

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, August 5, 1952.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Dunks) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PROCEDURE ON QUESTIONS.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—I remind members that under our Standing Orders the procedure is to ask leave of the House if a member desires to make a statement or read an extract prior to asking a question. In some Parliaments it is necessary to have a resolution to that effect. I would like members to adhere to our Standing Orders, which are as I have stated.

QUESTIONS.**ELECTRICITY SUPPLY FOR RADIUM HILL.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Is the rumour true that the Electricity Trust intends to provide a power line to serve Radium Hill in the near future? If so, as there is considerable interest in this subject in towns along what may be the route of the transmission line, can the Premier state its approximate route?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Electricity Trust has been investigating two questions on behalf of the Department of Mines—(a) whether it would be advantageous to construct electrical services at Radium Hill to provide for the needs of the mine, or (b) whether it would be advisable to construct a transmission line to Radium Hill from established sources. Investigations so far reveal that the latter would be the cheaper, and I have no doubt that in due course a proposal involving such a project will be placed before Parliament. What towns can be served is not so easily resolved. A connection would have to be made to existing services where the voltage is high and the mains have sufficient capacity to carry the additional load. It would appear at present that the most suitable point of departure would be at Waterloo, but the matter is being surveyed further. Another aspect is involved in as much as overtures have been made from Broken Hill for an extension of the service to that city, and that matter also is being investigated.

CONTROL OF CATS.

Mr. DAVIS.—A report recently appeared in the Port Pirie press regarding cats in the district, and it was mentioned that most of them were skin and bone owing to disease and

lack of food. The Port Pirie Corporation received the following letter on the matter from a ratepayer:—

Re your article in the paper about 16 cats in Fifth Street, you are getting out light. If Dr. Viner Smith, as Health Officer, likes to visit Solomontown he will find no less than 50 between Midway Service Station and the foundry, also around King Street. This is no exaggeration, as in our own street every morning the smell is something disgusting and the milkman has to stand guard while we collect the milk. There are cats with three legs, one ear, and one eye. The most sensible plan in my estimation is registering them the same as dogs. I am not a person who dislikes cats; I like one clean one.

Will the Minister of Local Government bring down legislation for the control of cats?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I once read a very interesting article entitled, "No-one Owns a Cat." That is quite true. A cat changes its master as quickly as anything I know. I suggest that the honourable member use his ingenuity to devise a private Bill.

EFFECT OF MYXOMATOSIS.

Mr. HEASLIP—Reports appeared in the press recently regarding a disease up the River Murray, mostly at Mildura and Loxton, which affects cats and dogs, and it is being linked up with myxomatosis. Has the Minister of Agriculture any information that would assure the people that myxomatosis is not harmful to animals other than rabbits?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Following upon press reports regarding a mysterious disease breaking out among dogs in the Mildura and Loxton areas, I obtained from the Chief Inspector of Stock a report which I should like to make public because of its importance. It reads:—

So far as I am aware myxomatosis has never been recorded as occurring in man, domesticated animals or birds, and it is understood that this disease is quite harmless to other than a particular genus of rabbit—to which the wild rabbit of Australia belongs. In Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation Bulletin 96, published in 1936, which describes investigations made in 1934-35 in England into myxomatosis by Sir Charles Martin, F.R.S., D.Sc.—who was for two years previously in charge of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation's Division of Animal Nutrition, Adelaide—Sir Charles states, on page 21, that—"Quite a number of attempts to infect laboratory animals—guinea pigs, rats, mice, and domesticated animals of various kinds—have been made by those pathologists who have studied myxomatosis. The number of attempts made to infect these various animals is usually not stated and presumably in the case of the larger domesticated animals—horses, cattle, and sheep—the number of

experiments was limited to a few, but the evidence is sufficient to show that myxomatosis is a highly specific disease."

Again in an article on myxomatosis by Dr. L. E. Bull, D.V.Sc., published in the *Journal of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation*, Volume 17, No. 2, May, 1944, it is stated by him, in respect to the specificity of the virus, that—"Sheep, goats, horses, pigs, cattle, dogs, cats, fowls, pigeons, ducks, man, monkey, guinea pigs, mice, rats, ferrets, and hamsters have all been tested by workers overseas and all have been found to be refractory. This work was repeated in Australia and in addition, 16 varieties of native animals were tested. All these animals were found to be refractory."

Dr. Bull is Chief of the Division of Animal Industry C.S. & I.R.O. and one can feel assured that, realizing all the implications, he would not make any recommendation for general use of the virus—unless he was well satisfied by critical tests—that there was no risk to humans and other animals or birds.

In view of the above published statements made by these two eminent research workers who have specially studied the disease, it would seem unlikely that this reported epidemic among dogs in the Victorian Mallee is myxomatosis or in any way related to it. If it were—or the two things were related—it could reasonably be expected that there would be reports of similar trouble among dogs in other parts of Victoria as well, since at Myxomatosis Conference in Melbourne on 17 June the Victorian delegates made the statement that there was no district in the whole of that State in which myxomatosis had not become established among rabbits. It is recalled that last year, also, Victorian newspapers reported sickness and deaths occurring in dogs and other stock in an area in the north west of Victoria where myxomatosis had been established among rabbits by the C.S. & I.R.O. which trouble was alleged to be due to this disease. It was later reported in the papers that investigations had proved the trouble to be due to other unrelated causes.

Recently I submitted a report on an investigation made by this department into reported deaths of domesticated animals and poultry in the Loxton area, which were being attributed by owners concerned to myxomatosis. As stated in my report, we were not able to secure much actual material to work on, but with such sick animals and poultry as were seen and examined it was found that the trouble was due to other distinct diseases. I am unable to hazard any guess as to what the reported disease in the dogs in Victoria is.

GLOSSOP DRAINAGE SCHEME.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—As the Minister of Lands knows, the problem of rising seepage water in the new Glossop township is an urgent one. Approaches have been made to him and the responsible department over a long period, and today I received a reply from the Minister in which he said that the Engineer-in-Chief had stated it would take some months to gather

sufficient data to enable a reasonable design and estimate to be prepared for the work. Does the Minister know, and if not will he ascertain what data are required, for the department has been working on this seepage matter for many months, probably a year? If he could indicate the information required the Glossop Township Committee might be able to help the department in the matter of designing a scheme?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—There has been some delay in obtaining the information necessary to show whether or not a drainage scheme is possible, because of the nature of the soil. It is very stony and there are many problems. Perhaps the main reason for the delay is that all efforts in the river area have been directed towards settling ex-servicemen applicants. It would mean that any plant or officers taken away on a scheme of that nature would necessarily slow down any move as regards soldier settlement.

Mr. Macgillivray—That is not correct.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—It is. However, I will obtain a further reply for the honourable member.

DESTRUCTION OF COUCH GRASS.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Has the Minister of Agriculture any reply to a question I asked last Wednesday about a poison to destroy couch grass?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I referred the matter to the Research Officer, Weeds, in my department who has furnished the following report:—

Within recent years the growth regulating chemical trichloroacetic acid (T.C.A.) has been found to possess grass-killing properties. Unlike the more familiar hormone-like weedicides, 2,4-D, M.C.P.A., and 2,4,5-T, this grass-killer is not selective in its herbicidal action; therefore it cannot be used to destroy grasses growing either with economic crop plants (including cereals, fodder plants, fruit trees, and vines), or amongst cultivated ornamentals whether these latter be annuals, shrubs, or trees. T.C.A. is most effective against couch grass when either applied directly to the roots of the plant after cultivation of the infested area, or applied to the soil when moist, as the chemical acts through root system more than through the above-ground parts of couch grass. T.C.A. will kill almost all forms of plant life. This would greatly restrict the situations in which local government authorities could safely apply the material. Although freely available, the present price of T.C.A. is such that its use is only economic on small areas of couch grass infested land of high potential value, such as market gardens or plant nurseries, and even then only on sites removed from economic crops or ornamental plantings.

The chemical has a very short term soil sterilizing effect, which is a great advantage in some situations, as the older soil sterilizing weed killers such as arsenicals and chlorates often rendered the ground useless from a productive point of view for an indefinite period.

SOUTH-CROSS ROADS INTERSECTION.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I received a letter from the Unley Corporation dated July 30, 1952, in which the town clerk states:—

I have been directed by my council to request that you ask the Minister of Local Government for a reply to a deputation that waited on him about the separation of road and rail traffic at the intersection of Cross and South Roads.

Has the Minister any reply to the deputation which I introduced on behalf of the Unley and other councils so that they will have some idea as to what is expected of them in connection with the grade separation which was advocated?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I thought my reply to the deputation was adequate and I regret that the councils did not quite appreciate that the work was in no way one of real urgency or could not be accomplished within the foreseeable future. If a more definite reply is required, that reply may be passed on. I will look up the minutes of that deputation, but I think that reply was accepted. The fact remains that more urgent work of much more potential value to the State remains undone, and whilst that position remains, I cannot give any undertaking as to when the work will proceed, if at all, in the near future.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In view of the extraordinary bottleneck which has been created at this intersection as a result of the Goodwood-Marino railway duplication it has been necessary to have a sign placed on the wig-wag warning apparatus to prevent right-hand turns when a train is crossing this main intersection. As a consequence a traffic jam builds up from north, south, east and west, involving extra work for police officers to clear the congestion. The Government accepted a report without making investigations into the likely result, ignoring pleas and questions raised by myself and representations by deputations. In view of this will the Minister of Local Government immediately arrange for the inclusion of the Marion Road in the main roads schedule and investigate the possibilities of having a new cutting on the Sturt Creek where it intersects the Marion Road and the erection of a bridge there to enable some of the traffic to be diverted from the South Road to the Marion Road?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will dissect the honourable member's speech and endeavour

to bring down a co-ordinated reply. In the first place, however, he has grossly reflected upon the Public Works Committee in saying that its report was wrong and that the Government wrongfully took notice of it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On a point of order. I did not use the word "wrongfully" and I object to the Minister's insinuation.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I placed my own interpretation on the honourable member's meaning, but I withdraw the word. In any case, if the report was not wrong the Government was right in acting on it, so the honourable member may have it whichever way he likes. The duplication of the line has not affected the position to any great degree. As regards the rest of the question, I will bring down a reply.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE OF MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week relating to difficulties which had been reported by insurers in having their vehicles covered for third party risk as required by the Road Traffic Act?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I took this matter up with the underwriters and have received the following report:—

The chairman of the Fire and Accident Underwriters Association of South Australia (Mr. W. H. Jackson) desires to assure the Premier that the association will not countenance any departure from the undertaking which association members have given the Government in relation to compulsory third party insurance. The association would be greatly surprised to learn that there has been in fact any such departure on the part of any of its members as it has been clearly impressed upon them that the association's policy is to facilitate whenever possible the administration of any Act of Parliament with the provisions of which insurers are in any way concerned. Mr. Jackson desires it to be known that his association will only too willingly investigate any complaint by a member of the public who claims that he has experienced difficulty in obtaining compulsory third party cover.

It will be seen from that report that the association is strongly behind the legislation, and, if there be any complaint, the matter should be taken up with Mr. Jackson who, I am sure, will see that an immediate remedy is provided.

HOUSING AT STOCKWELL.

Mr. TEUSNER—Whilst I am fully appreciative of the work of the Housing Trust in providing homes in rural districts, there is at Stockwell, a small town in my electorate, an

important, long-established industry, a flour mill, which recently has had some difficulty in holding employees because of insufficient housing accommodation. Will the Treasurer take up with the Housing Trust the question of conducting a survey of Stockwell's housing requirements with a view to acquiring land for homes to meet those requirements?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, I will be pleased to do that.

CONTROL OF DENTISTS' FEES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—A friend of mine, who is also one of my constituents, told me that he was obliged to take his wife to a city dentist for extractions and a denture, that the dentist rendered to him an account amounting to 27 guineas for the denture, which was fitted on the same day as the extractions were made, and a few days later he was obliged to take his wife back to the dentist for an adjustment of the fitting, for which he received a further account for £6 6s., although the teeth were left with the dentist for only five hours. That fee seems to me quite excessive, but my constituent finds that he must pay for he is in the dentist's hands. Will the Premier ask the Prices Branch to investigate the charges made by dentists and see whether such charges warrant their being brought under price control?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the member will forward me the names of those concerned I will have the matter investigated.

MONEYLENDERS' CHARGES.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Premier read the article by Blake Brownrigg in last night's *News* relating to the problems of assimilating Europeans into the Australian way of life? The article is the first of two dealing with the problems confronting South Australia's 32,000 migrants. It refers to their difficulties and states:—

And now comes the spectre of unemployment. Some unemployed New Australians, up to their eyes in debt, have got themselves into the hands of usurers who charge them 60 per cent interest for small loans.

Will the Premier have the position investigated with a view to bringing down amending legislation to prohibit such exorbitant interest charges?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Under the Money-lenders Act the permissible interest rates are set out. They have not been increased recently and as far as I know the legislation is satisfactory. It may be that, in some instances, persons have illegally charged higher

rates, but unless complaints are made to the authorities nothing is known of these private transactions. The prescribed interest rates were considered and approved by Parliament. If any greater rate is charged then the person concerned should complain and an appropriate investigation would be made.

PORT LINCOLN WHARF STRIKE.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—At Port Lincoln there has been an intermittent strike on the waterfront which has seriously disrupted the shipping of overseas commodities and local perishables. Local residents are in the exasperating position of not getting fresh fruit and vegetables regularly, which is very annoying as well as inconvenient. Will the Premier take this matter up with the Minister for Shipping to see if the trouble cannot be ended so that the port can revert to normal shipping conditions?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This is not a new problem. For a considerable time there has been a shortage of labour at Port Lincoln and, consequently, there has been a serious delay in handling ships and in unloading wheat cargoes coming by train from the country. The Stevedoring Industry Commission made an order to increase the number of waterside workers to 200 but the local union has accepted only 175. The problem is one of fairly long standing and, although it is one of control by the Stevedoring Industry Commission, I will bring it under the notice of the Federal Minister for Shipping to see if there is any appropriate action he can take.

REGISTRATION OF ELECTRICIANS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—About two years ago I introduced to the Premier a deputation from the Electrical Trades Employees Union, which desired to have electricians registered. Does the Premier intend to introduce legislation during this session for that purpose?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government gets many requests for legislation to license or control various sections of industry. They are usually restrictive in their nature and are in some instances designed to stop persons from working in a particular profession. The Government believes the matter raised by the honourable member can be best dealt with by having fairly rigid inspections by the Electricity Trust, which is the authority that governs electrical installations. It does not desire the cost of electrical fittings and installations to rise excessively, as it might with a licensing system.

BARMERA WINERY.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Is the Minister of Irrigation aware that Penfolds Wines Proprietary Limited has held considerable land in the Barmera township ostensibly for the purpose of building a winery, and that a lease was granted only after representations had been made to the Premier who, I believe, was assured that the company had sufficient plant to establish the winery almost immediately. That interview took place some years ago and the company has held the lease for that purpose ever since. Is there any truth in the rumour that it does not intend to build the winery?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have not heard of any such rumour, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

FAIRVIEW ESTATE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—About 10 years ago the Government purchased a property, known as Fairview Estate, near Lucindale in the South-East. Has the property been developed or any portion of it allotted? If not, what is the Government's intention regarding this considerable area?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The honourable member indicated that he would ask this question, so I obtained a report, which is as follows:—

Fairview Estate, 31,646 acres, was purchased by the State under the Crown Lands Development Act in October, 1945. It was submitted to the Commonwealth in 1946 for development under the provisions of the War Service Land Settlement Act, but was refused by the then Government in July, 1946. 26,602 acres of the area was again submitted to the Commonwealth in April, 1951, and refused, but on re-submission the present Minister of the Interior agreed to reconsider the matter on receipt of a soil survey by the C.S. & I.R.O. This cannot be carried out before the end of the year. The matter is one which will be discussed with the Commonwealth Minister when his health permits him to visit this State and if possible an inspection will be arranged with him.

This area was purchased at the very reasonable price of 5s. 6d. an acre, and it was considered by the Lands Development Executive that some 16 holdings could eventually be taken from it. I am hoping, if I can get the Federal Minister to inspect it, that he will agree to at least a portion being developed straight away. It is a very wet spot, but there are some suitable areas in it, although they are scattered.

VEHICLE WASHING FACILITIES AT ABATTOIRS.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Has the Minister of Agriculture any more information to give the House in reply to the question I asked last

week about facilities for washing vehicles at the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I referred the matter to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, and the general manager reports:—

Representation, in writing, was made some time ago by S.A. Country Goods Services asking "if facilities for washing down motor vehicles so that carriers' trucks could be cleaned after carrying livestock and be in a satisfactory condition to carry general merchandise." This request was agreed to by my board. A site at the stock markets was selected and the necessary preparatory work carried out in readiness for the concrete floor. The only factor holding up the completion of the works is the inability to purchase three tons of locally manufactured cement, which has been and still is unavailable for this class of work.

BARLEY PRICES.

Mr. STEPHENS—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week whether it was a fact that Australia was exporting first-grade barley to Japan at a cheaper price than that paid for inferior grade barley in this State?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have a report which has been made available to the Minister of Agriculture from the chairman of the Barley Board. It states:—

During the current season barley sales to Japan included 400,000 bushels of malting grade at 21s. 11½d. per bushel F.O.B. and 2,200,000 bushels of milling grade at 19s. 6¾d. per bushel F.O.B. whereas similar malting grade barley was sold to local consumers at 11s. 2½d. per bushel till the 19th June, 1952, and at 11s. per bushel since that date and milling grade at up to 11s. per bushel till the 19th June, 1952, and up to 10s. 9½d. per bushel after that date.

Mr. STEPHENS—Can the Premier say at what price first grade barley has been sold to maltsters and inferior grade barley to pig breeders in the last six months?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The prices to maltsters in Australia were set out in the report I read, namely, 11s. 2½d. and 11s. Speaking from memory as Prices Minister, the price to pig breeders was 15s. 2d.

PORT PIRIE WHARVES.

Mr. DAVIS—Is the Minister of Marine aware of the bad condition of the wharves at Port Pirie? If not, will he call for a report with a view to having repairs effected?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I am not aware of the alleged bad state of repair of the wharves, as it is not a routine matter to report such things to me. Parliament appropriates a certain sum annually for departmental maintenance and I am sure the Harbors

Board will effect any repairs acutely needed. However, I will call for a report in regard to the Port Pirie wharves.

FISHING BOAT FACILITIES AT THEVENARD.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Following on my visit to Thevenard some weeks ago I made a request to the Minister of Agriculture for financial assistance for the establishment of a boatslip there for the fishermen. Has the Minister any information to give on this matter?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The Deputy Chief Inspector of the Fisheries and Game Department will visit Thevenard in the near future and report to me on his return from that important centre.

CUSTODY OF MONEY AT POLICE STATIONS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—On July 29 Mr. Fred Walsh asked the Premier a question in regard to a sum of £400 alleged to be missing from a suburban police station. At the honourable member's request I now ask the Premier if he has any further information.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Commissioner of Police reports:—

It is not a fact that about £400 was discovered missing from a suburban police station. The audit system in operation in the metropolitan area is considered satisfactory. Evidently Mr. Walsh, M.P., is referring to a case where an investigation of accounts of a court of summary jurisdiction in the suburbs has disclosed discrepancies which at the present moment amount to £31. The officer concerned has been arrested on information and is at present on remand from the Adelaide Police Court.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL BENEFITS ORGANIZATIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In reply to my question of July 22 regarding hospital and medical benefits organizations the Premier said that the Government had the matter under consideration. Is he aware that on June 28, 1952, a company was registered under the name of "Ajax" and is offering certain benefits to contributors to the health scheme? This company has three salesmen at present at Wudinna on Eyre Peninsula and their activities have been reported to the Adelaide Detective Office. Will the Premier have a complete investigation into the company's activities to ascertain whether it is *bona fide* and can stand up to the claims mentioned in its brochures?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—At the beginning of the session the honourable member drew attention to a case where he considered certain

people were not adequately protected. Pursuant to a statement I made at the time, the matter was taken up with the Commonwealth authorities, but the position as regards the Commonwealth is somewhat confused. I am not in a position to say whether the company concerned is or is not registered. I subsequently stated in Parliament that the Government was preparing legislation. It will be of a general nature setting out what should be the standard for the protection of the public, and will not be directed at any company which may or may not be reputable on the information to hand.

LAND SETTLEMENT IN NORTH-WEST AREAS.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked on July 24 concerning the allotment of land north-west of Lake Cadibarrawirracanna to young men in my district?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following report from the chairman of the Pastoral Board:—

The land situated immediately north-west of Lake Cadibarrawirracanna is pastoral block 744, "Giddi-Giddinna," and is held by Messrs. R. D. Kempe and R. S. Scobie under licence 6437. This block comprises some of the worst pastoral country in the State and does not warrant any expenditure on improvements in an endeavour to permanently stock the area. The land has not been stocked by the present licensees, nor by the previous licensees, G. & E. A. Brooks, Limited, and has always been held to serve as a buffer between Anna Creek and Nilpinna. The board has no knowledge of any recent inquiry for this country and has no plans to inspect the land in the immediate future. It is thought, however, that the land actually referred to is that situated west of Wintinna, Mount Gillen West, and Murlooppie, and may include portion of pastoral block 1037 held by T. Cullinan under licence 5517. This area is situated approximately 90-100 miles north-east of the lake referred to above.

Mr. W. Reick and his brother recently interviewed the board regarding this land and they are probably the persons referred to by Mr. L. G. Riches, M.P. They were informed that it was not intended to call applications for this country until such time as the board was satisfied that there was a reasonable likelihood of its successful occupation and that it would be at least 12 months, and probably longer, before an inspection of the area could be made. Messrs. Reick advised the board that they had not been on the area they desired to lease, although they had a good knowledge of leased land further north, having done considerable boring and dam construction work on Welbourne Hill and Teyon Stations.

Over the past few years several inquiries have been received for land in this vicinity

and if it is ultimately decided that the land is suitable for occupation, it is considered that it should be gazetted open to general application. Although Messrs. Reick impressed the board as being good types of men, the board, in fairness to other applicants, would not be prepared to recommend the granting of any temporary tenure to them pending gazettal. During the last two years the board's time has been fully occupied in making inspections of the large number of pastoral leases which have come up for re-valuation.

The board is fully committed for this year, but it may be possible for an inspection to be carried out some time next year. As far as is known, the country is waterless and inhospitable, and as the departmental buckboard would be unsuitable for the purpose of inspecting the land, it will be necessary for a four-wheel drive truck to be engaged for the trip so that a satisfactory inspection can be made.

TRANSPORT FOR COUNTRY PATIENTS.

Mr. RICHES—I understand that the Whyalla Town Council has referred to the Premier the question of the cost of transporting sick people from country centres to Adelaide. This cost represents a very heavy burden on men working in industry and others. Applications have been made seeking some form of Government assistance to meet this expense. The Government assists indigent persons but the people I have in mind are those in ordinary wage groups who find that an account for £25 for transport to hospital represents a heavy liability at a time when other unforeseen expenses occur. This position arises at Whyalla and nearby districts. I have in mind a station labourer who was struck down with poliomyelitis and is unable to receive the benefit of the scheme under which the Government subsidizes transport, because there is no local board of health to give the necessary certificate. Has the Premier made any inquiries into the desirability of granting financial assistance in cases of this kind and, if not, will he give the matter consideration before the Budget is presented?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government has embarked upon an ambulance scheme which is operated by the St. John Ambulance Brigade. The Government has given financial assistance for the inauguration of a transportation scheme, and I understand it will be extended to the country. It is true that when indigent patients have had to come to the city the Government has given transportation assistance. That is also the position with poliomyelitis cases that have to be brought to the city for special treatment. The poliomyelitis case from outside a local health district has not come under my notice. If the honourable

member will give me the name of the patient I will have the matter examined. I think it is unusual because it appears to be outside the scheme that has been drawn up. If the honourable member will give me particulars I will take up the matter with the appropriate authorities to see what assistance can be given.

TUMBY BAY-WHYALLA ROAD.

Mr. Christian for Mr. PEARSON (on notice)—

1. What amount of money was expended to June 30, 1952, on the Tumby Bay-Whyalla Road bituminizing programme (a) at the Whyalla end; (b) at the Tumby Bay end?

2. How many miles have been constructed ready for bitumen (a) at the Whyalla end; (b) at the Tumby Bay end?

3. What is the estimated cost per mile of the road when completed?

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

1. (a) £24,194; (b) £42,198.

2. (a) seven miles base course only; and a further two miles under construction. (b) five miles base course only.

3. Average estimated cost, £6,500 a mile.

PORT ADELAIDE HARBOUR DEVELOPMENT SCHEME.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—Can the Minister of Marine indicate the number and the value respectively of allotments and houses or buildings acquired by the South Australian Harbours Board on Le Fevre Peninsula in connection with the harbour development scheme?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The following table gives the information desired:—

Purchases up to July 31, 1952.

Description.	No.	Purchase price.
Land—		£
Allotments	1,289	101,255
Broadacres	257 acres	22,064
Buildings—		
Temporary shacks, 6; underground concrete shelter constructed by the army, 1	7	1,755
Permanent houses	nil	nil
Total purchase price		£125,074

A.S.G. LOCOMOTIVES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. How many A.S.G. locomotives were acquired secondhand from Western Australia recently?

2. When were they received in South Australia?

3. What was their total cost?

4. Were any substantial repairs or alterations required before they could be placed in commission?

5. How many are now in commission?

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

1. Six.

2. Two received November 22, 1951; two received December 3, 1951; two received December 17, 1951.

3. Anticipated total cost to the South Australian railways, computed on basis of three engines already in traffic and two others in progress:—

	£
Purchase price	15,000
Freight and transport handling costs	14,282
Repairs and alterations	65,000

Total for six locomotives £94,282

4. The low purchase price was based on the fact that substantial repairs and alterations were required.

5. Three and one additional locomotive to be placed in service approximately August 8 next. The use of these locomotives is enabling the railways to move several thousand additional tons of concentrates per week from Broken Hill. Each thousand tons of concentrates per week represents a revenue of £2,750 per week, or £137,500 per annum, in addition to which the export of this product is of great importance to Australia in helping to balance our import trade.

REPRESENTATIONS OF MINING COMPANIES.

Mr. MOIR (on notice)—

1. Is the Treasurer aware that (a) in the statement in lieu of a prospectus filed with the Registrar of Companies by the directors of the Western Wolfram N.L. on July 20, 1951, the declaration is made that "George MacDonald is the holder of certain wolfram claims in the Pilbarra district of Western Australia"; and (b) at that date MacDonald had applied for three mineral claims for tin which had not then been granted, but was not the holder of any mining claim for wolfram?

2. Is it considered that such a statement constitutes a breach of the provisions of the Companies Act?

3. If so, is it the intention of the Attorney-General to take any action?

4. Is the Treasurer aware that a prospectus issued by the directors of Western Wolfram N.L. contained the declaration "that no promoter, director, or expert has been in any way interested within the preceding two years in any real property or chattels real?"

5. Can the Treasurer ascertain whether any directors in this company were also directors in Wentani Wolfram N.L. at or about the

time Western Wolfram N.L. purchased from Wentani Wolfram N.L. a mining plant for £25,000?

6. Is the Treasurer aware (a) that Wentani Wolfram N.L. is the new name given on March 18, 1952, to a company previously known as Territory Tin and Tantalite N.L.; (b) that the whole of the assets and plant of this company were bought by Mr. George MacDonald for about £5,000 early this year; (c) that he is a foundation director and promoter of both Western Wolfram N.L. and Wentani Wolfram N.L.; and (d) that the board of directors of both companies is practically identical and includes a man who was a director of Territory Tin and Tantalite N.L. before it was bought out, and the name changed to Wentani Wolfram N.L.?

7. Is it considered that the declaration referred to made in such circumstances constitutes a breach of any section of the Companies Act?

8. If so, is it the intention of the Attorney-General to take any action?

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

1. (a) Yes. (b) Yes.

2. If the statement referred to in question 1 (a) is in fact false and was made wilfully, this constitutes an offence under the Companies Act.

3. The matter will be investigated and, if evidence is forthcoming, will be referred to the Crown Solicitor for appropriate action.

4. Yes.

5. It is believed that three directors of Western Wolfram N.L. were directors of Wentani Wolfram N.L. when the mining plant was purchased.

6. (a) Yes. (b) Information has been received to this effect, but has not yet been confirmed. (c) Yes. (d) Yes.

7 and 8. *Vide* answers to 2 and 3.

YONGALA SCHOOL.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Have complaints been made to the Education Department regarding the sanitary conveniences at the Yongala public school?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to install a septic tank there?

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

1. A request for the installation of a septic tank was received from the school committee.

2. Not at the present time.

SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (on notice)—

1. What amount has already been spent on the construction of the South Para reservoir?

2. What amount was spent in the last financial year?

3. Approximately what is the anticipated total cost?

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

1. £630,000.

2. £257,000.

3. £3,000,000 if construction costs remain at the present level. This amount includes the dam and pipeline.

CONTROL OF TRAMWAYS TRUST.

Mr. MOIR (on notice)—

1. In connection with the proposed agreement between metropolitan councils and the Treasurer regarding the future control of the Municipal Tramways Trust, is it the intention of the Treasurer to submit the draft agreement to this House for approval?

2. If not, what would be the effect of any amendments made by this House to the enabling legislation?

3. Are the councils prepared to accept the decision of Parliament as final?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The metropolitan councils are now considering a proposal which a representative meeting at the Town Hall decided to recommend to their respective councils. To give effect to the proposals would require legislation.

HOUSING TRUST ADVANCES.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (on notice)—

1. What is the aggregate amount owing to the Housing Trust on June 30, 1952, for moneys advanced by the trust to finance purchasers of houses erected by the trust?

2. How much of this amount is for money owing under (a) first mortgage to the trust; (b) agreement for sale and purchase between the trust and the purchaser; (c) second mortgage to the trust?

3. What is the average cost of a pair of brick houses built by the trust for letting?

4. What is the average cost of a brick house erected by the trust for sale?

5. Under what section of the Housing Trust Act has the trust power to lend money on mortgage?

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

1. £279,293 1s.

2. (a) Nil; (b) £262,079 13s. 11d.; (c) £17,213 7s. 1d.

3. As at June 30, 1952—£3,810 (including land, etc.).

4. As at June 30, 1952—£2,680 (including land, etc.).

5. The powers of sale given by section 29 of the South Australian Housing Trust Act and section 45 of the Housing Improvement Act include power to sell on credit.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

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

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a Joint Committee to which all Consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further question relating thereto may at any time be sent by either House for report.

That, in the event of the Joint Committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the Committee.

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions. That Messrs. O'Halloran, Pearson, and Teusner, be representatives of the Assembly on the said Committee.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY DRAFTSMAN.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

That Standing Order No. 85 be so far suspended for the remainder of the session as to enable the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant to be accommodated with seats in the Chamber on the right-hand side of the Chair.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

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

(Continued from July 31. Page 249.)

Mr. DUNNAGE (Unley)—Last Thursday I was dealing with railway matters and I intended to continue with them today and give further information, but as I have a heavy cold I will confine my remarks to several other matters. I understand that construction work on the new road from Greenhill Road to Beaumont has been held in abeyance because of the cost and the fact that the Government will not

receive sufficient loan money. I am particularly concerned about the development of Mount Barker Road, the main highway to Victoria. Replying to a question last week the Minister said it was the Government's intention to widen and straighten out the road wherever possible. I particularly draw the Minister's attention to the number of dangerous bends on it. I am aware of the problems confronting the department, but I feel that the sides of the hills at certain bends could be cut away to give a better view of approaching traffic. One particularly dangerous bend is almost opposite the Unley council quarry; at present it is impossible to see around the bend. At the end of this month the Adelaide city council's contract with the Unley council for refuse destruction expires and the latter has been forced to make provision for burning its refuse at the quarry. In approaching the quarry it is necessary for lorries to leave the road some distance back because of the danger to down-coming traffic, which cannot be seen until it is right on top of other traffic. Great inconvenience would be overcome if the corner could be widened or straightened and would also assist in preventing a serious accident.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The department intends to do the worst places first.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Refuse from the Unley district will be carted to the quarry by large trucks, making the spot in question more dangerous. Another dangerous corner is on Measday's Hill. Education is a matter in which I am greatly interested. For years I have continually brought under the Minister's notice problems associated with the Unley girls' technical school. I know it is impossible to construct a new school at present, but I am hopeful that it will be done at some future date. Children are accommodated in three or four different halls in the locality. I believe this is the largest school of its kind in the State, with an attendance of about 500 young girls whose ages range from about 12 to 17: most of them are really young women. Altogether, nine separate buildings are required to accommodate the students, and the headmistress has almost insuperable difficulties in supervising their work.

Mr. O'Halloran—What area are these buildings spread over?

Mr. DUNNAGE—At least half a mile. The big school is situated in the school grounds, with two temporary structures at the rear. At the far end of the primary school is the cookery and domestic arts centre. The

department purchased a large house across the road some time ago, where there is a temporary structure. Two more temporary structures are behind the junior school. On Unley Road an old building, formerly known as Chartres Business College, is used to teach the girls typewriting and so on. Manthorpe Memorial Hall on Unley Road is also used for school purposes, and the Unley town hall is used for assemblies and singing lessons three mornings a week. The only answer to the problem is the removal of the school. I have repeatedly brought the matter under the Minister's notice. Possibly the department would be able to move elsewhere the scholars in the Unley high school, which could be taken over by the technical school. I have suggested that the department purchase either a house or a block of land on Park Terrace. An older type of house with a large block of land is required. If that were done it would be possible to use the park lands for assemblies and sports. On two occasions I have brought under the Minister's notice properties for sale. There is not a vacant block of land suitable for a girls' technical school in any part of Unley and it would be necessary to go to either side of the Mitcham or the Clapham railway station for a site sufficiently large. When the school-leaving age is fixed at 16 we will need two and not one technical school for girls in the district.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Wouldn't you get a lot of migrant children then?

Mr. DUNNAGE—We get a lot of girls from other parts of the district now. Another technical school is needed in the southern part of Unley, say, in the vicinity of Edwardstown.

Mr. Frank Walsh—A site has been reserved just off Marion Road.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Yes, but that is for only one school, whereas by the time the school-leaving age is raised to 16 we will need in the Unley district another school, far larger than the present one, which caters for 500 girls, some of whom come from places as far distant as Willunga, leaving home at 7 a.m. and arriving home at 7 p.m. Some girls are forced to wait in the school grounds until 5 p.m. for their bus. I congratulate previous speakers and support the motion.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I support the sentiments expressed by previous speakers regarding our late King, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II., and Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie. The ex-Governor and his wife did a wonderful job and made themselves very popular by the way they mixed with the people.

The death of Mr. Leslie Duncan was a severe blow to the Labor Party, to this House, and to South Australians generally. I sat alongside him in this House for many years and I know how he stuck to his job although at times suffering so badly that he should have been home in bed. His honesty and sincerity were never questioned and I am sure he held the respect of all members. We offer our deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

The curtailment of public works, which must mean unemployment, is a serious blow to this State. The lack of success of the Menzies Government in raising loans compared with the success enjoyed by the Chifley Government shows that Australians have not the same confidence in the present Federal Government as they had in the Chifley Government, and that is a bad thing for Australia. His Excellency referred to the world shortage of goods and the opening up of large areas for development. This policy may be effective if carried out in the right way but, from what has been said both inside and outside this House, it appears that much dissatisfaction exists amongst primary producers. Recently we have heard much about food being wasted and have been told, for example, that potatoes are rotting in bags because the price is so high that people cannot purchase them. It is sinful for food-stuffs to be wasting while many people are hungry; it indicates that Australia is not managed as it should be—by the Government for the benefit of all Australians and not to put large profits and big dividends into the pockets of a few people. Pig breeders are complaining about the price of barley for pig feed as compared with its price for malting. Today I asked the Premier what prices were being paid by maltsters for first-class barley and by the pig breeders for inferior barley with which to feed their pigs.

Mr. Stott—Malting barley costs 11s. 3d. a bushel and pig feed 15s. 3d.

Mr. STEPHENS—Yes, the bacon producer has to pay more than 15s. for an inferior grade while the beer producer pays much less. Is the policy of this Government “Beer before bacon?” South Australians do not agree with that policy, yet I understand the Premier told a deputation of pig breeders who sought a lower price for pig feed barley because they could not carry on under the ruling price that they should raise the price of their bacon, as it was not controlled. They replied that the price had reached its peak and that, if it were raised, the home market would be crippled because people would not be able to pay it.

I asked the pig breeders, “Why don’t you feed your pigs on the best barley?” and they said, “We are not allowed to because it is reserved for the brewers and maltsters.” Preference is being given to beer over bacon—a wrong principle which should be reviewed.

No attempt is being made to prevent prices from rising and every week sees another increase in the cost of living, which under our arbitration system, must be automatically followed by an increase in the basic wage. If prices remain stationary there is no alteration to wages but if they go down then wages recede. The only way to prevent wages from rising is to have a Government that is strong enough to fix prices and refuse increases. Such action may injure some people, but is that not better than having thousands of persons unemployed, with families starving because of high prices? When the Commonwealth Government sought power to continue fixing prices there was a mass of adverse propaganda circulated in the papers and on the radio. I remember a statement appearing under the Premier’s photograph to the effect that the State could and would fix prices. We knew that was impossible, and it is even more impossible now for any one State to fix prices. The only way to return to stability is to let the Commonwealth Government do it. If South Australia fixes a price for any commodity that is higher than the price in Victoria, South Australia will not get the goods. Since the Premier made that statement he has said he cannot control prices, and he has to get the concurrence of all other Prices Ministers before he dare fix prices here.

Employers have presented a case to the Arbitration Court seeking the pegging of wages. That is a dishonest action because they know that prices have always increased before wages. They suggest that wages be pegged for the next two quarters but they do not suggest that there should be no increase in prices. Is that a Christian attitude? They pray, “Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven,” and “Suffer the little children to come unto Thee,” but their action, if successful, will bring about the same conditions as applied some years ago, when children starved. The Government has been passing the buck to the Prices Commissioners, and it is time it assumed the responsibility of fixing prices at a certain date and refusing increases. That would automatically prevent further increases in the basic wage, and ensure a return to stability. Some people do not appreciate comments of this nature but I can visualize what will happen

in the near future without some such action. At present hundreds are unemployed and receiving the dole. The Government has dismissed employees and private enterprise is doing the same. The writing is on the wall but many ignore it. The Government must soon take notice of it. It will soon be a problem to feed Australian workmen and their families, and the problem will be worsened with the arrival of more migrants. It was bad enough during the depression when deputations of unemployed waited on the Government seeking assistance and the experts said how much they could live on.

Mr. O'Halloran—You mean "how little."

Mr. STEPHENS—Yes. The experts said, "There is enough to keep body and soul together." I have been into homes of workers—decent men that any member would be pleased to invite into his home—and seen them living under starvation conditions. In the depression I brought many of these cases under the notice of the then Minister of Employment, the Honourable S. W. Jeffries. I saw women and children suffering from malnutrition forced to line up for their rations at the Port Adelaide police station. Some men and women were afraid to take another bite of food because their children had not had enough to eat. I suggested to the Minister that he and his family try to live for a fortnight on what these people were living on. Those conditions were not brought about by any fault of his and I pay a tribute to him for relieving many distressing cases. He told me that if I would bring individual cases to his notice he could help, but that he could not alter the system. He often provided food and shelter to men who had not had anything to eat for days. We must never allow a return to those days. People will not sit down quietly and take it again as they did in the depression. They were told then that there was no money to purchase the foodstuffs in factories and warehouses, but they will remind one that when war broke out there was plenty of money for the purpose of taking men's lives. If we can find money to destroy life surely we should be able to find money to save life. I am afraid to think of what may happen with thousands of New Australians in our midst if there is again a shortage of food and clothing, because no law will prevent people from getting the necessities of life.

Something must be done to check the growing unemployment, otherwise the cost of social services will increase. Would it not be better to find work for men so that they would be paying taxation instead of living on the dole

at the taxpayers' expense? It is nonsense to say that work cannot be found. If it can be found to manufacture munitions it can be found to produce the necessities of life. It would be interesting to ascertain the percentage of migrants who have been found employment in the country and compare it with the percentage working in the metropolitan area. We want to populate the State, but thousands of migrants are cooped up in my district like fowls in a pen and living under disgraceful conditions in tents, shacks, and sheds, whereas they thought they were coming to a healthy State. Work could be found for them by building factories on the banks of the Murray, where a good supply of water would be assured. Why does the Government persist in encouraging firms to establish factories in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. M. McIntosh—A big percentage of migrants have been employed by the Government in the country on railways and waterworks.

Mr. STEPHENS—The Government is keeping most of them in the metropolitan area. What proportion has been sent to the country?

The Hon. M. McIntosh—A great number of men working on railways and waterworks all over the State are migrants, many of whom were brought here by Mr. Calwell.

Mr. STEPHENS—I know that some are being employed in the country, but one only has to look at the electoral rolls to see how many remain in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—They are not on the electoral rolls.

Mr. STEPHENS—I have never been able to ascertain the percentages by questions in Parliament. Everyone knows that the Government is overcrowding the metropolitan area because, if factories were established in country districts, some members of a certain political Party would lose their seats in Parliament. The Government is afraid to put workers in the country.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Aren't you always clamouring for more schools, better roads, and improved wharves at Port Adelaide?

Mr. STEPHENS—We want decentralization. The Government is not prepared to publish statistics showing the percentages of migrants who have settled in the metropolitan area and in the country. I remember when certain members were asked whether they would like to see more Housing Trust homes erected in their districts, but they said they would rather see them remain in the metropolitan area. Port Adelaide is overcrowded and many of the

people there could be spared for work in the country. We talk about our defence policy, but where would we be if a few hostile aeroplanes raided this country? A few bombs on the city and South Australia would be ruined, yet the Government does nothing to open up the country. I am aware that few members are taking much notice of what I am saying; unemployment never worries them until it is brought right home to their doors. It will not be long, however, before they are compelled to take heed. I am not usually a pessimist, but I am very apprehensive of the situation that is fast developing, and I prophesy that the day will come when members opposite will be crying for mercy, for these people will not put up with the conditions they experienced in the last depression. Mr. Shannon criticised our social services and when asked which he would dispense with, said he would first abolish the free milk for school children. There is a man who would get Australia out of her difficulties by robbing the children of their free milk, despite all the evidence we have from England, New Zealand and other places of the good it does. He says much waste is associated with it, quite a different argument from that which he used during all the years I was fighting for the free milk scheme. He opposed it then because he said we could not afford it, but later he said that, as it might help the dairy farmers, it was all right. If there is waste, has he reported it to the Minister of Education? If not, as a representative of the people he is not doing his duty to this Parliament or the taxpayers. To suggest there is waste is to cast reflections on those responsible for the distribution of the milk, and as that is the responsibility of the Government alone he should have told his Government about it before mentioning it in the House. The honourable member would also take the 40-hour week from the workers of this country.

Mr. Christian—Hear, hear!

Mr. STEPHENS—Members opposite complain that Communists will not abide by Arbitration Court decisions, yet they are trying to destroy an Arbitration Court decision. Mr. Shannon complained that youths are leaving the country to work in the city because they can get better conditions and pay there. Is it a crime for any young man to try to better himself?

Mr. Michael—The honourable member said only a little while ago that people should be forced into the country.

Mr. STEPHENS—I did not. I said that the Government should start industries in the country and then the boys and young men would not need to come to the city.

Mr. Whittle—Who is going to start those industries? It is not the policy of the Government to do so.

Mr. STEPHENS—I know it is not the policy of the Government to do any good for the people. The only policy of members opposite is to create something from which private enterprise can get a rake-off. I have not forgotten the fight against the nationalization of the Adelaide Electricity Company. The slogan of those opposite is, "Profits before everything." Why not give young people better conditions in the country? When we tried to afford them the opportunity by an amendment of the Industrial Code this House refused the measure of justice it grants to workers in the city, and consequently those who supported that decision deserve all that is coming to them when people leave the country. Mr. Shannon also said that it was wrong for one employer to offer better wages and conditions than another. Both Mr. Whittle and Mr. Shannon dealt with the operations of the Housing Trust. Despite all the criticism of the trust, I should like to know where South Australia would have been without it. The trust stepped in and built homes for the people when private enterprise failed to do so. What would have been the position had the Government left this important operation to private enterprise? Where would many women and children be sleeping today but for the trust? I take my hat off to the wonderful work it has done.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—You give credit to the Government for establishing it?

Mr. STEPHENS—Yes, and I always give credit where it is due. I gave the Government credit for taking over the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. Many members opposite were not looking after the interests of the people, but only after those of the shareholders. They were afraid of public opinion, and the Premier had to fight his own Party. The Legislative Council saw the writing on the wall and it was not until then that Liberal and Country League members became aware of their position and gave way to the Premier, who did a good job. Members opposite were never prepared to give credit to Mr. John Curtin and Mr. Ben Chifley before they died, although they did give them a little credit after they had passed on.

Members on this side are prepared to give the Premier credit for all he has done. Long before he suggested the development of the Leigh Creek coalfield I heard the late Mr. John Fitzgerald mention the matter and I also heard him raise the question in this House, and he was laughed at. I also remember the member for Murray, Mr. McKenzie, speaking of the possibilities of Moorlands coal, and how members opposite laughed, but now its possibilities are looming and later someone else will take credit for the suggestion. As soon as we can get justice there will be a Labor Government in power in South Australia, but first there must be more decentralization. We want a democratic Parliament and a democratically-elected Government, which we have not today. I represent more electors than any other honourable member, and in some cases as many as four members. I ask members to examine the position and see how many electors return all the Ministers. While the number of electors in my district is increasing, the number in other electorates is decreasing. It is hard for my Party to escape the effects of jerrymandering, but there will be an awakening some day. The people realize that there must be no more of it.

When Mr. Whittle was speaking about housing operations at Ryde, New South Wales, where roads are built before the houses, I agreed that that was the correct practice. I mentioned this matter some years ago in the House, and since then I have visited New Zealand and seen what that Government is doing. First it buys the land and surveys it and then the sewer, gas, and water pipes are laid to serve the area, and not until then are the roads built. This saves much unnecessary work afterwards. I agree with Mr. Whittle regarding payment for the construction of roads in trust home areas. On one occasion I introduced a deputation from the Enfield Corporation to the Housing Trust asking it to assist councils in building roads in trust areas, but it was unable to do so. Councils find it difficult to keep in proper repair even those roads already constructed. The roads at Ryde and Auckland, New Zealand, were built by Labor Governments. I do not know whether Mr. Whittle intended to give those Governments a pat on the back when he spoke.

Mr. Whittle—I was aware of the position.

Mr. STEPHENS—The same practice should be adopted here. On numerous occasions I have asked the Government to manufacture cement, but private enterprise is the only stumbling block to this being done. We have

the necessary materials and manpower, and yet cement is still being imported from Japan. Unemployed persons could be engaged on this work. When I suggested that the Government should manufacture cement, members opposite said, "We cannot get the necessary machinery in South Australia." I replied that South Australian engineers could make practically any machinery, and this was proved during the war when we built aeroplanes and produced munitions of war. When I told a member of the Liberal and Country League in the Legislative Council that members in this House had said that South Australia could not make cement-making machinery he replied that his company would be prepared to take an order and immediately make it. In his speech at the opening of Parliament last year the Governor said, "Before long South Australia will be relieved of the necessity of importing cement." The Government has been saying that for many years but we have not yet been relieved, and we will never be relieved while the private cement companies have their way. They want to retain the business in order to keep prices up. The Government could start its own cement factory and use the cement for building hospitals, homes, wharves, and railway works, but it is not prepared to do so, and imports it from Japan. The money that Japan thus accumulates will be used later to fight us. That is the biggest mistake we ever made. Australia is being sold for gold, which will be used against our lads in future, as it has been previously.

Mr. McLachlan—You agree with Mr. Menzies' import restrictions?

Mr. STEPHENS—To a certain extent, but he has not restricted the importation of cement from Japan. The greatest ambassador ever for Japan is the Right Hon. Bob Menzies and he always has been. If he did as much for Australia as he is prepared to do for Japan I would not criticize him. I do not forget what he did years ago for Japan, and I know what he is still prepared to do for that country, which gets preference over the Australian people, including our soldiers.

Every member, whatever his Party, should do his best to prevent unemployment coming to South Australia. If we get the same number of unemployed as in the depression years we shall not be able to sit in comfort in our homes, with decent beds and good living conditions, or drive our motor cars along the streets, or to even walk about in safety. I am afraid of what will happen if thousands of men become unemployed. A day of reckoning is coming.

In the past I have made signs or predictions, which have later come true although at the time members opposite laughed at me. When I suggested bringing River Murray water to Adelaide members opposite said I was foolish, because the water could not be brought over the hills. I pointed out that it could be brought around or through them. Now River Murray water is to be brought to the city. When I suggested the widening of roads to prevent bottlenecks I was told it could not be done, but it is being done today. I was laughed at when I suggested that the Marine Act be altered following on the Nelcebee-Gerard case, but it was done and compensation was paid. Apparently it is the person who brings the matter forward, not the merit of the matter, that is considered. No notice is taken of many of the proposals made by the Opposition, but they are regarded as good ideas when brought forward by Government members. I hope that during this session some notice will be taken of what I have said so that benefit may result to all people in the State.

There are many matters I would like to deal with, but as I have dealt with the question of overcrowding our metropolitan area, unemployment, rising prices and wages, immigration, Commonwealth loans, Arbitration Courts, primary producers and housing, I will leave the other matters for a future occasion. I support the motion.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—It is with much pleasure that I support the motion and join with other members in expressing loyalty to our new Queen. I am in accord with the sentiments so ably expressed by members on both sides of the House about the death of King George VI., who rendered such yeoman service to the Empire. I agree that we can be really proud of our Royal Family, who do so much to keep the British Commonwealth of Nations together. There is a bond of unity because of the existence of the Royal Family. We look forward to the reign of our new Queen being one of much advancement. There has been some discussion as to whether the reigns of Queen Elizabeth I. and Queen Victoria were as great as has been suggested. I think the answer is to be found in history. They were two great periods in the history of the British Empire. We look forward to another great period of advancement for all the peoples of the British Commonwealth, as it is known today. I express sympathy with the family of the late Mr. Les Duncan. He was a kindly man, whom to know was to love. During my political career his electorate bordered

mine and whenever our interests were mutual we got along together admirably. His passing was a great loss to Parliament.

There is always much interest in an Address in Reply debate, which gives members the opportunity to express their views on matters mentioned in the Opening Speech, and on matters associated with their electorates. In this debate we have had varying opinions on different matters, and to all of them I have listened with much interest. This time the usual practice was departed from, because both the mover and seconder have had long Parliamentary experience. Mr. John Clark, the new member for Gawler, took up much of our time in dealing with petty matters. When he gets out of the clouds and comes down to earth he will realize that there are 38 other members in this Chamber, all of whom have won elections and all of whom are honourable Christian men.

One of the greatest problems we have to face today is that of rising prices which are said to be due solely to the activities of the present Commonwealth Government, but I point out that there are rising prices all over the world. On July 10 last there was in our local press a report about a letter from Mr. A. B. Thompson, local secretary of the Australasian Society of Engineers, to his friend Mr. McMullen. I do not think Mr. Thompson would express complimentary remarks to either the present Commonwealth Government or the State Government. His letter came from Honolulu and he said that Australia does not know the beginning of inflation, and he quoted prices, comparing them with Australian prices.

Mr. O'Halloran—The other day one of your colleagues commended America for what it was doing.

Mr. MICHAEL—I am not concerned about that. I am giving my views. There are two contributing reasons for our present inflationary period. One is the 40 hour working week, for which the previous Commonwealth Government was responsible. Whatever argument there may be in favour of such a working week, it has been a contributing factor to inflation. Many of the workers on the lower rungs of the ladder are worse off through our having a 40 hour working week. They have been without houses and have had to pay extremely high prices. Another contributing factor was the failure of the Chifley Government to take the opportunity handed to it on a plate to bring the Australian pound back into line with the English pound.

Mr. O'Halloran—Why hasn't the Menzies-Fadden Government done it?

Mr. MICHAEL—I think it is because of a difference of opinion in the Government. My point is that when the opportunity came the Chifley Government did not take it. The New Zealand Government did, and the information I have is that economic conditions in New Zealand are better than in Australia.

Mr. O'Halloran—The cost of living in New Zealand is higher than it is here.

Mr. MICHAEL—I have been unable to get information to make me believe that. I feel sure that their economic conditions are better than ours. Every politician, irrespective of Party, gives lip service to decentralization. The Playford Government has done more in the past 10 years to bring about decentralization than has been done in any other period in South Australian history. Look at what has been done in the South-East. I have made 30 to 40 trips to that part of the State in the last seven years in connection with the decentralization policy of the Government. Where there were large holdings 10 years ago there are now hundreds of farms.

Mr. O'Halloran—How many?

Mr. MICHAEL—A good many hundreds. I have not got the latest figures, but I know that some hundreds of soldier settlers have been put on farms and much developmental work has been done in the Upper South-East on land commonly known as the Ninety-mile Desert. In that area the Australian Mutual Provident Society is doing a good job, following the passing of legislation in this Parliament. In addition, private individuals are developing land in the locality, and it is all assisting decentralization. On Kangaroo Island much work is being done. The Government decided to develop a large area for soldier settlement purposes and it is proving successful. It must be a long job and I do not think it can be done more quickly. Private individuals have gone to the island in recent years and great development work is taking place. Along the River Murray there has been an increase in development and a large area at Loxton has been brought under irrigation, all of which is assisting decentralization. There is no need to remind members what is being done at Port Pirie, Whyalla and Leigh Creek.

Mr. O'Halloran—And with all those things there are 3,000 fewer on the land today.

Mr. MICHAEL—The member for Frome is forgetting the great increases in mechanization. The best thing that could happen to South Australia would be more small farms. Socialization always plays into the hands of

the big man and many small businesses have gone out, which is not in the best interests of the country. There should be much more decentralization. In the Barossa Valley and other parts of my electorate many farms are being subdivided and new homes built.

Mr. O'Halloran—Those beneficial results have occurred despite the Government's actions.

Mr. MICHAEL—It is easy for the honourable member to say that. There is a great urge today for greater primary production. In the past we have depended too much upon our secondary industries. I am not enthusiastic about urging farmers to grow more wheat. The call for more wheat is to get a better trade balance, but there are other ways in which that can be done. Meat and barley production for export will bring about a better trade balance. No farmer has a right to hold land out of production, but he can best judge for what purpose the land should be used. It takes time to bring land into full production, but if we are to build up our primary production better conditions must be provided for the country and proper roads built.

I have never hesitated to express my appreciation of what the Government, and particularly the Minister of Repatriation, has done towards developing new land for soldier settlement. It has been a great work. Any ex-serviceman who gets a block in the South-East or on Kangaroo Island is particularly fortunate. Let me quote from an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* last Wednesday under the heading "Changes in 'Bandicoot Country'":—

Three years ago, when the Tasmanian Minister of Agriculture (Mr. J. J. Dwyer, V.C.), and Director of Agriculture (Mr. F. W. Hicks) inspected Kangaroo Island land to be developed for soldier settlement, they said it "wouldn't even run a bandicoot." Yesterday, after another inspection, they commented: "The settlers on this land have a winning ticket in Tatts—any they didn't even have to buy the ticket." "Development since we last saw the island has been phenomenal," Mr. Dwyer added. "About 60,000 acres of scrub has been sown to pasture and many thousands of acres are settled with people living on their own farms. In any agricultural language this is no mean achievement in three years. It reflects great credit on the Minister of Lands (Mr. Hincks) and Mr. Rowland Hill, chief executive officer of the Department of Lands. In 10 years time the island should be supporting 250,000 fat lamb ewes." Mr. Hicks said that the strike of clover and grass on Kangaroo Island had been excellent. Incorporation of mineral elements, such as copper and zinc, had had a remarkable effect. If

country, which previously produced next to nothing, could be converted into good farms capable of carrying at least two sheep to the acre, it must be regarded as work of national importance.

Mr. Rowland Hill, who always held a particularly high opinion of Kangaroo Island, is beginning to see the fruits of his advocacy of development of that area. I commend the Government for breaking up and preparing new land for soldier settlement, and I hope it will not relax its efforts in securing land for all qualified ex-servicemen. I trust that with a saner idea of values it might be possible to purchase single unit farms.

Mr. Macgillivray—You have always opposed every effort to get that and opposed a motion to give effect to it.

Mr. MICHAEL—I have never opposed the purchase of single unit farms. Another matter worthy of more than passing notice is the development of the pyrites mine at Nairne. It is a matter of far greater importance to South Australia than is conceded by many members. Recently, I read an article in *Trends*, a publication issued by the Rural Bank of New South Wales, dealing with sulphuric acid. It states:—

The urgency of the market demand for sulphuric acid is recognized as one of the most accurate and sensitive indications of the general state of trade. More recently *Fortune* magazine went on record (July, 1951) that "an industrial civilization may be measured by its per capita consumption of sulphuric acid." In the manufacture of fertilizer; in food preservation; in the manufacture of paper and explosives; in the treatment of petroleum and other oils; in the galvanizing of metals; in the manufacture of rayon, medicines, fungicides and for innumerable other purposes, sulphuric acid is the cornerstone upon which many productive processes rest.

That points out the importance of sulphuric acid, not only for use in agriculture but for many other purposes. There is a great world shortage of sulphur. A cutting from the United Kingdom *Farmer and Stockbreeder* for December 1951 deals with the growing increase of sulphur consumption and states that world agriculture is affected by 1,500,000 ton deficit. It adds that the sulphur committee of the International Materials Conference has urged all countries to economize in the use of sulphur and to develop production from sulphur bearing minerals. For a long time Sicily was the main source of sulphur supplies, but as demand increased, the United States was drawn upon largely for sulphur. The article in *Trends* continues:—

Nevertheless, production of sulphur is not keeping pace with the increasing world demand, and it is feared that known reserves in these

U.S.A. sulphur domes will be rapidly exhausted if exploited continuously at the current rate. Hence the serious injunction from the International Materials Conference earlier this year urging all parties to develop alternative sulphur resources. An example of the extent to which the search for additional supplies of sulphur has been intensified may be gathered from one of the latest projects in U.S.A. being undertaken by the American Freeport Sulphur Company. About two-thirds of the sulphur deposits which it now proposes to work is out under the sea and even the remaining third is under very marshy country, the surface of which is such that it is impossible to contemplate building upon. In addition the area is exposed to tropical gales and hurricanes. Power plant to superheat to steam two million gallons of water a day, together with all the necessary supplementary structures, will therefore have to be floated 75 miles to the site on steel barges. And the molten sulphur when recovered by the Frasch process mentioned previously will, of course, have to be floated back the same distance to suitable storage sites, as building adjacent to the site is impracticable. To the success of such engineering marvels will Australian farmers and pastoralists owe in part their supplies of precious "super" to maintain crops and pastures; will Australian steelworks owe their supplies of sulphuric acid in order to provide galvanized iron for roofs and gutters; will oil refineries function; and will many branches of chemistry survive. The development of such deposits takes long periods of preliminary engineering and construction. Meantime the sulphur shortage persists, and the search is being intensified in other directions for alternative sources of supply. Australia has no deposits of elemental sulphur (brimstone). There are some deposits in New Britain and possibly other Pacific Islands, but the reserves are small. The deposits are in any case so located as to be uneconomic to work. In 1938-39 we imported 115,000 tons of sulphur. In 1949-50 and 1950-51 sulphur imports were 178,000 tons and 166,000 tons respectively, indicative of the increased demand today for sulphuric acid, mainly for superphosphate production. The balance of our increasing sulphur requirements is produced within Australia from (a) pyrites, (b) other sulphide ores from the lead, zinc and copper mines at Broken Hill and Captains Flat (New South Wales), Mount Isa (Queensland), Norseman (Western Australia), and Mount Lyell (Tasmania), and (c) spent oxide and waste smelter gasses. The sulphur content of a proportion of the concentrates produced at Broken Hill, mainly zinc concentrates, is utilized for the production of sulphuric acid, prior to the production of electrolytic zinc. This is the principal single source of local sulphur supply. It is supplemented by sulphur production from pyrites and pyrites concentrates drawn from other mining centres. In all, the equivalent of between 70,000 and 80,000 tons of sulphur are produced from these sources to supplement the imports of more than double that quantity of elemental sulphur. It is hoped that a further 36,000 tons of sulphur a year will be produced in the near future from the

recently announced project to develop the pyrites deposits at Nairne in South Australia only 25 miles from Adelaide. To this end an agreement was reached between the South Australian Government and certain private companies (the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd. and associated chemical and fertilizer companies) to work these resources for the recovery of sulphur. Crude ore production will be at the rate of around 360,000 tons a year which it is expected will yield approximately 36,000 tons of sulphur. From this enough sulphuric acid will be produced to ensure that South Australia's requirements of superphosphate will be met with a minimum of reliance on imported sulphur. At the estimated rate of working the Nairne deposits are expected to last about 100 years.

That article shows the great importance of the development of the Nairne pyrites deposit to South Australia.

The aerial baiting of dingoes is a live question in the northern parts of our State and in the adjoining parts of New South Wales and Queensland. Recently an agreement was reached between those three States that concerted action should be taken in this matter, but, as a result of my observations during a recent trip through the north, I urge caution, as not one of the many people, including property owners and employees, to whom I spoke, advocated this system. Some were waiting to see the results of tests, but many said that it would be useless and might do more harm than good.

The Adelaide *Advertiser* of May 22 referred to a statement by Mr. Beattie of the C.S.I.R.O. that Adelaide should be the marketing centre for the export of beef from northern Australia. Although I hesitate to say that one or two visits to the north necessarily make a man an authority on the beef industry, I have seen enough to give me an appreciation of its problems. Failing the ability of an Adelaide meat works to handle this trade, Mr. Beattie suggests Wallaroo as a suitable site for such works. His reasons for naming Adelaide as the best site are that it is cooler than Brisbane, that it is three or four days' travel nearer the British and Continental market, and that it is the natural outlet for most of the cattle coming down through the channel country. However, while travelling on the Birdsville track I observed—and a man need not be an expert to observe it—that the last 250 miles into Marree is extremely difficult country. The cattle come down from the northern breeding country to the channel country, which is ideal for fattening, and the natural outlet is *via* Marree, whence they are railed to Adelaide. It

is necessary to look after the Birdsville-Marree track on which little work has been carried out for some time. There are artesian bores about every 30 miles, but very little has been done to them since they were put down about 50 years ago. Today they are in poor condition and the number of cattle railed from Marree to Adelaide had fallen from 27,343 in 1933 to 11,118 in 1950. It may be said that the numbers vary with the seasons, but I point out that the average for the nine years 1933-41 was 18,692, whereas for 1942-50 it was 10,999—a decrease of almost 50 per cent.

Mr. Whittle—Are there fewer cattle in the area today or are they going in another direction?

Mr. MICHAEL—I think they are going in another direction.

Mr. Hutchens—They are going where amenities are provided for their safe travel.

Mr. MICHAEL—Up to a point that is the reason, but efforts are being made by the big meat works on the east coast of Australia to attract them in that direction and roads are being put down, but I do not think roads are the main solution.

Mr. Hutchens—Water is more important.

Mr. MICHAEL—Yes, but the only solution is a railway. Because of the uncertain nature of the seasons facilities must exist for the speedy transport of cattle from areas afflicted by drought to pastured areas and the only way by which that can be provided is by rail. If the beef export trade is to be retained for South Australia a railway must be built to link Marree with Goyder's Lagoon—a distance of about 200 miles. Between those points cattle on the hoof lose as much as 1cwt. We should press for the linking of Alice Springs and Birdum by rail and the extension of the line from Marree to Goyder's Lagoon, by which cattle could be moved without that loss of condition.

I urge the Government to pursue its developmental work and regret the necessity for a curtailment in the works programme arising from the shortage of loan moneys, but I feel sure this Government will make the best possible use of available funds. I support the motion.

Mr. McLACHLAN (Victoria)—I take this opportunity to express sorrow at the death of King George VI. and to extend to Queen Elizabeth II. my loyalty and best wishes for a long and peaceful reign. I hope she will not have to undergo the trying times which her

father experienced and which no doubt had a detrimental effect on his health. She has already proved herself a woman of grand character and virtue and one who, like her father did, lives an exemplary life so that it may be an example to her subjects in all parts of the world. Sir Willoughby and Lady Norrie go to New Zealand with my best wishes. I have no doubt that New Zealanders will learn to appreciate them as we did. They did an excellent job here and gained the esteem and friendship of the whole community. I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my sorrow at the death of Mr. Les Duncan. Many types of men holding various political views come to this House but some endear themselves more than others. Mr. Duncan was the friend of every member, and the House will be poorer for his absence. I welcome his successor, Mr. Clark. I listened with much interest to his maiden speech and I could criticize it if I desired. He impressed me as a man of ability and I feel certain he will strengthen the Opposition. I agree wholeheartedly with his remarks on Communism and Christianity. I realize the menace of Communism and the virtue of Christianity, but neither his Party nor mine can combat Communism alone. However, if we put Christian ideals into our politics, see virtue in one another, and forgive those who trespass against us as we ourselves would be forgiven, then we shall have a splendid chance of ultimately ridding this country of the Communist menace.

There is not much cause for complaint in my electorate and the people realize that the Playford Government has done much in the past and is doing everything possible for the future. I will later refer to some of the Government ventures in the South-East. Frequently at race meetings, gymkhanas and rodeos, appeals are broadcast for parents to collect strayed children, whose description is given. Unfortunately several appeals are sometimes made before parents claim their children. They apparently realize the child is in the safe custody of a policeman and so do not worry. Provision should be made whereby, in the event of the police officer being satisfied that parents did not do everything possible to regain their child, they may be fined for their neglect.

Last year the laws dealing with penalties for persons found guilty of driving motor vehicles whilst under the influence of alcohol were amended. Members unanimously agreed that it was a serious offence and constituted a menace and that everything possible should

be done to prevent it. A friend in my electorate was unfortunately addicted to alcohol. After he was prosecuted and found guilty of a third offence the magistrate ordered imprisonment for three months and cancellation of his driving licence for three years. The defendant realized the penalty was just and when he was released from gaol decided to master his craving for alcohol. For the last 18 months he has led an exemplary life and has not had a drink. His friends approached me to see if anything could be done to have the cancellation period remitted. I approached the Attorney-General and he wrote advising me that the person should have applied for remission of sentence within one month of it being imposed. It would have been ludicrous for him to do so then as it was his third conviction and he appeared to be a no-hoper, but he has made such an effort since that he should be given an opportunity of going before the same magistrate and producing evidence to show that he is doing the right thing. It is characteristic of British justice that when a man does his best the law is designed to help and not hamper him.

Mr. Pattinson—There is provision in the Act for him to return to the court and seek a remission.

Mr. McLACHLAN—That is interesting to know, but according to the Attorney-General nothing can be done.

Mr. Pattinson—He apparently misunderstood you and refers to the month for appeal against sentence. He can appeal to the court on the matter of clemency.

Mr. McLACHLAN—To make it clear that I have been led astray I will read the Attorney-General's letter. He said:—

I acknowledge your letter of 29th ultimo and desire to inform you that there is no power to reduce the period for which the driving licence of — has been cancelled by the Court. The only way in which this penalty can be reduced is on appeal to the Supreme Court, but such appeal must be lodged within 30 days of the verdict of the court. The time within which — could appeal has expired long ago and therefore nothing can be done now to reduce the period of suspension fixed by the court.

Mr. Pattinson—With all respect to the author of that letter, it is incorrect.

Mr. McLACHLAN—It was signed by the Attorney-General. During this debate reference has been made to soldier settlement. I have always maintained that the Government is doing its best under the prevailing conditions to settle ex-servicemen. I do not share the pessimism of the Minister of Lands who

suggests that it is doubtful whether all ex-servicemen will be settled. I feel that the time is rapidly approaching when stability will return to this country and value will be put back into the pound. When there is some liaison between what money will earn and what land will produce, history will repeat itself and there will be plenty of land available in South Australia. Fifteen years ago it was possible to purchase practically any property in my district at value because the owner knew he could easily buy another property. This period of inflation has upset the equilibrium of many things and unfortunately our ex-servicemen suffer, but I am optimistic and feel that if human nature can stand up to the trials confronting it, and if we have the necessary courage, stability will return and things will function normally again. At the recent Returned Soldiers' League conference it was mentioned that the executive was working on rentals under the zoning system. I know the South-East as well as any member and I do not know of any country that varies so much in such a short distance. It is almost possible to throw a stone from land worth 10s. an acre to land worth £10 an acre. It is absolutely impossible in an area of 5,000 acres, divided into 12 blocks, for each block to have the same production capacity or the same rental value. I have travelled among the ex-servicemen settlers and know that some blocks are definitely better than others. I urge that the Government give close consideration to adjusting rentals or providing the poorer blocks with a greater quantity of superphosphate until they are built up.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—Are some settlers better workers than others?

Mr. McLACHLAN—Yes. Many of the rentals indicate that a standard rental is fixed for a settlement. Mr. Stephens referred to trust homes and gave the Government much credit. There is no doubt that trust homes have been a boon to South Australia. I often go to the abattoirs on business and pass many trust homes and I am always surprised at the tidiness of the gardens and the cleanliness of the houses. Trust houses are not confined to Adelaide but are being built in almost every town in South Australia. I was delighted when the Premier announced that trust homes were to be built in the country to assist primary producers. They will be a means of increasing production.

I agree with the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that the Government should purchase land some three miles out along

bitumen roads in the assured rainfall areas, on which people could milk a couple of cows or run a couple of hundred fowls. The Australian likes security and privacy, and, given the right conditions, he will realize his responsibilities and do what this or any other Government might expect of him. There is much fourth and fifth rate country on which development is taking or has taken place. I foresee tragedy for some because they have invested their savings in this inferior type of country because they were unable to purchase better country. Because machinery and suitable labour has been hard to get and people owning bulldozers ask £6 or £7 an hour for their use, many of these people find that all their money has been spent with their land perhaps only a quarter developed. If they cannot get the money necessary to develop their properties the country will go back to scrub and they will fail. They may then become sour and cynical and perhaps even disciples of Communism. It seems to be the recognized procedure for people in trouble to go to the Government for assistance. They think the Government has unlimited money, but unfortunately that is not the case. The fact that these people are in trouble indicates that there is less money about. I hope that the banks and stock firms who, in recent years, have made handsome profits and placed much aside in reserves, will display leniency and do all they can to help these people, irrespective of their financial policy.

Possibly some of our primary producing organizations, such as the Stockowners' Association and the Australian Primary Producers' Union, which are constantly doing their utmost to get better conditions and prices for men on the land, could appeal to their thousands of members to agree to a levy in order to raise a fund to assist these people. It is not unusual for some landholders in the South-East who are well established to make available to less fortunate settlers a few heifers, superphosphate, use of tractors, or wire. Only a few days ago an executive of a stock firm told me that a religious organization in a town in the South-East had sent £100 to reduce a man's account. That shows a wonderful spirit and if we can foster it we shall do something to help a deserving section. Many settlers put all their money into the purchase of poorer-quality farms and have shown the real pioneer spirit, but unfortunately they took up land after all the good country had been acquired.

Mr. Whittle—Was this country Crown lands?

Mr. McLACHLAN—Much of it was heath and bracken country, from Keith to Kingston and Lucindale to Bordertown. It is amazing to see the large number of small houses that have shot up in these areas. The people glean a living by running a few cows and fowls, as well as by engaging in other primary pursuits. They certainly have the job in front of them. I have always advised them to be cautious about going into poorer country and have told them to purchase 100 acres rather than 1,000, otherwise they cannot develop all of it.

Mr. Macgillivray—Two years ago the Government had an active policy of subdividing estates in the South-East. The Mount Schank property was an example. What is your opinion of that policy?

Mr. McLACHLAN—The Government has done a wonderful job in regard to closer settlement in the South-East. I have lived there for the past 25 years and many estates have been subdivided. Perhaps 300 good farms have been established from larger holdings.

Mr. Fletcher—Many of the large estates have disappeared.

Mr. McLACHLAN—Yes. Under normal conditions it would be only natural that the larger estates would continue, but with high probate duties and the next generation perhaps not being interested in land some of the large holdings have been subdivided. About five months ago the owner of Killanoola, Miss Seymour, decided to sell 700 acres. It fetched £15 an acre whereas 12 months previously it would have realized about £30 an acre. I do not share the Minister's pessimism that we will not eventually get sufficient land for soldier settlement in the South-East. With land values falling and cost of production rising many people, like Miss Seymour, will think the time opportune to convert their properties into cash.

Mr. Macgillivray—Do you think the Government's closer settlement policy of a few years ago should be continued and the Government help people to settle on the land? That policy died by the wayside.

Mr. McLACHLAN—I do not agree that it died by the wayside. The Government has done so much in the South-East in the last five years that there is now not so much to do. Padthaway, Wrattenbullie, and Binnum are a few examples of developmental work undertaken by this Government. Many estates have been purchased for settlement; they cannot be bought twice.

Mr. Macgillivray—I am not familiar with the district. Apparently your point is that all the available lands have been subdivided?

Mr. McLACHLAN—Unfortunately, there is not anywhere near the amount of land available that there was, but there are some holdings that will find their way on the market in the next three or four years. In about 25 years the holdings of 500 acres on which ex-servicemen have been settled will each provide a living for two settlers. With the aid of science and the use of superphosphate and trace elements the productivity of the land in the South-East is amazing. I know a thrifty man who has made much money from 265 acres. Some members might call him a wool baron now. He owns three or four houses in Mount Gambier, two in Millicent and two in Naracoorte. He also has a modern car and a truck. The population of the South-East will continue to increase, and this brings me to the question of decentralization. The Playford Government has done an excellent job in this respect. I listened with much interest when the Premier replied to the Leader of the Opposition on this point. The population of the electorate of Victoria has doubled during the last 10 or 12 years, and this has been brought about by decentralization.

Mr. Dunnage—Do you favour decentralization?

Mr. McLACHLAN—Certainly. Last Sunday I witnessed a firefighting display at Nangwarry, a town which did not exist 25 years ago. Mr. Ingram and Mr. Grant, of the Woods and Forests Department, told me that there are about 210 houses now at Mount Burr and 202 at Nangwarry. Extensions are being made to the sawmills, which will result in greater production. Members opposite may say that little has been done towards decentralization, but from my observations in my district it seems that an enormous amount has been done by this Government.

Mr. Macgillivray—The Labor Party claims that the decentralization was effected through its efforts.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The Labor Party claims to support decentralization, but wants large sums spent on works in the metropolitan area.

Mr. McLACHLAN—We should try to create good feeling between both sides of the House. I believe the Hon. John Gunn was the originator of afforestation in the South-East.

Mr. Whittle—No, afforestation was commenced long before he took office.

Mr. McLACHLAN—I read in the press last week that the first pines were planted in the South-East 50 years ago. Possibly the Gunn Government encouraged afforestation in the South-East. If it did, this Government has

left nothing undone to continue the development. Much has been said in this debate about the establishment of a deep sea port in the South-East, but it has all been propaganda. Members opposite are looking for a change of Government and think that my seat is in danger. They are trying to belittle the efforts of the Premier to establish a deep sea port, but he has done all he could. In the early stages he thought Robe would be the ideal site, but investigation proved it was not. He was courageous enough to admit that Robe was not suitable, so he looked elsewhere for a port. Now it seems that Cape Jaffa will be suitable. I will not say that a port will be established there in a year or two, but many of us will be here when a deep sea port in the South-East will be a reality, particularly if the people in the district prove to the Public Works Committee that production and future development warrant it. It is most unfair for members opposite to try to belittle the Premier's efforts.

Mr. Riches—Wasn't hawking the port all around the South-East propaganda in the first place?

Mr. McLACHLAN—No. It was a question of if of the best site to establish the port. Members opposite may get a half-wit to think it was propaganda, but they cannot trick intelligent people, and that is why this Government has been in power so long.

Mr. Riches—I think you might find the people have been tricked too long.

Mr. McLACHLAN—The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Democracy ensures that we have an election every three years and we on this side of the House are prepared to abide by the peoples' decision. I have been pleased to note the great progress in the drainage of the South-East. In the early stages there was some antagonism towards the scheme and even I was a little sceptical. We had heavy rains early in the year, yet many people in the South-East are saying that there is not so much water lying about. This has possibly resulted from the effective drainage system installed. This is another example of the efforts of this Government to do everything possible to make country available and bring about greater production. If the drainage scheme ultimately proves successful it will be the means of making much more land available for closer settlement because it will be possible to build homes on country that at present becomes inundated for three or four months each year. I think two or three members opposite have referred to

the fact that Federal Government loans have failed because the people did not have confidence in the Menzies Government. When the Leader of the Opposition was speaking about the flotation of loans I asked him what had happened in New South Wales, which has a Labor Government. He replied that he did not think New South Wales had floated such a loan. I said I would find out, and now for his information I propose to quote some figures from the July issue of the *Australian and New Zealand Bank Limited Quarterly Survey*, as follows:—

Recent semi-Government loans have all been at £4 2s. 6d. per cent. These were the Queensland State Electricity Commission loan for £500,000, Grain Elevators Board of Victoria for £450,000, Sydney Water, Sewerage and Drainage Board for £1,750,000, Electricity Trust of South Australia for £4,000,000, and the State Electricity Commission of Victoria for £3,500,000. The South Australian loan raised £2,469,000 from conversion and £3,033,000 cash, giving substantial over-subscription.

That speaks well for the South Australian Government and proves conclusively that our people have the utmost confidence in the Playford administration.

Mr. Hutchens—You do not think the high interest rates encouraged them?

Mr. McLACHLAN—They did not in New South Wales, for the article goes on:—

The Queensland loan closing date was extended before full subscription was obtained, while the Sydney Water Board loan closing date was extended, and that loan raised only £1,096,100, compared with the £1,750,000 invited.

Mr. O'Halloran—Neither of those was a Government loan.

Mr. McLACHLAN—I said semi-Government, the same as the South Australian.

Mr. O'Halloran—The New South Wales Water Board is not even semi-Government.

Mr. McLACHLAN—This paper quotes it as such and it should be an authority. There is no doubt, however, that New South Wales could not float a loan, whereas we did it easily here. The Leader of the Opposition probably knows as well as I do that the failure of Commonwealth loans can be attributed to many things besides Government administration. We have only to pick up our newspapers to see how incomes have fallen. I know men in the South-East who this year will get probably from £5,000 to £50,000 less for their wool than they got last year.

Mr. O'Halloran—After they have paid their taxes?

Mr. McLACHLAN—That is gross returns.

Mr. O'Halloran—What will they have left?

Mr. McLACHLAN—Probably not a great deal and that would still be a reason why they could not put money into loans.

Mr. O'Halloran—That bears out my charge.

Mr. McLACHLAN—Quite the reverse. How can people subscribe to a loan if they have not the money. Members opposite are prone to exaggerate the situation. Seven or eight years ago it did not matter what one paid for a house, a car, a block of land, a sheep, or a cow, for values were rising every day.

Mr. O'Halloran—At that period all prices were pegged.

Mr. McLACHLAN—And cost of production was not nearly so high as it is now.

Mr. O'Halloran—There was no inflation.

Mr. McLACHLAN—Inflation was beginning, but had not been completed.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is an inverse method of reasoning. Is it completed now?

Mr. McLACHLAN—No, but we have a Government in Canberra doing something towards stopping it. However, members opposite do not want that because inflation is their greatest ally since it brings about misery and suffering. Unfortunately, the Federal Government is not getting the assistance of the people who are going to benefit and that is why I say it has shown much courage, but is getting much abuse. I have taken a cutting from the Federal *Herald* which shows the amount of trouble my friends opposite are going to in an effort to belittle the efforts of the Playford Government. Mr. Clyde Cameron said:—

I have waited for a fortnight in the hope that some Liberal member from South Australia would rise and express some sympathy with the Premier of South Australia in the very raw deal that he is getting from the Australian Government. Because of the financial policy of this Government, it is utterly impossible for South Australia to complete the many grand schemes that have been announced from time to time by Mr. Playford. For instance, he was going to provide us with a deep-sea port at Robe. That was when there was a by-election in the division of Victoria.

Mr. John Clark—That is true.

Mr. McLACHLAN—The deep-sea port was mentioned years before that by-election. Mr. Cameron went on:—

However, when the position there cleared up, and it seemed that most support was needed in Mount Gambier, the proposed deep-water port was shifted there.

It would be interesting to know how there could be a deep-sea port at Mount Gambier,

but it simply shows that these fellows will say anything if they think it is detrimental to the Playford Government. He continued:—

As each by-election occurs, the location of the proposed deep-sea port is changed accordingly. Now, unfortunately, because of the lack of funds, the Premier cannot give effect to the plan, wherever the ultimate site of the port may be. When Mr. McLachlan, the Liberal member for the electoral division of Victoria was in danger of losing his seat in the State Parliament, the Government announced a great scheme to broaden the gauge of the railway running from Wolseley to Mount Gambier.

Could there be anything so mean and despicable? and that came over the air. I think such tactics belittle politicians. Mr. Cameron went on:—

As the election was approaching it was decided to hold the grand opening ceremony when, by the provision of a third rail, the work of widening the gauge had proceeded only as far as Naracoorte. Everybody naturally thought that, in a matter of weeks, the extension of the wide gauge to Mount Gambier would be completed. But when the election was over and Mr. McLachlan had scraped home by 200 votes, nothing further was done about the matter.

It is an old saying that a lie can never be caught up with, but this is one that will be, for within the next few weeks broad gauge trains will be running to Kalangadoo; and at my own expense I intend to publish Mr. Cameron's remarks so that the people will know who is doing the right thing—Mr. Cameron or Mr. Playford. When Labor members go to the South-East during the next election campaign that is one lie for which they must make amends, and there will be no avoiding it. Mr. Cameron also said:—

This Government apparently refused again to provide the Liberal Government of South Australia with the money that was needed to complete the scheme! I cannot believe that there could be any other explanation, because the only possible alternative is that the Liberal Premier was so completely dishonest that he deliberately sabotaged the schemes that I have mentioned as soon as the elections were over and talked about public works only when he knew that another election was just around the corner.

That is an awful statement to make about anyone, but I am sure that most people in South Australia regard the Premier as a man of great integrity. It is tragic that this type of propaganda should intrude into politics. One never hears the Leader of the Opposition make statements like that, which is the reason why he holds the respect of people all over South Australia. It ill-behoves me to criticize others, but I think the propaganda aspect of this debate

has been the most marked. I had always thought it something perfected by the Communists. Unfortunately, we on this side seem to be using some of it too, but I am certain that it would be better if we indulged in less.

Members have been talking about the 40-hour week, and more work in the week, but I think it can be proved conclusively that in some industries which are highly mechanized production has increased under the 40-hour system; this applies, for example, in the timber industry in the South-East. Whether the 40-hour week is right or wrong, what is lacking in this country is effort and thrift. If a man working on, say, the tramways did 10 per cent more work we might get cheaper tram fares, and similarly if men working on the railways and on the highways did 10 per cent more work we might get cheaper fares and better roads.

Mr. RICHES—If they work 10 per cent more they get out of work the sooner.

Mr. McLACHLAN—I was waiting for someone to say that. If the building employee did 10 per cent more in a week would not every section of the community benefit? I am ready to admit that the people I represent may be just as much at fault, and may be wasting just as much time.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Are you not in conflict with the Premier who said that South Australia had the second highest production per head predominantly because of the efficiency of the worker?

Mr. McLACHLAN—Precisely, but that does not nullify what I am saying. If a man walks three miles an hour, and that it is a great effort, it does not follow that I would not applaud it as a better effort if he walked $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles.

Mr. HUTCHENS—You contend that the man who is predominantly efficient and stable should be driven to do 10 per cent more.

Mr. McLACHLAN—The people of this country have ears to hear and eyes to see. Travel where you will throughout the country and you will not find the people sweating. I am not trying to belittle anyone, but am merely stating what is occurring for anyone to see.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Actually you mean they should sweat to a state of exhaustion?

Mr. McLACHLAN—Nothing of the sort. This country must have a little more effort and a little more thrift and then we shall get somewhere. By increasing our loan moneys and making more paper money I feel we are only putting off the evil day.

Mr. RICHES—Offhand can you think of any single case where increased production has resulted in cheaper prices?

Mr. McLACHLAN—I have never said anything about that. Until the people realize their responsibilities I feel we shall never reach the goal we aim for. We are importing many more commodities than we should, such as galvanized iron and fencing wire, things we could manufacture in Australia.

Mr. RICHES—We want steel works in South Australia.

Mr. McLACHLAN—I am ready to admit that many of the suggestions members opposite make would benefit South Australia. They have criticised the Commonwealth Government, but I think they have overlooked the fact that possibly some of our trouble has been brought about by huge defence expenditure. None of us is too old to forget World Wars I. and II., and I am certain that if previous Governments had given the same consideration to defence as the present Government many present anomalies and ills would never have eventuated. I believe the Commonwealth Government is doing an excellent job for the defence of Australia, and I visualize many of the unfortunate people members mention as being on the road being absorbed in the near future in defence projects. I support the motion.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I also support the motion and join with other honourable members who expressed regret at the death of King George VI. We in this far-distant part of the British Empire realize that His Majesty was not blessed with great physical strength and reigned during a time of extreme difficulty. Practically the whole of his reign was one of trial and tribulation, but he proved himself a man of strong courage. His wife, now the Queen Mother, and his daughter, Queen Elizabeth II., were great comforters to him in times of stress and trouble. This Parliament should express its appreciation of the lives of these two great women and on behalf of the people in my electorate I express their loyalty to the new Queen and the Crown. It is people of the type of those in my electorate in the main who provide the men for the navy, army, and air force in times of war, and it is on such people that the country depends for its existence and progress. On their behalf I also express appreciation of the services of His Excellency Sir Willoughby Norrie and Lady Norrie. While serving in their high and noble position they journeyed into the working districts of the State and made many friends. It

was with mixed feelings that we said good-bye to them. We feel that our loss will be New Zealand's gain. We are indeed very fortunate to have at Lieutenant-Governor a man of such high standing as Sir Mellis Napier. I feel that his kindly disposition and his fairness as Chief Judge of the Supreme Court have gained him the respect of the people. I agree with Mr. Riches that South Australia would do well to select from among its own citizens one to serve in the high office of Governor.

With other honourable members I regret the death of Mr. Leslie Duncan, the late member for Gawler. When serving my first term as member of Parliament I could turn with confidence to Mr. Duncan as a source of guidance. On every occasion I found him most charitable and helpful. It could be said of him that although small of stature he was a man high in ideals, strong in courage, and determined on all occasions to do the right thing for the people of South Australia. He has left his footprints on the sands of time and his example has encouraged those who are sick and forlorn to take heart again and go on to do better things. I feel that in Mr. John Clark we have one well qualified to adopt the noble ideals of the late member. I agree with Mr. Tapping that next year, when an O'Halloran Government is elected to serve its first term, Mr. Clark will find a place in the Ministry. Many wrong impressions have been given during the debate, and if I were not prepared to attempt to correct them I would be unworthy to occupy my seat.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Having been reminded by numerous speakers in this debate that this is a pre-election session, I had a look at the Premier's policy speech, as reported in the *Advertiser* prior to the 1950 elections. It said:—

The policy his Party offered was designed not only to improve the general welfare of the community, but also to provide the greatest opportunity for individual citizens to develop their initiative and enterprise, qualities upon which the Empire has been built, the Premier (Mr. Playford) said in his policy speech at Gumeracha last night.

Later the report said:—

A rising standard of living, improvement of social services and public utilities, and full employment were dependent on development and progress such as there had been since his Government assumed office, Mr. Playford said. In primary production South Australia had made greater progress . . .

I will not read any more of the report, but stress the statements that the policy of the Liberal Party was designed to improve the

general welfare of the community, provide the greatest opportunity for individual citizens to develop their initiative and enterprise, improve the standard of living, improve social services and public utilities, provide full employment, and make greater progress in primary production. The people were told that this was the policy of the Liberal Party. I propose to show that the promises were not fulfilled and that the policy was not carried out. We might go so far as to query whether the promises were made with good intentions. It must appear to all fair-minded people that the supporters of the Government have been doing much talking in this debate with little more than a fear complex.

Mr. O'Halloran—There has been a great deal of fear complex.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I was being merciful. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition is correct. Their arguments were built on prejudice and class hate. I must endeavour to qualify my remarks, lest I be guilty of doing the same things as honourable members opposite. Let us have a look at the speeches made by the mover and seconder of the motion. Mr. Shannon said he would not say certain things lest he might be accused of political window dressing, but said that deeds speak for themselves, and that praise for the Government from him would be redundant. Mr. Whittle said he did not intend to say what he thought should be done, but would content himself by saying he had complete faith in the Treasurer of South Australia. To me, this sounded like high pressure salesmanship. It was like saying "Please buy my shop-soiled, broken and valueless goods. They are mildewy and are covered with fly specks. I can give you no guarantee, but I am sure the goods will be useful." That is what they said in effect. I congratulate the Government on the choice of mover and seconder of the motion. When a Government is in difficulties it has to pick the right men to get the Government out of those difficulties, and it is significant that two professional auctioneers were selected. Mr. Pattinson qualified for a selling licence. When he referred to Liberalism he looked at his notes and said "We are seeing a resurgence of it, particularly among the young people of this community."

Mr. O'Halloran—Did he say that?

Mr. HUTCHENS—The Leader of the Opposition seems surprised: so was I. How could an honest, clear-thinking man make such a claim in view of recent election results?

An indication of the hostility towards the Liberal and Country League Party is reflected in a review of elections held in four States since March last. There has been a loss of support for the Liberals and their satellite Parties. In the Lyne (New South Wales) Commonwealth by-election there was a fall in the majority for the Liberals of 6.5 per cent. In the Port Melbourne (Victoria) election the Liberals slipped back to the level of the Communists, and the candidate's deposit was lost. In the recent Gawler by-election there was an increase in votes against Liberalism of 4.8 per cent; in an election in Queensland an increase of 3.9 per cent, in a Liverpool (New South Wales) election an increase of 3.7 per cent, and an increase of 5.7 per cent in the Victorian Legislative Council elections. In the Ashfield (New South Wales) by-election there was a swing to 9 per cent against Liberals. The seat had been held by the Liberal Party for more than 50 years. Labor took the Ashes on that occasion and the Liberals left the field with regret. To be merciful I shall say nothing about the Tasmanian Legislative Council elections, or the Queensland municipal elections. It would be convenient for Liberals in this State to believe that the results showed a vote against the Commonwealth Government. I now return to the Gawler by-election. In order to lead the electors to believe that there was a difference between the Commonwealth Liberal Party and the South Australian Party, the Premier said:—

At State elections the Opposition brings in Federal issues as much as possible. They did it at the last Gawler by-election. The Party had on the job every Commonwealth politician it could get.

I know something of that by-election. I do not say it boastfully, but I spent as many as 37 days in the district during the campaign. The Liberals had five paid organizers on the job. Did not the Minister for Defence (Mr. McBride) play a major role in the campaign? Did he not go to Wasleys, a once Liberal stronghold, to address a well-advertised meeting? Did he not open the campaign for the Party, and did he not draw an audience of six persons, and then adjourn the meeting early in order to save face? Did not the Speaker of the House of Representatives canvass votes amongst the ladies at Gawler? The Party had every right to do this, and we do not deny it that right, but we resent suggestions that we have not the same right. One day during the Gawler campaign I went to Williamstown with

the Labor candidate, Mr. John Clark, and Mr. P. Galvin, M.H.R. We had lunch with Mr. Smith, Liberal organizer for Wakefield, who stressed the good fortune of the Labor candidate in having the active support of State and Federal members. He said it was difficult to get his Party to get members to go to Gawler. A number of Federal members made it clear to us that they knew the status of the Playford Government was so low that the Liberal candidate faced certain defeat and they did not want to be associated with it. I wonder whether any member opposite can prove I am wrong when I say that we are not seeing a resurgence of Liberalism. That is in direct contradiction to what the member for Glenelg said—that the Liberals can see a resurgence of their Party. In the *Advertiser* of April 23, 1952, an article under the heading "Liberal Party in the Doldrums" stated:—

There were many indications in Australia at the present time that the Liberal Party was in "the doldrums," the president of the South Australian Liberal and Country League (Mr. Dudley Turner) told delegates at the conference of the Women's Council of the L.C.L. in the Liberal Club Hall yesterday. "It might be," he said "that if there were an election in the near future, things would look bad for our Party."

The following is a copy of a letter dated March 31, 1952, headed "The Liberal Party of Australia, Office of the President, New South Wales Division, National Buildings, 30 Ash Street, New South Wales, which states:—

Dear Sir,

The funds of the Liberal Party will be exhausted at the end of this month. Unless relief is forthcoming, we shall be forced to turn our organization into a poverty stricken, ineffective instrument and break faith with many members of the Party's staff who came to us in the belief that they could make a career out of their services to the Liberal cause.

The letter is signed "Yours truly, B. F. Dargan, Vice-President, New South Wales Division, Chairman Finance Committee." It shows that the highest officials of the Liberal Party consider it is in the doldrums, and an almost poverty-stricken and ineffective instrument. It is sheer effrontery for the member for Glenelg to say that there is a resurgence in the Liberal Party that has, in the opinion of many of the public, been reduced to the level of Communists. And with what justification? We have only to turn to the Premier's policy speech when he said there was to be a rising standard of living. But what makes a high standard of living? It is peaceful leisure made possible by social amenities and economic security. It is the highest kind of hypocrisy

for a Liberal leader to promise to the public generally a higher standard of living. Public utterances have proved beyond doubt that no so-called Liberal subscribes to a policy of improvement in social services, public utilities and full employment or for any progress beyond that which will provide profits for the few.

The Premier, in his 1950 policy speech, claimed credit for full employment, but he must now accept the responsibility for unemployment. Replying to a question last week he said that those who were receiving unemployment relief benefits on July 25 were almost 80 times greater than in the previous six months. Eight days later a press report claimed that they were 100 times greater than in February last. Nothing will reduce the standard of living in any country more rapidly than unemployment. Is there any good reason for unemployment in this country, other than a surplus of goods? Of course not. What do Liberal Party supporters propose to do now? The member for Onkaparinga said:—

Increase the working week to at least 44 hours a week.

The member for Flinders said:—"Put work back into the week." This is no more than a subtle plea for a longer working week, for the Premier has said on many occasions—or claimed last Wednesday night to have said—that the South Australian worker, who was wisely led, had raised production second to highest in the Commonwealth, predominantly because of his efficiency and stability. Doubtless the member for Rocky River believes in the cry for a longer working week, which must mean more unemployment. It is obvious that he also wants a reduction in wages. He said:—

Unfortunately the majority of people today want to do as little work for as much reward as possible.

Dealing with the period of full employment, he also said that we have passed through abnormal times. Apparently now that we have unemployment he feels that we are returning to normal. When speaking of periods of full employment he said, "We cannot pass through such a phase without having upsets." It must be obvious what the member for Unley meant when he argued that valueless individuals in his electorate had motor cars and used taxis to the detriment of the tramways. Evidently he meant that people in his electorate who had been sailing on the smooth seas of prosperity would be pirated. I think that after next year's elections the voters of Unley will discharge a little of the dunnage on which they stacked their fortunes and future. Why should

we expect another approach to these problems from the Liberals when that is their policy? In the *Advertiser* of March 15 last, under the heading "Call for Unpaid Labour Forces," it is stated:—

"Every patriotic Australian might well do five hours work unpaid in a job of national interest after his 40 hours week," the Minister for External Affairs (Mr. Casey) told a Young Liberal rally in the Melbourne Town Hall tonight.

The report continued:—

The honeymoon is over. We have been living in a fool's paradise. . . . Mr. Casey said that it did not trouble his conscience to make his suggestion of more work.

I have kept a record and find that I and my colleagues work from 65 to 70 hours a week. What better case have we for contending that extra working hours must lead to mass unemployment? An article in the *News* of August 5, 1950, claims that Mr. T. Malcolm Ritchie, the Liberal Party Federal President, said:—

If we attacked the position with the realism it deserves we would immediately revert to war-time conditions of the 56-hour week and peg wages.

Talk of this nature is not new. In the *Advertiser* of January 14, 1949, Professor T. Hytten, economic adviser to Liberal Party interests, is reported to have said:—

The aim of economic policy should be not full employment.

The effect of this would be a slackening of effort leading to higher industrial cost, a shortage of raw materials, and concealed unemployment. I draw attention to this union of policy, as well as of efforts. The Premier's reply to me on July 29 shows that the desire for an unemployment pool is an accomplished fact and the Liberals claim, with glee, that we are now back to normal times. Further evidence of the desire of Government supporters is their advocacy of the prohibition on rental homes. This, too, when more than 9,000 applications have been submitted for emergency homes and there are 200 houses awaiting completion.

There is a definite plan to condemn the workers and the wage and salary earners of South Australia who, by reason of their efficiency and stability have given this State the second highest production in the Commonwealth. The Liberals want them to be exploited by unscrupulous landlords and to be denied wireless, refrigerators and other lesser amenities. I mention wireless and refrigerators because Mr. Shannon, speaking on behalf of the Government, strongly advocated the prohibition of wireless, refrigerators and other necessities.

But the Premier wants the world at large to believe that he is not a party to this. Last week, when speaking in this debate he said, in effect, to those who were watching the Liberals and their satellites parade "Look, they are all out of step with me."

Mr. O'Halloran—They are all going out.

The Hon. T. Playford—But we will be coming back again, too.

Mr. HUTCHENS—In the sweet by and by. I want it remembered that these satellites are going the same way. It is only to draw attention from his colleagues that this show pony type of person would have people believe they are out of step. In case it may be thought that there is or ever was the slightest intention of the Premier to make a break, in the smallest degree, from the policy determined by the Liberal Party and implemented at present by the Federal Government and the Governments of Western Australia and South Australia, I draw attention to an article in the *Advertiser* of December 12, 1949—two days after the Federal election—which credits (or discredits) the Premier, with claiming that he was naturally very pleased with the result. He is reported as saying:—

The Liberal and Country Parties now have the responsibility, and the South Australian Government is prepared to help the Commonwealth to give effect to its policy.

In the 1951 Federal election campaign Mr. Playford advanced the slogan "A vote for Menzies is a vote for Playford," and the Premier has stuck and is still sticking to his Federal colleagues to the detriment of this State. The Premier's attitude on the question of the abolition of uniform taxation is sufficient to prove conclusively that, when his Party gives the order, he will jump into line and into step.

During the speech by the member for Adelaide in this debate the Premier talked at length with the member for Eyre in a loud and discourteous manner, but later, in his speech, he had the audacity and effrontery to say that he had listened very intently to the member for Adelaide. After taking quite a few notes of the Premier's speech, I scrapped the speech that I had prepared so that I might reply to some of the points made by him. In dealing with the proposals for the abolition of uniform taxation he tried to make us believe that, when the Prime Minister made what has been described as a "bombshell" move—the announcement that his Government was prepared to hand back to the States the taxing power—he, Mr. Playford, said in effect, "The

sooner the better—let's have it," but since the Premier made his speech I have read a few newspaper reports which tell a different story. On July 8 the *Advertiser*, which does not usually write down our Premier contained the following report:—

Making his surprise offer, Mr. Menzies told the Premiers that the Commonwealth was abundantly and promptly willing to discuss the return of the States to the taxation field The Premiers sat in silence for nearly a minute after Mr. Menzies had suggested that they might like to adjourn for half an hour to continue the proposal The Premiers made no move to adjourn.

The report states that the Premiers of Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania, and Victoria addressed the conference. The *Canberra Times* of that date reported the meeting as follows:—

The offer made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) caught the Premiers completely by surprise, and only three States, New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland, were prepared on the spot to accept the return of taxation.

The Perth *West Australian* reported:—

The offer took the Premiers by surprise, but Mr. Cahill (New South Wales) agreed to the abolition of uniform taxation On the suggestion of Mr. Playford (South Australia), the conference decided that a committee of financial experts should be set up this week to advise a special meeting of Premiers.

Mr. O'Halloran—It sounds as if he were postponing the evil day.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. In commenting on the conference, the *Sydney Morning Herald* stated:—

Political observers believe the line-up of the Premiers on the taxation proposal is: Mr. McDonald (Victoria)—definitely wants his own taxation power; Mr. Cahill (New South Wales)—less anxious than Mr. McDonald; Mr. Playford (South Australia) and Mr. Gair (Queensland)—lukewarm about the proposal; Mr. McLarty (Western Australia) and Mr. Cosgrove (Tasmania)—fear.

The *Sydney Daily Telegraph* contained the headlines "Uniform Tax to go—Federal move stuns Premiers." The *Hobart Mercury* reported on the move as follows:—

Prime Minister's offer on tax surprise for States The State Premiers were completely surprised at their conference today when the Commonwealth offered to abandon the uniform taxation system and return taxing powers to the States. The offer was made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, but only three States, New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, were prepared on the spot to accept it.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Apparently there is some difference in Labor opinion in New South Wales, Queensland and South Australia.

Mr. HUTCHENS—It seems strange that the member for Burnside should know more about the Labor Party than about his own Party.

Mr. O'Halloran—The report shows the freedom of thought existing in the Labor movement.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes. The Brisbane *Courier Mail* reported:—

Western Australia and Tasmania would not commit their Governments to opinion. Mr. Gair (Queensland) was prepared to stand up to the responsibility of collecting taxation. As far as this was concerned the Premier's attitude was undefined and not worthy of comment.

Not one of those seven Australian newspapers recorded a more than lukewarm attitude about the Prime Minister's proposals, although Mr. Playford would have us believe that he desired the taxing powers back as soon as possible. The member for Unley said that the Premier comes very close to being a "Mandrake" and when we realize that Mandrake is a fantasy of fiction and not fair dinkum, a character believed in only by foolish people, we have no argument with that description.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—You should accept Mandrake for you quoted from the newspapers.

Mr. HUTCHENS—The member for Burnside is getting quite witty. Has the Premier or any other Government member given a logical reason for the return of taxing powers to the States? We have heard some weird and wonderful proposals, but examination shows them to be merely other forms of uniform taxation. The member for Semaphore submitted a convincing case for uniform taxation and I do not propose to repeat his arguments, but I point out that, prior to uniform taxation, on an income of £600 a year—about the amount now received by the basic wage earner—taxation amounted to £89 9s., which was the highest figure in the Commonwealth, as against £26 2s. under uniform taxation. I have heard no reason advanced for believing that we would not return to the position where we were paying the highest income tax in the Commonwealth. *The Commonwealth Year Book* discloses that South Australia has 1.75 persons to the square mile, compared with Victoria 23.97, and New South Wales 9.90. The Premier had much to say about remarks attributed to the Honourable A. A. Calwell, as quoted by the member for Glenelg, saying that they were the policy of the Labor Party. The Premier said:—

For the information particularly of the new member opposite, I point out that this shows how a member on this side of the House can speak at variance with Government policy. The

member for Glenelg is closely associated with the Government, yet he made a statement today with which I completely disagree. He referred to remarks made in the House of Representatives in 1942 by Mr. Calwell when he supported the Uniform Tax Bill.

The Premier was ready enough to point out an error on the point of the Leader of the Opposition, but he himself has erred because this was not a Bill for uniform taxation, but was the Income Tax (Wartime Arrangement) Bill. He went on to say:—

I asked the honourable member for Glenelg to supply it, and I told him that I completely disagreed with what he said.

It will be remembered that the honourable member for Glenelg subscribed to Mr. Calwell's statement, namely:—

Tonight we are participating in an historic incident. We are considering legislation which will fundamentally affect the future of Australia because it will inevitably result in the destruction of the States as we know them.

The Premier said he believed that to be the fundamental policy of the Labor Party, but if he had read the whole speech he would have noted that Mr. Calwell, then a back bencher, spent much time in disagreeing with the then Treasurer, Mr. Chifley. In reply to Mr. Calwell's remarks Mr. Chifley said, "The whole of the honourable member's statement is entirely incorrect." How ridiculous! how childish! what subtle, despicable political trickery! for the Premier to suggest that uniform taxation is the fundamental policy of the Labor Party. The Labor Premiers of New South Wales and Queensland said their States were ready to accept the responsibilities of State taxation, but our Premier sat like an egg-bound fowl wondering what to do with this thing that had been dropped. Mr. Calwell said, "I emphasize that the Labor Party is not a unificationist party which wants all power centred in Canberra." The Premier believed unification was the Labor Party's policy and therefore was in error. In 1927, a young Liberal saw the shape of things to come and spoke up. The Premier was so impressed that he promoted him. The speaker was the present member for Torrens, and he said:—

During the course of this debate a great deal has been said about the finances of the State and concerning the proposals tentatively agreed to by the State Premiers and the Prime Minister. Much has been also said in the debate which is harmful to the relationship between the Commonwealth and the States. Whether the Commonwealth has unduly invaded the sphere of the activities of the State, and in so doing has crippled State enterprises or

not is a matter of opinion. The fact remains that the progress and prosperity of this State and the Commonwealth are identical. One cannot progress and prosper without the other. The same people form the States and the Commonwealth, and the same people elect the members of the Commonwealth and State Parliaments, and in the main the same people pay the taxes. I regret that some members instead of trying to bring about a more harmonious relationship between the Commonwealth and the States seem to deliberately go out of their way to create greater antagonism and greater ill-feeling It seems to me the States and the Commonwealth must work together in harmony if the best interests of the people are to be served.

What better case could one put forward for the continuance of uniform taxation? Last week the member for Glenelg quoted Mr. Alfred Deakin as having said:—

The rights to self-government of the States have been fondly supposed to be safeguarded by the Constitution. It has left them legally free, but financially bound to the chariot wheels of the central government. Their need will be its opportunity. The less populous will be the first to come. Those smitten by drought or similar misfortune will, however reluctantly, be brought to heel.

In August, 1942, (Mr. Pattinson went on) Mr. Calwell said:—

Tonight we are participating in an historic incident. We are considering legislation which will fundamentally affect the future of Australia because it will inevitably result in the destruction of the States as we know them.

Mr. Pattinson went on to say:—

I place Mr. Calwell in the same category as his distinguished predecessor, Mr. Alfred Deakin, as having the uncanny gift of prophesy, but Mr. Calwell's prophesy was made 40 years after that by Mr. Deakin. These two prophesies have come true in a remarkable manner in 1952. Whatever may be the dangers or disabilities of re-introducing something like our former system of taxation, I hope that our Premier will put up a strong and vigorous fight to get back for the States some power to control their own taxation. Irrespective of Party, once a man goes from South Australia to the rarified atmosphere of Canberra he regards himself as living in a little world of his own and endeavours to operate a system of Government by remote control. Too many of these men forget the source from which they came and the support that enabled them to reach their destination. It will be a sorry day for Australia if we get a centralized system of government.

The Premier disagreed with Mr. Pattinson and said:—

I do not think Mr. Calwell's remarks will ever come true. The State Governments are now closer to the people.

His claim, after 10 years of uniform taxation, is surely the best for its continuation. How-

ever, if Liberals think differently, the Premier will be obliged to submit a case in an endeavour to justify his Party. The present position is different from the position when a Labor Government was in power. During Mr. Chifley's term as Prime Minister and Treasurer the system of uniform taxation operated and the States were respected. He was never once guilty of referring to State Premiers in a scathing manner as did Mr. Menzies in Queensland on July 15.

Mr. Pattinson—Do you remember Mr. Chifley saying, "I favour the abolition of the States"?

Mr. HUTCHENS—No. Our State Premier then had no reason to claim, as he did recently, that we had reached an all-time low in Federal and State financial relationships. The Premier should not complain, because he supported uniform taxation. With tears in his voice he now complains because this State is obliged to abandon its most important works designed to step up production. Why should he expect the Labor Party to refrain from linking State politics with Federal politics? He knew the financial policy of the Federal Liberal Party, yet he pleaded with the people to dismiss the Labor Party and Mr. Chifley who was quoted by the *Advertiser* of December 1, 1949, as saying:—

Not one Premier in Australia, including Mr. Playford, can say that they have not received a fair deal at the hands of the Federal Government.

The problems affecting public works projects concerns most members. I regret that I was not present last Thursday to hear the honourable member for Unley. I agree with his remarks about the South Para reservoir and the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline: one of these projects should be finished before the other is proceeded with. It is time the Government stated which works it intends to complete. The member for Gawler asked the Minister of Works a question about the South Para reservoir and the Minister replied by letter as follows:—

Adverting to your question regarding employment on the South Para reservoir, the figures are as follows—39 men are at present employed by the department at the South Para exclusive of those engaged on the tunnelling scheme under the contract, and 81 men have been diverted to other works. As the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline affords the most rapid and assured means of supplementing the supply of water to the metropolitan area and adjacent areas, inclusive of Gawler, which is connected of course with this supply, the Government is giving a higher priority to the pipeline than to the reservoir scheme.

In view of that reply I would have thought there would be an increase in the number of persons employed on the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline, but strangely enough, there were less. I predict that we shall never be told the exact position and that millions of pounds will be spent on projects which will be partly completed and stand idle. That money could be better used in completing more urgent requirements.

In 1949 the Premier said that his Government was prepared to support a policy of freedom from controls. That was his catch cry, but his actions have belied his words. I am not alone in the opinion that there is now a vicious form of controls operating. To prove my point I will quote from *The Mail* of May 31. Under the heading "Import Cuts Will Last Long Time," Professor Sir Douglas Copland (Vice-Chancellor of the National University) stated:—

Import restrictions were "about the most insidious form of economic control," but they would not be temporary. "Let us not be under any illusion: they will last for a long time." The restrictions were necessary, but were too long delayed and had come in an extreme form.

The controls are insidious, treacherous, deceitful, and operating secretly. What has been the result of these controls? The *Advertiser* of May 21 reported that pepper, mace, cinnamon, and cloves would all be off the market within a few weeks, but that the big worry was that sauce and pickle manufacturers, meat canners, and condiment manufacturers might have to stop making their products altogether or make an inferior product because of the prohibition of the importation of the necessary ingredients. Let us consider the loss to our export trade.

Hundreds of tons of fruit and vegetable will be thrown on the scrap heap this year as a result of import restrictions, yet the Liberal and Country Parties talk about freedom from controls. Not one word of protest has been uttered by the South Australian Government on this matter in the interests of the primary producer. Some controls are necessary, but no single control is a cure for all our economic ills. I submit that Federal price control did much to retain a more stable economy than we have today. However, Federal price control was abolished, and all that went with it, because Federal and State Liberal members travelled and stumped this State saying that the people could depend on the State Governments to effectively control prices. I do not say that price control is the panacea for all our economic ills. In reply to the member for Onkaparinga, I say that no Labor man, speaking on behalf of the Australian Labor Party, has ever claimed that Federal price control in itself was a cure for all ills; but it did much to protect the people from increased prices and rents. After the member for Semaphore had said that rents had increased in some cases by 50 per cent I went to the Parliamentary Library to check prices operating under Federal control against those operating under State control on July 9. The first thing I noticed was that the price of the *Advertiser* had doubled. The increases in the prices of some necessary commodities are interesting. I have a table showing the prices of some vegetable as at July 9, 1948, and July 9, 1952. I ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

	<i>Advertiser</i> , July 9, 1948.		<i>Advertiser</i> , July 9, 1952.		s. d.
	s.	d.	s.	d.	
Peas	1	4 lb.	2	4 lb.	1 0 dearer
Beans	2	0 lb.	3	6 lb.	1 6 dearer
Onions	0	1½ lb.	0	2½ lb.	0 1 dearer
Triamble	0	2½ lb.	0	4 lb.	0 1½ dearer
Potatoes	1	3 doz. lb.	4	6 doz. lb.	3 3 dearer
Celery	0	6 stick	1	3 stick	0 9 dearer
Cauliflowers	1	0	2	0	1 0 dearer
Cabbages	—	—	—	—	10 times as high
Beetroot	0	4 bunch	0	6 bunch	0 2 dearer
Carrots	0	4 bunch	0	7 bunch	0 3 dearer
Turnips	0	2½ bunch	0	6 bunch	0 3½ dearer

Mr. HUTCHENS—The Premier said that the remarks of the member for Onkaparinga had been distorted to give an impression that was never intended, but I point out that Mr. Shannon attempted to prove his case by quoting figures about the cost of bricks and said there were reasons other than the abolition of Federal price control for increased costs.

He said that bricks cost three times as much as they did prior to the war because of a go slow policy and that the next factor causing inflation, as insidious as it was harmful, was the darg. I emphasize that prejudice and class hatred dull the mind. The member for Onkaparinga overlooked the fact that all bricks made in South Australia are produced

under the piece-work system. From copies of the *Government Gazette* I have prepared a table showing the piece-work rates per 1,000 bricks for various employees working in brick-yards. I ask leave to have the table inserted in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

Piece-work rates per 1,000 bricks.

	1947.		1952.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.
Pughole men	8	0	16	3½
Loftmen	2	4	3	4½
Cutting off	4	8	8	9½
Padding off	7	0½	13	1½
Scintling	1	7½	3	1½
Handpressing	9	11½	12	0½
Wheeling, setting in kiln . .	9	5½	17	5½
Burning	8	0	15	9
Wheeling out kiln	7	2½	13	3½
	£2 18	3½	£5	3 ½

Mr. HUTCHENS—The table shows that the increase in the labour cost per 1,000 bricks between 1947 and 1952 has been £2 8s. 0½d. During the same period bricks have increased in cost in the metropolitan area by £6 17s., £7 1s., and £7 12s., plus at least 22s. 6d. per 1,000 for delivery—the answer to the unfounded claim that the darg was the cause of inflation. The member for Mitcham talked about excessive profits and I sincerely regret that having made such a strong point for their control he finds himself denied the right, at least to a degree, from furthering his view by voice and vote. I notice that the member for Adelaide has brought under the notice of the House the profits made by an Adelaide finance company. In 1947 its profits were £315. That was in the year in which the 40-hour week was introduced. Its profits in 1948 increased to £429; in 1949 to £988; in 1950 to £1,895; and in 1951 to £3,823. I agree wholeheartedly with the member for Mitcham that something should be done to control excessive profits. I have prepared a table showing how the purchasing power of the pound has diminished since the relinquishing of Federal price control, despite promises to put value back into the pound. It is as follows:—

Value of the pound. Based on the Item ("C" Series) retail price index for Adelaide.

	Price Index.	Value s. d.
Sept., 1939	903	20 0
Sept., 1946	1120	16 0
Sept., 1947	1165	15 6
Sept., 1948	1127	14 0
Sept., 1949	1393	13 0
Dec., 1950	1608	11 3
Dec., 1951	1990	9 0
May, 1952	2170	8 4

U

The poor worker doesn't see much of it. Inflation has run wild; it has almost galloped itself to exhaustion. Under Federal price control wages and prices were kept fairly stable. I compliment the artist on his cartoon in yesterday's *News* showing how rising prices have been responsible for wage increases. When the Federal Parliament controlled prices in 1946 the basic wage rose by only 2s. In 1947 it rose by 4s., and in 1948 by 4s., but following the abolition of Federal price control in 1949 it rose by 10s. In 1950 it rose by 10s. also, in 1951 by 37s., and so far this year it has increased by 28s. There are many weaknesses in the system of controlling prices in this State. As a result people are exposed to exploitation, but little is done about it. Early this year one of my constituents showed me a pair of shoes purchased from a Rundle Street store. They were odd in size and colour and number of eyelets. I was told that a lady purchased them after having tried one on. She paid the account and took the shoes home, and then discovered that they were odd. She took them back to the store, together with the docket, but she was informed that the docket stated that the shoes were "not exchangeable." I rang the manager of the department because I felt confident that there had been a mistake. I told him that he might hear more about it and a few days later he rang and said that if I did not represent a district like Hindmarsh and was not dependent on numbskull workers I would not be elected to Parliament. He promised me a little opposition at the next State election. A few days later I received the following letter from the Public Benefit Bootery, 14 Rundle Street, Adelaide:—

Reference your telephone conversation on Monday, February 18, 1952, regarding a pair of shoes purchased by a Miss X. . . . As mentioned the shoes were reduced on account of there being a slight variation in size. Miss X tried the shoes on, and was quite agreeable to take them, she was informed that they were not exchangeable and the docket was clearly marked "No exchange." We have contacted our solicitors, and legally are not compelled to exchange the goods, or refund the money; even under pressure of a Parliamentarian, of the House of Assembly. However, considering the amount involved and Mr. X efforts to have the shoes returned; on production of the receipt docket, we will gladly refund the 29s. 6d.

(Sgd.) C. G. Harvey, Manager.

On receipt of that letter I forwarded it to the person who lodged the complaint, from whom I received the following reply:—

In answer to your letter of the 21st inst., and also copy of letter received by your from

Public Benefit Bootery Limited. I would like to clear up one or two points referred to in Mr. Harvey's letter. He infers that because the amount involved is so small he has decided to refund the money, but I would like to point out that the amount has only been small right from the start of this dispute, but he did not see his way clear to do anything about it until now. He also mentions my efforts to have the shoes replaced, but I was not so concerned with having the shoes or the money refunded as with having the transaction shown up in its true light. My daughter is quite certain no mention was made at the time of sale about a slight variation in size, or that she was informed that they were not exchangeable. The docket was wrapped with the shoes and was not seen until they were unwrapped at home. My wife, who was with her at the time, can vouch for this.

Some attention should be given to these practices in order to protect the people, for this appears to be one of the loopholes by which the Act is evaded.

Now I turn to one or two other points raised during this debate. In an endeavour to claim that the country has been developed under his Government the Premier said:—

The number of South Australian country factory employees in 1938 was 7,000 and in 1950-51 was 11,128, an increase of 4,128.

However, it should be remembered that Whyalla was almost non-existent in 1938 whereas, on the 1947 census figures, its population was 7,000.

Mr. Davis—It is nearly 9,000 now.

Mr. HUTCHENS—A few other Government projects are of a socialistic type consistent with Labor's policy and therefore it is obvious that, apart from a few predominantly Labor electorates, there has been an alarming drift from the country, as the following figures illustrate. On the Premier's own showing the number of country factory employees has increased by 4,128 since 1939, which represents an increase of 50 per cent, but in the same period the figures rose from 36,371 to 72,041 in the metropolitan area, an increase of 98 per cent. The Leader of the Opposition, speaking of primary production, said that it was a sorry tale, as indeed it is, and anyone knowing the real facts but endeavouring to make us believe otherwise must surely fall within the category of the disloyal. The editorial of the *News* of Saturday, March 24, 1951, put it in a nutshell thus:—

Big sums of money are being set aside by the West to provide economic aid for South-East Asia, but some of this money might be spent on supplying food, but it is not much use having money to buy food if there is no food to buy.

This editorial was headed "Produce food for selves and others" and it went on:—

An important message was given to Australia this week by Dr. H. G. Trumble who has returned from work as a world agronomist with the Food and Agricultural Organization of U.N. in Washington. He described food as democracy's weapon against Communism. He said, "About 20 per cent of the world's people are living within a democracy while 30 per cent are in Communist-dominated territories. The remaining 50 per cent will become allied eventually with whatever cause proves strongest in the physical sense."

Our duty therefore is clear. We must aim at increasing our food production in every respect, although I will show that we are not yet doing so. The State's population has increased in 14 years by about 200,000, whereas the number of rural employees has decreased since the thirties by 1,305. The Premier, in admitting that the number of landholders had dropped by 3,526 since 1938, pointed out the obvious fact that on the other hand the average area of the holdings had increased. This seems to be due to the policy of the Government; big holdings owned by King William Street farmers, worked by employees. This State was developed by the initiative of the individual landowner. A certain Senator, returning from Queensland following the notorious meeting there, said that the South Australian Premier was wanted in Queensland to show them how to farm.

Mr. Whittle—He had nothing to do with the notorious meeting in Brisbane.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Time may tell a different story. I did not say he was at the meeting, but he was in Brisbane at the same time. I have visited Queensland and have gone more than 1,000 miles above Brisbane, and it is very interesting to examine this State which is alleged to suffer by comparison with South Australia. Its population for 1950-51 was estimated at 1,216,359. Of this number 444,617 are in the metropolitan area and 771,709 in the country. From Cairns, which is 17ft. above sea level, one moves to the Atherton Tablelands 3,011ft. above sea level, and there we find that, owing to the initiative of the Queensland Government, people are settled on small farms making very comfortable livings, with their own factories, towns, picture theatres, and an ever-increasing population. I am indebted to the member for Flinders who, in an effort to rebut the Leader of the Opposition's claim that primary production was a sorry tale, gave some figures, with which the Premier agreed, on the production of cereal

foods. I propose to quote them again so that the House will not forget them. They are as follows:—

	Bushels.
1938-39	40,000,000
1948-49	40,000,000
1949-50	43,000,000
1950-51	49,000,000
1951-52	48,000,000

That sounds good, but it is only half the story and half truths are most deceiving. The 1938-39 production, with a population of 505,131, is the equivalent of 79 bushels a head, whereas the 1951-52 production, with an estimated population of 729,836, is the equivalent of only 66 bushels. That is a decline of 13 bushels a head of the population. In 1939 we heard in the Lieutenant-Governor's speech that "Agricultural products are the cause of grave concern to my advisers." We have had the same phrase down the years; it is a sorry tale. I heard the Prime Minister speak at the Bonython Hall on September 3, 1951, when he declared that if Australia did not increase primary production we would be an importing instead of an exporting nation. I consider that our Premier's promises regarding public utilities have not been kept.

Recently, I visited the River Murray districts and noticed the extensive development under irrigation that was being undertaken. I give credit to the Minister of Irrigation and his department for their activities in transforming barren and useless country into holdings to enable men to get a good living from 25 acres. I saw the Cooltong area, which is capable of producing hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of produce. I visited the Murray districts by train as far as Morgan and one almost needs to be a buckjump rider to remain in the carriages. To send fruit from some of the Murray districts by rail through Tailem Bend under normal circumstances takes three days. As a consequence of the slow rail service thousands of pounds worth of stone fruits produced in the river districts are allowed to rot on the ground, thus depriving consumers in the metropolitan area of cheap and good fruit. The member for Glenelg had something to say about a jetty for Glenelg.

Mr. Pattinson—That is the most important topic you have mentioned to date.

Mr. HUTCHENS—As pointed out by Mr. Pattinson in his speech, he is in a unique position in that he has represented not only a country district but also a metropolitan district in this House. This makes him as responsible as anyone for the position in

which the Glenelg people find themselves today in respect of their jetty, because he has been pleased for years to support a Government that will permit public utilities to rot and decay. Rather than spend money on a jetty at Glenelg the Government should be more concerned with the provision of improved transport facilities for food products, and in this respect should provide another bridge over the Murray. I remind Mr. Pattinson that there are two jetties in my electorate and I hope they will not be allowed to deteriorate to such a degree that a puff of wind will blow them away. Even if they were destroyed, I could not plead for their replacement while the people in the river districts are without a bridge to enable goods to be quickly transported to Adelaide. Because of the lack of modern railway facilities on the West Coast almost 600,000 bush. of wheat in No. 14 pool, reaped 18 to 20 months ago, is still waiting to be shipped. At eight centres over there the wheat is mice-infested, weevil-ridden, sprouting and badly exposed to the weather in rotting bags. Mr. Pearson tells his electors that it will not be long before their railway service will get some obsolete narrow-gauge carriages and trucks from the South-East which are not wanted there. Even if this rolling stock is transported to the West Coast in the quickest possible time we will not be able to save 1,000,000 bush. of wheat in No. 15 pool from the same fate as that in No. 14 pool.

I will now summarize what I have said. In his policy speech the Premier referred to improvement in public utilities, but now we have loan restrictions and an easing of public works. As to his reference to a rising standard of living and full employment we now have a growing army of unemployed persons, and, instead of greater progress in primary production we have a decline in the per capita production of cereal foodstuffs. We have a great nation undeveloped in natural resources moving towards a depression, yet the Prime Minister travels the country making speeches and leaves his Treasurer at home to make mistakes. The Premier of South Australia looks for press photographers to photograph him with his synthetic smile, which is a subtle way of trying to convince the people that all is well, when really we are in a sorry state. There is a sad tale to tell because of the united efforts of the inhuman, undemocratic, unscrupulous, un-Australian Liberal Party and its satellites. Only an election can and will change this deplorable state of affairs. I support the motion.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I support the remarks of previous speakers regarding our loyalty to Queen Elizabeth II., and the sentiments expressed concerning the death of King George VI. I was sorry that Sir Willoughby Norrie had to leave South Australia, because he and Lady Norrie had endeared themselves to the people. I regret the death of Mr. Les. Duncan, who was a sincere and hardworking man. On many occasions he should have been at home instead of being in this House looking after the interests of his constituents. Australia is fast approaching an economic crisis. I have read many of the speeches made in this debate, but none of them dealt with this crisis. We have the position of wages chasing prices. The recent 13s. a week increase in the basic wage debunked Sir Arthur Fadden's statement that inflation had been controlled by the policy of the Commonwealth Government. Nobody wants these wage increases.

Mr. O'Halloran—Except, perhaps, Sir Arthur Fadden.

Mr. STOTT—Yes, because they increase taxation. The Commonwealth and State Governments are doing nothing to deal with increased prices. The Commonwealth Government has made it clear that it intends to pass the buck to the Arbitration Court, and our Premier said he would not lift one finger in the interests of South Australia. With its limited jurisdiction the Arbitration Court cannot be expected to provide all the answers in the attempt to meet the crisis. The Premiers of New South Wales and Tasmania are willing to assist the Court in reaching a decision, but not the Commonwealth and South Australian Governments. The Arbitration Court can grant an increase in wages when the "C" series of index figures justify an increase. Should the court be able to freeze wages following the application by employers, whilst at the same time interest rates are allowed to rise? I doubt whether the court has power to do this in the public interest. The employers want to freeze wages, but the Loan Council allows interest rates to rise. That is not the way to deal with the position.

About 12 months ago an economic conference was held in Sydney at the invitation of the Prime Minister, when suggestions for solving the economic problem were sought. I told the Prime Minister that the banks should be called together and that the "C" series of index figures should be subsidized in order to put the lid on inflation, and that when the next survey was made it would be found that wages would not have to be increased so much. I

said that if necessary bank credit should be used in the payment of subsidies. The Prime Minister replied that my remarks had been noted and that in his opinion the issue of bank credit would be a form of inflation. I admitted that we wanted a little bit of the dog that was biting us in order to prevent inflation. It would not be a complete cure, but the first thing to do is to attempt to prevent wages chasing prices. If we got the "C" series of index figures under control, following the payment of subsidies, the increase in wages at the end of the next quarter would not be so great. We would not have had such a big increase as 13s. a week. That would have been a way to halt inflation. We could look into the position six months later. The Government, however, did not act on that. We have reached a position where nobody wants a wage increase because he has to pay more in taxation and gets less goods. The South Australian Government should have intervened in the matter; it is far too serious for any Government to sit idly by.

The Hon. T. Playford—Did you say that this Government has not intervened? I think you had better find out the facts.

Mr. STOTT—The *Advertiser* reported that the Premier said he would not intervene in the case.

The Hon. T. Playford—I did not say that. The State has intervened; we are in the court now.

Mr. STOTT—That contradicts what I read. I understood the Premier to say that the Government has not intervened.

The Hon. T. Playford—I said that the Government is already in the Arbitration Court.

Mr. STOTT—I take it that the Government will assist the court in arriving at a decision. On the other hand, the New South Wales Government is opposing the application. But can the Governments really leave the solving of this important question entirely to the court? I doubt it. It has no power to freeze interest rates or stop them from going sky high. Had we taken steps 12 months ago to subsidize the "C" series index we would have been able to find ways and means of avoiding an approach to the court. A second mistake was made by granting an increase to 3½ per cent in the interest rates, which meant that money dropped from £100 to £88 10s. That was the reason why the loan was not fully subscribed. The public lost interest in it. The Commonwealth Government has had to close down on imports and certain cuts have been made. I

do not blame the Federal Government for all the problems with which we are faced as many of them are world-wide. In its last Budget the Commonwealth Government should have budgeted for a deficit instead of a surplus. However, instead of encouraging production it has discouraged people.

Interest rates should have been pegged at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It was with the idea of inducing the public to invest in loans that the interest rates were increased. The Commonwealth Government did not worry about investors getting only £88 10s. for their £100. The position has become chaotic and we are witnessing a debacle. Never before in the history of the Loan Council has there been such a set-up. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to say that the States are on the Federal Government's back, but where else could the States go? A brawl has been created between the State and Federal Governments, and the Loan Council has served its useful purpose, for, unless confidence is restored between Governments, the confidence of the public in the loan market cannot be expected. Had the interest rate been frozen, the Arbitration Court could have been asked to freeze wages, but it is futile to ask the Court, which must take cognizance of all sections, to freeze wages if interest rates are allowed to rise, for in effect this would mean that the worker was being asked to take less.

When Australia was galloping into the present crisis, out of the blue came a most fortunate occurrence—Conciliation Commissioner Galvin's award. Had the Federal Parliament taken cognizance of that award and refused to vote for the increase in members' salaries recommended in the Nicholas report, Australia would have been given a lead, but it voted for the increases, so how on earth could industrial peace be expected to follow? The Federal Parliament lost a golden opportunity of giving a lead to all Australia.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Would you have refused the increase if you had been a Federal member?

Mr. STOTT—I am not a Federal member, but the honourable member knows that when I say a thing I stick to it, and I would have said the same thing in the Federal Parliament at that time as I say now.

Mr. Moir—There was a unanimous vote on the increase in salaries.

Mr. STOTT—Yes, and both the Federal Opposition and the Government must be blamed for the step. I do not quarrel with the

Nicholas report, but say that the Federal Parliament turned down a golden opportunity to lead Australia in the matter of wage fixation.

Mr. Frank Walsh—You had the opportunity to give a lead in 1948 but did not accept it.

Mr. STOTT—That was with regard to prices, but these things must be put in their proper places. A special Premiers' conference should be called.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Two have been called already.

Mr. STOTT—Yes, but the problem has not been tackled in the right way and there is an acrimonious feeling between the States and the Commonwealth, because the States cannot get sufficient money through the Loan Council. A conference should be called to work out ways and means of solving the present crisis and stopping inflation. No. 1 item on the agenda should be the pegging of interest rates, and then the Arbitration Court could be asked to freeze wages.

The Hon. T. Playford—Does the honourable member believe that interest rates are a part of the "C" Series Index?

Mr. STOTT—No, but no-one can justifiably apply to the Arbitration Court for the freezing of wages when interest rates are being allowed to rise. This matter affects everyone, yet many previous speakers in this debate have merely quoted remarks made 12 months ago and have offered no real solution of the problem. Subsidizing of the items in the "C" Series Index will help prevent prices from rising and will result in the stabilization of the basic wage.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Did you support a similar proposal when you had the opportunity?

Mr. STOTT—I have advocated this method for many years, and refer the honourable member to my speech at the economic conference held in Sydney last year. If interest rates were pegged, confidence would be restored on the loan market, for the investing public would know that it is no good waiting for a higher rate of interest on the next loan and would invest its money. It is not that people have not got money, for the recent South Australian Gas Company loan was over-subscribed in two days because of the interest rate offered.

Mr. Davis—Would you lend your money to a Government in which you had little confidence?

Mr. STOTT—No, and the public generally has lost confidence in the loan market. Let us by combined action solve the problem of getting Australia out of this crisis. Let us do something for Australia by supporting the Government in power and trying to get

to get us out of the chaos. Let us plead with it to take steps to save Australia from the galloping chaos that confronts us.

Mr. Davis—It is behind us too.

Mr. STOTT—Then let us benefit from past mistakes. The import restrictions and the assessment of the provisional tax of the primary producer on the assumption that he will earn the same income in 1951-52 as he earned in the previous year from high wool prices have been two bad mistakes and are reflected in our food production programme. The only way to solve our imports problem is to export more, and that means increased production. I do not suggest we should hang around the primary producer's neck and plead with him to produce more. He will answer the call if he has an incentive. He needs many types of goods—barbed wire, water piping, fencing material, and so forth. We should encourage the worker and provide him with an incentive to work overtime in order to produce more goods. We vitally need production of goods in Australia. Freezing wages would only be a drop in the bucket and would not solve the economic problem. There should be a special Premiers' Conference and State Premiers should call a party political truce for the time being in an effort to solve this problem. After subsidizing costs the Arbitration Court could be approached for the freezing of wages and, if interest rates were pegged, it would have the support of the working public. The workers do not want increases because the more they get the worse off they are. It would be a foolish thing to adjust the exchange rate, which would be a terrific blow to the wheat, the dried fruit, and other industries. Every primary producers' organization is in favour of no alteration.

Mr. Pattinson—Why should the lenders' interest be frozen and the workers' wages be frozen and yet the sky be the limit for primary producers?

Mr. STOTT—That is not so. At the time it was suggested that the exchange rate be adjusted over £600,000,000 was invested in Australia and any adjustment would have meant a loss of about £100,000,000, and the crisis would have been accentuated.

Mr. Pattinson—What sacrifices did the primary producers make?

Mr. STOTT—Do you suggest they made no sacrifices?

Mr. Pattinson—It is their greatest period of prosperity.

Mr. STOTT—The wheatgrowers of Australia have made a contribution of over £100,000,000.

Mr. Davis—Have they gone short to do it?

Mr. STOTT—That is not the point. The wheatgrower has made a contribution by providing a cheap loaf of bread.

Mr. Davis—Everyone wants the wage earner to make a sacrifice.

Mr. STOTT—I do not ask that. The wheatgrower has made his contribution by selling wheat for flour at 10s. a bushel when the overseas price is 21s. 6d. or 22s. a bushel.

Mr. Davis—Shouldn't there be a limit to the profits on everything?

Mr. STOTT—I have already said so, but apparently I am speaking to the wall.

Mr. Pattinson—You keep making statements but you do not convince us. Repetition won't do it.

Mr. STOTT—It depends on the honourable member's viewpoint. Is he prepared to admit that the primary producer has made a contribution in this economic crisis?

Mr. Pattinson—I admit he has made a small fortune in the last 10 years.

Mr. STOTT—If primary producers had not been bound by wheat legislation there would have been an open market and Australia would have faced a worse economic crisis and city dwellers would have had something to squeal about. They would have been asked to pay 22s. a bushel for flour for bread.

Mr. Davis—Should Australia be ruled by overseas prices?

Mr. STOTT—The honourable member agrees with me, but he must be consistent. I am trying to make a contribution to help us out of this crisis. The point at issue is that we are curtailing our imports because we have no credit overseas.

The Hon. T. Playford—You believe in a payable price for wheat, surely?

Mr. STOTT—Yes.

The Hon. T. Playford—Then why not give the employee the same privilege?

Mr. STOTT—He is getting a privilege from the wheat industry to the extent of the difference between 10s. a bushel for flour and 22s. a bushel overseas. If we adjust the exchange rate we have 20 per cent less credit in sterling overseas.

Before concluding I will refer to the electrification of the suburban railways. The Government and the city council should get together to solve Adelaide's transport problem. The city council is determined to widen Bank Street for the purpose of providing an outlet for traffic to the Adelaide railway station, but

that will make no contribution to the problem. The traffic problem in Adelaide is getting more difficult every month. We find a bottleneck in King William Street at 5 p.m. at every intersection as a result of the installation of safety zones for pedestrians. Eventually the trams will have to be eliminated from King William Street and the centre poles removed so that traffic will not be impeded. With the increase in motor registrations the whole of King William Street will soon be a bottleneck at all times of the day. Another north-south highway will have to be provided in the city. The only additional outlet presenting itself is the Morphett Street bridge, which will have to be widened in order to take trolley or diesel buses. I have always advocated in this House that there should be a Minister of Transport to govern the transport system in South Australia. Railways, tramways, taxicabs and country goods carriers would be controlled by one Minister. I do not support the argument that the State should not take over the Municipal Tramways Trust because country people should not be called upon to contribute to tramway deficits. Transport presents a State-wide problem, and country people have to use the city as a centre even if they do not patronise the trams.

Transport systems in all States suffered as a result of the war because all necessary maintenance work could not be undertaken. Fortunately, the South Australian railways are being rehabilitated as a result of excellent work at the Islington workshops. The Transport Control Board and the Government should consider easing the restrictions on road transport. We have a broad-gauge railway line in my district. The population does not warrant any great extension of services, but the railways cannot be eliminated altogether in the Murray area without detriment to settlers. The Eyre Peninsula railway system is in a sad state and something should be done to improve it in order to transport wheat, barley and

oats more quickly to the ports for shipment. I am glad that during the past few months the department has expedited the delivery of wheat and barley from the Peninsula. The department is doing a good job with a worn-out system, but we cannot wait for the broad-gauge to be constructed to Mount Gambier before transferring rolling stock from that division to Eyre Peninsula. In any case that rolling stock may be worn out before reaching the peninsula. We hear much nowadays about the five-year food production programme, but we can increase the production of food-stuffs considerably by modernising transport systems on Eyre Peninsula as well as in the district I represent.

Many members are getting complaints about the school bus services transporting children to area schools. In many cases the department has asked parents to contribute towards the cost of the bus fares. Some parents have stated that the Education Department's subsidy has been inadequate and the Minister, although usually sympathetic, states that the costs of running the buses are getting so great that it is beyond the capacity of the department to meet them. If we are to encourage people to go into the country to produce food we must realize the importance of facilitating the education of settlers' children. The Government should consider increasing the allowances made for conveying children to area schools. The Public Works Committee is considering the question of the construction of bridges over the Murray, and I hope its report will soon be tabled. Congestion at the punts is increasing and even outside busy periods queues can be seen at Blanchetown and Kingston. I support the motion.

Mr. FLETCHER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 6, at 2 p.m.