—

In the final analysis it will be the workers who will get this country out of its difficulties. It will not be the rajahs of finance or the captains of industry, but the plain ordinary wealth producer, whether he works on the farm, in a mine, or in a factory.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is correct.

Mr. DUNKS—Is that fair to the people who during these times of trouble and rising wages have tried to maintain stability and keep men employed by adopting new methods and installing new machines and taking a keener interest in their businesses than they did before?

Mr. O'Halloran—And, judging by the financial columns of the press, getting their due rewards.

Mr. DUNKS—But if it had not been for their ingenuity and thoughtfulness in finding ways and means of turning out the same work in 40 hours as they did in 48, they would have been out of business and their employees out of work and we should have had the depression that many members from time to time fear. I believe that high taxation is a cause of much of our trouble. I heard it said during the debate that taxation should be increased and that one of the ways of overcoming inflation was by increasing taxation and paying it out in subsidies.

Mr. O'Halloran—You don't agree with the Treasurer?

Mr. DUNKS—In most things. The Treasurer himself occasionally says things I do not agree with and probably the same applies to me. Perhaps some of the things I have said today will make an impression on him and he will say, "There might be some wisdom in the things Mr. Dunks has said." I draw members' attention to a publication entitled "Jubilee Without Jubilation." All members should have a copy. It is published by a former member of this House, Mr. E. J. Craigie, a man who, although an Independent, was a most excellent debater and put forward some most interesting ideas which were nearly always wrong from our point of view. However, he was always earnest in what he said. He gives figures about combined Federal and State taxation, showing the increase at 10-year periods. It would be taking up too much time and space in *Hansard* to follow them right through. In 1901-2 the taxation per head of population, Commonwealth and State, was £3 0s. 7d. a year, but by 1949-50 it had increased to £66 11s. 5d. According to an article in the *Mail* a few weeks ago it will reach £87 a head of population this financial year, and will go higher.

Mr. O'Halloran—Have you the figures for 1930-31?

Mr. DUNKS—No, they are 10-year periods. In 1919-20 the total was £10 14s. 0d. and in 1929-30, £14 6s. 9d. Mr. Craigie states:—

"This table shows that combined Federal and State taxation has grown from £3 0s. 7d. per head of population in 1901-2 to £66 11s. 5d. in 1949-50—a staggering burden to be carried by the small section of the community who are actual wealth producers."

Mr. Craigie goes on:—

The next table should be of special interest as it shows the value of total production each decade from 1901 to 1949, and the percentage of that production taken by Federal and State taxation at those same periods.

It shows that in 1901-2 10.10 per cent of our national production went in combined taxation. It had risen to 47.22 per cent in 1949-50. I ask members to study the figures and see the amount of subsidies that is being paid today.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is not what we pay in taxes that matters, but what we have left that really counts. People still had more left in 1949-50 than in 1901.

Mr. DUNKS—I grant that, but we should allow people to retain more and encourage them to produce, remembering that the £1 they received in 1901 was worth £1. It is not worth the same today as it was in 1901. The total amount of taxation in 1950 was £536,000,000 out of which we paid £43,628,000 in subsidies. The subsidy on butter was £11,300,000, cheese £7,000,000, woollen goods £20,000,000, wheat £628,000, pre-fabricated houses £1,500,000 and coal imports £3,200,000.

Mr. Riches—The taxpayer pays in accordance with his ability to pay.

Mr. DUNKS—Yes, but in this case we are paying according to the ability of the other fellow to eat, and I do not agree with that. If I want six pounds of butter in my home, why should the member for Stuart be expected to pay for half that quantity? Why should I not pay for it?

Mr. Riches—It is like a man with a big family.

Mr. DUNKS—A man with a big family receives child endowment of 5s. a week for the first child and 10s. a week for each additional child. That is not the right way of doing things. The last suit of clothes I bought cost £39, English material. Does any member say that because he pays taxation I should buy a cheaper suit of clothes? That suit should have cost me nearer £50. Some members buy ready-made suits of cheaper material and pay for part of the cost of my English material.

Mr. O'Halloran—What subsidy was paid on imported goods?

Mr. DUNKS—On woollen goods, £20,000,000.

Mr. Whittle—It was to keep the price of woollen goods down in Australia. Why not ship all the butter we produce and get a better price?

Mr. DUNKS—Let the people do as they did before.

Mr. O'Halloran—Yes, let the workers eat fat!

Mr. DUNKS—No. The Leader of the Opposition is always trying to make out the worst possible case.

Mr. O'Halloran—That used to be the cure 30 years ago.

Mr. DUNKS—I am not concerned with that, but with things as they are today. Mr. Whittle contends that I would be prepared to send butter out of Australia. Why not do as we did under the Paterson plan? If I want more butter make me pay for it, but by the way proposed I will not be paying for it; the price will be halved because of what the people are paying in taxation. Another matter is indirect taxation. Have members followed this question to its conclusion and realized what the workers and employers are paying in indirect taxation today? On every packet of cigarettes people are called on to pay 5d. in excise duty, for a box of matches ½d., for a gallon of petrol 8½d., and for a gallon of beer 4s. 7d., which works out at £8 10s. a head of population. It is said that this taxation, in the next Budget, will reach the colossal figure of £70,000,000. Customs duty will account for £92,000,000; £11 per head of population. This puts up prices and the seller gets the blame every time. Take the sales tax, which was brought in as a special measure to tide us over a great difficulty. I think Mr. Scullin was Prime Minister at the time and the sales tax was considered to be a great idea. Today we are paying £58,000,000 in sales tax.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Treasurer recently said that sales tax should be increased on certain types of goods.

Mr. DUNKS—I am not his adviser and he makes his own decisions.

Mr. O'Halloran—Are you repudiating him?

Mr. DUNKS—I have said nothing of the sort; I am discussing the question of sales tax. I want members who represent the lower grade of the community to realize the exact position. Indirect taxation is being placed on to the lower grades, as far as wages are concerned, and they do not realize the amount they are paying. One of the most pernicious things we have in taxation is the pay-roll tax. Recently the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, General Eisenhower, said:—

They shall lose freedom who think it may be preserved (without sweat and sacrifice). People in this country who think they should work less hours and derive more benefits in wages to purchase the amenities of life, without some sacrifice and hard work, will find there will be a day of reckoning for them before long. The pay-roll tax was brought in for the purpose of finding money for social welfare.

Mr. O'Halloran—For child endowment.

Mr. DUNKS—I do not want members for one moment to think that I am against social welfare as I have advocated it, particularly along the lines that exist today, ever since I read the report of Sir William Beveridge. I examined it when it was published and talked to many groups of people about it, telling them I was perfectly in sympathy with its provisions. However, it was a system of national insurance. That is the system which should be in operation today. Although it might cost the young people more for awhile it is a move in the right direction because it will provide protection for people during their working years and give them a pension when they retire.

Mr. O'Halloran—The pay-roll tax was imposed to provide for child endowment and avoid increases in the basic wage.

Mr. DUNKS—It is a wrong premise on which to fix taxation.

Mr. Riches—There is a big saving to industry.

Mr. DUNKS—I do not think so.

Mr. Riches—If the basic wage went up the single man and the man without dependents would get an increase, whereas under the child endowment scheme only those with families benefit.

Mr. DUNKS—If the honourable member is correct, is it fair that the man in industry who makes a loss should have to pay 2½ per cent on the wages he pays.

Mr. Quirke—It is wrong in principle.

Mr. DUNKS—Absolutely. It is a tax on gross profits. Whether or not the man in industry is successful he has to pay the 2½ per cent. The more an industry pays in wages the more it pays in pay-roll tax. In 1941 we paid 2s. 2d. on the basic wage of that time. Today it is 4s. 8¾d. on the basic wage. Each

time wages go up the pay-roll tax increases. In the near future employers will find themselves having to pay as much as 5s. or 6s. I am pleased that in these times of prosperity workers have wall-to-wall carpets, washing machines and refrigerators, and the young men have motor cycles and the older men motor cars, but unless we are prepared to work harder in the future and produce more goods the inflation trouble will get worse. If we face up to circumstances, and someone gives a lead to the Arbitration Court to have the working week increased until we get out of our difficulties, we might get somewhere. If workers and owners of industries said they would work on every public holiday in one year in an attempt to catch up the lag in production, it would be something which would go down in history as extraordinary. It would show people everywhere that Australia was making a desperate effort to get out of her trouble and doing everything possible to prevent the inflationary spiral. The last paragraph of the Governor's Speech reads:—

I now declare this Session open and trust that your deliberations may be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the State.

I suggest that we will need all the Divine Providence that it is possible for us to get. I support the motion.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—I join with other honourable members in congratulating the mover of the motion. Older members are always interested in seeing the calibre of a new man. Unfortunately I was necessarily absent from the Chamber when Mr. Pearson delivered his speech. I regret that, but it was a forced absence and no discourtesy was intended. I read his speech and it reads very well, but he will find before long that I cannot agree with all he said. He will find that members here do not always agree with each other. I congratulate him on his election and on his maiden speech.

I join with other honourable members in expressing appreciation of the fact that His Majesty the King will be able to visit Australia. There is no doubt that the stability which has always existed in what was known as the British Empire, but which has now got away from that proud title, is due mainly to the welding force of the throne of England. Other thrones have fallen by the wayside. Not so long ago in Europe they fell like leaves in autumn, but the solid structure behind the throne of England, based on the English Parliamentary system, has been a great stabilizing force in the continuance of what we now know as the British Commonwealth of Nations. I hope nothing will happen to prevent Their Majesties and Princess Margaret from visiting Australia.

I want to correct some statements made by Mr. Heaslip regarding remarks made by me on the opening day of the session. I do not accuse him of deliberate error in this matter, but I ask him to be careful in what he says about statements by other honourable members. My remarks were misquoted. He drew a completely wrong inference from what I said and he implied that I attacked the farmers when I said that wheat production per acre was lower now than it was 30 years ago. Anyone who reads my speech knows that I based the statement on the decline in the fertility of the soil, and that I did not blame the farmers. Mr. Heaslip said I was wrong in what I said, but in order that there will be no further queries as to whether I was right or wrong I shall quote figures from the latest *Pocket Year Book* issued under the authority of the Chief Secretary. I said we were producing less wheat per acre now than we did 30 years ago, and the following figures in the book prove it:—

Five years ended—	Production. Bushels per acre.
1910-11	11.55
1915-16	8.19
1920-21	12.84
1925-26	12.06
1930-31	8.52
1935-36	10.20
1940-41	11.15
1945-46	12.22

The average from 1910 to 1946 was 10.77 bushels per acre. Annual production was as follows:—

Year.	Production. Bushels per acre.
1943-44	13.49
1944-45 (drought year)	5.70
1945-46	9.72
1946-47	11.08
1947-48	13.70
1948-49	12.67

The average from 1943 to 1949 was 10.89 bushels per acre. Between 1910 and 1946 immense areas of marginal lands were cropped for wheat, and that is included in the average of 10.77 bushels per acre. Consequently the average has been seriously reduced. Much of the area cropped then has now gone out of production. Wheat is being produced now on better class land, but we are not producing any more per acre. We can produce quantities of wheat, but undoubtedly, based on figures in the

Pocket Year Book, we are producing less per acre today than we did 30 years ago. In those days we could buy fairly cheaply all the plant needed to work a 500-acre farm. We could purchase the seed drill, a 5ft. or 6ft. harvester for about £80 to £90, and the various other plant needed. With a team of horses the plant would not have cost more than £1,000. Today the tractor alone costs £1,000 or more. The header costs anything from £800 to £1,000. In addition the combine and everything else must be purchased. The plant needed for a 500-acre farm today could not be purchased for less than £3,000 to £4,000. The net result of this is that the price of wheat cannot decline much below the home consumption price in Australia before wheat production becomes absolutely unprofitable. All we have done by improved methods is to reduce the amount produced and increase the cost of production because of the diminishing number of people on the land and the aggregation of land into larger holdings. Recently I said that if our population were increased to 10,000,000, on our present rate of production we could not export even one bushel of wheat.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—What percentage do we export now?

Mr. QUIRKE—About 50 per cent. My statement was challenged, but I have proved conclusively that it is correct. I was very careful to refer to production per acre and not to total quantity.

Before touching on the financial position in Australia, I must refer to the growing incidence of poliomyelitis in this State. At its present rate of increase this disease could ultimately present the State with a problem compared with which the problems of inflation would be unimportant. Inflation will not be with us for ever, but we must be concerned with the life, well-being, and future of all South Australians. The member for Mitcham frequently referred to the law of supply and demand, but I have another name for that law—"boom and burst." In the past prosperous periods have been followed by depressions. We have not yet learned to handle prosperity, but it is of small moment to achieve prosperity if our people are to be twisted and maimed by some disease, the remedy for which we do not know. I do not claim to be an authority, and as a layman I would probably receive no recognition in the halls of science. However, I read extensively about these matters and can relate my reading of three or four years ago to that of today, and I hope to contribute something to the solution of this problem. The Parliamentary library contains a book *Farming and Gardening for Health or Disease,* by Sir Albert Howard, who asked Mr. J. E. R. McDonagh, a member of the Hall College of Surgeons and a recognized authority on these subjects, to state in the simplest language the results of his investigation on the nature and causation of disease. Mr. McDonagh replied as follows:—

Every body in the universe is a condensation product of activity. Every body pulsates, that is to say, it undergoes alternate expansion and contraction. The rhythm is actuated by climate. Protein in the sap of plants and in the blood of animals is such a body, and it is also the matrix of the structures in the former, and of the organs and tissues in the latter. If the sap in plants does not obtain from the soil the quality nourishment it requires, the protein over-expands. This over-expansion renders the action of climate an invader, that is to say, climate, instead of regulating the pulsation, adds to the expansion. The over-expansion results in a portion of the protein being broken off, and this broken-off piece is a virus. The virus, therefore, is formed within and does not come from without, but protein damaged in one plant can carry on the damage if conveyed to other plants. The protein in the blood of animals and man suffers the same damage if it fails to obtain the quality food it needs.

In many parts of South Australia disease is rampant in stock because of the type of feed consumed by it. Dystokia, an infertility disease, has been traced back to a mono-diet of clover, an excess of clover, which is a nitrogenous, highly proteined food. An excess of that to the exclusion of other forms of food sets up a disturbance in that animal which brings on dystokia. The virus which constitutes what is known as spotted wilt in tomatoes is carried from tomato to tomato by the bite of thrips, just as the mosquito transmits malaria. The virus may be in one plant and not in others. When one tomato plant is affected by wilt gardeners are urged to pull it up and burn it. However, I let the plant run its course and find that at a certain stage it can be cut down, the fresh growth being free of wilt. When one plant becomes infected with the virus from within through some disturbing cause, and when the thrip takes the disease from one plant to another, all of them may be infected. However, that seldom occurs. The plants escaping the infection are those from which the seed should be saved for future

plantings. With regard to the constitution of a virus, Mr. A. L. Hagedoorn, a geneticist, in his book *Plant Breeding*, states:—

What is the difference between a virus and one of the normal constituents of the cells? I am convinced this difference is one of degree only. In Japanese hops, for instance, green plants and spotted plants do not differ in the genes; they have the same nucleus. But there is a difference in some cytoplasm constituent. Plants with spotted leaves will have spotted seedlings, always, even if the seedlings had a green-leaved father. And conversely, if we start with a green-leaved plant, we can cross it with pollen from spotted father-plants, and we can even repeat this several times, but no spotted seedlings are ever produced. Between this case and that of an infectious spotting in some plants there is no real difference, and I feel very sure that it would be possible to transmit the spotting of such Japanese hops into normally green plants by grafting or injection. If we compare "normal" cell constituents with viruses, we not only see cases such as that of the spotted hops or Aucuba, where a cell constituent is passed in the cytoplasm and produces a semi-pathological condition, but there are cases where a virus, that can be recognized by its pathogenic effect, can be present in some plants without any harmful effect at all.

The substance in one plant is perfectly normal to that plant, but when transferred to another it becomes a virus setting up all complaints of a virus. Hagedoorn continues:—

This is true of what the potato phytopathologists call a "latent virus." We start with two clones of potato, calling them A and B. No symptoms of virus infection are noticed in either. Now we graft a piece of plant A into plants of the B clone. As a result, those B plants show symptoms of a serious virus infection. This disease can be transmitted from one plant of clone B to the other.

The point is that until two plants are brought together there is no disease. The author goes on:—

There are two ways of interpreting those facts. The potato pathologist is liable to say that plant A is immune to the virus; it carries the virus in a "latent" condition. But we can only say—and it really amounts to the same thing—that this substance which we call a virus when we see its action in B is a normal constituent of the cells of the plants of clone A. Some of the viruses and some of the kinds of infectious spotting in plants can be transmitted by injecting some fresh juice, or by grafting, yet the plant from which juice is taken is not affected by a virus. We must ask ourselves this question: is it possible that what we call viruses in our plants (or animals, or even humans) are substances which are normally present in the cells of healthy living beings?

This is a world-famous geneticist speaking. This is how he answers the question:—

I would like to answer this question in the affirmative. It seems the most probable hypothesis. It seems reasonable to believe that brand-new viruses may start attacking our plants or ourselves, but that they are new only in so far as they are quite common substances in the wrong place.

It is not necessary for me to read any further from that passage, but I shall quote one example that he gives:—

One of my colleagues—Professor Harland—recently told me of a case in which he had grafted a wild tomato species upon a potato. The combination showed violent symptoms of a virus infection, which rapidly spread to all sorts of plants in the experimental garden, and could be eradicated only by ruthlessly destroying a large area of different kinds of plants. It is quite possible that Harland created a virus by this graft. If this is the explanation, even this case would not need the assumption of a "mutation"!

Time and time again in animal feeding, of which I claim to know something, it has been shown that diseases can be cured by taking the animals off improved pastures and putting them on natural pastures. This is a common practice in the South-East, where graziers call the natural pastures which have not been treated with superphosphate or clovers "hospital paddocks." Violent outbreaks of disease can be cured by doing nothing other than shifting stock to those paddocks. The point arising from this is whether we are on the wrong track in seeking the cause of poliomyelitis. At present we are trying to isolate the virus. According to the two geneticists I have referred to the virus is the most elusive thing on earth, but it is practically pure protein. Protein cannot be manufactured by the human or animal body, but it is synthetized in plants and can only be eaten by animals which, in turn, are eaten by us. That is how we get our protein, but protein in the first place must come from the soil. According to one scientist, the soil must be in the right condition before we can get a complete protein from it. Assuming that the soil fertility or some set of conditions is not sufficient to complete the structure of the protein—and it is composed of up to 21 different acids—we can have, as one scientist says, an expanded protein and a piece broken off which can set up a virus disease. In our treatment of poliomyelitis we are aiming at isolating the virus first and then combating it. That can be done and I would not suggest that that

process be stopped, but I suggest that whenever poliomyelitis attacks a family a close examination of every article of foodstuff consumed by those people in the past few weeks should be made. Doctors and scientists will not fumigate schools because they believe poliomyelitis is not infectious as is a germ-borne disease.

If it is not infectious why is it that all members of a certain family went down with it? I do not know whether the diet of that family was investigated. People in Clare have had poliomyelitis and there have been 17 cases from Waikerie. All the sunshine and orchards of that town did not prevent poliomyelitis from attacking its residents. The problem of this disease transcends in importance that of inflation. The lives of men, women, and children are at stake and I am afraid we are on the wrong track throughout the world in handling it. Beri-beri incapacitated millions of natives in Sumatra, but they were cured by giving them the bran off the rice, the bran that had been cleaned off to make it white. Pellagra, known as the poor whites' disease of the southern States of America, was the result of an over-consumption of maize flour and a failure to consume sufficient other essential foodstuffs. This disease had the scientific world mystified for years until one doctor said it was essential to feed the people properly and to give them injections of synthetic vitamins. There is no difference in the principles of feeding stock and feeding human beings in order to obviate disease. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 2, at 2 p.m.