

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, July 29, 1952.

The House met at 2 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY SPEAKER.

The CLERK—I have to inform the House that, owing to his absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business, the Speaker will not be able to attend the House for several weeks.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That, pursuant to section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1951, and Standing Order No. 24, the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Dunks), Chairman of Committees, do take the Chair of this House as Deputy Speaker to fill temporarily the office and perform the duties of the Speaker during the absence from the State of the Speaker on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I second the motion.

In the absence of any other nomination, Mr. Dunks was declared elected Deputy Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker took the Chair and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**STATE'S FINANCIAL OPERATIONS FOR 1951-52.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Treasurer give the reason for the delay in publishing a statement of the State's financial accounts for the year ended June 30 last, and give an approximate idea of the result of the year's operations?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When the Lieutenant-Governor delivered his speech on the opening day of the House there was some doubt as to the charging of certain interest by the Commonwealth. The Leader of the Opposition knows that last year a considerable amount of loan money provided to the State was made available by the Commonwealth Government, and the question had arisen what rate of interest the Commonwealth Government would charge for money advanced for State loan programmes. In these circumstances it was not possible at the time to give an accurate result of what the year's operations would be. Since then there has been no appropriate occasion on which the Government could make an announcement, but now that the Leader of the Opposition has asked the question, I can state that the results of last year's State's activities are generally satis-

factory; in fact, taking into account the difficult times, I consider them extremely satisfactory. The figures for last year will show a small surplus.

WHEAT PRICES.

Mr. GOLDNEY—I understand that at last week's conference of Ministers of Agriculture held in Perth the question of the International Wheat Agreement and the future price of wheat was discussed. Has the Minister of Agriculture any information on the matter to give the House?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The question of wheat prices was on the agenda, but because the International Wheat Agreement had not been finalized the discussion was adjourned. It was unanimously considered by the conference that discussions on the future of stabilization should be held over pending the finalization of that agreement. There is still some doubt whether there will be a renewal of this agreement and that cannot be finalized until the next meeting of Ministers, expected to be held in January after the Presidential election in the United States of America. It was felt that the future of wheat stabilization in Australia depended largely on the International Wheat Agreement, and as a consequence it was unanimously decided that it was advisable to leave the position as to wheat as it was. That will mean legislation to continue the existing agreement for a further 12 months so that we may know what the position is concerning the International Agreement, and then consideration can be given to a new agreement for stabilization.

CONTROL OF MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Was any finality reached at this morning's conference between the Premier and representative councils regarding the future control and working of the municipal tramways system?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Each of the councils in the metropolitan area accepted my invitation to send a representative to my office to discuss this matter with me. I pointed out that groups A and B had accepted my proposal No. 3, but with certain qualifications. The Adelaide City Council, the other group under the Act, had accepted proposal No. 2. There was no unanimity among the council groups and I therefore suggested that the councils go into the matter further themselves and see if they could prepare an alternative scheme for consideration, and that I would be prepared to consider it if they could reach agreement

among themselves. At a meeting held at the Adelaide Town Hall by the councils, which I did not attend, I understand that they discussed some alternative proposals which the Lord Mayor outlined to me only briefly by telephone. I understand that the alternative proposal the councils are discussing is something along the lines contained in proposal No. 2 of the original proposals, with the amendment that the Government appoint the controlling authority. That is the present position as I understand it. I have not yet had official confirmation of what the proposals are, or whether they are indeed acceptable to metropolitan councils. The position is that the councils themselves are going into what they believe to be suitable alternative proposals to those already submitted.

IMPROPER LITERATURE.

Mr. HUTCHENS—At the request of the South Australian School Committees' Association I draw the Premier's attention to an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* on July 9 which credits him with having shown to the Prime Minister and other Premiers a periodical depicting nude women. It goes on to say that the Premier made some comments that this type of literature should not be made available to young people. Section 4 of the Children's Protection Act defines "obscene publication" as one giving special prominence to "criminal news, police reports, or accounts, stories or pictures of lust or crime, any drawing, picture, or written or printed matter of an indecent, obscene, or immoral nature." Section 11 states that any person who "sells, lends, or gives, or offers to sell, lend, or give to any child an obscene publication, shall be guilty of an offence against this Act and liable to imprisonment for any period not exceeding six months, and to a fine not exceeding £50." Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered prosecuting under this Act and whether he believes such prosecution could be successfully conducted so as to deal with the literature to which he referred in Canberra?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The particular publication to which I referred at the Loan Council meeting was printed in Sydney, and quite obviously no action could be taken in South Australia against a firm printing a publication there. It was registered for transmission through the post as a newspaper and, in fact, was posted as a newspaper to this State; therefore it is circulated through this State by means of the post office, over which

the State Government has no control. Obviously the only way to prevent the distribution of these publications is, firstly, uniform action by the States to see that they are not published in Australia and, secondly, ensuring Commonwealth co-operation to see that they are not distributed through the post. That was the decision arrived at by the Premiers. The Premier of New South Wales undertook, firstly, to go into the matter of publications emanating in his State, and, secondly, to call the States together for some joint action as soon as he evolved some suitable arrangement.

MUTTON AND LAMB EXPORT PRICES.

Mr. PEARSON—In a number of previous years the announcement of the export prices of mutton and lamb has been so long delayed that the season has been well advanced before producers have had any real indication what the prices would be. Can the Minister of Agriculture inform the House regarding the prices of these commodities for the export season about to commence?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I understand at present negotiations are being conducted in England with reference to prices of lamb and mutton—and possibly other meats—for the coming season, and I communicated with the Federal Minister for Commerce and Agriculture (Mr. McEwen) urging that as soon as the prices are known they be announced. The honourable member is right in saying that past delays in this matter have caused considerable confusion, not only in the minds of producers, but also in the minds of those dealing in these commodities, and it is essential that the announcement be made as early as possible. It would appear that this year we shall have a favourable lamb season and there should be considerably more lambs available for export than during the last two seasons. Consequently it would be advisable to spread the kill over a longer period. Producers would naturally take advantage of an earlier announcement of prices to market their lambs over a longer period than if the announcement had not been made.

LOCATION OF ATOMIC PILE.

Mr. McALEES—The Premier has stated that Fitzgerald Bay has been suggested as a site for the establishment of an atomic pile in this State, and given reasons for such a choice. The same qualifications are possessed by Wallaroo, and seeing that the matter has not yet been finalized, will he consider Wallaroo's claims in this respect?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will bear in mind the honourable member's observations with regard to Wallaroo, but I think the matter will ultimately depend on the extent to which the plant, when established in this State, will have to be isolated from centres of population. The plant I saw working in the United States of America was on Long Island and therefore fairly close to New York, a big centre of population, but I cannot say to what extent it is desirable to have a large plant of this nature associated with a centre of population. I will consider the honourable member's remarks if and when the question becomes one for decision.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD.

Mr. SHANNON—Much congestion still takes place on the main Mount Barker road. The proposed deviation from Burnside to the Saddles at Crafers is no longer practicable because of financial reasons, but I understand it has been suggested to the Highways Department that the existing road be widened at certain points to permit at least three lanes of traffic at those points. Can the Minister of Works say what progress is being made with this programme, and whether some instruction will be given to the Commissioner of Police as to the existing law of keeping as near as practicable to the left-hand side of the road in order that the maximum use may be made of such points when the widening has been carried out?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Immediately the Government received the report of the Traffic Committee relating to the widening and straightening of certain sections of the road to permit more rapid transport, the necessity for which has arisen largely from the use of the road by very long vehicles—many of them interstate, some intrastate, and some local buses—I took the matter to Cabinet, which approved of the widening of the road in certain places. Then I got in touch with the Commissioner of Highways, who accepted it as part and parcel of the general improvement of that road. The work will be proceeded with as soon as circumstances permit, having in mind that the Commissioner is already heavily committed with regard to other works. It is generally taken for granted that we have more money in our road fund than we can spend, but actually the reverse is the position as we have no surplus and the amount we receive by way of petrol tax today will not take care of the increased costs, plus the extra wear and tear on the road by the additional vehicles on the

road which yield us that small increase in revenue. Consequently, we are unable to indulge in any elaborate scheme of improvement or a heavier road programme. We shall be fortunate if we can maintain our roads in their present condition on our present revenue.

Mr. Shannon—There will be no widening, then, of the Mount Barker Road?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As circumstances permit, the Highways Commissioner will go ahead with that portion of it. I will take up with the Chief Secretary that point of the honourable member's question relating to police action.

Mr. Shannon—Distances between vehicles on the road, particularly long vehicles, is an important aspect.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes, and those phases I will take up with the Chief Secretary. I am not optimistic enough to believe that we can take men, materials, and money from other sources in order to facilitate perhaps more rapid transport, which can be done by other means, such as greater control of traffic. The two matters go together and have been accepted by the Government as a whole.

ADELAIDE RUBBISH DESTROYER.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to the question I asked on July 22 about the Adelaide rubbish destructor?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I told the honourable member that this was a matter under the control of the Adelaide City Council, and that I would ask for a reply for him. I took the matter up with the town clerk by letter on July 23, and the reply he has courteously furnished is as follows:—

In reply to your letter of the 23rd inst. regarding a question asked by Mr. Lawn, M.P., in respect to the refuse destructor, from the honourable member's question it would appear that he has been misinformed as no agreement has been entered into by the Adelaide City Council relative to this subject matter with the committee stated to have been formed.

In short, apparently the information given to the honourable member is not in keeping with the facts.

SUPERPHOSPHATE DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Today's *Advertiser* contains a report of the recommendations made by Mr. Gillespie, S.M., who recently conducted an inquiry into the distribution of superphosphate in South Australia. It states that the learned gentleman has suggested that superphosphate consumers should be given a voice on a committee controlling the allocation of the

tonnage production in each year. It went on to say that a cereal grower and a pastoralist should be selected by the Government to represent consumers. Has the Government considered Mr. Gillespie's suggestions and what steps, if any, are being taken to give effect to his recommendations?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. Gillespie's report will be laid before Parliament by the Minister of Agriculture today. The Government considered his recommendations in Cabinet yesterday, and decided that the Minister of Agriculture should take the necessary steps to implement them. It will be necessary for the Minister to secure the acceptance of the recommendations by the superphosphate companies. Mr. Gillespie does not recommend legislation if that can be achieved by agreement, which is the first step. Secondly, it will be necessary to get two suitable representatives to assist in the distribution of superphosphate in collaboration with the Government's nominee.

CUSTODY OF MONEY AT POLICE STATIONS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Last week I asked the Premier a question about money alleged to be missing from the Adelaide Police Station. I have now been informed that money has been discovered to be missing from another police station. Is it a fact that last week about £400 was discovered missing from a suburban police station? Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to institute an inquiry into the Police Commissioner's auditing system to prevent such scandals and preserve the honour of the Police Force in general?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I was absent from the State during the latter part of last week and I have not received any report from the Chief Secretary of a happening of the nature mentioned, but I will make inquiries and let the honourable member have a reply tomorrow.

BARLEY PRICES.

Mr. GOLDNEY—I understand that the decontrol of barley prices was discussed at the Prices Ministers' Conference in Brisbane last week. Has the Premier any information to give the House on this question?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I listed for consideration at the Brisbane conference the question of decontrolling the price of barley and informed the representatives of other States that South Australia had decided that this was necessary. We have found from investigation

that other States have exported large quantities of barley at world parities and have secured South Australian barley at lower prices to meet local consumption. One State last year exported 450,000 bushels of barley and imported from South Australia 479,000 bushels.

Mr. Pearson—It was Cape barley.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I realize there was a difference in the grade of the barley, but the system under which we are working at present is one that encourages the growth of inferior types of barley in other States. Secondly, it has come to the knowledge of the Prices Department that large interests in Australia have been buying up heavy quantities of barley. Under those circumstances I notified the other States that when I returned from the Prices Conference negotiations would be entered into with the Barley Board with the object of decontrolling the price, subject to the board's setting up an equitable method of distribution and price fixation in Australia. The Minister of Agriculture has already discussed the matter with the chairman of the Barley Board and preparatory action has been taken.

Mr. STEPHENS—Can the Premier say whether it is a fact that Australian first-grade barley is being sold to Japan at a cheaper rate than that paid for inferior-grade barley in this State, and, if so, why is such preference given to the Japanese people?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know the actual price of barley sold to Japan, so I cannot answer the question, but I know that over a long period the price of barley sold in Australia has been very much lower than world parity, and I believe that position still obtains.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—Japan pays about double the Australian home consumption price.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will get such information as I can on the overseas price today compared with that paid here.

BASIC WAGE ADJUSTMENTS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier any further information to give in reply to the question I asked last week about the publication of figures relating to periodical adjustments in the basic wage?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As the honourable member knows, the amount of information issued by the Statistician's Department in regard to this matter has been somewhat meagre. Detailed information is not supplied,

but at the recent Prices Conference I was able to secure some information on the matter. I find that my suggestion last week when answering this question that the rise in South Australian figures was probably substantially due to the legislation passed concerning rents was correct. There was an adjustment of rent in this State which had not taken place in any other State last quarter. From calculations made by one of my officers I am informed that the amount of that adjustment represented 1s. 2d. a week. The chief rises in the cost of living in South Australia were on account of food products and rent. I find that the total amount of the rise last quarter was 13s. 2d., but as the "C" series figures are taken by the court to the nearest shilling it was necessary to make an adjustment of 13s. There was a carry over from the previous quarter. I understand that the amount came to just above 6d., which brought the increase to 13s. I confess this is a most important matter to South Australia. I am not now saying what the rise should be, I am speaking in relation to the other States. Honourable members realize that many of our industries are dependent on the low cost of living in this State to enable them successfully to compete with the other States, from which they have to bring their raw materials and where largely their markets are located. I have some general figures here which I am prepared to supply to the honourable member, but personally I believe some investigation is necessary in this State with regard to relative costs in the other States, because I do not feel that the relativity between the States is at present correct. Only last week when an officer from South Australia had to go to New South Wales to take up duties there on behalf of this State it became necessary to obtain a house for him, which was provided through the good assistance of the New South Wales Government. However, he had to be provided with an additional £3 a week to enable him to live on a basis corresponding to that on which he lived in South Australia, but there is no margin provided comparable with that figure in the cost of living figures for the various States. However, the matter will be further examined.

RIVER MURRAY FLOODS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I have heard over the air that it is the intention of the Highways Department to transfer the large punt at the Berri crossing up to the crossing at Lyrup when the Berri crossing becomes flooded by the rising floodwaters of the River Murray.

Can the Minister of Local Government say whether it would be possible to have something similar done when the Kingston crossing is also under water and transfer the large punt from there down to the crossing at Waikerie? This would be of very great assistance to the travelling public. Also, will the Minister ascertain whether the approach to the Waikerie punt on the north side of the river can be made more direct and kept in a trafficable condition even despite the rising river?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The honourable member, having mentioned this matter before, I took the opportunity to discuss it with the Highways Commissioner. The reply is that if it appears likely that the punt at Waikerie will be in operation an appreciable time longer than the punt at Kingston a larger punt will be moved to Waikerie. Whether it will be the Kingston punt or another will depend on which punt needs reconditioning. This reconditioning is generally done during periods of high river. In either case, with a larger punt a duplication of cables will be involved, there being only one at the moment. An alteration of the landing stages would also be necessary, and other appreciable alterations, but that will not deter this job being undertaken if it is worthwhile. As regards the question of a higher approach at Waikerie, that has not been closely investigated, but it will be followed up to see if it is feasible to give a longer period of service. I was informed that last year we just scraped through, and it would appear that a higher level is likely this year, in which case perhaps, even with our best endeavours, the punt will be out of operation. In order to give service to the people in this area two highway reconstruction gangs are operating, one on the road between Berri and Barmera, and the other from Cobdogla to Overland Corner. Good progress is being made on the section between Berri and Barmera, and when that gang has finished the work there it will be moved on to complete the road, making it a really good highway in all conditions through from Morgan, obviating any great inconvenience to people on that side of the river. That was one of the recommendations made by the committee which investigated the matter, and the Government is giving full effect to that recommendation.

GUMMOSIS.

Mr. TEUSNER—For many years South Australian orchardists, particularly those in

the Barossa district, have been concerned with the prevalence and spread of gummosis die-back in orchards, particularly among apricots. Recently some evidence was established that this disease also spread to prunes. Following upon representations made by a deputation representative of fresh and dried fruit industries which I recently introduced to the Minister of Agriculture, it was pointed out that in many cases it was becoming uneconomic to grow apricots in view of the prevalence of this disease. It has been rumoured that the C.S.I.R.O. is withdrawing from this field of research. This body has carried out much research in past years, but no remedy has yet been found to overcome the disease. The Minister said that he would give serious consideration to the views of the deputation, which had requested among other things that there should be an intensification of the research. Is the Minister in a position to make a statement and can he say whether the C.S.I.R.O. proposes to withdraw from research in relation to this matter?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Following upon the excellent deputation introduced by the honourable member, which submitted a very strong case for the continuation of investigations into this disease, I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister controlling the C.S.I.R.O. (Mr. Casey) and urged that it should continue. This morning I received a reply to the effect that he had further discussed the matter with the C.S.I.R.O. It had pointed out that the C.S.I.R.O. had lost the services of a very valuable officer engaged on this research work, and owing to the difficulties of replacing him it has suggested that the work be done by the Waite Research Institute and the South Australian Department of Agriculture. In order that the Minister should be fully apprised of the situation here I sent a full report of the transcript of the deputation that waited on me. The concluding paragraph of his reply states:—

The C.S.I.R.O. is quite firmly of opinion that if the problem of gummosis is to be solved it will be dependent upon work done by your department and by the Waite Agricultural Research Institute which alone are in a position to offer any useful contribution.

It is as difficult for the Department of Agriculture in South Australia and the Waite Research Institute as for the C.S.I.R.O. to get a qualified officer to do this work, but in accordance with my reply to the deputation I will immediately take up the question with the Waite Institute with a view to seeing whether a suitable officer can be appointed

to carry out this research work, the importance of which is fully recognized by my department. Every possible step will be taken to ensure the carrying out of the research work previously carried out by the C.S.I.R.O.

MOUNT GAMBIER SAWMILL.

Mr. FLETCHER—Can the Minister of Afforestation say what is the position regarding the establishment of the Government sawmill at the Caves property, Mount Gambier, and what provision is being made to deal with the continued growth of production on Government forests in the Mount Gambier area?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Because of the curtailment of the loan programme we were unable to go on with the building of the big mill at Mount Gambier this year, towards the establishment of which we had hoped to do preliminary work; but that will not be possible. It is hoped that a small plant will be able to take up some of the slack and increase production from the Mount Gambier mill, which at present is producing about 100,000 super feet a week. We will transfer another small plant to that mill and increase the production for the time being, but that will still not take all the timber available, and we are at present investigating the advisability of letting out contracts to other mills and any other possible use for the timber which will be coming in from the thinnings now available in the forest.

APPOINTMENT OF AGENT-GENERAL.

Mr. DUNNAGE—It is a considerable time since Sir Charles McCann died, and nobody has been appointed to replace him as Agent-General in London. Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered such an appointment?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government has considered this matter and has appointed Mr. A. H. Greenham as Acting Agent-General. Only this morning I received from outside sources very eulogistic remarks on Mr. Greenham's work.

POLICE TRANSPORT.

Mr. RICHES—Apparently there is a shortage of transport in the Police Department and the work of some detectives engaged on urgent inquiries has thereby been hindered. I also understand that complaints have been received from country centres regarding this matter. Will the Premier inquire of the Chief Secretary whether the Police Department has sufficient transport to reasonably meet its needs, and, if

not, whether it will be obtained? Also, is the best use being made of available transport? It has also been reported to me that some vehicles have been taken home all night by officers engaged in driving instruction and that three police cars are engaged in special speed tests to Waikerie today, while transport is not available to detectives engaged on urgent business.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In recent years it has been the policy of the Government—a policy supported by the Commissioner of Police—to make the Police Department more mobile than in the past. The days when a police force could be stationary and immobile have gone and many motor vehicles have been bought, involving heavy expense, to provide a mobile force. That has already been accomplished and consequently the Police Force is better mobilized than ever before. In regard to the general administration of the department, I have no doubt that the Police Commissioner has considered the matters the honourable member has mentioned.

POTATO SUPPLIES AND PRICES.

Mr. SHANNON—Yesterday's *News* reported a statement alleged to have been made by the chairman of the Potato Board that any variation in the fixed price of potatoes would be detrimental to those growers that had played the game and stored potatoes as compared with other growers who, as he said, by "devious means" had secured the delivery of the whole of their crop to the market. There is undoubtedly a surplus of potatoes not only in South Australia but in Victoria and Tasmania. Both those States are seeking to sell some of their surplus in the same market as South Australia, namely New Zealand. I understand that the various potato boards are more optimistic about the position than some of the growers who have hundreds of tons stored in their sheds. I say, for the benefit of the press, I did not mention previously that there were rotten potatoes in growers' sheds. The fact is that growers are perturbed that they will have rotten potatoes in their sheds if they cannot clear them in the selling period. Potatoes do not keep indefinitely. Is it a fact that growers in the hills withheld their early potatoes in order that growers on the plains might quit the balance of their crops? At the conclusion of the year, when plains potatoes will be freely available, will growers on the plains co-operate similarly in order that hills growers may quit the balance

of this season's crop? Is the board powerless to prevent certain growers from quitting their potatoes by "devious means?"

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I must confess I had some difficulty in following the honourable member's question. However, as far as I can make out, it involves some criticism of the action of the Potato Board in its handling of the potato crop this year. Twelve months ago everybody was crying out for more potatoes. There was a shortage here and the growers said there would be a greater shortage this year because they were not going to plant potatoes as they could not get enough money for them. However, in spite of these protestations coming from Tasmania there have been some of the biggest crops ever as a result of a favourable season.

Mr. Shannon—They had the Lord on their side.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Exactly, and I do not know of anything better. The Potato Marketing Board is not a price-fixing but a regulating board and regulates supplies to the market as they can be absorbed. There have been considerable sales of potatoes to New Zealand; in fact, Tasmania has quitted a big tonnage to that country and it is hoped that we shall be able to sell from South Australia a reasonable tonnage either to the eastern States or to New Zealand. If that is possible, quantities in growers' hands or in stores will be considerably reduced. The potato position shows how easy it is to make plans, but how difficult it is to implement them. I am satisfied that if there were no regulatory board there would be a glut of potatoes and they would possibly be sold at greatly reduced prices, to the growers' detriment. The growers are considerably better off as a result of the operations of the board. If it came to a vote I believe the growers would decide by an overwhelming majority, as they did last time, to continue the operations of the board.

MOONTA BAY PRESSURE TANK.

Mr. McALEES—I have asked questions several times about the installation of a pressure tank at Moonta Bay. Can the Minister of Works say whether it will be installed by the coming summer?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Electricity Trust power lines have been moved from the site of the Moonta Bay tank and the levelling of the ground is in progress. The fabrication of the steel stand is nearing completion and

the erection of the tank and stand will commence in about four or five weeks. I should therefore imagine that the tank will be installed by next summer.

HOUSING TRUST EMERGENCY HOMES.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Premier a reply from the Housing Trust regarding its future policy in the allocation of temporary dwellings?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The chairman of the Housing Trust reports:—

The total programme under the Government Emergency Housing Scheme is for 2,261 dwellings. Of these, 1,895 have been completed and occupied. Of the 366 houses to be completed about 120 are intended for occupation by employees of the Engineering and Water Supply Department or the South Australian Harbours Board, and a considerable number of applicants have already been approved for inclusion in the remaining houses. So far, from the applications received for these houses the living conditions of about 5,500 have been investigated by personal visit and among these are many who are in need of housing. Applications are still being received at the rate of about 200 per month, but it is obviously impracticable to interview or inspect the living conditions of all these applicants in view of the limited number of houses remaining to be allotted. Where it is clear that the housing need of an applicant is particularly urgent or there are other special circumstances, the applicant will be interviewed or his present living conditions inspected. However, as the building under this scheme is nearing a close it is obvious that the trust cannot select as tenants all who are in need of housing. It is the view of the trust that the Government Emergency Housing Scheme has proved eminently successful in providing speedily a considerable number of dwellings which have alleviated the needs of a large number of people, but the trust is also of opinion that there should be a limit placed upon the numbers of these dwellings to be erected and that the programme should not be further extended.

SULPHURIC ACID PLANT.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—

1. Is the Treasurer aware that residents of Le Fevre Peninsula are resisting the proposed construction of an acid plant adjacent to Snowden's Beach, being fearful of sulphur emission which could have a detrimental effect on residents, homes, and plant life?

2. Would he consider recommending to the sponsors of the project that the acid plant be erected on the eastern side of the Port River, which section has been set aside as an industrial area in accordance with the harbour development scheme?

3. Could the Port Adelaide City Council reject a building application for this plant on the proposed site at Snowden's Beach?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Chief Inspector of Factories reports:—

I wish to report having interviewed Mr. H. W. Lyons, managing director of Cresco Fertilisers Limited, who is also chairman of directors of Sulphuric Acid Limited, together with Mr. C. A. Abbott, the works manager for Cresco Fertilisers Limited. A factory for the production of sulphuric acid is to be built by Sulphuric Acid Limited on a 40-acre block of land on the western side of the Port River adjacent to Snowden's Beach. Mr. Lyons assured me that the possibility of building on the eastern side of the river has been fully explored, but nothing suitable for their purpose being there, it was decided to accept the only suitable and available area on the western side. The contractor responsible for the design, construction, and installation of the entire plant is Simon Carves Limited, an enormous British organization of civil, mechanical, and electrical engineers, possessing extensive research and development laboratories for chemical and other industrial engineering plants, and with a world-wide experience in establishing sulphuric acid plants. Messrs. Lyons and Abbott were both very definite in their statements that no sulphur or other dusts will be emitted, and, after having examined the plans and specifications for the plant, including the means for the elimination of dust, I am satisfied that residents have no valid reason to be fearful of sulphur emission which could have a detrimental effect on them, their homes, and/or any plant life. On the 24th instant, I interviewed Mr. Upton, town clerk of Port Adelaide, who stated that a number of written and oral complaints *re* the proposal to establish this factory had been received by the corporation from individuals only. Mr. Upton had received advice that the council cannot prevent the establishment of this factory if the erection of the building is in compliance with the Building Act. The town clerk would be very grateful if the Honourable the Minister made a public statement on this matter, to allay the doubts in the minds of residents in the vicinity.

I may add that the Health Department concurs in this view.

TAPEROO PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—In view of considerable housing expansion in Largs North area, can the Minister of Works indicate when it is proposed to commence construction of a primary school at Taperoo?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—It was proposed to establish a permanent new primary school at Taperoo and to build this in brick. Unfortunately this proposal has had to be deferred owing to the present financial position. In order to meet the educational needs of the district it is proposed to establish a primary

school at Taperoo using prefabricated wooden classrooms, and it is expected that work on this school will begin in the near future.

ELECTRICITY TRUST LOAN.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (on notice)—

1. Who were the underwriters for the last Electricity Trust loan?
2. What were the financial arrangements made between the trust and the underwriters?
3. What sum was paid to the underwriters?
4. Did the underwriters pay the costs of advertising?
5. Did the floating of the loan cost the trust any amount other than the underwriters' commission? If so, what amount?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The chairman of the Electricity Trust of South Australia reports:—

1. Cutten and Harvey, sharebrokers, of Adelaide, and Ian Potter and Company, share-brokers, of Melbourne.

2, 3, 4, and 5. A contract was made between the Electricity Trust and the underwriters after consideration of offers for underwriting which had been made to the trust by two groups of underwriters. The conditions of the contract accepted were financially the more favourable to the trust. It is not the policy of the Government to make available terms and conditions of contracts, especially where there is competition for the business. Under these circumstances I believe it to be in the best interests of the State not to make these conditions public as the trust will be seeking further offers for underwriting later in the year.

UNEMPLOYED PERSONS.

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—

1. How many persons were registered as unemployed in South Australia on February 25, 1952?
2. How many on July 25, 1952?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. At February 25, 1952, four persons were in receipt of unemployment benefit, whilst 1,613 persons were registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service as unemployed and still waiting placement.

2. At July 25, 1952, 315 persons were in receipt of unemployment benefit, whilst 2,146 persons were registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service as unemployed and still waiting placement.

It is pointed out that these figures do not necessarily indicate correctly the number out of work on the dates in question. Some may have obtained employment by their own efforts between the date of registering with the Commonwealth Employment Service, and the dates

mentioned, and not had sufficient time to notify the Employment Service. Others may have neglected to notify jobs secured. This information was supplied by the Regional Director, Commonwealth Employment Service.

CONVERSION OF RESIDENCES TO FACTORIES.

Mr. LAWN (on notice)—

1. How many houses and/or residential establishments in the City of Adelaide have been converted to factories and storerooms during the past two years?
2. How many are withheld from use as residences so as to be available for future conversion to factories or storerooms?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Permits under the Building Materials Act to demolish dwelling-houses, or to make alterations to houses which would render them uninhabitable as dwellings, have been issued in very few cases and then only if—(a) the house was unoccupied; and (b) the house was sub-standard, or there was some other very good reason. Although the precise number is not available without a great deal of research, the approximate number of approvals granted is three.

BASIC WAGE INCREASE.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke, for Mr. DUNKS (on notice)—

1. How many State public servants and other Government employees in South Australia will receive the basic wage increase of 13s. a week after the first pay day in August?
2. What will be the extra cost a week to the Government?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. 26,300 male employees and 5,900 female employees of the Government (including railway employees) will receive the increase in the basic or living wage in August. The increase for females is 10s. per week. The increase for the majority of railway employees is 12s. per week for males, and 9s. per week for females.

2. The direct cost is £20,600 per week.

OPERATIONS OF A COMPANY PROMOTER.

Mr. MOIR (on notice)—

1. Is the Treasurer aware that—(a) a company promoter, now on remand in New South Wales for 25 charges of failing to retain money in trust pending allotment of shares, is now operating in Adelaide; and (b) this man,

assisted by his son, who claims to be an expert mining engineer, has already received about £100,000 from the people in South Australia, and is still busily engaged in these operations?

2. What protection is afforded investors, when a member of the Stock Exchange is permitted to actively associate with a man with such a reputation and assist him to float companies in South Australia?

3. Is the Registrar of Companies aware of the past and present operations of this man?

4. Has the Registrar of Companies power to stop his activities and protect the public from him and his associates?

5. If not, is it the intention of the Attorney-General to take immediate action to stop these operations and to institute an urgent inquiry into the activities of this man, his son, and their close co-operators and the syndicates and companies concerned in order to ascertain what has become of investors' money and whether any charges are warranted?

6. Is the Attorney-General aware that the nine companies formed through this agency are—(a) situated in several States; (b) that the names of the directors for each company are identical in most instances; (c) that with only one exception no shareholders' meetings have been held; and (d) a large number of bewildered shareholders are striving to get some means of finding out what has happened to their money and obtain protective action by the authorities?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. (a) Assuming that George McDonald is identical with George Alexander Johnston McDonald, it is believed that he is now on remand in New South Wales on 25 charges of failing to retain money in trust pending allotment of shares, and is the same person who is now operating in South Australia in promoting the following mining companies, viz.:—New Metals (Aust.) Limited, Blue Bar Wolfram No Liability, Hartigan Tin No Liability, Cooke's Creek Wolfram No Liability, Western Wolfram No Liability, Western Shaw Gold No Liability, and Wentani Wolfram No Liability. (b) There is evidence that some of these companies are raising capital in South Australia. It is believed that at least £30,000 has been raised.

2. The committee of the Stock Exchange has no power to discipline its members who assist in flotation of companies. If the committee has evidence that any company is dishonest it may remove its name from its list.

3. Yes. Complaints have been made by various people against McDonald, but when the complainants were referred to the police they have failed to take the matter up with the police. The Registrar is aware of the fact that McDonald had assisted in forming the abovementioned companies, but is unaware of any breach of the Companies Act.

4. Where sufficient reliable evidence is obtainable, showing a breach of the Companies Act, or of any other offence, prosecutions can be launched.

5. There is ample machinery in sections 156-8 of the Companies Act for any shareholder to obtain an investigation of a company's affairs. There is also power under section 158 (a) for the Attorney-General to recommend to the Governor the appointment of the Auditor-General as an investigator, but that power can only be used where certain evidence is available.

6. The Attorney-General is aware of only seven companies formed in South Australia as previously stated. (a) They are registered in South Australia, but the leases concerned are in Western Australia. (b) Yes—substantially. (c) All meetings required by the Companies Act have been held. (d) The Attorney-General is unaware of complaints by any large number of shareholders. Some complaints have been made as previously mentioned.

SWINE COMPENSATION FUND.

Mr. MICHAEL (on notice)—

1. What was the income of the Swine Compensation Fund for the year ended June 30, 1952?

2. What was the expenditure from the fund during the same period?

3. What amount was standing to the credit of the fund on June 30, 1952?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The replies are:—

1. £15,213 3s. 1d.

2. £10,885 8s. 11d.

3. £56,242 0s. 6d.

NORTH SALISBURY SEWERAGE.

Mr. GOLDNEY (on notice)—What provision is being made for the sewerage of houses being built by the Housing Trust at North Salisbury?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—A sewerage scheme was designed for Salisbury some time ago, but the extensive developments in this town, either in progress or proposed, have meant a complete review of the proposals to embrace all residential parts of the town, including the Housing Trust area at North Salisbury. The estimated cost of the scheme is now

well in excess of £30,000 and, therefore, reference to the Public Works Standing Committee will be necessary.

HOUSING TRUST AND SECOND MORTGAGES.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (on notice)—

1. Does the Government approve and encourage the Housing Trust's investing portion of its capital on the security of second mortgages on properties erected and sold by the trust?

2. What are the relative aggregate amounts invested by the trust on the security of second mortgages during the year ended June 30, 1951, and June 30, 1952?

3. What is the average rate of interest charged on such loans on second mortgage?

4. Is the trust having difficulty in selling its houses for cash?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. The Government approves of what is being done by the Housing Trust to finance purchasers by means of a second mortgage for a small proportion of the purchase price.

2. For the year ended June 30, 1951, nil; for the year ended June 30, 1952, £17,205.

3. 4½ per centum.

4. Many of the purchasers of Housing Trust houses are able to finance the purchase of houses without the help of a second mortgage from the trust. In some instances, however, deserving applicants who applied several years ago, and who are able to pay deposits of substantial amounts, are still unable to finance the purchase of a house without the aid of the trust given under second mortgage.

MANNUM TO ADELAIDE PIPELINE.

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—

1. What is the estimated total expenditure on the Mannum to Adelaide pipeline project?

2. What expenditure has been incurred up to the present?

3. What was the maximum number ever directly employed on the project?

4. What is the number now employed?

5. When will the scheme be completed?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. With the continually rising wages bill and the necessity to import large quantities of steel, it is now estimated that the scheme will cost approximately £7,000,000.

2. £2,061,000.

3. 328.

4. 310. The first number included men working on construction of camps and houses which, of course, is non-recurring. A great number of men are indirectly employed by contractors fabricating pipes and manufacturing pumps, large valves, etc.

5. This is dependent upon many factors mostly outside the control of the Government, such as supply of materials and availability of loan funds, etc., and in a project of this magnitude it is not possible at this stage to forecast a date for its completion, but it will proceed with all possible expedition, being grouped with the State's works of highest priority.

ACCIDENTS AT CROSSINGS.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (on notice)—In view of the deplorable railway crossing accident at Parafield on July 23, and other recent crossing accidents, what steps are being taken to safeguard life, not only at obviously dangerous crossings, but at crossings which become dangerous through weather conditions, fogs, or glaring sunshine?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

So far as protected level crossings are concerned, South Australia has probably more automatic protected crossings than any other State and has been the first to introduce the new automatic gates which are operating so successfully at Ovingham and Croydon. Twenty sets of these gates have now been delivered and will be installed in due course. The fundamental problem is the greatly increased amount of road traffic and the real remedy is more care on the part of drivers. Only this morning, July 25, at Pooraka, where we have fully manned double gates, together with flasher lights, a motorist ran clean through the gates. The number of people killed at level crossings last financial year was eight, whereas on the roads generally, 172 persons were killed. Incidentally, so far as railway passengers are concerned, in the last 30 years only two have lost their lives. Where crossings are open, and there is good visibility along the track, it would be an advantage in many places to instal "Stop" signs, and it is proposed to increase the use of such, but I would point out that many local councils object to their use. So far as "weather conditions, fogs, or glaring sunshine" is concerned, these disabilities apply to motorists both on the open road and when crossing railway tracks, and it is well-known that when foggy and wet conditions and misty rain occur, accidents are at a maximum, particularly at week ends.

ALLOTMENT OF BLOCKS TO EX-SERVICEMEN.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (on notice)—

1. How many returned soldier applicants for land are still awaiting allotment of land?
2. Is the Government satisfied that sufficient land will be available for all approved applicants?
3. When does the Government anticipate that all approved applicants will be offered land, or if there is not sufficient land for all, the unsuccessful applicants be informed that there will be no land for them?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The replies are:—

1. 783 dry lands; 199 irrigation.
2. On present indications, it appears that despite all endeavours to obtain land, the area of "dry" lands available will not be sufficient to meet the requirements of all applicants, but the Government is continuing its efforts to secure additional suitable land. As regards irrigation lands, an application has been made to the Commonwealth for an increased planting allocation for South Australia. In the event of this being granted, it is hoped that all irrigation applicants will be settled.
3. Following requests by ex-servicemen's organizations some 450 dry lands applicants were informed in February last that because of the shortage of land, no guarantee could be given that they would ultimately be allotted a block under the scheme, although every endeavour would be made to secure land for them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. SIR ROBERT NICHOLLS.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

That three months' leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Young (The Hon. Sir Robert D. Nicholls, Speaker) on account of absence from the State on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES AND DEPUTY SPEAKER.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

That the honourable member for Eyre (Mr. Christian) be Acting Chairman of Committees of the whole House so long as the Chairman of Committees shall be acting as Speaker, and in the absence of the Speaker and of the Chairman of Committees he take the chair as Deputy Speaker. The Acting Chairman of Committees shall, while acting as Deputy Speaker or as Chairman of Committees, perform the duties and exercise the authority of the Speaker or of the Chairman of Committees,

as the case may be, in relation to all proceedings of the House or of any Committee. Provided that, if the House shall adjourn for more than twenty-four hours, the Acting Chairman shall continue to perform the duties and exercise the authority of the Speaker for twenty-four hours only after such adjournment.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption of Address in Reply.

(Continued from July 24. Page 121.)

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—As a new member I rise with some diffidence to speak, but I find some consolation when I realize in looking round the House that all members, old or young, had at some time to undergo the same ordeal. I am honoured to be a member, but that feeling is tinged with sadness at the thought that my presence is due to the death of my dear friend, the late Mr. Les Duncan. Both inside and outside the House I have heard many tributes to his work, and even the Governor on the eve of his departure spoke to me in tones of warmest regard of our late friend. Mr. Duncan was in this House for nearly 14 years. Earlier he had edited the *Gawler Buntyp*, one of the finest country newspapers in South Australia, and during the war he returned to edit that paper while the owner's son was away in one of the services. I regret Mr. Duncan's death and will try to hold the torch he carried. He was a grand man who did his best for his party, for the Parliament in which he sat, for the district he served, and for the State in which he lived. I am proud of the vote of confidence given at the recent by-election to the Party I represent.

A few remarks are necessary regarding the by-election campaign in Gawler, during which my Party asked the electors three plain questions and received a definite answer. At each meeting my fellow speakers and I asked the electors what they thought of so-called Liberalism, both Federal and State, and stressed the fact that it was part and parcel of the same thing, whatever names the parties had gone by in the past and whatever names they would bear in the future. The electors answered that question by more than doubling the previous Labor majority. Secondly, my colleagues and I wanted to know whether the electors favoured our present unjust, unfair and undemocratic franchise law with regard to both Houses of this Parliament. In this House 13 members represent about 272,000

people and 26 represent about 168,000, and there is a restricted franchise in regard to another place. I told the electors that it had always amazed me—and it always will amaze me—that a country such as ours, which had fought for democracy in two bloody world wars, continued to bear such a situation as this. Again, the answer of the electors was to more than double the previous Labor majority. Thirdly, we asked the electors what they thought of the so-called “satellite town” scheme and again received the same answer.

I do not claim that there was anything sensational in winning the Gawler by-election, for after all Mr. Duncan had held it for Labor for 14 years, but I was an entirely new candidate, whereas Mr. Duncan had been an established man with a high record of service both in Parliament and in his district; yet my Party more than doubled its previous majority—a definite rebuff to the Government in general and to the Premier in particular. I trust that I will not be considered impertinent—although I shall not be greatly concerned if I am—when I suggest that the cunning personal letter sent out as a final trump card by the Premier, designed to appear as if it had been written by his hand, was a type of propaganda below the dignity of even a Liberal Premier. On the day of the by-election one dear old lady entered a Gawler polling booth, and the poll clerk had some difficulty in finding her name as it was on a supplementary roll. The lady said “My name must be on the roll and the Premier must know about me, for he wrote to me and asked me to vote.” The answer to that letter was a personal rebuff to the Premier, and it did more harm than good. Although the Premier made many personal appearances during the campaign the election result was evidence of the opinion of electors regarding the so-called “Liberal” Party. I am not decrying the tactics of my opponent, who is a fine man standing high in my regard, but I decry the dishonesty, if I may call it so, of some of the political tactics adopted in this campaign.

It has been said that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Early in the campaign the Labor Party printed pamphlets to explain our policy to the electors. Some weeks later the Liberal Party produced a similar pamphlet printed in blue ink, but, whereas we used the full four pages of our pamphlet to define our policy, the Liberal pamphlet used only three pages, leaving

the last one blank—possibly for promises to be fulfilled. The pamphlet was headed, “Facts which You should Consider as a Thinking Elector.” As thinking members of this House no doubt the pamphlet would be of value to us as well. Firstly, there was the old, old cry “He was freely selected by Gawler citizens, not by a group controlled from Adelaide and which may care little for the interests of Gawler.” These Gawler citizens were a small minority of the citizens of Gawler representing the local Liberal and Country Party branch. Certainly my selection was made in Adelaide. Six persons were nominated for selection as the Labor candidate, three being from Gawler, and those three received 97 per cent of the votes cast. That shows how little interest was displayed in the candidates that did not come from Gawler.

The second point in the pamphlet was the same old story once more:—

He did not have to sign an oath binding him to any Socialist or other programme. Like all L.C.L. candidates he is free to vote as he thinks best in your interests. He is not under domination of Party bosses.

I have not yet had much experience in this House, but I have read *Hansard* regularly for years, and have noticed how members opposite vote when the whip is cracked. Some Liberal members, to put it mildly, were not very keen on the proposed satellite town near Salisbury, but when the vote was taken it was a different story. That is an example of the freedom of will shown by Liberal and Country Party members. The next point in the pamphlet is a jewel beyond price—“As a member of a progressive Government he can naturally do more for you than if he were in opposition to that Government.” I thought of this recently when the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that it had been suggested in his district that because he happened to be Leader of the Opposition people in his district did not get treatment as favourable as they should have received. The inference to be gleaned from that statement in the pamphlet is that if the citizens of Gawler elected a Liberal candidate they would get more for their district. There may be something in that, although I would hate to think such a thing of any Government. The statement goes on, “He will support and work for more houses.” What Parliamentary worth his salt would not support and work for more houses? Since I came here I have spent much of my time trying to get houses for some of my electors, and some of my colleagues representing city districts are kept much busier than I in trying to achieve the same object. I applaud

the activities of the Housing Trust, but there are still many people urgently in need of houses.

Believe it or not, the pamphlet next stated, "He will support and work for an efficient fire brigade." This was an insulting reference to the work of the Gawler Council. Gawler already has an efficient fire brigade. The council, because of financial obligations, most reluctantly and against its principles, was forced to entertain the idea of changing the type of brigade. If the Government supplied a fair amount to councils for the upkeep of fire brigades no such change would have to be considered. The pamphlet then referred to new industries for Gawler. The late Mr. Les Duncan, immediately after his election, said to me that if there was one thing he would do in Parliament it would be to work for more industries for Gawler. He struggled with that end in view for 14 years without much success. If my opponent at the elections had been elected apparently there would have been some hope of new industries for Gawler. The pamphlet also mentions a modern sewerage system for the town. The citizens have been asking for such a system for years, but I understand that the proposition has not yet been dealt with by the Public Works Committee. The pamphlet promised many things, but their slogan "Performances, not Promises," surely should have been the other way round. The only promise not mentioned for Gawler was of a deep sea port at Smithfield or Sandy Creek!—perhaps because there is no coastline in my electorate. Despite the statements in the pamphlet, which came very close to political dishonesty, the Labor majority was more than doubled.

When the result of the election was announced a large section of the press tried to give the impression that the Labor Party won the seat not because of any unpopularity of the Government, but because of Labor opposition to the satellite town scheme and because of a strong personal vote in my favour; but, in the first place our greatest increase in votes was in country areas in which the satellite town scheme would mean very little, and secondly, surely nobody can believe that an untried man such as myself could have an enormous personal following. One prominent citizen in Adelaide told me a few weeks ago that he liked to think that the result in Gawler was a 90 per cent personal vote for me. I am not a wonder: members have probably realized that already. If any candidate could get a personal vote of 90 per cent he would be another Winston Churchill. My Party said of

the satellite town scheme that the expense of providing public amenities such as roads, water, and sewerage was not warranted, seeing that these facilities already exist in or are proposed for other country towns. Secondly, we quoted the Premier's words uttered in this House in 1950, when he spoke of "a separate, self-contained urban area with its own corporate existence and in time its own traditions." Other towns, such as Gawler, have that now. Tradition is a natural growth: it is not something that comes with turning on a tap. Some towns never acquire a tradition. Thirdly, we said the satellite town scheme would result in the use for building of some of the finest agricultural land in the State. Surely that is self-evident. Already thousands of acres of good land near Gawler are covered by an explosive works. I know these works are a necessity, but we should not use any more arable land for building satellite towns. Fourthly, we said that greater production is required, not less. Our safe rainfall areas are limited; we should try to extend the areas under agriculture. The drift to the city so ably explained by the Leader of the Opposition is a damning indictment of this Government. Fifthly, it is hard enough to attract industries to towns already in existence. I mentioned how Mr. Duncan tried to attract industries to Gawler. A Greater Gawler Committee is now trying to establish more industries in Gawler. It is not a political committee, but is a body representing every section of the community.

I am very proud of the support given by my Party, and as a new member I should like to give a brief declaration of faith. I am a Christian and a Labor man by birth and inclination, and I believe the two things go together. I am proud of my Party, because I believe it really tries to carry out the sublime principles of the Sermon on the Mount, and shall always be proud of that Party. I believe that only by the open acknowledgment of the Christian spirit can this world be dragged out of its present chaos. I am firm in my opposition to the outworn political doctrines which I believe are ruining the nation. I believe in Party government; I believe it is our only bulwark against Fascism, Capitalism, and Communism. Unfortunately, we still have Communism with us. I hate and detest the godless dogmas of this faith. I believe it is a doctrine of decay and atheism. I commend to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and to other members, a book which is well worth reading, by Douglas Hyde—*I Believed*. It deals with the horrible doctrines of Communism. Hyde was a prominent

Communist who realized after many years in the movement that Christianity and Communism do not mix, and he chose Christianity. His book gives a startling picture of what Communism means to the ordinary citizen.

I express appreciation of the welcome and help given to me by members on both sides since I came into Parliament. I particularly mention the Speaker, who has done everything possible to make me feel at home. I also thank all members who helped to get me elected to Parliament—those on this side who helped me directly and those on the other side who helped me indirectly. I have already realized that bitterness and a certain amount of fight in debate need not necessarily be carried beyond this Chamber; also that the lot of an Opposition member is not always easy. The very first question I asked in this House received a reply which I consider a masterpiece of evasion. There is some consolation in the fact that thousands of people in the State believe the life of the present Opposition will be short and that before long it will be in office and on the Government benches.

I join with other honourable members in mourning the death of our late beloved King. Despite the troublous times in which he lived he maintained that wonderful link of monarchy and kingship within the great British Commonwealth of Nations, and I know that that same spirit will continue. I am proud to be living in the new Elizabethan era. I suppose we can all remember that last noble Queen of England, who began to rule as a mere girl, the great Queen Victoria. We hope that the reign of our present young queen will be as great as hers. It has frequently been said that the first Elizabethan era was one of the greatest in England's history. It was notable for men like Shakespeare, for explorers, for soldiers and sailors and also for statesmen like Walsingham and Burleigh, who guided England through a very dangerous time. I believe that in this new Elizabethan era we have great statesmen waiting to govern in the same tradition and that this period will also be famous for its statesmanship. In the first Elizabethan period England faced the menace of Spain and of imperialism—not atheism—but in these days we face the menace of Fascism and Communism.

I regret that Sir Willoughby Norrie and Lady Norrie have left our State. They proved immensely popular and able. We are very fortunate in having a Deputy Governor with the ability of Sir Mellis Napier to carry on in the Governor's place. When I criticize

anything in this Address in Reply debate I want it to be understood that I am not in any way criticising the Lieutenant-Governor, but the policy the Government formulated in his Address. In his Speech the Lieutenant-Governor referred to the curtailment of the State's programme of public works because of the loan position. The reason is not far to find. It is lack of faith in the Federal Government and that will always mean the failure of our loan flotations. We have only to remember the wartime loans raised when we had a Federal Government in power in whom the people had faith. We then had very little difficulty in filling loans to carry on the bulk of our war effort. I favour uniform taxation. I believe the question should be considered of a greatly increased percentage of taxation money being allotted to the States so that the State Governments may know the depth of their purse and plan accordingly, as a private individual does.

As regards loan money allotments, the States have recently not been treated as well as when the revered Ben Chifley was in office. We cannot expect always to have a Prime Minister with the feeling for State Governments that this great man had. In his Speech the Lieutenant-Governor stated, "Waste and confusion occur if plant and materials are delivered at a time when operations cannot be proceeded with." We already have examples of that; for instance, the South Para reservoir project, where only 39 men remain out of a total of 120, the others having been diverted to other works. We know that much money has already been spent there. There is the possibility of a deterioration in the plant and equipment, and also of further unemployment. Already, as was indicated in the reply to a question today from the member for Hindmarsh, the gaunt, grey wolf of unemployment is stalking this land. I do not intend to be pessimistic. When men come to me looking for work, I have vivid memories of the depression which overtook this country in the thirties; and I do not believe the people will put up with another such depression. We must take every step to avoid it. I believe we are now suffering from having blindly followed a Federal Government which has proved itself absolutely incapable of governing. It has lost the confidence of the people. It is unable to fill its loans at a time when savings bank deposits are very high. People do not lend to those they do not trust, and the same applies to Governments. I again remind members of the war-time Labor Government which held the confidence of the people. Then

came an election and thousands of people sold their birthright for a gallon or two of petrol and a little more child endowment. However, I do not think they will ever be caught that way again.

The Lieutenant-Governor also stated, "While some economic adjustments now appear inevitable they may well be followed by a sustained period of stable and prosperous economic conditions." I wonder just what adjustments they will be. We have heard some unsatisfactory replies to questions about the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. I do not think the Government has any idea of what those adjustments will be. I think the second part of the Lieutenant-Governor's statement is an amazing one—"may well be followed by a sustained period of stable and prosperous economic conditions." How on earth does anyone know? Perhaps it is a forecast of the period which must follow of Labor rule in the Federal and South Australian spheres, although I do not think it was intended to mean that. What a mighty job they will have when they start! The Lieutenant-Governor also said, "Labor is becoming more freely available." Surely everyone realizes why. Recently for a certain Government job 67 persons offered, whereas for a job 12 months ago it received only one application. Labour is becoming more freely available because many more people are out of work.

The Lieutenant-Governor also remarked, "State railways are carrying out a noteworthy programme." I agree, and pay a tribute to our railwaymen, who are doing a very fine job. However, some things in the Railways Department give us cause for concern. Although Gawler is reasonably well served with trains, the local people think that there should be a quicker service. Many of my constituents would like to see a train provided between 6.17 p.m. and 9.55 p.m., particularly as many young people come down to Adelaide to do night work at the School of Mines and apprentice work and would like to return within reasonable time. I am sure that position will be remedied. The other day the Leader of the Opposition raised the question of having the wrong kind of representative in Parliament and related this to the question of getting work done in the district. This reminded me of what was said during the by-election campaign when I was at Wasleys. One gentleman said to me, "It seems very funny that districts like Kapunda and Barossa can have daily trains to enable people to go to and from work, whereas places like Wasleys and

Hamley Bridge can't. This means that many young men and women have to live away from their homes for the whole of the week." I am not suggesting that they do not get these trains because their representative is not a member of the Government Party, but this was suggested to me. The Lieutenant-Governor also mentioned the proposed electrification of suburban railways, but as usual we do not hear very much about the electrification of country railways. One can imagine the kind of trip that would be available to Gawler and beyond if that line were electrified; and yet occasionally we hear the Government talking of decentralization. "The Highways Department has itself carried out a substantial programme of maintenance and reconstruction of arterial highways and of providing roads for newly developed rural settlements for residential areas opened up by the Housing Trust." I applaud those comments in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, but I feel that more should be done in Housing Trust areas to provide roads and footpaths. The provision of these amenities by the local councils is a big drain on their finances, and many of them are finding it very hard to meet this additional expense.

I should like to hear from the Government something about the proposed widening of the Gawler Road. Night trotting will soon start at Gawler and many of the local people, particularly those at Smithfield, whether interested in trotting or not, are concerned about what might happen on this road because of the heavy motor traffic. One man at Smithfield is building a store, garage and post office and about 12ft. of his land has been purchased by the Government for widening the road. He is very concerned about the position and is wondering whether he will be expected to pay the cost of all piping, and drains in and out to this business. He feels that the part bought by the Government should be its responsibility. Another paragraph of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech deals with a remarkable discovery: it relates that the Government has located additional coal bearing areas at Moorlands. What a performance! Although we have been hearing about Moorlands coal for 50 years, suddenly we hear about it in this way again. Perhaps some wise Prime Minister like the revered Ben Chifley will make money available to the State for the development of this field, as he did for the development of Leigh Creek. If so, I wonder who will get the credit for it.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech also mentioned that the population in our schools was increasing. Children are the finest type of

migrant we can get in the State. I am also happy to hear that more schools are being built, although I note the absence of any reference to the supply of teachers. Surely the Government does not imagine that, as happened in a previous period of unemployment, young men and women will flock to the Teachers College for safe employment!

Paragraph 28 of His Excellency's Speech stated that freedom from price control was to the advantage of the public, but I submit that it is not. Recently I saw a list of about 700 articles showing their prices before the relaxation of controls and now, and in every case the price had increased since the lifting of control. I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion, who tried exceedingly hard to bolster up a weak case, for which they have my sympathy. The honourable member for Burnside delivered a carefully prepared speech, and I could not but admire the facility with which he set up arguments and then knocked them down. Like the honourable member for Onkaparinga, he appeared to advocate another new and more complicated form of uniform taxation. I was surprised to find that I entirely agreed with many of the statements by the member for Mitcham. For instance, he said that private industries and Governments have made too much use of loans. I was delighted to hear him support decentralisation, and agree with the policy of setting up new industries and expanding old ones in country towns—a policy that has always been advocated by my Party. I suggest that a town such as Gawler, nearer the city than Murray Bridge, be used for the experiment he mentioned, for Gawler has everything except sewerage, and some day it may get that. The Institute of Architects in Adelaide has set its students the assignment of preparing a plan for a projected town of 20,000 inhabitants in Gawler, so I am not alone in my great dreams for that town. I was both delighted and amazed to find that much of what the member for Mitcham had to say was Labor policy. The member for Flinders made a good speech, but I find that I cannot agree with any of it, for it contained too much of the old biased material based on the "Don't work hard for the boss's benefit" nonsense—a type of utterance that is designed to stir up trouble. Much was said about the United States, and I wondered whether such utterances could have had anything to do with the proposed development of uranium resources. I was reminded of a story recently told me by the Honourable Norman Makin, former Ambassador to the U.S.A., whose wife

went into a shop to buy darning needles. The female shop assistant was astounded at Mrs. Makin's request, and Mrs. Makin learned that women in America did not darn socks, but bought new ones. That may be one of the reasons for their high sales figures, but it indicates a practice which I do not think should be adopted here. I was amazed to hear the member for Flinders speak of social services, first as progress and later as a means "to bolster the thriftless and protect the indolent"—surely contradictory statements.

The gradual growth of social services in this country will cause these years to be favourably remembered in history yet to be written. All historical reforms have been accompanied by frantic warnings of doom and decay, but these have not eventuated. Surely it must be recognized that we are gradually giving to all, with the exception of the old age pensioners who are still shockingly treated, the opportunity to lead a life worthy of human beings. While this opportunity was needlessly confined to a minority, many conditions praised as freedom should have been denounced as privilege. Any action which causes such opportunities to be more widely spread is therefore doubly blessed. Such opportunities not only subtract from inequality, but add to freedom, and surely in a democracy every man, woman and child, as part of his birthright, should be free. I support the motion.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—I join with His Excellency and speakers in this House in expressing my great sympathy and sense of loss in the death of our late King George VI., and add my humble tribute to the words of the Address in which we affirm our unswerving loyalty and devotion to the person and throne of Queen Elizabeth II. I joint with other speakers in their praise of Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie. We in South Australia have always been highly blessed in our Governors, and possibly no former Governor occupied such a high place in the affection of South Australians as Sir Willoughby. I also join in expressing my regret at the death of Mr. Les. Duncan, who during all the years he served in this House said nothing to which anyone could take personal exception. With his passing every member has lost a dear personal friend. I welcome to this House the honourable member for Gawler who has just resumed his seat, and sincerely congratulate him on his maiden speech. I suppose every member can remember the fear and trepidation with which he looked forward to his first speech in this

House, and, even if we cannot always agree with what Mr. Clark says, we must agree that he will be a decided acquisition to his Party.

The member for Onkaparinga very rightly devoted much attention to the question of State finance, but all his arguments and suggestions were entirely wrong, very largely because he started off with a wrong premise. I admire the actions of Mr. Playford, a Liberal Premier, who has been willing to enter the lion's den at Canberra and fight for the welfare of his State. His action was politically unique and I shall quote some authorities to show that he was absolutely right in all his claims and arguments, and that criticisms of his statements by the Prime Minister, the Federal Treasurer, and even by some members of his own Party in this House, are entirely false. In effect, the Premier said that the only limit to the money made available to South Australia should be the availability of material and manpower. The Premier of Victoria, Mr. McDonald was reported as saying to Mr. Menzies, after the Loan Council meeting, "By your decision we are rushing back to depression days at break-neck speed." The Premier of Queensland, Mr. McGair, said to him, "You are either unconscious of the effect this is going to have or you are trying to create a depression and a pool of unemployment." Those statements were made by Premiers of a different political complexion from Mr. Playford, and one would not have been surprised to find him disagreeing with them, but he is quoted as saying, "The whole show is completely snide." Mr. Playford made that statement with regard to financial control by a Liberal and Country Party Federal Government.

In this House Government members have expressed their confidence in sound finance and have told us that we must work harder, produce more, and tighten our belts, so that we will soon get out of our troubles, but I am surprised to find such statements coming from members who are primary producers, because in the 1930's, when the same plea was made, wheatgrowers grew more wheat, but eventually some found themselves in gaol because they could not meet their commitments. The price of wheat dropped to 10d. or 1s. a bushel, and wool fell to 9d. a pound. How could primary producers, who were not only ruining their own health but destroying the State in doing it, meet their commitments? Now the same thing is happening again, yet we hear the same old cry—"Produce more." If greater

production can arrest inflation why has the United States of America a more vicious inflationary financial system than any other country? I shall quote authorities to show that there is no connection between production and financial systems. Any farmer can grow foodstuff and secondary industries can produce other necessities of life, but no producer, either primary or secondary, can produce one bank note unless he be a forger.

If greater production is the answer to our financial problems, why was there any financial problem in the nineteen-thirties? The shops and warehouses in Adelaide were then bulging with goods which they were anxious to sell to starving mothers and children. That was shown in evidence before a committee appointed in 1938 at the instigation of the then member for Unley, Mr. McLeay. It was found that many children were without enough clothes and bedding and many people were suffering from mal-nutrition. This was not because of any shortage of goods. The needs of the consumer cannot be met if he has not the where-withal to pay for them. The State Premiers know that if a man loses his employment he cannot buy any of the goods that are produced, yet they speak of "sound finance." The devils in hell must chuckle when they hear people talking of sound finance with the enthusiasm of a Christian martyr and saying "I may be old-fashioned, but I believe in the good old principle of working harder and producing more." I, too, believe in hard work and have worked hard all my life and enjoyed it. However, we must never confuse finance with production. The banks, and no other organization, alter the amount of money in the community, irrespective of the needs of producers and consumers. I get tired of hearing the arguments advanced by members opposite. I have read through some literature that I have had for years. The foreword of a book called *Economic Tribulation* shows that the author, V. C. Vickers, was an authority on finance. It states:—

Vincent Cartwright Vickers was born on 16th January, 1879, and educated at Eton and Magdalen College, Oxford. He was a Deputy Lieutenant of the City of London, a Director of Vickers Limited for 22 years, and a Director of the London Assurance from which he resigned in January, 1939. In 1910 he was made a Governor of the Bank of England and resigned this appointment in 1919. Later, he became President of the Economic Reform Club and Institute.

This man was not a red-ragger or a Communist, but a man of the highest repute. He resigned as a Governor of the Bank of England

because he could no longer abide its false pretences and the misery he knew was stemming from that institution. To his credit he said:—

I therefore decided to take the unprecedented course of offering to my readers my own qualifications for putting down before the British people the very precarious condition of our monetary system as it exists in this country today; that this money system forms the most important part of our economic system, and that the nation's economic system forms part of our social system.

There is no mention of greater production or working harder. He continued:—

Ever since that day in 1926 when, not in arrogance, but with humility, I felt it my duty to explain to the Governor of the Bank of England, Mr. Montagu Norman, that "Henceforth I was going to fight him and the gold standard and the Bank of England policy until I died"—(and well I remember the words of his reply!)—I have been an ardent money reformer. Some few years afterwards I resigned my long Directorship of Vickers Limited; since when I have spent much time and money in advocating the necessity for a reform of the monetary system. This has naturally brought me into contact with most sections of the community, with Communists and those with axes to grind, with malcontents and debtors, and, in addition, with men and women who are honest and disinterested patriots. Not more than a tenth of my income is earned; the rest comes from investments in banks, Bank of England stocks, American and Canadian securities, etc., and mainly from British industrial securities. I am, therefore, a capitalist—one who has seen better times—and content to remain in my present financial position, but most unwilling to have my present standard of living further reduced. I bear no ill-feeling towards my own class or any other class. I seek neither notoriety nor kudos. If someone can change my convictions I shall be only too ready to alter them. But in 15 years nothing whatever has occurred to make me alter by views. I still believe that the existing money system is actively harmful to the State, creates poverty and unemployment and is the root cause of war.

Those statements must be respected by everyone as they are the words of an authority on finance. Some people may think that Vickers was a crank, but he was not. The root cause of our troubles is a rotten financial system that does not reflect our ability to produce or satisfy the needs of the worker. It is futile to debate the merits of Liberal versus Labour policies, employer and employee relationships, and town versus country outlooks while there is an overriding authority, the financial system. Vickers said:—

"Sound finance" means nothing at all. It is merely a sort of bankers' slogan adopted to disguise the injustices of a credit system; so that whatever the form of financial jugglery in question might be, it should, in the ears of

the public, give the true ring of the genuine coin or, at any rate, have a comforting sound about it. Whether we like it or not, we must realize that the opinion of the City of London very often does not represent the opinion of the Country; that "sound finance" is essentially an expression invented by the bankers and the dealers in credit.

I hope members on the Government benches remember what this former governor of the Bank of England said about "Sound finance," namely, that the term is only a figment of the imagination, and a term used to fool the people. Unfortunately, many people are prepared to be fooled rather than think for themselves. Vickers continues:—

Under such conditions of "sound finance" the Communist is naturally content to abide his time; for he observes that the trend of affairs is slowly converging towards the very conditions which he most desires to see—a growing discontent with finance and the money system, an increasing weariness of the present form of party government, and an increasing poverty and loss of influence among those who have so recently been the mainstay and backbone of the country. Unless the great producing industries of this country hold together, consult together, and support one another, there is no safe anchorage for the nation in the storm that is already on the horizon.

That was written in 1939, but Vickers' opinions are just as sound today. The member for Gawler told the House of the steps taken by a former Prime Minister, the late Mr. Chifley, in regard to finance. I believe that when Mr. Chifley withdrew subsidies on food-stuffs he commenced the inflationary spiral which resulted in his being put out of office. Mr. Menzies promised to put value back into the pound and maintain full employment. Both men fell down on their promises. If an election were held tomorrow the Labor Party would go back into office. What will be the benefit to the people if we turn out one Government which did not fulfil its promises and put in another similar Government? Financial reformers in Australia have for 20 years told the people that money is only a matter of bookkeeping. The people of Australia for the first time in their lives will now demand money, and I will not be surprised if before the end of this week we find the Prime Minister, who has definitely stated that his Government will not use Central Bank credit, will be forced to do so because of public clamour. That will come about because of a growing consciousness among the people that finance is what I have termed it before—a shibboleth of bankers and meaningless. If a man advocates orthodox

finance he is a traitor to the people, to the State, to the Commonwealth, and the Empire.

In 1930 we had unemployed men at street corners and women and children starving. We have not yet caught up with our building programme of schools, hospitals, and housing, because tradesmen were not allowed to work in those days and no apprentices were employed. When the war started the Government had to get the assistance of the discards of the community. I do not say that in condemnation of the men themselves, but physically they were not fit for military service and were sent to the Northern Territory to build roads to enable our troops to manoeuvre and thus help to protect this country. They were paid from £2 a day upwards. They were not like the fit and able-bodied men who were left rotting during the depression years, but men who were actually too old.

Orthodox finance is not even intelligent. It cost the Commonwealth Government and the people of Australia ten times as much to do this work as it would have cost if able-bodied men had been employed. Can members imagine how I feel about the whole position when I recall the indignity, degradation, and want associated with the depression? Nothing worth-while has been done under our present financial system. Today we have a Premier who was big enough to oppose the Prime Minister, bankers and the lick spittles at Canberra. I have nothing but the greatest contempt for most of them. A very valuable book was written by H. D. McLeod entitled, "Theory and Practice of Banking." He was a lawyer appointed by a Royal Commission to investigate the facts concerning money. In England at one time banks used to fail regularly every 10 years. It was so much like legalized theft that the Government had to step in and restrict their issuing notes. I have been twitted that I am anxious that printing machines should be set in motion to print pound notes. I have never advocated that. Sound financiers do not do it only because they are restricted by Act of Parliament. However, there is no restriction on the amount of credit of any Government in the British Empire, or the world, as far as I know. Banks can issue credit to any amount they see fit. I do not want it to be suggested that they are exploiting the position now. Banks are not the perfect organizations their supporters have led us to believe they are. People suffered mightily during the time the banks were growing up.

I shall quote one or two authorities to show whether banks create money out of nothing or not, or whether it is only a matter of book-keeping. The city of Adelaide may want a water supply, but is told by the dictators at Canberra that that is the State's responsibility and that it cannot supply the money. The position is somewhat the same as if a Rundle Street store were told by its book-keeping department that it would do no more for a week or a fortnight, as it had been given too much to do. I believe that is somewhat the position at Canberra, and they refuse to allow us to carry on because they are not prepared to do the necessary book-keeping. I support the statements of authorities whom I believe are beyond criticism. First, I shall quote from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th Edition, under the heading of "Banking and Credit":—

Banks create credit. It is a mistake to suppose that bank credit is created to any important extent by the payment of money into the banks. A loan made by a bank is a clear addition to the amount of money in the community.

That is a contradiction of everything that bankers and their supporters say. They say the banks cannot advance money unless someone first deposits it. In his book, McLeod said:—

The essential and distinctive feature of a bank and a banker is to create and issue credit payable on demand, and this credit is intended to be put into circulation and serve all the purposes of money. A bank, therefore, is not an office for the borrowing and lending of money, but it is a manufactory of credit.

Just as a book manufacturer makes books, and a clothing manufacturer makes clothes, so a bank makes credit. Mr. R. G. Hawtrey, Assistant Under Secretary to the British Treasury, in his "Trade Depression and the Way Out" said "When a bank lends it creates money out of nothing." Also behind that is the hard work of the community. I contend that the State Government, on behalf of every section of the community, should get money for nothing from the Commonwealth Bank, not the private banks. Those who provide the security are the primary and secondary industries and the workers, therefore, why should not they be able to use the credit anywhere and when that desire is necessary?

Mr. Christian—The question is how far can we mortgage our assets?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The amount which can be issued should be governed by the material and manpower available. If a State has material and manpower idle and has work

that is necessary for the welfare of the community, then the Commonwealth Bank, through the Loan Council, should advance the money to the State. It should not be limited by gold or other fictitious things, but by the human needs of the community.

Mr. Christian—Would you use that form of finance for all social services?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Many social services could be financed by that means. I favour the continuation of the present system of taxation for a time, although it has not the importance attached to it by the member for Burnside. Taxation is a negative aspect of finance, whereas I preach the positive gospel of giving the State Governments and the people of Australia the money necessary to carry out public works programmes. In his book *Post-War Banking* the Rt. Hon. R. McKenna, chairman of the Midland Bank, reputed to be the largest trading bank in Great Britain, states:—

The amount of money in existence varies only with the action of the banks in increasing or diminishing deposits. We know how this is effected. Every bank loan and every bank purchase of securities creates a deposit, and every payment of a bank loan destroys a deposit.

McKenna did not say that the amount of money in the community is not altered by production, but he said—and quite rightly—that it is altered only by the action of the banks. If £200,000,000 is to be put into circulation by the Commonwealth Bank it should be done by subsidizing the cost of living to that extent.

Mr. Riches—Is it possible to subsidize without price control?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—If price control is necessary, it should be continued for two or three months so that relief may be given with regard to the prices of those commodities contained in the "C" series index. Last year we were told that the Australian economy had been stabilized and that the basic wage would remain stationary, but what has happened? Under a system of subsidies the basic wage had increased by only £2 over a period of some years prior to 1949, but since then wages have spiralled. Under the present system of failure to subsidize prices of our essential foodstuffs a crash must come which will solve the problem of inflation but will ruin its victims. The pursuance of a policy of "sound" finance must cause misery, failure, destruction, and the final calamity of war. Before 1939 Australian producers owed to the banks more money than

the total value of their property at the then ruling valuations, but today they are in a more favourable position, and, if somebody had had enough sense to stop inflation when the community's debts had been paid off, the position would have remained under control, but with the continuation of present financial conditions a crash must come. Today the worship of the golden calf by the ancient tribes of Israel has been replaced by the worship of gold and high finance to which sons were sacrificed in 1914 and 1939 so that the debts of the fathers might be redeemed. Orthodox finance is the most hellish product of modern civilization, and so long as we tolerate it we will experience repeated misery and war.

Since the end of the war the member for Stanley and I have paid a good deal of attention to the subject of soldier settlement. Today, in reply to a question by the member for Torrens, the Minister of Lands said that 783 applicants for dry land blocks had not yet been settled. Many of them are not likely to be settled, for it is now many years since those men, as soldiers, were promised settlement and still little has been done. If the member for Stanley and myself have done nothing else, we have warned these men against the hostile Ministry responsible for their plight. The final betrayal came when it was announced that it was unlikely that many applicants would obtain land. After years of waiting they were told in effect "You will have to help yourselves to get properties."

This Government's policy has been to turn down single unit farms. I pleaded with both State and Commonwealth officers to accept such properties in my own district. If they had been purchased and offered to returned soldiers the successful applicants would be in a sound position today, if not affluent. Departmental officers could always find reasons for not purchasing single unit farms. Perhaps they were not large enough or not perfect, but few things in this world are perfect. Everyone knows my opinions about the wisdom of acquiring single unit farms. Ex-servicemen who were settled on such farms in New South Wales some years ago have paid millions of pounds off their capital liabilities. They have reaped the benefit of the good seasons and high prices after World War II. Will any member say that high prices for wheat, wool and fat lambs will last much longer? Already some prices have dropped by 50 per cent. The boom period may never return. Ex-servicemen in South Australia have been denied the opportunity of receiving high

prices for their products because of the Government's policy not to acquire single unit farms.

Last week I asked the Minister of Lands a question about a valuable property near Meningie that the Land Settlement Committee had recommended be acquired and which the Government purchased very cheaply. It borders a fresh-water lake which can be used for irrigation purposes. I believe the members of the committee are of the opinion that the property should be subdivided and successful applicants given the opportunity of developing it so they can take a pride in their achievement rather than allowing a Government department to develop it, thereby greatly adding to the financial liability of the settlers. However, the property is still in the hands of the Government and a stock and station agent is getting the benefit of it. Are taxpayers buying the property so that agents can make a profit out of it? Action is required, not words. The actions of this Government in respect of soldier settlement can be subjected to the direst criticism, whatever its intentions may be. The Land Settlement Committee concurred in the acquisition of Mount Schank, a property famed throughout the Commonwealth. The Government acquired that property for soldier settlement at an exceptionally cheap price, because the owner considered he owed a debt to returned soldiers. Years passed but settlement was delayed until houses and fences were erected and the gates painted. I was happy to get my property after World War I, without a house or fence or gates being painted. The socialistic attitude of letting Government departments do the development means that the age of individual has passed.

Considerable opposition has arisen from certain organizations along the River Murray to the expansion of irrigation areas. The dried fruits people have opposed expansion on every occasion, but that has never been the attitude of the growers who were prepared to allow expansion, and so were the citrus growers. In *The Citrus News* of April, under the heading "Expansion Report," it is stated:—

Where citrus establishment under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme is concerned, overall plantings last year conformed very closely to the expected acreage—530 acres. In New South Wales, greater progress was made at Coomealla than had been anticipated, with the result that about 200 acres were planted; original information had been that no part of the new extension would be ready for planting before 1952. In South Australia, on the other hand, progress has been slow and the total new acreage amounted to only 330 acres, against an intended 500.

It can be seen that South Australia is lagging badly in its War Service Settlement Scheme. The article continues:—

In South Australia this year's plantings seem certain to lag well behind earlier expectations, and are estimated to reach only 440 acres against the earlier target of 800. The 1953 plantings are expected to be about 200 acres, leaving well over 1,000 acres to be taken up under South Australia's War Service Land Settlement Scheme allocation. Altogether, only 1,909 acres out of a total of 11,068 acres planted between 1945 and 1951 have been made under War Service Land Settlement, with private plantings thus accounting for more than 83 per cent of all new citrus acreages planted during that period.

While the Government has stressed the necessity for increased production of fruit and vegetables the department responsible for carrying that policy into effect has fallen down on its job. Further, the department refuses to allow anyone to do the work that it should be doing itself. I have volumes of correspondence concerning ex-servicemen desiring land. One is a married man with three children. When he returned from the war he thought of settling on his father's property and eventually inheriting it. It was intended that a younger brother should study for one of the professions, but owing to ill health he could not continue with his university course.

Now there are two families, plus a single son, who expects to be married shortly, who must be supported. This young man has asked the Minister whether it would be possible, in the event of his father giving him some of his unplanted land, for him to plant up his portion. He would pay for the pumping plant and for the general development. One would have thought that the department, having an unexpended allotment of 1441 acres of citrus and at that time having no hope of absorbing a further 385 acres of deciduous tree plantings, would have been glad to allow him to undertake the development.

We have the Commonwealth Government appealing for more production from the land, but this young man, prepared to produce dried fruits needed for export to help meet our overseas commitments, was told that the capacity of the pumping plants which pump water for the irrigation areas had to be considered. As most of these plants have been in operation for from 25 years to 30 years surely the department should know their capacity. I look upon that as sheer evasion.

The letter I have received from the Minister on the subject also says that the department wants to know the sizes of main channels and pipelines. If the departmental officers came

to my district I could tell them the capacity of the pipelines which water my area, and all other settlers could do the same. Do members think for a moment that the department does not know? Of course it does; but it must find some excuse to prevent an individual from helping himself. A settler is not allowed to help himself unless it is done with the help of the department.

Thirdly, the department raises a query regarding the suitability of soils. We had the most expert evidence possible in Australia regarding the soils in the Loxton area, but that evidence is worthless because thousands of acres recommended for horticultural planting were later used for planting. Men who have been living in the area for a quarter of a century working this soil know what it can do. The department is frightened of some of us who can talk with authority. I say without fear of contradiction that it could have got this information, if not within a fortnight, certainly within a month. Now, it is too late, because the planting season is on us.

Mr. McLachlan—Will you read the whole of the letter?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—The letter addressed to me for passing on to the Minister contained the following:—

Would it be possible for you to interview the Minister of Irrigation on my behalf, to see if it were possible for me to obtain permission to irrigate and plant my own land, Block 1162 Berri, I.A. consisting of six acres which is adjacent to my father's dry land on Block 482 Berri I.A. which he is willing to transfer to me to plant also, making approximately 16 acres all told which would be suitable for planting. I am an ex-serviceman having had two years service in the R.A.A.F.

I did not apply for classification for land settlement, as in the first place my father and I thought there would be enough income from his property for both of us. This is not so, as I am now married and have a family of three children which I have to provide for. I am now 27 years of age and with the exception of my R.A.A.F. service have spent all my life working on an irrigation fruit block. If the Minister gives me permission to plant up the area asked for, I will install a spray pumping plant and plant up with citrus and stone fruits.

The Minister's reply to me was as follows:—

In reply to your letter of the 16th inst., concerning the application of..... for approval to irrigate and plant land in the Berri irrigation area, it is pointed out that the application has not been refused as stated by you, as a reference to the final paragraph of my letter of the 11th ultimo will show.

As you are aware, the allocation of plantings to this State for the purposes of the War Service Land Settlement Scheme has been

received in the face of some opposition from the Commonwealth and the industries concerned and, as further areas will be needed if all the qualified ex-servicemen who still desire settlement are to be provided for, a restriction has been placed on new plantings within established areas so as not to prejudice the further applications which have been made.

There are also other factors to be taken into consideration before an expansion of plantings can be agreed to in existing areas and, in order that the department will be able to determine how far extensions can be permitted, district officers were asked some months ago to report on the position for the areas under their control, taking into account—

1. The capacity of pumping plants.
2. The sizes of main channels and pipelines.
3. The suitability of soils.

If the department were anxious to extend settlement and get men on the land it could soon get the information. This is only an argument to prevent the men from helping themselves. The Minister adds:—

When this information has been received from all areas and when the current application for an additional 3,000 acres for War Service Settlement has been dealt with, the opportunity for additional plantings in existing areas will be made known so that deserving applicants will be able to submit their applications for consideration.

That letter was written on April 21 last. Had a favourable reply been given the settler could have undertaken planting, but that is now too late. I took this problem to the Premier, the only man in the Government with a glimmer of commonsense and a realist—a man who lives up to his responsibilities. It is entirely false economy to leave unplanted an area on which capital commitments have already been incurred, and the Premier at least supported me in that respect. He gave me permission to tell the settlers exactly what I have said here—that he will take the matter up personally. I hope something satisfactory will soon be done. The letter which the Minister of Irrigation sent back to the applicant is all hooey as regards soldier settlement in our irrigation areas. If a returned soldier with finance has land he cannot do anything without the department's sanction, and the only persons who can develop the land in any way they see fit are those on private land with river frontages who can plant deciduous and citrus trees until the cows come home.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—That application has not been refused. Do you not now support, as you always have, first the settling of applicants under the scheme?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am in favour of approved applicants under the scheme being settled.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—That is all my letter means.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—It says much more. It says in effect “While we as a department cannot absorb all the applicants under the scheme and we cannot see any hope of absorbing these 1,400 acres of citrus, plus nearly 400 acres of deciduous trees, we will not allow anyone else to do it.”

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—We give ex-service applicants the first opportunity. You have just said you agree with that. As I said the other day in answer to a question, now that the State has been allotted an additional 3,000 acres for planting it will proceed to settle applicants under the soldier settlement scheme.

On new areas it is necessary to install new pumping plant and undertake other capital expenditure, whereas at the moment hundreds acres could be absorbed in existing areas, but those who control the Irrigation Department are not interested in existing areas, but only in new schemes like those at Loxton, Murtho, Paringa and Cooltong. The departmental officers are not thinking primarily of returned soldiers, otherwise they would say “Here we have 1,400 acres. There is no hope of absorbing them in the near future, so we will help those who are prepared to help themselves and go ahead and plant.” They are tied hand and foot and this is the so-called Liberal policy. If it had come from some other type of philosophy, we could answer it. No one would be so stupid as to put up such an argument and at the same time say that we are producing more and putting more men on the land.

I felt that I would be shirking my responsibility if I did not support the member for Mitcham as to the necessity of a bridge being constructed across the Murray at Blanchetown. On a visit to Loxton recently the Premier took along his pet reporter to write up his sayings, and one of the things which emanated from that tour was that a monument should be erected to the Premier. I think that is an excellent idea and solidly support it. One should be erected at Blanchetown with the following thereon:—

Erected to the memory of our Premier who had not the vision to see the necessity of having a bridge placed at one of the most important trade routes in South Australia.

so that all the carriers and the travelling public generally could worship at the feet

of the Premier. I should like to have a wire recording taken of some of the statements made during the worship period. We could even have another memorial on the other side of the river. People from all parts of the State and the Commonwealth have been laughing us to scorn about our punts. We have a new punt at Loxton, but it is slower than any other punt that has ever been on the river. You hardly know whether you are moving unless you line up with some point on the other side. This punt has what is known as a fluid drive, but it should be called a static drive. It has been installed only about a fortnight, but has already broken down three times. I understand that in that time three new fluid drives have been installed. I believe even the department says it is only an experiment—an experiment on the busiest trade route of the State! The unfortunate people who have to use these punts, including the employer who has to pay valuable wages for men and has valuable plant worth thousands of pounds lying idle for hours, are inconvenienced because of this rotten punt system. If the Government has not enough initiative or the money to put a bridge across the Murray, I suggest that private enterprise be permitted to do so. It would appear that the Government has not enough energy, ability, finance or imagination, or whatever it is. When the Electricity Trust was formed to take over the assets of the Adelaide Electric Supply Co. we were beguiled into believing that electricity would be supplied all over the State, but that belief has proved to be unfounded, for in many places primary producers are now no better off in this respect than when the company operated. Some settlers at Taylorville and Tullunga Flat across the river from Waikerie asked the trust to supply them with electricity, which the trust agreed to do, but at a tariff higher than normal because of the distance between the properties and consequent increased costs of installation, an offer which shows that the trust is not a purely socialistic concern but a strictly business proposition. Some settlers in the area have gone so far as to buy electrically operated appliances for use on their properties, others have placed firm orders in anticipation of a supply of electricity, and in almost every instance they are committed to the expenditure of hundreds of pounds, but now they have been told that it will be nearly two years before the trust will be able to meet their needs. Recently I told the assistant manager of the trust that, if the trust was

short of finance, it should be in a position to decide whether its expenditure was to be incurred in the city or in the country.

Mr. Davis—You know where the money will be spent.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes, in the city. The time has come when, if the Government really means what it says about its desire to stop the drift to the city, it should say to Government and semi-governmental departments, "If you are short of money, such shortage should be reflected in the city, and the country areas should get first call on your supplies," but this amenity is denied these settlers engaged in supplying the city with essential fruit and vegetables. Our rural population has decreased and the Government's housing programme will not help the position, for what farmer will be able to bear the capital cost of £2,500 for an additional home in which to house an employee? The aggregation of farm lands must be stopped, for a man, such as one who recently came to my notice as being the owner of seven farms, will not work for maximum production while he must pay away the greater part of his income in taxation. The land should be subdivided so that the returned soldiers will be helped and long-standing promises honoured.

Mr. Davis—How would you place returned soldiers on those big holdings?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am a member of the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee which did a first class job in the early days of its life by breaking up many big properties in the South-East and settling ex-servicemen on them. In only one or two cases did those big landholders object to the Government's acquisition of their properties, and, if this committee today had a mandate to acquire properties in such a way as to inflict no hardship on the owners, good work could be done for the people of South Australia. I support the motion.

Mr. McALEES (Wallaroo)—I join with previous speakers in expressing regret at the passing of our late King George VI. South Australia has suffered a loss in the departure of Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie, for Sir Willoughby was one of the greatest Governors we have had. I listened carefully to the speech of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, but heard nothing with regard to my district. This Government has taken everything out of Wallaroo, and if it were possible to take the water from the harbour and put it in Port Adelaide it would do so.

I listened with interest to previous speakers, particularly those commenting on the financial position. The member for Flinders took us on a trip to America, and we were away so long that I started to get seasick. The member for Mitcham told us that the worker enjoyed too many luxuries such as washing machines and radio sets, but I point out that the worker, as the producer of these "luxuries," is entitled to their use. In speaking of inflation the member for Flinders said that we must work harder for longer hours and for lower wages. He said the workers were not doing a reasonable job; also that some organizations had told their members not to work too hard because they would only be helping their employers to make bigger profits. No member has been associated with the industrial movement longer than I have, and I have never heard of any such statement from an organization of employees, and I challenge the member for Flinders to name one. He would not make such a statement in Port Lincoln.

I desire to say a few words about the Government's decentralization policy. I listened with interest to the Premier's remarks in reply to a question from the member for Semaphore about the establishment of an industry in his district. I have lived in Wallaroo for the last 70 years and know what damage the fumes from an acid plant can do, particularly to gardens, iron roofs and fences, but the people of Wallaroo would be prepared to overlook any damage as long as men were kept in employment. They would welcome another acid plant in that town. If the plant is established at Port Adelaide what will happen to the industry in Wallaroo? At present 62 men are engaged all the year round in producing acid there. Is the establishment of a plant at Port Adelaide an example of decentralization? When it is in production will the men at Wallaroo have to move to Port Adelaide to follow their occupation? The fumes from an acid plant have an obnoxious smell and I endorse the remarks of the member for Semaphore in objecting to the establishment of a plant in his district.

I have found that it does not pay to praise an organization that is doing a good job. Two years ago I commended the Housing Trust for building houses at Wallaroo, but little has been done since. In reply to a question from me the Premier said that the trust would build more houses as they were required. I believe about 50 people have applied for trust

homes in Wallaroo, but they are still waiting. Recently the foundations were prepared for three more houses, but many more are required. I fear that after those houses have been erected the trust will again cease operations in Wallaroo. I regret that Ministers rarely visit the district, although the Minister of Education visited it twice, but his time was mostly taken up with the school children. Three months ago the Premier promised me he would visit Wallaroo, but said he could not fix a date. He also told the Mayor of his intended visit and preparations were made to receive him, but he has not yet turned up. Many industries in the town have closed down, but few new ones have opened. Little has been done at the grain distillery building; work has been held up here through lack of power. The Premier has promised that the power will be laid on by next December. I hope he is right this time because, according to his previous statements, it should have been there by last December.

The railway roundhouse, which could accommodate any locomotive in the State, was removed. However, a portion of it should have been retained to house the locomotives located at the town. I believe that roundhouse was removed to Taillem Bend and that it has not yet been re-assembled there. Some time ago a Senator visited Wallaroo and asked me what had happened to the roundhouse. The Minister of Railways promised me that a portion of the roundhouse would be retained at Wallaroo to accommodate locomotives. I saw the Railways Commissioner about this matter, but he did not seem to know much about it. The only accommodation for the locomotive used on the jetty is a tool shed, but only part of the engine can be covered. Two 700 class locomotives purchased from the Victorian Government are used in Wallaroo and the Senator was surprised that there was no housing for them. If the people responsible for sending locomotives to Wallaroo without adequate protection from the elements had to pay for them themselves they would take more care of them. I own a wheelbarrow and always put it in a shed after I have used it, yet valuable locomotives are left in the open. I hope my remarks have not fallen on deaf ears. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Sitting suspended from 6 till 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—Reading the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech one cannot but fail to realize that much thought and attention was expended in compiling it. Further, one cannot but realize that conditions have changed

greatly in the last 12 months. Many members have been pessimistic about these changed conditions, but neither pessimism nor optimism can alter them. During the past four or five years we have been going through an abnormal period. We must now realize that the honeymoon is over and face the facts.

Mr. Riches—Is there anything wrong in prolonging the honeymoon?

Mr. HEASLIP—Not if you can afford it. Some members have blamed one section of the community or the Government for the position in which we find ourselves today, but no section or Government is entirely responsible. Further, no Government or section can get us out of our troubles. I believe that the changing conditions through which we are passing are evolutionary; something which we have to accept whether we like it or not. We should, however, do all we can to shape it as we want it. We are a democratic nation and if we desire democracy with all its faults and failures—and we all know that it is not perfect—instead of Communism, we must make the one work or accept the other.

Mr. O'Halloran—I hope we shall never accept Communism.

Mr. HEASLIP—If democracy will not work we shall probably get Communism whether we like it or not.

Mr. O'Halloran—Then we must make democracy work.

Mr. HEASLIP—Exactly, but how? The biggest factor against democracy today is the increased cost of living, and we have to do something about it. It is brought about by increased cost of production which in turn is brought about by a lack of moral responsibility on the part of the individual. Unfortunately the majority of people today want to do as little work for as much reward as possible, and here I do not single out any section of the community: all classes are equally at fault and the only answer is to increase production. I have heard it said that this will leave the workers without jobs, but that is a very short-sighted argument. Within the last few weeks a cost of living increase of 13s. a week has been announced. Of what avail will that 13s. be to the worker if he is not employed? If it is not absorbed it is passed on to the cost of production and the very man who receives that increase is the man who is going to pay for it. The alternative is to produce more articles for the same amount of money. We have a 40 hour week and I believe it could be made to work.

Mr. Davis—Why hasn't it worked?

Mr. HEASLIP—Why are we importing so many goods instead of producing them ourselves? We should be able to export commodities in competition with the rest of the world, but we cannot do it. The only section which is doing it is the primary producer. Let us examine the 40 hour week a little more closely. Forty hours a week for 52 weeks in the year represents 2,080 working hours: but we work only five days a week, or 260 working days a year. Out of that we pay for, but get no production from, two weeks holidays for each man. That is 10 days fewer. In addition we have nine public holidays and further provision for five days a year sick pay. This brings the total number of working days down to 236 and on the basis of eight hours a day makes a total of 1,888 working hours a year. Therefore, instead of a 40 hour week we are getting only a 36½ hour week.

Mr. O'Halloran—Does that apply to all industries?

Mr. HEASLIP.—No

Mr. O'Halloran—What percentage work only 1888 hours a year?

Mr. HEASLIP—Practically all secondary industries, and they are exactly the ones who are failing to compete with the rest of the world.

Mr. O'Halloran—You said we could not produce sufficient for our own requirements.

Mr. HEASLIP—We cannot with a 40 hour week.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What hours should we work?

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not suggest what they should be, but we are not working the so-called 40 hour week, and I have not allowed for morning lunch and smoke-ohs and the time taken for putting on coats before the knock-off whistle blows.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Has the hon. member ever worked in any industry?

Mr. HEASLIP—I happen to have quite a few interests and I know what we are paying for.

Mr. Davis—How many men has machinery displaced? Is not the worker entitled to some benefit from the introduction of machinery?

Mr. HEASLIP—He is entitled to all the benefits he earns, but he must earn them.

Mr. John Clark—Are you opposing his right to have holidays?

Mr. HEASLIP—I am not opposing anything, but simply trying to show that the 40 hour week is not a 40 hour week.

Mr. Hutchens—What do you suggest as an alternative?

Mr. HEASLIP—Increased production.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Give us comparisons of what you have produced on your farm in the last 12 months.

Mr. HEASLIP—My answer to that is that the only section of the community able to compete with other countries is the primary producer. The secondary industries have missed a wonderful opportunity over the past 10 years, for markets have been available of which they have never been able to take advantage. Australia makes the cheapest steel in the world, but has been unable to make enough of it to supply those markets. It is a calamity and I still say that it is brought about by lack of production. Let us have high prices by all means, but let us earn them because if we do not we cannot afford them.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Are you suggesting that the worker does not earn his money?

Mr. HEASLIP—I am saying that all of us, the honourable member included, are not doing our fair share; even the highest paid executive has not been pulling his weight. Conditions have changed, and I think for the better. Everyone, Governments included, has been competing for the limited amount of material and manpower available. In doing so they have not created any more of either, but have simply increased the cost which has to be met by all the competitors.

Mr. O'Halloran—What would be wrong with organizing some of the thousands of unemployed in order to increase production?

Mr. HEASLIP—There are not many thousands, and at the outset of my remarks I said that we had passed through an abnormal period and are now returning to normality. However, we cannot pass through two such phases without having upsets. We are re-adjusting ourselves to different conditions.

Mr. Hutchens—What do you call normality?

Mr. HEASLIP—Something which levels up. I saw a report recently that there were more swagmen in the outback than for many years. There should be none. After the period of prosperity we have enjoyed any man who has not been able to put aside sufficient to prevent the necessity of putting a swag upon his back is not worthy of the name of Australian, with the exception, of course, of those who have just come into this country.

Mr. O'Halloran—You think a man who is out of work should not go looking for it?

Mr. HEASLIP—No man should be carrying his swag today. The honourable member for Port Pirie blames the Federal Government for the position. Overseas factories are producing goods more cheaply than we are and the Federal Government did a very good thing in taking the action it did. Mr. Davis also said that Port Pirie produced 250,000 bush. of peas annually, but I say it is beyond the capacity of Port Pirie to produce that quantity.

Mr. Davis—I meant £250,000 worth of peas.

Mr. HEASLIP—It is the districts outside Port Pirie that produce the peas—Napperby, Telowie, Nelshaby, Port Germein and Baroota, all of which are in my electorate of Rocky River and should receive the credit. The member for Mitcham, realizing the danger to the city, advocates the establishment of large industries at Murray Bridge, but I do not agree with him. Why make the big towns bigger? They are already big enough and provide all the amenities and facilities that Adelaide possesses. It would be much better to make the small towns bigger.

Mr. Davis—What has your Government ever done to increase industries in country towns?

Mr. HEASLIP—If we want to stop the drift of people to the city we must realize that we have a job to do. We must appreciate that the honeymoon is over and that abnormal times have gone. We are now entering a more normal period. To obtain employment in a secondary industry today one must be a skilled man. The member for Thebarton wanted to know what I knew about industry. I am interested in an industry in which three machines are used, but the union will only allow the employment of one apprentice to two skilled men.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What is wrong with that?

Mr. HEASLIP—The whole of South Australia has been searched for another skilled man, but he is not available, with the result that one of the three machines in the factory is idle. Orders cannot be kept up because we are not allowed to teach another man the trade. The unions are not doing the right thing by their members in disallowing that.

Mr. Fred Walsh—That would not be the dwelling that was turned into a storeroom?

Mr. HEASLIP—No. It is a highly skilled trade which takes five years to learn. Men who have learned a trade need not be out of work today.

Mr. Fred Walsh—What about the war years?

Mr. HEASLIP—During the war, but not today. The member for Mitcham also advocated taking away part of the Government

road grant from councils. Knowing the country as I do I have great respect for councils and I should hate to think that they are to be deprived of their means to do road work required there. The money they receive is as well spent as anywhere else. I cannot say that of the Highways Department. Anybody who has travelled over that stretch of road between Bungaree and Georgetown will realize it. I do not know how much a mile it cost to construct, but if Mr. Dunks knew he would not advocate more money for the Highways Department, but for councils.

Mr. Davis went on to say that employers wanted men to work like horses. I strongly object to that statement. Farm workers are doing a good job, and the falling off in production is not the result of their shirking work or lacking energy. Mr. Davis contends that it is because of the greed of farmers. Mr. Davis is greatly out of touch with primary production when he says that farmers are greedy. There have never been more employees getting a share out of the crop than there are in South Australia today. He said, too, that many primary producers had turned from wheatgrowing to wool production. Why not? What is wrong with that if by growing wool they can create more credit overseas whereby machinery can be imported? There is a reduction of the wheat acreage but there is no shortage of wheat in Australia and not likely to be any. Consider the figures. Last year 184 million bushels of wheat were produced, of which 38 million was used for human consumption in the form of bread or flour. Breakfast foods absorbed 4 million; 102 million were exported as wheat and flour last year. Stock feed accounted for 27 million, to which I strongly object. People are crying out for wheat, yet we are feeding it to pigs. Why cannot barley, maize, sorghum and other cereals be used for the purpose? Of the balance of production, 10 million bushels were retained for seed, etc., on farms. Wheatgrowers, in turning to wool, have not endangered this country. If by turning to wool, meat and dairy produce wheatgrowers can obtain more credit overseas they will still be doing their share for Australia. Where would we be if it were not for the primary producer and our overseas exports?

Mr. O'Halloran—Isn't there an obligation on farmers to produce foodstuffs for the rest of the world?

Mr. HEASLIP—People need wool to keep warm and if they cannot keep warm they will die. The Russians found that out. Wool is a necessity.

Mr. O'Halloran—What percentage of Australian wool went behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not know, but it must have been only a small proportion. Statements have appeared in the press about the shortages in primary production, especially wheat, but nobody has yet referred to the work of the Department of Agriculture. Departmental officers collect and pass on to producers, through the various agricultural bureaux, information that is of immense value to all primary producers and to others in the country. The prevention of soil erosion, of which Mr. Herriot is in charge, and the passing on to posterity of something handed down to us, is most important. The preparation of correct reports and the passing on of information that leads to the growing of two ears of grain or two blades of grass where previously only one grew is a great tribute to the Department of Agriculture and the officers who collate and pass on that information. A recent innovation is the establishment of a rural youth movement. Up to the present one branch has been formed at Spalding in the charge of Mr. Peter Angove. It is a project worth trying, whether it succeeds or not. The movement is for youths under 18 years, who are divided into two groups, the first aged between 12 and 15 years, and the second between 15 and 18 years. Its object is to instil in the younger generation a realization of their responsibilities to Australia and mankind generally.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I join with other members in paying a tribute to the work of the late Mr. Leslie Duncan. I value the help and advice he gave me as a colleague. He was willing to help any member at all times but unfortunately time marches on with all of us and eventually we must go. In reply to a question by me concerning the number of houses and/or residential establishments in Adelaide which have been converted to factories and storerooms during the past two years, and the number withheld from use as residences so as to be available for future conversion, the Premier said today that no permits were granted for the conversion of homes to factories and that the information sought was hard to obtain, but he thought not more than three places would be affected. I do not doubt his sincerity in passing on the information supplied to him, but it is ridiculous to suggest that only three homes have been converted to factories in the past two years. I can take any one from the department which supplied that

information to streets in Adelaide where that number has been exceeded. Last year I mentioned the Kar-fix Company in Gilbert Street, and recently I had a letter from an old age pensioner concerning a house in that street which had become vacant and asking whether anything could be done whereby she could obtain occupation. The law only permits ex-servicemen to take court action to obtain such homes for residential purposes. Scores of homes in Adelaide have been converted to factories, and many have been boarded up and used as storerooms. After 12 months, application can be made for permits to convert such places to factories. If the Government is able to relax the control of building materials it should tighten up the legislation which permits homes to be converted for uses other than residential.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech significantly does not mention electoral reform. I do not propose to deal with it at length because in the last two years it has been discussed extensively. The supporters of the Government have referred to democracies but they are not prepared to make South Australia one. Democracy to my mind is government of the people by the people for the people, but in South Australia only one-third of the community has the right to vote for the Legislative Council.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Do you like the New South Wales system of franchise, under which no elector has a vote for the Legislative Council?

Mr. LAWN—I remind the honourable member that recently Victoria extended its franchise, and the result of the recent election in Victoria is probably responsible for the same privileges not being extended here. Our people should have the right to vote for both Houses of Parliament, and we should extend the right of adult suffrage to the men and women of our State. When there is a war or a shortage of production some members are very ready to have a crack at the men of 21 years or under and suggest they should get out and work and sweat to produce more. They do not mind asking mothers to supply this country with plenty of male cannon fodder but they are not prepared to give those men or their mothers the right to vote for the Legislative Council. Furthermore, the Government has gerrymandered electoral districts in South Australia so that it is assured of a return to office. In referring to the rights of the States to tax the mover of the motion suggested that State

Governments should have more responsibility, but this Government has dodged its responsibility by gerrymandering the districts in its own favour. Its policy is such that Government members have not been able to say much in praise of the Government's achievements or its future prospects.

In 1939 a select committee was appointed to enquire into usury being practised in this State and in 1940 the Money-lenders Act was passed making it obligatory for money-lenders to be licensed. Unfortunately the Act is sadly lacking with regard to the limit of interest to be charged. The relevant portion of section 32 of the Act reads:—

32. (1) Where proceedings are taken in any court by a money-lender (or by the assignee or transferee or holder of a debt or security in respect of a loan by a money-lender) for the recovery of any money lent either before or after the commencement of this Act, or the enforcement of any contract or security made or taken either before or after the commencement of this Act in respect of money lent either before or after the commencement of this Act, and there is evidence which satisfies the court that—

- (a) the interest charged in respect of the sum actually lent is excessive; or
- (b) the amounts charged for expenses, inquiries, fines, bonus, premiums, renewals or any other charges are excessive, or
- (c) the transaction is harsh and unconscionable, or is such that a court of equity would give relief,

the court may—

- (i) re-open the transaction and take an account between the plaintiff and the defendant; and
- (ii) notwithstanding any statement or settlement of account or any contract purporting to close previous dealings and create a new obligation, re-open any account in connection with the transaction; and
- (iii) relieve the defendant from payment of any sum in excess of the sum adjudged by the court to be fairly due in respect of such principal, interest, and charges as the court, having regard to the risk, the value of the security, the time of repayment, the amount of the loan, and all the other circumstances, may adjudge to be reasonable.

In the *News* of January 28, 1952, there is an advertisement, headed "Personal Loans Without Security," on behalf of Commercial Discounters (Adelaide) Ltd. It tabulates the amounts that can be borrowed and the rates of repayment. They are as follows:—

Loan.	Interest.	Repayment.
£5	£1	24 at 5s. weekly
£10	£1 10s.	23 at 10s. weekly
£10	£3	52 at 5s. weekly.
£15	£4 10s.	52 at 7s. 6d. weekly
£20	£3	23 at 20s. weekly
£20	£6	52 at 10s. weekly

The interest rate charged by Commercial Discounters works out at 55.87 per cent. It is certainly getting its pound of flesh. I do not know that these people are performing any useful service to the community. They are not contributing to increased production, but simply fleehing money from the poorer sections of the community who want a small loan to carry them over financial difficulties. If a person borrowed £20 and at the end of 12 months repaid £26, including interest, the interest would amount to 30 per cent, but having to pay the amount back at the rate of 10 shillings a week the rate becomes exorbitant. It is daylight robbery. The firm concerned has an authorized capital of £50,000, but there were only 24 fully-paid £1 shares as at September 30, 1951. The shareholders are H. W. Bunce of Botany, New South Wales, one share; Commercial Discounters Ltd., Sydney, one; J. M. Edwards, solicitor, Sydney, five; J. M. Edwards and H. W. Bunce, conjointly, nine; Stanley H. Lewis, solicitor, 47 Waymouth Street, Adelaide, one; T. H. Martin, company director, Vacluse, New South Wales, one; Kenneth W. Neill, accountant, 44 Grenfell Street, Adelaide, one; and W. R. Schofield of Sydney, five. This company was registered on November 3, 1937, and the directors as at April 2, 1952, were P. W. Fisher of Sydney, New South Wales, Stanley H. Lewis of Tusmore Avenue, Tusmore, T. H. Martin of Vacluse, New South Wales, W. K. Neill, 34 King Street, Brighton, S.A., Dr. W. F. Pattinson of Killara, New South Wales, and W. R. Schofield of Vacluse, New South Wales. The secretary was Hubert George Craig, of 49 Wattle Avenue, Brighton, South Australia.

With the exception of two or three of them, all shareholders come from New South Wales, and with a capital of £24 they are able to carry on a money-lending business and charge the community of South Australia 55.87 per cent interest. Is it high finance if a company with a capital of £24 is permitted to carry on a money-lending business? It is not the only such company in South Australia. There are others, including Adelaide Finance Ltd. One has three directors, all prominent members of the Liberal and Country League and one a member of this House. *The Oxford Dictionary* defines "usury" as:—

The fact or practice of lending money at interest; especially in later use, the practice of charging, taking or contracting to receive, excessive or illegal rates of interest for money on loan.

Webster's Dictionary defines it as "An unconscionable or exorbitant rate or amount of interest."

The Bible teaches us that we should not indulge in usury, and verse 19 of chapter 23 of Deuteronomy says:—

Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother: usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury.

That was the teaching of the Jews—not to charge usury among themselves, but they could charge it to others. At the time the Jews carried out that practice I understand the Christians were not allowed to and did not indulge in it, although now I believe that alleged Christians can. It is most unfair that people who are forced to borrow a few pounds to tide them over a special occasion should have to pay 55.87 per cent interest. This is a condemnation of the activities of those who support the present Government and permit this state of affairs to exist.

Mr. Brookman—What do you propose that the Government should do?

Mr. LAWN—I do not suppose it would do what I would do, but money lending should be prohibited in such cases.

Mr. Brookman—The people who want the money may not agree with you.

Mr. LAWN—I think that the banking institutions can cater for loans to the public. They are much more responsible than such people as those I have quoted. These private companies and individuals should be banned from lending.

Mr. Macgillivray—Why do you not introduce an amending Bill to stop this practice?

Mr. LAWN—One could try, but I am confident the Government supporters would not permit such a measure to be passed.

Mr. Brookman—Would you ban money-lenders altogether?

Mr. LAWN—I would ban that type. One paragraph in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech refers to the curtailment of South Australia's public works programme. One thing our State Treasurer has become well-known for is his flair for making spectacular announcements concerning proposed developmental works. The latest of these concerns the erection of a second power station at Port Augusta, estimated to cost £12,000,000. The improbability of its being proceeded with in the near future is emphasized by the fact that the States' loan programmes are to be considerably curtailed. The loan position is likely to remain uncertain for some time—certainly while the present Commonwealth Government is in power.

When I was a young fellow I can remember a Government of the same colour as that now in power at Canberra wooing the electors at election times by telling them that a Labor Government would not have the confidence of

the public either in Australia or overseas. I also remember that when a Labor Government was returned it was unable to obtain the finance to carry on. The Liberal Party then came out and said, "You have not the confidence of the people and they will not make money available." If it were true in those years it is certainly true now, when we have a Prime Minister saying that the public will not lend money either to the Commonwealth or the States. Therefore, these Governments must have lost the confidence of the people. If that is so, it is about time the people were given an opportunity to rectify the position and put in power a Government which would hold their confidence.

I wonder whether the Premier has not lost all sense of responsibility in his unchecked career of lavish public spending. Looking back over the last few years, which are punctuated by his announcements, one is struck by the enthusiasm with which he has taken up various projects, very often on the eve of an election. When I read of his strong condemnation at the recent Loan Council meeting of the Commonwealth's loan allocations to the States, I wondered then whether it was dictated by the fact that there is to be a general election in South Australia early next year. One of his spectacular announcements I have in mind concerns the construction of a deep-sea port at Robe. During the 1950 State election campaign he went to Robe, which is in the electoral division of Victoria, and which no doubt he considers a border-line seat, and promised the people a deep-sea port. He certainly gave the impression that the matter was settled and that a port would be constructed there in the near future, but after the election in which the Liberal and Country League candidate was successful, the Premier was responsible for the removal of the deep sea port project from Robe to Cape Jaffa. It is now on the list of State works to be commenced at some future date but I have given up hope of seeing it completed. Five years ago with a great flourish the Premier initiated work on the broadening of the gauge from Wolseley to Millicent via Mount Gambier, which was to be completed in 18 months but which is still going on. Two years ago—about two months before the last State election—the Premier organized a function at Naracoorte to celebrate the broadening of the gauge as far as that town, but, as the broadening has as yet been completed only as far as Kalangadoo, I doubt whether the new gauge will reach Mount Gambier in time to be of use to the Liberal Party in next year's election campaign.

I understand that in the Flinders by-election campaign last year the Premier promised electors that deep sea fishing havens costing £1,250,000 would be constructed along the Eyre Peninsula coast so that fishermen would be able to keep their craft safe during storms, but that plan has also been shelved. During the recent Gawler by-election campaign many promises regarding housing, a fire brigade, and a sewerage system were made, but I wonder whether those projects, too, will be shelved. The premier has made many promises to South Australians through the press; indeed I understand he is the only member of the Government permitted to make such promises, for no other Minister makes these announcements. These promises, which include a mental hospital at a cost of £370,000, are made for the sole purpose of inducing electors to return a Liberal and Country Party Government, and it is time electors were told the truth—that this is a crook Government which aims only at misleading the voters by means of false promises when elections are pending. Doubtless other promises will be made between now and March, especially during the election campaign.

Mr. Fletcher—You are all the same.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member was one who hoped to benefit as a result of promised projects and I cannot help it if my remarks have hurt him a little. Paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech deals with the economic position in this State, and I have no doubt that, in the curtailment of the Loan funds, the Premier will find some excuse for the delay in completing the projects to which I have referred. It is stated that the economic position of the State remains sound, but, although I have much faith in the future of South Australia, I say that the present administration of both State and Federal Governments is far from promising. South Australians have seen better days than those through which they are passing and those which appear to be looming before them. Between 1941 and 1949 Mr. Curtin and, later, Mr. Chifley led a Federal Government with a sound policy. If the present Federal Government has a policy, it can be said that it is the policy propounded by Professor Hytten—to create a pool of 8 per cent unemployed in Australia so as to keep down prices.

Mr. O'Halloran—Another professor said that Australians should eat less.

Mr. LAWN—Yes, that was advocated by a leading economist who, I understand, will soon leave Australia. The Federal Labor Government financed the second world war from within Australia by means of private savings and not

with the aid of finance through big banking institutions. Australians had sufficient confidence in the Curtin and Chifley Governments to finance a war, and during that period the Commonwealth Government paid off our overseas debt over £100,000,000 without borrowing a penny overseas. When it was defeated at the polls in 1949, it left a balance in the social services fund of over £100,000,000, and it vacated office with the remarkable record of having effected a surplus in Commonwealth accounts, which surplus was disposed of according to law. Between 1941 and 1949 Australia's overseas funds were gradually built up, and the effect of Labor's wise policy continued to be seen for at least 12 months after its defeat. In December, 1949, Australia's overseas credits were £406,778,000, and during 1950 they increased to £563,218,000. During early 1951 phenomenal prices were paid overseas for our produce, and Australia had an overseas credit balance in June, 1951, of £718,228,000. Then the change in Commonwealth Government policy began to take effect until at the end of May, 1952, the receding overseas credit balance had fallen to £310,990,000, and it is still receding. The Playford Government must also accept some blame with regard to these receding overseas credit balances. On August 2, 1950 (*Hansard*, page 173), I said:—

Paragraph 7 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech refers to secondary industries. On July 27 I asked the Premier the following question about motor vehicle imports:—

A statement appeared in the *News* of July 15, regarding the big rise in imports by South Australia. It said that for the 11 months ended May 31, our imports rose by nearly £15,000,000, but exports dropped by about £6,000,000. Motor vehicle imports showed a substantial increase, more than £5,000,000 to £8,242,470. Apart from the question of the trade balance position, I have in mind the value to South Australia of the motor industry. Will the Premier consider this matter with a view to approaching the Commonwealth authorities to see if the importation of motor vehicles and parts can be restricted?

The Premier replied:—

The motor body building industry is the most important secondary industry in the State. I have approached the Federal Government on a number of occasions, not with the object of restricting but of increasing imports so that the output of motor bodies will be maintained and men kept in employment. The industry is being seriously jeopardized by lack of chassis coming into the State. I visited one of the principal motor body building firms last week, at its special invitation, to discuss the problem, and I made representations to the Federal Government on its behalf. It is greatly concerned to get the necessary turnover to maintain the industry on a proper balance and keep men in work.

I did not think the approach of the Premier was justified as I could see it would have the effect of aggravating the receding trade balance. One member opposite asked if I was advocating the closing of this factory. The same firm on whose behalf the Premier approached the Commonwealth Government in 1950 to increase the imports of chassis has now, as I forecast, commenced to build the complete car here. In a few months this firm will not need dollars in America or Canada in order to import chassis, engines or bodies. This is the result of the present financial restrictions. Had the company been requested to assemble cars here two years ago it might have accepted the overtures.

The Hon. T. Playford—The arrangement to which the honourable member is referring was made at least two years ago, and I assisted in making it.

Mr. LAWN—To build the complete car in Australia?

The Hon. T. Playford—I said that at that time they desired increased imports to enable their project to go ahead. The firm had to get the overseas interest to approve of the arrangement.

Mr. LAWN—Other firms are building complete cars in Australia and this firm could have done so before 1950. The Premier may have been aware of the proposed change in policy.

The Hon. T. Playford—It was not a recent innovation to assemble the complete car here, but a long-term proposal. It is not possible to build a complete car by a sudden change in plans, but only by gradual evolution.

Mr. LAWN—This firm is not gradually changing over, but has made a sweeping change in organization. By next June it will be making the complete car here.

The Hon. T. Playford—Last year 70 per cent of an Australian car was made in South Australia.

Mr. LAWN—Only the body was made here.

The Hon. T. Playford—And the wheels and many other parts.

Mr. LAWN—This firm does not make the wheels. They are being made at Finsbury by another firm. I wish to refer to the drift in the unemployment position. My information has been obtained from the same source as the Premier's when he replied to a question by the member for Hindmarsh, namely, the Regional Director of the Department of National Service. I was advised by him by letter dated May 13, 1952, that the number of unemployed in South Australia on April 28, 1950, was 375 males and 106 females, a total of 481. On April 27, 1951, it was 304 males and 139 females, a total of 443. The total unemployed on February 25, 1952, was 1,600, four of whom were drawing relief. On May 2 there were 590 males and 317 females unemployed, a total of 907. The figures given by the Premier today show that on the 25th of this month 2,146 were unemployed, with 315 on relief. The position therefore is rapidly deteriorating. There must be thousands in Australia now out of work in a time when there should be full and plenty. Many members want greater production. Here is one way to get it: put these people back into work. One or two Government supporters have stated that the honeymoon period is over. I do not know what they mean unless it be that the period of full employment is over. It is an alarming state of affairs if they have to tell the people they are unable to carry on a policy of full employment which this country has enjoyed since 1941, and a shocking indictment on both State and Federal Governments. I have carefully studied the distribution of the national income and expenditure. A comparison of the distribution of national income in 1938-39 and in 1950-51 is most interesting. The figures are as follows:—

	1938-39.	1950-51.	Increase Per Cent.
	£m.	£m.	
Wages, salaries, pay of members of forces, etc.	444	1,497	237
Company income	84	355	323
Surplus of public authority business undertakings	32	—1	—
Farm income	44	809	1,739
Income of unincorporated businesses, professions, etc.	83	320	285
Net rent and interest—			
Dwellings	64	78	22
Other	28	43	54
National income	779	3,101	299

Company income increased by 323 per cent, but that of wage and salary earners who, according to some members opposite, are not producing enough, increased by only 237 per cent. The member for Rocky River said that some people were apt to do as little work as possible for as much as possible. I remind him of the capitalistic theory of buying labour in the cheapest market and selling goods in the highest. If business men wish to exploit labour they cannot object to an attitude of employees to get as much as possible for their labour and then buy in the cheapest market. I have no criticism of the increase of 1,739 per cent in the income of farmers, because in 1938-39 they were not getting a fair deal, but neither was the wage earner. However, it is not fair for primary producers to criticize the increased earnings of wage earners. The proportion of the national income paid in wages and salaries in 1949-50 was 51.8 per cent as compared with 48.6 per cent in 1950-51. The Commonwealth Bank Statistical Bulletin No. 97 discloses that in the iron and steel and heavy engineering group capital increased from 29.8 million pounds in 1949 to 40.3 million pounds in 1950, and other metal and machinery groups from 12.2 million pounds in 1949 to 23.2 million pounds in 1950, so industry does not appear to have done badly out of the economy of the country in the last couple of years. It is all very fine to disregard facts and make the bald statement, "We want more production." I dealt with the question of the 40-hour week 12 months ago and do not propose to touch on this tonight, but if members want to face up to facts I propose to have it recorded in *Hansard* where they will be able to peruse them. I am not asking them to accept my unsupported word, but I am quoting the State Government Statistician and the Commonwealth Statistician and companies' annual reports and balance-sheets, and I will prove to this House that production is not lagging, but that, on the other hand, the employee has given more production on the 40-hour week than on the 44- or the 48-hour week. I refer to Bulletin No. 3/52 issued by Mr. Semmens, the Acting Government Statist. In regard to output value he says:—

The gross value of output was £192,355,532, increase £50,827,303. Nearly all the principal industries showed increased output values, the greatest increase being for smelting, motor bodies, plant and equipment, metal pipes and tubes, sheet metal working, woolscouring and fellmongering. The value of output, however, does not give a true indication of the value of factory production, primarily because of dupli-

cation between industries. A better measure of value of work done in factories is obtained by deducting from the value of output the cost of raw materials, containers, power, fuel, light, oil, water, tools replaced and repairs to plant. The net result thus obtained represents the value added in the process of manufacture. The total £67,541,615 showed an increase of £15,232,629.

The Statistical Register compiled by Mr. Bowden, the Government Statist, for the year 1949-50, Part V.—Production, discloses some interesting figures. On page 88 will be found a return of articles used and produced. This gives quantity production and not value, so that members opposite cannot argue that because of increased prices the value of production is a false figure. I am sorry that the statistician is not very helpful in regard to motor body production. I have known of this for some years, but his contention is that as there are only two large competitors in South Australia if he publishes the figures both firms will know what the other is doing. However, there are some interesting items. For example, fibrous plaster sheets is given in square yards, as follows:—1944-5, 258,814; 1945-6, 348,274; 1946-7, 524,630; 1947-8, 714,796; 1948-9, 893,577; 1949-50, 969,406. This discloses that production has been more than trebled since 1944-5.

Mr. Fletcher—How many workers are there in the industry now?

Mr. LAWN—That is a reasonable question, but that information is not obtainable. One can only judge from these figures and as everything is increasing the honourable member cannot claim that every industry has doubled or trebled its labour force since 1944-5. However, I will give some figures on that aspect later. The next line shown is "Other plaster goods," as follows:—1944-5, £4,748; 1945-6, £7,395; 1946-7, £13,251; 1947-8, £26,361; 1948-9, £37,999; 1949-50, £42,072. Plaster of paris is shown in tons, as follows:—1946-7, 8,889 tons; 1947-8, 9,896 tons; 1948-9, 9,919 tons; 1949-50, 25,507 tons. This shows an increase of treble the amount produced in 1946-7, notwithstanding a reduction of four hours in the working week in 1948. Reinforcing steel is shown in tons, as follows:—1944-5, 186 tons; 1945-6, 290 tons; 1946-7, 615 tons; 1947-8, 373 tons; 1948-9, 421 tons; 1949-50, 1,022 tons.

Mr. Brookman—What about the production of other steel products which could not take place because they were diverted into steel rods for building? I would like to know the overall production of steel for the Commonwealth.

Mr. LAWN—The Statistical Register is available to all members and the honourable

member can look up any item in which he is interested. The figures for cement bricks and blocks are:—1946-7, 1,819,000; 1947-8, 2,655,000; 1948-9, 2,374,000; 1949-50, 3,830,000. The figures for red bricks are:—1944-5, 20,082,000; 1945-6, 33,570,000; 1946-7, 42,438,000; 1947-8, 46,522,000; 1948-9, 53,921,000; 1949-50, 53,311,000.

Mr. Whittle—That is to the credit of a good Liberal Government.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member might give some of the credit to the workers. It is the supporters of this Government who are saying that the employees are not giving increased production so where there is an increase the Government cannot claim the credit and say, "We have achieved an increase, but still want more."

Mr. Whittle—The Government very largely assisted those big plaster works and put them on their feet.

Mr. LAWN—I know something about the motor body industry and I do not think the Government did anything for that.

Mr. Whittle—It did not need Government assistance.

Mr. LAWN—It is the employees who are making these profits for the companies, not the companies' shareholders. Kerosene is shown in gallons, as follows:—1944-5, 24,254 gall.; 1945-6, 20,701gall.; 1946-7, 30,759gall.; 1947-8 31,864gall.; 1948-9, 30,409gall.; 1949-50, 42,798gall.

As people representing the farmers say that the employee in industry should not have a 40-hour week it is interesting to see what he has produced in the way of implements for the farmer. Agricultural implements are referred to on page 93. The first line is ploughs:—1944-5, 2,005; 1945-6, 1,411; 1946-7, 4,580; 1947-8, 1,196; 1948-9, 1,167; 1949-50, 1,452.

Year.	Persons Employed.	No. of Solid Fuel Stoves.	No. of Gas Stoves.	No. of Electric Stoves.	Total.	No. of Stoves Per Employees.
1938-39	3,693	54,461	46,733	8,757	109,951.	29.7
1945-46	3,693	46,368	22,072	31,778	100,218	27.1
1947-48	4,457	53,257	39,706	99,176	192,139	43.1
1948-49	4,691	63,067	49,624	101,867	214,458	45.7
1949-50	4,728	63,333	46,890	102,068	212,291	44.9
1950-51	not available	73,205	55,677	100,174	229,056	—

The figures show that stove production per employee on a 40-hour week has been considerably increased. The following information was supplied to me by those engaged in the baking trade:—During the 48-hour week bakers were baking bread in wood ovens at the rate of 400 loaves an hour. With a new

The figures indicate that the peak was reached just before the introduction of the 40-hour week. Take the manufacture of cultivators, the figures for which are as follows:—

Year.	No.
1944-45	170
1945-46	336
1946-47	455
1947-48	398
1948-49	338
1949-50	404

The manufacture of biscuits, shown under the heading of "Food, drink and tobacco" shows the following:—

Year.	Lbs.
1944-45	4,803,279
1945-46	4,394,812
1946-47	4,550,311
1947-48	4,864,630
1948-49	5,336,907
1949-50	6,751,677

(an all-time record)

Much information is available through the press. In the *Mail* of Saturday, January 12 last (page 11), the following statement appeared:—

You can thank our employees for keeping down the price of . . . Certainly we pay increased wages, and an increased price for all raw materials we must purchase, but to offset these costs of increased production targets were set. As a result of the concentrated efforts our employees have exceeded even these targets by a margin sufficient to reduce production costs to enable us to absorb extra charges for raw materials, bottles, fruit, etc.

The employees of this firm co-operated to such an extent that they exceeded the set target, reduced production costs and enabled the firm to absorb extra charges. The Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics refers to the manufacture of stoves, ovens and ranges of all Australian factories for the period 1938-51 and gives the following information:—

Year.	Persons Employed.	No. of Solid Fuel Stoves.	No. of Gas Stoves.	No. of Electric Stoves.	Total.	No. of Stoves Per Employees.
1938-39	3,693	54,461	46,733	8,757	109,951.	29.7
1945-46	3,693	46,368	22,072	31,778	100,218	27.1
1947-48	4,457	53,257	39,706	99,176	192,139	43.1
1948-49	4,691	63,067	49,624	101,867	214,458	45.7
1949-50	4,728	63,333	46,890	102,068	212,291	44.9
1950-51	not available	73,205	55,677	100,174	229,056	—

travelling oven, on a 40-hour week they were baking 1,200 an hour, and with a smaller travelling oven 600 an hour. Old wood ovens, which were later converted to oil burners, baked 400 loaves in 35 minutes. As regards sealing, or weighing of bread, old machines weighed 1,200 loaves an hour and

new machines, 1,820. On a 48-hour week these machines weighed 57,600 loaves and with a new machine, on a 40-hour week, 72,800. Working 48 hours bakers produced 20 dozen bread rolls an hour, whereas on a 40-hour week they baked 50 dozen. In other words, they baked 960 dozen rolls a week on a 48-hour week and 2,000 dozen a week on a 40-hour week. The production of yeast buns is about the same as bread rolls. I understand that pies are not under the control of the Prices Commissioner and are sold at 8d. each today. Working a 48-hour week a baker made between 18 to 20 dozen an hour, or 864 to 960 dozen a week. Today, on one particular type of machine, working a 40-hour week, a baker can produce 40 dozen an hour, or 1,600 dozen a week. On another type of machine he produces 50 to 60 dozen an hour or 2,000 to 2,400 dozen in 40 hours.

I think I said last year that there was a suspicion that employers in one trade were not concerned about production figures and were prepared to allow their employees to work overtime. It was stated that the firm would approach the Arbitration Court for a reversion from the 40-hour to a 44-hour week. I have before me the annual reports and balance-sheets of a company for the years 1950 and 1951. I also have figures relating to 1949 but they do not state the number of employees. In 1949, 29,943 cars and trucks were produced. In 1950 this company employed 10,114 employees throughout Australia and produced 43,968 cars and trucks, or an average of 4.3 per employee. The amount allowed for depreciation and directors' fees was £538,657 and the net profit was £2,603,364. An amount of £1,682,282 was retained in the business. In 1951 there were 10,164 employees and 45,505 cars and trucks were produced, or an average production per employee of 4.4. Depreciation and directors' fees totalled £587,851, the net profit was £3,348,023 and £2,828,328 was retained in the business. In referring to the increased production the 1950 report states:—

The gain that was registered resulted largely from an increase in _____'s production made possible by the splendid co-operation of _____'s employees and suppliers in all centres, and by technological improvements which have become effective during the year.

The 1951 report states:—

Average employment in 1951 was 10,164. Although the volume of products produced by the company exceeded that of the previous year, it was achieved with a relatively small increase in employment

The reports suggest that the increased production was achieved with a relatively small increase in employment. The report continues:—

In 1951 the _____'s suggestion plan had its most successful year. Suggestions submitted in all plants totalled 2,223, of which 712 were adopted, while awards totalled £5,718, including one award of £900 shared by two employees in the Perth plant. Since its adoption, the suggestion plan has demonstrated that it effectively stimulates employee initiative. It affords particular recognition to employees for their constructive ideas, thus tangibly linking their individual success with that of the business.

Last year I said that unions did not want to hold up production or to impose bans. We want increased production because that is our hope for getting a reduced working week and a better share of the national income. That is the only argument we can use before the Arbitration Court for either an increase in the basic wage or a reduction of hours. The Arbitration Court is not concerned with what it costs for a man and his family to live. It has stated that it is concerned with the economic position of the industry and its ability to pay. In this industry employees do everything possible to encourage greater production and they returned profits which exceed the company's paid-up capital of £2,311,600. Government members cry out for increased production, yet the figures I have quoted prove that employees are giving a greater production with a 40-hour week than with a 44-hour week. In 1950 the production manager of this company told me that when the 40-hour week was introduced the employees did the right thing and maintained a better production than in the previous year. I asked him "Didn't we give an increased production when the hours were changed from 48 to 44 a week?" and he replied "Yes, but we didn't believe you this time." Notwithstanding the increased production Government members say they want more production. What do they want?

Mr. Brookman—Would employees work harder if we lowered the working hours still more?

Mr. LAWN—I answered that question last year. There is always an appropriate time to do anything and the hours will be reduced when the time for it arrives. That is governed by a judicial tribunal which decides whether or not the time is proper to reduce the number of hours. When those decisions are favourable

for Government members they applaud arbitration but when they go against the Government the tribunal is wrong.

Mr. Heaslip—Has the company you mentioned been working with the same amount of machinery as before?

Mr. LAWN—I just said that this firm obtains suggestions from its employees and as a result there has been increased production. There has been co-operation between the firm and its employees. To maintain increased production there must be planning and more equipment and machinery. I have already cited examples in the baking trades where new machinery has increased production. During the last 12 months I had an opportunity of challenging the employers in the motor industry and asked them to produce production figures before a Conciliation Commissioner. Not one of the companies supplied that information voluntarily. However, when I was examining a company witness, he told the court that whereas in 1939 40 motor bodies were being produced daily, there were now 60. I asked, "Are your employees doing a better job than in 1939?" and his reply was an emphatic, "Sure." Mr. Conciliation Commissioner Galvin was suspicious that union members should be giving a greater production, and asked the witness, "But what are your employment figures today compared with 1939?" The witness replied, "We have 400 to 500 employees less." Mr. Galvin did not ask any more questions. What more evidence do Government members require to convince them that employees are giving greater production today? Greater production will not cure the economic ills of this country but a change of Government will.

Mr. Teusner—Tell us something about bricklayers.

Mr. LAWN—I do not know much about them, but I heard Mr. Shannon claim that they lay only 300 bricks a day. I believe I heard a member say that last year. I wonder whether Mr. Teusner can tell me how many bricks they lay.

Mr. Teusner—I have heard various figures mentioned in this House and elsewhere. Some have told me they lay 350.

Mr. LAWN—You are 200 out. I have been told by bricklayers that they lay 550 and they say that is a good day's work. I have another advertisement here which should be of interest to country representatives. It appeared in the *Advertiser* in October last, advertising a motor scythe, and it said that this machine does the

work of six men for 6d. an hour. I ask members opposite why they do not buy such a machine. The advertisement says that this is the actual experience of thousands of Australian primary producers. It cuts grass, hay, and crops more quickly and cleanly than could six husky men using hand scythes and petrol costs only 6d. an hour. It is simple in operation and the initial cost is low. If members opposite want more than that, they are hard to please. No doubt farmers are utilizing these machines and yet we are told that workers are not producing anything.

I now come to the question of the recent increase of 13s. a week in the basic wage. The Commonwealth Statistician says that that 13s. must be paid to the wage earner to give him in August sufficient money to meet the prices which existed in April, May and June, the basic wage then being £11 4s. a week. The worker is only catching up with the prices business people have been charging. Is it a coincidence that when the Statistician's officers were in a certain South Australian country town getting figures for that month there happened to be in the town on the same day officers from the Prices Branch policing only the prices regimen?

If members opposite are genuine in their attempt to stop the inflationary spiral they should favour the pegging of prices to those ruling in April, May and June. According to the Statistician, we would then be all square, but if the employer is now permitted to increase the cost of his goods owing to the addition of that 13s., there will be no end to the spiral. The Minister controlling prices should not permit manufacturers to increase the price of their goods because of the basic wage increase. I suggest that the States should hand over price control to the Commonwealth Government. I believe that one way to retard the spiral is for the Commonwealth Government to subsidize certain goods. However, it is not fair to ask the Government to find money for subsidies if it is to have no say in the prices to be paid for articles subsidized. If prices were pegged immediately and a definite Government policy pursued to subsidize various items, conditionally upon prices being reduced, then within six months we could either cease or at least relax price control. It must be effective price control and not the hybrid system we have now. If we had a period of subsidized control, the basic wage would eventually right itself. I have taken out a list showing the basic wage as at August since 1939 and it is as follows:—1939, £3 18s.; 1940, £4; 1941, £4 3s.; 1942, £4 11s.; 1943, £4 14s.; 1944, £4 13s.; 1945,

£4 13s.; 1946, £4 15s.; 1947, £5 4s.; 1948, £5 14s.; 1949, £6 4s.; 1950, £6 14s.; 1951, £9 4s.; 1952, £11 4s.

I also prepared another list showing the basic wage existing at various periods. In November, 1946, it was £4 15s., but in the following month it was increased by 7s. to £5 2s. It would be interesting to see what happened in the next 12 months, and then to make a comparison following the increase of 21s. a week after a change in the Commonwealth Government. Despite the 7s. increase in December, 1946, no further increase was allowed in February, 1947. In 1946-47 we had a Labor regime in power under Mr. Ben Chifley. In May, 1947, the basic wage was increased to £5 3s.; in August, 1947, to £5 4s.; and in November, 1947, to £5 6s.—a rise of 4s. over those four quarters under a Federal Labor Government. In November, 1950, the basic wage in Adelaide was £6 17s. and in December, 1950, the Commonwealth Arbitration Court increased it to £7 18s. Subsequent quarterly adjustments in February, May, August and November, 1951, brought the basic wage for Adelaide to £9 15s. an increase of 37s. a week under a Liberal and Country Party regime in Canberra. The *Advertiser* of May 25, 1948, and the *News* of May 28, 1948, contained the following advertisement authorized by the Liberal Party:—

A personal message to the people of South Australia—I say this to you . . . You may vote "No" on Saturday in the full knowledge that when Canberra control ceases your South Australian Government will introduce legislation to control prices and rents as may be necessary.—T. Playford, Premier.—To keep controls within your own State vote thus—Yes (2), No (1) on Saturday, May 29.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is the most costly piece of advice ever given to South Australians.

Mr. LAWN—Yes. Mr. Chifley did not make rash promises, and, when he did promise progressive reductions in taxation, he implemented those promises, but here Mr. Playford promised the introduction of such legislation as his Government thought necessary to control prices and rents. Evidently the Premier has not thought it necessary to exercise very much control over prices and rents. Last year when the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act was amended I opposed the "retrospectivity" clause, and pointed out that rent was considered when fixing the basic wage, that it would take six months for the basic wage earner to receive the benefit of any rise consequent on an increase of rents, and that he would not

receive the benefit until June this year at the earliest. Last week in this House the Premier admitted that the main factor in the 13s. increase in the basic wage announced this month was the increase in rents. In November, 1949, Mr. Menzies promised to cut living costs and improve industrial relations, and the *Australian Women's Weekly* of December 10, 1949, contained the following statement by him:—

In the joint Opposition policy speech I emphasized our determination, in co-operation with the States, to facilitate the training and provision of domestic workers so that the present burden on so many thousands of wives and mothers can be lightened. Our plans for reducing the inflated cost of living were also stressed. This is probably the most worrying problem confronting the housewife today; the problem of getting a little more value out of the Labor-Socialist pound. Statisticians conservatively allow that the pound of 1939 is now worth only 12s. 2d. in "buying" power. But the average Australian housewife knows only too well that it would be nearer to the mark to say it is worth only 10s. Prices can be reduced only if increased production of essential goods and commodities is achieved. We believe that increased production will be achieved as soon as workers realize that they will benefit directly by their additional effort. Under Labor-Socialist Government, they have no such realization or prospect. Under the new non-Socialist Government, keen patriotic productive effort will be rewarded by incentive payments and profit-sharing. But there is another angle. While encouraging production to the full, our Government will hold itself ready to pay price subsidies in appropriate cases; particularly in respect of items affecting the cost of living of basic wage earners.

If Mr. Menzies contended in December, 1949, that, although economists said that the 1939 pound was worth 12s. 2d. in buying power, it was really worth only 10s., he would now have to admit that as economists consider it to be worth 6s. 11d. at present, its real worth is nearer 4s. The Prime Minister also said to the people of Australia in 1949, "Take it from me, we can and will put shillings back into the pound." However, he does not keep his promises. On another occasion he said, "The Chifley pound is worth 10/- today. The Liberal pound will buy you 20/- worth of goods". I am appalled at the mutilation of the Australian pound.

Mr. O'Halloran—There will not be much left of it soon.

Mr. LAWN—Recently we read in the press that the Federal Treasurer (Sir Arthur Fadden) said that there was more value in the pound now. He must have been unlucky for

he said that only about a week before the announcement of the latest increase in the basic wage.

Mr. O'Halloran—Only two days before.

Mr. LAWN—I ask members to picture an operating table around which are two amateur doctors—Mr. Menzies and Sir Arthur Fadden. The patient is the Australian pound. The doctors have the best surgical equipment available in Australia and are assisted by Sister Playford and five other nursing sisters. They are all anxiously watching, when suddenly Doctor Fadden says, "The patient moved, I saw it move". Sister Playford says, "Well, doctor, if you are right we cannot be charged with having murdered the Australian pound; we can only be charged with having inflicted grievous bodily harm". Doctor Menzies says, "I am not so sure that the patient moved. I did not see it move, and I only hope that your statement was not the result of an over-imaginative mind." It seems that these amateurs are not aware of what they are doing to the Australian pound, for only two days before the announcement of the latest basic wage rise they said there was more value in the pound.

Let us see what the people think of the mutilation of the pound. According to the Sydney *Sunday Sun* of April 22, 1951, the people desire the Federal Government to resume the control of prices. An article in that newspaper states:—

Federal prices control wanted.—Sixty-four per cent in favour.—Australians want Federal price control irrespective of the party returned to power. A Gallup Poll this month shows that majorities in all States would vote to reverse the 1947 Prices Referendum. In this survey three questions were asked and replied to as follows:—

Full price control.—Question: "Would you favour, or oppose, again having full price control, as during the war?" Voting was:—In favour, 72 per cent; opposed, 22 per cent; no opinion, 6 per cent. Those in favour comprise nine out of 10 of those who will vote Labor next Saturday and six out of 10 of those who will vote Liberal-Country Party.

Prices Referendum.—Question: "Price control is now run by the States. If a referendum were held on giving the Federal Government power to control prices in peace-time, would you vote 'Yes,' in favour, or 'No,' against?" Unexpectedly, the "Yes" vote was higher among men (70 per cent) than among women (59 per cent). The Australia-wide vote was:—Yes, 64 per cent; no, 24 per cent; undecided, 12 per cent. This compares with only 51 per cent "Yes" in a similar Gallup Poll six months ago. Of those who will vote Labor next Satur-

day eight of 10 would vote "Yes" at a prices referendum. So would six out of 10 Liberal voters.

I point out to members who desire greater production that when there is anything to be done there is always an apparent way of doing it, but the apparent way is not the only way and frequently not the best way. I remind them that not all industries are as efficient as they could be. Before workers are urged to work harder members should see that industries are managed efficiently. It is not fair to make the bald statement, "We want more production from the workers," when the employees are producing more in 40 hours than they did in 48. The member for Flinders said:—

The basic wage is now over £11 a week for attending a place of employment for 40 hours, and civil servants attend under 40 hours.

He was slighting workers when he said that they are paid over £11 a week for merely attending their place of employment for 40 hours. They do not merely attend; they work hard. Workers in Port Lincoln do not receive the basic wage for merely attending. I think the fact was that the honourable member really did not have very much to say. I wish now to refer to a statement by Mr. Shannon. As recorded at page 61 of *Hansard*, he said:—

In some industries it has been customary for one employer to go in a friendly way to the employees of a competitor and say, "I will give you a pound a week more than you are receiving and I have a nice scheme for my employees by which they enjoy more privileges than you enjoy now. Come and work for me." How could that employer afford to offer something which his competitor could not? I am talking of the "cost plus" times when the manufacturer had merely to say to the Prices Commissioner, "Here is my list of costs and this is the price I must get to cover them," and the Prices Commissioner would approve the price asked, no account being taken of the benefits which eventually had to be paid for by the consumer.

Mr. Fletcher—Those costs were due to the black marketing of labour.

Mr. Shannon—Yes, and, in view of the fact that they pirated labour from their competitors, I am amazed that such employers expect sympathy when times get hard. Black market labour cost many people much money but made profits for only a few. Another serious factor contributing to the inflationary spiral is price control. Under present legislation the Prices Department investigates the affairs of a firm applying for an increase in price and, if its books disclose rising costs, an increase is approved. It matters not one iota to any manufacturer today whether his management is efficient, whether he is careful to avoid leakages in costs, or whether he is

using all available refinements. Part of the increased price approved may be due to increased costs which the manufacturer, because of his laxity, has failed to take care of.

Either the honourable member does not know the workings of the Prices Branch, or the Minister controlling it does not always speak the truth. I am inclined to believe both the Premier and Mr. Lea, the general manager of the Electricity Trust, who have separately made statements to a deputation of the Trades and Labor Council. During the overtime ban at the Osborne works a deputation from the Trades and Labor Council waited on Mr. Lea and he informed them that the Premier as the Minister controlling the Prices Branch would not approve any increase over and above award rates. If Mr. Lea is right—and I believe he

is, for similar statements have been made to me by other employers—the member for Onkaparinga is most misinformed in making a wild statement like that. On the other hand, if he is correct it is an indictment on the working of the Prices Branch.

I sum up with the following lines:—

Up, up, up go the prices.

Up, up, up go profits too.

Unemployment figures keep rising.

That's what the Liberal's policy does for you.

Mr. PATTINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 30, at 2 p.m.