

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, September 24, 1952.

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

**QUESTIONS.****SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE AND TRAMWAYS TRUST CONTROL.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—As a number of Opposition members wish to make arrangements ahead can the Premier say whether it is intended that the House shall sit in the evening on Tuesday and Wednesday of next week and the following week?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—With the permission of the House I shall reply to the question by reading the following letter, which I have just received from Mr. Chas. E. Sutton, president of the Municipal Association of South Australia, and which has a bearing on the matter under discussion:—

You have no doubt read the press report of last night's meeting in connection with the Municipal Tramways Trust, but with the concurrence of the Lord Mayor, I, as chairman of the meeting, desire to officially report the position to you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! I do not think the Premier is in order in answering the question in this way. I do not want to stop him from reading the letter and giving information to the House, but I suggest that he first ask leave to do so.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask leave to read the letter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The letter goes on:—

All councils of A and B Group were represented, as also was the City of Adelaide, and the 19 councils in A and B Group all agreed to accept and abide by a majority decision. The Lord Mayor then read out a resolution of the City of Adelaide as follows:—  
“That the council will accept a majority vote of the constituent councils of the M.T.T. on the voting basis as decided at the meeting with the Premier on September 11, provided that the majority vote does not involve the loss of any of Adelaide City Council's powers other than the power to appoint members of the trust.”  
You will see they were not prepared to accept unreservedly any majority decision and this created quite a bit of feeling amongst some of the councils, and Kensington and Norwood stated that they only had authority to accept the majority decision subject to all councils and the City Council agreeing. A vote was then taken on Nos. 2 and 3 proposals and with the 9 votes allowed to the City of Adelaide the voting was 18 in favour of No. 2, that is:—  
“That a more efficient type of control be established, and that the Government appoint

the board.” Ten metropolitan councils supported No. 3 proposal. Thereupon all the councils in the minority, that is, those that supported No. 3 agreed, without reservation, to support No. 2, the only exception to this being Kensington and Norwood. The Mayor of Kensington and Norwood has agreed to call a special meeting of his council for tomorrow night (Thursday) and he has promised to recommend to his council that they support the majority vote and will advise me on Friday of the result and I will then officially report to you on the matter. As Kensington and Norwood are one of the smaller councils and on an assessment basis represent only approximately 2½ per cent. of the total assessments of the various councils, I can say that on an assessment or a “property rights” basis there is a 97½ per cent vote in favour of No. 2, and I sincerely trust that by Friday I will be able to report a 100 per cent vote.

The municipal authorities have not yet reached complete agreement on legislation which may be necessary in connection with the Tramways Trust. Its financial position is urgent and difficult. It has been able to carry on with assistance from the State Bank, which now considers it has gone sufficiently far in making temporary financial assistance available. If the councils this week reach agreement on some form of arrangement the Government proposes to introduce urgent legislation on the matter, and then it will probably be advisable for the House to meet on Tuesday and Wednesday nights of next week. The matter is urgent because of the very grave financial position of the trust. If it is reported in the press that agreement has been reached the Government will introduce the legislation next week.

**SLAUGHTERING OF EYRE PENINSULA SHEEP.**

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether further labour has been secured to fully man the chain at the Port Lincoln Freezing Works? Since a visit to my district over the week-end I believe more than ever that more stock will be offering than the works will be able to handle.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The latest information I have is that they are still endeavouring to get a few more men. Subject to their being obtained we shall be able to man three-quarters of the chain at Port Lincoln and handle considerably more stock. At present they are keeping up fairly well with orders.

**OIL COMPANY'S ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN.**

Mr. HUTCHENS—Is the Premier aware of the extensive advertising campaign being conducted by one oil company in newspapers throughout Australia for one of its products?

Full page advertisements have appeared in every chief newspaper in Australia, and in some instances on more than one occasion. The cost of this space with one Adelaide newspaper is almost £300, and in certain interstate newspapers it costs about £800 for each insertion. In addition to this expense, the same company is involved in heavy costs advertising its products over the air. Can the Premier give an assurance that when he attends the approaching conference of Price Ministers, and is considering the question of the price of petrol, he will keep these facts in mind, and also the fact that petrol companies have spent huge sums in purchasing and building elaborate service stations? And can he assure the motor-ing public that they will not be called upon to pay for these things through an increased price for petrol?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Many factors go to make up the price of an article, and the Prices Commissioners take all of them into account before deciding on any increase. I assure the honourable member that that will be the position in the near future. With regard to advertising, on a previous occasion when a firm's application for a price increase was investigated, it was found that, although that firm had spent a large sum on advertising, the resultant turn-over had meant not an increase but a reduction in cost to the public, so advertising in itself is not necessarily a bad thing, but in some circumstances, because of the demand created, may involve the public in a lower unit cost.

Mr. Macgillivray—That would not be true of petrol.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is a general comment. The additional capital being put into the petrol industry through the purchase of one-brand petrol stations, and all such things, are taken into account before decisions on price increases are reached, and they will be taken into account at the Prices Conference on Friday.

#### UNSEEMLY BEHAVIOUR AT SEACLIFF.

Mr. PATTINSON—Yesterday I directed a question to the Premier concerning a public nuisance committed each week at Seacliff by dance patrons, who journey there from Adelaide in buses provided for the purpose by the promoter of the dances. Today I was informed that that promoter is not a member of the Metropolitan Omnibus Operators' Association, all the members of which strictly refuse to allow passengers to carry liquor in bulk on their vehicles. I was further informed that

that person is not licensed by the Adelaide City Council or the Transport Control Board, for he charges an inclusive fee for the fare from the G.P.O. Adelaide to Seacliff and the admission to the dance, and apparently therefore is presumed, technically, not to be plying for hire. Will the Minister of Works take up this matter with the Adelaide City Council and the Transport Control Board to ascertain their views as to whether it would not be a desirable practice for operators of buses carrying large numbers of passengers to these dances and back to the city—many of them inebriated—to be under some sort of control or licensing authority?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I shall be glad to make those inquiries, but speaking without any prior knowledge on the matter, I say that as far as I know neither the Tramways Trust, having authority within 10 miles' radius of the G.P.O., nor the Transport Control Board under its Act, can under ordinary circumstances forbid the practice complained of.

Mr. Macgillivray—Cannot the police act?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—They have no knowledge prior to nor perhaps even after the event. Whereas this Government is sometimes accused of exercising too much control in these matters, this is a case where our leniency has been abused. I will go into the matter with the Tramways Trust, the City Council and the Transport Control Board to bring a stop to the present deplorable practice complained of.

#### WINKIE TOWNSHIP.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Settlers at Winkie are anxious that a township be established on the settlement and have asked that the Irrigation Department supply such a township with water, but the Minister of Irrigation has explained that that cannot be done during the present financial year. A letter dated October 23, 1951, from the Secretary for Irrigation to the Secretary of the Winkie Progress Association states:—

In the meantime action will be taken to secure the land and to have it subdivided and offered for allotment in anticipation of the expenditure being approved when the 1952-53 Loan Estimates are presented to Parliament. Will the Minister bring down a statement, tomorrow if possible, setting out what his department has done by way of clearing and subdividing the land, for many workers who stayed in Winkie hoping to get allotments on which to build homes are leaving the district because they feel there is no future for them there?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes.

## MUTTON PRICES.

Mr. HEASLIP—I understand it is the policy of the Government, where supply has caught up with demand, to decontrol the price of a commodity. For some time there has been a surplus of mutton. This surplus will increase in future and the export price controls the local price. Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to decontrol the price of mutton?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There is no intention at present to decontrol further any meat items; in fact a recent schedule compiled by the Prices Department, from which I received a report, discloses that many offences are being committed at present. Indeed, there are down for prosecution more than a score of such offences; so although prices of meat have recently been much more in accordance with the upset prices on which the retail prices have been fixed, in a number of instances the inspectors have detected what they believe to be breaches of the Act and have launched prosecutions.

## OBSCENE LITERATURE FOR CHILDREN.

Mr. McKENZIE—In 1949 I asked the Premier a question regarding the reading of obscene literature by children, and since then the matter has been frequently mentioned in the Federal Parliament. The effect of these books on children is bad for, despite any good home training a child may receive, they must have an adverse effect on the child's character. Can the Premier say what action he has taken to prevent the sale of such literature and what future action is intended?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The State law gives the Government considerable powers over literature of an obscene nature. The police are constantly making investigations and on a number of occasions have taken action to deal with what may be regarded as obscene publications, but I think the honourable member, like many other members, is concerned about a type of literature that may not be obscene but is very useless and undesirable, and tends, particularly with children, to direct the mind along avenues of beating the law and to extol Deadwood Dick activities. I believe it is usually syndicated. It is subject to import control by the Commonwealth, but from observation I believe that control is very loose because the community has certainly been flooded with a large quantity of it. I raised this matter with another Premier at a recent Premiers' Conference. We tabled for examination by other Premiers, copies of the sort of literature

freely in circulation today. The Prime Minister said that the Commonwealth authorities would examine their position, and the Premier of another State where a considerable amount of this literature is published also said that he would examine the position. I agree with the honourable member that much of the literature fed to the young child's mind is undesirable and that the community would be much better off without it.

## REPAIRS TO ROADWAY.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Minister of Railways a reply to the question I asked last week about repairs to the roadway from the main railway yards at Mile End to the Chrysler Works opposite?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As promised, I took the question up with the Railways Commissioner and he, in turn, took it up with his officers on the spot. He has replied that the crossing has been inspected and steps are being taken to repair the road immediately. Whereas he will repair the surface over the sleeper width, the local government body will undertake repairs to the road. I take it that the matter will be attended to in co-operation with the council concerned.

## ROAD CARRIAGE OF WOOL.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Railways any further information in reply to the question I asked some days ago about the alleged abnormal increase in the road transport of wool to the metropolitan area from the country?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The report of the Railways Commissioner indicates that there has been a big increase despite the fact that South Australia is said to be very restrictive in its road control. The following figures show the wool clip for the past three years and the quantity of wool transported by rail:—

	1949-50.	1950-51.	1951-52.
Clip . . . . .	Bales. 355,388	Bales. 385,317	Bales. 406,494
Handled by rail	314,405	264,908	294,070

It can be seen that the quantity handled by rail now is considerably less than it was three years ago, notwithstanding that the total production of wool has greatly increased. The Transport Control Board has not issued permits for the carriage of wool by road from centres where rail facilities are available, so the fact that rail haulage of wool has decreased while the total wool clip has increased has not been due to permits granted to road hauliers, but to the fact that under the present rates of charges and the non-control

of owners of ancillary vehicles it has been found profitable, apparently, to cart wool by road. I see from time to time assertions that South Australia has been very restrictive in issuing permits. Today I asked the chairman of the Transport Control Board what the position was. According to many statements, one would think that the issuing of permits had stopped, but in fact, for the 14 days ended September 19, 425 applications sponsored by consignors had been made, of which 422 were granted, so only three were refused. The great majority of applications for permits have been granted, notwithstanding the fact that the Transport Control Board is obliged, by Act of Parliament, to co-ordinate road and rail transport.

Mr. Macgillivray—The board is the biggest menace in the State today.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Our laws relating to transport are the most lenient, as far as I know, in the world. The owner of the ancillary vehicle is not controlled, control is not exercised within 25 miles of Adelaide, our registration fees are much below any others in the Commonwealth, and our permit fees are so low that, although the fee from here to Brisbane on a 14-ton load would amount to nearly £200 the South Australian levy would be only £5.

#### MOUNT BARKER ROAD.

Mr. SHANNON—There have been rumours recently that the widening of certain sections of the Adelaide to Mount Barker Road will be commenced next week or the week after. Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the survey of the road between the Big Gum Tree at Glen Osmond and the Saddle at Crafers has been completed and, if so, at how many points along that route is it practicable to widen the traffic lanes to provide for vehicles to travel more than two abreast?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will obtain a report from the Commissioner of Highways. I would not think that even that point has yet been decided.

#### UPPER MURRAY TRANSPORT FACILITIES.

Mr. STOTT—Can the chairman of the Public Works Committee say whether the evidence of the Murray Lands District Councils' Association has been completed in reference to railways and bridges across the Murray, and is it possible to get the report expedited so that it will be available before the session closes in order to give members the opportunity to peruse it?

Mr. CHRISTIAN (Chairman, Public Works Committee)—Evidence has been taken on the question from a number of councils, but there is still one council, to my knowledge, which may desire to give evidence, and until the committee has all the evidence to hand it cannot arrive at a decision. The committee hopes to make a decision shortly.

#### PRICE OF GAS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—As it has been claimed from time to time that the price of coal is a considerable factor in assessing the price of gas, can the Premier advise what are the prospects of a reduction in the price in view of the recent reduction of 1s. 6d. a ton for New South Wales coal?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—About eight weeks' supply of coal is held in South Australia which was bought at the old price, and this must be consumed before the new price applies. I assure the honourable member that these matters are watched, and if any opportunity offers for a price decrease it takes place. The new price has not yet become operative to the Gas Company.

#### SLAUGHTERING OF SHEEP AND LAMBS.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—In answer to a question by Mr. Michael on September 17, the Minister of Agriculture said that the Abattoirs killing rate of both sheep and lambs was about 40,000 a week. A few years ago a select committee recommended that the killing facilities at the works be increased to a total of 70,000 a week. Can the Minister explain the discrepancy between 70,000—if in fact the additional chains have been installed—and the killing rate he mentioned, or is the position that sufficient labour is not available to maintain a higher rate than 40,000 a week for export?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The position at present is that there is only sufficient labour available to enable the board to man sufficient chains to kill 40,000 lambs a week for export. If there were a greater demand the board would endeavour to recruit more labour so as to be able to kill a greater number. If sufficient labour were available it would be possible to step up the number to 70,000 a week.

Mr. HEASLIP—Owing to the shortage of manpower at the Abattoirs, rather than work the men Saturday mornings, would it not be advisable to put another chain into operation and train more men to handle the influx of lambs and mutton which will be coming in in the next few weeks?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—For some time the board has pursued a policy of training men so that it will have a greater number of experienced staff during the killing season. I will get a full report from the board for the honourable member.

#### COUNTRY ABATTOIRS.

Mr. McKENZIE—Will the Government consider setting up country abattoirs, particularly at such centres as Tailem Bend, where stock could be slaughtered immediately after sale, and thus save them from the ill treatment they receive today? I have in mind cruelty which occurs to animals, particularly at Murray Bridge. Young lambs are taken from their mothers early in the morning, brought to the Adelaide market by train that night and then taken to the Abattoirs for sale. If the market is glutted they are not sold and are then trans-shipped to Melbourne. They are too young to be fed and have to go through this period of starvation. Young calves are also taken from their mothers early in the morning, sent to country markets and then transported to the Abattoirs, which they do not reach until the next day. Stockmen tell me that in order to unload these calves, many of which are only a couple of days old, they use a stick loaded with a battery.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There is a motion on today's Notice Paper dealing particularly with the question of setting up country works, and I hope to be able to say a few appropriate words on it. If the honourable member listens to me, I think he will get all the information he desires.

#### HOUSING TRUST ACTIVITIES AT PORT AUGUSTA.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked the Minister of Lands on September 16 regarding the rents charged for new Housing Trust homes at Port Augusta?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In pursuance of the promise made by the Minister I obtained the following report from the chairman of the trust:—

When fixing the rents of its houses the South Australian Housing Trust must fix "economic rents," that is, rents sufficient to meet the outgoings of the trust such as interest, capital repayment, rates and taxes, provision for maintenance, etc. The costs of construction of houses of the trust have increased appreciably over past years. This has been brought about by increases in wages and increases in costs of materials. In addition, maintenance and administration costs

have risen in consonance with the increases in wages and there have been increases in rates and taxes. It therefore follows that the economic rents to be charged for houses now being built must necessarily be greater than those of houses built in times of lesser costs. However, the wages of persons who seek to be tenants of trust homes have also risen in conformity with the general wages levels, and the rents of houses now being erected at Port Augusta, namely, £2 7s. 6d., are, in general, somewhat less than one-fifth of the income of the tenants who will occupy them. For the purpose of fixing these economic rents, the trust has calculated on an amortization period of 53 years.

#### STATE BANK REPORT.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1952, together with balance-sheets and profit and loss account.

Ordered to be printed.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REGISTRATION BOOKS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 477.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—I oppose the second reading, but commend Mr. Shannon for his move to prevent the sale of stolen motor vehicles. At present owners of motor vehicles have enough papers to carry without having to carry more. First of all, on applying for registration of a vehicle there must be a third party insurance certificate, and it is extraordinary the number of people who apply for re-registration of their vehicle without having this certificate. Then there is the registration certificate itself, and the driver's licence. There is also a paper in connection with the re-sale of the motor vehicle. Under the Bill about 250,000 motor vehicles would have to be inspected by the police. I represent a suburban area and know how difficult it is to find the local policeman, so how much more difficult it would be for a country person to find his local policeman. If the Bill is passed there will be nothing to prevent dealers in stolen motor vehicles from carrying on their business. They will be able to take stolen vehicles to police stations and get a certificate. There is not much difference in the appearance of popular models, and it would be easy for persons dealing in stolen vehicles to alter the engine numbers. I do not think the average policeman would know whether or not an engine number had been altered; it would be a job.

for an expert. The passing of the Bill would assist persons dealing in stolen motor vehicles.

Mr. Shannon—Do you think they would like interviewing the police?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Under the Bill the persons I have in mind could defeat the law.

Mr. Shannon—I propose that the inspection certificate shall be issued in triplicate, and you know how the copies will be distributed.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—That does not affect what I am saying. Having got the documents these persons would be able to continue with their crooked business. Stolen motor cars could be sold, and there would be the certificates issued by the police. This Bill will not assist the problem facing us. The police forces of this and other States have high-powered motor vehicles and dual-wave radio sets with which to combat crime, but still men break the law. Whilst we have the co-operation which now exists between the Motor Vehicles Department and the Police Department of this State, I believe that comparatively few motor cars will be stolen. Recently I was told of a case where, although the engine number of a stolen car had been altered, the job had been done so expertly that the sale of the car had been easily effected. In these days police officers have enough to do without having to investigate a quarter of a million motor vehicles within the next few months.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—No one disagrees with the object of the honourable member for Onkaparinga in introducing his Bill, but some of its features require consideration. I have obtained from the heads of the departments concerned information which, together with certain exhibits, I will place before members so that they may see some of the difficulties of the matter under discussion. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles reports:—

Mr. Shannon very kindly let me have an advance copy of his Bill designed to check the theft of motor vehicles, and discussed the provisions of that Bill with me. Whilst I feel that Mr. Shannon is to be commended on the time and thought given to the subject matter of the Bill, I am confident that its provisions will not stop the theft of motor vehicles, and will not prevent the registration of stolen motor vehicles. I doubt if any provisions within the bounds of practicability will achieve that object.

It is proposed, *inter alia*, that every owner of nearly 200,000 motor vehicles at present registered shall take his vehicle to a police officer for inspection, and for a certificate giving a full description of the vehicle to be lodged with the first application for renewal

of the registration. That provision would cause a lot of inconvenience and much loss of time to owners situated in the more sparsely populated parts of the State, and resident perhaps 30 or 40 miles or even more from the nearest police station. A busy farmer would not take kindly to being called upon during seeding or harvest time to take his car truck or tractor which may have been in his possession and registered by him for several years past to a distant police station for inspection. Imagine his state of mind if after travelling 30 or 40 miles to the nearest police station he found the officer in charge absent for the day or perhaps longer. It must not be overlooked that on the West Coast, in the far north, and in the north-east parts of the State, police stations are few and far between, and in most cases are one man stations. The officers in charge of such stations are often absent from their stations on duty or from illness of the flesh to which even members of the police force are prone.

Primary producers who use a tractor and trailer for carrying produce or goods of any kind on a road are required to register all such tractors. It would seem to be quite unnecessary to require the owner of a tractor to take it to a police station for inspection before registration or renewal of registration. Approximately 3,000 tractors are registered at the present time. The engine number, which is the identification mark of a motor vehicle, is often not easy to find, and is often confused with a part number stamped on an engine. I think most owners would find difficulty in locating the engine number of their vehicles. Members of the police force would in many cases be hard put to it to locate the correct engine number on motor vehicles submitted for inspection. In many cases the engine number is shown on a brass plate affixed to the engine or to the dashboard of the vehicle. That plate can easily be removed and altered, or replaced by another plate. I submit herewith a few number plates on which the engine number has been altered.

I have samples of such engine number plates, and in many instances it is impossible to detect an alteration. When such a plate is fixed on a motor vehicle and perhaps smothered with grease the job of a police officer in detecting a fraud becomes even more difficult. The Registrar's report continues:—

I doubt if anybody can detect the alterations without the help of scientific instruments. Such instruments would not be available at country and suburban police stations. Even where the engine number is engraved on the cylinder block the original number can easily be altered with the aid of an emery wheel and one or two tools. A thief who wanted a certificate from a police officer could take the vehicle to a police station in the evening when light conditions are bad, on the plea that his daily employment did not permit of the vehicle being submitted for inspection during daylight hours. I venture to suggest that, when weather or light conditions are unfavourable or when the police officer is busy with other duties, the

inspection would be perfunctory. It is even probable that in such circumstances the police officer would accept the engine number given him by the applicant for the certificate. Where the inspection is thorough it is highly improbable that a member of the police force would detect a cleverly altered engine number. Experience has shown that an examination by a police officer does not always result in the recognition of a stolen motor vehicle. I have been informed of two cases where cautious, prospective purchasers caused vehicles to be submitted to the police for inspection before purchase. Police officers were unable to find anything wrong with the proposed transactions, and the prospective purchasers parted with their money. Later it was found that the vehicles were stolen in another State, and the vehicles were re-possessed by or on behalf of the actual owners. I could understand a would-be purchaser in such circumstances feeling there was a moral obligation on the Police Department to make good the loss suffered by him. A certificate of inspection issued by a police officer could readily be altered by a dishonest person with the aid of an eraser and typewriter.

Mr. Shannon—The certificate would have to be issued in triplicate and the duplicate would go to the Registrar's office.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Registrar's report continues:—

The provision in the Bill which provides for a duplicate to be sent to the Motor Vehicles Department would not help very much.

Mr. Shannon—Why not?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The report gives the answer:—

The certificate obtained at a suburban or country station would be presented to the department, and registration secured long before the duplicate certificate reached the department by post or through the usual channels used by the police.

Mr. Shannon—There is no need to register a vehicle before the duplicate arrives.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Even now, when we ask primary producers to get a certificate from the police that they are primary producers, there is continual agitation by people in the country pointing out how much time is taken up in having to comply with such regulations. If we held up the registration of motor vehicles indefinitely while transactions and communications pass between certain officers the motoring public would find the legislation extremely irksome.

Mr. O'Halloran—We had to make special provision to overcome delays of that nature.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I thank the honourable member for his interjection. On about three occasions Parliament has had to consider the provision dealing with police certificates being issued in respect of primary

producers. That is only a small matter and does not involve a scientific examination of a number plate. The report continues:—

Motor vehicles are required to be produced for inspection before registration in New South Wales and Victoria, but this does not prevent theft of motor vehicles in those States. Mr. Shannon, in his second reading speech, said that New South Wales was perhaps the happiest hunting ground for the motor thief. He said that in that State last year 558 motor cars were stolen and 15 per cent (84) were not recovered, and yet in that State motor vehicles have to be submitted for inspection every time application for renewal of registration is made, in addition to the inspection at time of original registration and at times of transfer of registration. Mr. Shannon gave the Victorian figures as 1,147 cars stolen in the four months February 1 to June 1, 1952. Of that number 60 cars were not recovered. Against the New South Wales figures of 84 stolen cars not recovered last year, and the Victorian figures of 60 stolen cars not recovered in the four early months of this year, the South Australian figures stand out in marked contrast. For the four and 1/3rd years March 1948 to August 1952, the total of stolen cars and trucks not recovered is 13, or three a year.

Mr. Shannon—A certificate is not issued in New South Wales as in Victoria.

Mr. O'Halloran—I thought the Victorian figures were worse than those of New South Wales.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—They are much worse.

Mr. Shannon—For reasons I explained in my second reading speech.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The registrar's report continues:—

I submit that the small number of cars stolen and not recovered in this State does not warrant the inconvenience and expense to every South Australian motor vehicle owner which acceptance of the Bill would entail. The issue of registration books will not stop the theft of motor vehicles, but the production of a registration book could lull a prospective purchaser into a false sense of security. A large number of motor vehicles are sold under hire purchase agreement. The registration book would be issued in the first instance to the holder under the hire purchase agreement who registers the vehicle, and not to the legal owner of the vehicle. In such cases, the entry of a person's name in a registration book would not be evidence of his right to sell the vehicle, yet most prospective purchasers would accept it as such. That is the whole purpose of the registration book—to be evidence of the right of the last person named therein to sell the vehicle. Many motor vehicles are encumbered by bills of sale and other liens. Such encumbrances are not recorded in registration books. Owners' certificates, or registration books, are issued in Victoria, and in that State 18,000 such certificates were lost last year, necessitating the issuance of 18,000 duplicates. With that large

number of unaccounted for owners' certificates floating about, it would not be difficult for a dishonest person to get hold of one and, with the aid of an eraser and typewriter, alter it to meet his purposes.

The owner of a vehicle must produce his certificate of ownership when he desires to sell the vehicle. In South Australia we have to retain the copy of our registration and driving licence, but I am sure that many members would not be able to recall in which drawer they had placed theirs. The same could apply to certificates of registration. In Victoria last year no fewer than 18,000 duplicates had to be issued because the originals had been misplaced. With such a large number unaccounted for the falsification of certificates becomes an easy matter. The Registrar's report goes on:—

Part of the prescribed form provided by the Victorian Police Department for an owner to notify transfer of ownership is a form for the owner to make a statutory declaration that he has lost his owner's certificate. It can be seen from this that the Victorian Department takes it for granted that the owner will have lost his owner's certificate and will not be able to produce it when the vehicle is sold.

That is an interesting feature. The Victorian papers actually make provision for certificates being lost.

Mr. Shannon—I have tightened that point up in my Bill.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Registrar continues:—

Victorian authorities have informed me that motorists in that State deliberately lose or destroy registration books showing a record of three or four owners or more in order to obtain a duplicate book which does not show the previous history of the vehicle. Victoria has recently increased the fee for a duplicate owner's certificate to 5s. In view of the high cost of printing and postage involved in the many transfers of ownership, the fee of 2s. 6d. for a registration book prescribed in the Bill is inadequate. The Bill provides for the issue of a registration book only in the case of vehicles for which registration or renewal of registration is applied for after its provisions become law. Many vehicles are sold in this State for which no registration book could be produced. A thief could obtain registration of a motor vehicle and a registration book by stating that the vehicle was previously a Commonwealth owned vehicle, and not subject to the registration laws of this State, or that the vehicle was previously used only on farm property, or was for a lengthy period in a dealer's stock, or had previously been registered in the Northern Territory or in another State.

Secondhand motor vehicles often change hands two or three times in a week. An owner trades in his used car to a distributor as part

payment for a new car. The distributor quickly passes it on to a secondhand dealer. That secondhand dealer may know of another secondhand dealer wanting a car of that particular make, and ownership again changes. The second dealer then sells it to a private user. The several changes of ownership all occur in a few days. In the meantime, the registration book is in the post, or travelling backwards and forwards, and the ultimate purchaser is debarred from registration and use of his car until the registration book is available after its journeyings back and forth between the several owners and the department. Where the changes of ownership occur in the country it could be two or three weeks, or longer, before the vehicle is registered and available for use by the final purchaser. The registration book would be chasing the various transferees, and not catching up with the owner anxious to secure registration and use of his vehicle. In actual practice, the registration book would not be returned direct to the department by the transferor, but would be handed to the transferee, and an unscrupulous secondhand dealer could make what entries best suited his purposes, and so mislead an unsuspecting purchaser. With registration books passing into the hands of secondhand dealers, the way would be wide open for trafficking in such books. It would be impossible for owners in distant parts of the State on disposal of a vehicle to return a registration book within the 48 hours provided for in the Bill.

Owners are now given 21 days in which to notify transfer of ownership, and apply for transfer of registration. The officer in charge of the Motor Registration Office in Victoria has informed me that under that complex system of registration in that State, greatly complicated by the issue of owner's certificate, he regards the work of his office as up-to-date when registration labels (discs) are issued within 14 days of receipt of application for registration. Many Victorian owners have informed me that it is quite usual to have to wait several weeks for the receipt of a registration label. At present it is an offence for an uninsured or unregistered motor vehicle to be driven on a road. How then is an unregistered motor vehicle to be driven on a road to a police station? If an unregistered vehicle is to be allowed on a road for the purpose of being driven to a police station for inspection, the use of unregistered motor vehicles will be facilitated, and it will be impossible to maintain the present tight control over the use of uninsured and unregistered motor vehicles. I think it would be a retrograde step to put difficulties in the way of an owner registering a motor vehicle. The easier it is to register, the less likely it is that an unregistered motor vehicle will be used.

Mr. Shannon has stated that Inspector Gill has claimed that the proposals in the Bill would save thousands of man hours. The Inspector could only mean that his branch of the police force would be saved many hours of search. The man hours saved by the C.I.B. Branch would be counter-balanced over and over again by the man hours expended

by other branches of the police force in examining a quarter of a million motor vehicles in the first year of the scheme's operation, and 50,000 annually thereafter. The work of the Motor Vehicles Department would be doubled, and the cost of inspection certificates in triplicate and registration books would be heavy. However, the objection to the proposals which will weigh most with members is the inconvenience and expense to nearly 200,000 owners lawfully in possession of motor vehicles.

Assuming that in the first year 300,000 vehicles were inspected and that a police officer would take half an hour to inspect each vehicle and write a certificate, one man would be engaged for 150,000 hours or 3,750 weeks, or 72 police officers would be engaged for a year on full time. In the second and subsequent years, on the basis of 50,000 vehicles, 25,000 man hours a year would be involved in this work.

Mr. Shannon—You realize that in many instances country police officers know not only the owner, but also the vehicle, and would not want half an hour to inspect it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If it is to be of any value at all the certificate must be worth while. If the police officer were to issue the certificate because he knew the owner and the vehicle the whole thing would fall to the ground. When a purchaser sees a certificate he must expect it to be of some value. The report continues:—

A particularly objectionable feature of the proposed legislation from a departmental point of view is the divorcement of the registration book from the registration of the vehicle. On transfer of ownership of a registered motor vehicle, the transferor may return his registration book for an entry of transfer of ownership. On the required entry being made in the registration book, it is forwarded to the transferee. Notwithstanding that the department has forwarded the registration book with the necessary entry of transfer of ownership entered therein, the transferee may be prosecuted a week or two later for using an unregistered vehicle. It can be anticipated that most purchasers of motor vehicles bearing a current registration disc, and receiving a registration book from the department with the name of the purchaser entered therein as the owner, will conclude that the vehicle is registered at least until the expiry date shown on the registration disc affixed on the windscreen of the vehicle. Conditions in the Motor Vehicles Department are made difficult by the failure of many owners to lodge the required certificate of insurance with applications for registration. Failure of thousands of owners to meet the requirements of the proposed legislation can be anticipated with certainty, and if the Bill becomes law, conditions will be chaotic in the Motor Vehicles Department for the next year or two. For some years this department has supplied the Police Department

with a daily list giving particulars of every vehicle registered, and this is used by that department in its search for vehicles reported stolen. The State Traffic Committee is of the opinion that the expense and inconvenience involved in the proposals of the Bill are out of all proportion to the benefits to be obtained from it. With that opinion I am in full agreement.

Attached to the report are specimens of the Victorian owner's certificate, South Australian registration certificate, application for transfer of registration bearing forged signature of the transferor, specimen of lists of registration supplied to the Police Department daily, police list of stolen vehicles not recovered since 1948, specimen engine number plates with altered engine numbers, Victorian form for notice of disposal of vehicle with form for statutory declaration of loss of owner's certificate attached and a police list of vehicles stolen. It will be seen that the Motor Vehicles Department has co-operated with the police to the fullest extent to enable them to get down quickly on a stolen vehicle when an attempt is made to dispose of it in this State. This close tie-up is indicated by the fact that for the 4½ years, from March, 1948, to August, 1952, the total number of stolen cars and trucks not recovered was 13, or about 3 a year. I have received the following letter from the President of the Chamber of Automotive Industries of South Australia, which I make available for the information of honourable members:—

At a meeting of my Chamber yesterday it was unanimously agreed that the present legislation in South Australia is quite adequate and in our opinion is better than in most other States, and we feel that the new amendment proposed by Mr. Shannon will do nothing more than our present legislation so far as stolen cars are concerned but will, on the other hand entail an enormous amount of work both for the industry and the public, but more particularly to the Police Department who at the moment are so busy that it is almost impossible to get a police officer to destroy a disc let alone check all the particulars required under this new legislation. Besides this you can quite imagine the chaos and congestion by everyone having to submit their vehicles for police inspection, and in our opinion would not only cost the industry thousands of pounds extra a year but the taxpayer would be up for thousands for extra work having to be done by the Police Department and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. At the present time the work necessary to register a motor vehicle is as follows:—

(a) Prepare registration form; (b) provide a certificate of insurance; (c) provide a weighbridge note which entails driving vehicle to a registered weighbridge and paying a fee (with goods carrying units); (d) provide a statutory

declaration signed before a justice of the peace (for p.p. vehicles); (e) provide a police certificate from local officer (for p.p. vehicles); (f) provide a transfer or retainer schedule in case of a secondhand vehicle.

There is a vast amount of time taken to prepare these various forms of paper work and may I point out that this work must be done by someone who is above the average employee type to avoid mistakes and to be sure that there is no wrong form used. This means a lot of time by motor company executives and to further complicate the registration procedure would mean even more valuable time taken.

The proposed new amendments would entail a terrific job of work for the Police Department. When it is necessary to have a police officer destroy a disc on a vehicle which is immobile we find considerable delay in actually getting a constable to do this. How much more delay will be had when the police force have the terrific number of vehicles to check and issue owners' certificates is not hard to imagine, but we feel that an extra force of police officers would need to be recruited to handle this work on some motor vehicles in South Australia. Where vehicles are to be inspected and certificates issued initially will also be a major problem as the area required would be considerable, and it would be necessary to have many areas equipped with the police officers and with some 300,000 odd vehicles in South Australia office accommodation to do the work involved.

After the initial certificates have all been issued there would still be a problem to have space and staff available to do "Transfers of Owner Certificates" and we foresee that space is not available at the North Terrace site of the present Motor Vehicles Department. This means that to transfer a registration, if the amendment is incorporated in the Road Traffic Act, the public and more particularly the motor trade will have to take each vehicle to the police area before the registration could be transferred. The motor trade does not consider that owners' certificates are at all necessary, and comparing South Australia with, say, Victoria, where these certificates are now in force, we find that more thefts and untraceable cars occur in the State of Victoria than here, and so all so-called benefits of such legislation are not factual.

The public are afforded complete protection in South Australia if they deal through the registered and recognized traders, as all second-hand dealers have a secondhand dealers' licence issued by the Police Department, which will not issue such a licence to any person of ill-repute, and if a licensed secondhand dealer should sell a stolen car, he is legally bound to stand up to any loss the client should suffer, and it is his responsibility to see that all vehicles he buys are free of any encumbrances and are, in fact, the property of the seller. This protection to the public, in my opinion, is adequately covered and the only time the public can be fleeced is if they deal from outsiders who have no responsibilities, and have got no status so far as the owner-

ship is concerned. I feel that anybody who is as clever as the ordinary car thief could fake an engine number, even if it were inspected by police and could still be transferred.

Dealing with the hire-purchase vehicles, in this case the registered owner is not the owner and therefore an owner's certificate would not be a true form by any imagination. When you consider the colossal expense of every owner having to drive his vehicle, in many cases up to 100 miles, you can imagine the actual cost, not only to the owners, but to the trade, and we are definitely up against any such legislation because we feel that it will do no good and not make any more protection than we have on our present registration form, which is, in my opinion, to all intents and purposes the same as the owner's certificate.

I have not had time to go into this matter with the police authorities, so I have no report from them. The matter was before the State Traffic Committee as far back as 1948. Every honourable member is seized with the importance of getting the best possible protection for motorists. I suggest to the honourable member that he does not press the Bill at present. If he does, in view of the reports I have received I must oppose it. If the honourable member is agreeable the Government will get a report from the police authorities and then submit the matter to the State Traffic Committee for inquiry and report. When the report is to hand I shall make a copy of it available to the honourable member.

Mr. Moir—Will you bring before Parliament any suggested amendments to the legislation?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Whenever the committee suggests amendments they are given earnest consideration. Not all recommendations by it have been accepted by the Government, but about 99 per cent of them have been presented to Parliament. It is a very valuable committee and the excellence of our traffic laws are due to its work.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I have indicated to members on this side, and to some members opposite, that I propose to accept the Premier's suggestion that the matter be referred to the State Traffic Committee for further consideration. I thank the Government for adopting this attitude to my proposal, which is new to South Australia. When the matter is thoroughly investigated it will be found that a law similar to what I propose is in operation in the United Kingdom. They have registration books for all motor vehicles, and it cannot be said that that country is behind the times in trying to assist owners of motor vehicles. The Premier said that Victoria has suffered a greater percentage of losses in

connection with stolen motor vehicles than South Australia. He pointed out that in that State many thousands of certificates of ownership are lost each year, but many are not actually lost, because the dishonest person, by making a statutory declaration and paying the necessary 5s. can get a certificate of ownership without producing the motor vehicle concerned. It is assumed that he is honest and has really lost his certificate. Victoria has a loose system of tying up ownership of vehicles, and it has led to many unhappy experiences on the part of people who have bought motor vehicles with certificates of ownership only to discover later that they were stolen vehicles. By means of my Bill I hoped to overcome this difficulty. Under the measure a person losing a registration book cannot get another unless the vehicle concerned is inspected by the police.

Some people are careless with their documents. I have not heard it said that owners of property are careless with their certificates of title. A registration book is really a certificate of title, and it would be of more monetary value than a certificate of title to land. If people are careless with valuable documents they must put up with the inconvenience of getting duplicates. Today, if a certificate of title is lost it is not possible to get another by merely making a statutory declaration. Many formalities have to be gone through, and it seems to me that there should be some such system for careless owners of motor vehicles. Registration books would be of value. The two main reports by the Premier referred freely to the time involved in police inspections. They made their own estimate of what was involved from the police officer's point of view in providing the necessary certificate on which the issue of the registration book depends. I would have thought that the first to be approached to see whether or not, firstly, the time factor was important and, secondly, whether the staffing of the Police Department was adequate for the work entailed, would have been the Commissioner of Police. I did consult him. I felt in duty bound to consult all the interested parties. The only one whom I did not go to—and for this I offer no apology—was Mr. Freeman, whose report the Premier quoted, apparently without knowing much about it. I did not call upon the representative of the secondhand dealers for the good reason that I realized that this would involve secondhand motor traders in some extra work.

I am prepared to load that on their shoulders and I am not prepared to discuss with them whether or not they would be parties to protecting the private owners of motor vehicles. If it involves them in a little more work in the buying and selling of vehicles, but is a good thing for the private owner, they will have to put up with it.

I saw the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and I was quite happy that the Premier quoted his report, for I had a long talk with him and knew the tenor of his views. I also had a talk with the owners' representative, the R.A.A., and I think that upon reflection the Premier will realize that he should have got a report from the Police Department before he spoke, for he would then have been better equipped to look at the question from the point of view of what was involved in the matter of time of police officers, and he would also have had an opportunity to discuss with Inspector Gill what will be offset in the time saved in searching for stolen vehicles if the police have an opportunity to inspect every vehicle prior to its registration for the first time, or prior to its re-registration as a secondhand vehicle. These were matters which I went into realizing that I would have to submit something within the bounds of reason; that I could not bring down legislation involving some of our public officers in untold time and the State in untold expense unless I could present a reasonable case. Other countries have a somewhat similar system and it appeared to me that if they could run it we could do so. The United States of America has not overlooked this problem and although there are some 48 States, all with their own local laws, there is an attempt, I believe, to get an overall common law relating to the ownership of motor vehicles, because, of course, they have many million more people and cars that require much closer supervision than we need to give them here.

The figures the Premier quoted with regard to the non-recovery of stolen vehicles in other States compared with South Australia reflect great credit upon the assiduity of our own Police Department in seeking to recover stolen vehicles. Once more I thank the Government for its approach to this problem, and in reviewing the matter I ask it to seek the fullest information for I am sure that evidence can be secured from other Governments where this type of legislation is in operation and the Government has better facilities for obtaining it than is available to a private member. If the Government thinks this matter has any merit

for the protection of the owner of motor vehicles I hope it will take steps to secure all such evidence. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave to continue granted; debate adjourned

#### EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 478.)

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I oppose the Bill. I listened attentively to Mr. Shannon's introductory speech and I thought that he lacked enthusiasm for the measure. I claim that it is a retrograde step, for the Early Closing Act has been brought to its present high standard over a long period and any move to undermine those standards is entirely wrong. On the contrary we should keep abreast of modern times; rather than take something from existing concessions we should improve them. It is rather remarkable that this is the first we have heard of any dissatisfaction on the part of hairdressers or their patrons in regard to their trading hours, and as far as I know the instance quoted by the sponsor is an isolated one; I have seen nothing in the press advocating an extension of hours. Had this attempt been made some years ago when most employees were working on Saturday mornings it would have had more merit, but today the majority of employees do not work on Saturday mornings and therefore have an opportunity of getting their shaves and hair-cuts then if they cannot do so on weekdays.

In concluding his remarks Mr. Shannon told us quite plainly that if this measure were successful it could be applied to almost any town in South Australia, so apparently, although he says his desire is to serve his constituents in the district of Onkaparinga, he has a desire to extend the operations of the measure to every part of the country where it is practicable. That is entirely wrong, because it would destroy a longstanding principle much appreciated by patrons and hairdressers alike. He said that some people in his constituency did not arrive home until after the barbers shops were closed, but I have refreshed my memory with regard to the provisions of the Act and find that hairdressers may remain open until 6 p.m. on weekdays and 12.30 p.m. on Saturdays, and section 42 makes it abundantly clear that, in addition, patrons already in the shop may remain for another 15 minutes. Consequently, the honourable member's incorrect statement makes his case the

weaker because more time is available to patrons than he would have us believe. Moreover, although the Act prescribes the closing time it makes no provision regarding the opening time, so if a hairdresser desires to open prior to 8.30 a.m. or even at 7 o'clock it can be done. Having made observations I contend that, with the modern electric clipper and so forth, a normal hair-cut involves about 11 minutes; for many, of course, it can be done in less than three. If this move were successful the hairdresser who employs an assistant might be forced to keep open after the present prescribed hours in order to compete with the man who employed no labour and he would therefore be at a great disadvantage.

Mr. Shannon—He could work by himself after hours and not retain the employee.

Mr. TAPPING—I hope the House will reject the measure because its repercussions will be far-reaching. There have been moves for some months to extend general trading hours, for in the City of Adelaide certain employees have been asked to come to work five minutes later on weekdays in order that they may work until 12 noon on Saturdays. This move is being resisted by the employees and I really see no need for it, because not many people now work on Saturday mornings, and it is not fair to ask employees or even employers to work longer hours if it can be avoided. I have heard no outcry from the people that the hours should be extended even in the City of Adelaide. In Semaphore and Port Adelaide there is an organization known as the Port Adelaide Retailers' Association which has given this matter mature consideration and has unanimously agreed, within the last 14 days, that the closing time on Saturdays shall remain at 11.30 a.m., for employers desire to have their recreation too and do not wish to revert to the unsatisfactory conditions of other days. The honourable member for Onkaparinga meant well in introducing this Bill, but because most men do not work on Saturday mornings and have ample time then and until 6 p.m. on weekdays to have a hair-cut, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—I support the Bill as I support any measure allowing a man to work longer if he wishes to do so. If a man desires to work he should be allowed to do so, and, if we as a nation are to get out of our difficulties we must work longer hours and produce more. I do not think the member for Semaphore realizes that this Bill will affect only country people and that country people living out of the towns do not work a five-day week, nor by the clock.

Mr. Davis—They never stop.

Mr. HEASLIP—It is a good job for Australia in general that they don't. If there is a job to be done they work until it is completed. A five-day week in the hairdressing industry would mean that primary producers would have to knock off for a hair-cut on a week-day.

Mr. Tapping—Hairdressers open on Saturday mornings at present.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, but if this Bill is defeated primary producers must continue to visit country towns on Saturday morning for a hair-cut.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Don't some of them go in on a week-day?

Mr. HEASLIP—Generally the women visit the towns on week-days to collect the mail, but the men stay at work on their farms. If they want a hair-cut they must have one on Saturday morning.

Mr. McAlees—Shearers do not work on Saturday.

Mr. HEASLIP—They are in the minority, and it is the majority of country people about whom I am speaking. The member for Semaphore said it was unfair to ask men to work longer if the community could afford to do without their services, but I do not think we can afford to do less work, because production must be increased to bring back normal conditions. This Bill is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Davis—It takes away the rights of the worker.

Mr. HEASLIP—That is not so for under it no-one is compelled to work. Indeed, if an employee is asked to work he will receive penalty rates. If the country hairdresser were allowed to operate on Saturday afternoon primary producers could avail themselves of his services on their weekly visit to the town to see the local football match.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I oppose the Bill. I was not surprised to hear the remarks of the member for Rocky River, who desires men to work from daylight to dark for the convenience of others. He said that an opportunity should be given to the primary producer to have his hair cut at the week-end, but, if the honourable member had his way he would have the men working the same long hours as the primary producers but for the convenience of someone else. Why should Parliament take from the workers the shorter working week rights for which they fought for many years? Recently in Port Pirie discussions have been held regarding the trading hours of shops, and

I am pleased that members of the Shop Assistants Union have won their point, for every man is entitled to a week-end off. Why should hairdressers be forced to work on Saturday for the convenience of someone else? It is ridiculous to say that, because they live in the country, people have no opportunity to get their hair cut on a Saturday morning. If primary producers are as generous as we are led to believe they can afford to let their men off for an hour or two during the week for a hair-cut.

Mr. Moir—Do you advocate the closing of hotels on Saturday?

Mr. DAVIS—I have no desire to close any business nor to make any distinction between classes of workers. At one time we were told that rural workers could not have Saturday afternoon off because it would interfere with the work on the farm, and I remember the time when shop assistants had to work during the week, have half a day off on Wednesday, and work until a late hour Saturday. When it was suggested that shop assistants should work on Friday evening instead of Saturday, we heard the same cry that it would inconvenience shoppers. Today country people would be opposed to the abolition of Friday afternoon trading, for in Port Pirie and surrounding towns both the employer and the employee do their shopping on Friday afternoons. Is it not as reasonable to ask that all shops as well as hairdressing establishments remain open on Saturday mornings? What is the difference between a man who wants to have his hair cut and a man who must do some shopping? It may be said that a man's wife can do his shopping, but I say it is as essential for the man to be able to go into the town on Friday afternoon to do his shopping as to have his hair cut.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I, too, oppose the Bill and make it clear that no member is more sympathetic to the cause of primary producers than myself. There is no more noble band of people and I would be the last one to deny them any service.

Mr. Riches—Did the primary producers ask for this Bill?

Mr. HUTCHENS—No, and it is strange that people who have the privilege of occupying the benches in this place should expound the arguments that have been used in support of this measure, for in 1911 the arguments used by the member for Rocky River this afternoon were advanced with regard to a measure prohibiting trading in retail shops on Sunday. Gentlemen with the same political

interests as he then argued that it would be against the best interests of the primary producer to close shops on Sunday. In order to do his shopping the primary producer is able to adjust his hours in a way not possible to an employee working under an award. The argument that primary producers need the privilege this Bill confers to carry out their work in the best interests of themselves and the nation falls flat. The member for Rocky River contends that the Bill will not force anybody to do anything, but that is ridiculous. If we give the right to one man to extend his trading hours that may compel his competitors to do the same.

Mr. Shannon—Is that why Rundle Street traders keep open until noon on Saturdays?

Mr. HUTCHENS—It suits them to close at 12 o'clock; they have agreed to do so.

Mr. Shannon—The same thing could happen in other trades.

Mr. HUTCHENS—There was an agreement between Rundle Street traders to close at 11.30, but because a few broke it, most had to keep open until noon. Certain Adelaide traders, on principle, close at 11.30. This Bill is intended to operate in certain areas for a start, but once it becomes law it will be possible to extend its provisions to the whole State. It is really the thin end of the wedge. Mr. Shannon did not give any figures or produce any evidence to show that the measure is necessary. It is dangerous legislation and could have a detrimental effect on the community. If it is passed it will not be long before people ask that hotel trading hours be extended. *Hansard* shows that in 1911 it was said that Sunday trading should be allowed to protect primary producers, but no decent-minded person would advocate a return of Sunday trading.

Mr. SHANNON—On a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, is there anything in the Bill relating to Sunday trading?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No. The honourable member is in order in referring to it by way of illustration, but cannot discuss it generally.

Mr. HUTCHENS—I am confident that no decent-minded person would seek an extension of existing trading hours. I have other matters to place before the House and ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted and debate adjourned.

## DECENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. O'Halloran—

That in view of the alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area of South Australia, an address be presented to the Lieutenant-Governor praying His Excellency to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon—

- (a) Whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meat works, establishments for treating hides, skins, etc., and other works for the processing of primary products should be established in country districts; and
- (b) what other secondary industries could appropriately be transferred from the metropolitan area to the country; and
- (c) what new industries could be established in country districts; and
- (d) whether more railway construction and maintenance work could be done at country railway depots; and
- (e) what housing provision should be made to assist a programme of decentralization.

(Continued from August 20. Page 484.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—When this matter was last before the House, on August 20, I drew members' attention to a number of matters which had been specifically referred to by the Commonwealth Rural Re-construction Commission, including the whole question of post-war land settlement and rural areas development. The commission was appointed by the Hon. J. B. Chifley, probably the most outstanding Labor Prime Minister in the history of the Commonwealth. The chairman was Mr. Frank Wise, Leader of the Opposition in the Western Australian Parliament, who later became Premier of that State. I quoted from about six of the commission's reports, and said that, in my opinion, the basis on which Mr. O'Halloran introduced his motion was wrong, inasmuch as it disregarded economics. Mr. O'Halloran contended that I misquoted him. I replied that I would be glad to quote a few of his remarks from *Hansard*. He said that economics did not come into the question. There were interjections by Mr. Heaslip and Mr. Quirke. This is what Mr. O'Halloran said:—

This worship of the idol of pure economics left me cold many years ago and it leaves me colder with the passing of time.

Evidently Mr. O'Halloran meant that we did not have to consider economics in this question of development, and that some other principle should guide us. His contention is quite

contrary to the tenor of the Rural Re-construction Commission's report, which emphasized that rural development undertaken by artificial measures was doomed to failure. In paragraph 1644, on page 79 of the Commission's seventh report, under the heading "Decentralization of Industries," the following appears:—

It has been pointed out in paragraph 1641 that secondary industries are but slightly developed in towns in farming areas; therefore, the young men and women from farms normally seek employment in cities and larger towns, rather than remain dependent and often not fully occupied on the home farm. The building up of secondary industries in country centres would undoubtedly alleviate this position, and would add considerably to the effectiveness of the towns concerned. While such decentralization is a matter for consideration by those who have special knowledge of those industries, this Commission takes the opportunity of recording certain aspects of the subject presented to it in evidence. It does so because it is well aware of the pressure which will be exerted on responsible persons by local bodies or prominent individuals to obtain preference for schemes which would give them advantage, irrespective of the ultimate fate of the projects. Pandering to such proposals can have disastrous effects. When once the artificial support which originated ceases, the factory or works often finds normal competition too severe and the project fails; those who put their money into the venture lose it and, worse, the extra prosperity which the centre enjoyed during the period of activity and which encouraged all sorts of developments disappears, leaving the town more dishevelled and less useful than it was before the episode began.

Mr. Riches—The motion does not ask for any artificial assistance.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is the whole point. Mr. O'Halloran said he was tired of considering economic conditions, that they left him cold; even colder as time went on. The Rural Reconstruction Commission was entirely sympathetic and set out to do something for the country, but it entirely rejected Mr. O'Halloran's proposal. It said that if we ignored economic conditions and if outside support on which the industry was established ceased, it would fall to the ground, leaving the position worse than before. Incidentally, that is the position in both Victoria and New South Wales now. Members must be struck by the number of unemployed persons in Victoria and New South Wales compared with the number in South Australia. Further, only

half as many, on a population basis, are on relief in South Australia as in the other Australian States. The greatest numbers on relief are to be found in Victoria and New South Wales.

Mr. Riches—And in the capital cities.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. Many industries in those States have established branches in the country, and that is where unemployment is highest, particularly in Victoria. By all means let us decentralize, but let us establish industries that can stand on their own feet.

Mr. Riches—That is what the motion asks for.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. The Leader of the Opposition stated:—

This worship of the idol of pure economics left me cold many years ago and it leaves me colder with the passing of time.

The honourable member implied that the system of establishing industries in country centres involved a subsidy.

Mr. Riches—He made that remark in answer to an interjection.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In his concluding remarks he said he was not in favour of any system of compelling people to go to or live in certain places.

Mr. Riches—Nor was he asking for the establishment of uneconomic industries.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will come to that later. If no special support is required for an industry what is the purpose of appointing a Royal Commission? Section 1646 of the report from which I previously quoted sets out the guiding principles for the establishment of industries. It states:—

(a) There is little to be said for the establishment of an industry in a centre which is not suited for it; for example, an industry needing much power or water can only be effective at centres where such resources are available.

(b) The higher ratio of labour to the total resources used in our industry the better the chance of success.

(c) The existence of freight rates which make the project unsatisfactory may be an obstacle in the case of some types of manufacturing.

(d) If a factory is established to process farm products, its raw material should be available over a large proportion of the year and should if possible come from farms of various types.

(e) Apart from economic implications, decentralization of industry is closely associated with the availability of amenities. Operatives will not willingly follow an industry

from the city unless the amenities of the city, such as adequate housing, water supply, sewerage, electricity and entertainments are available. These must be provided before the industry is transplanted.

That section of the report endorses the policy my Government has followed. Since we took over the Adelaide Electric Supply Co. Limited power lines have been extended in many directions. Many members are not aware of the tremendous work that has been done by the Electricity Trust. This is one instance of how the Government has done something tangible for country areas. The motion states:—

... whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meatworks, establishments for treating hides, skins, etc., and other works for the processing of primary products should be established in country districts, and what other secondary industries could appropriately be transferred from the metropolitan area to the country . . .

The proposal to establish meatworks in country districts is not a new one. Parliament discussed it when the Hon. R. S. Richards was Leader of the Opposition. The prosperity of his district depended for many years upon the copper mining industry, and when it closed down many people had to go elsewhere for employment. The Government of the day called for a report from the then General Manager of the Produce Department, Mr. Pope, on the question of establishing a freezing works in the district, but he said that the numbers of stock available would not keep the freezers going throughout the year and that it would be an uneconomic proposition. Mr. Richards was not satisfied, and asked for further information. A special committee investigated the question, but confirmed Mr. Pope's opinion that the stock available could not justify the establishment of a freezing works at Wallaroo. Mr. Richards was still not satisfied and introduced a deputation to me representing the trading interests of Kadina and Wallaroo, farmers, stockowners, churches, and other organizations. I knew the deputation had the interests of the district at heart and that its sincerity was beyond question. I said I would be prepared to sponsor the establishment of the works and as Treasurer, to find the money, on one condition, namely that the graziers would use the facility to be provided. It would have cost £200,000 to provide the freezing works, but I have not heard another word about it from them. Recently we had many requests from Eyre Peninsula for graziers

to be allowed to send stock by road to the Metropolitan Abattoirs.

Mr. Riches—Only because the stock cannot be handled at Port Lincoln.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. When the request was made only half a chain was being used at Port Lincoln. I believe at present only three-quarters of a chain is being employed. An economic reason prompted the request. The grazier knows he would get a better return by sending his stock to the Metropolitan Abattoirs than to the Port Lincoln slaughter house.

Mr. Christian—That is quite right.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The question arises whether the charges at Port Lincoln are excessive and out of keeping with those at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. The Port Lincoln works are run by the Government Produce Department. They do not pay taxation, and have been financed in the cheapest possible way, yet the net loss for every sheep slaughtered there last year was no less than 5s. 3d. That is not the full picture. The loss on every pig slaughtered was 30s. and on every head of beef £4 10s. That shows where we get if decentralization of industry is on an uneconomic basis. Primary producers who were instrumental in establishing the Metropolitan Abattoirs lost practically everything they put into them, and then the Government took the works over.

Mr. Stephens—What is the loss on the Abattoirs?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There is no loss.

Mr. Stephens—Because the metropolitan people have to meet the costs.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Actually the slaughtering charges at the Metropolitan Abattoirs are slightly lower than those at Port Lincoln, and that position is not due to inefficient management at Port Lincoln. Not one district in South Australia can provide export stock except for a short period of the year. It is generally of a few weeks' duration.

Mr. Hawker—And not every season either.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is so. The Metropolitan Abattoirs have the advantage over Port Lincoln in that they slaughter stock throughout the whole year, which means that overhead costs are spread over the 52 weeks.

Mr. Stephens—The Metropolitan Abattoirs are losing on export operations.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As this section is run by the industry I am sure that its various branches, which have direct representatives on the board, would soon complain if one section had to pay the costs of another. The real basis for the difference between the abattoirs at Port Lincoln and those at Gepps Cross is that the latter work for 52 weeks a year; therefore the overhead costs are carried progressively over that period, but when a plant works for only three months of the year, all its costs must be carried in that period, and consequently are exorbitant. Instead of the Port Lincoln works earning sufficient income to be able to pay interest at the rate of 4 per cent spread over the whole year, they must make a profit of 16 per cent in the three-month period to cover overhead expenditure. The Government desires to build up the export industry on Eyre Peninsula. Incidentally, it is the export industry there which has made the request for stock to be sent to Adelaide. Export meat has a high percentage of rejects under the Commerce Department regulations, but this reject meat is, nevertheless, good for home consumption. The Metropolitan Abattoirs have a ready market for export rejects, but that is not so at Port Lincoln. For many years the Commerce regulations would not allow sheep with glands to be exported. I understand that they have since been amended to allow the export of sheep with one or two glands. That meat in every way is of high quality.

Mr. Davis—What becomes of the reject meat at Port Lincoln.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Parliament has given the Port Lincoln freezing works authority to send it to the metropolitan area provided it has received a certificate from the inspector. The fact that it is not readily available to the market has a depressing effect upon prices. The Government has had much experience in the establishment of industries in the country, and the member for Wallaroo is aware of its activities to establish an industry in his district. Only in the last few weeks it has provided additional finance. In considering the matters dealt with in the motion, we should not divorce them from economics. As I want to bring one or two other matters before the House, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 13. Page 375.)

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Minister of Local Government)—The introducing of this Bill is like using a steam roller to crush a fly. The member for Chaffey mentioned that last May a father went to the Woodside military camp to take his boy home, and was questioned there and also at his home about his right to carry other youths with him. We are now asked to alter the whole system contained in the Act to provide that anyone in military uniform may travel unrestricted on any kind of transport. To assume that the Act was introduced only to protect railway revenue could not be further from the truth. The object was to provide the best possible services by co-ordination between road and railway activities and to ensure that the people using them were protected, even occasionally against their own folly. At the request of the military authorities special facilities were afforded to enable anyone at the camp adequate transport to return to their home. On the day in question there was a check-up by officers of the Transport Control Board to see that there was an adequacy of service, but no redundancy. Consequently, many drivers were asked what they intended to do. On the information before me, at no time was any man who wanted to return to his home refused the facilities to do so. The gentleman concerned in the incident related by the honourable member was questioned and he replied that he was at the camp to pick up his son. He was told by the inspector that he could not carry any of the other lads unless he had a permit and he then said, "What can I do? I have promised to take them home." Apparently therefore, he had made prior arrangements. Mr. Macgillivray led us to believe that this gentleman, having reached Woodside with his truck, felt he was under an obligation to take the other boys back with him.

Mr. Macgillivray—My statement is correct and that of the Minister is incorrect.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—It is one man's word against the other. The fact is that the board gave the gentleman the benefit of the doubt and took no further action. The object of the legislation is first to see that adequate

services are provided and, secondly, to ensure safety. The safety is ensured by seeing that the vehicle is adequate for the purpose. In this case there was an open truck. What would have been the position of the board if an accident had occurred with the lads on the truck?

Mr. Fletcher—Did the lads pay a fare?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—That is another matter, but even if they did not pay it would not absolve the board from seeing that there was proper protection for the passengers. The label on a vehicle that passengers are carried at their own risk means nothing, and will not stand at law. The board is entrusted to see that people can travel under certain conditions, and one is that the vehicle is adequate for the purpose, and there must be protection for people providing a service against people who come in occasionally and act as pirates. The board has to check up to see that the trainees are adequately serviced.

Mr. Macgillivray—There is no service at all for lads wanting to go back to the river towns.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The honourable member is entirely at variance with the facts. The board has never refused a permit for military personnel to travel by road on week-end leave, or other purposes, when there is no other form of public transport available. Many special permits have been granted for the Woodside trainees to travel to Upper Murray areas on week-end leave, as the railway service is not convenient.

Mr. Macgillivray—Hear! Hear!

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The honourable member said there was no service available to the trainees, but all applications received by the board have been granted. It has granted numerous special permits to allow trainees to travel by taxi-cab or bus from Woodside Camp to Adelaide on special train days in order to arrive in Adelaide before the special train and make connections with services to country centres. Besides this issue of permits to River Murray areas road transport permits have been granted to travel to other areas, some as far afield as Mount Gambier. The chairman of the board says that no application for a permit has been refused. It must see that the vehicle is suitable for the purpose, and people giving a service must be protected against pirates who come in occasionally. If the board

is working in agreement with the military authorities to see that a service is provided for the trainees, why the need for the Bill? The Act provides that a vehicle used for the carriage of passengers for hire must be covered by a certificate of safety, unless the vehicle is operated pursuant to a licence issued by the Transport Control Board, the Municipal Tramways Trust, or a local governing body. These three bodies would see that the examination for safety was conducted before a licence was issued. It would be tragic if a table-top lorry, as in this case, carried 20 to 30 passengers and some of our finest types of Australians were killed in an accident. The board must see that people who carry on a service are adequately protected, and there must be protection for the passengers.

Mr. Macgillivray—The Minister is confusing the whole issue. There is no question of hire. This man did a neighbourly act by taking the boys home on his truck when they could not get home in any other way.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Over a period of years this has been proved to be a debatable matter. The board accepted the explanation of the man that he did not intend to take anyone except his son, but the inspector said the man did not know what to do because he had promised to take the other boys home. The board says that there were a number of hauliers who issued papers saying that no fare was being paid, that passengers accepted all responsibility, and that the owner of the vehicle was not responsible in the event of an accident. To show to what extent this practice had developed, the board had a truck intercepted at Port Pirie. There were five people on it, and in answer to questions the owner said that none of them had paid fares and were being carried free. On being interrogated four of the passengers substantiated the statement that they had paid no fare. The fifth passenger on interrogation said he was a mounted constable and had paid a fare of 5s. for the ride. When the owner was confronted with the mounted constable she denied that a fare had been paid, and in the case that was held she still pleaded not guilty, but changed her plea to one of guilty after evidence for the complainant had been heard. In the case under review the father of the boy did not accept a fare, but on the face of it he was contravening the Act. On being questioned he was told that all he had to do to get a permit was

to ring Mr. McMillan, the chairman of the board. The Act says there can be no carriage of passengers without a permit. Why should a man with a son in uniform be above the law? He said, "I understand Mr. McMillan is in Melbourne."

Mr. Macgillivray—He did not say that. I said it.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—At the time Mr. McMillan was not in Melbourne. The honourable member said he was on railway business, but he was not on such business in either Victoria or South Australia. He could have been contacted, but the man said he would pay the fine, which was nothing but complete disregard for the law.

Mr. Macgillivray—Let us alter the law.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Why alter the law because one man will not observe it? Is that a good reason?

Mr. Macgillivray—I say it is a silly law.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—It is not a silly law. It was designed to protect not only the railways but the man who provides the service as against the pirate who comes in on any odd occasion when it suits him. Moreover, in this case it is not the railways, because they were not involved, but there is a licensed operator who has a franchise and he had to be protected. The board says there was no occasion whatever when anybody was refused the right to travel, and it made provision in conformity with the requirements of the service. If those who have the franchise are not protected and consequently forced out of business, in future there may not always be a man with a son in the camp who is prepared to do it, and the boys will be left stranded. The whole object of the Act is to provide for the safety of the passenger and require those who ply for hire to accept responsibility, and it is useless to say they do not charge. Supposing a man who was the sole support of a family had been killed. What great benefit would the community get because he had not paid any fare? It would still have to maintain his family. The honourable member brings forward one illustration, and because, on a certain day, someone was questioned he wants to alter the Act and throw it wide open. I know it is his intention to bring the Act into disrepute and ridicule—

Mr. Macgillivray—The Minister has no justification for saying that.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—My justification is the honourable member's demeanour in the whole matter. By interjection he said it is the worst thing we have. Every commission we have set up has said that the control should be continued and extended. The first was presided over by Mr. (now Sir William) Goodman, and it suggested the complete control of all transport. Following that we had a commission consisting of Mr. Justice Reed, at that time a prominent lawyer in the city, as chairman, Mr. Murray Fowler, today chairman of Elder, Smith & Co. and a prominent business man, who certainly could not be regarded as having the railways at heart, Mr. Shillabeer, a farmer, and Mr. (now Sir Keith) Angas, afterwards chairman of the Stock-owners' Association. The only Government nominee was Mr. Wainwright, the then Auditor-General. Although they first said they believed that the whole thing should be wiped out their report shows that the more they went into it, the more they came to the conclusion that the control should be continued and extended, and that was their final recommendation. The Transport Control Board therefore is not operating under a scheme of things which is arbitrarily in the interests of the railways. Here was a commission antagonistic to control of any description, but finally recommending an extension of it. The board did no more on this occasion than question whether the man should carry these boys and under what authority. In the vernacular he told them "You can do what you like, but I am taking these boys." He was told to inquire, by telephone, from the Chairman of the Board, but he did not even do that, merely giving his name and address and saying he would pay the fine. With a good deal of grace and courtesy the Board accepted his explanation that he was not plying for hire, and nothing further was done. The boys concerned were in duty bound to attend the camp and provision had been made for their return on the week-end.

Mr. Macgillivray—That is not correct.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The honourable member cannot deny it.

Mr. Macgillivray—Otherwise the father would not have come down to take his son back.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—He would not have known in advance that it was not the case.

Mr. Macgillivray—His father rang him up.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—He may not have known that provision was made, but even so, what of it? The board has never refused a permit and on this occasion permits had been granted to travel from Woodside to the Upper Murray areas, and it has always been done by the people running the proper service.

Mr. Macgillivray—At that time the lads could not pay the cost of the road service.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I thought the road service was such a magnificent institution that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! The Standing Orders do not allow interjections. I do not want to be too narrow in my interpretation of them, but when it comes to a dialogue between the Minister and a private member we are getting a long way outside Standing Orders. I ask the Minister to address the Chair.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I agree, though the dialogue was not of my creation. Emphatically, and in conclusion, I say— (1) There is no necessity for the Bill; (2) a permit has not been refused; (3) on this occasion the person supposed to be affected did not suffer any disability; (4) he was discourteous and would not even put in a telephone call for a permit; (5) the board was acting in conformity with its rights, privileges and duties; (6) it was under an obligation to see that the person was properly equipped; and (7) unless the House wants to bring the whole thing into ridicule, it will not pass this Bill. Adequate provision has been made for the transport of national servicemen on leave, and any troops taking advantage of a free ride with a lorry driver are not covered in case of accident. If something happened to them the board would be blamed. I oppose the Bill for, if it were passed, many people might suffer.

Mr. FLETCHER secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE INCORPORATION BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the Hon. T. PLAYFORD and read a first time.

#### RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COM- PANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### PUBLIC OFFICERS' SALARIES BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### URANIUM MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee's report adopted.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE'S REPORTS.

The Deputy Speaker laid on the table reports by the Public Works Standing Committee on the Mount Gambier East and Mansfield Park primary schools. Ordered to be printed.

#### METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Minister of Agriculture), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act, 1936-1948. Read a first time.

#### ILLNESS OF HON. F. J. CONDON.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—In moving that remaining Orders of the Day be Orders of the Day for tomorrow, I express to members of the Labor Party and to the family of the Leader of the Opposition

in the Legislative Council (Hon. F. J. Condon) the sympathy of the Government and its supporters at the honourable member's illness and express the hope that he will soon be fully recovered. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to accept these wishes on behalf of my Party.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)—Although regretting the cir-

cumstances, I shall be delighted to accept the Premier's kindly remarks and convey them to the honourable member's family. I have been informed that Mr. Condon was admitted to Calvary Hospital this afternoon.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 25, at 2 p.m.